

London Borough of Hackney
Council
Municipal Year 2019/20
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

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, Cllr Polly Billington,
Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Jon Burke,
Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman,
Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway,
Cllr Kofo David, Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Sade Etti,
Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Humaira Garasia,
Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Michelle Gregory,
Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Cllr Clare Joseph,
Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Anna Lynch,
Cllr Yvonne Maxwell, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie,
Cllr Sem Moema, Cllr Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze,
Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Sam Pallis,
Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters,
Cllr Emma Plouviez, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Tom Rahilly,
Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Rebecca Rennison,
Cllr Caroline Selman, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Gilbert Smyth,
Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Patrick Spence, Cllr Simche Steinberger,
Cllr Vincent Stops, Vacancy, Cllr Jessica Webb,
Cllr Carole Williams, Cllr Caroline Woodley and
Cllr Penny Wrouth

Apologies:

Cllr Feryal Clark, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Richard Lufkin,
Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Anna-
Joy Rickard

Officer Contact:

Tess Merrett, Governance Services

Councillor [Speaker] in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 There were apologies for absence from Deputy Mayor Clark, Councillor Levy, Councillor Lufkin, Councillor McMahon, Councillor Race and Councillor Rickard.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from or on behalf of Councillors Burke, Conway, Hayhurst, Lynch, Gordon and Moema.

2 Speaker's Announcements

- 2.1 The Speaker informed Council of some of his highlights over the past few weeks. These included:

- The Holocaust Memorial Day commemoration service on Monday 27 January which was well attended. The Speaker thanked all those for attending the service
 - A charity dinner had taken place on the 20th February with £2,400 being raised. The speaker thanked Councillor Hanson and Councillor David for providing prizes for the raffle
- 2.2 Members were informed that the Hackney Half marathon was returning on Sunday 17 May. Councillors were encouraged to volunteer to take part and help raise funds for Speakers' designated charities. For more information on how to take part in the Half Marathon councillors should contact the Speakers Officer so they could get a code which would give them a discount off their entry fee.
- 2.3 The Speaker was hoping to arrange an afro-Caribbean night and a Laburnum Boat Club Boat ride. Councillors were to look out for further announcements.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 There was a declaration of interest from Councillor Stops in relation to agenda item 5 Deputations. Councillor Stops explained that the Frampton Park Community Hall was a live Planning Application. Therefore as the Planning Sub-Committee Chair, Councillor Stops would excuse himself from the Council Chamber during the Deputation.
- 3.2 The following Planning Sub-Committee members and substitute members would also excuse themselves from the Council Chamber during agenda item 5 Deputations:

Councillors Fajana-Thomas, Hanson, Ozsen, Potter and Snell.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

- 4.1 The Speaker notified the council that he had received notification of error in relation to agenda item 9 paragraph 9.4. Owing to a technical problem when merging the agenda on the committee management system mod.gov.uk, Councillors who voted against the recommendations, or were not present to vote, were recorded as also having voted for the recommendations. This had been rectified online but because of costs the decision was taken not to re-print and reissue hard copies of the agenda. The correction had removed Councillors Cameron, Klein, Levy, Ozsen, Papier and Webb from the list of Councillors voting for the recommendations.
- 4.2 Councillor Odze highlighted one correction that was required to Page 21, agenda item 11 paragraph 11.4, fifth bullet point (eight line) needed to be reworded to be clearer. This was in order to reflect that it was actually Councillor Odze's father's sister that he was referring to.
- 4.3 Councillor Steinberger queried why his name had not been mentioned

in relation to the error with paragraph 9.4 of the minutes. Councillor Odze and the Speaker confirmed that the Councillor Steinberger's name was not mentioned as his name had not been involved in the error and that his name had been included originally.

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 22nd January 2020 be approved as an accurate record of proceeds subject to the following amendments:

- **Agenda item 9 paragraph 9.4**
- **Agenda item 11, paragraph 11.4, page 21, fifth bullet point (eighth line)**

5 Deputations

5.1 Councillor Joseph introduced the deputation from local residents who had brought a deputation to Council stop the Frampton Park Community Hall from being demolished and removed from the housing supply programme and for the youth services to be restarted. We also ask that there is a cap on the number of flats being built and no more housing developments allowed on the estate.

5.2 Mr Torren Lewis, began his deputation by explaining that he had lived on the Frampton Park Estate for over 20 years. Mr Lewis spoke of this concerns about the proposed demolition of the Frampton Park Community Hall and its removal from Hackney Council's housing supply programme. Mr Lewis recognised that there was housing crisis and that several families on the council's housing waiting list. Mr Lewis added that that the Frampton Park Community Hall was a valuable resource providing much needed facilities to not only children and young people on the estate but also other members of the local community. The hall's importance in the community was not be underestimated. Mr Lewis insisted that the community hall be removed from the housing supply programme citing the connection between the decline in youth services and the increase in incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour and crime in the area. Mr Lewis suggested that Hackney Council look at alternative sites for additional housing. He highlighted that other housing projects would soon becoming online the area and they too would be dependent on the hall for community services.

The Speaker opened the floor for questions.

5.3 In response to a question from Councillor Gregory, Mr Lewis replied that the hall was used by the local charity Hackney Quest as well as for social gatherings. There had been bookings in the hall for the past few weeks and it was understood that Hackney Quest were happy to return to the hall.

5.4 In response to question from Councillor Wrout, Mr Lewis replied by outlining the three options for the future of the hall were; 1) keep the hall as it was; 2) develop the much needed community space; and 3) build a new hall at 100% council rent pricing with construction of the hall paid for with the sale of private housing.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

- 5.5 In response to a question from Councillor Etti, Mr Lewis replied that before its closure the hall had been consistently used for about 15 to 20 years Monday to Friday and some weekends. The upstairs section of the hall was used almost every weekend.
- 5.6 In response to a question from Councillor Smyth, Mr Lewis replied that Hackney Quest provided an outlet for young people and it as a place for them to go off the streets. Hackney Quest also provided family services such as food banks and it also provided services to the elderly too. The closure of the hall was a massive impact on the local community, it was seen as irreplaceable.
- 5.7 In response to a question from Councillor Adejare, Mr Lewis replied that the plans to demolish the hall had fragmented the community and as he reiterated earlier the loss of hall to the local community would be devastating.
- 5.8 Mayor Glanville thanked Mr Lewis for coming to the Council meeting and making his deputation. The Mayor explained how he had been taking part in community conversations about the project, as well as the raising of a petition and continuing extensive dialogue with Councillor Joseph and her fellow Victoria ward councillors. The Mayor spoke of how he valued his talks with Mr Lewis and the team working on the project on the 2nd December. The Mayor went on to explain how Hackney was facing an unprecedented housing crisis with more than 13,000 families on the housing waiting list, more than 3,000 of whom were homeless and in temporary accommodation. The Mayor added that in addition many families in existing Council homes were overcrowded or were in homes that did not meet their medical needs. The Mayor detailed how, last year on the Frampton Park Estate, there were 147 families on the Council's waiting list with 22 of whom were in the most 'urgent' band. The Mayor illustrated his point by emphasising how urgent cases could result in a cancer patient who cannot come home from hospital because their home was unsuitable or a family with a child with severe disabilities, who desperately needed a better home to care for them. The Mayor explained that if the Council did not build new homes they would be letting down families in the borough, so as a result the Council was building thousands of new homes, the majority being affordable social rent and shared ownership. On the Frampton Park Estate, the Council had four projects that it could build with over 100 homes. Social rent homes would be prioritised for those families most in need on the estate. The Mayor explained that local residents will not be rehoused if the Council did not build the homes as part of the project. The Mayor believed that this was not the point of Mr Lewis' petition, which appears to be fundamentally opposed to the building of Council homes. The Mayor gave reassurances that homes built on Council estate land were self-financed and did not contribute to other Council projects. The Mayor highlighted that currently Frampton Park Estate had three community halls, all historically underinvested. The Council were proposing a major investment programme in these other community facilities.

