

London Borough of Hackney  
Council  
Municipal Year 2015/16  
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015

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

**Councillors in  
Attendance:**

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

**Apologies:**

Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Michael Levy and  
Cllr Clayeon McKenzie

**Officer Contact:**

Emma Perry, Governance Services

---

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

**1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence from Members are listed above.
- 1.2 An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Ebbutt.

**2 Speaker's Announcements**

- 2.1 The Speaker spoke about the former Hackney Mayor and Councillor Joe Lobenstein MBE who sadly passed away at the end of June 2015, aged 88. Mr Lobenstein arrived in London in 1939 as a refugee from Nazism and had entered local politics in 1962 as a member of the former Metropolitan Borough of Stoke Newington.

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

- 2.2 Mr Lobenstein became a member of the London Borough of Hackney in 1968 and served on the Council for more than 30 years and had held a number of key offices during this time. He had been leader of the Hackney Conservative Group and was later elected Mayor of Hackney four times in a row from 1998 to 2001. Mr Lobenstein had been awarded an MBE in 1980 for his outstanding political and social activities and was made a Freeman of the Borough in 1997.
- 2.3 Mr Lobenstein had also been very active in the local community over a period of decades and was a notable spokesperson for the Society of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations (Kedassia). He was survived by his wife Bella, children and grandchildren, and would be greatly missed.
- 2.4 Gordon Bell MBE, Freedom of the Borough, said a few words in tribute to Mr Lobenstein, who he had known for 50 years. Gordon Bell advised that Mr Lobenstein had given eminent service to the Borough, supported by his wife, and was a great man. He stated that Mr Lobenstein had radiated charm, humour and authority, and was a great mediator. Mr Lobenstein had raised thousands of pounds during his time as Mayor and would be greatly missed and always remembered.
- 2.5 Councillor Odze paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein and stated that he was always approachable and had been there for the people of Hackney and the Jewish community.
- 2.6 Councillor Desmond paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein and stated that he had made a unique contribution to the Council and community as a whole.
- 2.7 Councillor Sharer paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein and stated that he had met him 22 years ago and he always had a great sense of humour and purpose.
- 2.8 Councillor Rathbone paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein who he had known for 35 years. Councillor Rathbone stated that Mr Lobenstein was a good human being with a great sense of humour.
- 2.9 The Mayor paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein and stated that himself and a number of fellow Members had memories of working alongside him. The Mayor referred to Mr Lobenstein's time as Mayor of Hackney and stated that he had always been a good Chair of Council and always treated everyone with respect.
- 2.10 Councillor Steinberger also paid tribute to Mr Lobenstein. Mr Lobenstein had been a mentor to him when he joined the Council and the community still asked after him. It was a great loss to the community and he wished his wife and family all the best.
- 2.11 A minutes silence was observed in memory of Mr Lobenstein.
- 2.12 In happier news, the Speaker congratulated Venerable Rachel Treweek, the Archdeacon of Hackney for the last four years, who recently had her election confirmed as the Diocesan Bishop of Gloucester. Bishop Treweek was the first female to be appointed as a Diocesan Bishop and would be the first female Bishop to enter the House of Lords as a 'Lords Spiritual'. Congratulations was also given to Reverend Elizabeth Adekunle who had recently been appointed as the new Archdeacon of Hackney. The Speaker was also pleased to

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

announce that Reverend Robert Wickham, the Rector of St John at Hackney, had recently been appointed Suffragan Bishop of Edmonton.

2.13 The Speaker was also pleased to announce that the Queen's Birthday Honours List recently recognised a number of people working in public service in Hackney, as follows:-

- Dr Kevan Collins, the Chief Executive of the Education Endowment Foundation who was awarded a knighthood for services to education. Sir Kevan was a non-executive Director of the Hackney Learning Trust's Education Advisory Group.
- Professor Jane Anderson, Consultant Physician and Director at the Centre for the Study of Sexual Health and HIV at Homerton Hospital was awarded a CBE for services to HIV medicine and sexual health research.
- Sarah Bailey, Executive Headteacher at Queensbridge Primary School, De Beauvoir School and Mapledene Children's Centre was awarded an OBE for services to education.

2.14 The Speaker also reminded Members of the Speaker's Charity Gala Dinner taking place on 30 October 2015.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

3.1 Councillor Steinberger wished to raise under a point of order that Christopher Sills had submitted a public question before the deadline date and wished to know why this had not been included in the agenda. In response, it was explained that the question had not been received by Governance Services by the set deadline and therefore could not be included in the agenda. Councillor Glanville confirmed that he would provide Christopher Sills with a written response to his question.

3.2 Councillor Hayhurst declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 – Deputation: b) Closure of Median Road, as he was on the Council of Governors at Homerton Hospital.

3.3 Councillor Sharer declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 9 – Report from Cabinet: Biannual Children's Social Care Report, as his wife worked for a company which had provided legal advice on this matter.

3.4 Councillors Demirci and Taylor both declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 12 – Draft North London Waste Plan & Revised Memorandum of Understanding, as they had both been appointed to the North London Waste Authority.

3.5 The Chief Executive and Corporate Directors of Legal, HR & Regulatory Services and Finance and Resources had interests in Agenda Item 16 – Changes to the Disciplinary Process for Specified Senior Officers.

### **4 Minutes of the previous meeting - 20 May 2015**

4.1 **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 May 2015 be approved, as a true and accurate record.

