



COUNCIL

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

Wednesday, 23 November 2022
at 6.30 pm
Hackney Town Hall,
Mare Street, E8 1EA

Live stream link: https://youtu.be/xPctMck__c

Backup link: <https://youtu.be/wHTn68UyzeM>

Mark Carroll
Chief Executive
15 November 2022
www.hackney.gov.uk

Contact :Natalie Williams
Governance Officer
governance@hackney.gov.uk

MEETING OF COUNCIL WEDNESDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 2022 ORDER OF BUSINESS

1 The Mayor's Civic Awards

Following nominations, three individuals and three organisations will be recognised for their contribution to the lives of Hackney residents.

2 Apologies for Absence

3 Deputy Speaker's Announcements

4 Declarations of Interest

Members are invited to consider the guidance which accompanies this agenda and make declarations as appropriate.

5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 17 - 50)

To consider the minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Council on 26 October 2022

6 Petition

Hackney Council should urgently reconsider their plans for motorcycle and scooter parking charges, or risk devastating impacts to the lives and livelihoods of riders and those who rely on them.

We are extremely concerned about the effects that these changes will have on riders who live and work in Hackney. We believe that the proposals will be detrimental to the economy and life of Hackney. These changes are disproportionate, unjustified and not evidence based.

Our concerns include:

1. **Damage to the economy of Hackney and the livelihoods of those who work in Hackney**

The proposed parking charges will make it impossible for many riders to work or visit businesses in Hackney. This includes commuters, delivery riders and

couriers, but also volunteer riders who provide vital support to the NHS, such as Blood Bikers or the Bike Shed Community Response.

Around half of all motorcycle journeys are for commuting, however the proposals will make it impossible for most who commute into Hackney by motorcycle or scooter to continue to do so. For riders who are able to continue to commute the £6 an hour costs could add up to £13,800 over a year.

It's a mistake to assume that in all cases walking, cycling or public transport offer a viable alternative. Many riders tell us that as a result of these charges they would be forced to give up working in Hackney, or move to live in another borough. This will impact not only these individuals but the economy of Hackney.

2. The proposals are disproportionate and unfair to riders

The evidence presented by the Council doesn't support the changes. Charging motorcycles and scooters the same amount as cars fails to meet the Council's duties of fairness and proportionality. It fails to account for the amount of space motorcycles take up, the fact that motorcycles do not cause congestion, or the lower levels of pollution they produce.

With the increasing popularity of new micro-mobility modes it makes no sense to treat motorcycles and scooters as equivalent to cars, when in reality they are more similar to other 2-wheeled modes. An electric motorcycle for example has similar impacts to an e-scooter or cargo bike, but their riders are penalised under these proposals just for having a licence and number plate.

3. Lack of appropriate consultation or evidence

Many riders who would be affected by these new charges have not been aware of the consultations about them. We are extremely concerned that the changes will go ahead without reasonable engagement with those who it will affect the most. In addition, the Council's evidence base used to support these charges is flawed, and shows a fundamental misunderstanding of motorcycles' overall behaviour and impact. For example it relies on the false belief that motorcycles and scooters are worse for air quality than cars, based on unreliable research which compares 30 year old motorcycles and scooters without catalytic converters with 20 year old cars with catalytic converters.

Hackney Council should reconsider their plans in light of the facts about motorcycle and scooter use

Motorcycling is a transport mode relied on by a diverse range of people, including nurses, doctors, couriers, delivery riders, business owners and volunteers. Those who use motorcycles and scooters, due to the nature or

length of their journey, often cannot reasonably use other means of transport. For many, a motorcycle or scooter is the only affordable option for their travel needs.

On a per km basis motorcycles and scooters produce significantly lower emissions than cars of CO2 and key pollutants such as NOx, PM10 and PM2.5. Motorcycles and scooters also do not contribute to congestion, and therefore their use has the effect overall of reducing emissions from other vehicles. The fact that 8 motorcycles can park in a single car bay frees up kerbside space for other uses, further easing congestion, or allowing it to be converted to space for walking, cycling or leisure.

Not all trips can be replaced by walking, cycling or public transport. For those that can't, motorcycles and scooters are the best alternative to cars. Instead of seeking to unfairly punish riders. Hackney should follow the example of other Councils in recognising the value of incentivising motorcycles and scooters over car use, as a means to meet their air quality and climate change

A copy of the petition can be viewed at:

<https://www.change.org/p/stop-plans-for-new-motorcycle-and-scooter-parking-charges-in-hackney-savehackneymc>

Lead petitioner: Ben Pearson

7 Questions from Members of the Public

The deadline for questions from members of the public is 12 noon, four clear working days before the meeting (Wednesday, 16 November). If you wish to submit a question you can do so by emailing governance@hackney.gov.uk or via the Council's website: <https://hackney.gov.uk/menu#get-involved-council-decisions>

A supplementary agenda setting out any public questions received after the publication of the main agenda will be circulated shortly after this deadline.

8 Questions from Members of the Council

8.1 From Cllr Garbett to the Mayoral Adviser for Older People and Carers

Hackney has the largest amount of unclaimed pension credit in London. What has the Council done in the past to address this and what are you doing to address this now?

8.2 From Cllr Troughton to the Mayor

One in four Hackney residents rely on buses as their main means of transport including many in King's Park, where there are already very high levels of deprivation, that depend heavily on the 236 and 242. With the Government failing to invest in sustainable and affordable public transport, Transport for London's proposals would leave many King's Park residents even more isolated and poorer. Can the Mayor please update us on his campaign to save our buses, so we can report back to the thousand or more residents who signed the petition calling for a sustainable and affordable way to travel?

8.3 From Cllr Binnie-Lubbock to the Mayoral Adviser for Private Rented Sector and Housing Affordability

Many residents who are private renters are reporting real difficulties with the cost of living and in particular private rent increases. Can the Mayor's Advisor for Private Renting and Affordability share with the Council the work she has been doing in recent months to address these concerns?

8.4 From Cllr Patrick to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service

Hackney residents are struggling with the rising cost of living – mortgage payments, rent, food, and household bills are all rising. What is the Council doing to support residents in light of the financial crisis and what support is it receiving from central government in order to help?

8.5 From Cllr Walker to Cabinet Member for Housing Services and Resident participation

The Council's draft Resident Engagement Strategy (2022-25) has pledged to create a residents-first culture at the heart of our housing service. Following consultation, how will the strategy ensure resident voice and participation across different tenures to drive improvements and ensure that poverty, social isolation and poor health are tackled head-on?

8.6 From Cllr Desmond to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Delivery, Inclusive Economy & Regeneration

Hackney Downs Councillors have been campaigning to protect Kidzmania children's soft play centre, which is threatened by development by Peabody Housing Association. How can the Council help protect this popular centre and persuade Peabody to adapt their plans to ensure it survives and prospers?

8.7 From Cllr Ogundemuren to the Cabinet Member for Employment, Human Resources and Equalities

Given the cost of living crisis, public sector workers need a pay rise. Can the Cabinet Member give an update on the 2022 / 2023 pay claim made by the unions and when does she expect staff to see an increase?

8.8 From Cllr Oguzkanli to the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Culture

Can the Cabinet Member give assurances that the Council will work with partners and stakeholders to make sure that the future of St Leonard's hospital remains a fully comprehensive health service aimed at providing much-needed health services in Hackney?

9 Elected Mayor's Statement

10 Strategic Plan: Enclosed (Pages 51 - 99)
Group Director: Chief Executive

11 Pensions Committee Annual Report: Enclosed (Pages 101 - 117)
Group Director: Finance and Corporate Resources

12 Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report: Enclosed (Pages 119 - 182)
Group Director: Chief Executive

13 Motions

13a Cash Welcome Here (Cashwelcomehere#)

Hackney Council notes:

Since the pandemic, shops and services increasingly only accept cards as a method of payment. According to Which, around 1 in 5 consumers have been stopped from making cash payments.

So far this financial year, 1 in 3 payments made at the Council's Self Service Payment Centre were cash payments. A record £3.32 billion in cash deposits and withdrawals were handled at Post Office's branches in July 2022, and they report that personal cash withdrawals are up 20% since last year.

Going cash-free excludes many people.

1. People on lower incomes often rely on cash and avoid cards as they may be waiting for payday, trying not to bounce a direct debit or worrying

about going into an overdraft — average overdraft rates have recently increased from 12.34% to 27%. Cash is more easily ring fenced.

2. Older people often struggle to use cards and fear associated scams.
3. Children learn the value of money by using coins and notes.
4. Staff in many cash-free businesses interviewed by Victoria Councillors confirmed that cash machines often fail, and then cash is temporarily accepted.
5. Staff often receive a smaller share of tips on cards.
6. Between 1.3 and 2 million UK adults do not have a bank account. This figure includes refugees and homeless people without the documents to get a bank account. A cash-free society could be devastating for them.
7. People leaving abusive partners often need to hide money away, leaving no trace.

As more shops go cash-free, the options dwindle for those who need to use cash. No one has voted for this and it has not appeared in any manifesto.

The government has promised to protect access to cash in the Financial Services and Markets Bill, but not to mandate cash acceptance.

Hackney Council therefore commits to:

- Establishing Hackney as a #cashwelcomehere borough, supporting the campaign started in Victoria Ward, and promoting an inclusive economy by encouraging local businesses and ensuring that council-run facilities accept cash and other payment methods.
- Lobbying the Government to include a mandate for businesses to accept cash in the Financial Services and Markets Bill.

Proposer: Cllr Clare Joseph

Seconder: Cllr Penny Wrout

13b Climate and Ecology Bill

Hackney Council notes:

- That in June 2019, Hackney Council declared a climate emergency and committed to become a net zero carbon borough by 2040 and is developing a climate action plan to achieve this.

Hackney Council also notes:

- The work of Hackney Council to reduce carbon emissions, reverse biodiversity decline and tackle toxic air pollution

- That in 2022, Hackney has again been a Healthy Streets Scorecard leader with 70% of suitable streets covered by a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN), the top score, and School Street schemes at 45% of all schools covered, the highest total number
- That there is a Bill before Parliament—the Climate and Ecology Bill according to which the Government must develop an emergency strategy to limit global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees celsius above pre-industrial levels
- That less than 5% of Hackney's carbon emissions are from the Council's corporate operations and buildings
- That the Council cannot tackle the climate emergency alone and the Conservative Government needs to step up with a plan to reach net-zero carbon emissions much sooner than the current target of 2050
- The lack of ambition shown by the Conservative Government since 2010 in tackling the climate emergency
- That many other London councils have joined the UK100 network of highly ambitious local government leaders and it is the Hackney Council's intention to bring forward its net zero target to 2030 so it can join the UK100 network.

Hackney Council further notes:

- The Climate and Ecology Bill requires that the UK to play its fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial temperatures; and
 - ensures that all the UK's consumption emissions are accounted for;
 - protects and restores biodiverse habitats along overseas supply chains;
 - restores and regenerates the UK's depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, maximising their capacity to absorb CO₂ and their resistance to climate heating and flooding;
 - sets up an independent Citizens' Assembly, representative of the UK's population, to engage with Parliament and Government on these issues

Therefore, Hackney Council resolves to:

- Support the Climate and Ecology Bill;
- Write to Diane Abbott MP and Meg Hillier MP letting them know that this motion has been passed — urging Meg Hillier MP to sign up to support the Bill, and thanking Diane Abbott MP for already doing so; and
- Write to Zero Hour, the organisers of the cross-party campaign for the Bill, expressing the Council's support.

Further, Hackney Council pledges to:

- Continue to assess our largest impacts on the climate and ecology, prioritise where action needs to be taken and measure and monitor progress towards clear targets
- Reduce our emissions at source and limit the use of carbon offsets as part of the global effort to avoid the worst impacts of the climate crisis;
- Work with residents and our local business, voluntary, community & faith organisations, groups and public sector bodies to cut the emissions generated by non-Council sources in the borough, promoting and incentivising efforts to reduce their carbon footprint
- Engage residents with a genuine climate assembly, made up of a representative group with real power to steer the council's climate environmental work and with areas of devolved decision making responsibility.
- Write to the Secretary of State for Education to ask for their support for a Nature Premium to guarantee regular time in nature for all children and young people, with additional funding and support to level up those with the least access to nature as advocated for by the Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Proposer: Cllr. Alastair Binnie-Lubbock

Seconder: Cllr. Zoë Garbett

13c Fireworks and Sky Lanterns

Hackney Council notes:

- Fireworks can be a source of significant problems, fear and distress for many animals. They can cause psychological distress and injuries as animals attempt to run away or hide from the noise.
- The noise generated by fireworks has been found to be the most common cause for fear responses in dogs. The loud and sudden noise can also be a trigger for PTSD-related symptoms in humans. The debris can also pose a hazard to other animals.
- The short-lived nature of firework noise can make it difficult for the police or local authority officers to pinpoint locations and take action.
- Fireworks can be a risk to public safety when lit in small garden spaces in which people of all ages including children can be injured and there is a risk to fire safety for private and public property.
- In October 2022, fireworks were let off into a large crowd of people at Stratford shopping centre. Over the years, there have been a number of incidents involving fireworks in Hackney including a two year old sustaining burns.

- Fireworks and sparklers are only permissible for purchase from registered sellers for private use on selected dates of the year including: 15th October to 10th November, between 26th to 31st December, 3 days before Diwali and 3 days before Chinese New Year. It is possible to purchase fireworks outside of the dates above but only from retailers with a specific licence.
- An estimated 200,000 sky lanterns are released every year in the UK. As the popularity of sky lanterns increases, so too does the risk to animals and the environment.
- Sky lanterns are a danger to animals, a fire risk, an aviation hazard and a litter nuisance. When ingested, sharp parts can cause internal bleeding in animals. Animals can become entangled in fallen lantern frames and suffer from injury or stress trying to free themselves, and sometimes starve to death from being trapped.
- In Wales, sky lantern releases are banned on council-owned land and property. In other countries, sky lantern release is considered environmentally irresponsible and classed as a crime. In England, although almost 200 councils have voluntarily banned sky lanterns on council-owned land, it remains legal to release paper lanterns.

Hackney Council therefore resolves:

- To require the advertisement of all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries well in advance of the event.
- To actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people and measures to mitigate the risks. (As examples of possibilities: a public campaign of Rocket 'o'Clock having people fire them at the same time so the impact is shorter. It could even be a campaign on sharing food rather than sharing fireworks (The council may have other ideas and is not expected to use these examples if a better resolution is found)
- To encourage local firework suppliers to stock 'quieter' fireworks (less than 70 dB) for public and private display.
- To only use 'quieter' fireworks (less than 70 dB) in all council funded firework displays.
- To not issue special licences to retailers that allow them to sell fireworks outside the following dates: 15th October to 10th November, between 26th to 31st December, 3 days before Diwali and 3 days before Chinese New Year.
- To ban the release of sky lanterns on Hackney Council owned land and discourage their release anywhere in Hackney.

Hackney Council further resolves to write to the UK Government and urge it:

- To introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 70dB for those sold to the public for private display.

- To ban the release of sky lanterns on public and private land, in line with the Civil Aviation Authority to ensure public safety around airports.

Proposer: Cllr. Zoë Garbett

Seconded: Cllr. Alastair Binnie-Lubbock

Dates of Future Meetings

Members are requested to note the dates of Full Council meetings for 2022/23. All meetings of Full Council will commence at 7.00pm and are scheduled as follows:

- 25 January 2023
- 1 March 2023
- 17 May 2023 (Annual Meeting)

Public Attendance

Following the lifting of all Covid-19 restrictions by the Government and the Council updating its assessment of access to its buildings, the Town Hall is now open to the public and members of the public may attend meetings of the Council.

We recognise, however, that you may find it more convenient to observe the meeting via the live-stream facility, the link for which appears on the agenda front sheet.

We would ask that if you have either tested positive for Covid-19 or have any symptoms that you do not attend the meeting, but rather use the livestream facility. If this applies and you are attending the meeting to ask a question, make a deputation or present a petition then you may contact the Officer named at the beginning of the Agenda and they will be able to make arrangements for the Chair of the meeting to ask the question, make the deputation or present the petition on your behalf.

The Council will continue to ensure that access to our meetings is in line with any Covid-19 restrictions that may be in force from time to time and also in line with public health advice. The latest general advice can be found here - <https://hackney.gov.uk/coronavirus-support>

Rights of Press and Public to Report on Meetings

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 give the public the right to film, record audio, take photographs, and use social media and the internet at meetings to report on any meetings that are open to the public.

By attending a public meeting of the Council, Executive, any committee or sub-committee, any Panel or Commission, or any Board you are agreeing to these guidelines as a whole and in particular the stipulations listed below:

- Anyone planning to record meetings of the Council and its public meetings through any audio, visual or written methods they find appropriate can do so providing they do not disturb the conduct of the meeting;
- You are welcome to attend a public meeting to report proceedings, either in 'real time' or after conclusion of the meeting, on a blog, social networking site, news forum or other online media;
- You may use a laptop, tablet device, smartphone or portable camera to record a written or audio transcript of proceedings during the meeting;
- Facilities within the Town Hall and Council Chamber are limited and recording equipment must be of a reasonable size and nature to be easily accommodated.
- You are asked to contact the Officer whose name appears at the beginning of this Agenda if you have any large or complex recording equipment to see whether this can be accommodated within the existing facilities;
- You must not interrupt proceedings and digital equipment must be set to 'silent' mode;
- You should focus any recording equipment on 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 to respect the wishes of those who do not want to be filmed and photographed may result in the Chair instructing you to cease reporting or recording and you may potentially be excluded from the meeting if you fail to comply;

- Any person whose behaviour threatens to disrupt orderly conduct will be asked to leave;
- Be aware that libellous comments against the council, individual Councillors or officers could result in legal action being taken against you;
- The recorded images must not be edited in a way in which there is a clear aim to distort the truth or misrepresent those taking part in the proceedings;
- Personal attacks of any kind or offensive comments that target or disparage any ethnic, racial, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability status could also result in legal action being taken against you.

Failure to comply with the above requirements may result in the support and assistance of the Council in the recording of proceedings being withdrawn. The Council regards violation of any of the points above as a risk to the orderly conduct of a meeting. The Council therefore reserves the right to exclude any person from the current meeting and refuse entry to any further council meetings, where a breach of these requirements occurs. The Chair of the meeting will ensure that the meeting runs in an effective manner and has the power to ensure that the meeting is not disturbed through the use of flash photography, intrusive camera equipment or the person recording the meeting moving around the room.

Advice to Members on Declaring Interests

If you require advice on declarations of interests, this can be obtained from:

- The Monitoring Officer;
- The Deputy Monitoring Officer; or
- The legal adviser to the meeting.

It is recommended that any advice be sought in advance of, rather than at, the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs)

You will have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (*DPI) if it:

- Relates to your employment, sponsorship, contracts as well as wider financial interests and assets including land, property, licenses and corporate tenancies.
- Relates to an interest which you have registered in that part of the Register of Interests form relating to DPIs as being an interest of you, your spouse or civil partner, or anyone living with you as if they were your spouse or civil partner.
- Relates to an interest which should be registered in that part of the Register of Interests form relating to DPIs, but you have not yet done so.

If you are present at any meeting of the Council and you have a DPI relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you **must**:

- Not seek to improperly influence decision-making on that matter;
- Make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of the DPI at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent; and
- Leave the room whilst the matter is under consideration

You **must not**:

- Participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business; or
- Participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

If you have obtained a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer or Standards Committee prior to the matter being considered, then you should make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of the DPI and that you have obtained a dispensation. The dispensation granted will explain the extent to which you are able to participate.

Other Registrable Interests

You will have an 'Other Registrable Interest' (ORI) in a matter if it

- Relates to appointments made by the authority to any outside bodies, membership of: charities, trade unions,, lobbying or campaign groups, voluntary organisations in the borough or governorships at any educational institution within the borough.
- Relates to an interest which you have registered in that part of the Register of Interests form relating to ORIs as being an interest of you, your spouse or civil partner, or anyone living with you as if they were your spouse or civil partner; or
- Relates to an interest which should be registered in that part of the Register of Interests form relating to ORIs, but you have not yet done so.

Where a matter arises at any meeting of the Council which affects a body or organisation you have named in that part of the Register of Interests Form relating to ORIs, **you must** make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of the DPI at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. **You may** speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

Disclosure of Other Interests

Where a matter arises at any meeting of the Council which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you **must** disclose the interest. **You may** speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

Where a matter arises at any meeting of the Council which **affects** your financial interest or well-being, or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate to a greater extent than it affects the financial interest or wellbeing of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest, you **must** declare the interest. You **may** only speak on the matter if members of the public are able to speak. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or voting on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

In all cases, where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that the interest in question is a **sensitive interest**, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest itself.

This page is intentionally left blank



j
London Borough of Hackney
Extraordinary Full Council Meeting
Municipal Year 2022/23
Date of Meeting: Wednesday, 26 October 2022

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Councillors in Attendance: | <p> Cllr Humaira Garasia - Speaker of Hackney Mayor Philip Glanville - Mayor of Hackney </p> <p> Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Grace Adebayo, Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Frank Baffour, Cllr Alastair Binnie-Lubbock, Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Zoë Garbett, Cllr Eluzer Goldberg, Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Shaul Krautwirt, Cllr Lee Laudat-Scott, Cllr Hershy Lisser, Cllr Anna Lynch, Cllr Yvonne Maxwell, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren, Cllr Ozsen, Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Fliss Premru, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Caroline Selman, Cllr Anya Sizer, Cllr Gilbert Smyth, Cllr Simche Steinberger, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, Cllr Lynne Troughton, Cllr Claudia Turbet-Delof, Cllr Joe Walker, Cllr Jessica Webb, Cllr Caroline Woodley, Cllr Penny Wrout and Cllr Sarah Young </p> |
| | |
| Apologies for Absence: | <p> Cllr Billington, Cllr Hayhurst, Cllr Moema, Deputy Mayor Nicholson, Cllr Oguzkanli, Cllr Pallis, Cllr Race, Cllr Ross, Cllr Sadek and Cllr Williams. </p> |
| Apologies for Lateness: | <p> Cllr Selman and Cllr Potter </p> |
| | |
| Officer Contact: | <p> Natalie Williams, Senior Governance Officer governance@hackney.gov.uk </p> |
| <p> This meeting was live streamed and can be viewed here: https://youtu.be/xPctMck__c </p> | |

Councillor Garasia [Speaker] in the Chair

1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Mayor Nicholson and Councillors Bllington, Hayhurst, Moema, Oguzkanli, Pallis, Race, Ross, Sadek and Williams.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Selman and Potter.

2. Speaker's Announcements

- 2.1 The Speaker informed Council of recent civic events and visits, which included:

- A visit to Hoxton market and Chatsworth Road Market .
- Leading tours for schools and community groups
- A visit to the Brady Club archive
- Joined Junior Safety Officers programme at a primary school
- Hosted Hackney Older Citizens at the Town Hall
- The Act of Hope and remembrance service at St Paul's Church
- Hackney Youth Parliament Resources launch
- Fame Star Youth Black History Month event at the Edge Youth Club
- Diwali celebrations
- Clapton Community Feast celebrating Black History Month with the older residents of Hackney
- An intergenerational Silver Sunday fun day at St Mary's Secret Garden

- 2.2 The Speaker invited Members to a Christmas panto event which she was hosting on the 21st December. Tickets could be booked via the Speaker's Office.

3. Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Cllr Adejare declared an interest in relation to the deputation at agenda item 5 by virtue of the fact that her sibling was a member of the campaign group Morning Lane People's Space who were presenting a deputation.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 4.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the previous meeting of Council held on 14 September 2022 be agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

5. Deputation

At July's Full Council meeting, Councillor Garbett asked about the plans for 55 Morning Lane following the end of the Option Agreement. In this deputation we will focus on a different aspect of planning for the site: the need for transparency, openness and accountability. After a failed and poorly constructed Option Agreement there has been a breakdown of trust between Hackney Council and local residents about the future of the site. Essential to addressing this is to be open about what has happened up to now.

We demand that our Council make public: the un-redacted Option Agreement, any checks that were done on Hackney Walk before entering into an agreement with them, and all the pre-application exchanges between the Council and Hackney Walk. As well as rebuilding trust, this will enable residents to engage fully with the process and to hold our Council to account.

We also demand that our Council make public and discuss at the Full Council meeting the reports that informed the Option Agreement including any viability studies or other reasoning that contributed to the decision to set a target of 20% affordable housing on the site.

Deputation leader: Heather Mendick

Councillor introduction: Cllr Clare Joseph

- 5.1 Cllr Joseph introduced the deputation. It was highlighted that residents overwhelmingly wanted to see social housing and the retention of a supermarket in any new development plans for the site. She implored the Council to be transparent in decisions going forward and to investigate different funding streams in order to provide the maximum level of social housing.
- 5.2 Adam Forman, Margaret Trotter, Pat Quigley and Heather Mendick addressed the chamber. They stated that there was a lack of transparency and scrutiny of the failed options agreement with Hackney Walk. A survey which they carried out showed that local residents wanted any future development plans to include a supermarket akin to that already on the site as well as affordable council housing. Concerns were raised that following the lapsed options agreement, the Council would sell to private developers. They informed Members that they had created a financial viability study to build low rent homes as well as commercial and retail space for rent on the site. The study (undertaken by students on a Planning Masters programme at University College London) showed it was viable to build a development with 50 percent or more council housing. Requests were made to speak with the Council's quantity surveyor and housing officers to discuss MOPS' proposals and to see the basis for any contrary proposals. Concluding, it was stated the Council needed to acknowledge there had been a breakdown in trust with residents. To rebuild this trust, it was requested that the priorities of local residents be embedded in any future plans for the site.
- 5.3 Following questions from Members, Heather Mendick stated that a Freedom of Information request was made as set out in the deputation text. It was felt that commercial sensitivity was outweighed by the level of public interest and was no longer relevant as the deal had collapsed. She did not believe that the lapsed options agreement was an opportunity for a fresh start unless there was openness about what had gone wrong and transparency and accountability going forward. Homerton ward Councillors were encouraged to engage with the campaign to codesign a suggested way forward.

Mayor Glanville's Response

- 5.4 Mayor Glanville emphasised his administration's commitment to listening to the views of local people and disputed that the options agreement was poorly constructed and lacked transparency. He believed that, while it failed, ultimately

it always sought to manage risk and protect the interests of the Council and the community.

- 5.5 The Mayor reported that there were no plans to sell the site. The intention was to commence a competitive procurement process with an experienced developer that could work with the Council and community. He believed that it was possible to deliver on an exciting collective vision for the site, based on the priorities of the community.
- 5.6 The Mayor explained that the options agreement and pre-application correspondence was confidential and exempt from disclosure under FOI legislation. The Council remained bound by the confidentiality wording in the agreement for a further seven years, which was normal and accepted practice for such agreements. The Council could not release the option agreement without the risk of legal action at the expense of the council tax payer. Assurances were given that extensive due diligence checks were undertaken on Hackney Walk and Dukeminster to comply with the Council's legal and financial obligations.
- 5.7 It was explained that the 20% affordable housing level set out in the option agreement was the minimum level of affordable housing required to be met in any development scheme at the time. This was set by the London Plan under the previous Conservative Mayor of London. The Mayor advised that a new 35% affordable housing target had since been implemented by Sadiq Khan, Labour Mayor of London. Any plans for the site would require to be in line with the Council's planning policy and be subject to planning permission.
- 5.8 It was stated that on average it costs between £350,000 to £400,000 to build a new Council home. 450 homes on the site at 100% Council rent before anything else was built would cost £180m. This would be the baseline for any modelling. It was confirmed that as there was not a current scheme proposed, there were no viability studies.
- 5.9 Concluding, the Mayor committed to prioritise the delivery of genuinely affordable housing. He committed to pursue every option to fund this and work with partners to deliver on a supermarket. He pledged to use the site to benefit Hackney Central and the borough, delivering housing, workspaces, opportunities for businesses, more jobs and high-quality and greener public spaces. The development of the site would be underpinned by the views of the community.

6. Questions from Members of the Public

6.1 From Debbie Anyo (AFRUCA Safeguarding Children) to the Mayoral Adviser for Housing Needs and Homelessness

What is the Council doing to address the growing cases of housing needs in families with no recourse to public funds, the impact on children in these families and temporary accommodation outside the borough.

In the absence of Debbie Anyo the Speaker read the question as set out, following which a response was provided by the Cabinet Member.

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

Deputy Mayor Bramble advised that there was a team dedicated to supporting children living with parents/carers with no recourse to public funds, who struggled to meet their children's needs due to this status. The No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) and the Private Fostering Team also offered support to children living in private fostering arrangements. The team endeavoured to resolve immigration issues as quickly as possible. As a result of the commissioning contract with Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network, families were offered timely access to immigration advice and support.

The Council had been supporting each family for just under one year. The families supported by the team were from a diverse range of backgrounds with 6 new families referred to the team for a Child and Family Assessment in the past month.

Over the past 5 years, the number of families that required accommodation and/or subsistence support through the NRPF and Private Fostering team at any one time had decreased. It was found that this was primarily related to the support received and subsequent resolution of their immigration status. As of September 2022, the team were supporting 50 families, with 79 children between them, with no recourse to public funds, with accommodation and/or subsistence, or other support needs related to their status. Support offered to those living outside the borough included assistance with registering with local GPs and maintaining links with Hackney services.

6.2 From Helen Lewis to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Recently Hackney Central has been targeted by graffiti such that the Narrow Way is now a disgrace. This is particularly evident on the shop shutters when they are down. Shouldn't the Council take responsibility for cleaning our civic centre and not leave it to individual shop owners?

In the absence of Helen Lewis the Speaker read the question as set out, following which a response was provided by the Cabinet Member.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Cllr Coban explained that the Council was committed to reducing and removing undesirable graffiti, and considered any graffiti on buildings and other structures without the owner's consent to be an interference with the property owner's rights. The Council's Graffiti Removal Service responded to reported graffiti issues from internal colleagues and from members of the public (via email, phone or the Fix My Streets app). The service also worked proactively to identify graffiti and carry out removal work, where possible. Where graffiti was deemed to be offensive, removal could take place within 24 hours where possible.

Cllr Coban explained the potential complexity of graffiti removal, the different methods used and measures to ensure its safe removal with no damage to surrounding property or infrastructure. For complex jobs, there was a charge to businesses and removal was subject to the property owner's permission, by

way of a signed disclaimer. Without this, the Council was unable to remove graffiti. In addition, depending on the shutter type there was a possible risk of flooding in particular basement areas of premises.

In reference to the Narrow Way, the graffiti team had already attended the site, and the shutters on these businesses would not withstand the Council's graffiti removal jet washers without incurring damage. The businesses would need to respray their shutters to remove the graffiti. The Council reserved the right to take formal action against owners to secure removal. Should business owners not comply, the Council could remove the graffiti and recover the costs from the owner.

The Speaker decided to vary the order of public questions and prioritise questions from those who were present in the chamber and remotely.

6.9 From Catherine Cannon to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Given the climate emergency and Hackney Borough Council's stated aim to reduce their emissions, will the council consider committing to serving fully plant-based fare at any future catered meetings and events as other councils have done?

This question was asked by Louisa Hillwood who was in attendance in the chamber.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Cllr Coban advised that on Monday, 24 October 2022, Cabinet approved the draft Hackney Climate Action Plan (CAP) for public consultation. He explained that as part of the draft CAP, the Council would be looking at reducing emissions from food as well as promoting sustainable diets to residents and encouraging climate friendly menus to schools and care services.

Cllr Coban stated that input from residents and various stakeholders would be very welcome as part of the CAP consultation process. He believed that in order to reach Net Zero by 2030 and to tackle the climate crisis, a wider look at lifestyle choices including travel and dress would also need to be explored.

It was reported that Hackney was leading on work relating to food emissions as part of the One World Living, consumption based emission work from London Councils. A workshop with fifteen other boroughs was recently held in Hackney Town Hall to encourage London boroughs to increase plant based meals as part of their procurement processes, as well as reducing food waste from contractors and increasing agro-ecological sourced food.

Supplementary Question

What is the timeline for the CAP and food emissions work?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Cllr Coban explained that a Climate Emergency was declared in 2019 and the Council had been a leading forerunner with regard to this. The Council had

recently won the Local Government Chronicle national award for its response to climate change. He advised of the intention to bring together a strategic framework across the Council which encompassed low carbon development, transport, and food emissions. The CAP would include not only Council areas of responsibility but also actions that local people could take to assist in tackling climate change. A 3 year detailed implementation plan would be put in place to assist. Cllr Coban highlighted the importance of responding during the 10 week consultation period as this would inform how best to deliver commitments and ensure an ambitious pioneering CAP.

6.3 From Larry Keegan to the Cabinet Member for Housing Services and Resident Participation

How can the Council justify leaving a community flat on Warburton Estate empty, especially with 3 community halls in walking distance available for TRA meetings? Apart from the loss of revenue, it deprives a family of a home.

In the absence of Larry Keegan, the Speaker read the question as set out, following which a response was provided by the Cabinet Member.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Housing Services and Resident Participation

Cllr McKenzie reported that the Council had 10 flats and one studio (bedsit) designated for community use. He explained that historically, most had been managed by Tenants and Residents Associations (TRAs) and used for their meetings, office administration and ad hoc social events. These arrangements had been in place for many years and agreed at a time when there was significantly less demand for social housing in the borough.

Following a review of community halls 2019, and since the pandemic, the Council undertook work to begin to revert these flats back to housing use and create much needed homes for vulnerable households. Patterns of use have changed, with over half of the flats no longer actively used by TRAs. However, because of the length of time the flats had been designated for community use, planning permission was required to return them to residential use. For those flats no longer in use, the Council was actively working on planning applications to secure change of use and these were on track to be submitted by December 2022. If planning consent is granted, these flats would be allocated through the Council's letting policy in 2023.

Concluding, Cllr McKenzie stated that where flats remained in use by TRAs, work would be undertaken to identify alternative suitable meeting spaces so residents' interests could continue to be championed. This included discussions with Warburton and Darcy TRA who continued to manage and make use of the community flat at Warburton House for their meetings. A full report on the community flats would be presented to Cabinet for decision early in 2023.

6.4 From Fozia Bham to the Cabinet Member for Housing Services and Resident Participation

Why has it been so problematic for long standing tenants to add their name to the housing register for a bigger place? The cyber attack happened 2 years ago and the Council keeps giving conflicting information.

In the absence of Fozia Bham, the Speaker read the question as set out, following which a response was provided by the Cabinet Member.

Response from the Mayoral Adviser for for Housing Needs and Homelessness

Cllr Etti advised that Hackney as well as most parts of London was in the midst of an affordable housing crisis. This was due to rapidly rising rents combined with cuts in financial support for low income families which had directly resulted in rising homelessness, increased overcrowding and extended social housing waiting lists. Demand by far outstripped available supply.

Cllr Etti informed that the Council operated a Choice Based Lettings (CBL) scheme, where those accepted on the housing register were able to “bid” for social housing properties. The redesigned Allocations Policy recognised that overcrowding was a significant issue and the need to prioritise severely overcrowded households.

To be considered as severely overcrowded, households required two more bedrooms (or rooms that could be used as bedrooms) than they have in their current accommodation. With high demand and an extremely limited number of properties available for social rent, acceptance on the housing register would not address immediate housing needs. Applicants accepted as severely overcrowded would be placed into Band B with waiting times of; 9 years for 3 bed properties, 13 years for 4 bed and 39 years for 5+ bed need.

Cllr Etti reported that the Council’s Housing Register IT System was irreparably damaged by the criminal cyber attack and work was underway to build a new system. Teams were updating records for single households and homeless families for whom a housing duty had been accepted.

Council tenants experiencing overcrowding should talk to their Housing Officer to explore all options available. Support to access a range of toolkits of advice and guidance about rehousing including: mutual exchange, Homeswapper, Homefinder UK and the The Fresh Start Scheme was available.

The Mayoral Adviser relayed apologies for the delays residents had experienced in the processing of applications to join the housing register as a result of the cyber attack. Assurances were given that officers were working tirelessly to resolve the remaining issues whilst making sure that residents did not miss out.

6.5 From Zaynab Aswat to the Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

There has been a remarkable increase in the number of phone thefts and assaults surrounding Springfield Park and surrounding roads up to Clapton.

What plans are in place to increase security and prevent these crimes reoccurring on a daily basis?

In the absence of Zaynab Aswad, the Speaker read the question as set out, following which a response was provided by the Cabinet Member.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services

Cllr Fajana-Thomas informed that she had liaised with Inspector Rob Bradley, Safer Neighbourhood Inspector, who informed her that there had been several crimes of theft reported in the vicinity (approximately 4 in one month). The Integrated Gangs Unit lead officer had given assurances that the area was not one known for recent or historical gang violence.