The Mayor insisted that the Council had not described Frampton Park Community Hall as 'underused' as justification for its demolition. At the time of the original Cabinet report, the Hall's level of services were reported to be limited and that wider investment was needed. The current hall was in poor condition with no disabled access to the upstairs and there had been repeated noise complaints about the hall. The Council's plans would deliver a much needed investment as well as providing desperately-required new homes. The Mayor

insisted that the Council fully supported Hackney Quest, however, their use of the hall had always been temporary. They had, with Council support, voluntarily moved to nearby premises, where they continue to provide services. The project was critical in enabling the Council to continue to invest in better services for young people as well other local residents. The Council had undertaken a wide-reaching consultative process with local residents through an extensive programme of events and workshops. This programme would continue and the Mayor was adamant that many local residents supported the project. It was for these reasons, the Mayor explained, that he could not accept Mr Lewis' request to halt the building project. This would be a betrayal of those families in urgent need. The building project could see these families, in a few years' time, rehoused in new Council homes in their community. The Mayor hoped that work on the building project would continue and that Mr Lewis would see the transformative effect these plans would have on those local residents desperately in need of a new home.

6 Questions from Members of the Public

6.1 Question from Ms Feodora Rayner to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm

I welcome the Council's increasing recognition of the importance of active travel and liveable neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, is implementing the Silvertown Tunnel Scheme, effectively a motorway into central London. How will you mitigate the negative public health effects of increased traffic and congestion on Hackney residents, workers and visitors?

Response from Mayor Glanville:

Mayor Glanville began by thanking Ms Rayner for her question and stressing how the Mayor of London was an incredible ally of Hackney. The Mayor of London was delivering a bold and comprehensive response to the climate change emergency through a series of measures including the *Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ)*, 12 low emission Bus Zones and 1500 Electric Vehicle charging points. The Mayor explained that this had led to a 97% drop in breaches of hourly Nitrogen Dioxide.

The Mayor agreed with those concerns expressed over the Silvertown Tunnel Scheme and Hackney Council had strongly objected to the scheme in the public inquiry. In 2015 the Council had passed a motion against the tunnel and the majority party continues to lobby against it. The Mayor highlighted the impact of increased traffic emissions on the public's health and how it could be reduced through measures to prevent, reduce or replace polluting activities. The Mayor highlighted how the tunnel would particularly impact on those residential streets in Hackney adjoining the A12.

The Mayor explained how Transport for London (TFL) had obtained approval for the scheme by stating that tolls on the Silvertown and Rotherhithe crossings would prevent significant increases in traffic. The Council had sought clarity on what would happen if the TFL modelling was proven wrong and there was an increase in traffic. To minimise this happening, the Council had insisted on a strengthened governance of the tunnel. The Council would continue to have a say in the management of the tunnel through its membership of the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group. The Mayor highlighted that TFL had agreed to

monitor traffic levels on a number of Hackney roads near the junction with the A12.

These roads included Homerton High Street, Wick Road, Kenworthy Road, Cassland Road and Victoria Park Road. While TFL expected there to be near zero impact on traffic but any significant increases would automatically trigger a range of mitigations. The Mayor cited the most powerful of these was to cut off the increase of traffic at source by increasing the tolls on traffic using the two tunnels. The Mayor highlighted that TFL would also support additional monitoring of air quality data, including in areas where the scheme could lead to traffic diverting to alternative routes. If there had been a material worsening in air quality, because of the scheme, TFL needed a scheme of mitigation to be submitted to the Mayor of London for approval.

Mayor Glanville went on to explain that separately from the Silvertown Tunnel decision but clearly now of increased importance, Hackney was also taking the initiative to reduce the level of through traffic in Hackney. The Council commissioned a Through Traffic in Hackney study to inform this. All options were being considered, although more research was needed to determine which would have the greatest impact and can be delivered the quickest. Hackney was currently updating its Air Quality Action Plan, which would include a number of actions to improve air quality in Hackney. The Plan would be open to public consultation later in the year, thereby allowing people to comment on how Hackney intended to address issues impacting on air quality and the council looked forward to working with a re-elected Mayor of London to deliver on these ambitions.

Supplementary question:

Ms Rayner thanked the Mayor for his answer and welcomed that the council was taking the issue seriously. Ms Rayner explained that public health did not just mean poor air quality a large percentage of local Hackney residents suffer from asthma and whilst others were obese or overweight or suffered from other long term health conditions. She added that last year 94 people died in the Lea Way. These all issues as a result of increased traffic and Ms Rayner said that she would like to see some indication from the council of a commitment to an increase in public access to the streets.

Response from Mayor Glanville:

Mayor Glanville replied that there was broad agreement on the challenges of the congestion and traffic to both the capital in the borough. The close link between public health, traffic and sustainability is taken seriously by the council. The council would continue its membership of the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group and to analyse the data that TFL has collected during the implementation of the scheme. The council hoped that TFL would reconsider the scheme but it had to be recognised that it had been through several different gateways but it has to be recognised that it was now moving away from the council. The council had undertaken a number of other measures around sustainable travel – the Mayor was proud that the council was a public sector leader on programmes such as School Streets. The council was continuing with its most ambitious tree planting programme which would have a positive impact on air quality and public health. The council was looking at which species of trees are best linked to the council's green wall project and cleaner air. The council was strongly advocating for a better bus fleet. The

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Mayor highlighted Councillor Burke's work with TFL to get the 106 bus electrified which travels through the borough. The council was also putting more work into the creation of cycling and walking schemes. The public will be able to see the impact of the council's diesel surcharge to take those types of vehicles out of the local communities. The Mayor thanked Ms Rayner for raising her points with the council.

6.2 Question from Noah Birksted-Breen to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm

In spite of the best car-reduction schemes by Hackney Council, most Hackney residents are still breathing illegally toxic air. Will you commit to consult residents on removing non-essential cars from Hackney, alongside a borough-wide health campaign informing residents of the toxicity level in their ward plus the benefits of walking/cycling?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm

Councillor Burke began by explaining that Hackney Council was working hard in the borough and collaborating with other boroughs on a number of initiatives to improve air quality, such as with the pan London anti-idling programme. As mentioned previously by the Mayor, Hackney Council were also lobbying TFL, whose roads contribute to some of the highest levels of pollution in Hackney, as well as the Department of Transport requesting that they remove the obstacles that prevent local authorities from tackling issues around air pollution. Hackney was also currently updating its Air Quality Action Plan, which will include a number of actions to improve air quality in Hackney including a public health campaign. The Plan would be open to public consultation later in the year.

Councillor Burke explained that it was very difficult to define what were "non-essential cars" from Hackney. It was dependent on the particular circumstances of residents and it was not always possible to introduce a ban on car usage. Overall, Hackney was seeking to reduce car ownership and use through a large number of measures which include financial incentives for behaviour change as well as managing the supply and demand for road space e.g. including the use of emission based pricing for parking permits.

Councillor Burke spoke of how Hackney had played a key role in lobbying for the extension of the Ultra Low Emission Zone [ULEZ] and strengthening the LEZ. Hackney wanted to see the ULEZ beyond the previous boundary of the congestion charge zone but lobbied for a London-wide scheme. Whilst air quality was a more significant issue in Inner London there were still widespread failures of National Air Quality Objectives in Outer London. Hackney would continue to lobby for a London-wide ULEZ and for a progressive tightening of the restrictions in order to meet our national air quality objectives.

Councillor Burke further explained that Hackney had taken a lead in reallocating road space from motorised to sustainable and active modes through permeable filters, car-free streets; on-street cycle parking; parklets; Play Streets and School Streets. Hackney had been a long-standing proponent of using permeable filters on streets to allow cyclists to pass through neighbourhoods but not motor vehicles. Hackney had over 120 restrictions including bus gates, Ultra Low Emission Streets and School Streets. With the

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

School Streets programme cars were banned from entering certain streets around schools. Hackney's plan was to roll out the programme so that it covered all primary schools in the borough by January 2021. Complementing this programme was Hackney's long established sustainable travel to school programme encouraging reduced car use.

Councillor Burke went on to comment on how the council was pursuing a number of cycling and walking initiatives in the borough e.g. the installation of 420 cycle hangars in the borough with another 125 expected by the summer 2020. In December 2019, 70 car parking spaces were allocated to dockless and there are 10 parklets in the borough. Added to these initiative were cycle training, on-street cycle parking and an, expansion of the cycle route network. There was also a Liveable Neighbourhood scheme supporting reduced car usage and encourage more walking and cycling.