## 5 Deputations

### a) Chats Palace

- 5.1 Councillor Rennison introduced the deputation and welcomed the two speakers, Laia Gasch and Jacquetta May. Jacquetta May was the Chair of Trustees and stated that Chats Palace would be celebrating its 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary next year and invited the Council to celebrate with them on the 5 September 2016.
- 5.2 Chats Palace was in the process of introducing a new vision for the venue, which was fit for purpose. They were located within a Grade II listed building, originally opened in 1913, which required a large amount of restoration and regeneration. Chats Palace offered a range of different activities and had hosted various events over the years, promoting a sense of ownership and social inclusion. Chats Palace also kept and preserved archives from the local area.
- 5.3 Victor McAllister had joined Chats Palace six months ago, as one of nine new Members, he ran a martial arts class at the venue as well as being treasurer. Victor was joined by a couple of his students who gave a brief demonstration of some of the martial arts moves learnt at his classes.
- 5.4 Laia Gasch, fellow Member of the Board, reiterated that Chats Palace was a place of trust and social inclusion, which required regeneration in order to meet its full potential. Laia Gasch stated that the Board had already been in discussions regarding potential regeneration projects with officers from the Council, alongside Ward Members. She also invited the Council to join in with their 40<sup>th</sup> year celebrations.
- 5.5 Councillor Patrick spoke in support of Chats Palace, a venue that was very close to her heart however no longer in her Ward. In response to a question from Councillor Patrick, Jacquetta May explained they had lots of ideas for the 40<sup>th</sup> celebrations, involving working with the Hackney Museum and Archives service and a number of local artists. They had also applied to the Heritage Lottery Fund for additional funding.
- 5.6 In response to a question from Councillor Rathbone regarding the sustainability of Chats Palace, it was explained that although the venue had its ups and downs they believed that it had huge potential and would receive the additional funding needed to fund the restoration works. Chats Palace faced a challenge to ensure that the building was fit for purpose and a long lease was required in order to secure the additional funding required, with discussions already taking place with the Council. Jacquetta May confirmed that Chats Palace had a sustainable business model and she appealed to all Members of the Council to help support and preserve this important venue for the community.
- 5.7 Councillor Rahilly welcomed the deputation and supported the work of Chats Palace.
- 5.8 Councillor Akhoon also supported the deputation and stated that Chats Palace was a fantastic venue, with great people working for it.

- 5.9 Councillor Odze also welcomed the deputation but stated that unfortunately he would be unable to join in the celebrations on the 5<sup>th</sup> September 2016 as it was on the Jewish Sabbath.
- 5.10 Councillor McShane responded to the deputation and thanked all of the representatives from Chats Palace for attending. Councillor McShane stated that Chats Palace was a great place which brought the community together and recognised the challenges it faced in ensuring the venue was fit for purpose. Councillor McShane congratulated the Board of Members who had worked hard to improve the venue and made great efforts to secure additional funding. He was confident that with the Board in place Chats Palace had a very long future.

**b) Closure of Median Road**

- 5.11 Councillor Sales introduced the deputation during which she advised that the announcement of the closure of Median Road in March 2015 had caused distress to patients, service users and Healthwatch, as a result of the lack of consultation.
- 5.12 Shirley Murgraff, Hackney Older People's Reference Group and a member of City of Hackney Re-ablement and Integrated Care Board, stated that the Council had previously agreed the provision of intermediate care beds at Median Road, but had since tabled a new proposal which no longer included this provision. Shirley Murgraff advised that a NHS Community Voice meeting had taken place on Re-ablement and Intermediate care during which disappointment had been expressed in the consultation process followed, in particular the lack of public and patient engagement and the lack of consultation with Median Road staff members. Furthermore, concern was expressed with regards to the lack of consideration given to a viable option proposed by staff.
- 5.13 Shirley Murgraff requested a full enquiry into the lack of consultation undertaken by Hackney Council and sought the commitment of the Council to full consultation in the future. Furthermore, it was requested that there be parity between the Council and NHS requirements for public and service user consultation.
- 5.14 Councillor Odze expressed concern that the provision of intermediate care would need to be provided out of borough at a financial cost to the Council. Malcolm Alexander elaborated on Councillor Odze's concerns, stating that the cost incurred from St. Pancras Hospital was considerably higher than Median Road and additional pressure would be put on patients having to travel out of the Borough.
- 5.15 Councillor McShane responded to the deputation and explained that the original intention was for Median Road to provide intermediate care for six weeks, however it had since become akin to a residential care home with users staying for a period of 20 weeks, which did not promote independent care. Furthermore, intermediate care was classified as medical care and although the use of an outside provider had been considered, it was deemed a complicated arrangement hence the decision to close Median Road. It was noted that from

1 September 2015, Meandor Court would be supported 24 hours a day with the aim to reduce the average stay from 20 weeks to 12 weeks. It was further noted that the Health and Wellbeing Board had agreed to discuss a set of co-produced principles for user involvement.

## 6 Questions from Members of the Council

### 6.1 From Councillor Jacobson to the Cabinet Member for Housing:

“Now that the fixed penalties for sleeping rough have been shelved, what reassurances do we have that each and every person in Hackney who finds themselves homeless are guaranteed a bed for the night?”

#### Response from Councillor Glanville:

Councillor Glanville stated that the Council spends around £3m annually in supporting the single homeless and it was working with its partners to review how it could improve service delivery further. The Council endeavoured to accommodate any homeless person identified, and it worked closely with commissioned rough sleeper outreach groups to support and assess the needs of all rough sleepers in the Borough.

Councillor Glanville advised that a number of bed spaces were available through the No Second Night Out accommodation hubs, a pan-London resource, as well as locally commissioned services through the Supporting People programme. This included a number of emergency and assessment beds in the Borough. However, it was noted that the No Second Night Out provision and the Council's assessment beds may not be available every night due to the growing numbers of households finding themselves homeless, but the Council would continue to work with rough sleepers to find accommodation as soon as possible.

Hackney's Housing Advice Service, along with its commissioned Greenhouse service, provides initial assessment and ongoing support to ensure that rough sleepers receive the support they need. Hackney had also recently been commissioned, along with Tower Hamlets and the City of London, to run a cross borough rough sleeper service, No First Night Out (NFNO), which aims to identify possible rough sleepers before they sleep out. This ambitious project was being watched by the GLA, who provided part of the funding. Councillor Glanville added that a Homeless Strategy would be reported to Cabinet in the Autumn, which would include the commitment to develop of a cross Council rough sleeper strategy.

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Glanville stated that it was important that proper assessments were carried out by the homeless prevention service, to assess the needs of people using the various homeless services both in the Borough and across London, and provide adequate support.

