

London Borough of Hackney
Council
Municipal Year 2014/15
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

**Councillors in
Attendance:**

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

Apologies:

Cllr Dawood Akhoon, Cllr Will Brett, Cllr Barry Buitekant, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Christopher Kennedy and Cllr Jessica Webb

Officer Contact:

Emma Perry, Governance Services

Councillor Soraya Adejare [Speaker] in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Akhoon, Brett, Buitekant, Coban, Conway, Etti, Kennedy and Webb.

2 Speaker's Announcements

- 2.1 The Speaker advised of the upcoming Half Marathon on 20th May, and invited members to participate in a community cricket match involving officers in July 2018.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

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

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

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

5 Petitions for debate - Walford Road area closures consultation

- 5.1 Lucy Harbor submitted the petition and made representations on behalf of the Clean Air William Patten Primary School Parents’ Groups against the proposals for the closure of Walford Road area.
- 5.2 Ms Harbor stated that William Patten School was one of the top 50 polluted schools in London with NO₂ levels exceeding EU legal limits. The proposals would increase traffic and congestion around the school and worsen the air pollution levels for the children at the school. The children’s exposure to pollution would negatively impact on their health and research supported the findings that high levels of pollution affected lung growth and cognitive development in children. Children with lung and heart conditions were especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution.
- 5.3 As a result of the proposals, traffic and congestion would increase in Stoke Newington Church Street and Stoke Newington High Street and Kersley and Defoe Roads, which would contribute to the pollution at the school. Moreover, higher levels of traffic would impact on road safety increasing the risk of accidents.
- 5.4 Ms Harbor expressed her concerns with regard to the consultation process and requested that the Council accepted that the statistics around air pollution outside the school were incorrect and misleading and that the correct information be publicised. Secondly, that the Council consider abandoning the scheme and find an alternative solution that would benefit all groups. Finally, children had the right to walk to school free from pollution and that the Council should tackle and not increase pollution around the school.
- 5.5 Cllr Stops expressed his support for the proposals emphasising that the Council had a long term strategy to improve air quality and that cycling and walking schemes had been introduced to discourage people from driving. The Council’s road closure measures were intended to reduce traffic and decrease air pollution in the borough.
- 5.6 Cllr Steinberger supported the petition expressing concern at the high levels of pollution at schools. He believed that the proposals would not reduce the high levels of air pollution and instead divert traffic to nearby roads contributing to more traffic and congestion on some roads. It was imperative that the Council listen to the parents’ objections and review any unsuccessful schemes saving public money.
- 5.7 Cllrs Fajana- Thomas welcomed the proposals to tackle high levels of air pollution at schools in the borough and expressed her willingness to work with the parents’ group

to address their concerns. Cllr Hercock also emphasised that the Council had implemented walking and cycling schemes to discourage driving and make alternative modes of travel easier.

- 5.8 Cllr Jacobson expressed sympathy with the parents' group but believed that the proposals would encourage more parents and children to walk to school therefore reducing the schools runs.
- 5.9 Cllr Demirci responded that she did not agree that the statistics were misleading or incorrect and would be willing to hold a meeting with the petitioner to discuss the statistics. Secondly, the Council would not abandon the scheme. No decision has been made. The statistics were still being analysed and a decision would be made in June 2018. Finally, the current levels of pollution were not in breach of the EU limits and taking no action would increase the air pollution around the school. Councillor Demirci confirmed that the Council was undertaking in depth air quality monitoring which would be shared with the school and the parents and believed that the air quality at the school, playground would not be in breach of EU limits.
-
- 5.10 Cllr Demirci stated that the primary purpose of the road closure schemes was to reduce traffic and decrease air pollution in the borough. Hackney had successfully promoted and implemented walking and cycling schemes to reduce the number of drivers on roads.
- 5.11 Ms Harbor welcomed the offer made by Cllr Fajana –Thomas to work together to address the parents' group concerns. It was highlighted that the continuous monitoring at the school was based near the office but the worse air pollution was at the facade of the school building. Ms Harbor expressed her dissatisfaction with the current proposals believing that not enough significance had been given to the impact of higher pollution at the school.
- 5.12 The Mayor assured those present that the Council would work to decrease pollution in Hackney Schools.
- 5.13 It was recorded that Cllr Steinberger was not in favour of the proposed road closure scheme.