Cllr Fajana-Thomas reported that the Safer Neighbourhood Team for the area had committed to ensuring that all reported crimes were investigated thoroughly and the victims provided with a full update after the investigation. Police officers had been directed to increase patrols in this area particularly in the winter months. The Council Enforcement Officer was working closely with the Police to prevent further crimes in the area. In addition, Parks Officers for Springfield Park had been briefed to be extra vigilant and to report any suspicious activities to the police.

In conclusion, Cllr Fajana-Thomas encouraged residents to ensure that all phone thefts were reported to the Police via the 101 telephone number. This would ensure that the Community Safety Partnership was made aware of all crimes in the area which would assist them to patrol the area in a focused way.

6.10 From Sophie Cameron to the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Culture

October is menopause awareness month and it is 6 months since Hackney Council passed a motion calling for better support for those experiencing menopause. Can I ask what actions have since been taken to improve menopause support for women in Hackney and to campaign for better outcomes for women nationally?

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

Cllr Kennedy highlighted that following the passing of the motion, the requests of the council had been passed up to national level for consideration in the creation of the national Women's Health Strategy.

The Council welcomed the publication of the [Women's Health Strategy for England](#) in summer 2022. The new strategy accepted that insufficient focus was placed on the menopause at a national level. Although the strategy set out encouraging 10 year ambitions, it was felt that the pace at which these would be delivered was inadequate particularly without dedicated funding to ensure improvements. The Council would however work with local partnerships with the NHS and voluntary sector, to act as an advocate for sustained change to better address the menopause.

A women's reproductive health survey was held by City & Hackney NHS Trust in April-May 2022. Over 2,500 people completed the survey which provided invaluable insight into what women were experiencing in terms of (peri-)menopause, symptoms, and the care received. Cllr Kennedy reported the results of the survey demonstrated that whilst some of the women had received good support, more was needed to ensure (peri)menopause support was available and accessible.

To help address the need for better information and support for the menopause, the City & Hackney NHS Trust had developed, an innovative Community Gynaecology Service which included menopause virtual patient engagement events and smaller group consultations. He highlighted the various events and attendance levels, which had received excellent feedback, with more events planned in coming months.

Concluding, Cllr Kennedy pledged that the Council would continue to work to ensure all employees were aware of the council's menopause policy and advocate for greater awareness and support in local workplaces.

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

7. Questions from Members of the Council

7.1 From Cllr Binnie-Lubbock to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Residents are worried about the felling of mature trees on Council land, which does not need to go through usual planning processes, even in a conservation area. Has an assessment been made on the possible impact to Hackney's mature tree targets as a result of this, also including the recent heatwave and vandalism?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

Cllr Woodley expressed extreme pride in the wealth of trees maintained in Hackney. Work was ongoing to increase Hackney's tree canopy, with 5,000 new street trees and more than 12,500 new trees in its parks and green spaces. Acts of vandalism on trees were described as few and far between. Contractors and volunteers undertook extensive watering programmes both on the streets and in parks and assisted in keeping tree loss to a minimum. All trees that had died due to vandalism or disease would be replaced to ensure continuity in provision.

A list was kept of trees that required replacing under contract, as well as other replacements. For the year 21/22, there were 30 street trees that were replaced under contract. There were plans to continue to build upon the Tree Champion and Tree Carers networks. Future plans included tagging street trees with QR codes linking to a mapping project showing Hackney's trees with their locations, and names.

Cllr Woodley explained that there were occasions where trees had to be

removed due to being hazardous. The Council's tree surveyors assess and commission the work and liaise with tenants impacted to agree a plan and a date for removal. She explained that only trees that were dead, dying or diseased or where there was a public safety issue were removed. Any tree which was removed was automatically replaced. When a tree poses a safety hazard, the tree is either reduced to a monolith - where all main branches are removed or, the tree is felled and the remaining trunk or stem left in place on the ground to provide biodiversity benefits. The loss of trees was considered as part of any planning applications in line with the Council policies which sought to protect trees of amenity value and deliver biodiversity gain.

Concluding, Cllr Woodley spoke of the connection between the Climate Action Plan and the Council's building of affordable homes. Keeping mature trees remained a priority, but it was acknowledged that due to the housing crisis and need to build affordable homes, this may not always be possible. However, the Council would work with the community to design and deliver better communal space, a net increase in the number of trees on site and more biodiversity.

Supplementary Question

The loss of mature trees can be a shock to residents. Can the Council improve its consultation process and make its tree database publicly accessible? This would enable the public to map trees and understand the reasons behind felling decisions?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

Cllr Woodley looked forward to the launch of the mapping programme. She explained that the Council kept data on trees that could potentially cause harm. These could be shared with ward councillors who in appropriate circumstances could share with residents who had concerns or who may be impacted.

7.2 From Cllr Suso-Runge to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service

According to the Institute for Fiscal Studies, the Government's unfunded tax cuts as part of their recent 'mini-budget' could result in £18bn of cuts to public services in the coming financial year. What assessment has the Council made of the potential impact of these cuts on the people of Hackney?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance, Insourcing and Customer Service

Cllr Chapman stated that following the U-turn on the 45p tax rate, on 3 October, the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) warned that an extra £18bn was needed in each of the next two years in order to restore the 2021 plans, as inflation was then (and now) sitting at around 10%.

Cllr Chapman advised that following a change in Prime Minister and Chancellor, most of the tax measures in the Mini Budget had been revoked and the duration of the Energy Support Scheme reduced to 6 months. This created a great deal

of uncertainty, which widened further when the new Chancellor announced that a Medium Term Financial Plan would be announced on 17 November. It was reported that this would involve a combination of spending cuts and tax increases.

The Council would not have a firm indication of how it would be affected in 2023-24 until the announcement of the Provisional 2023-24 Local Government Finance Settlement in December 2022. It was expected that Conservative government austerity would continue for some years to come.

Concluding, Cllr Chapman advised that he and Deputy Mayor Bramble had written to the Chancellor requesting appropriate levels of support for Hackney Council and its residents and to avert a further wave of austerity. He gave assurances that the Council had introduced a variety of initiatives to help residents through the cost of living crisis. He referenced the Help at Hand: a guide to the support available for Hackney residents during the cost of living crisis which was available in paper format and online. Members were informed that various Council measures and initiatives would be continually reviewed and reshaped according to changing economic conditions. In the event of public spending cuts, the Council would respond pro-actively and positively through existing framework and policies.

7.3 From Cllr Garbett to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Will the CO2 emissions from the Edmonton incinerator be included in the Climate Action Plan (CAP) and the 2030 net-zero target?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Cllr Coban explained that the CAP was the first holistic plan to address the climate and ecological crisis. It was based on evidence, having undertaken emissions pathways studies, both for Council emissions and borough-wide emissions. The total emissions for treating waste, which included recycling, food and garden waste and the residual element from waste facility in Edmonton, were included in the consumption emission category as Scope 3 emissions.

Cllr Coban reported that the waste element of all the consumption emissions was very small; whilst emissions from consumption were the biggest category for the borough, the waste element only accounted for 2% of that overall 74%. The emissions from the energy from waste facility, known as Scope 1 & 2, were included in the national territorial accounts by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy as industrial or commercial emissions for Enfield, due to the activity taking place within Enfield's boundaries.

North London Waste Authority (NLWA) was actively investigating the use of Carbon Capture Use and Storage technology for the new Energy Recovery Facility, and were continually assessing the feasibility and likely timeline for when it was likely to be implemented.

Cllr Coban highlighted that Cabinet had also agreed to rejoin the UK100 Network of Councils. This committed the Council to net zero emissions by 2030 across specific Council functions, namely non-tenanted council buildings and

fleet. The Council's goals aligned with the Paris Agreement, thereby making the Climate Action Plan not only ambitious but also more robust than many other council plans.

Supplementary Question

Carbon Capture Use and Storage technology is unproven, how does this align with the 2030 target when the real solution is the sorting and recycling of waste?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Cllr Coban stated that in 2016 the NLWA carried out extensive research on the sorting and disposal of waste. The only alternative available to the Council was to send waste to landfills or to incinerate; whether it be in London or elsewhere. Carbon Capture Use and Storage technology was requested by campaigners. Subsequently, the NLWA committed to incorporate use of the technology to assist in the reduction of emissions. He advised that this was the cleanest and greenest method available.

7.4 Question from Cllr Margaret Gordon to the Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

Hackney's poverty strategy calculates that 48% of our children are living in poverty after the cost of housing is taken into account. What is the Council doing to mitigate the impact of the cost of living crisis on children already experiencing poverty or in danger of falling into poverty?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

Cllr Woodley stated that it was unacceptable that nearly half of children in Hackney lived in poverty, once housing costs were taken into account. Poverty for most part was linked to the cost of housing, childcare and insecure low wages. This meant that many parents and carers in Hackney were working and struggling financially. It was highlighted that if national policy was more focused on affordable housing, childcare and better paid jobs, as well as having an adequate benefit system in place, there would not be so many children living in poverty.

Cllr Woodley reported that so far in 2022, 18,000 of the estimated 32,000 children likely to be in poverty in Hackney had received support, with more support available to those identified as vulnerable. Concerns were raised about the long term impacts for those who experience poverty early in life and the outcome of poor emotional and physical health as well as challenges in employment and secure housing in later years.

It was acknowledged that the Council was limited in what it could do, however the scarce resources were focused on those who needed the most help. From April 2022, a greater share of the Community Grants budget (£1m out of a £2.5m budget) had been dedicated to developing advice provision. This included the Hackney Money Hub, the Help at Hand Booklet and the upcoming commission into affordable childcare. A Cost of Living Panel discussion would be taking place with the Mayor and Cabinet on 9 November. A Poverty

Reduction framework was being worked on across finance, health, policy and early years, in conjunction with community partners.

Specific support for children and families in summary included:

- Half of the £2.8 million of Government funding via the household support fund, earmarked to support families with children.
- Access to £15 of support for all children on Free School Meals
- Support for families contacting or being referred to the Council via children's centres, youth hubs and community partners.
- Access to Healthy Start and Alexander Rose vouchers for eligible families.
- Access to the national Holiday and Activities Programme (a meal and activities)

Concluding, Cllr Woodley advised that the Council was working to become a Right to Food Borough, joining up with other London Boroughs and cities across England. The Council was committed to continuing its work locally whilst lobbying the government on a range of issues to help mitigate the impact of the cost of living crisis on children and their families.

Supplementary Question

Does the Cabinet Member agree that what the children really need is a general election and the return of a Labour Government?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Families, Parks and Leisure

Cllr Woodley expressed her agreement to the question posed.

7.5 Question from Cllr Binnie-Lubbock to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care

Are there residents with children who have school lunch arrears; if so, how many and what debt collection methods are used in those situations?

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

Deputy Mayor Bramble informed Members that the Council was working with local schools and education settings to offer advice and support on tackling food hunger in schools and during school holidays. She advised that she had written to all headteachers to remind them of the support available and to help signpost families to key information, advice and guidance. This included support for families with no recourse to public funds.

All maintained schools and academies were required to provide free school meals (FSM) to eligible children. In 2022, 38% of all state-funded pupils in Hackney were eligible for FSM (13,352 pupils), the 7th highest among all English local authorities. The percentage of pupils eligible for a FSM and taking up a meal was 30.6%, meaning that around 20% of pupils that were eligible (2,800 pupils) were not claiming free school meals. The Council was working with schools to increase uptake.

The Deputy Mayor reported that information regarding income from school meals and debt collection was initially managed at school level. The Council's Education Department, with the support of partners, was engaging with local schools with a focus on putting in place processes that allowed and enabled schools to share information and escalate 'family at risk' concerns outside of their normal processes. This would assist in targeting additional support for families that may be struggling with the cost of living crisis.

Concluding, further measures for schools to address food poverty were highlighted. These included a dedicated task group to look at local pupil hunger, assessing how schools were supported and what additional support could be provided. Additionally, she welcomed work in this area undertaken by the Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission.

Supplementary Question

Can the Council commit to stopping the use of bailiffs and other debt collection methods, where in their remit to do so?

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

The Deputy Mayor invited any specific cases to be brought to her attention. She advised that she did not have the current figures for individual schools as this was being collated.

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

8. Elected Mayor's Statement

- 8.1 Mayor Glanville relayed his thanks to the Speaker for her handling of the request for an extraordinary Council meeting and for the quick response and mobilisation of the Monitoring Officer and Governance team.
- 8.2 The Mayor also offered a vote of thanks to various Council teams, the fire brigade, businesses, residents and Cllr Woodley for their quick response to the flash floods in Cazenove Road and Stamford Hill areas. He acknowledged the frustrations of residents and businesses in the area and informed the chamber that a meeting was convened the following day to discuss surface water flooding. Additionally, the Council had met with Transport for London (TfL) to discuss the frequency of gully cleansing and their timetable for working with the Council on a long term solution and response to flash flooding on TfL roads. Mayor Glanville highlighted the Council's commitment to climate mitigation and green infrastructure to alleviate and absorb rain water across the borough. He emphasised his commitment to improving the Council's response and ensuring action from TfL and Thames Water.
- 8.3 The Mayor spoke about the different events which took place during the recent Local Democracy Season, notably: Hackney Youth Parliament's attendance at Cabinet, local schools touring the Town Hall and his visit to Mossbourne Riverside Academy to meet their school council. The first in-person Mayor's

question time since the pandemic was held on 17 October. The Mayor highlighted his administration's manifesto commitment to improve democratic accountability of the Executive as well as increased resident involvement. The Mayor also attended the Hackney Youth Parliament 'Who Do They Trust?' event with representatives from Hackney Youth Parliament, Hackney's Young Futures Commission, Voyage Youth, Rise 365 and the local police.

- 8.4 The commitment to rebuild trust and make Hackney an anti-racist borough was highlighted. The Mayor informed the chamber that he and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services had written to the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police following the findings of the Casey Review, which found the Metropolitan Police's internal disciplinary system to be racist, misogynist and sexist. The Mayor stated that his administration wanted to work with the Police to see institutional change. As such, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services would continue to engage with communities and hold the Police to account.
- 8.5 The Mayor referenced former Prime Minister Liz Truss' mini-budget which saw record high levels of inflation, tax cuts for the richest and a new wave of austerity, ultimately crashing the economy. He believed that Rishi Sunak, the third prime minister of the year and first Asian prime minister, was an important moment for the country and for diverse representation and leadership. The Mayor however expressed dismay at Mr Sunak's track record as Chancellor, his choice of Home Secretary and Equalities Minister and the Conservative Party's ongoing mismanagement. He raised concerns that Hackney would bear the brunt of more Tory austerity and chaos.
- 8.6 The Mayor spoke about his attendance at the recent Labour Party Conference in Liverpool and commended plans for a fairer, greener Britain set out in the Labour Party leader's speech. The Mayor highlighted his administration's achievements since the last Full Council meeting, which in summary included:
- The approval of the ambitious Climate Action Plan – an evidence-based approach which set out plans to decarbonise Hackney in a socially just way.
 - The refreshed Parking Enforcement Plan.
 - Sustainability Day, held on 23 October, where residents got advice on energy saving and sustainable living.
 - Investment in the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities system, expanding places and opening the newly refurbished Pavilion School.
 - The Here to Help offer and booklet - a cost of living support guide.
 - Ongoing work with the Council's partners, NHS, local charities and other public bodies to investigate further support for residents.
- 8.7 The Mayor outlined plans to restructure and invest in the Libraries Services to ensure an efficient and reliable service. This included major renovations to Stoke Newington Library, improved accessibility to Stamford Hill Library and plans to deliver a new Library for Woodberry Down in Phase 4 of the regeneration project. Regarding the new staff structure, it was explained that

all staff would be on a higher pay grade and had been offered support and training for the new roles. It was highlighted that a new Libraries Strategy was recently approved by Cabinet.

- 8.8 Concluding, the Mayor was proud that Hackney was a cooperative and social enterprise Council. Having signed up to the Co-operative Councils Innovation Network, the Council would work with and learn from like-minded councils and organisations across the country. The network would seek to find solutions to some of the problems faced by residents during these difficult times. Mayor Glanville committed to working together for a better Hackney.

Conservative Group Response

- 8.9 Cllr Steinberger spoke of his attendance at Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II funeral which he described as a very moving occasion. He praised the efforts of former Conservative Prime Minister, Liz Truss, which he felt had positively impacted Hackney and welcomed Rishi Sunak as Prime Minister. He believed that the appointment of Britain's first Asian Prime Minister demonstrated the Conservative Party's commitment to diversity.
- 8.11 Cllr Steinberger thanked Cllr Woodley for her attendance at the flood scenes and questioned whether road works had impacted drainage which contributed to the flooding.
- 8.12 Cllr Steinberger raised a number of points which included: the Council's lacklustre response to deputations and the recent efforts of Cllrs Levy and Papier who intervened in an attack on a female outside the Town Hall. He thanked Andy Cunningham, Head of Streetscene, who was retiring after several years of service and Eda Ziya Conti, former Speaker's Officer, who was leaving the Council and wished them well for the future.
- 8.13 Cllr Steinberger questioned why after two years following the cyber-attack all council systems and software were not up and running. He also questioned how a new housing policy could be implemented given the ongoing issues from the cyber attack which he believed had impacted the housing register.
- 8.14 Concluding, Cllr Steinberger stated his dissatisfaction with the lack of consultation with the Conservative group with regard to the calling of this extraordinary meeting.

Green Group Response

- 8.15 Cllr Garbett acknowledged the difficult times that many people experienced and believed that compassionate Green policies were needed to address these. She stated that a Prime Minister was needed who would set a budget that responded to the issues faced by people across the country, however she did not believe that new Prime Minister Rishi Sunak would deliver this. She urged the importance of continued lobbying of the Government and the power of the Council to call for better.
- 8.16 Reflecting on the recent Green Party Conference, Cllr Garbett reported that a motion was passed to back the Enough is Enough campaign; a mass movement resisting the cost of greed crisis and backing striking workers. In

light of this, she stated that the Green group stood in solidarity with Library staff in the borough against proposed job cuts. She emphasised the importance of libraries being adequately staffed. The Green group supported Unison's call for the Council to hold its restructure consultation to allow for the new Library Strategy and changes to embed before considering staffing levels. The Mayor and Cabinet were implored to listen to the concerns raised by staff and unions.

- 8.17 Cllr Garbett stated that a general election was required to address the destruction caused by successive Conservative Governments. It was hoped that this would be the last election under the first past the post voting system. It was also hoped that the Fair Votes motion for consideration later in the meeting would garner cross party agreement, showing support for genuinely representative democratic justice. It was stated that proportional representation was not only needed to stop Conservative Governments, but to ensure there were more Green MPs proportionate to the number of people who vote Green. Cllr Garbett stated that more people were needed to speak positively about immigration, stand in solidarity with striking workers and treat the climate emergency with required urgency.
- 8.18 Cllr Garbett was pleased to see the administration's commitment to the 2030 Net Zero target in the Climate Action Plan (CAP), which was lobbied by the Green group and in their manifesto. However, concerns were raised regarding the lack of targets and specific plans to achieve these goals and refusal to commit to a people's assembly. She believed this demonstrated a lack of accountability and ability to see the public as partners with equal ownership. She believed this attitude extended to the Morning Lane People Space group who had not been recognised as an equal partner regarding plans for the development of 55 Morning Lane. The importance of the site and why it mattered was highlighted. Further parallels were drawn with the site at the Shopping Village at Ridley Road. She believed the Council needed to listen and respond to the voice of residents and stakeholders and raised concerns regarding potential gentrification.
- 8.19 Cllr Garbett spoke of events that she and Cllr Binnie-Lubbock had attended during October in support of Black History and looked forward to working with black led organisations in the borough to effect change. She believed that recognising and celebrating black history, achievements and culture should not be restricted to a particular season. Cllr Garbett emphasised the importance of being anti-racist in words, policies and actions to address the inequalities experienced by black and global majority communities.

The Mayor's Reply

- 8.20 The Mayor stated that the inflation, economic and interest rate crises were all a result of Conservative mismanagement. Citing the actions of the current Home Secretary and her comments at the recent Conservative Party Conference, The Mayor believed the PM's solidarity with black and global majority people in the UK and abroad was short lived.
- 8.22 The Mayor shared concerns relating to the flooding and explained the complexities which were due to road ownership split between the Council and TfL and a nearby Thames Water sewage system, all within close proximity to

the flood site. He stated that the people of Stamford Hill and Stoke Newington required all agencies to provide a long term solution as well as a suitable response in the event of flooding.

- 8.23 Tribute was paid to Andy Cunningham, Andrew Monk and Eda Ziya Conti all of whom were leaving the Council.
- 8.24 The Mayor acknowledged the impact of the criminal cyber-attack on residents. In relation to the housing register, he explained the intention was not to rebuild the old system that did not work but to produce an improved system which would focus on the most vulnerable. He pledged his administration's commitment and that of officers to rebuilding services. He commended the leadership of Ian Williams and Rob Miller in this matter and encouraged Cllr Steinberger and any other interested councillors to contact them to find out more.
- 8.26 Mayor Glanville stated that the proposed libraries restructure presented no threats to safety, services or provision. He informed that library staff had redesigned the service and were being consulted as part of a statutory process.
- 9.27 The Mayor stated that he was proud of the Council's commitment relating to emission reduction and his administration's ambitious climate action to ensure Net Zero targets are attained. He advised that all plans would be fully accountable within the democratic structure of the Council.
- 8.28 Mayor Glanville gave assurances that the Council would continue to work in partnership with residents. With regard to future plans for publicly owned sites. Where possible, these would be co-produced but needed to be realistic. In closing, he stated that the reason the Council had purchased private assets bringing them into public ownership was because his administration were municipal socialists who sought to build an anti-racist borough with Socialism at its heart.

9. Licensing Committee Annual Report

- 9.1 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services introduced the report. Commending the work of the Licensing Team, she made special mention of the Hackney Nights campaign which sought to provide a safer night time economy in the borough. The Council was committed to working in partnership with licensed premises, residents, the police and other agencies to ensure Hackney remained a pleasant and safe environment. She highlighted her commitment to ensuring that all decisions were fairly taken, upholding the licensing objectives and consideration given to the views of residents. It was reported that local MP Meg Hillier had undertaken to work with the Council on some of the challenging areas of the Licensing Act 2003 which was felt to require legislative changes.
- 9.3 The Chair of the Licensing Committee thanked the lead member for her support. He paid tribute to licensing officers and members of the sub-committees who worked to ensure that the needs of residents were balanced whilst supporting businesses to be part of a vibrant and mixed economy. He commended the Licensing Service for meeting the challenges

and pressures of leading a world class night time economy which was an intricate part of forming Hackney's reputation as a great place to live, work and visit. Cllr Smyth described the Hackney Night's Portal and Late Night Levy as inspirational and integral to providing a safe space for all. He commended the report to Council.

RESOLVED: To note the Licensing Committee Annual Report.

10. Motions

The proposed tabled amendments to the motions are attached at **Appendix C**

10a Long Covid

The motion as set out at agenda item 10a within the agenda was MOVED by Cllr Lynch and SECONDED by Cllr Sizer.

Cllr Lynch introduced the motion. She spoke of her experience of having lived with long covid since contracting it in March 2020. She also spoke of the nursing community who undertook their job in the height of the pandemic with no PPE provision, many of whom were still suffering the effects of long covid. The purpose of the motion was to raise awareness of long covid, to advocate for those with long covid and to garner support for the campaign for long covid to be recognised as a disability. She thanked consultants and healthcare professionals at the Homerton Hospital and Lower Clapton Health Centre who had looked after her.

Cllr Sizer spoke in support of the motion, which she believed was contrary to the government's lacklustre engagement with the issue. She quoted the recent All Parliamentary Party Group on covid which found that 'the UK Government covid policy making has continuously failed to take into account long covid'. Concluding, Cllr Sizer referenced that the pandemic revealed and caused deep unfairness in society, the disproportionate effect of covid on those of black and global majority and the mental health implications of long covid.

The proposed amendments as set out in the tabled papers Amendments to Motions were MOVED by Cllr Garbett and SECONDED by Cllr Binnie Lubbock

Cllr Garbett spoke to the proposed amendments explaining that she saw the continued impact of covid on people's lives. The proposed amendments sought to enhance specific points, speak to the experiences of residents and incorporate learning from working in the NHS. They related to: the parity of esteem, the role of carers being a crucial public service and a call on the Council to use its local influence with regard to employment policies. The amendments also requested the Council keep up to date with research on the issue and recognise the financial implications of covid.

The proposed amendments were put to the vote without debate.

The amendments to the MOTION were lost and were declared NOT CARRIED.

The substantive motion was put to the vote without debate

The MOTION was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

Hackney Council notes:

- As of 1 May this year, [figures from the Office for National Statistics](#) (ONS) reveal that two million people living in private households in the UK – or 3.1% of the population – reported they were still experiencing Covid symptoms more than four weeks after their first suspected coronavirus infection.
- About two in five of those with long Covid, or 826,000 people, noted that infection was at least a year ago while one in five, or 376,000 people, said it was at least two years ago. In addition, 71% of those with Long Covid said their symptoms had a negative impact on their day-to-day activities, with 20% saying their ability to undertake such activities had been “limited a lot”.
- As a proportion of the UK population, the prevalence of self-reported long Covid was greatest in people aged 35 to 69 years, females, people living in more deprived areas, those working in social care, teaching and education or health care, and those with another activity-limiting health condition or disability,” the ONS added.
- At present it is not clear what causes Long Covid, but it can be the result of the initial infection sending some people’s immune systems into overdrive, meaning they attack not just the virus but their own organs.
- NICE (National Institute for Health & Care Excellence) describes Long Covid as “signs and symptoms that continue or develop after acute Covid-19”. This definition includes both ongoing symptomatic Covid-19 and post Covid-19 syndrome. Therefore, according to this definition, Long Covid starts from four weeks onwards.
- Long Covid symptoms are plentiful, and more are being seen as related to Covid 19 infection.
- At a local level Hackney Council celebrates the Post Covid Specialist Assessment Clinic and The Covid Rehabilitation (CoRe) service provided by Homerton Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, including the work of respiratory consultants Professor Karalasingam Rajakulasingam and Dr Santino Capocci.
- Hackney Council will continue to highlight the needs and support our school children experiencing long Covid symptoms and issue guidance when available from the government to schools and educational settings on the many pupils living with Long Covid, and support for them.

Hackney Council therefore resolves to:

- Working with our health partner organisations to ensure that support for those experiencing Long Covid is a central part of the next City and Hackney Long Term Conditions Strategy.
- Recommend to the Head of the Paid Service that the Council's employment policies and procedures be reviewed to ensure that those with Long Covid symptoms are supported.
- Consider the key recommendations of the Long Covid publication by the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Coronavirus.

Proposed by: Cllr Anna Lynch

Seconded by: Cllr Anya Sizer

10b

Fair Votes

It was noted that the proposer and seconder had agreed to a number of suggested amendments. As such, an amended motion incorporating these amendments was tabled.

The amended tabled motion was MOVED by Cllr Garbett and SECONDED by Cllr Binnie-Lubbock

Cllr Garbett introduced the motion, reflecting on the current state of politics. She believed that people had lost confidence in politics and politicians, voter turnout to elections was low and people did not believe their vote made a difference. Some of the reasons cited for this were: incompetence, corruption, misogyny and the choice of prime minister reserved for a select few. It was stated that in Europe, only the UK and Belarus use the archaic first past the post voting system in general elections. The benefits of proportional representation (PR) were outlined. Cllr Garbett expressed disappointment that electoral reform was not a priority for the Labour party despite support from Labour MPs. The support for similar motions amongst neighbouring Labour Councils and beyond was highlighted. Cllr Garbett informed that she did not agree that PR allowed additional risk of extremist views or unstable coalitions and as such was not able to agree to the further proposed amendments to the motion.

The proposed amendments as set out in the tabled papers Amendments to Motions were MOVED by Deputy Mayor Bramble and SECONDED by Cllr Ogundemuren.

Deputy Mayor Bramble spoke to the proposed amendments. She stated that people had become disillusioned with politics and politicians. The importance of political education was emphasised. She believed the motion did not reflect the imperfections of democracy and that the real barrier was voter identification which would silence the voice of many, irrespective of the voting system. In conclusion, the Deputy Mayor stated that until such time of an electoral review it was important not to actively endorse one voting system over another, but to ensure that the Council advocated for the democratic rights of voters.

Cllr Ogundemuren also spoke to the proposed amendments. He believed that the introduction of voter identification would disenfranchise those marginalised

and from black and global majority backgrounds. He highlighted the importance of diverse representation but not at the cost of those who faced the worst outcomes in society.

Cllr Binne-Luccock advised that ongoing discussions were being held with Hackney Youth Parliament regarding voting systems. It was clarified that one particular form of PR was not being promoted over another however to remove it would change the overall essence of the motion.

The proposed amendments were put to the vote.

The amendments to the MOTION were declared CARRIED.

The substantive motion was debated.

Cllr Binnie-Lubbock and Deputy Mayor Bramble contributed to the debate.

The substantive motion was put to the vote

The MOTION was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

Hackney Council notes:

- Research has found that electoral systems impact participation in politics for example there is a positive correlation between proportional representation (PR) and women elected to legislatures.
- The introduction of PR for local elections in Scotland has led to an increase in turnout, which was 44.8% at the last elections, held in 2022. In contrast turnout in Hackney in 2022 was 34.29% (this varies by ward with the lowest turnout in Hoxton at 24%).
- The Labour Party in government successfully implemented Proportional Representation to a number of elections, introducing PR into the London Assembly, in devolved government for Scotland and Wales and the Supplementary vote for the Mayoral elections.
- The Labour Party's conference in 2022 passed a motion calling on the Party to make a commitment to introduce a Proportional Representation electoral system for general elections.
- 370 Constituency Labour Parties (CLPs) – about 60% of the total number – have now formally passed policy in favour of PR.
- The Green Party has long supported a fairer voting system and PR for national and local elections to ensure seats in parliament better reflect the share of votes cast, as well as supporting extending the right to vote to those aged 16 and up.
- With the Welsh Senedd reviewing legislation on Single Transferable Vote for local councils, England looks likely to be the only part of the UK without any form of PR at the local level.
- According to polling, the majority of voters in the United Kingdom support the use of PR for elections in the United Kingdom.
- The last Labour Government put together the Jenkins Commission, which recommended the adoption of the AV+ voting system. This system is

similar to how we vote for the London Assembly, giving voters local representatives and regional list members.

- PR would end minority rule. In 2019, 43.6% of the vote produced a government with 56.2% of the seats and 100% of the power. PR also prevents 'wrong winner' elections such as occurred in 1951 and February 1974.
- The current Conservative government, elected by less than 30% of the electorate under the First Past the Post voting system, led by a Prime Minister selected by just 81,326 Conservative Party members, is enacting an extreme policy platform that was not in its manifesto and does not therefore have any democratic mandate.
- In June 2022, Unison, Prospect and the University and College Union (UCU) voted to embrace more proportional general elections. The list of trade unions that back electoral reform is long and growing, it currently includes Unison, Unite the Union, Fire Brigades Union and Musicians' Union.

Hackney Council recognises:

- That there are many reasons people are disillusioned with politics and that disproportionate electoral systems could have contributed to dangerous levels of distrust and disillusionment with our democratic process along with other factors such as politicians and institutions failing to focus on issues that matter most to people's daily lives.
- That it is essential that faith is restored in our democratic system and that the public see Parliament as fairly reflecting their views and their votes.
- That our First Past the Post voting system could be a significant barrier to restoring this faith.
- That the current Conservative Government introduced the biggest barrier to Hackney's communities engaging in democracy by introducing voter ID requirements and removing the limited use of the supplementary vote in England and Wales in the Elections Act 2022.
- That this Council lobbied against the Elections Act¹, its introduction of voter ID and the removal of the supplementary vote for directly elected Mayors.
- Voter ID is also a significant barrier to Hackney residents engaging in democracy, particularly among poorer and more diverse communities that may not have valid ID such as a passport and drivers licence. 24% of the electorate hold neither a passport or photographic driving licence² and Hackney Council estimates that 47% of households in Hackney have no driving licence holder.³ Democracy must be inclusive and accessible to work.
- That a system of Proportional Representation in which seats match votes and all votes count equally could help to rebuild public trust by ensuring that all political views are represented in Parliament and at local councils in proportion to their level of public support.
- That no voting system is perfect and many forms of Proportional Representation lack the vital local link between elected representatives

1

<https://news.hackney.gov.uk/voter-id-plans-will-disenfranchise-young-black-and-asian-council-tells-mps/>

² <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/voter-id-key-facts-and-figures/>

³ <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>

and their constituents, risk creating fragile coalitions, and risks creating opportunities for extremist views in our democratic institutions.

Hackney Council therefore resolves to:

- To write to the Secretary of State for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities and the Home Secretary, to call for a national review of voting systems in England and condemning the introduction of voter ID and removal of the supplementary vote for Mayoral elections.
- To consult the Hackney Youth Parliament on their choice of voting systems for Youth Council elections.

Proposed by: Deputy Mayor Bramble

Seconded by: Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren

Close of meeting.

Duration of Meeting - 7:00- 9:51pm

Attachments

Appendix A - Questions from the public not answered due to time constraints
- to follow

Appendix B - Questions from Members not answered due to time constraints
- to follow

Appendix C - Proposed tabled amendments to motions
(Agenda item 10) - attached

This page is intentionally left blank

**Extraordinary Council Meeting
Wednesday, 26 October 2022**

**Agenda item 10: Proposed Amendments to Motions received by the
Monitoring Officer prior to 12 noon today**

Underlined text = proposed additional wording

~~Strikethrough text~~ = proposed deletions

10. Motions

10a **Long Covid (Green Group Amendment)**

Hackney Council notes:

- As of 1 May this year, Figures from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) reveal that two million people living in private households in the UK – or 3.1% of the population – reported they were still experiencing Covid symptoms more than four weeks after their first suspected coronavirus infection.
- About two in five of those with long Covid, or 826,000 people, noted that infection was at least a year ago while one in five, or 376,000 people, said it was at least two years ago. In addition, 71% of those with Long Covid said their symptoms had a negative impact on their day-to-day activities, with 20% saying their ability to undertake such activities had been “limited a lot”. There is also evidence regarding the mental health impacts of Long Covid.
- As a proportion of the UK population, the prevalence of self-reported long Covid was greatest in people aged 35 to 69 years, females, people living in more deprived areas, those working in social care, teaching and education or health care, and those with another activity-limiting health condition or disability,” the ONS added.
- The importance of rest and recovery and the inequalities in the availability of this to, for example, people in low paid, insecure and/or labouring jobs.
- At present it is not clear what causes Long Covid, but it can be the result of the initial infection sends some people's immune systems into overdrive, meaning they attack not just the virus but their own organs.
- NICE (National Institute for Health & Care Excellence) describes Long Covid as “signs and symptoms that continue or develop after acute Covid-19”. This definition includes both ongoing symptomatic Covid-19 and post Covid-19 syndrome. Therefore, according to this definition, Long Covid starts from four weeks onwards.
- Long Covid symptoms are plentiful, and more are being seen as related to Covid 19 infection.
- At a local level Hackney Council celebrates the Post Covid Specialist Assessment Clinic and The Covid Rehabilitation (CoRe) service provided by

Homerton Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, including the work of respiratory consultants Professor Karalasingam Rajakulasingam and Dr Santino Capocci.

- The pandemic is continuing and the financial impact continues to be felt by the Council. Across London the evidence of Long Covid in cost pressure terms is emerging.
- Hackney Council will continue to highlight the needs and support our school children experiencing long Covid symptoms and issue guidance when available from the government to schools and educational settings on the many pupils living with Long Covid, and support for them.

Hackney Council therefore resolves to:

- Work with our health partner organisations to ensure that support for those experiencing Long Covid is a central part of the next City and Hackney Long Term Conditions Strategy.
- Recommend to the Head of the Paid Service that the Council's employment policies and procedures be reviewed to ensure that those with Long Covid symptoms, and their carers, are supported.
- Work with and encourage our supply chain and borough partners to also review their employment policies (if they have not done so already) to support and protect those suffering from Long Covid.
- Dedicate a Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission meeting to hear from residents and staff experiencing Long Covid to further inform policy.
- Stay up-to-date on research of the impact of Long Covid including on children and young people and incorporate findings into future policy development and service provision.
- Consider the key recommendations of the Long Covid publication by the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Coronavirus.