Turning to local air quality problems, Councillor Burke spoke of how in 2018 Hackney had introduced the restrictive Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV) streets in Shoreditch during peak times. This was the UK's first scheme that uses the ULEV criteria to reduce traffic dominance, improve air quality and promote more sustainable travel. The City Fringe Low Emission Neighbourhood was an ambitious area-wide liveable neighbourhood programme focused on addressing local air quality problems as well as complementing improvements to the public realm. The need to improve air quality has stimulated the establishment of a Zero Emissions Network (ZEN) in Shoreditch in 2019. For the last seven years, Hackney has been collaborating with the neighbouring boroughs of Islington and Tower Hamlets to improve air quality and encourage walking and cycling through the ZEN. Hackney had been working with 1400 local businesses and over 900 residents to raise awareness air quality issues.

Councillor Burke advised that these measures were being supported by broader health interventions in schools and sports such as the Daily Mile, which encouraged school children run or jog outdoors. Over 25 primary schools in the borough had taken part.

Supplementary question:

While celebrating the achievements of Hackney and its ambitions as a leading London Council tackling air quality, Mr Birsted-Breen asked the council whether they wished to consider being the first London council to be car free. Mr Birsed-Breen cited the examples of recent Councils who were seeking to make their city centres car free in the next three years. It was suggested that Hackney Council could set an example to its local residents and update them on air quality levels so they are aware when air levels have been breached.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm

Councillor Burke replied that the relationships that Mayor Glanville has successfully cultivated over the last year in the area of conservation and the successful programme of innovation were both impressed and inspired by the work of those citizens who have lobbied for car free city centres. It was important that centres like Hackney's remained a centre of economic activity. Councillor Burke added that those cities that had managed to bring in car-free city centres had more powers at their disposal than Hackney Council but in

principle the vision for an environment with cleaner air was to ever fewer cars on Hackney's roads and all the benefits that cascade out from doing it the vehicles, from the very presence can be viewed as hostile is something we can share.

Councillor Burke assured Mr Birstead-Breen that Hackney Council would leave no stone unturned to utilise the powers that it has to help achieve the shared goal of both Mr Birsted-Breen and the Council. In relation to the prohibition of specific vehicles on the road it was not within the powers of Hackney Council and that any work done in this area needed to be undertaken sensitively to bring the public along with the council, so that the public are aware that any measures will not affect someone in a household who had a lifelong disability, for example, and those other similar types of vulnerable persons are not affected by the council's desire to reduce car use.

6.3 Question from Mr Christopher Sills to The Cabinet Member for Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

In May 1968 when the Conservatives controlled the Council the twinning arrangements with a suburb of East Berlin were suspended and not revived. Would you agree with me that it is now time to revive it to show that Hackney wants to remain friends with the European Union (EU) people?

Response from Councillor Nicholson:

Councillor Nicholson replied that Hackney was a global borough, welcoming people from around the world. The borough had a rich, vibrant mix of different communities and is the sixth most diverse borough in London. About 15% of Hackney residents were from other EU countries. European citizens in Hackney make an enormous contribution to the civic, economic and cultural life of the borough. They were friends, neighbours, colleagues and valued members of Hackney's communities.

Councillor Nicholson added that the skills and expertise of these citizens from the EU, for example, had brought huge benefit to the local economies. They had been at the heart of Hackney's business growth and were vital to the local health and social care system.

Councillor Nicholson cited the Mayor's open letter to Hackney's EU citizens last month, in which he wrote that the UK leaving the EU changes nothing in how welcome and valued all 41,500 of them. Hackney Council would continue to support them – whether pressing the Government to ensure its EU Settlement Scheme did not become another mismanaged Windrush scandal, to lobbying for a fair and open immigration system.

Councillor Nicholson cited other examples of Hackney Council initiatives in support of its EU citizens including the Mayor's #HackneyLovesYou campaign and last year, the Council's passing of a motion in support of the borough's EU citizens. The Mayor had also wrote to all of Hackney's EU nationals on the electoral register, reminding them of their rights and also the help that was available to them from the council. Information was published on how EU nationals could apply for Settled Status from Government and there was the promotion of local organisations offering hope along with a walk-in-service at the Hackney Service Centre.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Councillor Nicholson explained that in terms of the council's formal international relationships, Hackney had twinning relationships with seven other towns and cities around the world. One of these dated back almost 60 years to 1962.

Hackney had developed strategic city relationships with other cities around the world, to promote economic activity and share knowledge and best practice. Hackney had also engaged formally with Oslo (alongside Austin, Texas), and had also had informal discussions with representatives from the public and private sectors of EU nations.

Hackney's work with Oslo had focused on tackling climate change and supporting the local green economy. Being the host of European Green Capital 2019 provided Oslo with the opportunity to implement a number of major transformational projects, which Hackney had been learning from. Hackney and Oslo had also supported each other's tech and creative sectors for the last seven years. Hackney remained a global borough and welcomed its EU friends.

Supplementary question:

Britain decided to leave the EU but wanted to remain friends with its citizens and reviving this hold twinning arrangement would be a good way. Would Hackney be interested in doing just that?

Response from Councillor Nicholson

Councillor Nicholson replied that he hoped that some of things that he touched on earlier addressed Mr Sills' question. Councillor Nicholson added that he was happy to have a further chat with Mr Sills outside the meeting to discuss the matter. The various different relationships all helped to ensure that Hackney continued with that great tradition of building relationships and communities both in Europe and beyond.

7 Questions from Members of the Council

7.1 Question from Cllr Ben Hayhurst for the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing needs

Can the cabinet member for Finance and Housing Needs give an update on the work the council has done to increase the take up of pension credit?

Response from Councillor Rennison:

Councillor Rennison replied that a recent exercise had taken place looking at all households where the Benefits and Housing Needs Service hold information relating to Housing Benefit customers. The exercise identified 830 households that were potentially eligible to claim Pension Credits but were not doing so. Around 100 were from mixed age couples for whom that entitlement no longer applied. Hackney Council, however, recognised that there was a significant number of households that were not claiming pension credits (this was likely to exceed those currently claiming Housing Benefit or Council Tax Support) when they were eligible and fully understand the consequences of this.

Councillor Rennison explained, that because of this, last year the council undertook an exercise to try and personally contact 100 mixed age couples in advance of the 13th

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

August 2019 legislative change deadline. They were advised to make a claim for Pension Credit. The council was working with AGE UK East London and the Older Persons Reference Group (OPRG) as to provide support for the claimants as well as regularly contacted with the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) to highlight residents' concerns. On the 28th September 2019 council officers had sent a letter to 741 households across Hackney advising them to make a claim for Pension Credit, providing guidance on how to make the claim and highlighting the support available from again AgeUK East London and OPRG. Households with identified income shortfalls were contacted by telephone and followed up with personal visits. Information was shared with colleagues in Council Tax and Housing Management Services making them aware of these residents so more targeted support could be provided when delivering their own campaigns for collecting rent and Council tax.

Councillor Rennison highlighted that members had been written to advising them of this campaign and providing details of the number of cases that were contacted in each of their areas. The council recognised and valued the role independent advice organisations play in supporting residents in realising their rights. As a result the council had protected advice grant budget from cuts and the council was working proactively with the advice sector to respond to the increasingly challenging environment.

The overarching principle of funded advice services was understanding what matters to residents in context, which include helping to identify unclaimed benefits or tax credits and helping people to claim. If, for example, a person approached a service about debt, they would highlight those organisations that help them in exploring other ways to support them. Advice was also being provided in health and community settings. This would help in reaching those people who may not go to traditional advice settings.

Councillor Rennison informed the members that the funding for Hackney's advice sector remained unchanged at approximately £770k. A further £120k was also available to support the advice sector based in General Practitioner (GP) surgeries. The council had also protected £2.6m for use on its wider voluntary sector grants programme.

The council was committed to maximising the income of Hackney's disadvantaged residents through a range of processes across its departments. Council officers would continue to engage with and lobby government departments against welfare reform and austerity. They would be reminded that central government was responsible to ensure all benefit take ups were maximised.

There was no supplementary questions.