RESOLVED:

That the petition be noted.

6 Deputations

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

The deputation was introduced by Cllr Margaret Gordon.

- 6.2 Lisa Kelleher told Council that she was present to represent the Parents and Carers from the SEN Campaign Group. She herself had four children in Hackney Schools and two of these children received SEN support. She told Council of the Group's concern at the proposals to change Special Educational Needs and Disabilities funding arrangements and its effect on these children. She asked Council to reconsider (1) the proposed 5% cut to SEND spending (2) not to vary the provisions of the service as

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

required by the Children's Act. (3) To take a long term strategic approach to SEND. Lisa Kelleher considered that the Council should look at the demographics and consider what can be provided. For instance, she highlighted the difficulties that would be caused through a 5% cut to the visually impaired together with cuts to specialised teaching. She expressed concern that the 'circle of friends' was to receive large cuts.

- 6.3 Lisa Kelleher went on to say that there had been a significant drop in SEN service provision with more than 5% cuts. She expressed concern about reduced support to children's playgrounds and special schemes and highlighted the danger of driving children out of mainstream schools. She told Council that £3.8m was going to out of Borough schools where costs were high with reduced control.
- 6.4 Adullah Amerat told Council that he had a rare medical condition and outlined his needs as a special education needs child. He expressed concerns about the impact that the cuts to SEND funding would have on his life.
- 6.5 Councillor Simche Steinberger expressed concerns about changes to SEND funding arrangements and asked what assurances had been received about the service. He told the group that the Conservative group would do all it could to support it.
- 6.6 Councillor Ian Sharer told Council that he was the grandfather of a Downs Syndrome child and expressed concern that the most vulnerable in society would be affected by the proposals.
- 6.7 Councillor James Peters told Council that he was a governor of a special needs school and that there was likely to be a decrease in specialist provision in the Borough and that his school could only maintain the service for a short time. He expressed concern that since 2011 there had been no increase in Central Government funding for these services, despite there being an expansion in the Council's statutory duties in this area. He expressed concern about the consultation on changes to SEND funding and the Conservative Party's austerity.
- 6.8 Councillor M Can Ozsen thanked the group for coming to Council to make representations and their very good work in campaigning on this issue. He asked how they felt the consultation was conducted. He referred to the consultation around SEND funding as being very stark and that cuts would be severe. He expressed concerns about the morality of a bankrupt society.
- 6.9 Deputy Mayor Bramble strongly expressed her concerns about the fact that the funding of SEND was in a state of crisis. 100m was being cut from services to children with special needs across London. Government funding to Hackney was to be cut by 1m. The Council was using current financial resources to sustain spending in this area in the future. Deputy Mayor Bramble referred to ongoing Government lobbying in opposition to the changes in funding. She, herself, had written to the responsible minister outlining concerns and had given evidence in Parliament. She stated that the Government had taken half of the existing funding out of the Borough and the Council now faced many difficult choices. Deputy Mayor Bramble told Council that as a teacher she had worked with parents and children with a range of special needs and that of central importance was the need to protect children. She asked all concerned to lobby Government against the cuts.
- 6.10 Mayor Glanville stated that the Borough had one of the best SEND provision in London.

7 Questions from Members of the Public

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

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

Response:

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

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

The Council had taken steps both to increase supply of alternative accommodation and to prioritise the families placed in B&B into moving into alternative temporary accommodation. These included expanding Hackney's directly managed hostel offer with 34 temporary accommodation hostels providing 814 bed spaces and work was ongoing on a new 148 bed space hostel and proposal for a further hostel in Kingsland Road which would deliver 321 additional units. Also extensive use of void stock marked for regeneration schemes had been made delivering more than 300 properties. In addition work was being undertaken on buildings, units secured from Housing, purchased and refurbished properties for delivery of additional temporary accommodation units.

Despite this aggressive expansion of temporary accommodation stock, demand continued to exceed supply and would continue to do so unless the Council could source a significant number of affordable properties into which families in temporary accommodation could be permanently housed. The Council had been working with other partners to acquire properties in and outside London, the West Midlands and closer to London.