Proposer: Cllr Zoë Garbett **Seconder:** Cllr Alistair Binnie-Lubbock

10b **Fair Votes (Amended Substantive Motion)**

Following the acceptance of 2 amendments proposed by the Labour Group, the proposer and seconder amended their motion as follows:

Hackney Council notes:

- Research has found that electoral systems impact participation in politics for example there is a positive correlation between proportional representation (PR) and women elected to legislatures.
- The introduction of PR for local elections in Scotland has led to an increase in turnout, which was 44.8% at the last elections, held in 2022. In contrast turnout in Hackney in 2022 was 34.29% (this varies by ward with the lowest turnout in Hoxton at 24%).
- The Labour Party in government successfully implemented Proportional Representation to a number of elections, introducing PR into the London Assembly, in devolved government for Scotland and Wales and the Supplementary vote for the Mayoral elections.
- The Labour Party's conference in 2022 passed a motion calling on the Party to make a commitment to introduce a Proportional Representation electoral system for general elections.
- 370 Constituency Labour Parties (CLPs) – about 60% of the total number – have now formally passed policy in favour of PR.
- The Green Party has long supported a fairer voting system and PR for national and local elections to ensure seats in parliament better reflect the share of votes cast, as well as supporting extending the right to vote to those aged 16 and up.
- With the Welsh Senedd reviewing legislation on Single Transferable Vote for local councils, England looks likely to be the only part of the UK without any form of PR at the local level.
- According to polling, the majority of voters in the United Kingdom support the use of PR for elections in the United Kingdom.
- The last Labour Government put together the Jenkins Commission, which recommended the adoption of the AV+ voting system. This system is similar to how we vote for the London Assembly, giving voters local representatives and regional list members.
- PR would end minority rule. In 2019, 43.6% of the vote produced a government with 56.2% of the seats and 100% of the power. PR also prevents 'wrong winner' elections such as occurred in 1951 and February 1974.
- The current Conservative government, elected by less than 30% of the electorate under the First Past the Post voting system, led by a Prime Minister selected by just 81,326 Conservative Party members, is enacting an extreme policy platform that was not in its manifesto and does not therefore have any democratic mandate.

- In June 2022, Unison, Prospect and the University and College Union (UCU) voted to embrace more proportional general elections. The list of trade unions that back electoral reform is long and growing, it currently includes Unison, Unite the Union, Fire Brigades Union and Musicians' Union.

Hackney Council recognises:

- That there are many reasons people are disillusioned with politics and that disproportionate electoral systems could have contributed to dangerous levels of distrust and disillusionment with our democratic process along with other factors such as politicians and institutions failing to focus on issues that matter most to people's daily lives.
- That it is essential that faith is restored in our democratic system and that the public see Parliament as fairly reflecting their views and their votes.
- That our First Past the Post voting system could be a significant barrier to restoring this faith.
- That the current Conservative Government introduced the biggest barrier to Hackney's communities engaging in democracy by introducing voter ID requirements and removing the limited use of the supplementary vote in England and Wales in the Elections Act 2022.
- That this Council lobbied against the Elections Act¹, its introduction of voter ID and the removal of the supplementary vote for directly elected Mayors.
- Voter ID is also a significant barrier to Hackney residents engaging in democracy, particularly among poorer and more diverse communities that may not have valid ID such as a passport and drivers licence. 24% of the electorate hold neither a passport or photographic driving licence² and Hackney Council estimates that 47% of households in Hackney have no driving licence holder.³ Democracy must be inclusive and accessible to work.
- That a system of Proportional Representation in which seats match votes and all votes count equally could help to rebuild public trust by ensuring that all political views are represented in Parliament and at local councils in proportion to their level of public support.
- That no voting system is perfect and many forms of Proportional Representation lack the vital local link between elected representatives and their constituents.

1

<https://news.hackney.gov.uk/voter-id-plans-will-disenfranchise-young-black-and-asian-council-tells-mps/>

² <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/voter-id-key-facts-and-figures/>

³ <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>

Hackney Council therefore resolves to:

- To make representations to Hackney's MPs asking them to lobby for change to our outdated electoral systems and support proportional representation.
- To write to the Secretary of State for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities and the Home Secretary, to call for a national review of voting systems in England and condemning the introduction of voter ID and removal of the supplementary vote for Mayoral elections.
- To consult the Hackney Youth Parliament on their choice of voting systems for Youth Council elections.

Proposer: Cllr Zoë Garbett **Seconder:** Cllr Alistair Binnie-Lubbock

10b(i) **Fair Votes (Labour Group Amendment)**

Hackney Council notes:

- Research has found that electoral systems impact participation in politics for example there is a positive correlation between proportional representation (PR) and women elected to legislatures.
- The introduction of PR for local elections in Scotland has led to an increase in turnout, which was 44.8% at the last elections, held in 2022. In contrast turnout in Hackney in 2022 was 34.29% (this varies by ward with the lowest turnout in Hoxton at 24%).
- The Labour Party in government successfully implemented Proportional Representation to a number of elections, introducing PR into the London Assembly, in devolved government for Scotland and Wales and the Supplementary vote for the Mayoral elections.
- The Labour Party's conference in 2022 passed a motion calling on the Party to make a commitment to introduce a Proportional Representation electoral system for general elections.
- 370 Constituency Labour Parties (CLPs) – about 60% of the total number – have now formally passed policy in favour of PR.
- The Green Party has long supported a fairer voting system and PR for national and local elections to ensure seats in parliament better reflect the share of votes cast, as well as supporting extending the right to vote to those aged 16 and up.
- With the Welsh Senedd reviewing legislation on Single Transferable Vote for local councils, England looks likely to be the only part of the UK without any form of PR at the local level.
- According to polling, the majority of voters in the United Kingdom support the use of PR for elections in the United Kingdom.
- The last Labour Government put together the Jenkins Commission, which recommended the adoption of the AV+ voting system. This system is similar to how we vote for the London Assembly, giving voters local representatives and regional list members.
- PR would end minority rule. In 2019, 43.6% of the vote produced a government with 56.2% of the seats and 100% of the power. PR also prevents 'wrong winner' elections such as occurred in 1951 and February 1974.
- The current Conservative government, elected by less than 30% of the electorate under the First Past the Post voting system, led by a Prime Minister selected by just 81,326 Conservative Party members, is enacting an extreme policy platform that was not in its manifesto and does not therefore have any democratic mandate.
- In June 2022, Unison, Prospect and the University and College Union (UCU) voted to embrace more proportional general elections. The list of trade unions

that back electoral reform is long and growing, it currently includes Unison, Unite the Union, Fire Brigades Union and Musicians' Union.

Hackney Council recognises:

- That there are many reasons people are disillusioned with politics and that disproportionate electoral systems could have contributed to dangerous levels of distrust and disillusionment with our democratic process along with other factors such as politicians and institutions failing to focus on issues that matter most to people's daily lives.
- That it is essential that faith is restored in our democratic system and that the public see Parliament as fairly reflecting their views and their votes.
- That our First Past the Post voting system could be a significant barrier to restoring this faith.
- That the current Conservative Government introduced the biggest barrier to Hackney's communities engaging in democracy by introducing voter ID requirements and removing the limited use of the supplementary vote in England and Wales in the Elections Act 2022.
- That this Council lobbied against the Elections Act⁴, its introduction of voter ID and the removal of the supplementary vote for directly elected Mayors.
- Voter ID is also a significant barrier to Hackney residents engaging in democracy, particularly among poorer and more diverse communities that may not have valid ID such as a passport and drivers licence. 24% of the electorate hold neither a passport or photographic driving licence⁵ and Hackney Council estimates that 47% of households in Hackney have no driving licence holder.⁶ Democracy must be inclusive and accessible to work.
- That a system of Proportional Representation in which seats match votes and all votes count equally could help to rebuild public trust by ensuring that all political views are represented in Parliament and at local councils in proportion to their level of public support.
- That no voting system is perfect and many forms of Proportional Representation lack the vital local link between elected representatives and their constituents, risk creating fragile coalitions, and risks creating opportunities for extremist views in our democratic institutions.

4

<https://news.hackney.gov.uk/voter-id-plans-will-disenfranchise-young-black-and-asian-council-tells-mps/>

⁵ <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/voter-id-key-facts-and-figures/>

⁶ <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>

Hackney Council therefore resolves to:

- ~~● To make representations to Hackney's MPs asking them to lobby for change to our outdated electoral systems and support proportional representation.~~
- To write to the Secretary of State for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities and the Home Secretary, to call for a national review of voting systems in England and condemning the introduction of voter ID and removal of the supplementary vote for Mayoral elections.
- To consult the Hackney Youth Parliament on their choice of voting systems for Youth Council elections.

Proposer: Deputy Mayor Bramble

Seconder: Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren



| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | |
| Title of Report | Council Strategic Plan 2022-2026 |
| For Consideration By | Council |
| Meeting Date | 23 November 2022 |
| Classification | Open |
| Ward(s) Affected | All |
| Group Director | Mark Carroll, Chief Executive |

1. Summary

- 1.1. Hackney adopted a corporate plan in 2018 which set out borough and corporate challenges. This was refreshed in the light of the pandemic with a direction of travel for the plan agreed in 2020. Challenges were identified over the short, medium and long term and the nine priorities adopted in 2018 were consolidated into seven. The plan identified the direction of travel for new ways of working, learning from work that had been accelerated during the pandemic.
- 1.2. With new corporate leadership and a new political administration elected in May 2022, a new Strategic Plan has been developed and the full draft is provided as an appendix to this report. The move to describe this as a “Strategic Plan” rather than a “Corporate Plan” is reflective of the outward facing nature of the plan, which considers the role of the Council within a wider partnership.
- 1.3. The Strategic Plan:
 - considers the Council’s role within the wider operating and external context;
 - sets out the key political and corporate commitment for the next four years, which we will report on annually, so that residents and stakeholders can hold us to account;
 - outlines the values, the way we will work in partnership, the priorities for change and for the workforce.
- 1.4. The Strategic Plan is high level by design. The main commitments and agenda for change are outlined, against an analysis of the current context and challenges. This recognises that we are operating in a time that continues to be difficult to predict and a time of global and national crisis. At the time of writing, prospects for the economy are deteriorating and demand

on services is becoming even greater and more acute. We need to be prepared to adapt our plan to an even more challenging context. The more our residents struggle, the greater the demand for council services and support, whilst the pressures of inflation make those services more expensive to deliver.

- 1.5. Like many other authorities our finances have been stretched by 12 years of austerity, the impact of Covid-19, increases on demand on our statutory services and the current unfunded inflationary pressures. Uniquely we also continue to absorb the financial impact of the cyber attack. Each year we refresh our medium term financial plan which takes account of both cost pressures and funding expectations. With the absence of multi-year funding settlements from Government, for a large proportion of the Council's income there is a great deal of uncertainty and assumptions have to be made based on past experience and policy analysis. There is an estimated budget gap for each of the years covered by this plan. The leadership team will aim to close these gaps through budget proposals which are either cost reducing or income generating. This means that the new commitments in this plan will have to be delivered by prioritising what is within existing service budgets.
- 1.6. In response, it is clear that we need to fundamentally change as a Council. I have set interrelating priorities for the way the Council operates that reflect these challenges. We need to be financially sustainable, put residents first and transform both our services and the way we work to become a modern, flexible, collaborative Council, skilled to meet future challenges. The Strategic Plan describes what this means in greater detail, covering:
 - The way we use data and digital technology
 - Build our capability to change
 - Create the right governance and decision making
 - Measure and evaluate our work
 - Putting residents first and shaping all our plans through effective engagement, co-design and co-production.

2. **Recommendations**

- 2.1. That the Strategic Plan be adopted.
- 2.2. To agree to an annual cycle of progress updates to Full Council in May of each year, linked to the Annual Meeting (AM).

3. **Background**
- 3.1. **Policy Context**
- 3.2. In 2018, Hackney adopted a long term vision for the borough, [the Community Strategy](#), that has informed our plans and strategies including the [Local Plan 2033](#):
 - 3.2.1. A borough where everyone can enjoy a good quality of life and the whole community can benefit from growth
 - 3.2.2. A borough where residents and local businesses fulfil their potential and everyone enjoys the benefits of increased local prosperity and contributes to community life
 - 3.2.3. A greener and environmentally sustainable community which is prepared for the future
 - 3.2.4. An open, cohesive, safer and supportive community
 - 3.2.5. A borough with healthy, active and independent resident
- 3.3. This vision recognised that, over the last twenty years, Hackney had become a vibrant place that has enjoyed a new wave of small businesses, makers, technology firms, designers and hospitality industries, attracted by the cultural diversity and vibrancy that creates a unique sense of place. The Council has helped shape this dynamic economy and the opportunities that have been created for residents. The Community Strategy recognised that not all residents had benefited from the prosperity, nor did they feel that existing economic opportunities were available to them. The broad strategic aims set at that time, and strengthened in our Inclusive Economy Strategy were for the Council to focus on aspects of the economy we could influence to enable better access and a share of good economic growth and prosperity.
- 3.4. The cost of living crisis makes this far more challenging. Having this long term strategic vision, however, ensures that we stay focused on our long term goals which still focus on harnessing the opportunities that come from shaping a vibrant inclusive local economy.
- 3.5. Even when this vision was adopted four years ago, there was a recognition that we were operating in an increasingly constrained and difficult context. Having this long term strategic vision helped ensure that the actions taken as part of the pandemic response were designed to still help us achieve our longer term goals. We also continued to progress work to understand what life is like for younger and older people and what action is needed to improve this. This is reflected in the Young Futures report and Ageing Well Strategy which are both being progressed.

- 3.6. Hackney also adopted a corporate plan in 2018 which set out borough and corporate challenges. This was refreshed in the light of the pandemic with a direction of travel for the plan agreed in July 2020. Updates on progress against the last Corporate Plan were provided to Cabinet in July 2021 and February 2022 and have been published on the Council website here: <https://hackney.gov.uk/corporate-plan>
- 3.7. The new Strategic Plan for 2022-2026 has been developed through an iterative process. It is grounded in a rich analysis of the current context, as well as the updates on progress made against the Corporate Plan adopted in 2020 which was reported to Cabinet in July 2021 and February 2022. This work also supported a refresh of the corporate risk register and, in turn, the key strategic risks are reflected in this plan.
- 3.8. The biggest risk to our long term vision is the way that the pandemic and now the cost of living crisis has led to even greater inequality and poverty, impacting those who were already disadvantaged the most. This has also exposed even more greatly the deep rooted structural and systemic racism in Hackney and in wider society. Poverty is entrenching and more people are falling into difficulty. A cost of living crisis disproportionately impacts lower income groups, as more of their income goes on essential costs. Nationally, there is no coherent policy relating to poverty or the cost living crisis. We are also now concerned about an even greater range of impacts on households, regardless of their income, including those with children or with high mortgages, people running businesses and freelancers.
- 3.9. There has already been a strong focus on tackling underlying causes, developing earlier help services and developing the skills of frontline staff to support residents. This becomes more difficult, however, in the face of the growing demands, costs and reduced resources. Daily life is becoming so much more of a struggle for individuals. This places a greater strain on communities and affects economic opportunity, health and wellbeing, how well children thrive, and educational outcomes. As a consequence, we are seeing a growing complexity of need across all frontline services, health inequalities have got worse and we have seen a sharp increase in mental health needs.
- 3.10. This plan sets the vision and priorities for the Council for the next four years. It is ambitious in what it sets out to achieve, but it is recognised that this needs to be delivered in the midst of economic uncertainty and within shrinking resources, which is set out in the Chief Executive's introduction.

- 3.11. [National trends show](#) that trust and confidence in the state is on the decline. Locally, residents still have a relatively high level of trust in the Council, although this is much lower for Black and Global majority residents and social housing tenants. This indicates a polarisation of views and we cannot just focus on the headline. This needs attention and a much more segmented and targeted approach if we are to get actions right to become a fairer borough. This can make it more difficult to reach and engage with residents and start to tackle inequality and meet complex needs. We have worked hard to respond to the Cyber attack in 2020 and the review into the treatment of Child Q in 2022 as these presented key risks to trust and confidence.
- 3.12. A key part of maintaining the current levels of trust and confidence and building trust where it is low, will be improving services, where needed, and this also recognises that those most reliant on Council services will be most greatly impacted by poor services.
- 3.13. The progress that has been made towards a Council that becoming more inclusive and anti-racist and working with cultural humility, including future planned work such as implementing the Social Care Workforce Race Equality Standards, is also going to be critical to us rebuilding trust and confidence. The work done during the pandemic to develop more collaboration with the voluntary and community sector, and grassroots and hyper-local networks, who have the reach and trust of residents, is integral to the way we can reach and engage residents. This includes through the eight local Neighbourhoods focused on preventing ill health, by joining up the work of Council, NHS and community partners.
- 3.14. Another risk to all our ambitions relates to the uncertainty surrounding our population and growth, in the wake of Brexit and the pandemic. In the longer term growth is still forecast and we estimate that, at the time of writing, Hackney's population is likely to be higher than at the time of the 2021 census, when growth was slower than expected. This makes it more difficult to plan services and places for the future. This is in the context of a housing market which remains buoyant and makes buying a house out of reach for most Londoners.
- 3.15. When we adopted our long term vision, increasing local prosperity by harnessing the benefits of local growth seemed far more feasible than it does now. Nationally, nearly three quarters of businesses are concerned about their future. The high employment rates we see nationally and locally, mask growing inequality in the labour market, as demonstrated by the [Deaton Review](#) - with wages stagnating and less secure work. In Hackney one in six people of working age are self-employed but this is much more likely to be an indication of labour market inequality than a positive choice. Whilst Hackney's out of work claimant count has come down since the height of the pandemic in March 2021, it is still much higher than pre pandemic.

- 3.16. We have focused on attracting businesses and employers that can help us shape growth that benefits residents. We have also secured good quality local jobs and increased the number of London Living Wage employers, alongside a proactive response to poverty, but this is not enough.
- 3.17. Hackney continues to build affordable homes and improve the private rented sector, including through licensing schemes and improving temporary accommodation. The high cost of housing and the greater complexity of need in communities, is, however, making meeting housing needs and finding temporary accommodation for homeless people virtually impossible. The Strategic Plan sets out what we will need to prioritise in this very difficult context.
- 3.18. Across London, we are also seeing increased numbers of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants because of a number of global crises. The hostile immigration environment means that there is a great deal of vulnerability in these migrant communities. This is placing an additional pressure on already stretched services and housing. Taken together, this is seriously undermining our first aspiration that everyone can enjoy a good quality of life and that Hackney can be a safe supportive community. Taken together, this is seriously undermining our first aspiration that everyone can enjoy a good quality of life and that Hackney can be a safe supportive community.
- 3.19. Hackney's aspirations to be a greener, more sustainable community have really galvanised in recent years in response to the global climate, pollution, and biodiversity emergencies. Extreme weather events like flooding and overheating are starting to have an impact locally. The UK has committed to net zero by 2050. In 2019, Hackney declared a climate emergency, recognising that if we act now we can impact on this crisis before it is too late, and mitigate impacts. The Council is committed to a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040. At the time of writing we are consulting on a Climate Action Plan which sets out how we might reach net zero by 2030. We are, however, limited in what we can do on our own, at a local level without national policy, funding and intervention. We are, however, limited in what we can do on our own, at a local level without national policy, funding and intervention.
- 3.20. Taking action to tackle climate change is also helping transform the public realm to make it easier to be physically active through improving parks and open spaces, greening our streets and bringing a 'child friendly' planning and design approach to road closures. The pandemic has impacted on residents health and wellbeing but also accelerated efforts to tackle health inequalities and encourage healthy active lifestyles and integrate health and social care.
- 3.21. The work of a Council is very different now from a decade ago, or even 2018, when we set a new vision. Responding to unexpected crisis events is likely to be the "new normal" for many years. National policy is also working against local aspirations - across education, housing, planning and economic development.

- 3.22. We will need to work more effectively with partners on shared outcomes and maximise use of the resources we have for community benefit - procurement, jobs, physical assets as anchor institutions.
- 3.23. We need to support our workforce to keep responding to the needs of a community that is struggling. We need to ask more of our leadership and staff, as we need workforce that both understands what being inclusive and anti-racist means, that is trauma informed and aware of the impact of poverty and that reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels. Our workforce is also, however, struggling with burnout after so many crises, and now the cost of living is pushing Hackney's lower paid staff into poverty. Some areas of our workforce are also ageing and we need to respond to their changing needs and plan for the future workforce in these areas. We have to respond to their material needs as well as thinking about how we retain staff who may well be considering alternative less pressurised roles. It is already difficult to recruit to some roles, particularly after Brexit. This will become more widespread. We will need a new workforce strategy with creative solutions that can respond to these challenges.
- 3.24. Mayoral Vision and priorities for the next four years
- 3.25. Working together with our communities, and our partners to tackle the unprecedented challenges that we face, we will make transformational change, we will co-produce and co-design solutions with residents, we will campaign for a better deal for Hackney; we will deliver outstanding public services; we will drive a fairer economic recovery; and we will make a better Hackney for everyone who lives and works here.
- 3.26. FOR A FAIRER, SAFER HACKNEY
- 3.27. We will tackle inequality through poverty reduction, and anti-racism, providing more Council homes as we improve standards of our existing homes, and creating pathways into decent jobs. We will improve our customer services. We will create safe, vibrant, and successful town centres and neighbourhoods and foster strong, cohesive communities and a more inclusive economy.
- 3.28. FOR A GREENER, HEALTHIER HACKNEY
- 3.29. We will continue to lead the way in the fight against climate change, working towards a net zero Hackney, with cleaner air, less motor traffic, and more liveable neighbourhoods. We will transform adult and children's social care, tackle physical and mental health inequalities and continue to support, value, and give voice to our older and disabled residents.
- 3.30. FOR EVERY CHILD IN HACKNEY

- 3.31. We will work to ensure every child and young person in Hackney has the best start in life; shaping a more inclusive and high performing education system, maintaining our early years and youth services, keeping children safe and investing in their mental health and well being, providing access to outstanding play, culture, and sport, and opportunities; tackling child poverty, and supporting those families who need us most.
- 3.32. Tackling inequality and promoting community wellbeing and cohesion is at the heart of the challenges we face and the response set out in the strategic plan. This has been informed by a detailed [Community Impact Assessment](#) which was first undertaken in March 2020. This assessed likely direct and indirect impacts of the pandemic in the short, medium and long term and was informed by national, regional and local intelligence, both quantitative and qualitative.
- 3.33. The Community Impact Assessment was refreshed in 2021 as this new Strategic Plan was being developed to consider the ways residents' lives were being impacted by multiple challenges. The Impact Assessment considers issues by groups protected under the Equality Act, by groups who are socio-economically disadvantaged and disadvantaged in other ways. It considers the intersectional issues that might mean one group is multiply disadvantaged or discriminated against, for example because of both age and gender. The Impact Assessment also considers the main risks and concerns from a cohesion perspective and actions needed to mitigate these. In addition, a detailed analysis of equality considerations was undertaken during the drafting of the Strategic Plan, to ensure that any gaps are addressed in our final draft.
- 3.33.1. This has all informed these draft equality objectives that explicitly set out how we respond to these issues throughout the Strategic Plan.
 - 3.33.2. The Council's approach to tackling inequality is explicitly identified under the following new draft equality objectives:
 - 3.33.3. Taking action to tackle structural and systemic discrimination - embedding an anti-racist approach and ensuring accountability
 - 3.33.4. Protective, preventative and positive action, that tackles underlying issues, recognising there is proven bias in the system
 - 3.33.5. Promote prosperity and wellbeing with targeted, positive action when needed
 - 3.33.6. Building strong, cohesive communities that are part of the solution
 - 3.33.7. Developing a workforce that is inclusive and anti-racist and reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels

- 3.34. The Equality Objectives in this Strategic Plan are still in draft format. Once the Strategic Plan is adopted, work will begin on developing a more detailed Equality Plan that will identify the proactive actions that will be undertaken under each equality objective. Under the Public Sector Equality Duty, the Council is required to consult on the Equality Objectives. This is planned for early in 2023, with the aim of adopting new objectives by summer 2023.
- 3.35. Sustainability and climate change
- 3.36. Hackney's aspirations to be a greener, more sustainable community have really galvanised in recent years in response to the global climate, pollution, and biodiversity emergencies. Extreme weather events like flooding and overheating are starting to have an impact locally. The UK has committed to net zero by 2050. In 2019, Hackney declared a climate emergency, recognising that if we act now we can impact on this crisis before it is too late, and mitigate impacts. The Council is committed to a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040. At the time of writing we are consulting on a Climate Action Plan which sets out how we might reach net zero by 2030. We are ambitious, however, constrained in what we can do on our own, at a local level without national policy, funding and powers to fully deliver. The Strategic Plan identifies the main commitments that are in the consultation draft of the Climate Action Plan for the borough that was agreed by Cabinet in October 2022.
- 3.37. Consultations
- 3.38. The new Strategic for 2022-2026 Plan has been developed through an iterative process outlined in the Policy Context under 6.1. A refresh of the Council's 2018 Corporate Plan was undertaken in July 2020. This means that the new plan is grounded in rich analysis of national, regional and local intelligence, both quantitative and qualitative and including resident views. Hackney's most recent Resident Survey undertaken earlier in 2022 has also been closely reviewed as part of this. The Strategic Plan is also informed by the political commitments made by the directly elected Mayor and Labour Party administration.
- 3.39. Risk assessment
- 3.40. The main risk of adopting a Strategic Plan is that it will only become more difficult to meet the commitments in the plan because the operating context becomes even more challenging with a worsening economy and increased demand on services. There is a specific related financial risk of being unable to deliver the commitments set out.

- 3.41. The main way that this risk is being managed is to be upfront in this plan about these challenges and how we need to respond. The second way that risk is managed is in the type of plan we are choosing, which is deliberately an adaptive plan that can help us stay focused on our long term vision and key commitments without being too prescriptive. The Strategic Plan is also grounded in an understanding of the conditions that need to be in place for the plan to be successful, and the ways that the Council will need to work differently to achieve this.
- 3.42. The Plan makes it clear that there is nothing in reserve for new commitments in this plan. They will have to be prioritised within existing service budgets.
- 3.43. On balance, there are more strategic risks from not adopting a Strategic Plan. These risks are about “mission drift” away from the outcomes we want to achieve to a more reactive response, as the operating context continues to be challenging, unpredictable and complex. This may result in more reactive ways of working without a careful strategic response.

4. Comments of the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources.

- 4.1. This plan sets the vision and priorities for the Council for the next four years. It is ambitious in what it sets out to achieve, but it is recognised that this needs to be delivered in the midst of economic uncertainty and within shrinking resources.
- 4.2. The fiscal and economic context in which the Strategic Plan is prepared is very bleak. Recent data suggests the Government is not only dealing with an economy which according to the Bank of England is in recession (September 2022) but also a deteriorating labour market and persistent elevated price pressures. In particular, the manufacturing decline is gathering pace to a worrying degree.
- 4.3. The cost of living crisis shows no sign of easing with inflation at 10.1% in September 2022. The high level of inflation has led to real wages (wages adjusted to take account of inflation) falling. Excluding bonuses, real wages have fallen by 3.0% since this time last year, a record fall.
- 4.4. So the deteriorating prospects for the economy are clear. The Bank of England expects a downturn towards the end of the year, with a contraction of almost 1 per cent between October and December. For the following year, GDP is forecast to remain below 2022 levels throughout the whole of 2023 with growth expected to average at zero across the twelve months.
- 4.5. The wide repercussions of much of this permeates this plan as it impacts directly on the lives of our residents and therefore on our priorities. It also impacts on the resources we have to deliver against those priorities.
- 4.6. Like many other authorities our finances have been stretched by 12 years of austerity, the impact of Covid-19, increases on demand on our statutory

services and the current unfunded inflationary pressures. Uniquely we also continue to absorb the financial impact of the cyber attack.

- 4.7. Each year we refresh our medium term financial plan which takes account of both cost pressures, and funding expectations. Cost pressures arise from inflationary factors, such as the pay award and energy prices but also from the demand for our services where additional investment is required to meet the needs of some of the most vulnerable residents. With the absence of multi-year funding settlements from Government, for a large proportion of the Council's income there is a great deal of uncertainty and assumptions are made based on experience and policy analysis.
- 4.8. Inevitably, we are estimating a budget gap for each of the years covered by the Strategic Plan. Through budget development work the leadership team will aim to close these gaps through budget proposals which are focussed on working innovatively and transforming our services but there will inevitably be some hard choices to be made. Although this is an annual process, we will look to plan ahead and identify proposals for both the next and subsequent financial years. This also means that new commitments in this plan will have to be delivered within existing service budgets through prioritisation processes.

5. Comments of the Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services

- 5.1. Under section 1 of the Localism Act (Local authority's general power of competence) a local authority has power to do anything that individuals generally may do. In addition, under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 (Subsidiary powers of local authorities) a local authority shall have power to do any thing (whether or not involving the expenditure, borrowing or lending of money or the acquisition or disposal of any property or rights) which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of their functions.
- 5.2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Strategic Plan is one of the discretionary documents forming part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework. Therefore the adoption of the Strategic Plan is a matter for Full Council and the recommendations are reflective of this.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - [The Full Strategic Plan](#)

| | |
|--|--|
| Report Author | Sonia Khan Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery 0208 356 5148 sonia.khan@hackney.gov.uk |
| Comments for the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources prepared by | Jackie Moylan Director, Financial Management 020 8356 3032 jackie.moylan@hackney.gov.uk |
| Comments for the Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services prepared by | Patrick Rodger Senior Lawyer 020 8356 6187 patrick.rodger@hackney.gov.uk |

Hackney Strategic Plan - Working Together for a Better Hackney

1. Exec summary

Foreword

This Strategic Plan, 'Working Together for a Better Hackney', sets out the ambitions for the Council for the next four years, as well as the challenges we face, and how we will respond, working closely with residents and partners. The Plan describes how we need to change as an organisation and become more collaborative and outward looking to work across the system to meet these challenges.

The Strategic Plan is framed by the new priorities for my new term as elected Mayor of Hackney for 2022-2026 and reflects the Manifesto Commitments of the newly elected Labour administration. They are underpinned by the Council's corporate values and the priorities for change.

We are in one of the most difficult times in post war memory; the Covid-19 pandemic has exposed and exacerbated the deep inequalities in society, and in our borough. In the Council, we have been victim to a severe criminal cyberattack which threatened many of our services, as well as our financial position and impacted on residents. Staff responded to those twin challenges with creativity and resilience but they were stretched to their limits. At the same time we accelerated our efforts to work towards becoming not just more inclusive, but a proudly anti-racist organisation, as well as stepping up our response to the climate emergency.

Sound financial management has been the bedrock of the Council's approach for many years, and as the UK faces the most severe cost-of-living crisis in 40 years, financial stability remains key. The more our residents struggle, the greater the demand for council services and support, whilst the pressures of inflation and rising interest rates make those services more expensive to deliver.

The updated Mayoral priorities and our 2022 Manifesto, are stretching and ambitious for the Council and our borough. They are focused on changing the Council for the better to achieve the best outcomes for residents, changing the way we deliver services, collaborating with other organisations and changing our relationship with residents and businesses. We will need to work hand in hand with residents and communities, always putting them first, and shaping all our plans through effective engagement, co-design and co-production.

This will mean that we need a leadership and workforce that is ambitious, and pioneering, ready to learn new skills and new ways of working. We will invest in their skills to unlock their talent and deep commitment to Hackney, and make sure the corporate buildings and equipment they use are commensurate to this task We will

ensure we are ready to tackle the climate emergency and accelerate our use of data, technology, and new partnerships to deliver better services and reduce inequality.

We have a role to play in driving economic recovery in a way that builds community wealth and continues to make the borough greener and fairer. As a leading institution in Hackney we can use our assets, job opportunities and our buying power to benefit residents and the local community, and this plan encourages others to join us. By working together we can maximise the benefit of those combined resources and a truly sustainable, inclusive and circular economy.

Hackney has changed beyond measure over the past 20 years, and it continues to evolve as a place, as new Census data for 2021 shows us. No one is certain what the long term future for London, and for cities in general, looks like and whether the trends we are seeing now will continue. But Hackney is an incredible place with amazing people, and I am confident that however our borough changes, it will still be the heart of London; diverse, vibrant, creative, exciting, and economically adaptable. I want to ensure we make the most of that change, reduce inequality and remain focused on our ambition for the borough and for our residents, no matter what we face together.

Introduction

Hackney adopted a corporate plan in 2018 which set out borough and corporate challenges. This was refreshed in the light of the pandemic in July 2020.

It is timely, at the beginning of a new political term, with new senior leaders joining the Council to refresh and reframe our core plan. At the time of writing, prospects for the economy are deteriorating and demand on services is becoming even greater and more acute. The more our residents struggle, the greater the demand for council services and support, whilst the financial pressures and potential for further Government cuts make those services more difficult to deliver.

This plan considers the role of the Council and what we can set out to achieve over the four years within this bigger picture. We have looked at Hackney's population and economy, needs in communities and what the trends are likely to be. We have also reviewed the published progress updates against the last plan. The Strategic Plan has also been developed with the Council's finances in mind. There is no certainty about future finances from Government and we are having to make a lot of assumptions. We currently estimate a budget gap for each of the years covered by this plan. The leadership team will aim to close these gaps but this will either mean cost reductions or income generation. The new commitments in this plan will have to be delivered by further innovation and prioritising what is within future service budgets.

We have considered the roles and plans for partner organisations, community organisations and residents. We have also reflected on how the Council is viewed, and what our values need to be to deliver better outcomes and build confidence where we have lost it. The Plan focuses as much on how we work as what we do, recognising that there will have to be change within the Council and across the whole system. We need to be financially sustainable, put residents first and transform both our services and the way we work to become a modern, innovative and creative organisation. The Strategic Plan describes what this means in greater detail, covering the way we use data, build our capability to change, create the right governance and decision making, measure and evaluate our work, involve residents and use technology.

The Strategic Plan identifies the main commitments, the ways the Council will change and work differently, the partnerships we need and the way we want to work more closely with residents. We know that we need to be prepared to adapt the plan as we face yet greater challenges, whilst keeping focused on the key outcomes we want to improve and the key commitments we want to deliver.

2. Context

2.1 Hackney the place and people

Population trends

- Hackney's population has increased by 5.3%, from around 246,300 in 2011 to 259,200 in 2021. This is lower than we expected and lower than the overall increase for England (6.6%), but comes after a previous decade of substantial growth.
- This is likely to be because the Census date was during the Covid-19 pandemic and Hackney's population may have been temporarily lower. We estimate Hackney's population to be closer to 280,941 which is the 2022 estimate based on population trend analysis.
- Based on the 2011 census (we don't have the 2021 estimates yet) Hackney is a relatively young borough. The 25-49 age group makes up almost half the borough at 48% of the total population with 30% being under 25. Hackney's older population will be the group who increases the most - we expect the group who are over 65 years old to increase from 21,105 to 32,249 by 2037.
- Hackney is the third most densely populated of London's 33 local authority areas

(Census data 2011 and 2021)

Economy

- Hackney has experienced rapid economic growth. Our business base has more than doubled since 2010, when we had 10,450 businesses, to 22,560 businesses in 2019. The vast majority of our businesses (99.8%) count as small and medium size businesses which means they have less than 250 employees (ONS Business Register 2019).
- Nationally 72% of businesses reported they had some form of concern for their business for October 2022 ([ONS Business Survey](#)).

Resident views

- 85% percent of residents are either very satisfied or fairly satisfied with their local area as a place to live, which is slightly higher than in 2018 when it was 83% and higher than the local government benchmark of 81%
- 65% of residents are satisfied with Hackney Council, down from 68% in 2018 and 74% in 2013- this downward trend is in line with the local government benchmark
- 67% of residents say that they have trust in the Council compared with 73% in 2018 - this is above the local government benchmark of 58%
- Social renters and Black residents are significantly more likely to give negative responses to all these questions

(Hackney Residents Survey 2022)

2.2 The key opportunities and challenges for residents and risks to our long term strategy

In 2018, Hackney adopted a long term vision for the borough, [the Community Strategy](#), that has informed our plans and strategies including the [Local Plan 2033](#):

1. A borough where everyone can enjoy a good quality of life and the whole community can benefit from growth
2. A borough where residents and local businesses fulfil their potential and everyone enjoys the benefits of increased local prosperity and contributes to community life
3. A greener and environmentally sustainable community which is prepared for the future
4. An open, cohesive, safer and supportive community
5. A borough with healthy, active and independent residents

This vision recognised that, over the last twenty years, Hackney had become a vibrant place that has enjoyed a new wave of small businesses, makers, technology firms, designers and hospitality industries, attracted by the cultural diversity and vibrancy that creates a unique sense of place. The Council has helped shape this dynamic economy and the opportunities that have been created for residents. The Community Strategy recognised that not all residents had benefited from the prosperity, nor did they feel that existing economic opportunities were available to them. The broad strategic aims set at that time, and strengthened in our Inclusive Economy Strategy were for the Council to focus on aspects of the economy we could influence to enable better access and a share of good economic growth and prosperity.