7.2 Question from Cllr Michael Desmond to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs

Given damaging central government changes to the benefits system that is leaving Hackney residents in debt and in rent arrears, can the Cabinet Member for Finance update us on what the Council is doing to support residents who are struggling financially, particularly those that are in debt to the council?

Response from Councillor Rennison:

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Councillor Rennison replied that Hackney was a borough with high levels of deprivation and relatively low average incomes, with 48% of children in Hackney living in poverty. Continuing welfare cuts, according to research, was informing the council that household debt was increasing. To tackle this problem the council was seeking foremost to establish robust council policies and procedures to support those struggling residents. This was the council's top priority, but frontline services were under constantly increasing pressure. This had meant that the council had to ensure that means anyone who can pay their council tax was paying to maximise income back into the service. Three members workshops had been convened to design policies and principles that that ensured the council supported residents struggling to pay whilst sanctioning those who simply choose not to. The priority was supporting vulnerable residents. As a result of these workshops a 'Vulnerable Persons' Debt Policy' had been formulated along with a set of 'Debt Collection Principles' and a new 'Corporate Debt Collection Policy'.

Councillor Rennison went on to explain that the council had also begun implementation of the six asks of the Money Advice Trust's 'Stop the Knock' Campaign. This campaign sought to improve local government's debt collection practices to resolve early any debt problems. Hackney Council, because of its commitment to this campaign, had put forward a range of recommendations. These included:

- Reducing enforcement use over time
- Piloting the use of tools to aid more effective contact methods
- Increase earlier debt holder engagement
- Enforcement agents only to be used as a final engagement tool
- Anyone referred to the council's Enforcement Agents, whom was found to have a vulnerability, would be referred back to the council
- Standard Financial Statements to be adopted by council tax and housing teams in order to facilitate with residents debt repayment arrangements
- The adoption of a policy setting out the council's approach to indebted vulnerable residents across all services. This would sit alongside any service specific vulnerable persons' policy
- The council's signing up of the Citizens Advice Bureau's council tax protocol calling for more effective partnership working and improved information for council tax payers. These principles have been incorporated into the council's Corporate Debt Collection Policy.

Additionally, the council were working on a range of other initiatives in this area. This included developing a system for single payment for multiple debts, a Direct Debit campaign and an early intervention pilots of 'debt support appointments'.

Councillor Rennison explained that the Revenues Service had tried and tested these approaches with positive results for many of Hackney's residents. Housing and other services within the council were moving towards this way of working as the further roll outs continued across council services. As detailed in the Corporate Debt Collection Policy, the council was aiming to prevent households from falling into debt and support those that did. With this the council was seeking to achieve its vision of all Hackney residents being healthy and successful.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Desmond thanked Councillor Rennison for her response. Councillor Desmond stated that when he was on the government's scrutiny committee he was extremely concerned about the approach to vulnerable tenants. These latest developments were a step in the right direction. Councillor Desmond asked if Hackney Council was making tenants aware of the discretionary housing payment and, if so, was there anyway that the council could enhance the promotion of this scheme as there was a small sum of money available for when vulnerable persons got into debt.

Response from Councillor Rennison:

Councillor Rennison replied that such scheme would be better picked up through the IT that tenants could access, but it was more about how the council used discretionary housing payments through a range of uses for example regarding the tenancy with short rent costs. The council also had a hardship fund and a conversation with members could take place outside the council chamber to increase the uptake for that fund. The funding was there and it would be useful to determine if it was needed and there were other additional pots of hardship money available. Councillor Rennison agreed to write to Councillor Desmond after the meeting with a fuller response.

7.3 Question from Councillor Wrout to the Cabinet member for Community safety, policy, and the voluntary sector:

The Conservative government shamefully overturned a House of Lords amendment to the EU Withdrawal Bill, and ended the guarantee that child refugees have the right to join their families in the UK. Can the cabinet member with responsibility for child and family welfare, outline what, if anything, Hackney with its strong tradition of welcoming refugees, can do to help children and refugee families who are estranged, now the Bill has become law?

Response from Councillor Selman:

Councillor Selman replied that in Hackney there were 48 unaccompanied asylum seeking children being cared for (as at December 2019) which included five children who were accepted under the Dubs amendment to the Immigration Act. Hackney had only ever had two children reuniting with their families under the Dublin III regulation. In addition, the council were also supporting approximately 40 former unaccompanied asylum seeking children within the council's leaving care service.

Councillor Selman explained that the council would do all it could to meet the needs of child asylum seekers and refugees. This would be through a number of provisions in various areas, including accommodation and support in areas such as education and mental health support. Many of the unaccompanied asylum seeking children had significant emotional and mental health needs as a result of the trauma and distress that they had experienced. Additional support for unaccompanied asylum seeking children was now being provided through a project funded by the Government's Controlling Migration Fund. This project was aiming to develop supported lodgings options and support for Vietnamese, Albanian and Eritrean unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Councillor Selman explained that this would not be a short-term commitment with help and assistance will be needed over many years. The most important requirement was for the recruitment of foster carers and other suitable placements, as well as the provision of translation services and access to education, medical and health services.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Hackney recognised and supported the vital role that local councils play in caring for every unaccompanied children seeking asylum. This could only be achieved if sufficient resources from Government were guaranteed long term.

There was no supplementary question.

7.4 Question from Cllr Sophie Conway for Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

Can the cabinet member with responsibility for equalities update me in what steps they have taken to address concerns I raised with them about the discrimination young black Caribbean and African girls face when they choose to embrace their natural hair?

Response from Councillor Williams:

Councillor Williams thanked Councillor Conway for the question and for being given the opportunity to update members on a number of actions the council was taking across service areas to address the issues raised. Councillor Williams recalled clearly the conversations she had with Councillor Conway and she apologised that it had taken her so long to start those internal conversations with officers and Cabinet colleagues. Councillor Williams continued and spoke about how, over the last few years, there has been an evolving conversation about afro hair in national and international press, both positive and negative.

There were consciousness-raising headlines about where hair comes from for wigs and weaves, fuelling an international trade in the exploitation of women. There had been positive international news stories, for example the U.S state of Texas draft a hair discrimination bill. Recent research had shown that one in six children with afro-textured hair were having a bad experience at school, and that there has been a 66% rise in negative hair policies towards Afro hair.

The impact of hair discrimination stretched far beyond a child's educational experience, whether at school, 6th form or university. It follows them into the world of work where cane rows have been described as "scruffy" and "unprofessional" while at the same time celebrities appropriate this aspect of African and Caribbean culture. Councillor Williams explained that this was also a source of stress and anxiety no matter the age and she welcomed the positive shift in headlines about natural afro hair. She added that this positivity mirrors advances made in the last few years on body image and campaigns against body shaming. Councillor Williams acknowledged Councillor Conway's question, from last month's full council, raising concerns about workforce diversity and how the council could share lessons learned particularly across education. Councillor Williams was sure that Deputy Mayor Bramble would be happy to discuss sharing lessons learned, to bring diversity of experiences and perspectives to Hackney's schools whilst supporting innovation through encouraging a diversity of perspectives as an integral part of tackling underlying and systemic issues that might drive inequalities. Councillor Williams wanted to take a moment to reflect on the strong clear message the council was sending to young girls and boys to embrace and take pride in their identity which includes their natural afro-textured.

Councillor Williams highlighted how last year, Hackney schools participated in this year's World Afro Day. She applaud those that took part and would like to see more schools following suit and taking part so that the next generation feels confident about their heritage and their identity. Last year's Black History season featured the *We Got*

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Style! exhibition in Hackney Museum which connected with so many people's personal experiences of getting ready to go out at the weekend. The exhibition celebrated the vital cultural contribution of barbershops along with some of the challenges created by a widespread lack of knowledge about African-type hair. Hackney Museum had a great reputation for exhibitions like the one that was put on last year, celebrating the history, contribution and identity of Hackney's diverse populations. Councillor Williams spoke about Morningside Children's Centre's hosting of a Family Natural Hair Workshop, where participants were able to share stories/tips and advice about their own experiences in managing textured hair. They were offered the opportunity to have hands-on practice using curly textured mannequins to practice plaiting/cane row techniques.

Councillor Williams acknowledged the work of multiple Hackney councillors who had had a role in conveying Hackney's message of inclusion and diversity.