Since peaking in the middle of 2016, the number of families requiring temporary accommodation had reduced by 25%, whilst those who have been in B&B over six weeks had been cut by nearly 40%, which was an achievement in the current market and the increasing pressure on homeless services. All efforts were being made to minimise the use of B&B accommodation.

In response to a supplementary question, Cllr Rennison assured Mr Sills that the Council was supporting families in Bed & Breakfast and temporary accommodation

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

and working towards decreasing the number of households in Bed & Breakfast accommodation. The reduction could only be achieved if there was an increase in availability of housing accommodation and an increase in the local housing allowance for London. The Council was campaigning for the local housing allowance to reflect the higher costs of housing in London boroughs.

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

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

Councillor Caroline Selman replied that Council was acutely aware of large events taking place in parks controlled by neighbouring boroughs which directly affected residents in Hackney. This particularly affected residents around Finsbury Park which was controlled by Haringey and Victoria Park which was controlled by Tower Hamlets. These events were licensed, authorised and controlled by those host boroughs and Hackney had no direct control over them.

For the largest music events in Finsbury Park, the chair of Hackney's Safety Advisory Group was a member of the Safety Advisory Group for those events. This meant Hackney took its views to the table but ultimately decisions were taken by Haringey.

Following last summer's events, Hackney's Councillors and officers had met Councillors and officers from Haringey and the managing director and senior officials at Festival Republic who staged the largest events in Finsbury Park. Hackney Council expressed in the strongest terms on behalf of its residents its dissatisfaction with the disruption and anti-social behaviour these events were causing Hackney's residents and that things had to change. At this meeting the managing director of Festival Republic and Haringey officers agreed to come and meet Brownswood residents at the ward forum organised by their Ward Councillor, Clare Potter who had consistently sought to represent the strong concerns of residents and to hear their experiences first hand. At this meeting Festival Republic committed to increase the security presence in Hackney seven fold for 2018 as well as develop a new security plan in consultation with local residents. The police also agreed to pay more attention to the issues from these events in our roads.

From Hackney Council's perspective, it would continue to put in additional parking restrictions for the main events. In order to minimise disruption and nuisance to residents the Council planned to specifically task uniformed officers in the streets immediately adjacent to the park where it was expected through past intelligence the most nuisance could occur. The staff would be particularly directed to be on duty at those times with the park closing after the events have ceased.

In Victoria Park, Tower Hamlets had appointed a new operator for events from 2018 and this would mean a new series of events, with long standing events like Love Box moving away. Officers from Hackney were meeting the new operators in the coming days to build working relationships and to find out details of the operational plans so they could assess these and work with them accordingly.

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

8 Questions from Members of the Council

8.1 From Councillor Snell to the Mayor:

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

Response:

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

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

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

These actions, and the associated communications and the blue EU-theme badges were much appreciated by Hackney's European Union residents in particular social workers and Garden School. The Council had also written to local businesses asking them to share their thoughts and concerns.

The Prime Minister gave European Union citizens some reassurance when she announced in December that they would have their residency rights protected. Though, there was still uncertainty about the rights of European Union citizens who arrived during the transition period and the Council would continue to call for clarity around this.

However, whereas European Union residents had received some much-needed clarity, business owners in the borough were still unsure about what Brexit might mean for them and the future of their businesses, their staff and the communities they served.

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

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

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

The Greater London Authority's (LGA) research published recently had made it clear that a hard Brexit would put Hackney's growing economic success in jeopardy, something expressed from the Borough's diverse business owners, many of whom feared it would lead to them having to close down or leave the UK. The Cambridge Econometrics report estimated that a 'no deal' would result in 87,000 fewer jobs in London by 2030, with Hackney's share of the loss at 2,100. Maintaining Hackney's successful local economies was not just about business, it was at the core of helping the Council to deliver on a huge range of wider socioeconomic aspirations to improve the lives of the Borough's residents.

The Council's focus had now shifted to its business community. The Prime Minister needed to show leadership and deliver on sensible trading arrangements which would secure jobs, growth and prosperity in Hackney, London and throughout the entire UK. Some practical steps the Council had taken to maintain pressure on the Government and support its business community included submitting a response to the LGA calling for evidence on the impact of Brexit; keeping businesses informed about developments and offering support and guidance where possible. Hackney's Works and Employment and Skills officers would explore how we could address any potential future skills gap; organising a conference for businesses about Brexit explaining some of the issues and what it might mean to them; and how the Council could work together to support its local economies.