### 6.2 From Councillor Patrick to the Deputy Mayor:

“Could the Deputy Mayor update Members on the impact of police cuts in Hackney?”

Response from the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Linden advised that in October 2010, Hackney had 770 Police officers, decreasing to 733 officers by October 2011 and there had since been a significant decrease to 597 officers in the borough as of April 2015, with a further reduction in Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) over recent years.

Hackney now had over 22% fewer officers in the Borough than in October 2010. By comparison, Tower Hamlets had just over 16% fewer, Newham have 3% fewer and Waltham Forest had more than 10% more officers in their Borough.

The Metropolitan Police, through the Local Policing Model (LPM), applied a new way of allocating Borough based posts in 2012, through what the Police called Demand and Resource Modelling. This process took account of crime performance and demand using the narrow period from May 2010 to May 2011, at which time Hackney had the best crime performance in London, and had seen a decade's worth of crime reduction.

In response to a supplementary question, Deputy Mayor Linden stated that the Council would continue to do what it could to reduce crime and that concerns had been raised with the Deputy Mayor for Policing, Deputy Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner.

6.3 From Councillor Akhoun to the Cabinet Member for Finance:

"What is Hackney Council going to do to mitigate the future effects of the cuts in Tax Credits will have on Hackney residents?"

Response from Councillor Taylor:

Councillor Taylor advised that there were approximately 23,700 households, which include 45,400 children, in Hackney that currently received Working Tax Credit. Of these, around 14,000 were working and received on average £8,602 per annum.

Councillor Taylor reported that in the recent summer budget, the Chancellor announced three significant changes to the Working Tax Credit scheme, some of which would not come into effect until April 2017 and could result in households in Hackney losing up to £1,230 per annum in income; removing around £17m from the local economy.

The households that were also receiving Housing Benefit would see the level of support they received go up as their Working Tax Credit reduced, although not at the same rate. These households may also qualify for a Discretionary Housing Payment, however this fund was finite and already under immense strain. Alongside this, the Council operated the Hackney Discretionary Crisis Support Scheme (HDCSS), which provided financial assistance cover for emergencies. However, it was noted that this scheme had previously been funded by Central Government and it was not clear whether the Council would be in a position to maintain the scheme beyond April 2016. Additionally the Council would signpost affected families to the Hackney Moneysmart project for budgeting support and to engage with the Council's Ways into Work team.

In response to a supplementary question regarding the rationale surrounding Labour Party MPs abstaining on the Government proposals for welfare cuts,

Councillor Taylor stated that it would not have made a difference and that the Council had to respond to the welfare cuts proposed by Central Government.

6.4 From Councillor Kennedy to the Deputy Mayor:

“In light of recent profile cuts to fire services in London, including the closure of Kingsland Road fire station in Hackney, could the Deputy Mayor update Councillors on the impact on call-out times for fire emergencies in Hackney?”

Response from the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Linden advised that the average attendance times had increased by 12 seconds and 18 seconds for the first and second appliances respectively between 2013/14 and 2014/15, following the closure of Kingsland Fire Station.

In response to Councillor Odze, Deputy Mayor Linden stated that congestion in the borough had reduced and therefore could not be identified as a contributing factor to the increase in attendance time.

6.5 From Councillor Sharer to the Cabinet Member for Housing:

“What is Hackney Council doing to mitigate the loss of social housing due to the Right to Buy at a discount?”

Response from Councillor Glanville:

Councillor Glanville explained that in 2012 the Government had ‘reinvigorated’ the Right to Buy (RTB) for council tenants by reducing the qualifying period for tenants and substantially increasing the discount available, from £16,000 to £100,000 (index linked) in London. This had resulted in an increase of RTB sales in Hackney from 10 in 2011/12 to 180 in 2014/15. Evidence suggested that in London only around one in eight council homes had been replaced within three years. There was also no guarantee that the replacement homes would be like-for-like in terms of affordability or number of bedrooms and the Government’s expectation was that affordable rent would be charged on replacement homes, at up to 80% of market rents.

Councillor Glanville advised that the Council had an excellent track record in delivering new homes, with the third highest amount of social housing built of all London’s boroughs since 2011, and the fifth local authority nationally. Through the Council’s estate regeneration programme, the Council was building 2,760 mixed tenure homes across 18 sites. With partners, the Council would also be delivering over 5,000 mixed tenure homes at Woodberry Down. Councillor Glanville stated that he was committed to working with partners to continue the Council’s track record in the delivery of new homes in the Borough.

Despite the Council’s efforts to mitigate the loss of social housing, the future delivery of social housing would be challenging. The recent budget had imposed a reduction in social rent levels of 1% for the next four years. In addition, under the Government’s new Pay to Stay proposals, tenants with incomes over £40,000 per annum would have to pay a rent at or near market rent level. The additional rental income would then have to be handed over to the Treasury, not retained by the Council for reinvestment in new homes. Some local authorities had set up a housing company to build and manage new homes, partly as a way of exempting the homes from the RTB policy, but it was unclear whether that would work.



**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

Councillor Glanville added that as a result of the Council investigating and taking action against tenancy fraud and fraudulent claims for RTB, in 2013/14 and 2014/15, over 150 council homes had been recovered. In addition, since July 2014, 53 RTB applications had been cancelled as a result of investigations. The Council, alongside partner local authorities, would lobby the Government on ways of mitigating the impact of RTB on delivering new social housing. He added that the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission would shortly be starting an investigation into the impact of RTB in the borough.

In response, Councillor Sharer stated that himself and fellow members of the Liberal Democrat Group were happy to join any campaigns to lobby the Government.

- 6.6 From Councillor Rennison to the Cabinet Member for Finance:  
Could the Cabinet Member for Finance tell Members how many people have accessed food banks in Hackney in the past year?"

Response from Councillor Taylor:

Councillor Taylor confirmed that between June 2014 to June 2015, 2,900 households had received assistance from the Hackney Foodbank, a 16% increase on the previous year. In addition, the Council was aware of a number of other food support projects running within the Borough by charities and churches.