The cost of living crisis makes this far more challenging. Having this long term strategic vision, however, ensures that we stay focused on our long term goals which still focus on harnessing the opportunities that come from shaping a vibrant inclusive local economy.

Even in our pandemic response, we tried to keep this long term vision in mind in the way we delivered our response, for example, ensuring resources went into the local

economy, supporting local communities and businesses. A detailed account of progress in the first four years is provided in this [Corporate Plan update](#).

The cumulative impacts of the pandemic, the cost of living crisis and global crises

The biggest risk to our long term vision that we now face is the way that the pandemic and now the cost of living crisis has led to even greater inequality and poverty, impacting those who were already disadvantaged the most. This has also exposed even more greatly the deep rooted structural and systemic racism in Hackney and in wider society. Poverty is entrenching and more people are falling into difficulty. A cost of living crisis disproportionately impacts lower income groups, as more of their income goes on essential costs. In Hackney many residents are in very low paid and insecure employment or cannot access public funds and their lives are becoming more precarious. We are also now concerned about an even greater range of impacts on households, regardless of their income, including those with children or with high mortgages, people running businesses and freelancers. Nationally, there is no coherent policy relating to poverty or the cost living crisis.

There has already been a strong focus on tackling underlying causes, developing earlier help services, shaping an inclusive economy that benefits local residents and developing the skills of frontline staff to support residents. This becomes more difficult, however, in the face of the growing demands, costs and reduced resources. Daily life is becoming so much more of a struggle for individuals. This places a greater strain on communities and affects economic opportunity, health and wellbeing, how well children thrive, and educational outcomes. Added to this, some residents who were vulnerable during the pandemic, and remain vulnerable, including older and disabled people, have become more socially isolated.

As a consequence, we are seeing a growing complexity of need across all frontline services, health inequalities have got worse and we have seen a sharp increase in mental health needs. The pressures that the health and care system is under is intensifying and making this much more challenging, with rising waiting times, people not able to access the care they need and persistent workforce shortages. Adult Social Care continues to work well with health partners to improve hospital discharge pathways. More working age and older adults are, however, turning to the Council for care and support than before, and this is rising a lot faster than population growth. This includes a significant increase in those requiring support to leave hospital safely. All of this leads to a higher level of preventable long term health conditions, which creates more pressure on the health system, affects quality of life, takes people out of the labour market and makes it much more difficult to age well.

Across London, we are also seeing increased numbers of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants because of a number of global crises. The hostile immigration environment means that there is a great deal of vulnerability in these migrant communities. This is placing an additional pressure on already stretched services and housing. Taken together, this is seriously undermining our first aspiration that everyone can enjoy a good quality of life and that Hackney can be a safe supportive community.

Impacts on public sector finances

This plan, built on the manifesto, sets the vision and priorities for the Council for the next four years. It is ambitious in what it sets out to achieve, but it is recognised that this needs to be delivered in the midst of economic uncertainty and within shrinking resources.

The economic context in which the Strategic Plan is prepared is very bleak. According to the Bank of England the UK is in recession (September 2022) with no growth forecast for next year. The cost of living crisis shows no sign of easing with inflation reaching 10.1% in September 2022 and forecast by the Bank of England to reach just over 13% in the last three months of 2022. Some food prices have risen particularly rapidly. The high level of inflation has led to real wages (wages adjusted to take account of inflation) falling in recent months by 3.0%, excluding bonuses, since this time last year, a record fall after a decade of very low inflation.

The wide repercussions of much of this permeates this plan as it impacts directly on the lives of our residents and therefore on our priorities. It also impacts on the resources we have to deliver against those priorities.

Like many other authorities our finances have been stretched by 12 years of austerity, the impact of Covid-19, increased demand on our statutory services and the current unfunded inflationary pressures. Uniquely we also continue to absorb the financial impact of the cyber attack.

Each year we refresh our medium term financial plan which takes account of both cost pressures and funding expectations. With the absence of multi-year funding settlements from the Government, for a large proportion of the Council's income there is a great deal of uncertainty and assumptions are made based on experience and policy analysis. Inevitably, we are estimating a budget gap for each of the years covered by the Strategic Plan. We will aim to close these gaps through budget proposals which are focussed on working innovatively and transforming our services but there will inevitably be some hard choices to be made.. For example, ew commitments in this plan will have to be prioritised within existing service budgets. Detailed financial assessments are therefore being undertaken of some of the most significant and costly commitments, for example those in the proposed Climate Action Plan.

It is of note that in 2010/11, our core funding was £304m. If we compare this to the 2022-23 total (adjusted to ensure as best as possible, a like for like comparison) we have a total of £162 m. This is a reduction of £142m or 47% from the 2010/11 total

This has been a seismic financial challenge which has been met through a combination of back office efficiencies, service transformation, rationalising our estate, insourcing and increases in income. Largely front-line services have been protected. Whilst we need to continue to challenge services to deliver more efficiently, this will not protect the frontline, we need to identify more radical solutions through the innovation and transformation referred to above and may need to invest in some areas to save money in the medium term.

What we mustn't lose sight of when articulating the financial challenges we face and the savings we make, is that year on year we continue to increase investment in our services, be that through pay awards for our staff that are not matched by increases in funding or funding cost pressures and demand in services (£12m estimated for 2023/24, for example), with most of this being invested in some of our most vulnerable residents in meeting increasing social care needs.

The Council has also faced difficulties for a number of years in fully funding social infrastructure, such as schools and health facilities through public finances and developers' contributions alone. We have had to use cross subsidy from our own development, although this may now be less viable because of the economic context.

In response, we need to use land and assets strategically and transformatively to deliver the homes, business space, infrastructure and other facilities that the communities need, whilst at the same time using Council land and assets to generate revenue and capital income that will support essential Council services in the long term. To help support this, we have agreed to implement a Corporate Landlord Operating Model and as part of that process we will ensure that governance is in place to look at assets and infrastructure delivery, strategic priorities and needs of local communities in the round. We are also undertaking a cross-cutting review of income generation. The aim is to maximise the council's income generation potential, to contribute to the ongoing sustainability of services.

When we adopted our long term vision, increasing local prosperity by harnessing the benefits of local growth seemed far more feasible than it does now. The high employment rates we see nationally and locally, mask growing inequality in the labour market. In this context, we need to unlock our own resources and to work more effectively with partners, who are "anchor institutions", to maximise use of all the resources across the whole system for the community's benefit - external funding, procurement, jobs, and physical assets. We also need to shape an economy that is greener and more circular to meet our net zero ambitions and to make sure it is future proofed and resilient.

Trust and confidence in the state

[National trends show](#) that trust and confidence in the state is on the decline. Locally, residents still have a relatively high level of trust in the Council, although this is much lower for Black and Global majority residents and social housing tenants. This indicates a polarisation of views and we cannot just focus on the headline. This needs attention and a much more segmented and targeted approach if we are to get actions right to become a fairer borough. This can make it more difficult to reach and engage with residents and start to tackle inequality and meet complex needs. We have worked hard to respond to the Cyber attack in 2020, Black Lives Matter and the review into the treatment of Child Q in 2022, as these presented key risks to trust and confidence.

A key part of maintaining the current levels of trust and confidence and building trust where it is low, will be improving services, where needed, and this also recognises

that those most reliant on Council services will be most greatly impacted by poor services.

The progress that has been made towards the Council becoming more inclusive, humble and anti-racist, including future planned work such as implementing the Social Care Workforce Race Equality Standards, is also going to be critical to us rebuilding trust and confidence. The work done during the pandemic to develop more collaboration with the voluntary and community sector, and grassroots and hyper-local networks, who have the reach and trust of residents, is integral to the way we can reach and engage residents. This includes through the eight Primary Care Networks and local Neighbourhoods focused on preventing ill health, by joining up the work of Council, NHS and community partners.

Population uncertainty

Another risk to all our ambitions relates to the uncertainty surrounding our population and growth, in the wake of Brexit and the pandemic. In the longer term growth is still forecast and we estimate that, at the time of writing, Hackney's population is likely to be higher than at the time of the 2021 census, when growth was slower than expected. We are less clear, however, about what our demographic makeup will be and whether, for example, we will see a continued decline in school roll numbers and increase in asylum seekers housed in "temporary" hostel/ hotel accommodation. This makes it more difficult to plan services and places for the future. This is in the context of a housing market which remains buoyant and makes buying or even now renting a house out of reach for most Londoners.

Housing crisis

Hackney continues to build affordable homes and improve the private rented sector, including through licensing schemes and improving temporary accommodation. The high cost of housing and the greater complexity of need in communities, is, however, making meeting housing needs and finding temporary accommodation for homeless people virtually impossible. The Strategic Plan sets out what we will need to prioritise in this very difficult context.

Meeting net zero targets

Hackney's aspirations to be a greener, more sustainable community have really galvanised in recent years in response to the global climate, pollution, and biodiversity emergencies. Extreme weather events like flooding and overheating are starting to have an impact locally. The UK has committed to net zero by 2050. In 2019, Hackney declared a climate emergency, recognising that if we act now we can impact on this crisis before it is too late, and mitigate impacts. The Council is committed to a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040. At the time of writing we are consulting on a Climate Action Plan which sets out how we might reach net zero by 2030. We are, however, limited in what we can do on our own, at a local level without national policy, funding and intervention.

Taking action to tackle climate change is also helping transform the public realm to make it easier to be physically active through improving parks and open spaces, award winning work to green our streets and bringing a 'child friendly' planning and design approach to road closures. The pandemic has impacted on residents health and wellbeing but also accelerated efforts to tackle health inequalities and encourage healthy active lifestyles and integrate health and social care.

Global and national crisis

The work of a Council is very different now from a decade ago, or even 2018, when we set a new vision. Responding to unexpected crisis events is likely to be the "new normal" for many years. In recent years we have had to respond to increased risks from terrorism, the Grenfell Tower tragedy, climate events, refugee crises, a pandemic and now a cost of living crisis. National policy is also working against local aspirations - across education, housing, planning and economic development.

Workforce and leadership

We need to support our workforce to keep responding to the needs of a community that is struggling. We need to ask more of our leadership and staff, as we need workforce that both understands what being inclusive and anti-racist means, that is trauma informed and aware of the impact of poverty and that reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels. Our workforce is also, however, struggling with burnout after so many crises, and now the cost of living is pushing Hackney's lower paid staff into poverty. Some areas of our workforce are also ageing and we need to respond to their changing needs and plan for the future workforce in these areas. We have to respond to their material needs as well as thinking about how we retain staff who may well be considering alternative less pressurised roles. It is already difficult to recruit to some roles, particularly after Brexit. This will become more widespread. We will need a new workforce strategy with creative solutions that can respond to these challenges.

3. Our response - Mayor's vision and priorities

Vision for the next four years

Working together with our communities, and our partners to tackle the unprecedented challenges that we face, we will make transformational change, we will co-produce and co-design solutions with residents, we will campaign for a better deal for Hackney; we will deliver outstanding public services; we will drive a fairer economic recovery; and we will make a better Hackney for everyone who lives and works here.

Mayoral Priorities

Working together...

FOR A FAIRER, SAFER HACKNEY

We will tackle inequality through poverty reduction, and anti-racism, providing at least 1000 more Council homes as we improve standards of our existing homes, and creating pathways into decent jobs. We will improve our customer services. We will

create safe, vibrant, and successful town centres and neighbourhoods and foster strong, cohesive communities and a more inclusive economy.

FOR A GREENER, HEALTHIER HACKNEY

We will continue to lead the way in the fight against climate change, working towards a net zero Hackney, with cleaner air, less motor traffic, and more liveable neighbourhoods. We will transform adult and children's social care, tackle physical and mental health inequalities and continue to support, value, and give voice to our older and disabled residents.

FOR EVERY CHILD IN HACKNEY

We will work to ensure every child and young person in Hackney has the best start in life; shaping a more inclusive and high performing education system, maintaining our early years and youth services, keeping children safe and investing in their mental health and well being, providing access to outstanding play, culture, and sport, and opportunities; tackling child poverty, and supporting those families who need us most.

Approach to tackling inequality - that is embedded throughout this plan

1. Taking action to tackle structural and systemic discrimination - embedding an anti-racist approach and ensuring accountability
2. Protective, preventative and positive action, that tackles underlying issues, recognising there is proven bias in the system
3. Promote prosperity and wellbeing with targeted, positive action when needed
4. Building strong, cohesive communities that are part of the solution
5. Developing a workforce that is inclusive and anti-racist and reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels

Priorities

FOR A FAIRER, SAFER HACKNEY

Key Outcomes we will track

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Income | Average pay in Hackney is lower than London and falling whilst the average London wage goes up. For the first time in recent years, women's weekly full time average pay has dropped fairly sharply and is below the level of men's (ONS annual survey). |
| Employment | Employment rate is 78.3% which is higher than before the pandemic. (ONS annual survey). |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Satisfaction with the place | 85% percent of residents are either very satisfied or fairly satisfied with their local area as a place to live, which is slightly higher than in 2018 when it was 83%. (Hackney Residents' Survey 2022) |
| Trust in the Council | <p>65% of residents are satisfied with Hackney Council, down from 68% in 2018 and 74% in 2013.</p> <p>67% of residents say that they have trust in the Council compared with 73% in 2018</p> <p>Social renters and Black residents are significantly more likely to give negative responses to all these questions. (Hackney Residents' Survey 2022)</p> |

Key indicators

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Unemployment | Hackney's out of work claimant count has come down to 5.2% (11,395 people) in July 2022 from just under 9.7% (20,000 people) in March 2021, but this is still much higher than pre pandemic - last time the rate was this high was 2012. This is also higher than London and 18-24 year olds and over 50s are particularly affected (ONS annual survey). |
| Poverty | 36.3% of Hackney households live in poverty after housing costs - Hackney is ranked the third highest out of all London boroughs for poverty after housing costs. (ONS modelling) and 48% of children in Hackney were living in poverty after housing costs (Modelling undertaken for the End Child Poverty Campaign) |
| Refugees and asylum seekers | London has also seen an increase in asylum seekers even before the current refugee crisis (from 700 to 5000 in 5 years) and Hackney has also welcomed over 70 refugees from Syria and Afghanistan and over 350 (to date) from Ukraine through formal schemes. |
| Housing | Hackney saw a 108% increase in housing prices in the ten years to 2021 , which is a faster rate than anywhere in London (UK Land Registry data) |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <p>One third of residents live in private rented housing. A three bedroom property in Hackney is £2280 in rent which is £500 per month or more above the London average (ONS data used in this London Rents Map)</p> |
| Crime | <p>During lockdown restrictions, crime went down. This data compares trends in 2019 before restrictions with the latest data: Knife crime and gun crime is lower in 2022 than it was in 2019. 'Theft from person' (including shoplifting) is up on the 2019/20 rolling 12 month figure and the hotspots are Shoreditch.</p> <p>Being worried about being a victim of a crime has decreased significantly since 2018 for all types of crimes (e.g. knife crime is down from 55% in 2018 to 36% in 2022, but women and Global Majority ethnicity residents remain more likely to be worried about some types of crime.</p> |

Tackling poverty and inequality

Hackney is a borough where **poverty and inequality** is becoming more entrenched after a decade of austerity measures and a pandemic. We need to take action in the short and long term to respond to this, creating the safety net needed to prevent people in need becoming more vulnerable and facing homelessness, whilst still dealing with the underlying causes of poverty and inequality. As well as coordinating support, we need to ensure that we work with empathy and compassion and support the whole person, not just their presenting issue. These are also times of global instability, we are proud of our work to support migrants and refugees and we plan to do all we can to remain a borough that welcomes refugees and asylum seekers, playing our part along with the rest of London.

We will:

- Improve the safety net for those in poverty, working across council services, partners and the voluntary and community sector to make the best use of scarce resources.
- Play our part in refugee crises, participating in formal schemes and valuing the community partnerships that are in place to deliver wider support.
- Maximise employment opportunities and support to ensure residents have immediate, practical help if they are struggling to find work.
- Address safeguarding risks with preventative actions
- Support those with complex needs- including those in housing need and who are homeless

- Develop new equality priorities that flow from the equality objectives set out earlier in this plan, and take account of refreshed analysis of need. These will incorporate existing priorities to:
 - Tackle the underlying causes of poverty and inequality that are set out in our [poverty reduction framework](#)
 - Embed anti-racism throughout the work of the Council and partners
 - Identify the proactive work that is needed to tackle structural and systemic inequality across the life course
 - Develop a LGBTQIA Strategic Framework

Responding to the Housing Crisis

We will respond to the housing crisis that Hackney has been in for many years by:

- Campaigning to improve standards in the private rented sector including pushing for more protection for residents from landlords (including ending “no fault” evictions), and campaigning for full licensing of the private sector.
- Reviewing the impact of the [Lettings Strategy](#) adopted in October 2021 and Choice Based Lettings to ensure it is delivering on its objectives and leaving no one behind
- Offering advice to residents at risk of eviction to help them keep their tenancies and offering advice about housing options in the private rented sector, working in a relational and trauma informed way
- Prioritising decarbonisation and “net zero” targets for all housing in Hackney
- Supporting the health needs of residents - including helping to improve mental and physical wellbeing and meet the needs of disabled people.
- Maximising opportunities for developing genuinely affordable housing, with a focus on the provision of Council Social Rent units, as part of our overarching approach to finding innovative ways to increase housing supply including working with experienced developers and other landowners to maximise the supply and pace of new homes delivery. This will also include exploring delivery of Hackney Living Rent - where rent is set at an average of local income and with longer tenancies - and for shared ownership to help local people onto the housing ladder. We will do that by building new homes, refurbishing empty homes, and buying back council homes that were bought under Right-to-Buy
- We will prioritise the delivery of high quality homes and genuinely affordable housing in our growth areas and town centres, alongside other facilities and infrastructure to support inclusive and resilient communities, support our economy, and create great places.
- Continue our partnership working with Registered Providers to maximise genuinely affordable homes, including Hackney Living Rent units
- Developing an Ending Homelessness Strategy to build on the progress that we made with the “Everyone In” scheme during lockdowns.

We also look forward to receiving recommendations from Scrutiny exploring and advising on existing housing models and developing new ways to build affordable and accessible homes in Hackney.

Making Hackney Safer

During lockdown restrictions, crime levels went down. Since coming out of restrictions, crime rates have increased but, overall, are lower than 2019/20. Being worried about being a victim of a crime has decreased significantly but women and Global Majority ethnicity residents remain more likely to be worried about some types of crime. To continue to make Hackney a safer place, we need to address the concerns of groups who feel or are less safe. We also need to address trust and confidence in policing which is low according to MOPAC confidence and satisfaction data. We are committed to work with the Police to build trust and confidence through shared actions between the Police, Council and community.

We will:

- Work in partnership to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour
- Progress actions to tackle hate crime, in partnership with communities and the newly formed Hate Crime Forum
- We will continue to prioritise building and fire safety recommendations for all housing in Hackney, ensuring that our homes are safe, sustainable and future proof. We will deliver a council-led Building Control service that will ensure new development in Hackney meets the highest fire safety standards.
- Progress the Council's Hackney Nights Strategy to provide clarity to residents and businesses on our approach, supporting growth while managing the impacts, in partnership with the Police
- Ensure there is a consistent understanding of the root causes of serious violence based on a public health approach
- Review our approach to gangs, ensuring that it focuses on prevention and victim support
- Work with community organisations to support people into drug treatment and recovery programmes, reducing harm arising from substance misuse for individuals and communities

Building trust and confidence in the Council and wider state needs to cut across all we do, without this we will struggle to reach the residents that need our support and to build good relations.

We will:

- Improve the way we manage Council housing and the overall condition of housing and set the same expectations of social housing landlords
- Work with the Police to build trust and confidence through shared actions between the Police, Council and community
- Take action at all levels to become more inclusive, humble and anti-racist
- Take a single council approach to enabling community regeneration in Hackney that requires all public services to combine resources to improve quality of place and services.

Hackney is a relatively **cohesive borough** but the community is under strain and tensions can rise quickly. We need to keep proactively building good community relations. There is a high level of civil society activity, and this can make us more resilient in challenging times, but local community organisations are under strain,

struggling to recruit volunteers, meet demand and stay afloat in the face of rising costs.

We will:

- Value and invest in volunteers and the voluntary and community sector and build ongoing partnerships, involving them in work across the areas of the strategic plan.
- Work with residents, artists, practitioners, creatives and performers to help them shape the cultural life of the borough, strengthen our communities, and enhance the quality of life for everyone.

Good growth: Jobs, businesses and regeneration

Over the last twenty years Hackney has become a vibrant place that, despite the economic downturn in 2009, has enjoyed a new wave of small businesses, makers, technology firms, designers and hospitality industries, attracted by the cultural diversity and vibrancy that creates a unique sense of place. This builds on a long history of industrialism, innovation and creativity. The Council is proud of the part it has played in shaping this dynamic economy and in the opportunities that have been created for residents.

Our Inclusive Economy Strategy, published in 2019, recognised that many longer term residents had not benefited from the prosperity, nor did they feel that existing economic opportunities were available to them. The broad strategic aims set at that time were for the Council to focus on aspects of the economy we can influence with targeted interventions to enable better access and a share of good economic growth. Through the pandemic this activity was very much about immediate crisis support for our residents and business sectors most impacted by the various lockdowns.

Maximising and shaping employment opportunities

The high employment rates we see nationally and locally, mask growing inequality in the labour market, as demonstrated by the [Deaton Review](#) - with wages stagnating and less secure work. This is particularly affecting low earners and increasing in work poverty. The UK and London have also seen changes in the nature of employment, with a rise in both part-time employment and in insecure forms of employment including temporary and zero hours contracts. The London labour market is 'hollowing out', with an increasing concentration of highly skilled, well paid jobs and low-paid, low skilled service sector jobs but fewer progression opportunities in between.

We need to find ways to better support local people and our workforce to keep pace with these changes and to learn new skills across their working life. We also need to collaborate with the business community, education providers and local communities to widen participation and open up well paid and good quality job opportunities in newer industries.

We are particularly concerned about how all of this affects those who already face labour market inequality including those who have been unemployed for over a year,

black and global majority residents, disabled residents, women, parents with dependent children, residents over 50 and young people.

In Hackney one in six people of working age are self-employed but this is much more likely to be an indication of labour market inequality than a positive choice. Whilst Hackney's out of work claimant count has come down since the height of the pandemic in March 2021, it is still much higher than pre pandemic.

We have focused on attracting businesses and employers that can help us shape growth that benefits residents. We have also secured good quality local jobs and increased the number of London Living Wage employers with 150 businesses in Hackney now signed up, which represents a 15% rise from the previous year. We continue to proactively engage with and encourage the local businesses community to become London Living Wage employers, alongside a proactive response to poverty. We now need to go further to ensure residents are first in line for job opportunities.

We will:

- Continue to be a London Living Wage employer, ensure our suppliers do the same and make the case to local partners and businesses to follow our lead
- Make sure Council jobs and contracts benefit local people through linking our recruitment policy, organisational development, employment support, local training, supplier requirements and business support activity
- Build on the Council's employment pathways programme and lifelong learning programmes, adding volunteering to apprenticeships, advice, skills courses, and routes into good jobs
- Continue to invest in the Council's apprenticeship programme, which has no upper age limit, whilst also creating high-quality opportunities through the Council's supply chain and regeneration programmes
- Support young people with special educational needs to gain experience and employment.
- Take a targeted approach to understanding systemic barriers to employment opportunities then implement partnership approaches to change that involves and benefits our residents

Supporting local businesses

During the Pandemic we proactively supported Hackney's businesses, awarding £100m of government grants to small businesses, retail, hospitality and leisure sector and £50m of business rate relief. Two discretionary grants programmes were developed to support the many businesses in the borough that are unable to access existing government grants as they do not pay business rates. These discretionary grant programmes have distributed £3.4m of Discretionary Grants and £8.1m of Additional Restriction Grants. For commercial tenants in Council owned properties, we offered rent free and rent deferral periods.

In most instances our businesses have survived the pandemic but have described how they are now in a weakened state due to using up their reserves or taking out loans through the various government schemes.

In the post-pandemic period we have seen the expectation of an economic bounceback dashed by inflation and fuel increases. Nationally, this is the main concern of the majority of businesses surveyed in the [fortnightly national survey of businesses](#). We are now in a new inflationary environment triggered by supply side challenges rather than the usual demand factors. This is a fresh challenge for the national economy: it is also one where there aren't any short term solutions; national and structural interventions are required.

In Hackney, just as across the country, businesses most at risk will be those with complex commodity supply chains, significant use of transportation or energy and those that need to run premises. This is expected to be a feature for at least two more years and the solutions sit at the national level.

We will:

- Stand side by side with local businesses in lobbying national government for the support and flexibility we need at the local level to survive the economic downturn
- Maintain continuous engagement with our small and micro businesses to understand the immediate and emerging challenges they face in different sectors and places
- Work with partners, funders and investors to create then deliver support packages to equip local businesses to meet the multiple challenges they face
- Develop and implement a more targeted approach to supporting local suppliers to be contract ready then win relevant public sector contracts
- Increase the capacity of our social sector infrastructure organisations to represent and develop businesses with a social ethos so they can form a larger proportion of our local economy
- Create more business-led area forums to collaborate on tackling local economic issues, offer peer support and partner with us to leverage funding and investment opportunities
- Understand the opportunities and threats to businesses and jobs of achieving net zero and growing the green economy based on evidence and the work of the Green Skills and Circular Economy Commission then take a targeted approach to delivery that leverages partnership and investment opportunities

We know that we cannot leave pure market forces to dictate the economy. We will take action to support business and residents through the economic challenges ahead and to shape a greener, fairer local economy. We want to take action to ensure that local businesses and residents are first in line to benefit from economic opportunity so that wealth stays in the borough.

We will:

- Double the size of our local green economy, helping existing local businesses to transition to become low-carbon businesses, creating more green jobs for local people and ensuring a just transition from carbon-intensive jobs and businesses.
- Understand the opportunities for innovation led economic growth and align our physical assets, business support, employment support and investment opportunities to maximise the benefit of the future economic recovery

- Work towards providing a fairer and more sustainable rate for our providers of adult social care services, starting with care homes and home care providers

Shaping places

As well as our work with businesses and employers to support them through challenging times and create more opportunities for residents and the local economy, we will continue to work with our communities to shape our town centres and neighbourhoods. This builds on the approach taken in Dalston and Hackney Central that was based on open conversations with residents. This has helped us ensure that area and town centre plans are grounded on a deeper understanding of what residents value, and what improvements they would like to see.

We will engage and co-design future plans for neighbourhoods, sites and spaces with communities to create great places and thriving town centres that respond to what residents and businesses tell us are their priorities for their local area.

This includes developing area based planning documents to help guide future development in our town centres and key growth areas, engaging with residents and businesses to set out clear place making and regeneration plans for specific places and sites that include physical, social and economic interventions, and working in partnership to deliver these, ensuring that this work unlocks more high quality housing, including genuinely affordable housing to rent and buy and workspace in the borough.

We will:

- Continue to focus regeneration on identified area priorities for our town centres and growth areas including the delivery of physical, social and economic interventions and improvements to create better places, a more inclusive economy, and the facilities that local communities need. We will use our planning powers to protect our high streets, continue to work in partnership and use our own land and assets to achieve this.
- Finalise and adopt area based plans for Dalston (supplementary planning guidance), Stamford Hill and Shoreditch (Area Action Plans). These planning documents will guide and shape the future growth and regeneration of these areas.
- Produce a range of thematic supplementary planning guidance documents to ensure the developments in the borough deliver much needed new homes and commercial spaces, are of the highest design and architectural quality and incentivise carbon savings on site.
- Adopt the Hackney Central Town Centre Strategy and work to deliver the priority interventions and proposals set out in this document, as identified by the local community.
- Further develop supplementary planning guidance for Hackney Central which sets out a planning and regeneration framework for the town centre and guidance on key sites.
- Actively engage young people in the future place-shaping, design and development of the borough via our planning and regeneration and use this as an opportunity for skills and career development.

- Continue to work with the Greater London Authority, the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) and the Growth Borough Partnership to collectively progress and shape the future of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and surrounding areas. This includes the delivery of an inclusive economy strategy, transferring planning powers from LLDC back to the boroughs by 2024, and ensuring the long term success of the area through collaborative working.
- Start work on Clapton and Homerton place-making plans (supplementary planning documents), drawing on the evidence from the Local Plan
- Deliver a plan making programme that continues to support a post covid economic recovery, continues to respond to the climate emergency, and one which reflects any changes to legislation including the transfer of planning powers from the London Legacy Development Corporation to Hackney in 2024.

Using Council land and assets

We will use our Council owned land and buildings creatively and strategically recognising that our assets, and the future use of these, plays a key role in the future economic position and success of the Council and the delivery of essential Council services and Council housing, as well as in enhancing places, boosting our economy and supporting business, and delivering more social value for our residents.

We will:

- Balance the use of our own properties to maximise impact and balance the need to generate income to fund essential services with providing economic support for local businesses and achieving wider social value
- Work with the community to engage, co-design and set out a clear vision and plans for Council owned land and assets in our town centres to maximise their potential and deliver new homes, jobs, business space and other uses needed in local areas.
- Proactively influence our local public, social and larger private sector organisations to use their spending power and assets in the same way as us and in a coordinated way

Key plans and strategies:

- Local Plan
- Corporate Asset Management Strategy (under development)
- Housing Strategy
- [Housing Asset Management Strategy](#)
- [Community Strategy](#)
- Inclusive Economy Strategy
- Economic Development Plan
- Poverty Reduction Framework
- Dalston Plan
- Hackney Central Town Centre Strategy
- Stamford Hill Area Action Plan
- Shoreditch Area Action Plan

Supporting strategies

- VCS Strategy
- [Net Zero Energy Strategy](#)
- Culture, Heritage and Libraries Strategy
- [Draft Climate Action Plan](#)
- London Council's Low Carbon Development Action Plan

FOR A GREENER, HEALTHIER HACKNEY**Key Outcomes we will track**

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Net Zero | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel used in buildings and vehicles are the biggest part of Hackney's 'territorial emissions. Since 2010, emissions from buildings and road transport in Hackney have fallen by about 27%. • The majority, 74%, of all emissions come from 'consumption emissions' relating to goods and services, the vast majority of which are not created within Hackney's borders. |
| Air quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7% of deaths of people over 30 can be attributed to air pollution in Hackney. This is similar to neighbouring boroughs, Tower Hamlets and Islington but is slightly lower than London as a whole and is 2% higher than England. |
| Life Expectancy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy in Hackney from birth is estimated in 2018-2020 to be 84 for women and 79 for men. Women's life expectancy has increased from 2001 from 80 and men's from 74 so there's a slightly larger increase for men, although the trends have broadly similar trajectories (Public Health England). |

Key indicators

| | |
|--|---|
| Climate Change and Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Change is a cause of concern for over two thirds of residents (Residents' Survey 2022). • Over half of all trips starting in Hackney involve walking or cycling - the highest in London (London Travel Demand Survey 2014-2017). • 34% of Hackney's households own motor vehicles, compared with 57% across Greater London. |
|--|---|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hackney has 58 parks and green spaces and 247 open spaces on estates - 28 parks are Green Flag rated - providing vital “green infrastructure.” • Air pollution levels within Hackney are highest around main roads with hotspots mainly in the vicinity of the A10 which runs north to south of the borough, in close proximity to the A12 in the east of the borough at Hackney Wick, and in the very south of the borough within Shoreditch. • Overall borough recycling rate has risen to 31% from 27% in 2018. Estate recycling has increased from 15% in 2015, to just over 19%. |
| <p>Health</p> | <p>Health conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventable death was coming down pre pandemic but has increased again (ONS avoidable mortality). • City & Hackney has the fifth highest rate of psychotic and bipolar disorders in England, with 4,500 on the Serious Mental Illness register and 11,000 people diagnosed with a personality disorder (linked to childhood abuse and neglect). • We have seen smoking rates half to 14% in the last decade. • Numbers who are not a healthy weight at reception age have declined to 10.9% (London average). Year 6 rates remain high (27.4%) and above London and national average. • Hackney and the City have recorded a significantly higher rate of newly diagnosed STIs than London and England, for the past nine years of available data (for all newly diagnosed STIs, Hackney recorded the third highest rate out of 148 UTLAs in 2020). • Hackney and the City had 1450 people aged 65 and over living with Dementia in 2019. We expect the numbers to increase by 46% to over 2120 by 2030. <p>Demands on adult social care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for Adult Social Care support in Hackney is increasing. The growth in all age population between 2016 and 2020 was on average 1.13%, whilst the increase in those receiving care in the same period was 6.14%. • At the end of the 2021/22, 2700 residents received long term support from Adult Social Care, such as home care or residential care. Most residents in receipt of long term support received it in the community, for example by receiving care and support in their homes. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During 2021/22 Adult Social Care facilitated 1700 discharges from hospital. 93% of patients returned to the community and 7% were placed in a care home on a short or long term basis. |
|--|--|

Maximising impact by seeing climate action as an opportunity to improve population health

By bringing together actions to tackle the climate emergency with actions to reduce air pollution, improve population health and reduce health inequities, we will maximise our impact. This is why these actions are brought together under the Greener Healthier priority. As part of developing the Climate Action Plan, outlined below, Hackney's Health and Wellbeing Board have considered the rapid evidence review by the London Climate & Health Network undertaken in summer 2022 and have started to identify key opportunities for joint action.

Responding to the climate emergency

In response to the climate emergency, Hackney is developing a **Climate Action Plan (CAP)**, alongside its existing Air Quality Action Plan. At the time of drafting this Strategic Plan the CAP is out to public consultation and includes a stronger target of reaching net zero for the Council's non-domestic housing emissions by 2030. The Council is committed to a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040. By 2026 we will also have an action plan to support all schools to achieve net zero by 2030. Rather than just focus on the Council's emissions, which represent 5% of the whole borough's emissions, the proposed Climate Action Plan will set out how, together, we reduce carbon emissions for the whole borough.

All of these changes are organised into five themes: Adaptation, Buildings, Transport, Consumption and Environmental Quality. Within each theme, we have identified a set of ambitious 2030 goals. Climate action is a complex and systems-wide challenge. To be effective, climate actions must be designed collaboratively, and with attention to who might be affected, and how. Proposals related to the green economy and social justice are integral to each of them and key issues have been identified that need to be addressed to help ensure that climate action in Hackney is just and equitable. The themes reflect the need to reduce emissions, protect the natural environment and build resilience to climate change alongside wider benefits to responding to climate change, such as the potential to improve public health.

We are working closely with other Councils in London through working groups convened by London Councils covering retrofit, low carbon development (which Hackney leads), low carbon transport, renewable power, reducing consumption, building the green economy and creating a resilient and green London. As the data above shows, Hackney can't control all of its territorial emissions, many car journeys, for example, will be through traffic and most emissions linked to consumption are not created in Hackney. We also all need to develop the same set of interventions and responses.

As part of the Council's existing programme of work to tackle the climate emergency, £25 million has been earmarked for climate related works from 2022/23 to 2024/25. In addition, private sector investment worth £11.5 million has been secured. Beyond this, the implementation plan will outline a clear set of actions and a case for investment and the next step is to identify sources of funding and capital investment. The Action Plan is for the whole borough and creates a clear case for a more coherent national policy and funding framework. For example, analysis shows that retrofitting all buildings in Hackney would require investment of approximately £3 billion in the building stock. To achieve this local areas will require significant public funding as well as access to affordable financial products.

Adaptation

These actions will ensure that we are prepared for and resilient to the impacts of the climate emergency, protecting our most vulnerable residents.

We will work with residents to be prepared for the impacts of climate change and take action to tackle:

- Overheating: through support to communities and work to bring temperatures down in existing buildings, streets and public spaces
- Flooding: reduce flood risk in all critical drainage areas, manage the existing sewage system capacity better and expand the sustainable urban drainage network
- Ensure planting in Hackney is resilient to droughts and changing weather
- Work with residents to be prepared for extreme weather events and climate change

Buildings

These actions will adapt existing buildings and set new guidance for new development.