Deputy Mayor Bramble had taken a strong lead in delivering the Labour party vision for an inclusive approach to ensuring that everyone feels like a valued member of the local community and society. Deputy Mayor had been working with officers on developing an inclusive policy which she would take out to schools, parents and pupils later this year. It would give schools the tools they need to make the right decisions and choices that do not impact and interrupt pupils education. Councillor Nicholson, who had responsibility for culture and library services, was thanked by Councillor Williams for his patience as she assailed him with requests to have an input into the annual Black History Season planning committee. He had also listened to Councillor Williams' requests to expand the number of books in Hackney's libraries that tell young children positive stories of afro-textured hair. Councillor Williams recalled how only yesterday she had received confirmation that the library service would be buying copies of Hair Love in the short term and they would be working with her to increase their selection of books with positive messaging about afro hair. Councillor Williams had also asked the forward thinking policy and partnership team to look at including a scenario in the manager's diversity training module, promised by the Chief Executive last year. Councillor Williams hoped that everyone could see that this was a joint effort and that responsibility did not lie with just with schools. Services across the council needed to be aware of the challenges created by the lack of knowledge of afro hair. This approach will ensure officers have the training they need to challenge their assumptions and biases while providing the soft approach via cultural events to embark on a non-confrontational and inclusive dialogue.

Councillor Williams thanked Councillor Conway once again for her timely question and for giving her the opportunity to update members on a number of actions the council was taking across service areas to address the issues she had raised.

7.5 Question from Councillor Humaira Garasia to the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play

Can the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play provide an update on the commitment to make Hackney a child friendly borough?

Response from Councillor Kennedy:

Councillor Kennedy began by thanking Councillor Garasia for her question.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

The Councillor explained that the term Child-Friendly was first coined by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). It provided advice and guidance to developing nations where cities were being rapidly expanded or built from scratch. The aim was to ensure that consideration of children and young people and their needs did not get lost in the haste to build houses, workplaces and transport infrastructure. Councillor Kennedy added that it was not long before people realised that that principle was relevant in the inner cities of more developed countries. This was shown in child-friendly design and urban planning, on a basic level, acknowledges that not only playgrounds but all public spaces were important for young people as it made sure that they can feel a sense of ownership of where they live. In Hackney, the council was proud of its record of its continued investment in our parks and estates.

Councillor Kennedy highlighted how Hackney Council were early adopters of Play Streets, the scheme which gives groups of neighbours the option to apply to close their street to traffic for a few hours a month. This would enable children to reclaim the streets as their own, in a safe and secure environment.

Hackney Council also had the School Streets scheme, which created temporary road closures outside schools during pick-up and drop-off times, where only pedestrians and cyclists were allowed to use the road. The council was proud that over 87% of pupils now travelled to school using a sustainable mode of transport. Hackney had even produced a School Streets Toolkit, which was a blueprint for rolling out the scheme across councils nationally and Hackney Council had received interest in the scheme from as far afield as Toronto and Singapore.

Councillor Kennedy added that Hackney was also on course to be the first Borough to develop a Child Friendly Places Supplementary Planning Document. It would highlight existing places and spaces that children and young people value in the borough and include case studies of best practice to help define and illustrate the design guidelines. Once adopted the document would become a 'material consideration' in planning decisions embedding consideration of children and young people in the council's design and regeneration processes.

Councillor Kennedy went on to explain that young people were at the heart of the drafting of the SPD through workshop sessions held with the Hackney Youth Parliament. Deputy Mayor Bramble and Councillor Kennedy had recently attended one of these early findings suggested that what young people wanted from their city is similar to what adults do, for example a sense of ownership and belonging in their neighbourhood.

Members who have had any involvement with the Young Futures Commission findings or the Hackney Wick Through Young Eyes Report would recognise the theme and it is one that was being picked up across the city. Councillor Kennedy spoke of how he was privileged to hear Mayor Glanville speak at the launch of the Mayor of London's report entitled Making London Child-Friendly.

As Hackney Council continues consultation with the young people in the borough, the council would continue to ensure that their engagement was meaningful and genuinely influences the outcomes that affect their lives now and in the future. It was through young people's enduring participation in these decisions that Hackney would truly become a child-friendly borough.

Supplementary question:

What plans does the council have to increase provision for primary age children with Social Emotional and Mental Health issues?

Councillor Kennedy replied that there was a Cabinet meeting on the 24th February that approved in the Capital Programme a spend of £400K on a new additional resourced provision, or ARP, at Gainsborough Primary School in Hackney Wick. In partnership with the school this funding would develop ten placements for children with Social Emotional and Mental Health needs. Alongside the £250K for an ARP at Queensbridge and the Garden School would provide over £2million for a sixth form provision. This underlined Hackney Council's commitment as a council to combat the government's chronic underfunding of the High Needs Block by increasing in borough provision for local children with special educational needs and disabilities.

7.6 Question from Cllr Soraya Adejare for Cabinet member for Planning

Dalston is one of Hackney's most vibrant areas; its community has helped give Hackney the reputation as a creative heart of London. Can the Cabinet Member for Planning update us on the work to protect Dalston's character and its residents from the worst elements of regeneration and growth?

Response from Councillor Nicholson:

Councillor Nicholson replied that Hackney Council was preparing a new Supplementary Planning Document for Dalston known as the Dalston Plan. This plan would set out the planning framework for Dalston building upon the policies set out in the new Local Plan (LP33). To inform the preparation of the Dalston Plan the Council carried out an extensive local engagement exercise from 2018 called the Dalston Conversation. This engagement with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders, had seen leaflets distributed to over 9000 properties in Dalston and Shacklewell. So far 267 respondents had provided over 700 contributions to the objectives, as highlighted the key priorities and concerns for the local community and the council were using this feedback to prepare the plan. The plan would use the feedback from the Dalston Conversation as well as ongoing engagement in the area to identify key proposals and projects for Dalston that the Council will prioritise and deliver. These initiatives would build upon the investment already planned for Ridley Road and Ashwin Street as part of the Good Growth Fund programme. The first stage of the Dalston plan on the key issues and objectives for Dalston was currently out to public consultation until the 13th March 2020. Following this the responses would be reviewed and a draft Dalston plan would be available for further engagement later in 2020. In addition to the work on the Dalston Plan, the Council had also successfully bid for £770k of Greater London Authority (GLA) Good Growth funding in 2018. That would be matched funded by Hackney Council, making a £1.5m project that would be used to deliver a series of public realm improvements to Ridley Road (including seating, greening) and Ashwin Street alongside improvements to Dalston's town centre offer via new market stalls, handheld card machines for market traders and the installation of town centre wi-fi. Architects had been shortlisted and would engage with traders, businesses and residents to ensure the community and key stakeholders had input into the scheme designs.

7.7 In accordance with the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Paragraph 11.7), the Speaker advised that the allocated 30 minutes for the consideration of Questions by Members on Notice had come to an end. A written response would be provided for the remaining supplementary and three members' questions.

8 Elected Mayor's Statement

- 8.1 Mayor Glanville began his statement by talking about his new cabinet. He reflected on how usual Hackney politics were neatly mirroring the changes taking place at a national level from responding to the General Election result to tonight's budget. As the Mayor announced his new Cabinet, he stated that he was afraid that his announcement did not come with the same levels of drama as the Prime Minister and his Special Adviser's new 'night of the long knives'. He Mayor stated that he was sorry to disappoint the press in the room and he added that no advisers have been marched out of the Town Hall.

The Mayor was proud to announce the following changes to his cabinet:

- **Councillor Rebecca Rennison had been appointed Deputy Mayor. Housing supply, regeneration and strategy would be added to her portfolio, making her the cabinet member for finance, housing needs and supply**
- Councillor Chris Kennedy had been appointed Cabinet member for health, adult social care and leisure
- Councillor Jon Burke would add parks and green spaces to his portfolio
- Councillor Caroline Selman would take responsibility for our work on domestic violence and abuse
- Councillor Caroline Woodley was the new Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play
- From the 9th March I am appointing Councillor Yvonne Maxwell would be the new Mayoral Adviser for Older People

The Mayor spoke of how his new Cabinet would enable him to drive forward a radical agenda to deliver a manifesto commitment to make Hackney a fairer, safer and more sustainable borough. The Mayor highlighted that this was in starker contrast to the national cabinet reshuffle fiasco.