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Taylor informed Members that individuals working an average of 23 hours in the private sector would be 0.5% worse off as a direct response of the Chancellor's budget. A family with four children, the first parent working full time and the second working five hours per week, who own their property and have a mortgage, would be 4% worse off and a single disabled adult living with parents, earning £210 per week would see a 9% reduction in their income.

Councillor Peters stated that the new London living wage had made it increasingly more difficult to live in London and requested that this be readdressed by the Chancellor, so as to be at a sufficient level to cover the cost of living in London.

(Due to time constraints, questions 6.7 and 6.8 were not taken at the meeting and the Speaker advised that Members would receive a written response. These responses are attached as Appendix One).

## **7 Elected Mayor's Statement (Standing Item)**

- 7.1 Mayor Pipe referred to the Summer budget outlined by the Government and stated that the biggest challenge that London faced was the level of benefit caps being proposed. Mayor Pipe feared that as a result of these benefit caps many people would find it too expensive to afford to live in London, with many of these doing some of the most crucial jobs.
- 7.2 Mayor Pipe made reference to the London Living Wage, which was currently £9.15. Mayor Pipe believed that this was a new minimum wage and did not address the growing cost of living in London.

- 7.3 Mayor Pipe stated that the Government was now forcing London Boroughs to sell their Council homes and that when the Council built new social housing, only 30% could be funded through Right to Buy receipts, requiring other sources of funding for the remaining 70%. This had resulted in it becoming increasingly difficult for London Boroughs to provide new social housing, creating a form of 'social cleansing' and people having to move out of London.
- 7.4 Councillor Steinberger, on behalf of the Leader of the Conservative Group, responded to the Mayor's statement. Councillor Steinberger raised concern that the Conservative Group had not been given the opportunity to respond to the Mayor's statement at the AGM meeting in May, as the Mayor had chosen not to give one. Councillor Steinberger also raised the issue of loft conversions and a number of planning appeals surrounding synagogues and Jewish schools.
- 7.5 Responding to the Mayor's statement, Councillor Sharer as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group agreed with Councillor Steinberger that the Mayor should give the opposition parties the opportunity to speak at Council meetings by way of response to his statement. This was the only opportunity opposition groups had to make statements in response to the Mayor's statement. If the Mayor did not make a statement, that opportunity was denied to them. Councillor Sharer agreed with Mayor Pipe regarding the Right to Buy scheme and believed that it was unacceptable that much needed social housing was being sold and not replaced. Councillor Sharer also referred to Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and whether these could be agreed by the Mayor, subject to the necessary consultation with residents.
- 7.6 Mayor Pipe thanked Councillors Steinberger and Sharer for their contributions. Mayor Pipe responded to the comments made regarding his statement and explained that at the AGM meeting there had been a number of important ceremonial matters to conduct and he felt it would be inappropriate to hold people in the meeting longer than necessary. In response to comments made regarding loft extensions, Mayor Pipe explained that in any application or appeal there was a need for respect for design and character of the street scene.
- 7.7 In response to comments made regarding the number of Council meetings scheduled a year, Mayor Pipe advised that the reduction in Council meetings had been welcomed by many and that with the agreement of public questions at Cabinet meetings, the Council had actually increased opportunities for public accountability.
- 7.8 In response to comments made by Councillor Sharer regarding CPZs, Mayor Pipe explained that there was a procedure that needed to be followed before a CPZ was implemented and that this could not be agreed on an adhoc basis.

**8 Report of the Corporate Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services: Members Allowances - Recommendations from an Independent Person, Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL**

(The order of business was changed and Item 8 was taken before Item 6 – Questions from Members of the Council, as Sir Rodney Brooke was in attendance for this particular item).

- 8.1 Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL introduced the report and commended it to Council. Sir Rodney Brooke explained that at its meeting on 28 January 2015 Council agreed to disband its own Independent Remuneration Panel and join the arrangements provided by London Councils Independent Remuneration Panel. Council had also agreed for him to act as an independent advisor by making recommendations to Council on allowances based on London Councils Scheme. Sir Rodney Brooke advised that he was also Chair of London Councils Independent Remuneration Panel.
- 8.2 Sir Rodney Brooke had now completed his review and his report and recommendations were included at Appendix 1 of the report and the draft Members Allowances Scheme that related to the report and recommendations was included at Appendix 2 of the report.
- 8.3 Sir Rodney Brooke referred to paragraph 17 of the report and explained that many of the allowances in the scheme were below the bottom level recommended by the London-wide Scheme. It was recognised that Councillors would not seek increases to the London-wide level at the present time given the current financial climate, however he recommended that the Council should raise allowances to the London-wide level when financial circumstances allowed.
- 8.4 Councillor Odze raised a number of concerns regarding the report and appendices. Council Odze referred to the allowance for the Chair of the Audit Committee, if this was the same for Corporate Committee, as he believed there was a basic principle that no Member should receive more than one special responsibility allowance. Councillor Odze also made reference to paragraph 8 of the report and the allowances for Leaders of the Opposition Groups, as he believed that the First Opposition Group Leader did have more responsibility which should be taken into consideration, regardless of the number of members in the Group.
- 8.5 In response to concerns raised by Councillor Odze, Sir Rodney Brooke stated that he entirely agreed that Members should only receive one special responsibility allowance and that if the Chair of the Corporate Committee was not also Chair of the Audit Sub-Committee, the Chairs of both the Audit Committee and the Corporate Committee should receive Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) of £7,407.45; and the SRAs should be reviewed in the light of experience of the workloads of the two bodies. He also acknowledged that the First Opposition Group Leader did a crucial constitutional role in holding the leadership of the Council to account, however he believed that the current SRAs for both First and Second Opposition Group Leaders was disproportionate given the ratios and could not be justified.