We will:

- Replace all lights on Council estates and in buildings with energy-efficient LED bulbs
- All Council electricity is already from renewable sources, but we will use our purchasing power by expanding UK renewables through arranging to purchase 100% of electricity used by the Council directly from a renewable energy generator
- Shift to heat pumps and district heat networks, retrofit buildings and ensure Council buildings meet required energy efficiency standards by 2030
- Switch more of the Hackney Council fleet to electric vehicles
- Lead the development of a Low Carbon Development Action Plan for London to help inform future planning guidance and produce local supplementary planning guidance to help meet our climate change objectives

Transport

We will continue our awarding winning work to support active travel and public transport. These actions will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transport network, improve air quality and help residents live active and healthy lifestyles.

We will:

- Develop a Main Roads Strategy to explore and plan new ways of reducing traffic and continue to roll out low-traffic neighbourhoods, after measuring the impact of existing schemes, and maximising their potential for safe cycling.
- Encourage all cyclists to cycle safely and considerately, and install 4000 additional secure bike storage spaces across our streets and estates by 2026.
- Develop safer pedestrian and cycling routes to enable all children to safely walk and cycle to every primary and secondary school in Hackney.
- Prioritise public transport - prioritising buses on future transport schemes and main roads, protecting and supporting the bus network.
- Take urgent action on Hackney's dangerous roads and junctions working towards Vision Zero with road safety a primary consideration on all schemes.

Consumption

The actions will encourage residents to change what and how we buy, use and sell, creating a new green economy in Hackney.

We will:

- Build on the extensive measures already in place to encourage recycling including to continue replacing all single use bins with dual-use recycling bins in all parks and green spaces.
- Shape a Circular Economy, which will ultimately seek to reduce consumer waste by changing attitudes to how we create, consume and dispose of rubbish.

Environmental Quality

These actions will maximise the potential for biodiversity in our green spaces, tackling climate change, reducing pollution and helping local ecosystems thrive.

We will:

- Take action to reduce air pollution from development and construction and by reducing solid fuel burning
- Progress our Green Infrastructure Strategy to increase the biodiversity of green space, and connectivity between green spaces and support community groups to manage land in a way that benefits people and nature
- Protect our blue corridors and water bodies from overdevelopment
- Reduce average water use

Working together

Through Hackney Light and Power we have launched the Hackney Community Energy Fund, to support community led energy groups to power our schools with renewable energy was recently launched. We want the whole community and partners to get involved in more initiatives like this. This will be progressed through ideas like Hackney Green Bonds, enabling local residents to invest in local projects to decarbonise the borough and developing a Climate Action Curriculum.

We will also consider how best to convene partners and businesses to progress the 2030 goals identified in the draft Climate Action Plan so as to scale collective action and align with the aspiration to develop a Hackney Net Zero Partnership.

Key plans and strategies:

- Corporate Asset Management Strategy (under development)
- [Housing Asset Management Strategy](#)
- [Net Zero Energy Strategy](#)
- Green Infrastructure Plan
- [Draft Climate Action Plan](#)
- London Council's Low Carbon Development Action Plan
- [Hackney Parks & Green Spaces Strategy](#)

Improving health and wellbeing and tackling health inequality

The pandemic and now the cost of living crisis together with entrenched poverty have negatively affected people's wellbeing. Health inequalities are even greater. Some residents, including older people and disabled people, have become more isolated and may still be cautious about going out. This isolation affects their wellbeing and makes it more difficult to offer early help when they need it. We need to work across the whole system to achieve equitable access, experience and outcomes. This means addressing all four "pillars" of the health system, as described by the King's Fund:

- Focus on wider determinants of ill health
- Developing an integrated health and care system
- Healthier ways to live
- Shape places and communities that are designed to make it easier to be healthier

We also need to co-produce solutions with residents and amplify the voice of service users through [inclusive approaches](#).

Focusing on wider determinants

The biggest drivers of health are linked to social, economic and environmental conditions (income, employment, education, housing, transport, climate etc). This means that the wider activities in this strategic plan have the potential to make the most significant contribution to health inequalities.

Developing an integrated care system

An integrated care system (ICS) is one that joins up community based, preventative and clinical support. Hackney is one of 7 Local Authority members of the North East London Integrated Care System (ICS). Local place based partnerships have been formed as part of the ICS. The City and Hackney Place Based Partnership has set local priorities and outcomes and below this. City and Hackney has eight primary care networks (PCN). Each one has up to seven surgeries. All 39 City and Hackney GP Confederation member practices also work closely together as members of their local PCN group. It gives residents access to a bigger group of healthcare professionals.

Each PCN is at the heart of one of the eight City and Hackney Neighbourhoods which serve the same geographic areas. Neighbourhoods are part of a national scheme which also brings together health and social care with local authorities and wider community and voluntary services. Working together in this integrated care approach means patients can access all the services available to them in a co-ordinated, consistent way. It means patients do not have to deal with multiple services to explain what they need and get support.

Over time, it is intended that services become more person-centred, working with residents to help manage their own health and care needs as well as supporting them to look at and access local support. Adults Services are doing more to embed an approach that supports individuals earlier, preventing, reducing or delaying care needs.

We will:

- Contribute to the work and aims of the North East London Integrated Care System (ICS- now known as “NHS NEL”) and support the priorities of the City and Hackney Health and Care Board (the local Place Based Partnership of the ICS) and its focus on children, mental wellbeing and long term conditions.
- Support the Health and Wellbeing strategy priorities that has been developed for 2022-2026 to improve the health of people who live and work in Hackney which has a specific focus on mental health, social connection and financial security.
- Ensure that the Population Health Hub (PHH) is a resource for all partners to draw on to improve population health and reduce health inequality.
- Co-produce a new Integrated Mental Health Network with local organisations complementing the work of the East London Mental Health Foundation Trust and establish a Black Thrive programme for Hackney that will tackle structural and systemic inequality in local mental health services
- Work with partners and people who use services to think creatively about how care and support services are delivered, how we can improve and innovate to better meet residents’ needs, and how we attract and retain a skilled workforce. An ambitious programme of Transformation is being planned and delivered over the coming years to meet these challenges.
- We will develop a new Carers Strategy

In addition, national reforms to social care are being planned. We will implement caps on how much individuals will pay towards the cost of the care over their lifetime, as well as ensuring we are paying a fair cost of care to providers.

Healthier ways to live

We need to support individuals and communities to adopt healthy behaviours
We will take action to enable people to live healthier lives, recognising that smoking, obesity and alcohol consumption are the main reasons that people die early:

We will:

- Proactively encourage walking and physical activity, including continuing to deliver the Sport England funded Kings Park Moving Together project and apply these lessons more widely

- Deliver the ambitions of the Smokefree 2030 manifesto commitment through actions across the whole system that will be led by the recently re-launched Hackney Tobacco Control Alliance
- Continued partnership action to reduce obesity through Hackney Healthy Weight Strategic Partnership including an ambition that all children in all primary schools participate in the “Daily Mile” and by improving access to healthy, affordable food
- Refresh of our local strategic priorities to reduce alcohol-related harms
- Commit to ensuring there are no new HIV infections by the year 2030

Shaping Places

By making places healthier we can support wellbeing and take climate action. Making places healthier means shaping the retail offer so that there is affordable, healthy food and creating clean, safe, green spaces, with good air quality. It is also about encouraging community support and connections, by creating good community networks, for example.

We will:

- Review our day services provision for residents who are eligible for care and support from the Council, to improve choice and personalisation.
- Improve how we track outcomes in adult social care, with a focus on strength based practice and an understanding of intersectionality (the multiple ways people can be discriminated or disadvantaged because of who they are- e.g. by gender, ethnicity and class)
- Promote the Healthy Streets Approach which improves air quality, reduces congestion and helps make areas greener, healthier and more attractive places, to encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport
- Continue to support Play Streets and School Streets and the principles as set out in the Child Friendly Places planning document to encourage doorstep play, ‘play on the way’ and opportunities to connect with nature
- Encourage food growing, with a focus on estates
- Continue to improve leisure centres and parks and invest in a network of new, free, outdoor gym facilities in our parks and green spaces
- Build on Child Friendly Places design guidance to co-produce a new design guide with disabled and older people to ensure that our streets, parks, estates, public buildings, high streets and public spaces are inclusive and accessible for all
- Progress work to make Hackney a place where residents can age well, progressing Hackney’s Ageing Well Strategy, making the place and services more age friendly and dementia friendly valuing the contribution of older people to life in the borough.

Key Strategies:

- [Draft Climate Action Plan](#)
- Low Carbon Development Action Plan
- Sustainability SPD
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- [Ageing Well Strategy](#)

- Integrated Care System Place Based Plan
- [Air Quality Action Plan](#)
- [Parks and Green Spaces Strategy](#)
- [Learning Disabilities Strategy](#)
- [Autism Strategy](#)
- [Mental Health Strategy](#)
- [Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy](#)
- [Hackney Nature Recovery Plan](#)

Supporting strategies

- Culture, Heritage and Libraries Strategy

FOR EVERY CHILD IN HACKNEY

Key Outcomes we will track

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Infant mortality | <p>The infant mortality rate is 3.6 per 1000 births which is slightly higher than London and lower than England (no trend data available).</p> <p>Public Health Data published by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities.</p> |
| Early years | <p>69.6% of reception pupils in Hackney schools are achieving a good level of development by the end of their first school year. This has remained at around the same level for the last 5 years and is lower than London (74.1%) and England (71%).</p> <p>2019 data from the Department of Education (this is the latest published data, assessments were not carried out during the pandemic)</p> |
| Education | <p>Hackney's average "Attainment 8 Score" is 54 which is the same as London and higher than England (50.9). Although attainment has improved over the last 5 years, students on free school meals, Turkish Kurdish Cypriot pupils, Caribbean pupils (boys) and Orthodox Jewish pupils face inequalities in outcomes.</p> <p>(each pupil's score is calculated by adding up the points for their 8 subjects, with English and Maths counted twice)</p> <p>Department of Education data for 2021.</p> |
| Children's health | <p>27.4% of children in year 6 (at 10-11 years old) are overweight which is worse than London (23.7%) and England (21%).</p> <p>This rate has not changed in recent years.</p> <p>Public Health Data published by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities.</p> |

Key indicators

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Childhood immunisation | 64% of C&H 5 year olds have had 2x MMR compared to 87% across England- children from deprived households are less likely to have all relevant childhood immunisations |
| Exclusions | In 2018/19, 44 young people from Hackney were permanently excluded from school which equated to a rate of 0.13 of the whole school population, which exceeded both national (0.1) and regional (0.07) Some children are significantly more likely to be excluded from school - boys, children from black and mixed heritage backgrounds, children from gypsy traveller backgrounds, children with special educational needs, children in receipt of free school meals, children from single parent families and looked after children. |
| Children's health | Waiting times for a CAMHS assessment are increasing The proportion of children with mental health conditions is going up. |

The impacts of the pandemic on children and young people and their families are wide ranging and the worst impact is likely to fall on those who were most disadvantaged from the outset. Even before the pandemic, we found that 48% of children in Hackney live in poverty after housing costs are taken into account, and this is likely to increase because of the cost of living crisis and poverty entrenching. Research that shows how this can impact poor mental, emotional and physical health later in life and lead to complex needs. We were also already seeing increasing demand and complexity of need across every frontline service and including those that support children with the highest needs: special educational needs, high cost educational placements and care placements. We also have disproportionately worse outcomes for some groups of children.

An inclusive focus on the early years helps us to tackle poverty in the long-term by giving children the best start in life. Our approach starts with a focus on early years but we also need to identify and respond to key points in a child's life when they might experience disadvantage and offer early help.

The impacts of the pandemic on children and young people and their families are wide ranging and could fall on those who were most disadvantaged from the outset. The public policy context requires us to further develop how we support schools, keep the highest standards and encourage inclusion for all, meet need through help rather than safeguarding services and enable more children to thrive and achieve their full potential.

In response to this increasing level of demand, complexity and vulnerability, at a time that is even more financially challenging than austerity, the Council is seeking to transform the way we work across the Children and Education system. This is so we can improve outcomes for every child in Hackney, reduce costs and lead the way in showcasing seamless support for every child. We are adopting the following strategic outcomes:

- Every child is **safe**, emotionally and physically
- Every child is **healthy** - emotionally and physically well
- Every child's **needs** are identified and **responded to early**.
- Every child fulfils their potential in **education** from 0 to 18+ (to 25 for children with SEND)
- Every child develops positive and caring **relationships** and feels **seen and heard/self-belief/empowered**
- Every child has the right to be treated **fairly**

We will develop a shared "practice model" that equips all staff across the system supporting children and families to focus on these shared, crosscutting outcomes, with anti-racism at its core.

Ways of working are key:

- Embedding a systemic, anti-racist and trauma informed approach
- Working in collaboration
- Coproducing the approach with children, young people and families: we will continue to champion young voices from across Hackney, supporting the Hackney Youth Parliament and its work and implementing the recommendations of the Young Futures commission. We will go further to promote youth participation in our democratic functions by inviting young people to attend each of the Scrutiny Commissions, to help make sure council decisions and services work for young people.

Every child is safe

In 2019 Hackney Children's Services was inspected under the OFSTED framework for inspecting local authority services for children (ILACS) and was judged as 'requires improvement' for overall effectiveness. Since then, we have been progressing a comprehensive [children's action plan](#).

In September 2022, OFSTED visited again and found that there had been key improvements to the front door services that help to ensure children receive the right support at the right time and that action for children at immediate risk is timely and effective. They concluded that senior leadership was driving necessary changes to improve practice and that staff felt supported through the implementation of a new practice framework, with a focus on an anti-racist, trauma-informed and systemic approach to practice. Caseloads in the access and assessment (A&A) teams, and for some newly qualified workers, remain too high and recording of supervision is inconsistent. They noted how the Council had sustained significant financial investment in youth services to address the risk of serious youth violence.

We will:

- Continue to progress the improvements identified in our plans and identified in the last OFSTED letter
- We will develop a Care Charter for all the children in our care which will set out our promises to them as corporate parents.
- We will develop the Edge of Care Strategy to focus on earlier intervention - provide support to the wider cohort of children at risk of entering the care system
- We are focusing on safeguarding children during adolescence including through contextual safeguarding

An investigation into the strip-search of Child Q, a Black teenage girl, by police officers in a Hackney secondary school was published earlier in 2022. The report found that racism and 'adultification bias' - where Black children are treated more harshly than their white peers - were likely factors in what happened. This independent review led by the City and Hackney Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel made 14 recommendations to ensure children are protected in future - with a focus on Black and Global Majority children. While the Council is not named in any of the recommendations, it has been leading aspects of the response, and these will continue to be a focus over the next four years including:

- ensuring the work by police and others leads to real change; responding to the impact of the case on communities; making changes to how the Council thinks and works as a result of this community feedback; and putting pressure on the Government to make changes in the law to ensure children are better protected.

Specifically with regard to stop and search of a child, we will:

- See this as an indication of possible risk to the child rather than seeing the child as a perpetrator, and use this contact as a safeguarding opportunity to intervene and protect children from harm and to keep our community safe.

Every child is healthy, every child develops positive and caring **relationships** and feels **seen and heard**

The City and Hackney Place Based Partnership has a strong focus on giving children the best start in life with ambitions to reduce infant and neonatal mortality, increase immunisation, improve early childhood development, improve healthy weight, reduce mental health crisis and reduce unplanned pregnancy. Supporting children and young people's emotional wellbeing is key to early help and prevention and since the pandemic, we have seen an increased demand for support.

We will:

- Respond to the increasing demand for mental health support, underpinned by a new City and Hackney Integrated 0-25 (5 year) Emotional Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- Continue the Wellbeing and Mental Health in Schools (WMHS) programme building schools' and professionals' capacity around identifying, addressing and referring children and young people for support.

- Develop a Healthy Schools Charter - a series of actions for local schools to sign up to that support the health and wellbeing of pupils

Every child's needs are identified and responded to early

Our approach starts with a focus on early years but we also need to identify and respond to key points in a child's life when they might experience disadvantage and offer early help. Early help is not a service, it is an approach that relies on changes to practice, but also to the culture, systems, collaboration and leadership, as many of the resources will be in families, communities and community based organisations, so we need to ensure we value the strengths, assets and resources in communities that can support residents.

We are very concerned how the rising costs of childcare will affect families of all income and also that nurseries will no longer be viable and will close.

We will:

- Develop a new early help offer, including developing a number of strategic children's centres into new Children and Family Hubs for children and families to secure help and to offer support to families from conception up until 19 or (25 for young people with special educational needs and disabilities - SEND). These Hubs will involve a range of professionals from the Council, Health and community partners.
- Develop and deliver our [Autism Strategy](#) and SEND Strategy, ensuring they are fully integrated and recognise both areas of increased demand for support as well as the wider range of additional needs, from social, emotional and mental health, to visual and hearing impairment, and the children and young people who benefit from the Disabled Children's and Short Breaks services.
- We will bring together the core principles and priorities in SEND as shared with us by children, young people, parents and carers, recognising the importance of communication, co-production, access to information, accountability and excellent provision. We want to reshape our SEND services to wrap support around the settings and schools Hackney children attend, to ensure earlier identification of need, better preparation for adulthood, and a more compassionate and effective response.
- We will increase the number of places provided for children with SEND within the borough, both in our special schools and also in our mainstream schools, creating additional resource provision and opportunities for respite, as well as embedding a more 'graduated' response to special educational needs across Hackney Education.
- By increasing SEND places in the borough we will reduce travel time for Hackney children, parents and carers, and at the same time aim to increase support for independent travel, as well as maintain our in-house SEND Transport fleet.

Every child fulfils their potential

We will give every child in Hackney the best start in life, and have set out how we will achieve this in our new [Early Years Strategy](#). The Strategy will be delivered to secure the right support for parents and carers, from pregnancy through immunisations, to choosing a playgroup, nursery or childminder.

We will also:

- Establish an Affordable Childcare Commission to map provision and access in the borough, support the growth of more public and private affordable child care options - including more social enterprise, third sector and co-op provision, and continue to invest in our network of local childminders.

Work to support schools falling into difficulty has had measurable success. Overall Hackney schools provision is in the top 20% of local authorities in the country, with 92% (35,529) of pupils attending Ofsted rated Good or Outstanding schools.

In line with the Council's work to tackle racial inequality, outlined earlier, we have developed and distributed guidance and tools for schools to develop a diverse and anti-racist curriculum and all Hackney schools have stated that they are reviewing/or have reviewed curriculum content to ensure it is reflective of all pupils. The Hackney Schools Group Board have continued to explore themes of belonging with Hackney Schools alongside workstreams exploring the curriculum and reading in schools.

The Children and Families Act, introduced in 2014, increased the age range of young people eligible for SEND support from 0-19 years to 0-25 years. In Hackney, this has contributed to a 34% increase in the number of children and young people we support. The extra support for young people is welcomed, however funding from Central Government has not been enough to enable councils to cover the extra costs, and funding for high needs Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND support) has effectively been frozen since 2011. Significant work is planned in line with the [school estates strategy](#) and this will be a priority over the next few years.

We will:

- maintain Hackney's record of education success, and we will work together with our schools to tackle the attainment gap so great results do not depend on a child's background or where they live. To support this we will also deliver an extended hours study space offer for pupils and students who cannot rely on having space or time to study at home.
- liaise with schools, including Alternative Provision providers, to ensure a whole school commitment to the principles of inclusion, and highlight the Inclusion Quality Mark which demonstrates and celebrates the work that schools do to support diversity. We will further develop the role of the Parent Liaison Officer to work with parents, carers and schools to ensure that engaging with parents is effective and inclusive.
- continue to roll out a 'no need to exclude' policy across our schools. We will aim to see a consistent reduction in 'off-rolling' and excluded pupils in Hackney by 2026, and continue to tackle the disproportionality within exclusions of black children and children with SEND.
- We have lobbied central government for changes in legislation to tackle unregistered settings. We await their final response following consultation last year.

Every child is equipped for adulthood and has choice over their future

- We will maintain and champion Young Hackney services, our four Hackney Youth Hubs and network of seven adventure playgrounds that provide a variety of activities and opportunities, recognising the value of play for creativity, health and wellbeing.
- We will create a 10 by 10 Programme to ensure by the time they are 10 years old, every child in Hackney has access to at least 10 different activities that help expand their horizons and equip them for the future
- We will also codesign a Leaving Care Plan with our children in care to ensure we provide the right support as our young people transition into adulthood.

Key strategies:

- Early Years Strategy
- [Hackney Young Futures Commission](#)
- [Schools Improvement Plan](#)
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- SEND Strategy
- Integrated Care System Place Based Plan

Supporting strategies:

- Culture, Heritage and Libraries Strategy

4. How we work

The more our residents struggle, the greater the demand for council services and support, whilst the pressures of inflation make those services more expensive to deliver. This also puts a greater strain on staff. This means we will need to fundamentally change the way we deliver some of those services, so we can safeguard them for the future. Without the changes set out below, we do not think we will be able to achieve the aspirations set out in this plan.

The way we work is going to be as important as what we do, because this is how we can be most impactful and create the right working relationships and conditions for work to be sustained. We want to be a Council that works for the people who live and work here- putting residents first. We need to be financially sustainable and invest in what matters to have a secure financial future. We want to be a Council that is modernised, flexible, collaborative, and skilled to meet our future challenges.

We will do this by:

- **Using data more effectively to help us understand problems in a more holistic way.** This will ensure we're able to use our resources most effectively to support residents in the best way possible and ensure we can make decisions that are well supported by evidence but not blocked by unnecessary bureaucracy.

- **Building capabilities across our services.** Bringing frontline staff directly into how we do change and creating development opportunities for all staff.
- **Enabling service areas to access a broad set of skills to support change.** Connecting knowledge and expertise within service areas with core design capacity and capability.
- **Implementing a Corporate Landlord Operating Model and creating the right governance frameworks.** The concept of a Corporate Landlord is that management around all property assets is carried out at a corporate and strategic level, rather than at a service level. Under this model the responsibility and accountability for both the strategic and day to day decision making around land and property assets that services occupy or use is centralised. This will ensure the most efficient use of property assets and ensure alignment with corporate priorities, strategies and standards.
- **Measuring and evaluating our work** so we know what to do more of and what we need to do less of in the future.
- **Working in the open by creating opportunities for residents to participate in our work** so that we can ensure our services and decisions are co-designed and informed by the communities we serve.
- **We will work to close the digital divide and make better use of digital technology to modernise and innovate** where we can to create better experiences for our residents and staff.

The following ways of working were developed over the last four years and put into practice during the pandemic and we are now seeking to embed this further through working at all levels to support staff and partners with the right skills and tools:

4.1 Communities as assets and putting residents first

- To do this successfully, we will need to work hand in hand with residents and communities, always putting them first and focusing on building trust and confidence where it is low and shaping all our plans through effective engagement, co-design and co-production.
- We also need to value and invest in volunteers and the voluntary and community sector and build ongoing partnerships, involving them in work across the areas of the strategic plan.
- This approach is at the heart of the Neighbourhoods work, focused on preventing ill health, by joining up the work of Council, NHS and community partners.

4.2 Inclusive, open and humble and anti-racist

- This also means being more inclusive, open and humble and tackling institutional racism and work towards being truly anti-racist
- To be equipped to meet the challenges we face, we need a workforce that both understands what being inclusive and anti-racist means and that reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels

4.3 Collaborative working

- Partnerships matter more than ever- so we can maximise the resources we have for community benefit - procurement, jobs, physical assets as anchor institutions
- As a partnership we need to be more outward facing and collaborative, working across the whole system to find the right sustainable solutions. This will require leaders to work across boundaries with a greater degree of openness than ever.

4.4 Place shaping and community wealth building

- We need to continue to be a place shaper and do more to shape inclusive economies and build community wealth
- We need to develop a consistent approach to hyper local and place based working, drawing on the good practice from existing pilot work
- We will look at co-operative solutions to challenge market failure in areas like social care, affordable child care, and community energy. This also fits with wider commitments to place making and wealth building and priorities for change as a Council to put residents first, to be financially sustainable and to be a modern and innovative Council.

4.5 Priorities for strategic partnership working

Systems leadership, or place-based leadership, is the coming together of organisations to collectively solve problems which no single body can do on its own. As a partnership we need to be more outward facing and collaborative, working across the whole system to find the right sustainable solutions. This will require leaders to work across boundaries with a greater degree of flexibility and openness to change than they have perhaps been used to.

Working with universities can help us respond to many of the challenges in this strategic plan, developing the way we work and tackle the most intractable issues, in an evidence based way, as well as shaping a more inclusive economy by working with local institutions to design learning for local people and businesses. The Council is proactively developing local partnerships, as well as assessing all the partnerships already in place across the Council, so we can maximise and strengthen these links in support of this Strategic Plan.

We have discussed the strategic plan priorities with partners. The following are emerging shared priorities for how we work and what we focus on together, which will be developed further:

Rebuilding trust and confidence with communities

Community confidence in authority has been stretched more than ever in recent times. We need to work in a way which acknowledges and understands how things are for residents through the lived experience of communities and individuals rather than working with a focus on services, plans and numbers. We need to work in a way that acknowledges and celebrates the value of our diverse communities, that understands the need for a change in how we work with different communities and

cultures, and which recognises the strengths and the positive impact communities can have on the lives of families within them.

Tackling inequality

Complex inequalities cannot be addressed by any institution working in isolation. More consistent curiosity, inclusive thinking and humility is needed in understanding the multiple drivers of inequality and the solutions needed across the system. This needs to be followed by a clearer commitment to owning and responding to the multiple drivers of inequality and working towards a single set of outcomes. This would, critically, include a partnership wide commitment to anti-racism.

Net Zero Commitment

The Council has significant work to do in relation to the Climate Emergency as an ongoing and increasing priority. At the time of writing we are consulting on a Climate Action Plan. Rather than just focus on the Council's emissions, which represent 5% of the whole borough's emissions, the proposed Climate Action Plan will set out how, together, we reduce carbon emissions for the whole borough. The Plan also sets out how we might reach net zero by 2030, which is more stretching than our current target of a 45% reduction in carbon dioxide equivalent emissions (against 2010 levels) by 2030, and net zero emissions by 2040. Working purposefully with partners will be key to the Council achieving its targets and those for the whole borough.

Shared challenges for our workforce

The challenges identified for the Council are also ones identified by Councils and we need to work together to look at:

- Supporting a workforce who are burnt out and now dealing with the cost of living crisis in their work with residents and in their own lives
- Developing an inclusive and anti-racist workforce that is trauma informed and aware of the impact of poverty and that reflects the diversity of Hackney, at all levels
- Supporting an ageing workforce and succession planning in these areas
- Responding to specific shared sectoral challenges, exacerbated by Brexit and the cost of living challenge

This page is intentionally left blank



| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | |
| Title of Report | Annual Report of the Pensions Committee 2021-22 |
| For Consideration By | Pensions Committee Full Council |
| Meeting Date | 22 November 2022 23 November 2022 |
| Classification | Public |
| <u>Ward(s) Affected</u> | All |
| <u>Group Director</u> | Ian Williams, Group Director Finance & Corporate Resources |

1. **Introduction**

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to detail the role of the Pensions Committee and summarise the key activities and achievements in 2021/22 that demonstrate how the Committee has fulfilled its role as the Scheme Manager for the London Borough of Hackney Pension Fund. This report will be presented to full Council at its November 2022 meeting as a summary of the Committee's activities

2. **Recommendations**

- 2.1. The Pensions Committee is recommended to note the report.
- 2.2. Council is recommended to note the report.

3. **Comments of the Group Director of Finance & Corporate Resources**

- 3.1. The Pensions Committee acts as Scheme Manager for the London Borough of Hackney Pension Fund and is responsible for the management of approximately £1.97 billion worth of assets and for ensuring the effective and efficient running of the Pension Fund.

3.2. The decisions taken by the Committee impact directly on the financial standing of the Fund and can therefore affect its funding level and its ability to meet its liabilities. These decisions could therefore also impact on the contribution rates payable by employers participating in the Fund, including the Council itself.

3.3. There are no immediate financial implications arising from this report

4. **Comments of the Director of Legal Democratic and Electoral Services**

4.1. The Council's Constitution gives the Pensions Committee responsibility for a wide range of functions relating to management of the Council's Pension fund. In carrying out those functions the Committee must have regard to the various legislative obligations imposed on the Council as the Fund's Administering Authority, particularly by the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Regulations 2013.

4.2. The annual report of the Pensions Committee's activities demonstrates how it has undertaken and fulfilled its statutory and constitutional responsibilities during 2021/222.

4.3. There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

5. **Background to the Report**

5.1. Delegated powers under the Council Constitution have been given to the Pensions Committee to oversee the management of the Pension Fund as the Scheme Manager and are set out in the Terms of Reference for the Committee.

5.2. The Pensions Committee is a committee of the Council and reports annually on the work undertaken at Committee. The attached report covers the 2021/22 Financial Year, during which the Committee has met 5 times to cover a broad spectrum of pension related business. The full programme of work and training undertaken by the Committee is set out in the Appendix to this report.

5.3. Members continued with an extensive training programme during the year which reflected the key requirements laid down in the CIPFA Knowledge and Skills Framework.

5.4. The Annual Report of the Committee evidences the work that the Committee has undertaken and demonstrates that it has discharged its responsibilities effectively both in terms of its legal responsibilities under the LGPS Regulations and the Committee's Terms of Reference.

5.5. The coming year will continue to provide the Committee with an extensive work programme which includes work on the Fund's approach to carbon risk and Responsible Investment more widely, as well as the Fund's investment strategy.

The Committee will consider the 2022 valuation and the setting of employee rates from 1st April 2023 and will also undertake a number of procurements in relation to the Fund's service providers. The Committee will also continue to closely monitor the quality of membership data submitted to the Fund, with ongoing work for officers on process improvements within the Council. A number of policy reviews will also be undertaken to update current arrangements. Ongoing training for the Committee in relation to both the Knowledge and Skills Framework and pertinent investment and governance issues will continue to be a regular feature as will monitoring of funding levels and investment performance

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Annual Report of the Pensions Committee 2021-22

Background documents

None

| | |
|--|--|
| Report Author | Rachel Cowburn Head of Pensions rachel.cowburn@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 2630 |
| Comments for the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources prepared by | Jackie Moylan Director, Financial Management Ema jackie.moylan@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 3032 |
| Comments for the Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services prepared by | Georgia Lazari Team Leader (Places) georgia.lazari@hackney.gov.uk 0208 356 1369 |

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

Annual Report of the Pensions Committee 2021-2022

I

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PENSIONS COMMITTEE 2021/22

1. CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION – COUNCILLOR KAM ADAMS

- 1.1. The Pensions Committee is responsible for the management of the Pension Fund and acts on behalf of the London Borough of Hackney as the administering authority. We have responsibility for all aspects of managing the Pension Fund, including the Fund's investments, maintaining member records and ensuring that governance arrangements are appropriate. This is a considerable responsibility; the Pension Fund was valued at £1.965bn at 31 March 2022 and has nearly 26,000 members.
- 1.2. 2021/22 has been a busy year for the Hackney Pension Fund, with a focus on the implementation of a revised investment strategy and the development of the Fund's Responsible Investment policy. The Fund has also continued to implement significant improvements to its third party administration service and made significant improvements to the quality of its membership data.
- 1.3. In 2016, the Pensions Committee set a target for the Fund to reduce exposure to fossil fuel reserves by at least 50% over the 6 years to 2022, with an interim review in 2019. By the time of the interim review, we had reduced exposure to carbon reserves by 31.4%, well over halfway to the target. These results were used to inform a revised investment strategy, which was implemented during 2021/22.
- 1.4. The final review against the target took place during 2022; the results showed that the Fund had reduced its exposure to carbon reserves by 96.9% between July 2016 and November 2021, demonstrating significant outperformance of the Fund's original target to reduce exposure by 50% by 2022.
- 1.5. We are proud to have responded to this issue early and to have been one of the first LGPS funds to set and transparently monitor performance against a carbon reduction target. The target has helped highlight the areas of greatest risk within the Fund's investment strategy and helped the Fund integrate carbon risk into the strategy setting process. We are determined to remain at the forefront of Council Pension Funds in tackling the risks of climate change to our investments.
- 1.6. Looking to investment more widely, 2021/22 saw very variable performance. The first 3 quarters of the year were marked by a relatively benign investment environment, despite concerns over growth and rising inflation. Quarter 4 then

saw Russia's invasion of Ukraine in late February, which caused a global shock. Equities declined and bond yields rose, whilst commodity prices soared, contributing to a surge in inflation.

- 1.7. Over the year to 31st March 2022, the Fund returned 6.1%, below its benchmark of 8.1%. The key driver of this underperformance was the Fund's exposure to growth equities, which suffered a sharp correction during quarter 4. Equities and property were the Fund's strongest performing asset classes in absolute terms; however, as set out above, the Fund's more growth-oriented equity mandates did underperform their benchmark.
- 1.8. The Fund made a number of significant allocation changes during the year, in line with agreed changes to the investment strategy. The Fund's multi asset allocation has been reduced, with both previous portfolios sold down and the remaining exposure moved to the London CIV. The Fund has also pooled its emerging market equities, and made allocations to a number of other pooled mandates within the London CIV.
- 1.9. The Fund's actuarial valuation at 31st March 2019 saw a funding level of 92%. Initial results from the 2022 valuation suggest that this had improved to 106% as at 31st March 2022, largely as a result of strong investment performance. Whilst some of these gains have since been eroded as a result of the challenging investment environment during 2022, reduced asset values have been more than offset by decreases in the estimated value of the Fund's liabilities. Whilst the 2022 valuation is yet to be finalised, the Council is set to reduce its contribution rate by 2-3% from 1st April 2023, from 30% to 27-28%.
- 1.10. 2021/22 has also seen another busy year for our administration team. Improvements to the Fund's administration service have continued to be a major focus with continued work on introducing online member and employer self-service, as well as the ongoing project to manage anticipated regulatory changes following the McCloud judgement on age discrimination.
- 1.11. The team have also continued a major program of work with the Council's payroll and ICT teams to help improve the quality of data submitted to the Fund. The team have assisted in the development of a new interface for the Council to submit data, which went live early in 2022. The Fund has seen a significant improvement in the quality of data held as a result of the project, which has been reflected in the 2022 valuation and annual benefit statement processes .

- 1.12. The Committee agrees to a training programme each year to ensure that it is able to evidence it has met the requirements of the CIPFA Knowledge and Skills programme and is able to fulfil the governance role with which it is charged. The Committee takes this aspect extremely seriously and training forms a key part of the agenda for each meeting, along with Committee Members and officers attending additional external training on a regular basis.
- 1.13. Details on the work and training undertaken by the Committee during the municipal year 2020/21 are set out in section 3 of this report. Section 4 provides an outline of the anticipated work during 2021/22 financial year..
- 1.14. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation for the hard work and commitment to the Hackney Pension Fund that the rest of my Committee Members have put in, given the considerable challenges that we face in managing a £1.9 billion pension fund during a period of considerable challenges for both the LGPS and the wider economy.
- 1.15. Particular thanks are due to Cllr Robert Chapman, who stepped down as Chair of the Committee in May 2022; on behalf of the Committee, I would like to thank him for his leadership and dedication over the last 8 years. I would also like to thank the hard work put in by our specialist advisors, the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and his staff over the past year.

Cllr Kam Adams
Chair- Pensions Committee

2. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

- 2.1. The following Councillors were members of the Committee during the 2021/22 municipal year –

Cllr Robert Chapman (Chair)
Cllr Michael Desmond (Vice Chair)
Cllr Kam Adams
Cllr Polly Billington
Cllr Ben Hayhurst
Cllr Patrick Spence
Cllr Nick Sharman
Cllr Margaret Gordon
Cllr Sem Moema

Cllr Lynne Troughton

In addition, Jonathan Malins-Smith is co-opted to the Committee as the Scheme Member Representative. Henry Colthurst is the co-opted Employer Representative.