In response to a supplementary question, the Mayor emphasised that Hackney was liaising with its public sector partners including health authorities in regard to its EU workers.

8.5 From Councillor Abraham Jacobson to the Cabinet Member for Housing

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

Response:

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

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

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

Since the return of the housing stock to the Council, Gerda had been pursued under the terms of the warranty on the doors and Gerda again agreed to replace the defective doors. To date, approximately 1300 doors had been replaced. However, because of delays in the replacement programme and the slow time scale for the replacement the Council had now instructed external solicitors, Sharpe & Pritchard, to progress the matter with Gerda. Approximately 284 defective doors still required replacement.

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

8.7 From Councillor Harvey Odze to the Mayor:

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

Response:

The Mayor stated that the best way to alleviate the current housing crisis was to have a Labour government, failing that to convince the government to end the damaging welfare reform, have proper regulation of the private rented sector and investment in social housing by granting local government the same freedoms that were given to Housing Associations. With these freedoms the Council could have built an extra 1400 new council homes by 2025 to rent and buy. Last month, the Council had unanimously adopted a new Hackney Housing Strategy with 35 actions. This was an ambitious programme setting out what the Council would do in relation to:

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

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

Mayor Glanville highlighted that since 2010 the Council had built 300 new council homes and was building hundreds more. More Housing Associations managed the biggest increase in visible and invisible homelessness it had ever seen. Further, the Council had set up a housing company.

The Council's housing strategy set out the huge challenges and the actions the Council and its partners would take over the next five years to help meet those challenges.

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

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

Response:

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

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

With regards to the types of material and their use, the plastics were: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) typically used in the production of new drinks bottles and various other grades of food packaging; High Density Polyethylene/Polypropylene (HDPE/PP) typically found in milk jugs, plastic bags and refillable plastic bottles and recycled HDPE was used to manufacture lawn and garden products, crates, office products and automobile parts; and Low Density Polyethylene (LDPE) typically used in bin bags, agricultural film or irrigation pipe.

Other materials were: metal tins and cans sorted into steel and aluminium. The metal could be converted back into new metal products; glass could either be used for fibre optics, insulation, bottle manufacturing or aggregate in road construction; and paper/card were recycled into new paper and card products.

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

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

Response:

Councillor Caroline Selman replied that violent crime could take many forms but what all types of violence had in common was the devastating impact it can have on victims, their loved ones and the wider community.

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

Within Hackney, an evidence led, partnership approach which focussed on prevention, and strategically tackling the long term causes of crime, was at the centre of the Council's response. Through the Hackney Community Safety Partnership the Council brought together partners from across not just police and probation, but public health, youth services and, through the Community Resilience Partnership, the voluntary and community sector.

The response to knife crime and serious youth violence was something that was rightly high up on everyone's minds, with knife crime increasing by 24% across London in 2016/17. While most knife crime incidents do not result in injury, the consequences can be devastating with lives lost or left permanently impacted.

In addition to the measures the Council takes to support the police and to working to take knives off the street, prevention and diversion is key. As a snapshot, some of the many measures taken include:

- Through universal provision, supporting young people in their social and emotional development to develop good decision-making and critical-thinking skills.
- For those young people considered to be at risk, knife and weapons awareness interventions are run through the individual sessions as part of the "Behind the Blade" programme and work with providers such as Street Doctors, who provide first aid sessions within our weapons awareness programme.
- Embedding Restorative Justice Approaches to reduce offending, school exclusions and prevent family and foster placement breakdown due to conflict.
- The Family COACH programme had been developed in response to emerging evidence of the strong correlation between later life gang involvement and bereavement or being a victim of a crime.
- Hackney's Youth Offending Teams works with a multi-agency team which includes a Forensic Psychologist, Virtual School, Speech & Language Therapists, Substance Misuse Treatment Worker and a Dealing Intervention Officer. Over the last year, that partnership has targeted the smaller cohort of young people in Hackney with complex needs and vulnerabilities who were committing a higher number of repeat offences. The model had provided an environment for professionals to work together to address the factors that most contribute to offending behaviours including communication difficulties, mental health needs, poor educational attainment and exclusion from school, home and community.
- Supporting the Parents Voice initiative developed by the Crib aimed at supporting parents; and
- Most recently, through the Hackney community grants programme, the Council had provided funding to Redthread's Youth Violence Intervention Programme, deploying a team of youth workers to Homerton Hospital's trauma department to engage young victims to move away from violence.