- 8.6 Deputy Mayor Linden thanked Sir Rodney Brooke for his report on behalf of all Members and accepted his recommendations. Deputy Mayor Linden stated that Sir Rodney Brooke had consulted all Members on his recommendations and had also taken into consideration the work of the former Independent Remuneration Panel.
- 8.7 Councillor Steinberger also thanked Sir Rodney Brooke for his work. In response to a question regarding paragraph 8 of the report detailing allowances for Leaders of the Opposition Groups, Sir Rodney Brooke believed that the ratio and recommendation set out in his report was a reasonable approach.

**RESOLVED** that the Council approves:

1. The report and recommendations attached to Appendix 1 of the report, as set out below:-
  - (a) The Scheme (including allowances for independent members) should continue to be updated for four years in accordance with the headline rate by which local government pay settlements are changed (including the recent 2.2% increase) and from the same dates.
  - (b) Other than (a) above, the scheme be implemented with effect from the beginning of the 2015-16 municipal year.
  - (c) The Chairs of the Planning Sub-Committee and the Licensing Committee should attract SRAs of £16,450.
  - (d) The Majority Party Chief Whip and the Deputy Speaker should attract SRAs of £5,000.
  - (e) The Chair of the Standards Committee should attract an SRA of £2,294.30.
  - (f) The First Opposition Group Leader should attract an SRA of £12,214.94 and the Second Opposition Group Leader an SRA of £8,143.30.
  - (g) The Scheme should make provision for payment to the Chair of the Design Review Panel of £450 for each Panel meeting and a payment to members of the Panel of £50 per hour, capped at £200 for each Panel meeting.
  - (h) Co-opted members on the Pensions Committee should receive the same allowance as that paid to other independent members, co-opted members and the Independent Person on Ethical Matters.
  - (i) The Chair of the Pensions Board should receive an SRA of £2,294.30.
  - (j) Scheme member representatives on the Pensions Board should be remunerated in accordance with the allowances paid to the co-opted members of the Pensions Committee, independent members, co-opted members and the Independent Person on Ethical Matters.
  - (k) If the Chair of the Corporate Committee is not also Chair of the Audit Sub-Committee, the Chairs of both the Audit Committee and the Corporate Committee should receive SRAs of £7,407.45; and the SRAs should be reviewed in the light of experience of the workloads of the two bodies.
  - (l) The Scheme should continue to make provision for payment of dependents' carers' allowance at a rate equivalent to the London living wage (together with travelling expenses) and, in appropriate circumstances, at a rate appropriate for specialist professional care.
  - (m) The Scheme should continue to make provision for travelling and subsistence allowances in accordance with the scheme for staff.

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

- (n) When the Council believes that financial circumstances allow, the following allowances be raised to the London-wide level: Basic Allowance to £10,938; Mayor's SRA to £83,639; Deputy Mayor's SRA to £42,675; SRAs for other Cabinet members to £35,865; SRAs for Chairs of Scrutiny Commissions to £15,826; SRAs for First Opposition Group Whip, Majority Group Chair, Majority Group Secretary, member of the Adoption Panel and member of the Fostering Panel £2,442.
  - (o) Except for the recommendations above, I recommend that the current Hackney Members' Allowances Scheme continue unchanged.
2. The draft Members Allowances Scheme, as attached at Appendix 2 of the report.

For: Many  
Against: 3  
Abstentions: None

## **9 Report from Cabinet: Biannual Childrens Social Care Report**

- 9.1 Councillor Bramble introduced the report and commended it to Council. Councillor Bramble advised that the Corporate Parenting Board played a key strategic role in ensuring that the Council and its partners meet their corporate parenting responsibilities. Throughout 2014/15, the Corporate Parenting Board focussed on a number of important topics; safeguarding looked after children, including from sexual exploitation; foster carer recruitment; the impact of judicial reforms on care planning; educational attainment of looked after children; and hearing from Hackney Foster Carer Council.
- 9.2 The Corporate Parenting Board had a particular focus this year on hearing from young people and working with Hackney's Children in Care Council, Hackney Gets Heard, to drive forward the actions that came out of the last youth-led Pledge inspection in summer 2014. After a period of collaboration and consultation, Hackney's Pledge to Looked After Children had been re-named the Hackney Promise, to be launched in the Summer 2015.
- 9.3 Councillor Odze stated that it was a well written report but raised concerns regarding the radicalisation of children and felt that there needed to be more information given surrounding this issue.
- 9.4 In response, Councillor Bramble advised that it was impossible to cover all aspects of the report in detail. However, she reported that the revised Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015 guidance stated that under provisions in the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, local authorities were required to establish channel panels from April 2015 to assess the extent to which identified individuals were vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism and arrange for support for these individuals.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

## **10 Report from Cabinet: Adoption of the Development Management Local Plan**

- 10.1 Councillor Nicholson introduced the report and commended it to Council. Councillor Nicholson advised that the production of the Development

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

Management Local Plan (DMLP), along with the Site Allocations DPD, had been shaped and informed by stakeholder engagement, including Ward Member engagement sessions, made available to all Ward Members, which took place between October 2011 and January 2012.

- 10.2 The Public Participation version had also been subject to an extensive consultation process and following this consultation a Schedule of Modifications was proposed and together with the DMLP, the Statement of Representation, Sustainability Appraisal Report, and other supporting documents were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 9 December 2013. An examination hearing of the submission version of the DMLP took place between 24 and 25 September 2014, with further post submission consultation between 24 February and 24 April 2015. This formal process of plan preparation was now completed, cumulating in the receipt of the Inspector's report on 3 July 2015.
- 10.3 Councillor Stops referred to Policy DM5 relating to the protection of public houses and wished to thank, on behalf of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA), all of those involved in saving the Chesham Arms Pub.
- 10.4 Councillor Odze was opposed to the recommendation and was extremely concerned regarding the use of an Article 4 Direction as he believed it could set a precedent and impact on other developments.

**RESOLVED** that the Council adopt the Development Management Local Plan and authorise the publication of the Adoption Statement (Appendix 3 to the report) required under Section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and Regulations regarding adoption of a Local Plan.

(Cllr Harvey Odze voted against the recommendation).