- 2.2. The table below outlines Members' attendance at Pensions Committee meetings during the 2021/22 municipal year and the training sessions at which members were in attendance. It is noted that Members have a large number of commitments, including other public meetings and ward commitments, and are therefore not always available to attend meetings of the Committee.

| Committee Members Attendance 2021/22 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------------|----------|------------|----------|
| | 16th June | | 30th September | | 23rd November | | 20th January | | 10th March | |
| | Meeting | Training | Meeting | Training | Meeting | Training | Meeting | Training | Meeting | Training |
| Cllr Robert Chapman (Chair) | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| Cllr Michael Desmond (Vice Chair) | P | P | A | A | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| Cllr Kam Adams | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| Cllr Polly Billington | A | A | P | P | A | A | P | P | A | A |
| Cllr Ben Hayhurst | P | P | P | P | P | P | A | A | A | A |
| Cllr Patrick Spence | P | P | A | A | P | P | P | P | A | A |
| Cllr Nick Sharman | P | P | P | P | A | A | P | P | P | P |
| Cllr Margaret Gordon | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| Cllr Sem Moema | A | A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Cllr Lynne Troughton | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Co-Opted Members | | | | | | | | | | |
| Henry Colthurst | A | A | A | A | P | P | A | A | P | P |
| Jonathan Malins-Smith | P | P | P | P | P | P | A | A | P | P |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| P = Present | | | | | | | | | | |
| A = Absent | | | | | | | | | | |

3. WORK UNDERTAKEN DURING 2020/21

3.1. The Pensions Committee has responsibility for the strategic management of the Pension Fund, which by the end of the financial year held £1.97bn worth of assets with 25,802 scheme members. We are responsible for deciding the broad asset allocation of the Pension Fund along with its strategic direction and for ensuring the long term solvency of the Fund, i.e. the ability to pay the pensions of all past, present and future scheme members. During the year, we have considered a wide range of issues and taken a number of key decisions affecting the Pension Fund. The work of the Committee has broadly fallen under the following categories during the year:

3.2. **Governance and Administration**

3.2.1. We have again seen considerable fluctuation in the funding level over the year, driven not only by volatility in asset values but also by changes in liability values as a result of changes in inflation and gilt yields. At the time the Committee approved the 2019 valuation in March 2020, the overall funding level was 92%. By the end of 2021/22, this had improved significantly to 106%. The rate payable during the year was 30% (31.5% in 2021/22), which also applies to 2022/23.

3.2.2. In recent years, the Fund has experienced significant issues with the quality of membership data supplied by its employers and particularly that supplied by the Council, the Fund's largest employer. The Council has experienced difficulties with data provision since the introduction of the new Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) in 2014. The Fund was required to make a number of reports to the Pensions Regulator in respect of late issuance of Annual Benefit Statements as a result.

3.2.3. During the year, the Committee continued to monitor officers' progress in working with both the Council and Equiniti, the Fund administrator, to develop new processes for data provision. The Committee is very pleased to note that a new automated interface process went live early in 2022/23, representing the culmination of several years' work. The quality of data held by the Fund has since increased significantly, and this is reflected in the timely production of Annual Benefit Statements for 2021/22 and the good progress made on the 2022 valuation.

3.2.4. The administration team continued to manage the contract with Equiniti, our third party administrator, during the year, delivering ongoing improvements to the Fund's administration service. One major ongoing project has been the delivery of new employer and member online services. These were delayed due to the onset of the COVID-19 outbreak in the UK in late March 2020 which unfortunately halted the planned rollout and training programme.

- 3.2.5. The first phase of the employer online portal work is now in progress. The inhouse Hackney pension team has worked closely with the project delivery manager from Equiniti and have agreed a detailed specification proposal. Employer training for the portal was held and follow-up work is now in progress with the employers. The council, the largest employer, has now moved into the “live” environment and monthly salary and contributions data is being uploaded each month directly into Equiniti’s administration system. Several other smaller employers are now also uploading into the live environment, and the team are engaging with the remaining employers.
- 3.2.6. The team are also working on the McCloud Programme, which will ensure the Fund is able to manage anticipated regulatory changes following the McCloud judgement on age discrimination. The regulations needed to implement the McCloud remedy within the LGPS have still not been published; however, the team are working to ensure that the Fund is as prepared as possible on the basis of the available information.
- 3.2.7. In recent years the risk of cybercrime has become much more evident, with the serious cyber attack on Hackney Council in October 2020 being a good example. Cyber-attacks on pension schemes are a significant risk and LGPS administering authorities are arguably at higher risk than other schemes due to the volume of data transfers between the administering authority and employers in the funds, as well as the high levels of assets of the funds. This is therefore an area of considerable interest to the Pensions Regulator.
- 3.2.8. The Committee and Officers have worked with the Fund’s governance consultant, Aon, to develop a Cyber Security Strategy for the Fund, which was approved by the Committee in March 2022. A key element of delivering this strategy will be working in partnership with Hackney Council as the Host Authority for the Fund, whilst still ensuring that the Pensions Committee and Fund officers have appropriate ownership of the risk and understands where Fund specific action and internal controls are required. Officers are now working with Aon to implement the strategy; initial security assessments have already been completed for the Council and Equiniti.
- 3.2.9. At the start of the municipal year, we reviewed the business plan for the year, setting out a timetable for both activities required to meet the Fund’s objectives for the year and for the regular review of policy documents. The Business Plan also sets out draft Committee agendas for review to ensure that key items of business are dealt with at appropriate intervals.

3.3. Investments/Asset Allocation

- 3.3.1. The first 3 quarters of the year were marked by a relatively benign investment environment, despite concerns over growth and rising inflation. Quarter 4 then saw Russia's invasion of Ukraine in late February, which caused a global shock. Equities declined and bond yields rose, whilst commodity prices soared, contributing to a surge in inflation.
- 3.3.2. Over the year to 31st March 2022, the Fund returned 6.1%, below its benchmark of 8.1%. Equities and property were the Fund's strongest performing asset classes in absolute terms, although some mandates notably underperformed relative to their benchmarks.
- 3.3.3. The Fund made a number of significant allocation changes during the year, in line with agreed changes to the investment strategy. The Fund's multi asset allocation has been reduced, with both previous portfolios sold down and the remaining exposure moved to the London CIV. The Fund has also pooled its emerging market equities, and made allocations to a number of other pooled mandates within the London CIV.
- 3.3.4. These include a new private debt allocation, which takes the Fund's total commitment to the asset class to 20%, and an allocation to renewable infrastructure. Initial commitments were made to these mandates late in 2020/21, with drawdowns commencing in 2021/22. Both allocations reflect the ongoing shift in the Fund's investment strategy towards income generating investments, which are becoming increasingly necessary as the Fund matures and benefit payments increase.
- 3.3.5. Given that funding allocations to illiquid asset classes requires the regular drawdown of capital over time, the Committee reviewed the Fund's approach to cash management during the year. Advised by the Fund's investment consultant, Hymans Robertson, the Committee considered how best to manage the short term demands that funding the new allocations would place on the Fund's cashflows. The recent spike in inflation has added additional pressures and rendered regular review of the Fund's cash management approach even more important.

3.4. LGPS Structural Reform and the London CIV

- 3.4.1. Asset pooling is now firmly underway across the LGPS, with all 8 asset pools in England and Wales now operational. Decisions around manager selection are now moving to asset pools where suitable strategies are available; however, investment strategy decisions remain firmly with individual funds. Asset allocation and investment strategy decisions for the Hackney Pension Fund are therefore still made by the Pensions Committee as the body responsible for the management of the Fund.
- 3.4.2. The Fund's current Investment Strategy Statement sets out its medium term plans for moving its assets to the London CIV. 2021/22 saw the Fund's second significant pooling transition exercise, following its first investments via the London CIV in 2018/19. The revised investment strategy, agreed during 2020/21, saw a number of new allocations to London CIV mandates, including active global equity, private debt, multi asset and renewable infrastructure.
- 3.4.3. Transition to these new pooled arrangements took place during the autumn of 2021. The Committee approved the approach to transition in March 2021 and reviewed the transition exercise after completion in November 2021.
- 3.4.4. Cllr Robert Chapman, Vice Chair of the Hackney Pensions Committee, and Ian Williams, S151 officer for Hackney, have both continued to sit on the Shareholder Committee of the LCIV, further underlining the Fund's commitment to the pooling arrangements.
- 3.4.5. The move to mandatory asset pooling has created a number of challenges for both LGPS funds and asset pools themselves. We have been generally supportive of the move to asset pooling; we have looked to maintain and improve a positive relationship with the London CIV whilst challenging where appropriate to ensure that the CIV acts in the interests of its client funds and helps us to deliver our strategic investment requirements.

3.5. **Responsible Investment**

- 3.5.1. As a Committee, we take very seriously the Fund's responsibilities as a shareholder in the companies that it holds, and considerable time and discussion has taken place on ways to improve the Fund's stewardship arrangements. One issue particularly recognised is that of fossil fuels and their impact on climate change. We recognise that these issues present systemic risks to the planet, but could also have a material impact on the financial position of the Pension Fund. We therefore have a long running work plan in

place to ensure that this issue is addressed within the Fund's investment strategy.

- 3.5.2. In 2016, the Pensions Committee set a target for the Fund to reduce exposure to fossil fuel reserves by at least 50% over the 6 years to 2022, with an interim review in 2019. By the time of the interim review, we had reduced exposure to carbon reserves by 31.4%, well over halfway to the target. These results were used to inform a revised investment strategy to strengthen the Fund's work in this area, with a focus on moving investments into more sustainable mandates within the new pooling arrangements. This was implemented during autumn 2021.
- 3.5.3. The final review against the target took place during 2022; the results showed that the Fund had reduced its exposure to carbon reserves by 96.9% between July 2016 and November 2021, demonstrating significant outperformance of the Fund's original target to reduce exposure by 50% by 2022.
- 3.5.4. We are proud to have responded to this issue early and to have been one of the first LGPS funds to set and transparently monitor performance against a carbon reduction target. The target has helped highlight the areas of greatest risk within the Fund's investment strategy and helped the Fund integrate carbon risk into the strategy setting process.
- 3.5.5. We are determined to remain at the forefront of Council Pension Funds in tackling the risks of climate change to our investments. The Committee has therefore set a target for the Fund to reach net zero by 2040, and plans to announce an initial interim target early in 2023. We have also started work on the Fund's first TCFD (Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures) report well ahead of the December 2024 statutory deadline for LGPS funds. Our initial report will cover the year 2021/22 and will be published in early 2023, nearly 2 years ahead of the deadline.
- 3.5.6. As set out above, the Fund has made significant strategy changes over the past 6 years, driven by wider economic changes and the government's asset pooling strategy as well as increased awareness of carbon risk. Much of the reduction in the Fund's exposure to carbon risk has been achieved through changes to the investment strategy. As we move into the next phase of asset pooling, we expect to make fewer major strategic changes and focus more on strengthening our engagement approach and working collectively with suppliers and other funds.

- 3.5.7. In line with this approach, the Committee approved the Fund's Responsible Investment Policy in March 2022. The Policy sets out our priority themes of climate action, developing clean energy systems and investing for the human condition. These incorporate a number of the UN Sustainable Development Goals and will help inform our engagement priorities. °
- 3.5.8. The Policy sets out the Committee's approach to voting and stewardship more widely, and sets out the role of the Role Investment Working Group (RIWG). The RIWG will have a membership made up of both Councillors and officers and will be responsible for setting the Fund's stewardship priorities and engaging on these with managers and other relevant stakeholders.
- 3.5.9. The Fund remains a member of the Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF), which is a collection of Local Authority funds who by acting collectively are able to apply pressure to management of companies to improve their governance standards. Cllr Rob Chapman, the Chair of the Pensions Committee, now sits as part of the LAPFF executive.

3.6. Financial Monitoring including Annual Report and Accounts

- 3.6.1. At the Pensions Committee meeting on 23rd November 2021 the Committee were presented with the 2020/21 Pension Fund Annual Report and Accounts for approval, pending completion of the audit.
- 3.6.2. The Fund's auditors propose to issue an unqualified opinion, modified to include an 'emphasis of matter' paragraph surrounding the valuation of pooled property investments, on the Pension Fund financial statements.
- 3.6.3. The 'emphasis of matter' paragraph concerns Note 4 of the financial statements, which describes the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on the valuation of the Pension Fund's pooled property fund assets as at 31 March 2021. As disclosed at Note 4, these valuations have been reported by the valuers on the basis of 'material valuation uncertainty' in line with guidance from the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). The auditors' opinion is not modified in respect of this matter.
- 3.6.4. The 2020/21 Pension Fund Annual Report and Accounts remains in draft form, as we await receipt of the certificate pending resolution of an outstanding query on the Council's accounts.

3.7. Training

- 3.7.1. To enable Committee Members to meet their fiduciary and regulatory responsibilities, the Committee were provided with a training session prior to each meeting. The CIPFA Knowledge and Skills Framework sets out in considerable detail the level of knowledge and skills that are expected of Committee Members who hold responsibility for the management of LGPS Funds; it is therefore vital to ensure that appropriate levels of training are available to the Committee.
- 3.7.2. The topics covered in the training programme for Members were provided in line with the Knowledge and Skills Framework to help ensure that the Committee are able to achieve the level of specialist knowledge required of them.
- 3.7.3. The topics covered during the year in line with the Knowledge and Skills Framework are outlined in the table below:

| Dedicated Training - Committee | Date |
|---|------------|
| TCFD and Stewardship (Investment performance and risk management; financial markets and products knowledge) | 16/06/2021 |
| Funding & Investment (Investment performance and risk management; Actuarial methods, standards and practices) | 30/09/2021 |
| Triennial Valuation (Actuarial methods, standards and practices) | 23/11/2021 |
| Valuation Assumptions (Actuarial methods, standards and practices) | 20/01/2022 |
| Cyber Security (pensions governance, pensions services procurement and relationship management) | 10/03/2022 |
| Supplemental Training - Committee | Date |
| Funding Issues (Actuarial methods, standards and practices) | 16/06/2021 |
| Investment Strategy & Transition (Investment performance and risk management; financial markets and products knowledge) | 23/11/2021 |
| Responsible Investment (Investment performance and risk management; financial markets and products knowledge) | 10/03/2022 |

4. Work Programme 2022/23

4.1 During the 2022/23 municipal year, the following reports are expected to be submitted to the Committee for consideration –

- Report and Accounts 2021/22
- 2022/23 Budget
- Business Plan 2022/25
- Detailed results - carbon risk audit
- Investment Strategy review, including responsible investment and new target for climate change
- 2022 Valuation
- Third party administration contract review
- Investment Consultancy Procurement
- Custody Procurement
- Cyber Strategy development
- Quarterly monitoring – covering Funding, Investment, Governance, Administration
- Membership data quality update
- GMP rectification exercise
- McCloud
- Regulatory changes and consultations
- Pension Fund Risk Register
- Training Programme
- Policy reviews

This page is intentionally left blank



| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | |
| Title of Report | Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2021/22 |
| For Consideration By | Council |
| Meeting Date | 23 November 2022 |
| Classification | Open |
| Ward(s) Affected | All |
| Group Director | Chief Executive, Mark Carroll |

1. **Summary**

- 1.1 It is customary for the Overview and Scrutiny function to present an annual report of its activities to Full Council. This is done each municipal year and is presented at Council by the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel. Attached is the Overview & Scrutiny Annual Report 2021/22.

2. **Recommendations**

That the Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Function 2021/22 be noted.

3. **Comments of the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources.**

The Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny function summarises the work of the function over the year and there are no financial implications arising from this report.

4. **Comments of the Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services**

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Appendices

Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2021/22

Background documents

N/A

| | |
|--|--|
| Report Author | Tracey Anderson Head of Scrutiny and Ward Forums tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 3312 |
| Comments for the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources prepared by | Jackie Moylan Director, Financial Management jackie.moylan@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 3032 |
| Comments for the Director of Legal, Democratic and Electoral Services prepared by | Louise Humphreys Head of Legal & Governance louise.humphreys@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 4817 |

Overview and Scrutiny

Annual Report to
Full Council 2021/22



Chair's Foreword

It is my great pleasure and privilege to introduce the annual report for Hackney Council's Scrutiny function for 2021/2022 - the fourth and final report of the 2018-2022 term.

Fearless, focussed and effective back-bench scrutiny of the Executive in public is an essential safeguard of the Mayor and Cabinet system. In a rapidly changing and often bewildering world, scrutiny in Hackney has sought to shape the Council's response to the many of the challenges we face and to push the Executive to deliver better services for the residents we serve.

The last year has seen great challenges for the Council and our communities. As we emerged from the first phase of the Covid pandemic and began to restore services following the cyber attack, the shocking assault on Child Q propelled Hackney into the national spotlight. Scrutiny has a vital role in shaping our local response to these events and giving voice to our communities and, in particular, in the ongoing response to Child Q, we have been able to draw on relevant evidence from previous investigations which have highlighted conditions leading up to this incident. The impact of the climate crisis and the cost of living crisis has affected our priorities across the Commissions.

We continue to innovate in scrutiny, retaining hybrid meetings which allow a broader range of voices to be heard and having scrutiny in the community. Commissions have worked jointly on pieces such as Housing for Care Leavers or on Disparities in Maternal Mental Health provision.

Scrutiny Panel has continued to develop our cross cutting role, focussing on the accountability for the Climate Action Plan and the Council's poverty framework. As we move towards the 13th year of austerity our Budget Scrutiny function has taken an increasingly central role across the Commissions and within the Scrutiny Panel itself, particularly with the work on the Council Tax Reduction Scheme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission has published a review on the outcomes for children excluded from schools, many of the recommendations having already shaped policy, and they are continuing with a review on adolescents entering care. In response to public concern, the Commission has also held a meeting on the reconfiguration of Children's Centres, prompting a reconsideration of the proposed changes.

Living in Hackney continued to focus on trust and confidence in policing, particularly from global majority residents and it has made specific recommendations around Stop and Search. Following on from the Scrutiny Panel's work on the climate emergency, Living in Hackney has also investigated Energy Strategy and Energy Systems, Climate Change and Buildings and the Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure.

Skills, Economy and Growth has examined the impact of Covid and other economic shocks on local businesses and has put a spotlight on the role of Council in influencing the recovery and setting Hackney's economy on a trajectory that is inclusive, green and fair. In particular the Commission has shone a light on Net Zero Skills, Cleaner Greener Transport, the Night Time Economy and support for smaller businesses.

Health in Hackney has had an ongoing focus on monitoring the response to the Covid pandemic and vaccine uptake across our communities, particularly for those working in health and social care. A spotlight has been shone on support for long covid and the mental health impacts of the pandemic, as well as business as usual changes to provision arising from the ongoing integration of health social care.

As ever, this report reflects the contributions of hundreds of individuals, in particular, the chairs and vice chairs - Cllrs Conway, Hayhurst, Patrick, Billington, Adejare, Potter and former councillor Snell, as well as all the Commission Members. We have relied on contributions from the Mayor and Cabinet, officers, outside bodies and, very importantly, from individual members of our local community who have given up their time to contribute to our meetings and reports. We have benefited from reports in the press which have brought our work more immediately to a wider audience.

I'd also of course like to thank Jarlath O'Connell, Martin Bradford, Craig Player and Timothy Upton (with us for part of the year), the brilliant members of our Scrutiny Team, led by Tracey Anderson, who all take enormous pride in their work and are instrumental in pushing the boundaries of what can be achieved by a Council's Scrutiny function.



Cllr Margaret Gordon
Chair of Scrutiny Panel 2021/22



Responding to climate change was a key focus of our work this year

The Overview and Scrutiny function is required to report annually to Full Council on its activities over the previous municipal year. This summary report covers the municipal year 2021/22.

Scrutiny in Hackney comprises 4 themed Commissions which meet 8 times per year:

- **Children and Young People**
- **Health in Hackney**
- **Living in Hackney**
- **Skills, Economy and Growth**

The Chair and Vice Chair of each panel then comprise the **Scrutiny Panel** which meets 4 times per year and which also holds a Vice Chair post for the opposition party. Members are appointed annually at the Council's AGM. Scrutiny holds the executive (Mayor and Cabinet) to account for Executive Decisions and contributes to policy development. It has no role in relation to 'Non-executive functions' such as Planning, Licensing, Pensions or Audit.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Chair’s Foreword | 2 |
| Scrutiny Panel | 6 |
| Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission | 12 |
| Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission | 23 |
| Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission | 33 |
| Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission | 41 |
| Inner North East London Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Commission | 54 |
| The Review process | 59 |
| Memberships of the Commissions | 60 |
| Contacts | 61 |



Scrutiny Panel



Scrutiny Panel



We meet four times a year and our meetings are a mix of our standing items which provide overview and looking at some issues which cut across the 4 themed divisions.

Net Zero, Sustainability and Decarbonising the Economy

This year we decided to initiate a cross cutting piece of work across the Scrutiny Panel and the Commissions focusing on the impact of the Climate Change challenge on the council and the borough. The purpose was to ensure that the Council is on 1 track to meet its Net Zero carbon emission targets by using both its statutory powers and its soft power to affect the necessary organisational, business and behaviour changes required. We also wanted to ensure that the necessary resources, finances and plans were being put in place to help make this happen.

The sessions focused on the actions being taken to achieve Net Zero, the road map to decarbonise the economy and the consequent impact on supply chains, procurement and service delivery. We heard from the London Councils Head of Climate Change about their Climate Change Programme and asked sustainability engineers from Buro Happold to set the wider context and share best practice

Senior officers from the Council set out the sustainability challenges facing the borough. We looked at the current governance framework to support this work and discussed it in detail with the lead Cabinet Member and the senior officers noting the elements that would feed into the preparation for the COP 26 conference. We urged officers to ensure that this work is better coordinated and embedded within service delivery and to examine how procurement processes and the whole supply chain can be optimised.

Key next steps were identified including: Developing Hackney's *Climate Action Plan*; *Delivering a Carbon Literacy Programme*; further developing the *External Communications and Engagement Strategy* and developing a robust Monitoring and Review Framework. In terms of funding there needs to be further applications to the government's scheme for building retrofit and a range of schemes which will subsidise electric vehicle (EV) charging points. New investment in fleet, changes to residual waste collection and blending, funding schemes such as the Green Homes programme, and helping to create commercial opportunities locally where risks may still be significant, all need to be explored as well as possibly using Hackney's own energy service company -



Summer heatwave - impacts of climate change

1 Net Zero is a statutory target set by the Climate Change Act 2008 for at least a 100% reduction of UK greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 (compared to 1990 levels). It replaced the UK's previous target to reduce emissions by 80% by 2050.

Hackney Light and Power, as a vehicle for investments and transformative change.

We noted that one of the key challenges is pacing and the need to avoid implementing changes faster than technology and people can adapt but also, not moving so slowly as to lose momentum. Other aspects of the work were carried forward by the Commissions (see their chapters for more) on a continuous basis but starting with the following:

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Living in Hackney | Retrofit of council houses and council buildings A review of the Council’s Energy Strategy Electric Vehicle Infrastructure |
| Skills Economy and Growth | ‘Green jobs’ and the shift to new skills; Ensuring the council’s procurement strategy aligns with the energy strategy Developing cleaner, greener transport for Hackney How the council supports SMEs to decarbonise |
| Health in Hackney | The ‘Net Zero’ strategies of each health partner The science on the health impacts of poor air quality |

The outcomes from each Commission’s work will feed into a combined report to the Scrutiny Panel and this work will be ongoing.

Council Tax Reduction Scheme - Task and Finish Group

In July we set up a **Task and Finish Group** to look at the **Council Tax Reduction Scheme**. The Scheme replaced Council Tax Benefit which used to be administered by DWP. This represented a fundamental move away from a demand-led benefit to a fixed budget scheme and meant that the Council had to provide financial assistance to those taxpayers on a low income who had difficulty with paying their Council Tax.

The Task Group focused on the impact of CTRS on poverty in the borough and considered options to achieve an eventual reduction to a zero CTRS model. It held 3 themed meetings and it was composed of current Scrutiny Commission Members.

We welcomed the focus on designing a more bespoke system for Hackney and we expressed concern about the underclaimed hardship fund which does not appear to be working as intended and we highlighted the need for a greater focus on care leavers. A final report from the Task and Finish Group will be presented to Scrutiny Panel later this year.

Mayor's Question Time

Each of the Cabinet Members are required to attend a Cabinet Member Question Time Session with their relevant Scrutiny Commission. The Mayor's CQT Session is a duty of the Scrutiny Panel and we ask questions on three pre-agreed areas. This year they were:

Decarbonising policies: The Mayor outlined his approach which is to continue to prioritise actions that are being delivered now to complete the *Climate Action Plan* and to recognise that progress this decade will be vital in delivering Net Zero by 2030. We wanted to understand whether climate goals were being delivered equitably.

Housing: We asked about actions the Council can take to *increase housing supply* and the impact of the pandemic, of Brexit (on the workforce), and of inflationary pressures on building materials and of supply chain challenges. We got reassurances on the risk to the existing programme. We noted that the Council had built over 1,000 new homes and has 2,000 in the pipeline, but it could not build new social housing without cross-subsidising them through other tenures.

The biggest challenges and opportunities for Hackney over the next 4 years: The Mayor talked about an important move to focus more openly on issues around poverty; the need to rebuild trust with local residents in the aftermath of the cyber attack, and the opportunities for new ways of working that had arisen through the Council's response to the pandemic. He also welcomed the opportunities to progress more 'place based' development with local partners and agencies e.g. in health.

Additionally we asked him about the implications for inner London of the government's 'levelling up' agenda; on the need for more council investment to support local businesses and on early help and early years education particularly in relation to groups such as young black boys.



Our Overview Role

We also looked at issues which cut across the 4 Commissions and which would benefit from a wider perspective:

Recovering from the Cyber attack

In July the Scrutiny Panel began the year with an update on the cyber attack, particularly in relation to the recovery programme, the restoration of key services and the financial impact that it had upon the Council. Due to the continuing criminal investigation into the attack, the amount of information that could be put in public domain at that time was necessarily limited. Those services areas which the Council had migrated to cloud based systems had benefited greatly from the additional security and resilience that those provided and we noted that recovery work was accelerating this migration focus and Google had become the key communication platform.

Ways of Working

We noted how working patterns brought about by Covid pandemic had also reduced the council's paper and energy usage significantly and so contributed to the Net Zero target. It was likely that whilst the Council would ensure that staff remain connected to local workplaces, some proportion of homeworking would be maintained in the weekly routines of staff. With less demand for office space therefore, the Council planned to rethink how it used its current estate. Such an approach would contribute to reducing the need for staff to travel and help improve the balance between work and other life commitments.

Poverty Reduction Strategic Framework

In February we looked at the *Poverty Reduction Framework* prior to it going to Cabinet and we provided some challenge on it to the four Cabinet Members and the senior officers responsible for it. The aim was to review the work of the Council in relation to developing a poverty reduction strategic framework to achieve the broader objectives and aspirations to reduce poverty.

The initial mapping made clear the need for better coordination of local efforts and the pandemic response had acted as a catalyst for developing a more preventative approach, as had the new Community Partnerships Network. We welcomed the ambition of the work and explored their three priorities: *addressing the immediate needs of food poverty* as a stepping stone to address wider needs; the very clear evidence base supporting the need to *prioritise early help and early years and the need to prioritise ways of working in the poverty response* which will ensure that front-line workers are better equipped to meet local needs. We noted now there needs to be a greater understanding among all staff of the totality of the local offer and then how to communicate that.

Annual Complaints and Members Enquiries Report

Each year we consider this report from the Head of Business Intelligence. Complaints had risen slightly, up about 7% in the year, but they were still below the three previous years. Members' Enquiries were up about 10%. The number of Stage 2 complaints going to the Ombudsman had reduced from 34% to 22% as officers were resolving more complaints in-house. There was however an increase in the length of time taken to answer complaints owing to lack of quick access to data because of the impact of the cyber-attack. We learned about the new 'case work' system which allows Managers to see more granular data and we commended the progress being made.

Our Financial Overview

A key part of our work is Budget Scrutiny and we invite the Cabinet Member for Finance and the Group Director for Finance and Corporate Resources for **Quarterly Financial Updates**. At each meeting we consider the most recent reports on: *Overall Financial Position (OFP)*, *Capital Programme* and *Housing Revenue Account*. Then in February we receive a summary of the key points of the Budget prior to it going to Cabinet and Full Council for formal approval. We are joined for these sessions by the Chair of the Audit Committee.

Financial Performance

Over the course of the year we provide some challenge to the Group Director on the progress of the budget against targets and discuss what the key drivers of overspends might be. At our first meeting in June for example we discussed the then projected overspend. By February, even after Covid and Children's Services set-asides were added this was being projected as £4.99m. We noted how pressures within Childrens and Adults Social Care were key drivers here and discussed mitigation measures.

We heard about discussions with the Department of Works and Pension (DWP) and Cabinet Office around additional funding needed to recover from the cyber attack and we learned how it had impacted the ability to collect rent, council tax and business rates. We discussed the cost pressures from Children's Social Care, the Children and Families Service and from SEND and we learned for example that funding from S106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy would be less that year and the reasons for that.

Children and Young People



Children & Young People



We have completed a number of successful scrutiny projects this year, all of which highlighted a number of consistent themes which we aim to bring to our scrutiny work wherever possible:

- As a Commission, our work is more powerful and impactful when we directly involve the voice of children and young people;
- Bringing new evidence to the table, by talking to service users, consulting with front-line staff or other local authorities adds new perspectives and contributes to improved decision making;
- Scrutinising issues which are important to local people and which resonate with the concerns of the community builds engagement and involvement with our work.

Our work was broken down into: full reviews, single-meeting items, joint or cross-cutting pieces of work with other Commissions, pre-decision scrutiny, ongoing oversight, annual overview items as well as Cabinet Question Times including an aspect of budget monitoring.

REVIEWS

Outcomes of school exclusion

We did a full in-depth review on the outcomes of school exclusions which not only assessed the underlying disparities of those children being excluded from school but also looked at how exclusion impacted on children and families, and the support available to them locally. Evidence gathering included focus groups with children who had been excluded or who were at risk of exclusion, focus groups with parents about their experiences of their child's exclusion and we visited numerous alternative provision sites, where children who have been excluded continue their education.

We reached a number of key conclusions from this work:

- Permanent exclusions rates among Black Caribbean children was increasing, countering national trends;
- Around two thirds of children permanently excluded are diagnosed with SEND *after* they have been excluded, suggesting that undiagnosed needs may be contributory to their exclusion;
- Permanent exclusion leads to significantly worse outcomes for young people including lower attainment, greater likelihood of not being in education, employment or training (NEET), increased prevalence of mental health concerns and greater likelihood of criminal exploitation;
- Whilst some alternative provision was nurturing, supportive and enabled children to achieve, too often it did not meet their needs, especially the most vulnerable children.

We reported in December 2021 making 18 recommendations to the Council, all of which were accepted. Critically, the recommendations focused on the need for the Council and local education services to address underlying causes of racial disproportionality in exclusions data including earlier diagnoses of SEND. Other recommendations encompassed the need for improved transparency, monitoring and challenge to school exclusions; supporting schools to be more inclusive through greater use of positive behaviour management strategies, extending provision of the Reintegration Unit to secondary schools, improved safeguarding risk assessments prior to any permanent exclusion and the need to overhaul commissioning, oversight and support for local alternative provision.

Our work has been positively received by Hackney Education and has already achieved a number of positive local outcomes:

- All schools are being encouraged to sign up to an Inclusion Charter which is being supported by the appointment of a Diversity and Inclusion Systems Lead;
- The Reintegration Unit now supports secondary schools pupils at risk of exclusion as well as primary;
- A new role for the Pupil Referral Unit is being developed to help more children maintain their places in secondary schools;
- A dedicated officer was now working with alternative provision to improve commissioning, performance monitoring, quality assurance and to ensure improvements are delivered;
- Hackney Education now reports annually to Councillors on permanent exclusions alongside all other school exits (School Moves, moves to alternative provision or Elective Home Education).

It will be important to maintain oversight of this body of work in the coming years to ensure that there is sustained progress against our recommendations and improved outcomes for local young people.

Adolescents Entering Care

We also started a new scrutiny review in 2022, looking at the increasing number of adolescents (aged 14-17) who are coming into care and how effectively they are being supported by the Council. Over a third of children now entering care are aged 16 and over and three quarters of all children in care are aged between 10-17 years. Many of the adolescents entering care have multiple and complex needs and it has become more difficult to find appropriate placements for them. A significant number of these children are not able or want to be cared for by foster carers, and need to be supported in residential care settings, sometimes a long distance from their families and friends. As our budget scrutiny work has revealed, these settings are also very expensive with the Council paying up to £10,500 per week (average £4,600) for some placements which is generating acute budget pressures within the Children and Families Service.

In the context of the above there are four main aims for this review: to understand more work on the demographic profile and needs of adolescents coming into care; to assess how effectively this cohort of adolescents are being supported by local services;

to review financial, governance and quality standards which underpin commissioning processes for care placements and to identify if there are more localised collaborative solutions to meet the care needs of adolescents; and through analysing pathways into care, identify if there are opportunities for early help which may reduce the risk of adolescents becoming looked after children.

JOINT / CROSS CUTTING PIECES OF WORK

Housing Support for Care Leavers (joint with Living in Hackney)

In partnership with Living in Hackney, we conducted a review of housing support for care leavers. A critical part of this review was a focus group with 10 local care leavers who clearly expressed the range of challenges they faced in finding stable affordable accommodation in Hackney to support their pathway out of care. We heard from key officers about the challenges faced in finding a range of accommodation to support the varied needs of care leavers, in particular the limited way in which the Council can offer affordable housing through its own housing register. Further details of the meeting are given at pages 30-31.

From this work, we developed a set of *10 recommendations* which have been submitted to relevant Cabinet members for approval which include: the need to improve the consistency and quality of housing advice for care leavers across both Corporate Parenting and the Greenhouse (the Council's homeless service); the need to increase the social housing quota for care leavers to 30 units; the need to improve transparency around eligibility; to ensure that Housing supports care leavers seeking accommodation in the private rented sector (PRS) which is of parity with other housing options. We asked that the Council should consider the development of an Accredited Landlord Scheme, act as Guarantor for deposit and rents for care leavers and provide assistance through Housing projects to help care leavers transition to PRS. We also suggested increasing the housing supply and options for care leavers through, for example, a property audit across both HRA and General Fund.

Our recommendations are timely as a new Housing Strategy is in the process of being developed and we hope to influence that. We are currently awaiting the Cabinet response to our recommendations.



Maternal Mental Health (joint with Health in Hackney)

Jointly with Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission (see also p.50), we looked at the disparities in maternal mental health i.e. perinatal health. It was noted that there were disproportionalities in the number of Black and global majority women accessing IAPT services and being diagnosed with mental health conditions. From the report it was clear that there was a patchwork of service providers where there was a possibility of some new mothers falling through the cracks. Both Commissions concluded that these services needed to be more integrated with clear lines of oversight and accountability. This was a complex area however and further investigation was needed particularly in relation to support for younger mothers, which would hopefully be picked up next year's work programme.

SINGLE MEETING ITEMS

Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND)

Concerns were raised to us around the provision of independent SEND education and support at a setting in Hackney. We requested a report from Hackney Education to review commissioning arrangements, quality control and financial oversight of independent SEND provision. In separate budget scrutiny work, we learned that, then, over £14m is spent annually on commissioning independent SEND provision, an area of spend which is rising significantly for the Council. Hackney Education acknowledged that there were deficiencies in financial controls and the oversight of quality monitoring of independent provisions and provided details of new improved accountability arrangements. We will continue to review and maintain oversight of these improvements to ensure that there is effective budgetary control and quality standards.

Children and Education's Anti Racist Action Plan

In March we received an update on the *Children & Education Anti-racist Action Plan*. Previously Hackney Education and Children and Families had produced separate anti-racist strategies but we wanted to see more evidence of a unified approach to addressing disproportionalities across all children services and to see progress in a unified children's strategy. Whilst we welcomed progress in developing common principles and approaches, on the basis of what was presented to us we still felt that there were two parallel strategies and further work was needed. In light of the outcomes of Child Q (the case of a young black girl who was strip searched in school by the police) Safeguarding Practice Review, we felt it was important that local services have a shared understanding of anti racist practice and a common understanding of safeguarding risks and approaches to Black and global majority children. Scrutiny's response to the Child Q issue will be covered in the 2022/23 Annual Report.

Sexual Harassment in Schools

In response to the *'Everyone's Invited'* revelations of sexual harassment of girls and young women, we looked at how Sexual Harassment was being addressed in local schools and by Hackney Education. *'Everyone's Invited'* is a website which serves as a safe place for survivors of rape, sexual assault or wider misogynistic experiences to anonymously share their stories. A number of local schools were named within this data. We invited the head of a local secondary school to set out the nature of sexual harassment in schools and the action taken to address it. A consistent theme coming from this session was the need for more robust and open Relationships and Sex Education to be taught consistently across schools in Hackney. We were aided in this scrutiny by the participation of members of Hackney Youth Parliament, who helped to provide additional and informed challenge to the local school and education leaders.