The Mayor next went on to highlight the issue of insourced schools cleaning. The Mayor spoke of how his fellow councillors would have seen the trade union UNITE's protest outside the Town Hall. One critical issue that the council has a lot of common ground and that was why the Mayor was at the protests outside the Homerton in recent weeks. The Mayor went on to state that was why the council shares common ground, because a key commitment from the manifesto was to explore insourcing more services into the council. The council had a track record of doing this and providing better pay and conditions. The Mayor spoke of how his new Cabinet team, was already delivering. He added that they were leading by example by using resources and levers to promote a more inclusive economy. This approach had been about making Hackney fairer for those that feel left behind and locked out of the massive opportunities that the local economy brings. This work would be used as a template for public and private organisations to insource services.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

Mayor Glanville explained that the council were bringing more of its services in-house, for example a raft of school cleaner and facilities jobs at ten schools in-house. Over 120 jobs in total, all of whom would now be on local authority contracts with all of the benefits that come with them.

The Mayor next spoke about climate emergency beginning by stating that a year ago, he was proud to personally declare a Climate Emergency - the Council caught up and under the leadership on this side of the chamber it did the same in June. The Mayor went on to state that it came as no surprise that on climate change, Hackney was leading the response to tackling the climate emergency locally. The council recognised that every layer of government needed to play its role and the council were determined to do its bit. The council had committed to do everything in its power to deliver net zero emissions by 2040, ten years earlier than the government. The Mayor added that Hackney Council were undertaking a number of measures to tackle climate change including switching to 100% renewable electricity by April this year, the largest tree planting programme in a generation, the rapid decarbonisation the Council's fleet vehicles and in spring of this year, the launching of the first large solar installation scheme by the council's municipal energy company, Hackney Light and Power. The Mayor explained that this scheme would improve the sustainability of Hackney's energy system by reducing energy demand while addressing fuel poverty through a new, borough-wide home insulation programme.

The Mayor reflected on the end of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) History Month progress that had been made in the fight for LGBT+ equality over the years and the further battles that were set to come. In Hackney, as was reaffirmed last month the council believed that it was important to stand up against prejudice and persecution in any form. Visibility was key, every LGBT History Month and Pride season, council proudly flies the rainbow flag from the top of its town hall. From the summer 2020, the council would be using the inclusive rainbow flag, which had extra colours to represent transgender people and queer people of colour. Hackney Museum would be co-ordinating an ongoing project to collect LGBT+ artefacts, as well as recruiting and training community volunteers to record LGBT+ oral histories so to capture those previously unheard voices. This year, as well as welcoming the return of events like Pride in the Park picnic, UK Black Pride, and Faggamuffin Bloc Party. The council were also looking at how services could be more inclusive for transgender, non-binary, gender non-conforming and intersex individuals who live, work or study in the borough. The Mayor spoke of how he looked forward to taking this message to a conference being held by the East London NHS Foundation Trust

(ELFT) on the 28th February. This was seen as clearly making a link to improving mental health for intersectional communities. In the summer, the council was due to launch a campaign to tackle a rise in homophobic hate crime, particularly around night-time economy areas, in partnership with the police and the borough's LGBT+ venues.

The Mayor recollected on how the AIDS crisis was used as an opportunity to stigmatise members of the LGBT community and an excuse to perpetuate violence and discrimination against the LGBT community. This

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

had cast a long shadow. Tackling HIV prevalence and reducing HIV transmissions had long been a priority for the Mayor and his administration. This was why the Mayor continued to call on the government to fund the life-changing HIV preventative drug pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). This had been shown to be nearly 100% effective in preventing HIV transmissions. The very basis of the NHS was that such life-changing treatments should be widely accessible, not just available to those who can afford to pay. The Mayor was of the view that if the government was serious about its pledge to get to zero new HIV transmissions by 2030, then it must make PrEP widely available as part of a national PrEP programme.

The government must step up and commit to making PrEP permanently available so people are guaranteed access to this life-changing preventative treatment and put this commitment into law. The NHS Funding Bill, currently going through Parliament, was a window to do just that but the government risked missing this opportunity, which would have such life-changing and dramatic effects on so many lives. The Mayor had written to the Health Secretary and would continue to raise this at the very highest levels of government.

The Mayor addressed the egregious mistakes that been made relating to the Windrush generation. He and his fellow elected representatives and community leaders, were appalled about how some of Hackney's residents had been treated as second class citizens. The Mayor spoke of how Hackney was proud to have a long-cherished history of being a destination for new arrivals to the UK, making it the special place it was today. The Windrush scandal was an example where the council had stepped up to challenge the hostile environment and stand up for its values of openness, diversity and tolerance. The Mayor was delighted that Hackney's Windrush Generations Festival was the winner of this year's Hearts for the Arts Best Arts Project – Community Cohesion Award. He added that the council would continue to celebrate the historic contribution made by the Windrush generation, as well as other migrant communities. At the same time the council would to continue to campaign to end the government's hostile environment. The government's policies had caused significant anguish and harm to local residents. The Mayor and Councillor Williams had to both written the Home Secretary and the Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee putting forward a number of recommendations. These included, for example, repealing the hostile immigration policies, the setting up a compensation scheme to holding a public and independent inquiry into the matter. The Mayor and Councillor Williams would continue to call for these wrongs to be redressed. The Mayor added, that on the 2nd March, between 4pm and 7pm, at the Hackney Museum, the council would be hosting at Windrush Drop in session to support those families affected.

The Mayor paid tribute the tireless work and efforts of Council officers. Without their dedication and support of the staff the council would not have been able to do achieve things that it had. The Mayor acknowledged that there were council officers who were taking voluntary redundancy and he wanted to pay tribute to their service to the borough. In particular, the Mayor wanted to draw particular attention to four officers were moving on or retiring:

- Tess Merrett

Tess had managed full Council and Cabinet meetings and has been the leading figure in the Council in ensuring that all council-related meetings ran smoothly. Tess had worked tirelessly to ensure that the council complied with all the constitutional rules, that it and cabinet reports were on time and that meetings ran orderly.

The Mayor thanked Tess for her years of service to all members of the council and wished her a very happy retirement.

- Suki Binjal

The Mayor commented that Suki had been with the Council over two and a half years, joining in 2017. During this time she had worked on modernising the Legal Services team and the programme of 'Excellence in Governance'. This had included work on schemes of delegation, the constitution and new procedures around decision-making. Suki had been most visible at council supporting the Speaker directly ensuring that meetings were well run and that councillors were kept safe in their decision making.

The Mayor wished Suki well in her new role in Birmingham and thank her for all of her clear advice.

- Michael Honeysett

The Mayor spoke about how Michael joined Hackney Council in December 2002 as Chief Accountant. He had been instrumental to the financial journey the council had been on over the last 18 years and in his current role as Director of Financial Management since 2009 during which time Hackney had maintained its strong record for sound financial management. This was at the same time as experiencing some of the biggest funding reductions in local government. The Mayor wanted to thank him for all the work that he has done for the council and his work on the budget at the February council meeting.

- Kay Brown

The Mayor spoke of Kay, the Director of Customer Services, who had been with the council for 19 years. Kay had joined the council as interim Head of Support Services back in 2001. The Mayor wished her a long and happy retirement. He thanked her for her years of service, as well as for the ongoing support she had provided to the Mayor and his office. Kay had been a credit to the council and her tireless commitment to public service had transformed the lives of so many of Hackney's residents.

- 8.2 Councillor Steinberger began by stating that he was not prepared for so many exits at the council meeting. He felt that his normal five minutes was not enough as it goes so quick. He started off by thanking the council officers and in particular Suki Binjal. He commented that the council had so many legal advisors since he had become a councillor but what he felt with Suki was that any time he needed to have a meeting with her, for whatever reason it was Suki was always there for the councillors. The councillor spoke of how he could easily get through directly to Suki if he needed to and she was always available. Councillor Steinberger spoke of how he would try to go to Suki's

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

leaving party on the 27th February and he spoke of how it would be hard for whoever would be filling her shoes after her. Hopefully they would be trained very well, however, Councillor Steinberger felt it would be very hard. He noted that Suki, whenever there was any stress, she was always smiling. The council would miss that. Councillor Steinberger wished her luck and he was sure she would be good at her job. The councillor was slightly concerned that this was a voluntary redundancy and it appeared that the council had not renewed Suki's post. The councillor would welcome clarification on this matter.