## **11 Report from Cabinet: Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document**

- 11.1 Councillor Nicholson introduced the report and commended it to Council. Councillor Nicholson explained that the existing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) needed to be replaced due to recent changes in legislation, particularly the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Also, much of the evidence and monetary contribution formulae which underpinned the previously adopted SPD was now out of date and needed to be replaced to reflect the new evidence base, as well as the overarching policies outlined in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and emerging Development Management Local Plan (DMLP).
- 11.2 Councillor Odze opposed the report, as he felt that the CIL penalised the Woodberry Down area as it was exempt from the scheme. In response, Councillor Nicholson explained that the current development within the Woodberry Down area allowed for a maximum level of affordable housing provision and sustainable homes. If the CIL was implemented across this development it would adversely impact on the level of affordable housing provision and create challenges regarding viability.

**RESOLVED** that the revised Hackney Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be adopted, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report), in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

(Councillor Harvey Odze voted against the recommendation).

## **12 Report from Cabinet: Draft North London Waste Plan and Revised Memorandum of Understanding**

12.1 Councillor Nicholson introduced the report and commended it to Council. Councillor Nicholson explained that the seven North London Boroughs, Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest, had prepared a draft North London Waste Plan (NLWP) on which they were required to consult. Once adopted by the North London Boroughs, the NLWP would provide a planning framework for decisions on the management of waste in North London up to 2032.

12.2 At the same time as producing the draft plan, the Boroughs had revised the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which established the governance arrangements for joint working. A MoU had also been drafted between the NLWP and London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), setting out how the Boroughs and the LLDC had and would continue to co-operate on waste planning matters and how they would monitor these arrangements.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the Council approves:

1. The draft North London Waste Plan (as set out in Appendix 1 to the report) for public consultation and approve delegated authority for the Corporate Director of Legal, HR and Regulatory Services to make any further necessary minor changes, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration.
2. The revised joint Borough Memorandum of Understanding (set out in Appendix 2 to the report), subject to the Corporate Director of Legal, HR and Regulatory Services making any further necessary minor changes.
3. The Memorandum of Understanding between the NLWP boroughs and the London Legacy Development Corporation (Appendix 3 of the report), subject to the Corporate Director of Legal, HR and Regulatory Services making any further necessary minor changes.

## **13 Report of the Mayor: Use of Special Urgency Provisions**

13.1 **RESOLVED** that the recent use of the special urgency provisions, as set out in paragraph 4 of the updated report, be noted.

**14 Report of the Chief Executive: Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report**

- 14.1 Councillor Munn introduced the report, as Chair of the Scrutiny Chairs Group, and commended it to Council. Councillor Munn referred to the Overview & Scrutiny Annual Report 2014-2015, which had been previously circulated to Members for consideration.
- 14.2 Councillor Munn stated that the Scrutiny Commissions had diverse remits but there was a theme running through this year's reviews. These included no one being left behind, protecting residents when they are at their most vulnerable, and opportunities for everyone. Councillor Munn took the opportunity to thank all of the Overview & Scrutiny Members, Officers and everyone that had contributed to the reviews and attended site visits.
- 14.3 During the debate, Councillor Chapman moved under Council Procedure Rule 16.1(xiv) to extend the meeting beyond 10pm, which was seconded by Councillor Odze.

**RESOLVED** that the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2014-15 be noted.

**15 Report of the Corporate Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services: Changes to the Constitution and establishment of an Audit Sub-Committee**

- 15.1 Gifty Edila, Corporate Director Legal, HR & Regulatory Services, introduced the report and commended it to Council. The report requested that Full Council established a new Audit Sub-Committee, appointed Members of this Sub-Committee, in addition to making consequential amendments to the terms of reference for the Corporate Committee which will act as the parent Committee to the new Sub-Committee. The report also sought Full Council's approval to make other changes to the Constitution.
- 15.2 Councillor Odze indicated that he was in objection to the proposals set out in the recommendation, as he believed it was going back on the previous decision to abolish the Audit Sub-Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Council approves:

- i) The establishment of an Audit Sub-Committee of the Corporate Committee and the terms of reference for the Sub-Committee, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report;
- i) The proposed membership of the Audit Sub-Committee, as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report;
- ii) The revised terms of reference of the Corporate Committee, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, and authorise the Committee to develop, monitor, review and make recommendations to Full Council on the adoption of byelaws;



- iii) The amendment to the Pensions Committee's terms of reference, as set out in Appendix 3 of the report, and authorise it to act as Scheme Manager on behalf of the Council; and
- iv) An amendment to the Council Procedure Rules, as detailed at Appendix 3 of the report.

(Councillor Harvey Odze voted against the recommendation).

## **16 Report of the Corporate Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services: Changes to Disciplinary Process for Specified Senior Officers**

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

### **RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the changes required under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 be noted.
- 2. That the proposed changes to Hackney Council's Constitution as detailed at Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed.

## **17 Motions**

- a No to Silvertown Tunnel

Councillor Lufkin introduced the motion and stated that a new four lane tunnel at Silvertown, next to the Blackwall Tunnel, would have a significant negative impact on air quality and traffic flow in the surrounding area. Councillor Lufkin was particularly concerned that the proposal would result in an increase in nitrous oxide in the surrounding area, resulting in even worse air quality levels in the borough and Hackney and London not being able to meet their air quality targets.

Councillor Lufkin advised that one of the Council's priorities was to promote sustainable travel and he urged that alternative strategies be looked into to improve pedestrian and cycling conditions and accessibility to public transport.

Councillor Snell formally seconded the motion and echoed Councillor Lufkin's concerns regarding impacts on air quality and traffic flow in the surrounding areas. Councillor Snell raised concerns regarding moving lorry traffic to central London, as a result of the proposal, which he felt would undo the previous good work of moving this away from the centre.

Councillor Demirci supported the motion and also felt that the proposal would result in an increase in traffic levels and would have a negative impact on traffic flow in and around the Borough. Councillor Demirci was also concerned regarding air quality levels, especially as there were 18 schools located within a 500m radius of the site. Reports from Kings College had stated that there were around 9,900 premature deaths per year as a result of poor air quality.