For the small minority of young people and adults involved with gangs, Hackney's Integrated Gangs Unit, the first co-located gangs unit in the country, brought together a range of partners to tackle gang crime through a combination of gang exit strategies, diversion and enforcement, in addition to preventative activities in partnership with the voluntary sector including Empower Safer London – led by Young People's Advocates, and offering one-to-one support, the Crib, St Giles Trust and Mentivation which offers mentoring, motivation and mediation for young people experiencing difficulty in education, the community and at home.

The above sets out some of the measures the Council was taking, including in partnership with the voluntary and community sector. But it was crucial to reflect on the commitment of those in the voluntary sector and the wider community who worked tirelessly to tackle the root causes of crime. Most recently, this month Councillor Selman along with others had joined groups of young people at Hackney CVS at the launch of the Hackney Wick Youth Report and a community led debate on knife crime – each one demonstrating why it was crucial that the Council listen to and work with those who understood their community best if Hackney was to achieve lasting change.

In addition to serious youth violence, under the leadership of Councillor Rebecca Rennison, tackling domestic abuse and eliminating violence against women was a key priority for the Council and despite continued government cuts, the Council continues to protect funding domestic abuse services. The Council worked in many different ways to tackle gender-based violence in the borough. Working directly with perpetrators to affect permanent behaviour change and leading the way in the sector through collaborations with third sector partners, the police and health services, to protect victims of abuse and bring perpetrators to justice.

8.12 From Councillor Harvey Odze to the Mayor:

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

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

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

Councillor Harvey Odzes asked a supplementary question on whether the Mayor would support the much needed change in the law for coroner services.

Mayor Glanville stated that he had sympathy for those communities affected and that the Council was awaiting a reply from the Lord Chancellor on this issue. He concluded that there was a need for a cross party dialogue on the matter.

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

9 Elected Mayor's Statement

The Mayor stated that nine Labour and two Liberal Democrat Councillors would be standing down from the Council in May 2018. Between them, they had 111 years' experience on the Council. They had all served the borough in different ways including as Cabinet Members, Chairs, Vice Chairs and Members of Scrutiny Commissions, Speakers, Members of committees and Ward Councillors.

He paid tribute to the work and contribution made by the Councillors that were standing down at the next local election:

Cllr Abraham Jacobson had successfully delivered the Park and Stride schemes to reduce pollution in the Borough and in particular his work on crime and Gerda doors. Cllr Dawood Akhoun for his contribution to road safety issues.

Cllr Ann Munn was an active member of scrutiny, chairing many Scrutiny Commissions and had expressed particular interest in issues of anxiety and depression. She was incredibly adept at working often with fractious groups in the area of health and shaping the Commission to be seen as an independent arbitrator in contentious disputes.

Cllr Barry Buitekant had been a very active Ward Councillor dealing with the highest number of casework in the Council and especially praised him for his work in Haggerston. He was independently minded and a passionate socialist.

Cllr Tom Ebbutt had been a very active member, thanking him for his work on the resident led Colville Regeneration and looked forward to continuing to work with him on Colville estate.

Cllrs Laura Bunt, Patrick Moule and Will Brett were thanked for their hard work and contribution to the Council. In particular Cllr Brett for the work undertaken on the Parkside Estate and a personal thank you for his contribution in his Mayoral campaign.

Mayor Glanville praised Cllr Jonathan McShane who was a close friend and honorary member of the class of 2006. Cllr McShane had held various positions within the Council from Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care to Chair of Health in Hackney London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. As Cabinet Member he had helped to navigate the Council through some of the most significant and complex changes to the role of the local councils, ensuring that Hackney had been at the forefront of the changes in public health that devolved responsibility to local government, bringing back democratic representation to this area of importance to the borough. He had also led on work ensuring home care workers received the London Living Wage and thanked him for his years of service to the Council.