Councillor Steinberger reflected on Michael Honeysett's time as a council officer and he felt that if he started talking about him he would still be talking about him in ten years' time. The Councillor noted the Mayor's comment that he gets his paper the next day whilst he got the paper straightaway! The councillor thought he may have more luck than the Mayor. The councillor thanked Michael for helping him all along but they were restricted in that they could do. Michael had always been there to help them and the councillor wished him all the success. The councillor commented how he met Michael earlier and he had not mentioned anything about him leaving the council, so as far as he was concerned he thought Michael was staying. The councillor thought that Michael leaving had only just happened. Councillor Steinberger thanked Michael for the all the work that he had done. Councillor Steinberger next talked about Tess Merrett and reflected how hard a job it was, and it had been quite so in the past with matters such as clearance of with the council minutes. He thanked Tess for all the professional work that she had done and her support to the minority group over the years, and that up to this point, and in dealing with Tess on work matters more recently, including earlier that day too there had been no mention by her of the impending departure. Councillor Steinberger spoke of how when the Mayor mentioned there was four people leaving he thought he meant him, though that was now not the case. That did not happen. Councillor Steinberger wished the Mayor happy birthday for the 27th February.

Councillor Steinberger recalled the Mayor's comments earlier about community cohesion and though last time the councillor could not get up to speak because the leader of the opposition spoke, and he was the Deputy Leader, Councillor Steinberger wanted to echo that it did not matter which community you are, who you are, what age you are, young or old, all the communities work together and in fact the relationship should be better and it should be irrelevant what party everyone was. When in the council chamber the councillors were working for the Hackney residents. Councillor Steinberger supported Mayor Glanville in everything, whatever it was, it was a shame that it was not about all the community, which was fine, but in the council chamber. Councillor Steinberger added that this followed on from the problem that the opposition had in their area, where local residents were going to court about the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), it was understood during this week. Councillor Steinberger wished them much success and he did not believe that the CPZ lived up to their needs, all the resident needs. Councillor Steinberger addressed comments that had been made previously about whom among the opposition supported U.S President Donald Trump, as far as Councillor Steinberger was concerned all five members of the opposition jolly well supported Donald Trump. The councillor was not sure where the Mayor got his information from on this matter. All the members of the opposition admired Donald Trump and Councillor Steinberger reiterated that he was not sure where the Mayor got his information

from. The councillor was of the view that the Mayor had not done his homework on this.

Councillor Steinberger noted the Mayor's comments earlier on regarding Homerton and how he had mentioned that he was outside rather than inside. Councillor Steinberger wondered why the Mayor could not be let in. The councillor noted that the Evening Standard newspaper was shocked about the Ridley Road markets shenanigans, so it was very nice to hear that extra money was coming in. The shopkeepers were very happy, some of whom had been there 30-40 years, now they were actually getting what they need.

Councillor Steinberger spoke about how the opposition would always be there for the different communities. The councillor apologised if there had been some mixed messages.

- 8.3 The Speaker thanked Councillor Steinberger for his comments and wished the Mayor a happy birthday.
- 8.4 Mayor Glanville replied that Councillor Steinberger had given him the best birthday present ever which was naming things that he was to talk about in his five minute response. Commenting on those members of the council staff who would shortly be leaving the council, the Mayor was delighted to announce that Dawn Carter-McDonald would be taking over from Suki.

The Mayor next talked about bringing on talent and he was delighted with the news that Councillor Demirci had been elected to parliament. The Mayor wished them luck, hopefully, to the council's next elected representative at City Hall.

Mayor Glanville explained that when earlier he had been speaking about the work the council was doing during the LGBTQ+ month during this period, in relation to combatting hate crime, the council had also been doing some intensive work with the other communities that had been feeling pressure. During discussions at Holocaust Memorial there had been discussions not only about antisemitism but also challenges around homophobia as well. As well as running that campaign against homophobia throughout the summer the council would also be doing further work in Stamford Hill and it was hoped that members of the opposition work with the council in the promotion of this work and it was ensuring there was dedicated resource for this work, wrapped around the BCU. The Mayor wanted to make ensure that all Hackney residents wherever they feel under threat from hate crime they have a place to go and what they had to say was taken seriously. Those people who feel threatened the council would stand up for them and the Mayor spoke of how he had taken on board what Councillor Steinberger had said.

The Mayor, commenting on the markets, and building Councillor Nicholson's earlier comments, the Mayor was in Dalston recently with the council's market trading team talking to both market traders and the public about investment in the market and how the work the council was doing to make improvements. The Mayor spoke of how it was interesting to speak to market traders and who had told him that they were happier with the market team than any other team that they had worked with in the council. The Mayor explained that at a Market Traders meeting, on the 25th February, a commitment was made to regularly

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

meet with market traders to ensure that the council continues to invest in the market and the environment around Dalston. It was important for the council to get all the parameters around planning to make that the market and the economy were right the public in Dalston.

The Mayor confirmed, as mentioned earlier, that he was outside Homerton Hospital. He was refused entry, the Mayor explained that he was there to simply wish the Chief Executive of the hospital a happy Christmas. The security staff would not allow him into the building, along with a member of the clergy. The Hackney Gazette's reporting of the incident was noted. The council was keen to see more in house services with sick pay and career progression for example. Talking to the staff in Homerton they had given decades of public service to the National Health Service (NHS), they were often Hackney residents themselves. Important points had been raised by governors at Homerton and there could not be a situation where people were afraid to take sick leave. It was hoped that everyone in the council chamber stood in solidarity with the Homerton workers.

9 Budget and Council Tax Report

- 9.1 The Mayor introduced the agenda item and began by stating that the recent changes announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not altered the direction of council finances. The Mayor continued by thanking the council's Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources and his team, along with the cabinet for their work on the budget. The Mayor explained that this budget was against a backdrop of continued austerity. The Mayor gave a brief overview of the spending cuts that began almost a decade ago which saw the council's core government funding cut by £140 million. Per Household, Hackney had seen the biggest funding cut of any London Borough at 45 percent. This equated to £529 from every single Hackney resident. This was £1,459 for every single Hackney household. The Mayor saw this as a gap impossible to bridge through council tax rises. This would result in money out of the pockets of the borough's very poorest residents.
- 9.2 The Mayor added that it was felt that the government had done nothing improve the lives of residents. Instead it was felt that they had undertaken a damaging and destructive programme of welfare reform along with a failure to regulate the private rented sector - worsening the housing crisis, along with a failure to stand up for employment rights for those poorer residents. There was a lost health Tory austerity has brought about a lost health decade with life expectancy growth having stalled for the first time in 100 years. Despite increasing demands for Hackney services austerity has meant that the council still needs to find an additional £19 million of savings by 2022.
- 9.3 The Mayor was of the view that Hackney stood to be one of the biggest losers of the government's proposed Fair Funding Formula - despite Hackney having high levels of need. The Mayor saw this as one of the biggest threats faced by the council and he called on opposition members him in speaking up for Hackney. Under the Government's proposals, "deprivation" and "homelessness" were to be removed as categories from the formula altogether. Hackney Council continues to campaign against these cuts which they saw as regressive. The council was committed to mitigating against them and prevent these cuts falling hardest in the borough. Regrettably Council Tax has had to be increased. This equated to about 90p a week for most there was no other choice. Despite this, Hackney still has one of the lowest Council tax rates in London.
- 9.4 The Mayor spoke of the how the budget demonstrated that the council was still ambitious for Hackney with fairness at its heart. It included investment decisions that would benefit Hackney's residents and businesses. The budget would help to make Hackney fairer, safer, healthier and more sustainable. This was achieved by investing in what matters, reviewing council fees and charges, launching a voluntary redundancy scheme, a new workforce strategy that sought to reduce agency spend. The council was also using this opportunity of the performance of its pension fund to prudently reduce contributions to invest in services. The Mayor paid tribute to the pension committee and especially it's Chair, Councillor Chapman. He had not only lead progress on divestment, but

had also safe guarded the council's key duty for both today and tomorrow's pensioners.