The role of the School Improvement Partners (SIPs)

We assessed the role of the School Improvement Partners (SIP) in early 2022, as this service is central to the way in which Hackney Education challenges schools about their performance and routes to strategic support. Hackney Education has 14 SIPs working with 81 local schools and 30 schools elsewhere (it is also a traded service) offering 3 core visits a year to work with school leaders on school improvements. Whilst this is clearly an important service providing a useful connection to local schools, we felt that the standards used to improve performance did not sufficiently reflect local priorities and ambitions (such as inclusion) and were more geared to Ofsted assessment frameworks. It was however encouraging for us to note that all schools, including academies were engaged within this programme.



PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY

We assessed early drafts of important new strategies before they were finalised and agreed by Cabinet. Pre-decision scrutiny gives non-executive members an opportunity to positively contribute and influence decisions before these become the agreed approach of the Council.

Early Years Strategy - Reconfiguration of Children's Centres - Following sessions we ran involving feedback from local parents our consultation response highlighted the unsatisfactory nature of the original consultation arrangements which had conflated proposals for the development of Early Years Strategy alongside plans to close two Children's Centres. Whilst we noted the financial context in which Children's Centre closures were put forward, we were unhappy about how these closures would impact on the availability of subsidised childcare given that there is a lack of comparable local alternatives. Subsequently the Council ceased the consultation and put any changes to the establishment of Children's Centres on hold. We will be returning to the issue next year.

School Estates Strategy - Hackney Education faces two key challenges in the coming years: falling school rolls and the need to increase maintained in-borough capacity for children with SEND. The School's Estates Strategy sets out long-term plans on how to best utilise the school estate to respond to these and other local challenges. Our main focus for scrutiny was to seek assurance that Additional Resource Units would be located where they are most needed and not in those schools where falling rolls had opened up capacity. In addition, we felt that improvements could be made to proposed commissioning arrangements for children with SEND from the Orthodox Jewish Community to involve local leaders further and increase in-borough provision. Finally,

the future environmental sustainability of the school estate was not fully reflected in the proposals we received and we asked that this be included in the final strategy.

Early Help Strategy - Early help is non-statutory support that is provided to children and families at risk of poor outcomes and who need additional help to achieve a good level of well being. We noted that this review has been in progress since 2019 and that the early help offer detailed proposals focussed solely on Hackney Council services. In examining the strategy, we agreed with the principles and processes to support its implementation but noted that it would be helpful to have a much tighter vision of what outcomes were expected from this strategy, particularly in relation to local disproportionalities. We felt that the final iteration of the strategy might also benefit from closer examination of the consensual nature of early help services and those circumstances where such help may be refused, as well as further details as to how the community and voluntary sector would be involved in delivery of the early help offer.

ONGOING OVERSIGHT ISSUES

Responding to Ofsted Inspection Report

In the light of recent inspections we maintain regular oversight of the necessary improvements required by Ofsted and we continue to monitor the action plan from the last full inspection, where children's social care was judged to 'require improvement'. We also see reassurance from officers that there is sufficient progress to achieve 'good' or better assessment at the next inspection. The key takeaway was that further improvements were necessary in information sharing across the partnership as well as the management challenge of having children living in neglectful environments for too long.

Ofsted also undertook a focussed visit in July 2021 to assess arrangements for Children in Need and those children on a Child Protection Plan. The outcomes of this inspection confirmed our previous concerns in relation to the impact of the cyber attack and use of temporary records systems. We received assurance from officers that the temporary record system would be replaced and Mosaic was reinstalled in April 2022.

Unregistered Schooling

We continue to maintain a watching brief on the oversight of 'Unregistered Settings' in Hackney, which was the subject of a previous review. In excess of 1,500 boys predominantly (though not exclusively) from the Orthodox Jewish Community continue to be educated in settings for which there is no regulatory, health and safety or safeguarding oversight. As we were reminded this year, the child safeguarding risks of unregistered schools remains high, boys at an unregistered school in Manchester had to be rescued from an ill-planned mountain hike, and there was a fire in a local unregistered school in Hackney.

Progress in this area however remains minimal, as efforts by local Safeguarding Children Partnership and Hackney Education continue to be rebuffed by local community leaders, as they fear that improved safeguarding arrangements are a precursor to changes to the curricula of their schools, to which they are vehemently opposed. We note that the Independent Safeguarding Chair continues to liaise with political leaders, highlighting

the inadequacy of legal framework to bring about safeguarding improvement in these settings. We do however expect some movement next year, as legislation currently going through parliament will introduce a much tighter definition of what constitutes a school, which will bring many unregistered settings into the regulatory and enforcement framework. It is hoped that improvement will be apparent when we revisit this subject next year.

CABINET MEMBER QUESTION TIME

Once a year we invite the two Cabinet Members with specific responsibilities in our area to attend a Cabinet Question Time and explore a specific area of focus that is agreed in advance.

In response to the widespread and growing concerns around **increased prevalence of mental health issues for children and young people**, we questioned the *Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Children's Social Care*. Local CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health) services were under pressure with the number of referrals to East London Foundation Trust doubling from 400 to 800, and the proportion diagnosed with a mental health condition increasing from 8% to 18%. We examined plans to improve access and ensure that services reach vulnerable groups of children. We noted we were not reaching the national standard for access to the eating disorders service and that a local summit of CAMHS partners had been convened to assess what improvements could be made.

Whilst it was acknowledged that CAMHS was clearly under pressure and that some young people were waiting a long time for mental health support, City & Hackney was performing better, comparatively, than many other areas, and it had the shortest waiting lists for talking therapies and other broader CAMHS assessments.

In terms of improving access, whilst there were no plans to introduce open access mental health hubs for young people, local services were focused on improving capacity across the CAMHS network. There has been limited progress in developing a 'no wrong door' approach across CAMHS and we will pursue this further in next year's work programme.

With **growing pressures within SEND services**, we questioned the *Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years, Parks and Play* on how increasing numbers of children were being diagnosed with Social Emotional or Mental Health concerns (SEMH) was contributing to rising demand for children to be put on an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Given our ongoing work on disproportionality, we wanted to understand more about the demographic profile of this cohort of children, the intersecting factors which may increase prevalence of SEMH and cumulatively, how the needs of these children were being met.

We noted that contributory factors to increased diagnosis of SEMH among children include: attachment history, a lack of emotional response and positive feedback by a caregiver. SEMH may also be related to trauma history such as abuse, domestic violence, bullying, exclusion and crime. We noted that additional provision for children with SEMH would be provided through the School Estates Strategy which would provide additional mainstream school support as well as more specialist school places in Hackney.

BUDGET MONITORING

We monitor in-year budgets of both Hackney Education and Children and Families Directorates to help identify service pressures and to ensure that identified savings proposals are on track to being achieved.

For *Hackney Education*, we focused on the SEND services as this is an area of ongoing significant budget challenge. In particular, we looked at the commissioning of independent and non-maintained SEND provision which accounted for £15m of the £48m high needs budget. We noted that in Hackney over 13% of children with SEND were attending an independent and Non Maintained sector, which was twice that of the national rate (6.2%) and the 5th highest of any English authority.

SEND services were expected to run up a £4.5m year end deficit, contributing to cumulative SEND overspend (at the time of our meeting) of around £14m. Whilst there was an understanding that central government would compensate for this, it was not clear if this would be for the total accumulated debt (or proportion thereof) or what the terms might be (such as service reform). As such, this remains a significant financial risk to Hackney Education and the Council more widely, and an issue over which we will retain oversight.

In examining the Children and Families Service budget we heard that the corporate parenting budget continued to be a significant area of overspend, totalling about £4m. From our questioning it was revealed that residential placements were the main contributor to this deficit, where over 40 children were placed in residential care at an average cost of £200k per placement per annum. We heard that with many young people entering care with particularly high levels of need, more were being placed in residential care especially as Covid had also impacted on the numbers of foster carers who might also be able to care for these children. As this was a nationwide issue, increased demand was also restricting supply and further fueling costs for residential care.

Similar issues were also highlighted in relation to the provision of semi-independent care which was needed to support the increase in the number of 16 and 17 year olds entering care in acute housing need. Both these discussions were helpful, as they assisted us in our other scrutiny work in relation to adolescents entering care, and underlined the need to review commissioning arrangements for residential social care placements.

ANNUAL UPDATES FOR OVERVIEW

Every year there are a number of standing items which we take to monitor key aspects of the performance of both our schools and the children's and families service and our Safeguarding Board. These updates help us maintain an overview of key services for children and young people and help us to identify if additional scrutiny is needed:

Children & Families Bi-Annual Report (twice yearly) - Two issues stood out we noted that a third of Child Protection Plans were in place for 3 months or less, which suggested that risk averse assessments were being made. We also noted the decline in front

door assessments being made, which we were reassured was because a new triage and helpline had been set up for local practitioners to advise them on the appropriateness of referrals.

City Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP) - With many practitioners moving to on-line consultations, we sought reassurance from the safeguarding partnership on how local practitioners were ensuring that the *voice of the child* was maintained in this environment. CHSCP countered that in their investigations they were broadly impressed with the ways children and young people were engaged and involved by practitioners. We noted that this has become a much wider concern and would result in national system wide recommendations for improved practice.

School Admissions - this is to ensure that there are sufficient school places at reception and secondary entry and that appropriate future planning is taking place. A key takeaway from the data was that falling school rolls were beginning to impact on local primary schools, with a number of schools agreeing to restrict their form entry numbers. We heard that falling school rolls would continue in the short-term at least, yet this additional capacity could help in response to growing numbers of children with SEND and the need to find in borough placements.

Pupil attainment - we review the educational achievement and progress of children in Hackney each year and review how the council is supporting underachieving groups. Due to the pandemic, teacher assessments replaced public examinations in both 2020 and 2021 which meant that it was not possible to compare results to previous years. Public examinations resumed in 2022.

Exclusions and Pupil Movement - this is a new standing item on our agenda which helps us maintain oversight of school exclusions as well as the number of children moving between schools (School Moves) and out of school (into alternative or Elective Home Education) in any one year. A key takeout from this item was that permanent school exclusions had fallen dramatically over school lockdowns, and that Hackney Education was working across schools to share best practice on how to sustain low levels of exclusions. We were also struck by the consistency of the disproportionalities in this data, with children from traveller communities and Black ethnic groups over represented in all pupil movements categories.

Childcare Sufficiency - this is also a standing item on our agenda where we can assess whether there is sufficient childcare across the borough, it is of sufficient quality and reaches those children and families in most need. At this session we noted that the pandemic has fundamentally changed the way parents utilised childcare services, where greater homeworking had reduced the need for childcare and where many parents restricted use to their free entitlements. In this context, many private nurseries were struggling as they had reduced demand for places and their ability to cross-subsidize free provision with paid for care was limited. We therefore questioned officers on the range of business support which was available to independent and voluntary childcare settings, and whether this could be extended.

Living in Hackney



Living in Hackney



The past year has been challenging for the Hackney community as a whole and this is recognised in the work we have undertaken in our Commission. At the forefront of our undertakings has been an overwhelming desire to ensure that the voices of residents are central and represented in our scrutiny of the services which residents receive.

Ensuring that services meet the needs of all and that, within the multiplicity of procedures and processes, all residents have a sense of agency was our key line of enquiry this year, across a very broad programme of work.

COMMUNITY SAFETY

We have a statutory duty to scrutinise the *Community Safety Partnership for Hackney* and to monitor its *Community Safety Partnership Plan 2019-2022*. Each year we conduct a review looking at a specific area of the Partnership and its work in relation to community safety.



Trust and Confidence and Inclusive Policing

A key part of our focus was on the need to reduce the disproportionality among ethnic minority groups being stopped and searched and to seek further progress on ensuring their community engagement structures are properly representative. This was the main concern coming out of our previous session in Nov 2020 and we had requested written updates from all the key parties. We began the year therefore by devoting a whole meeting to Community Safety hearing from the local Borough Commander and the London Lead for Violence and Stop and Search from the the Metropolitan Police as well as senior officers from MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) and Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).

We discussed **better use of police powers** (handcuffing, tasers, use of force and stop and search). MOPAC acknowledged that there was a disproportionate impact on some communities causing wider public concern. They acknowledged that while police's community engagement structures had been in place for some time they were not as representative as they should be and so their action plan contained a commitment to overhaul them. We pressed them for action on this while welcoming first steps such as their new race equality data dashboard.

On **data transparency** we asked them for a commitment to do more to better promote what data they currently put in the public domain and to make it much more accessible. MOPAC explained they have regular oversight boards led by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime where they review MPS data sets and the MPS business plan.

We questioned why a large proportion of **complaints or appeals** were not upheld by the IOPC. They explained that the latest figures showed 32% upheld and 68% found in favour of the police. This compared with a previous figure of c. 50% upheld. The IOPC replied that this reduction pointed to an improved performance by the police.

We also asked about whether it was possible for the IOPC to have a role in helping to establish the **standard for accountability of police officers**. We asked how officers could aid the public to understand how the IOPC, MPS and MOPAC work together to build trust and confidence. We asked for better reassurance to the public that the MPS does have robust processes in place to hold police officers to account. Referring to the IOPC website we pointed out that it was unclear to the layperson what the difference was between appeals and reviews. We asked the IOPC if they could assist Hackney Council officers and MOPAC to promote to local stakeholders and to take part in public meetings.

We challenged the MPS on a recently published **Public Inquiry** concluding that it had institutional corruption and we queried why IOPC's systematic reviews of the MPS hadn't highlighted this earlier before a Public Inquiry was necessary. We pressed them on the role of the IOPC in getting the MPS to be more candid and to view itself and its procedures more critically. The Borough Commander acknowledged that the MPS was a very large organisation but was not, in his view, institutionally corrupt or institutionally racist. He acknowledged that they did have areas where they do need to improve and added that these types of behaviours will be rooted out.

We commented that often the processes in place by the MPS may not address people's complaints in full because these actions are considered 'normal policing' by the MPS, however the public may see these things differently and this needs to be understood. We stressed that the public would like to see the recommendations of the public inquiry implemented in full. We acknowledged that there were no quick fixes but we asked that changes need to happen fairly quickly to provide reassurance to the public that there is a robust system in place and one in which the public can have some confidence.

On MOPAC we took issue with the failure of the Commissioner of the Met to acknowledge in full that there is **disproportionate treatment of black citizens** by the police across London. We asked how the MPS carried out local recruitment for its community Review Groups.

We questioned the effectiveness of **how the MPS is currently organised** across London, having regional and some centralised functions e.g. the tactical support units and the ways these are mobilised, in our view, breaks the link with local communities. The Borough Commander disagreed however stating that the TSG (Tactical Support Group) had the highest positive stop and search outcome rates in London and that there were unfortunately many misconceptions about its performance.

We challenged the **profile of MOPAC** pointing out that many in the community had never heard of it. We acknowledged their engagement efforts and enquired whether its budget had increased and noted it had not.

We discussed the contentious issue of **body-worn cameras**. The Borough Commander stated that the local BCU was establishing a Police Encounter Panel which would involve

an independent process looking at body-worn video footage or incidents that are shown in the media. We pressed them on who would be on it and if it would include local young people and how they would be recruited. We discussed the issue of identification and sanctioning of police officers who are not using body worn cameras as required and how this is handled. We asked about the MPS communication strategy for when police officers are disciplined or retrained when they are deemed to be not acting professionally.

We asked about the regular use of **Dispersal Zones** and their impact on trust and confidence in those neighbourhoods. The Borough Commander clarified that these zones do not make it easier to carry out stop and search as police officers still need to show a proportionate lawful and balanced use of stop and search.

The Borough Commander did highlight that in the previous 6 months they had stopped between 600–850 people per month in Hackney. The average positive outcome rate was c. 28%. He added that, unfortunately, they also do need to stop people as young as 12 yrs old who have been found carrying zombie knives or drugs or who are suspected of being engaged in serious violence. He explained that he would continue to direct his officers to use stop and search in a proportionate and lawful way in order to keep people safe.

Following on from the meeting Members accepted the Borough Commanders offer of a ‘ride along’ with police officers in Hackney to observe them on duty. We concluded that trust and confidence remains a key concern within our communities and it is important that we continue to monitor the progress of change. We will of course be returning to these issues.

CLIMATE CHANGE

In October Scrutiny Panel embarked on a cross cutting piece of work in response to the Climate Emergency (see p.6) and as part of this each Commission was asked to explore different aspects of the issue within their remits. We decided to look at Energy Strategy and Energy Systems, Climate Change and Buildings, Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure and the learning from London Councils’ ‘Net Zero Carbon Workstreams’.

The context for this work has been a number of resolutions at Full Council committing Hackney to deliver on the tougher stretching target of achieving a 45% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030 (from 2010) and Net Zero emissions by 2040 across all the Council’s full range of functions. The idea is to surpass the headline decarbonisation targets wherever possible.



Energy Strategy and Energy Systems

We examined the Council's Energy Strategy, and what will be needed to meet the Council's Net Zero target. We explored the trade-off between new technologies and 'going greener' vs. higher energy bills, and we looked at local planning policy and how it might be amended to help achieve Net Zero targets.

We heard from the Cabinet Members, Chair of Planning and the relevant senior officers. We welcomed the focus on increasing cross departmental collaboration as well on innovating and upskilling and on simplifying existing practice by focusing on the need to balance what can be achieved at pan-London level vs. borough level. We questioned the use of offset funds when development sites can't meet their Net Zero requirements. We discussed the Retrofit programme for council housing and we looked at the use of engineered timber in constructions as a possible solution to achieving Net Zero. We discussed the types of heating systems (district heating, heat pumps, ground source heating, solar panels) that new developments were implementing.

We noted how regeneration projects can create the critical mass to really develop district heating schemes and they can also be used to decarbonise existing buildings. We learned how solar panel installation is an integral part of achieving Net Zero and that the government, then, was backtracking on it after having cut the subsidies.

Climate Change and Buildings

Over two meetings we focused on climate change and buildings, looking at Hackney's council housing, new build homes and regeneration developments and the council's corporate property portfolio examining what changes and improvements might be made.

We noted how the social housing sector is facing a huge challenge to achieve Net Zero including crucially a 'C' rating on Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) across all homes by 2030. The volume, type, age and current efficiency ratings of the UK's social housing stock means an enormous retrofit operation will be required to meet these targets. But this is happening against a context of tightening fire safety regulations and cladding retrofit in the wake of the Grenfell tragedy which is an additional financial challenge, and a housing crisis which means that delivery of new affordable homes must be a priority.

Housing Services

A key challenge for Hackney's housing is that 75 % of households are flats and most household dwellings were built between 1900-1930. Flats are often built with solid brick walls and 90 % of heating systems are gas individual boilers. 27 % of homes are also in Conservation Areas. It is estimated that the average investment per council property will be £22,300 and in the private sector this will be much higher. We questioned the Cabinet Members and senior officers as well as the Resident Liaison Group and Lordship South TMO Chair and the Hackney Downs Estate Chair on how we might tackle these challenges.

Housing Services took us through their approach looking first at the fabric of the buildings and then the services. The first stage of moving to Net Zero is to reach EPC C rating and the Council only has approximately 50 % at this level.

Then, in the private rented stock, the key characteristics are that there are often multiple owners, different incentives between owners and occupiers, a more transient population which is younger and more mobile, properties are often older and more complex and a lot of regulation adds to the pressures of housing values and tenure loss.

The Resident Liaison Group reps argued that while most leaseholders would be happy to contribute they were concerned about works showing little or no evidence to support them. They observed that most of the Government's 'Green Homes Grants' had been returned because of challenges in securing equipment or materials.

We asked about the effectiveness of heat pumps and people using secondary heating when these proved insufficient. We discussed solar panels and the challenges when they are not suitable for particular properties because of positioning.

We heard about the "holy trinity of retrofit" starting with 'fabric first', then services, then renewables. We debated this order with officers and they explained how it had evolved. The consequences of this approach could mean not moving to heat pumps in the first phase because it is focused on getting the fabric of the properties as energy efficient as possible. There might also be economies of scale to be found around heat pumps. We noted that there will be a whole range of different options that will need to be weighed up by the Council and they will need to understand each as the research is carried out.

Housing Regeneration New Homes Delivery

In a second session we heard from senior officers about how new-build homes and regeneration developments will help deliver Net Zero and how the Council's maintenance programme and retrofit, as well as work on the non residential council properties.

We discussed two regeneration projects demonstrating a positive trajectory of change to achieving the Net Zero: Kings Crescent Phase 1&2 and De Beauvoir. King's Crescent had used a hybrid approach of refurbishing units and new buildings. A key change was to move from gas CHP to air source heat pumps using electric technology. The expectation was that these measures would help to reduce the on site carbon emissions by 49%.



Kings Crescent

Council's Strategic Property (non-residential)

We looked at the Council's non residential housing stock comprising mainly offices, depots, libraries, and the Town Hall (excluding schools and highways). The corporate assets are the buildings the council occupies to deliver the council services and the key challenge here is the age of the estate. We noted the successful re-adaptations of Keltan House, the Annex Bldg, Maurice Bishop House and 280 Mare St, where the Council was able to invest, against the future revenue streams, in the fixture and fittings of the building and heating system to make them more efficient. As a result, in the last few years the council had moved out of 100,000 sq ft of office space and this had the biggest impact on its carbon footprint as an organisation.

We discussed the need to upskill the Corporate Property team itself. We discussed whether the Council should insist that its commercial tenants should have their own Net Zero targets. We discussed the sheer variety of the nearly 400 commercial and VCS properties in the portfolio which range from buildings like Principal Place, the state-of-the-art HQ for Amazon, to small laundrettes on estates.

Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure

We examined Electrical Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in the borough and discussed the major plans to extend it with the Cabinet Member and key officers. We learned how EVs are currently too expensive for most residents, however the Council wanted to have the correct infrastructure in place for when they are ready to switch. There is an ambition to have 3000 charging points by 2030 and we stressed that they need to be located in areas that will create the most demand.

We learned that it was not about switching all vehicles to electric but creating the environment that supports people to switch when ready, however the Council's existing objective to achieve an overall reduction of vehicles remained a top priority. We noted that charging at home is relatively inexpensive but of course most residents don't have access to off-street charging using their own home tariff, therefore the aim must be to provide equity and access to a cheaper tariff.

We debated with officers that the new infrastructure must not clutter pavements, noting that the preference was to locate the charging points on 'build outs' and not on public pathways. We noted concerns about out of borough residents using Hackney's charging points as EVs do not require a parking permit.

We sought assurance that Hackney's 'no car' policy is maintained with a focus on greater use of public transport and campaigns against cuts to bus routes and for adequate funding for TfL. We noted that it was not the aim to have EVs replace the current car numbers and discussed the need to 'future proof' tenders and contracts to



account for technological advances. We explored what consultation will take place before the siting of charging points and how the Council will need to understand potential impact on streets and communities.

Climate Change - London Councils' Net Zero workstreams

We looked at workstreams initiated by London Councils that are being led by other Councils and we heard from Members and officers from Harrow, Enfield and Waltham Forest. The 'Consumption Emissions Workstream' focused on food, electricals, textiles, and plastics. The 'Retrofit Workstream' refers to fabric improvements, heat decarbonisation and renewable energy in all domestic buildings. We welcomed London Councils' ambition to get each council in London to work collaboratively, including with Registered Providers in multi landlord settings, by sharing data on property needs and existing investment plans and by looking to align programme delivery. We also learned about building market confidence by developing a retrofit plan, including clear targets, and mapping retrofit opportunities across the various housing tenures. We also discussed how a programme of low energy retrofit can form part of the ongoing housing maintenance programmes.

We discussed how a council can collectively procure and deliver retrofit at scale, including enabling home owners to access solutions and about the work with local educational institutions to promote the development of skills and careers in retrofit work.

HOUSING SUPPORT FOR CARE LEAVERS

In February we devoted a whole meeting to a joint session with the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission to review the housing support and accommodation options available to care leavers in Hackney. We used the session to examine how well Corporate Parenting and Housing Needs teams work together to support care leavers, and how current and future housing needs of this cohort are reflected in the Council's Housing Strategy.

As well as all the relevant Cabinet Members, we heard from the Group Director for Children and Education, the Director of Children's Social Care, the Director of Regeneration, the Head of Benefits and Housing Needs, the Head of Corporate Parenting, the Head for Care Leavers and their teams. We also did some benchmarking by hearing from senior officers from Lambeth and from Islington and most importantly we heard from 5 care leavers themselves. We held a separate Focus Group in advance on 2 Feb involving 10 care leavers and we visited two semi-independent accommodation sites on 14 Feb, where we also spoke to support staff and care leavers. All this fed into our main discussion.

We considered a range of reports which made clear the increasing demand for services as the number of care leavers grows. As of January 2022, the Service was supporting 399 care leavers aged 18 to 25 and in terms of the future growth there were 413 children in social care, 129 of which were aged 16 or 17. On the Housing supply side just 400 social lets in total became available in 2021 which the council could re-let, of which 18 units were allocated to care leavers via a quota system.

From the Focus Group we learned how the circumstances and needs of care leavers vary considerably and this requires very specific and bespoke support. Except for those already in a social housing tenancy, all were uncertain or anxious about their future housing situation. We noted a concern that care leavers may not always be given adequate housing advice or in a timely manner, and there is a case for more specialist housing advice and guidance to be provided.

We were alarmed to note that some were reticent about going to university for fear it would impact on their ability to maintain a tenancy or impact on their future entitlement to social housing. We noted that other councils extend tenancies to 25 yr olds. With 40 care leavers attending university, Hackney has one of the highest nationally. Where care leavers do wish to attend, advice is focused towards those universities outside of London as this may be more affordable for them.

We made a number of recommendations to officers. We noted that care leavers had to be eligible for support from the Greenhouse, and in danger of becoming homeless in order to access the deposit for a property in the private rented sector and we felt that it was unacceptable that care leavers should be exposed to such uncertainty in order to get basic assistance. Our view is that the Council has a special duty of care to care leavers and this must be reflected in the language which officers use, so they are not referred to as just 'residents'. Care Leavers face a number of 'drop-off' points at various stages of their transition from care (18, 21 and 25) and the Council has to work harder to ensure that there is more effective support for them at each of these key points. We concluded that the Council as a corporate parent should also undertake to establish a truly 'corporate offer' of support for care leavers.

ENVIRONMENT AND HOUSING

Hackney Leisure Services and Facilities

We explored our leisure services provision with Greenwich Leisure Ltd (the provider), council officers and the Cabinet Member. We asked why charges varied across sites, especially for swimming. We examined the concessions available, and how they are promoted to local residents. We examined how GLL works with Public Health. We asked why no cash was taken at leisure centres and why bookings were online only and why GLL does not have a Hackney specific website. We learned how cost is a big driver in usage and we pressed officers on better local promotion and in particular to those harder to reach sections of the community. We agreed that keeping leisure services affordable and giving access to facilities to support health and wellbeing is vital for residents in the current economic climate.

Fire Safety Checks

We continued our recent focus on fire safety in building with an update from senior officers on the arrangements in place to ensure fire safety products are fitted and checked and that they are the highest grade available. We were joined by the Co-Chairs of the Resident Liaison Group. We noted that the Fire Safety Team was not directly involved in the work of the New Builds Team and we asked officers to ensure much closer collaboration here as it seems an important oversight. We were pleased to hear

that Hackney was one of the few London boroughs which had committed to undertaking EWS1 surveys (cladding safety) for leaseholders on request.

Child Friendly Borough - Improving the infrastructure of our Play areas

We discussed with senior officers the significant work which went into the innovative *Child Friendly Places Growing Up In Hackney Supplementary Planning Document* which was approved in summer 2021. The SPD will help to set the Local Plan policies to ensure that subsequent developments maximise the benefit to children. It will be a 'material consideration' in the determination of planning applications and means that residential developments must devote some of their open space provision as child friendly spaces. The policy allocates 10 square metres of dedicated play space per child on a site of any new major residential developments and mixed-use schemes. We were pleased that the SPD built on the Hackney Young Futures Commission report and engagement work with Hackney Youth Parliament however we found limited input from Children and Families Service and asked that this be rectified in future.

Private sector housing licensing scheme

We looked at the work taking place to build the necessary evidence base for extending the *Private Sector Housing Licensing Scheme* borough wide. We heard from the Mayoral Advisor for Private Rented Sector and Affordability as well as senior housing strategy officers that there are now 30,000 properties in this cohort, up from 3,000 25 years ago, and Hackney has seen the fastest growing private rented stock in the UK. There are 3 licensing schemes: the borough-wide *Mandatory Licensing Scheme* for larger HMOs, the *Additional Licensing Scheme* for smaller HMOs and the *Selective Licensing Pilot Scheme* for everything else. Pilots are in Brownswood, Cazenove and Stoke Newington wards. We learned that the current national schemes will end in Sept 2023, at which point the Council could look to extend, although the process is bureaucratic and resource intensive. We encouraged the Cabinet to continue its efforts to build an evidence base to have these valuable schemes extended and expanded where possible.

Skills, Economy and Growth



Skills, Economy and Growth



Hackney's businesses and the wider economy have experienced some brutal shocks over the last couple of years and we have heard some devastating testimony from the voluntary sector, from entrepreneurs and from economic experts about the impact on individuals and our community. We have also heard some extraordinary stories of resilience and resourcefulness.

Our commission has examined in detail the impact of Covid and other shocks and tried to assess the role of the council in influencing the recovery and setting our economy on a trajectory towards one that is inclusive, green and fair. From skills provision to support for the transition to Net Zero, we will continue to focus on understanding better the powers the council has to shape the economy and how the council can best use those powers to improve economic outcomes.

Demand for Net Zero skills

We examined the demand for Net Zero skills, the creation of Net Zero jobs, and where the Council's responsibility lies here. We explored future skills in the construction, transport and energy sectors and the opportunities for local residents as we move beyond the pandemic and try to build back better.

We invited the Head of Employment, Skills & Adult Learning to share how the Council will respond to emerging green jobs, the skills demand, the skills of residents and the likely skills gap. Since Sept 2020, the Council's Adult Learning Service has been fully integrated with the Employment & Skills service enabling delivery of a more holistic offer. There are 3 areas of strategic focus: *Training with a direct link to employment opportunities*; *Building general and transferable skills*; and *Supporting our residents' wellbeing and positive mental health*.

We discussed the challenges with the Principal of New City College (part of Hackney and Tower Hamlets Colleges). We noted in particular how 16-34 year olds were the demographic most concerned about climate change, as they inevitably will be most impacted by it. The Principal strongly advocated for a greater parity of esteem between vocational and academic education and as part of this for the marketing of construction industry jobs to better reflect the reality now that 50% are office based while the incorrect perception is that all are on building sites.

Transport for a Cleaner and Greener Hackney

As the borough moves towards a cleaner and greener economy, clean transport will assume even greater importance in the race to Net Zero. We debated these issues with the Cabinet Member and senior Council officers.

70% of residents do not own a car, 40% of through-trips in the borough do not stop in Hackney, and 30% of residents cycle at least once a month. It was noted that there are some key equality considerations so that while the majority don't own a car, others do rely on them a lot for a range of different purposes and cycling, while most valuable, is not available to everybody

We discussed the contentious issues around LTNs and noted that independent polling was taking place to make sure we got an accurate reflection of what people think. We cautioned that, generally, when data comes back that doesn't chime with residents' lived experience, it can feel like the council is not listening. There is a value therefore to finding a better way of measuring lived experiences. We welcomed the fact that Hackney has the largest programme of School Streets in the country with 49 in operation and 14,000 children now walking or cycling to school more safely. We welcomed that tailpipe emissions are down by 74% as a consequence, outside school gates, and 30% more children are walking to school. We also discussed Hackney's ambitious programme for EV (electric vehicle) charging points, noting that there should be 315 in place by year end.

We were pleased to hear how nearly 2000 businesses were now engaged with the Zero Emissions Network. We challenged officers on how the Council needs to be assessing its own attractiveness in terms of both investment potential and how transport schemes impact because there is nothing to suggest (from research around the world) that lower road usage has any adverse effect on a local economy. Streetscene cautioned however that 40% of the traffic in the borough was through-traffic on the main road network, which doesn't stop in the borough, adding that if we're going to look after businesses and allow people to move around more freely, this needs to be addressed.

We asked about the impact of some people opting to travel by car instead of public transport usage because of anxieties around Covid and asked what kind of analysis was taking place to ensure better decisions are made in the context of recovering from the pandemic. Officers cautioned that TfL was focused on the cost of running the network rather than necessarily increasing usage.

We pressed officers on the importance of understanding the economic as well as the social benefits of transport policy so that we can see how transport policy decisions affect economic growth. We flagged an interest in the issue of support for bus services post pandemic to assist the Cabinet members in their discussion with TfL.

Supporting Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) to decarbonise

We looked at the crucial issue of how the Council can help support local SMEs to decarbonise their business model and operations to help them align with the aims and ambitions to meet Net Zero carbon emissions by 2040.

We explored how much local businesses understand what is required, what is within their control and what support they need. We asked what research has been done to assess the challenges facing them and what they think councils need to do. We explored whether business models and procurement are aligned to Net Zero and who holds responsibility to support this shift - the government, trade bodies or support networks?



Finch Cafe in London Fields

We heard from the Executive Director of Good Growth at the GLA about the Mayor of London's 'Accelerated Green Pathway' which is an analysis of the most practical route to get to Net Zero by 2030. We learned how the 'New Green Deal' aims to double the size of the Green economy by 2030 through retrofitting buildings, installing renewable energy and electric vehicle charging infrastructure and creating high quality green spaces and that there are over 1 million self-employed, micro and small businesses which need to be supported to achieve Net Zero. Managed well, the transition to a green and sustainable economy should create jobs, save on fuel costs and provide a cleaner and healthier city

We noted the range of grants for SMEs and commended their breadth but we pressed officers on what actions SMEs needed to take themselves. It was acknowledged that the scale of finance needed to support the Net Zero ambition was huge and with limited resources the Council must therefore prioritise its spending, which it is doing in the *Climate Action Plan and Economic Development Strategy*. The scale of the challenge also underlines the importance of working with partners both within the borough and externally. We explored whether Licensing can stipulate that business should be plastic free and what role Planning could play in relation to transport or even the development of a local scrappage scheme and asked if there was consistency in the regulatory levers being used.

We noted that success measures were not just numbers of grants taken up but, importantly, increased awareness within the sector i.e how many have engaged, how many have adapted and what can we learn from those who have not.

We queried whether there was enough information in the system to assess the environmental impact of green investment i.e. what is the return in relation to carbon removal of every £1 invested? This would help us to assess effectiveness better than just spending totals or grant allocations. We will need to understand better what are the activities in small business which would give the most yield in decarbonisation.

We explored how Business Rate Relief might aid transition to Net Zero and we asked the GLA to consider acquiring business spaces in local high streets to help shape small businesses to transition to Net Zero. We again welcomed the work of the Zero Emissions Network for businesses which was working on issues such as cargo bikes, small electric vehicles and street scene improvements.

Economic Stocktake and recovery of the Night Time Economy

The Covid-19 pandemic had an unprecedented economic impact both nationally and locally. Many businesses struggled following lockdown restrictions which shut them down or severely limited the movement of their potential customers. Although some kept going, many sectors such as the night time economy and hospitality saw huge losses of income.

We examined whether the Council's decisions and the government's measures had helped to stabilise the local economy and we asked what were the trends amongst those who survived or even thrived.

Government data estimates 24,000 registered businesses in Hackney although an estimated 40% on top are not registered, and the data does not include sole traders not registered for VAT or PAYE.

We considered detailed reports from officers and asked what data the Council collated and monitored about businesses pre and post pandemic and examined the support given from central government as well as the bespoke solutions locally. We asked the same on the Night Time Economy and how the Business Regulatory Service feeds into achieving the Council's inclusive economy objectives.

We explored whether the business grants had resulted in any under-claiming from specific businesses and if any particular grants were not taken up and learned that false claims rather than underclaiming had been the issue. We explored the characteristics of the businesses which had rebounded since the pandemic. We pressed for a 'before and after' evaluation in order to understand the progress or regression of the economy, the economic scarring and resilience provided as a result of the support the Council had provided.

We discussed the live data dashboard showing the contraction and expansion of local high streets following the lifting of each different restriction. Officers cautioned that further analysis and investigation would be necessary to get a proper picture.

We examined both the *Hackney Night Accreditation Scheme* and the *Hackney Nights Portal* which was a one stop shop for all the pubs and clubs to provide training and Covid protection support during the pandemic.

We discussed Temporary Event Notices (TENs) which had increased in number with the restrictions on indoor drinking. They are used as a useful barometer for assessing the health of the night time economy. Some Members remain critical of them however, arguing that they are too often used to circumvent existing licensing rules. We commended how the accreditation scheme enabled greater use of recyclable glasses and recyclable plastic.