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

Councillor Odze was not in support of the motion and felt that the proposed tunnel at Silvertown was a brilliant idea. Councillor Odze believed that the only way to relieve congestion in the area was to provide more capacity on the roads.

Councillor Jacobson believed that the proposed tunnel was a brilliant idea but only for pedestrians and cyclists and felt that any increase in traffic levels in the area would only add to the increasing levels of air pollution in the area.

## **RESOLVED**

“The Council notes that;

1. TfL have consulted on building a 4 lane tunnel at Silvertown next to, and in addition to, The Blackwall Tunnel, which Mayor Johnson says will double road capacity across the Thames at this point and help ease congestion.
2. As stated in a previous motion passed by Hackney Council in February this year, it is widely acknowledged that you cannot build your way out of congestion and that a more appropriate strategy would be to improve conditions for walking and cycling as well as make public transport more affordable.
3. The additional road capacity would lead to a significant increase in motor traffic in Hackney and significantly worsen air quality in this borough.
4. Hackney and London already suffer from poor air quality and building this tunnel is totally incompatible with Hackney and London meeting their air quality targets.

Therefore Hackney Council Resolve;

1. To oppose the building of the Silvertown Tunnel.
2. To ask The Mayor of London to work on a plan that recognises the need to improve air quality and that any Thames crossing must not be to the detriment of this aim.”

For: Many

Against: 1 – Cllr Harvey Odze

Abstentions: None

### **b Commitment to Fairtrade Borough Status**

Councillor Potter introduced the motion, as Chair of the Hackney Fairtrade Steering Group. Councillor Potter stated that the Council had first pledged its commitment to achieve Fairtrade status at Full Council in January 2007. Councillor Potter asked for the support of the Council in maintaining Fairtrade Status for the next two years, in accordance with the aims of the Fairtrade Foundation and their five criteria.

The Fairtrade Steering Group was re-launched in December 2014 and since then had been active in arranging various events and activities to encourage

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

more local residents and businesses to support Fairtrade products. Councillor Potter appealed to fellow Members to support these activities and to also encourage those in the community where there had been less of a take up, especially within religious groups.

Councillor Rathbone formally seconded the motion, as former Chair of the Fairtrade Steering Group. Councillor Rathbone explained that it was often difficult to increase the level of interest in promoting Fairtrade and encouraged an all-party support for the motion. Councillor Rathbone stressed the importance of Fairtrade and the difference it made to the lives of farmers and workers.

Councillor McShane thanked Councillors Potter and Rathbone for their motion, which he supported, and referred to the Skinner's Academy who had held an assembly on Fairtrade and a 'can you taste the difference justice' event.

Councillor Odze also supported the motion and thanked Councillor Potter for the work she had done as the new Chair of the Fairtrade Steering Group. Councillor Odze recognised the need to gain more support for Fairtrade and to point out that it was not always the more expensive option. He added that his eldest son had been involved in the first synagogue, located in Birmingham, to gain Fairtrade status in the UK.

## **RESOLVED**

"This Council notes that:

- Hackney achieved Fairtrade borough status on 4 May 2008 following a motion of commitment made by the Full Council on 31 January 2007 and is one of 23 London boroughs to have the status.
- Since then the Borough successfully renewed its Fairtrade status in 2009, and now needs to do so again as agreed in the Mayor's and Labour Members' 2014 Manifesto Commitments.
- To maintain Fairtrade Borough status for the next two years and beyond we need to show that we, as a community, are committed to the aims of the Fairtrade Foundation who judge us against a set of five criteria: -
  - The Council passes a resolution supporting Fairtrade and agrees to serve Fairtrade products within its buildings and offices.
  - Encourage businesses to make more of a commitment to stock and increase the availability of Fairtrade locally.
  - Work with local workplaces and community organisations (places of worship, schools, universities, colleges and other voluntary organisations) and encourage them to use Fairtrade products whenever possible.
  - Mobilise the local community and raise awareness in support of the campaign through events and media coverage.
  - Maintain a strong steering group to support and implement an action plan to achieve these criteria, which seeks representation from different sectors across the community.
- A Council member chairs the steering group meetings and the group is assisted by Hackney officers with administration and policy support.
- The Fairtrade Foundation is an independent, charitable organisation that raises public awareness of the need for Fairtrade. Their main vision is to

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

campaign for social justice and sustainable development through fairer trade structures that will ultimately have a positive impact on the lives of farmers and producers in the developing world.

This Council resolves:

- To confirm the Council's commitment to supporting the campaign to retain Fairtrade Borough status for LB Hackney by continuing to pursue the five criteria listed above, and to support the Hackney Fairtrade Steering Group's renewal application to the Fairtrade Foundation."

For: All

Against: None

Abstentions: None

## **18 Appointments to Committees/Commissions (Standing Item)**

### **18.1 RESOLVED that:**

1. Dr Navina Evans replace Dr Robert Dolan as a representative of the East London Foundation Trust on the Health and Wellbeing Board.
2. Councillor Jacobson be appointed to the vacant post on the Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE).

**Duration of meeting:** 7.00 – 10.20pm

## Appendix One

### 6.7 From Councillor Muir to the Cabinet Member for Housing:

“What is the Cabinet Member for Housing’s assessment of the impact of the Government’s policy of forcing Councils to sell most financially viable council homes when they become vacant?”

#### Response from Councillor Glanville:

The Government expects discounts for the forthcoming extension of the Right to Buy (RTB) to housing association tenants, to be funded from the forced sale of ‘higher value’ Council homes when they become vacant.

It is impossible to accurately assess the impact of this policy at present, because the Government has not yet published details of how the scheme will work. Provisions relating to the policy are expected to be included in a Housing Bill in the autumn. We were expecting a consultation before the summer recess, but it has not materialised perhaps because as Boris has said it is: ‘the height of insanity!’ or as Emma Reynolds has said: ‘A half-baked proposal that was uncosted and unfunded.’

Inside Housing: Civil servants are continuing to block the release of a document laying out the financial implications of the Right to Buy extension – despite accepting the ‘strong public interest’ in releasing the information.