Finally, Hackney's longest serving members, Cllrs Geoff Taylor and Sally Mulready. Cllr Geoff Taylor had been very active in his 16 years on the Council including as Cabinet Member for Finance, Speaker, Chair and member of charities and involved in civic matters. During his service he had shaped education especially his work in youth crime in Hackney and his work on early years, championing the work of Sure Start and new Children's Centres in 2008/09. In addition he was a passionate advocate for history. As Cabinet Member for Finance he had played a crucial role in helping manage the Council's finances during a very challenging period for public finances in the UK.

The longest serving member Cllr Sally Mulready had been on the Council for 20 years serving as a Chair, advisor and Speaker. She was a renowned campaigner and had dedicated her political life to challenging prejudice and discrimination towards minority communities and marginalised people. She had been involved in a number of high-profile international campaigns such as changes in the law on pension rights for victims of miscarriages of justice. Cllr Mulready served on Ireland's Council of State and was also Director of the Irish Elderly Advice Network, having made a huge contribution to the Irish immigrant community in Britain over many decades. Cllr Mulready had made an enormous contribution to the borough over two decades and created a mini political dynasty and was a loyal and supportive friend.

Mayor Glanville thanked Cllrs Jacobson, Akhoo, Munn, Buitekant, Ebbutt, Bunt, Brett, Moule, McShane, Taylor and Mulready for their service and contributions to Council. They had been part of Hackney's transformation and as they stood down they were safe in the knowledge Hackney was a better place through their work. They would be missed in the chamber and he wished them every success.

Cllr Steinberger also paid tribute to the Councillors stepping down and stated that it had been a pleasure working with them. He thanked them for their contribution to the Council and wished them success in the future. He thanked the Mayor for his interest and continued support for the Hatzolah Ambulance Service.

Cllr Sharer added that it had been a pleasure serving with all the Councillors standing down and that they would be missed in the chambers. In particular he praised Cllrs Akhoo and Jacobson for their work within the community.

10 Budget And Council Tax Report 2018/19

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

Mayor Glanville told Council that setting this year's budget had been the toughest in many years, finishing the year with an overspend and a very vivid reminder from Northamptonshire on what can happen without strong leadership and financial management. The last such Council to have a section 114 notice issued against it was Hackney Council in 2000, a time characterised by political crisis and a weak Tory/LibDem coalition that took the Council to the brink of collapse, something left out of former Cllr Sills' letter to the Gazette. He told Council that it was only saved by the

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

hard work of some of the Councillors he had paid tribute to earlier, former Mayor Pipe and the Labour party. He was sure that voters in the May elections would remember this. As he had reminded an earlier Council the impact wasn't just stark in terms of people's jobs and day to day services, it was part of a period that damaged the Boroughs' reputation.

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

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

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

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

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

Mayor Glanville told Council that in 2018/19, the recommended Hackney's Council Tax increase was to be 3% raising around £2.2m. He said that increasing Council Tax

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

was not an easy decision and that all efforts had been made to keep it as low as possible. However, he considered that the decision was the right one. He acknowledged that the rising cost of living and the worsening housing crisis continued to affect people and that this extra contribution would help fund services like social care, looked after children, day care, street scene and the costs of housing those in need. Decisions to make cuts in Council Tax Reduction Scheme to SEND had been equally tough. The Council had listened and reflected and changed its minds, where it thought it was right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Councillor Abraham Jacobson expressed concern about the deep cuts to local government funding. He told Council that in absolute terms knife crime had increased in the Borough with people murdered on the streets.

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

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

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

Councillor Simche Steinberger proposed the Conservative Party's alternative budget. This was seconded by Councillor Michael Levy. Councillor Steinberger thanked the Group Director for Finance and Resources for his work in preparing the budget. He told Council that he disagreed with the proposed Labour Party budget. He asked that in future, all political parties be involved in the preparation of the Council Budget in an attempt to find common ground. He highlighted areas of saving such as the plan for Dalston, Hackney Today and controlled parking zones in the Borough and revenue generation proposals such as providing parking for attendees at events such as large weddings and the provision of a Registrar's service to Waltham Forest. He referred to the need for a zebra crossing in Stamford Hill West and expressed concerns at the curtailment of the 73 Bus route.