We noted how Hackney was the first council to introduce the Ultra Low Emission Zone, in Shoreditch, which involved working with businesses to reduce the volume of vehicle deliveries and examining the potential use of cargo bikes.

Unlike many boroughs, Hackney managed to keep its Markets open by using careful Covid risk assessment management and we noted how across the sectors the Council had to create service specific road maps for phased reopening of all services.

Community Involvement in Planning & Area Regeneration

We examined the levers the Council has to influence community engagement with the Council's area regeneration programmes and looked at their progress. We heard from Area Regeneration and the Planning and Regulatory Service but also from an external voice, the Executive Chair of the Hackney Wick and Fish Island Community Development Trust.

We noted that the Local Plan (LP33) contains 33 key strategic development sites which are a mix of private, public and council ownership. It also contains site-specific development guidance and allocates particular uses for those. It also contains plans around the delivery of new homes, jobs, shops, community spaces and public realm developments all in the context of a quickly rising population.

We explored the opportunities to link regeneration with a 'fair recovery' and a more inclusive economy via the creation of new affordable homes, workspaces, jobs, transport improvements, community infrastructure and facilities and improved public realm.

We learned about the outcomes from two major recent consultations, the *Hackney Central Conversation* and the *Dalston Conversation* and looked at the *Hackney Wick Area Regeneration*. On the latter, we discussed the *Creative Enterprise Zone* programme that aims to support, retain and grow creative businesses in that area and better link them with local residents and other businesses via supply chain, jobs, training, educational opportunities and access to affordable space.

The CDT Chair described the lessons learned in Hackney Wick. Residents, community groups and businesses were more sophisticated in their approach than given credit for, he said, and there was a willingness to engage but not to be side-lined. Their model was moving away from passive beneficiaries, limited agency thinking and short-term results to one of increased partnership, devolving power, responsibility and accountability as well as long-term capacity building, and wealth creation, but this would need continuing resources to support such outreach.

We challenged speakers on which demographics were under-represented in engagement and what was being done to mitigate this. We cautioned how current models in Hackney Wick focused on creative space, but at least two thirds of the developments were not that. With the residential property market driving land values we asked whether such an overwhelming and vocal force can be challenged.



Hackney Food Network in action at Morningside and Gascoyne Youth Club

Voluntary and Community Sector recovering from Covid-19 pandemic

The local Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) has been through a transformation because of the pandemic and we asked for an update on how it came through and its future plans. We were keen in particular to hear from the Mutual Aid Groups which had come into their own during the pandemic.

We heard from HCVS (the local umbrella body for the VCS in Hackney), Volunteering Centre Hackney and from the founder of Woodberry Aid as well as council officers.

We learned how out of the pandemic new models had emerged for how councils work with VCS bodies and mutual aid organisations presented a key change to the Council's way of working. This represented a major culture change and we were impressed with the Council and the organisations' flexible response to the situation. We discussed how, by their nature, these mutual aid groups helped people to get jobs, acquire skills and dignity through their work helping their own community.

One of the challenges is to build on the achievements and develop a new network of these community workers that can sustain this activity borough wide. The work by Volunteering Centre and the Council was quite organic and at a hyper local level and we explored whether it was evenly spread across the borough.

We noted how the Council had dedicated capacity to this and worked with a digital support team to proactively develop a 'change program'. The support had to be scaled up and not just front line resources put in place but also management and leadership as well. We noted the success of the Food Network and how it had been necessary to ensure that all the council departments were working more collaboratively and that the correct framework was put in place to support the VCS.

The analysis and the experiences of the frontline organisations involved had demonstrated to us how a crisis became an opportunity for strengthening the relationship between the Council and the dynamism we have within our communities. How we might be able to support residents by harnessing the energy of the Mutual Aid groups is one aspect and resisting the temptation to be too centralising is the other. We noted how provision of food had become a key element, and this was not just related to food poverty but because food is such a connector beyond just providing sustenance. We encouraged officers to develop this area of work further.

Cabinet Member Question Time

For our annual CQT Sessions we invited the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy to discuss the opportunities provided for greater investment in Hackney's future by the larger local businesses; affordable commercial rents and the impact of Brexit and the pandemic on this; and the rejuvenation of the night-time economy. On commercial rents we noted that most small businesses can only function in some form of lower-cost space as they cannot afford current market rates and we also noted the importance of the contribution to be made from the council's own voluntary and community sector property portfolio.

Health in Hackney



Health in Hackney



Our work this year encompassed a very wide range of issues: Covid-19, Adult Services including Public Health, Primary Care, Mental Health and the new Integrated Care System.

COVID-19

Monthly updates on the Covid 19 pandemic

Monitoring the response to the Covid 19 pandemic continued to dominate our work and because of the arrival of new variants it meant our regular monthly updates from the Director of Public Health continued right through to March. We also heard regularly from the Vaccinations Steering Group at the CCG on the latest incidence rates, developments with the vaccinations campaign and the evolution of the various outreach programmes.



From the outset we worried that vaccination rates amongst domiciliary care staff remained stubbornly low. They contribute to transmission because they typically have multiple vulnerable clients. We were similarly concerned about family carers. We explored the characteristics of our low vaccination rates, a lot of it down to our significantly young population as well as vaccine cautiousness within a number of local communities. This led on from hearing about the local project on vaccine hesitancy in African Heritage communities carried out by the group Support Where It Matters (SWIM) Enterprises. We discussed the value of personal contact by GPs in winning over the vaccine hesitant and examined the various financial support programmes..

We discussed the impacts on service provision and council staff, hearing from a Director on making office spaces ready for staff to return, supporting leadership skills for hybrid working and continuing the engagement with service teams. We debated what more needed to be done on future mitigation such as greater investment in ventilation and air filtration systems in schools. Public Health provides them with the latest Health and Safety Executive practical guidance on ventilation, but we noted that the task of assessing air flow or providing individual HEPA filters for every space in each school would be enormous.

Treatment pathways for 'Long Covid' - briefing from the Homerton

We learned from the Head of Adult Therapies at the Homerton about their new 'Long Covid' clinic which had 300 referrals alone by May '21. Admission was based on clinical assessment at primary care stage and a diverse multi-disciplinary team across physical and psychological services provided the service. In our discussions we encouraged the clinic to join up with the successful vaccination teams, as both encouragement of vaccine take up and outreach on long covid were needed simultaneously, as was closer working with Homecare Services and with Healthwatch on the awareness raising programmes.



Pop up Covid testing site in Hackney Central

Update on Covid and Elective Recovery at the Homerton

The Homerton's Chief Executive addressed the huge challenge in recovering elective treatments post pandemic as well as the increased concern about the usual winter pressures on acute hospitals as the virus persisted. In December they had opened up their escalation ward (an additional 22 beds) earlier than usual. Although nothing like the 201 Covid in-patients they had at the peak, there were still 27 in patients as the Omicron variant persisted. She warned that if those numbers increased they would have to convert another ward for covid only. We noted how they segregated patients into 3 categories: *no clinical indications and positive test*; *clinical indications and negative*; and *clinical indications and positive*. The combination of attempting to get elective treatments back on a firm footing, the normal winter pressures and the omicron variant was putting great pressure on the system.

Community Mental Health and recovery from Covid 19

ELFT, our key acute mental health provider, outlined their move to a mix of face-to-face and remote access consultations i.e. a blended model. While we had some reservations about this, officers reassured us that while face to face consultations were important for first assessment, remote consultations would remain. They added that remote consultations worked really well with certain types of clients e.g. those wanting to stay at home and in familiar surroundings or with young people who preferred digital connections. We also asked about how their 8 local teams will align with PCNs, the Neighbourhoods Programme and the IAPT Service.

ADULTS, HEALTH AND INTEGRATION

What is Adult Social Care - overview of current provision

The Group Director Adults, Health and Integration gave us an overview of the current provision and budget. We discussed how delayed discharges of care and shorter stays in acute hospitals were impacting on the system and whether budget flows were being redesigned accordingly to make them more sustainable. We explored the challenges of retaining staff because of non vaccination, a major issue at the time. They had to backfill vacancies left by those who had not wanted the vaccine offer. We also explored the lack of workforce development and the need for better employment packages to attract more social care workers. We explored the differing arguments around in-sourcing various services and also the need to return clients to Hackney who had to be sent out of the borough.

Transformation Programme for Adult Social Care

We considered the Transformation Programme for Adult Social Care and asked whether there was an 'invest to save' element here or whether it was about case-by-case bids. We heard that the focus was more on using resources in a different and better way.

We debated career pathways and heard that the social worker qualification was a national one but terms and conditions are not national and so there was a big step to be crossed between being a front line care worker and becoming a Registered Manager and the challenge was how to stop staff migrating to the NHS, where there were better career opportunities.

We challenged officers on whether key principles for ensuring staff wellbeing could be written into contracts with providers. We learned that the provider landscape locally was incredibly diverse with some individual firms, some voluntary sector, some profit making, and while some things could be included in contracts it depended on the nature of the contract and the service.



Redesign of specification for Homecare

We discussed the redesigned specification for the provision of Homecare services as it was being completely re-commissioned. Across the 8 PCN areas there would be 2 or 3 new Homecare 'patches' run by fewer providers. We explored the current barriers to in-sourcing but heard that it would add £4-5m to the budget. Employment costs and pension obligations were a key reason for the price differential but under the Care Act there was also a duty to maintain a stable market for services.

The Group Director reminded us that the councils' role in quality was a complex one. One of reasons for moving to the zone-based model they were adopting for Homecare was that they'll have fewer providers to work with, which should allow the council to develop stronger relationships and deliver more training and support to the staff. On

the concerns about zero hours contracts, the Council would be better able to tackle this if providers were given more consistency of work and hours and so better able to plan their workforce and offer better conditions, so there were a number of ways to achieve a more secure employment model. She added that it was demand-led service so care must be provided to anyone who requests it and is eligible and therefore the development of more preventative work and working with partners in Neighbourhoods was vital in order to help ASC manage rising demand.

Public Health Spend overview

This was prompted by discussions amongst Scrutiny Panel Members on the Public Health element in the budget. The Director of Public Health detailed the Public Health Grant and how it remains based on historic spend rather than current demographics or need. She explained how public health money also gets spent in other sections of Council when it supports the wider public health agenda e.g. additional environmental health or trading standards officers. On the issue of potential reduction we explored the tracking of Public Health spend across the previous two years which would feed into decisions.

We noted how sexual health services spend was high because it is an open-access service. She also explained that spending money on subsidised activities that people are likely to do anyway is not the best approach and that the emphasis instead has to be on driving behavioural change. She also explained that with statutory funding it is not that you are required to spend 'x' amount on 'y' but rather the statutory service is often demand driven, so the key factor then becomes the capacity of the team to deliver that service both effectively and safely.

Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022-26

In December Public Health brought us a new draft *Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2026* for our input. Hackney's Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) has a duty to produce it and it set out the priorities for the borough. The three agreed priorities will be: *improving mental health and preventing mental ill-health; increasing social connection; and supporting greater financial security and reducing poverty*. We commended the accessibility and reach of the consultation which had been undertaken and we examined how it drives policy development and serves as an important catalyst for change among the multiple partners involved.

NHS items

GPs AND PRIMARY CARE

Secondary use of GP patient identifiable data

The kernel of the issue here was the public giving permission to their GPs for their medical records to be passed on to the central NHS Digital database as part of a new scheme called *General Practice Data for Planning and Research (GPDPR)*. We noted that there had been previous failed attempts by the government to progress this issue which had created mistrust and yet this attempt appeared to have been launched without first winning over public consent.

We noted that data is already extracted from the primary care system for all sorts of reasons and it is pseudonymised by age, sex, medical condition etc. The new GDPR would require a new extraction arrangement however and Practices had a responsibility to explain to their patients what the data would be used for but were still awaiting Guidance. Practices have to switch on the data extraction process too, in each Practice, and none in NEL had done so. The Local Medical Committees had also been campaigning against it. GPs were in a difficult position as the government had made this a contractual requirement for them. We concluded that the government needed to quickly publish clear regulations and an informed public then needs to decide whether to opt out. Unfortunately if thousands do so it will create a large data entry burden for an already overburdened primary care system.

Neighbourhoods Development Programme

Health and Care Partners had been implementing the *Neighbourhoods Programme* in Hackney, since 2018, albeit hindered by the pandemic, and in parallel NHSE has been rolling out the *Primary Care Networks*. Fortunately in Hackney both are coterminous. The latter are very much about Primary Care but there is a wider system focus with the Neighbourhoods programme. We explored how some of the funding was used e.g. social prescribers; community navigators, or specific services such as first contact physiotherapists and how all are centred on effectively GP Practice hubs. We noted that the non-recurrent funding for Neighbourhoods was winding down but funding for PCNs would be increasing.



Peppa Pig's Flu & Polio Vaccination event at Richmond Rd. Partner GP Dr Gopal Mehta far left.

Richmond Rd Medical Centre - a case history award winner

Richmond Rd Medical Centre has had a series of successes in the National GP Awards and to celebrate this and share the best practice we invited the Lead Partners (one of whom is also a PCN Clinical Director), to discuss the current challenges in primary care as well as to hear about the innovative approaches they use.

For context Healthwatch Hackney also provided us with two very helpful recent research reports on local primary care. We also heard from: Chair of the Local Medical Committee who is also a Joint Clinical Director for two PCNs, the Co-Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, the new Clinical Care Lead for Primary Care in C&H and the Primary Care Programme Director from NEL CCG.

We explored with Richmond Rd how they made their Access Model work where others had struggled and how they managed demand when they were a staff member down. The answer lay in very careful advance planning and a concerted whole team effort. We noted that they funded everything from within their existing GP Practice budget and these services (yoga or special ante-natal classes) were free for patients. They argued that investment in their patients had generated positive results in the long run and we noted other examples such as working with local Black African Churches to talk to them about blood pressure and diabetes.

During the discussion we learned that 7 GP Practices were still, wrongly, demanding photo ID from prospective patients, a discriminatory process. We wrote to the CCG to ask that these Practices be brought into line and they have done so.

Developments in GP Services - the next five years

We ended the year by devoting a full meeting to the strategic issues which are driving primary care locally and to look forward to what GP services might look like in five years' time.

We invited an external expert to frame the discussion. Dr Jon Robson (Clinical Effectiveness Group at Queen Mary University of London) gave a detailed presentation on quality improvement in primary care and the work they do locally in Hackney and we heard from all the key players in primary care locally from - the CCG, the PCN Clinical Directors, the GP Confederation as well as the LMC and Healthwatch providing some challenge.

Dr Robson explained how disease prevalence will vary considerably depending on factors outside of a Practice's control so there will always be outliers. He argued that: more needed to be done to identify and target renal failure in east London; that childhood immunisation and control of blood pressure were key deliverables; and that prioritising highest risk groups was vital. Generally, we learned that targets were crude measures and you need to incentivise behaviour change instead in order to make progress.

The CCG described the process of retendering or list dispersal when a Practice closes and we asked how the council could assist more on estates development issues. The PCN directors described the potential for closer work with the GP Confederation and how capacity was a huge problem with NHSE's plans predicated on the promise of additional GPs who hadn't been secured. The Clinical Lead for Primary Care made a strong argument that the over emphasis on fast or convenient access to a GP was not where their main priority should lie because some people's needs will be greater than others. The push for digital access had created inequality of access and a 'digital inverse-care law', in her view, so that those who might need the care more aren't able to get it. There is a need to reframe this argument and make it about the need for continuity of care, she argued. The GP Confed CE cautioned that with CCG/GP Confed/PCNs/LMC there was a danger of fragmenting the strategic positioning of primary care locally and these strands need to be pulled together, in the context of the new ICS, so that a strong voice for Hackney can be made.



Medicines Optimisation Scheme (dosette boxes)

In March the Local Pharmaceutical Committee contacted us, concerned about plans to end the 'Medicines Optimisation Scheme'. This funded dosette boxes and blister packs, prepared by local pharmacists, which are typically given to frail and elderly to aid administering their medication. NHSE will now only fund a much smaller cohort who must be identified as having a need under the Equality Act. Local carers and care agencies, among others, strongly disagreed and argued that this will adversely impact nearly 4000 vulnerable patients in Hackney, who will lose out.

The LPC rep explained that pharmacies were backfilling the loss of this funding by already requesting GPs to give them shorter 7 day prescriptions instead of the longer period prescriptions previously used, and are using this as a lever with NHSE. Payment is per prescription and item.

The CCG's Medicines Management Lead detailed the long history of the scheme. They had been pushing back on NHSE London not to end it without proper mitigation being put in place and had also started to facilitate the evolution to a new system by analysing the underlying data and providing guidance to the local pharmacies. Some GPs were of the view (shared by NHSEL) that because many of the patients did not fall under the narrow Equality Act definition, pharmacies should therefore not be requiring them to write 7 day prescriptions for them, which created an added burden for the GPs.

We questioned the expectation that local pharmacies' core contract should backfill this funding cut by NHSE, one which has serious equalities implications, and we undertook to formally write to NHSE if this could not be properly resolved locally. We were subsequently pleased to hear that NHSEL agreed to extend the funding for 6 months to allow all parties time to review all those on monitored dosage schemes.

MENTAL HEALTH

Relocation of inpatient dementia assessment to East Ham Care Centre

In October we considered an update from the Clinical Lead for Older Adults Mental Health at East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) on the move to make permanent the summer 2020 relocation of in-patient dementia assessment services from Mile End Hospital to East Ham Care Centre. We noted that the long-term aim had been to maximise the clinical benefits of co-locating services e.g. more flexible rotas, having expertise in one place, but that during the pandemic the move had to be rapidly expedited because of a Covid segregation issue at the Mile End site. We had endorsed that move at a special meeting in July 2020. We endorsed the permanent move, having made site visits to both sites and we welcomed the progress made since on their transport offer to families and carers which we had strongly championed.

Disparities in treatment in maternal mental health

In October we held a joint item with Members of the CYP Scrutiny Commission to explore disparities and inequalities which had been observed relating to the diagnosis and treatment of maternal mental health within City & Hackney.

We considered reports from CYP and ELFT and the Co-Chairs of the Black and Black-Mixed Heritage Group of the Maternity Voices Partnership, a group set up specifically to bring a patient voice to maternity service commissioning. We heard about the role of Health Visitors here and the work of the Family Nurse Partnership which itself provided 2 yrs intensive support to women under 25.

We raised a concern that the current patchwork of commissioners/providers means many users might fall between the cracks in provision but noted how this was a complex area at the intersection of mental health and maternity. We pressed ELFT about the *Patient Carer Racial Equality Framework* pilot and how this needed a higher profile among their own staff. We noted that the threshold to enter ELFT's Perinatal Service was "significant risk" otherwise a patient would be referred to IAPT. There was a single point of access and services had to work out which one of them needed to see the patient. We were reassured however that there was no 'wrong door' and referrals were never sent back. We asked whether a Neighbourhood Model of support might be preferable here and offer less rigid and less time-limited pathways which are hard to access.

We urged greater liaison with Children and Families Service to identify earlier the parents at risk and to figure out the touch points and identify where opportunities might have been missed. We were given assurances that the multi disciplinary teams were addressing this and we noted that CYP Scrutiny Commission would continue to pursue the issue of support to young mothers in its 22/23 work programme.

INTEGRATED CARE SYSTEM FOR NORTH EAST LONDON (NEL ICS)

In a number of sessions we continued to hold local health leaders to account about the development of the ICS and its particular impact in Hackney.

How will City & Hackney's 'Place Based System' operate within NEL ICS

NHS NEL came into being on 1 July 2022 and in the lead up we examined how it will operate. The Chief Executive of the Homerton is the designated 'Place Based Leader for City and Hackney' and she assured us that it was an evolution not a revolution, building on many years of partnership working. She explained that most of the out-of-hospital funding would come to 'place' level and that 'Place' would be predominant in all ICS discussions.

As well as the 'Acute Provider Collaborative' made up of the acute trusts, similar ones for 'Mental Health', 'Community Care' and 'Primary Care' were planned. We debated the governance structures and we urged the Cabinet Member and Healthwatch to ensure these are as transparent and locally accountable as possible. We noted that there was a big communications job to be done to explain all this to the general public.

Future plans for the St Leonard's site

Plans for the re-development of the St Leonard's Hospital site had been a burning local issue for many years. The site is old and requires significant investment to make it fit for purpose. An initial demand analysis found that users will soon run out of space unless there is a fresh approach. The Homerton currently holds the ring on the project and we questioned them on the progress being made with central government on building a business case which would see it retained as an anchor institution in the borough. We pressed them to ensure that there will be proper engagement, at each stage, with local residents in Hoxton and with Healthwatch.

New Pathology Partnership for east and south east London

We questioned the Chief Executive of HUHFT about the new pathology partnership for East and South East London which had been planned for some time but came into being on 1 May 2021. The new organisation is jointly owned by Barts Health, the Homerton and Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trusts and the 'GP Direct Access' element would move to a new hub at the Royal London. She gave assurances on the quality of service as local GPs had been concerned about turnaround times of tests from Barts Health. There would be no job losses but roles would shift around and this did not imply a merging of the Trusts involved; it was simply part of a national improvement programme for pathology services.

The 'King's Park Moving Together' project

We heard about this potentially transformative health project in King's Park, one of just 12 national pilots funded by Sport England with a focus on getting people to be more active. The Sport England officer responsible for the project described how it typified a new approach by them to working in a much deeper and on a longer-term basis with local communities than in the past. Up to now many projects have often been beset by stop-start funding. They were now 5 years into an 8-year funded project which will end in 2025. The Council staff member who heads the project described how they operated locally with 15-20 providers, who work with different population groups across a range of organisations. We heard too from one of the key providers, Journey Before Success CIC, about how it provides a wide range of activity programmes for traditionally under-served groups. We noted while the focus is King's Park ward, it will certainly influence future work across the whole borough.



A roadmap to Net Zero for Homerton Hospital

As part of wider programme this year, led by Scrutiny Panel, to look at the urgent issue of achieving 'Net Zero' by both the Council and its key local partners, we decided to look at each segment of the health and care sector locally and the progress they're making. We started with our largest acute provider, the Homerton. They outlined their strategy for achieving their climate change mitigation measures and we were pleased to learn how well ahead they were on these issues. We asked how they might be able to share best practice among local partners and we heard about the need to drive up the EPC ratings across their estate when buildings are of such varying ages and states of repair. We heard about the transport challenge for staff considering that many work unsocial hours and live out of the borough and so still use their cars. We discussed the big-ticket items such as replacing generators, chillers and air handling units and noted that HUHFT has benefited from some strong NHS national guidance.

Annual Reports of partners/stakeholders

Each year we hold local health partners to account in sessions where they come to answer questions on their formal annual reports. Healthwatch Hackney presents the report it submits to Healthwatch England and HUHFT presents the **Quality Account** it is required to submit to NHSE/NHSI. All acute NHS Trusts are required to formally secure comments on their draft Quality Account from the local scrutiny committee where they are headquartered. St Joseph's Hospice also sends their draft Quality Account although they are not under the same level of regulatory duty.

Once a year we question the Independent **Chair of the City & Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board** which provides a useful insight into this vital work and any problems in the system. This year we discussed pandemic impacts such as those in Residential Care being confined to their rooms and other Day Care users having to move into Residential Care during lockdown. We discussed the pandemic impact on those with learning disabilities or in supported living and struggling to comprehend an unprecedented situation. We discussed the learning from the single formal Safeguarding Adults Review during the year. We heard how the legal framework on Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards is changing and the requirements on local authorities and partner agencies will be shifting quite significantly.

We also questioned **Healthwatch Hackney** this year about them potentially carrying out further mystery shopping exercises on local services which are performing poorly. We also discussed with them how they will align with the other 7 Healthwatches in NEL. We encouraged them to lobby for high level representation in the new structures so that each council area can still retain its local character and we pushed for greater transparency and accountability to residents arising from the new ICS structure.

Cabinet Member Question Time – Council’s role in the ICS

Our annual Question Time session with the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social had him focus on one key topic - *the Council’s role within the emerging ICS*. He stated that the rationale behind the creation of ICSs was to move the NHS away from the focus on competition, introduced under the Lansley reforms, to a new structure which is more focussed on collaboration. A fair degree of flexibility had been built into the system and it could be made bespoke for each ICS area.

Hackney Keep Our NHS Public, who object to the move to ICSs, argued at our meeting that ICSs would allow more contracts to be handed to corporate interests and they asked how these might also be kept out of the ICS governance structures. This is an issue where Cabinet and Scrutiny would need to keep a close eye. They also expressed concerns about the travel impacts on Hackney patients when services are centralised. The Cabinet Member countered that, partly to clear the NHS backlog, ‘areas of excellence’ were being established and some patients would therefore face longer journeys to consolidated centres for treatment, but the view was that most patients were content with this if it meant getting treatment faster.

Inner North East London



Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Inner North East London



Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

INEL JHOSC comprises 3 councillors each from Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and one from City of London Corporation. Its function is to scrutinise sub-regional plans for the NHS and respond to formal 'case for change' proposals when appropriate. NEL comprises the 5 INEL boroughs above and the 3 Outer East London boroughs of Redbridge, Barking & Dagenham and Havering. The latter are scrutinised by a separate scrutiny committee ONEL JHOSC. We meet 4 times a year.

Implementation of North East London Integrated Care System

An Integrated Care System for North East London (NHS NEL) came into being on 1 July 2022 replacing the previous 5 CCGs, covering 8 boroughs. Over the two years leading up to this we held a number of discussions about its evolution with all the senior officers and Chairs involved as it gradually transformed from 5 CCGs to NEL CCG to NHS NEL.

NHS NEL draws together the various health networks in the region in a formally constituted and governed system and it takes on commissioning and finance functions of the old CCGs. It has a statutory Board (ICB), containing key statutory posts, alongside representatives from providers and local authorities as well as a larger Integrated Care Partnership Board (ICPB) which has a wider remit and wider membership from across the 8 boroughs.

We provided an ongoing challenge to what appears to be a general move from GPs to the large local Providers dominating the system and we queried how they will have a System focus when they also have a responsibility to their own Trust boards. We asked whether there was an evidence base that governance was more effective when you consolidated trusts and spread it across a large number of organisations and how they would be judging quality and effectiveness.

We expressed concerns about the potential of forcing the creation of an umbrella body for all VCS bodies across NEL and asked for commitment to not having private providers on the ICB. We heard how the Healthwatches and the VCS across the region would be embedded in the structure in order to guarantee a patient voice and a local voice.

North East London Save Our NHS (NELSON) came to our meetings to lobby for greater transparency in the ICS, demanding that all key meetings and papers be in the public domain. We expressed concern that the strong community links in the old commissioning structure might now be lost when incorporated into the much bigger NEL system. We urged the ICS to ensure that the representative of the local authorities on the ICB should be an elected member, as councils are member-led bodies. This was initially resisted by the NHS, and prohibited in their draft regulations, but was subsequently altered after national lobbying.

We expressed concerns about the Homerton not having its voice on the ICB as the only acute rep on it will be the Chair in Common of Barts-BHRUT (Barking Havering & Redbridge NHS University Hospital Trust). We received an undertaking from her that she would be a voice for all acute health trusts and had agreed to liaise with the Homerton's Chair.

We asked how the 'Payment By Results' system, which drives Acute Trusts, would be consistent with the new approach to joint working. Officers countered that a purely activity driven payment system had not served us well in tackling inequalities in the past and so the new system would help deliver the backlog by being better able to flex capacity and deliver results in a more coordinated way. We asked about the duration of the new budget settlement for the ICS. Towards the end of the year we asked for an update on the changes to funding flows comparing the 5 old CCGs to the new ICS, with the aim to understand how, apart from the significant slice going to the Acutes, the other budget lines will map across in the new ICS and which will end up 'system' level and which will remain 'place-based'.

Health updates from the East London Health and Care Partnership

At each meeting NEL CCG/NHS NEL would provide an overview of the key health issues across the acute trusts and the Chief Executives of all the trusts and the Clinical Chairs from each 'old' CCG area would attend our meetings.

Challenges of building back elective care post Covid pandemic

Over the year we questioned the senior officers on emergency surgery backlog targets and changes to pathways for cancer patients, reconfiguration of surgical centres of excellence the important subject of staff morale and burnout. Elective recovery was a challenge because even before Covid it was usual to do less planned elective work in January because of winter pressures.

Structure of Barts Health and developing provider collaboration

Across two sessions we examined the 'Acute Provider Collaborative' that is being developed between the 3 large acute health trusts which aims to improve elective recovery by using capacity across the trusts more effectively, sharing managers in areas of operational pressure and working on joint recruitment and retention.

Covid-19 vaccinations programme in NEL

At each meeting we received detailed updates on the latest 'vaccination dashboard'. We discussed among other things: the siting of vaccination sites, the work to challenge anti vaccination myths, work to tackle the low uptake among domiciliary care workers and within certain communities, work to vaccinate the homeless and asylum seekers, and about the availability of data on antibody prevalence.

Community Diagnostic Centres.

We examined the proposals for new Community Diagnostic Centres which are freestanding, digitally connected, multi-diagnostic facilities that will offer a range of testing (*imaging, physiological measurement, pathology, endoscopy*) and will complement existing provision in GP surgeries and acute hospitals. They will be located either adjacent to acute sites, in existing NHS community sites, or in new sites on high streets/shopping centres.



Artist's impression of the new CDC at Barking Community Hospital's site

Harmonisation of Continuing Healthcare policies across NEL

We examined proposals to consult on harmonising Continuing Healthcare (CHC) across NEL. Continuing Healthcare is a package of non-acute care for adults covering health and social care needs and which is funded entirely by the NHS. We urged them to consider that provision of a related advocacy service be included with the offer to ensure greater equity of support. We expressed a concern that greater budgetary pressure not be put on council Adult Services departments as a consequence of any change and we urged that the review is co-designed closely with Directors of Adult Services from the 8 boroughs, before it progresses.

Harmonisation of Fertility Policies across NEL

We examined a proposal to harmonise the 5 previous fertility policies in each of the old CCGs into a single equitable policy across NHS NEL. The aim was to ensure a single, more inclusive policy that reflects the most up to date views on eligibility recognising the variety of fertility situations and needs e.g. within LGBTQ+ community. We requested a preview of the consultation documents and set up briefing in Hackney for Members on the changes.

Accountability for managing future changes of ownership of GP practices

In January '21 concerns were raised to us about a decision of NEL Primary Care Commissioning Committee to approve, under Chair's Action in late Dec '20, the transfer of ownership of 8 GP surgeries in the NEL area from AT Medics Ltd to Operose Health Ltd, part of a wider sale of 34 such Practices across London.

The wider purchase of GP Practices by Operose, itself owned by the American Centene Corporation, made national headlines and INEL Members were unhappy about how the decision was made and communicated. We debated the issues raised by this transfer of ownership and in particular the accountability and transparency of current processes for managing changes of ownership of GP Practices. Two local GPs who are Chairs respectively of the Local Medical Committees in City & Hackney and in Tower Hamlets and who were campaigning against these developments came to argue their case.

We received assurances from the Independent Chair of the then NEL CCG that such changes in future are better communicated to local stakeholders and are given due time and consideration. Following the meeting we wrote to all INEL region MPs lobbying for a change in NHSE legislation/regulations, so that when groups of GP Practices are taken over, this should automatically trigger a full review of their APMS or GMS contracts, and we received assurances from Dame Meg Hillier MP that she was pursuing the matter.

Whipps Cross redevelopment programme and the special Whipps JHOSC

A special JHOSC was created hosted by Waltham Forest to deal only with the redevelopment of the Whipps Cross Hospital site. It first met in Oct and we agreed to defer to it on Whipps Cross items from then on. It comprises only the directly affected boroughs in the hospital's catchment area: Waltham Forest, Redbridge, Essex CC and Epping Forest DC. Its Chair, Cllr Sweden, is also on our committee and therefore gives regular verbal updates to us on the complex, major redevelopment.

The Review process



How we identify topics

The Commissions' work is divided between **single meeting** items, **mini reviews** (over 2 or 3 meetings) and a **Full Review** with items over perhaps a 6 month period as well as site visits. The pressure on agendas and the need to be both responsive and topical means that, of late, in-depth reviews have taken second place to the need to look at a number of short topics over the year. Each Commission tries to achieve a balance of giving sufficient space to an issue to be effective and productive while trying to cover as many areas as possible over the course of the 8 scheduled meetings.

Commissions in their overview role have to consider a number of **fixed annual items** such as: CYP (Schools Achievement, Children's Social Care, Safeguarding Children's Board annual reports); or Health in Hackney (Safeguarding Adults Board, Local Account of Adult Services and Healthwatch annual reports as well as Quality Accounts of local NHS providers and national consultations; or Living in Hackney (the annual Community Safety Plan).

At the start of the municipal year each Commission **writes to all its own key stakeholders**, the relevant Cabinet Members, relevant Directors and requests suggestions for topics.

The function also carries out an **annual Scrutiny Survey** where the public are invited to submit suggestions. This year we had over 30 responses covering a wide range of issues and all of these fed into the discussions at each of the Commissions.

They are also influenced by issues in the **media and social media**, issues coming up through **Member surgeries, performance reports** on local services e.g. poor CQC or Ofsted ratings, concerns of local third sector, community groups, TRAs, local health or schools campaigners etc. They are also influenced by the need to ensure the **manifesto commitments** of the Mayor are being delivered and the priorities of backbench councillors as well as the need for the borough to respond to or be ready for a major **change in the law or new government guidance** which might have significant local impact. All of these are weighed up and the Commission tries to come up with a balanced programme of work leaving space to be able to respond to **urgent issues** (a health crisis, floods etc) which will demand their focus and attention.

Each Commission runs a **Cabinet Member Question Time** session with their relevant Cabinet Members where they are held to account. The Mayor's CQT sessions are held by the Scrutiny Panel. Scrutiny Panel as well as ensuring no overlap of the work of Commissions also looks at cross cutting issues in single items and requires the Cabinet Member and Group Director for Finance and Corporate Resources to present regular updates on the budget and the Overall Financial Position of the Council.

Commission Members for 2021/2022

Scrutiny Panel*

Cllr Margaret Gordon (Chair), Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Polly Billington and Cllr Clare Potter

**comprises Chairs and Vice Chairs of the 4 Commissions and a Vice Chair allocated to the main opposition party, during 21/22 that position was vacant.*

Children and Young People

Members: Cllr Sophie Conway (Chair), Cllr Margaret Gordon (Vice-Chair), Cllr Sarah Young, Cllr Anya Sizer, Cllr Lynne Troughton, Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Caroline Selman and Cllr Anna Lynch; Co-optees: Richard Brown (until June 2021), Justine McDonald (until July 2021) Steven Olalere, Shabnum Hassan, Jo Macleod, Ernell Watson, Salmah Kansara and Michael Lobenstein, up to 5 young people from Hackney Youth Parliament and /or Hackney Care Council.

Health in Hackney

Cllr Ben Hayhurst (Chair), Cllr Peter Snell (Vice Chair), Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Kofo David, Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli and Cllr Emma Plouviez

Living in Hackney

Cllr Sharon Patrick (Chair), Cllr Soraya Adejare (Vice-Chair), Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Penny Wrout, Cllr Ajay Chauhan and Cllr Clare Joseph

Skills Economy and Growth

Cllr Polly Billington (Chair), Cllr Clare Potter (Vice-Chair), Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Sam Pallis, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Gilbert Smyth, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Patrick Spence and Cllr Vincent Stops

INEL Membership for 2021/2022

City of London

Common Councilman Michael Hudson

Hackney

CLr Ben Hayhurst (Chair) (also Chair of Hackney HOSC), CLr Kam Adams, CLr Peter Snell

Newham

CLr Ayesha Chowdhury (also Chair of Newham HOSC), CLr Anthony McAlmont, CLr Susan Masters

Tower Hamlets

CLr Gabriella Salva-Macallan (Deputy Chair) (also Chair of Tower Hamlets HOSC), CLr Faroque Ahmed, CLr Shah Ameen

Waltham Forest

CLr Nick Halebi (also Chair of a Waltham Forest HOSC), CLr Richard Sweden (also Chair of a Waltham Forest HOSC), CLr Umar Ali

Observer (non voting) from ONEL JHOSC:

CLr Neil Zammett (also Chair of Redbridge HOSC and current chair of ONEL JHOSC)

CONTACTS

Scrutiny Panel and Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission

Tracey Anderson, Head of Scrutiny and Ward Forums

tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission

Martin Bradford, O&S Officer

martin.bradford@hackney.gov.uk

Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission

Craig Player, O&S Officer

craig.player@hackney.gov.uk

Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission and INEL JHOSC

Jarlath O'Connell, O&S Officer

jarlath.oconnell@hackney.gov.uk