So we do not yet know, for example: the threshold at which council homes will be deemed ‘high value’; how the receipts from forced sales will be pooled and redistributed; and whether there will be any exemptions to the forced sale policy.

Nevertheless, together with other London boroughs, and based on Government announcements to date, we are already working to try and assess the likely impacts.

These impacts are likely to include:

- A loss of social housing in London: Based on our current understanding, existing RTB, the extension of RTB to housing associations, funded by forced sales, is unlikely to be financially viable. For the scheme to work, funds raised in London would have to be redistributed across the country to fund replacements outside London. There is no guarantee that replacements would be like-for-like in terms of affordability, specialist adaptations or number of bedrooms.
- Increase in the use and costs of Temporary Accommodation: The loss of social housing through forced sales will increase the use of Temporary Accommodation, along with the associated social impacts for families and financial costs to the Council and tax payers. Even where replacement homes are built, there is an inevitable time lag of 1-2 years between selling ‘higher value’ council homes and the availability of replacement homes.

- Clash of legal duties

We are at the forefront of current research into the likely impact of Right to Buy and forced sales. For example, with London's sub-regional housing partnerships (involving 24 other stock-holding boroughs in London), we are modelling the potential impact of forced sales in terms of the number of homes above 'high-value' thresholds and estimates of the number of forced sales in the first five years.

In addition, alongside three south London boroughs, we have commissioned a consultant to provide an assessment of the costs to the Council and taxpayers from the additional use of Temporary Accommodation resulting from the policy of forced sales.

Assessments of the various impacts are being prepared in such a way that they can be updated as soon as firm details of the RTB / forced sales scheme are known. With our partners, we will be lobbying Government to mitigate the impact of forced sales, for example exempting new homes that have been built as part of a regeneration programme, or exempting boroughs where the number of households in Temporary Accommodation is greater than the number of 'higher value' council homes.

As part of their forthcoming investigation into the impact of RTB in the borough, I am pleased that the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission propose to consider the likely impact of forced sales in Hackney, as well as ways of mitigating that impact.

As I have already said I gave evidence to the GLA Housing Cttee and met with Emma Reynolds and regularly discuss these issues with my colleagues across London.

Our Homes, Our London.

6.8 From Councillor Stops to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods:

"Would the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods please brief the council on the road casualty figures this year and tell Members what has been achieved since 2000?"

Response from Councillor Demirci:

In June 2015, Transport for London (TfL) released the official statistics of personal injury collisions and casualties that occurred in 2014. Hackney has made good progress in reducing the number of casualties on its roads, particularly in reducing the number of vulnerable road user casualties. Some key achievements include:

- In 2014, there were 60 killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties on Hackney's roads. This is 23 fewer KSI than in 2013. In comparison to the 2005-09 baseline, we have achieved a 53% reduction.
- There were 4 child KSI's in 2014. This is a reduction of 6 (60%) in comparison to 2013 and 71% reduction compared to 2005-09 baseline, and matches our previous lowest child casualty figure.
- There were 21 pedestrian KSI's in 2014. This is a reduction of 14 (40%) in comparison to 2013, and we have achieved a 53% reduction compared to the 2005-09 baseline.

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

- There were 15 cycle KSIs on Hackney roads in 2014. This is a reduction of 5 (25%) compared to 2013 and a 35% reduction compared to 2005-09 baseline.
- There were 18 powered two wheeler KSI casualties in 2014. Unfortunately this is an increase of 3 KSI in comparison to 2013. This picture replicated London wide where there has been a 3% increase in powered two wheeler KSI's.

Unfortunately, we have seen an increase in the number of fatalities and slight injuries on our roads. There were 7 fatalities in 2014 (4 Pedestrians, 3 Riders) of which 3 were on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and 4 were on borough roads. Records show that London-wide there was a 4% decrease in fatalities, although inner London saw an increase of 7%.

We have also seen a considerable increase of slight casualties on Hackney's roads. In 2014, there were 960 slight casualties, an increase of 153 (19%) from 2013. This is similar to the picture London wide where we have seen an increase of 15%. This has meant that the total casualties on Hackney roads has increased to 1,020, this is an increase from 890 (14.6%) from 2013. The picture is the same London wide where there had been a 13% increase from the previous year. Our initial investigation has shown that there were slight casualty increases in all vulnerable modes such as child, cyclists and powered two wheelers.

The Road Safety Plan (2015 to 2020) proposes a reduction of 40% in the number of KSI casualties and total casualties and largely focuses on reducing casualties amongst vulnerable road user groups. The action contained within the plan is being taken forward to be delivered as part of the Council's road safety education, training and safety scheme work.

With regard to progress since 2000, this is explained in detail in Hackney's Road Safety Plan 2006-2010. The targets set by the Road Safety Plan, against the 1994-98 baseline averages, were:

- 50% reduction in the number of killed and seriously injured for all road users.

Hackney achieved a casualty reduction from 194 in 2000 to 103, a 51% in the total number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI).

- A 75% reduction in child Killed or seriously injured.

Hackney achieved a casualty reduction from 1,255 in 2000 to 795 in 2010 (28%) in the total number of slight injury accident casualties.

- A reduction of 40% in the number of motorcycle, pedestrian and cyclist killed or seriously injured.

Hackney achieved a casualty reduction from 36 to 19 between 2000 and 2010 (24%), in the number of powered two wheelers KSI. Therefore we did not meet the target of 40% reduction in powered two wheelers. Pedal cyclist casualties in Hackney had gone up from 12 in 2000 to 23 in 2010, a rise of 21% from the 1994-98 average baseline figures. The comparative huge increase in cycling must be taken into account as to why we were not able to meet this target.

**Wednesday, 22nd July, 2015**

Hackney achieved a casualty reduction from 63 in 2000 to 27 in 2010 giving a 65% in the total number of people KSI. Therefore we did meet the target of a 50% reduction in pedestrian KSI. Overall, we have seen a reduction in the KSI incidents from 194 in 2000, to 60 in 2014 – a 71% reduction, with the 2013-14 achievements being amongst the best during this period.