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

Councillor Peter Snell stated that the Conservative Party proposals would lead to a false economy and Dalston was a critical hub for the area. He stated that conservative policy did not serve the people of Central Hackney.

Councillor Rosemary Sales told Council that the Conservative Party had made no attempt to understand that residents including Stamford Hill residents wanted to live in a safer borough.

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

Councillor Ian Sharer introduced the Liberal Democrat Party's alternative budget. The Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was seconded by Councillor Abraham Jacobson.

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

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

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

Abstentions: None (0)

Not Present: Councillors Akhoon, Buitekant Brett, Coban, Conway, Etti, Kennedy,

Ozsen and Webb (9)

The vote was not carried.

The Speaker invited Council to vote on the Liberal Democrat Party's alternative budget proposals.

FOR: Councillors Jacobson and Sharer

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

Abstentions: None (0)

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

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

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

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

Abstentions: None (0)

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

RESOLVED:

1. To bring forward into 2018/19 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £10.2m
2. To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1, below.
3. To note that the Budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan.
4. To note that in line with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources, is of the view that:

The General Fund balances of £15.0m and the level of reserves, particularly in relation to capital, are adequate to meet the Council's financial needs for 2018/19 and that in light of the economic uncertainty they should not fall below

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest audited Accounts as at 31 March 2017, the movements of those reserves since that date – which have been tracked through the Overall Financial Position (OFP) Reports, and the latest OFP projections. Note also, that the projections in the HRA to maintain the balance at £10.2m by 31 March 2018 are also considered to be adequate at this point in time but will need to continue to be reviewed in the light of the challenges facing the HRA.

The General Fund estimates are sufficiently robust to set a balanced budget for 2018/19. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2017/18 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2017 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.

5. To approve the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 7_for implementation from 1st April 2018.
6. To continue the policy requiring the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to seek to mitigate the impact of significant changes to either resources, such as Top Up Grant changes, or expenditure requirements.
7. To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 22nd January 2018.
8. To authorise the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to implement any virements required to allocate provision for demand and growth pressures set out in this report subject to the appropriate evidence base being provided.
9. To approve:

The allocation of resources to the 2018/19 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6;
The allocation of resources to the 2018/19 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on 22 January 2018.
10. To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2018/19.
11. To agree the prudential indicators for Capital Expenditure and the Capital Financing Requirement, the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for External Debt, the Affordability prudential indicators and the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators for 2018/19 as set out in paragraph 25, and Appendix 3.
12. To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £600m agreed above for 2018/19 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003. Further reassurance about the robustness of the budget is the confirmation that the Council's borrowings are within the boundaries of prudential guidelines.
13. To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.

14. To note that at its meeting on 24 January 2018 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2018/19 financial year as 71,145 in accordance with regulations made under section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The Council Tax Base is the total number of properties in each of the eight council tax bands A to H converted to an equivalent number of band D properties.
- 15(1) To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.
- (i) The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (2) of the Act)
 - (a) £1,120.781m being the expenditure which the authority estimates it will incur in the year in performing its functions and will charge to a revenue account, other than a BID Revenue Account, for the year in accordance with proper practices.
 - (b) £2m being such allowance as the authority estimates will be appropriate for contingencies in relation to amounts to be charged or credited to a revenue account for the year in accordance with proper practices.
 - (c) £nil being the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will be appropriate to raise in the year for meeting its estimated future expenditure.
 - (d) £nil being such financial reserves as are sufficient to meet so much of the amount estimated by the authority to be a revenue account deficit for any earlier financial year as has not already been provided for.
 - (e) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the 1988 Act, and
 - (f) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its general fund to its collection fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(5) of the 1988 Act and charged to a revenue account for the year.
- 16(2) The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)
- (a) £1,042.013m being the income which it estimates will accrue to it in the year and which it will credit to a revenue account, other than a BID Revenue Account, for the year in accordance with proper practices.
 - (b) £3.9m being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with section 97(3) of the 1988 Act.
 - (c) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(4) of the 1988 Act and will be credited to a revenue account for the year, and
 - (d) £nil being the amount of the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will use in order to provide for the items mentioned in subsection (2) (a), (b), (e) and (f) above.
17. £76.868m being the amount by which the aggregate calculated under subsection (1) above exceeds that calculated under subsection (2) above,

the authority calculates the amount equal to the difference; and the amount so calculated is its Council Tax Requirement for the year.

18. £1,080.44 being the amount at (3.2.17) divided by the amount at (3.2.14) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year
19. That the Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council tax for 2018/19 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

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

20. That it be noted that for 2018/19 the Greater London Authority has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

VALUATION BANDS							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
196.15	228.85	261.54	294.23	359.61	425.00	490.38	588.46

21. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3.2.19 and 3.2.20 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for 2018/19 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.

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

Note: Subject to GLA confirmation of precept on 22nd February 2018

22. To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.15 to 3.2.17 that Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2018/19 be £76.868m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,080.44 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,374.67 including the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept. An analysis of the tax base total Band D Council Tax across Council Tax Bands is shown in 3.2.21 above and an exemplification of the taxbase and discounts by band, is shown in Appendix 5.
23. To agree that in accordance with principles approved under section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and the new provisions included in the Localism Act 2011, the increase in the Council's Council Tax requirement for 2018/19 as shown at Appendix 8 is not excessive (6% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.

24. To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 to 2020/21, set out at Appendix 3.
25. To agree the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3.
26. To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in appendix 3.

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

11.1 Tim Shields introduced the report seeking approval to make amendments to the Constitution to include reference to the new proper officer post Data Protection Officer.

RESOLVED:

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

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

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

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

Councillor Sharman reported that the Mayor had met with the Audit Committee and agreed a broader role for the Committee with new ways of working from May 2018. He concluded by paying tribute to members of the Committee and to the role that the Finance and Resources Directorate had in making improvements, referring to it as exemplary.

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

RESOLVED:

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

13 Report of the Chief Executive: Gender Pay Gap Report

13.1 Cllr Carole Williams introduced the report on the gender pay gap and emphasised that the data showed on average women earned more than men at Hackney Council. This data would be published in March 2018 within the Workforce Profile report on the Council's website.

RESOLVED:

To note the report.

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

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

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

RESOLVED:

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

15 Motion

Motion 1 – Women's Suffrage

Councillor Carole Williams proposed and introduced the motion:

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

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

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

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

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

Councillor Williams stated that although progress had been made we must continue to fight for those denied the right to vote such as women in refuges and continue the work on removing barriers of participation.

Councillor Feryal Demirci responded to the motion.

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

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

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

The Council is celebrating this 100 year anniversary through an exhibition at Hackney Museum, Making Her Mark which looks at a century of female activism in Hackney including the inspiring stories of women who made a difference in the Borough and beyond, across issues ranging from education, workers' rights, and healthcare to domestic violence, the peace movement, and police relations.

On 3 March 2018, Well Street Market is celebrating our female led businesses by hosting a celebration day hosting all women entrepreneurs at its stalls. For the third

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

year, Young Hackney is hosting its inspiring young women's event on 6 March to coincide with International Women's Day (8 March). A careers event where local women come to inspire and empower the next generation of young Hackney women to broaden their horizons and aspirations, smash glass ceilings, and think outside the career box.

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

Members were encouraged to join these events and show their support.

RESOLVED:

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

Motion 2 – Anti Semitism

Councillor Harvey Odze presented the amended motion.

“This Council expresses alarm at the rise in antisemitism in recent years across the UK. This includes incidents when criticism of Israel has been expressed using antisemitic tropes. Criticism of Israel can be legitimate, but not if it employs the tropes and imagery of antisemitism.

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

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

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

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

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

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

The guidelines accompanying the definition provide that: “to guide IHRA in its work, the following examples may serve as illustrations: Manifestations might include the targeting of the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity. However, criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic. Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

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

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

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

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

Councillor Abraham Jacobson responded to the motion.

Councillor Abraham seconded the motion and thanked Labour Councillors for supporting this motion. He stated that the Jewish community were immigrants that had settled in England and his grandfather had immigrated in 1901. There had been a rise in antisemitism in London and nationwide but he and his family still felt safe living in Hackney free from hate.

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

RESOLVED:

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

16 Draft Programme Of Meetings 2018-19

RESOLVED:

To note the draft programme of meetings 2018-19

Duration of the meeting: 7.00-10.30pm