- 9.5 The Mayor spoke how the council was making a pledge for more money to help those local residents in poverty. The council was increasing the support available to help low or no income families, pensioners and care leavers through the Council Tax Reduction Scheme. This would benefit 27,000 households. Work would continue to ensure that all of the boroughs families on low or no incomes pay no Council Tax at all by 2030. Work would begin in 2020 to map out this journey and ensure that the council enters the next election with a commitment to reduce the council rate by 10 per cent. The council would invest an extra £500,000 to directly support Hackney's poorest residents, including help for families in food poverty to access fresh, healthy food. There was also a grants programme seeing nearly £ 3 million invested into local communities.
- 9.6 The Mayor spoke of how Hackney Council would continue to make its service delivery fairer with, for example, bringing its school cleaning and facilities contract for 10 schools in-house. The council would continue to fund its award winning employment and apprenticeship scheme and would continue to invest in Hackney Works, Supported Employment and Project Search internships for residents with learning disabilities.
- 9.7 The Mayor next spoke of how the budget was seeking to make Hackney safer by investing £7.3m to fund programmes like the Integrated Gangs Unit. The council would also expand its Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) network. The council was also setting aside a one-off £1.6m resource for its Children and Families Service to help keep local children and families more safe. The council would also continue to invest in the services which make Hackney such a great place to live.
- 9.8 The Mayor listed the investment in Hackney's parks and green spaces including £5m to restore Abney Park Cemetery, £130k on Daubeney Fields, £4m on improving Springfield Park, £500k to refurbish Fairchild's Garden and £2m for upgrading Shoreditch Park. This would take the total investment in Hackney's parks and green spaces to over £17m over the next 3-4 years. There would also be a new multi-million pound leisure centre at Britannia, better facilities at London Fields, Clissold, Kings Hall and our paddling pools. There was also 250 new homes with £60m in in existing housing stock. The Mayor added that last year the Council declared a climate emergency, and making Hackney greener and more sustainable runs through the heart of the budget. The council would plan an extra 30,000 trees in the streets, parks and green spaces, and install energy efficient bulbs in all of the street lights. This was saving money and the planet as the council went green. The Mayor explained that the budget demonstrated - now, more than ever, it was only the Labour administration that would stand up to the government and who were ambitious for a fairer, safer and more sustainable Hackney.

The Mayor commended the Budget to Council.

- 9.9 Councillor Steinberger proposed an amendment to the budget as set out in the amendment paper submitted. Councillor Odze seconded the amendment paper.
- 9.10 Councillor Steinberger began by thanking the team that had worked on the budget. The councillor thanked in particular Ian Williams. The Councillor spoke of how he looked at the budget and asked himself 'how on earth can this be a budget?' The councillor spoke of his disappointment of how as the opposition they did not get to make a budget they got to make amendments. Councillor Steinberger spoke of how if the opposition was to make a budget it would not be like the one that had been submitted to council today. He spoke of how several things in the budget submitted were not quite right and did not add up at all. He added that he could go all day and night about what was wrong with the budget. Councillor Steinberger spoke of how he was flabbergasted by the budget and how whether someone started with the Hackney part or the Mayor's part of the budget it was ridiculous.
- 9.11 Councillor Steinberger recommended that the two parties could meet prior to the submission of the budget to see if there was anything that could be agreed on. The councillor highlighted how the Mayor had referred several times to climate change in the budget but there were other areas that the budget must consider. Councillor Steinberger asked the council to consider what steps the Mayor of London was taking, the councillor cited the example of the West Bank Cycle lane. He also thanked Councillor Clarke for all the work she had done and he was happy to see that she was now in parliament. Going back to West Bank the Councillor spoke of how it was interesting that the local residents called the cycle lane 'fox lane' because they never saw a cyclist there at all. The councillor spoke of, how like the Mayor of London, Hackney Council was good at wasting money which in his view it was unbelievable. The councillor asked that if cycling was to be added to the budget, then he accepted that he and a lot of people had to lose weight but priorities had to be set right and it had to work. Councillor Steinberger was of the view that the statistics that were being quoted by the Mayor were not exactly the correct statistics. Councillor Steinberger continued by highlighting how strange it was with all the shenanigans and how it was all the same hobby horses again and again.
- 9.12 Councillor Steinberger turned his attention next to Hackney Today, or as he preferred to call it - Hackney Yesterday. He spoke of how he still received it four times a year and it was rubbish. Councillor Steinberger spoke of how he was guaranteed to get recycling because everyone gets one (a copy of Hackney Today). Councillor Steinberger, referring to Hackney Life, spoke of how, someone had come to his house on the 25th February and given him a copy of Hackney Life. Councillor Steinberger referred to it as Hackney Dead, highlighting how when there was a consultation on Hackney Today the council had said it was not a referendum it was a consultation. Councillor Steinberger was not clear what the Mayor wanted the opposition to say? Was it up to them to say about all the money that was being wasted on these type of things? The councillor argued that the council kept on doing this. The council said it consulted but the councillor was of the view that they were not doing this and that all they were really doing was trying to get to a place where the Mayor gets what it wants. The councillor spoke of how it was shame, because the budget was serious and he spoke of how he, and his fellow opposition members, did not support benefit cuts generally. Families need money to live and at the same

time Councillor Steinberger spoke of how he would like to see the pot, the extra money that was there for local residents to claim, more people should know more about it, as it was felt by the councillor that enough people knew about it. The councillor looking at the halls and the council's various estates and was of the view that the council did not use these to their full potential to bring in the money that is there. Councillor Steinberger concluded that before the Mayor started his consultation about collecting rubbish the outcome was actually interesting in that the council was going to go with once a week. Yet what the council had done was punish local residents who had done the recycling, they would get their rubbish collected once every two weeks, whilst other estates would get their rubbish collected every week. The people who had recycled up to now, the ones with the big families, were the ones that were being punished. The council had to get its act together.

9.13 Mayor Glanville replied by commenting on how the opposition's amendments to the budget were light on detail and it was felt that it was a sustained attack on the people of Hackney and it was felt that the opposition failed to understand. The Mayor added that because Labour was in the majority in the Council was that they understood the priorities of local residents better than the smaller opposition. Local residents' priorities were to walk down streets that were well lit do not cause them to trip over or fall into pot holes. It was suggested that the opposition were making a pre-London election attack on the Mayor of London wanting him to invest less money on local police. It was felt that it was good that London had a Mayor was increasing the council tax spend on 3000 new police officers. The opposition were questioning whether those officers in the budget, Mayor Glanville insisted that they were coming and they were being deployed into Hackney. The Mayor highlighted the £1.2 million that was being invested in young Londoners to help fund grass roots groups in Hackney to help local communities and tackle youth violence and help local communities come together. Addressing Councillor Steinberger's comments about recycling the Mayor replied that details as set out in the budget was the only way it could be done in a sensitive way. The councillor was correct in that it had generated the largest number of responses to the biggest consultation Hackney Council had ever conducted, there were exciting results but at this stage the Mayor could not talk about the results. The council had heard what people had said and they would continue to invest in estate recycling. The Mayor found it surprising that Councillor Odze had allowed Hackney Live to get into the alternative budget, as normally he was seen as stickler for spelling mistakes. The Mayor was of the view that the opposition appeared to have a particular wish to take no action against air pollution. The Mayor reminded the councillor that the cycle superhighway route went down the west bank because of a decision made by the previous London Mayor, Boris Johnson not the current London Mayor Sadiq Khan. The Mayor welcomed the opposition's wish to see no reduction in funding for children with special needs, this was something that all councillors were united on in the council chamber. The Mayor said he looked forward to see the opposition joining Deputy Mayor Bramble on the 28th February on a march to stand up for those protections for those children. It was hoped that the opposition could also join Labour councillors on the 2nd March in defence of child nurseries.

9.14 Mayor Glanville accused opposition councillors of undermining the entire budget around sustainable transport and the freedom pass by reviewing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) with a view to removing them. The Mayor

went on to highlight how in their amendments the opposition was proposing to move car parking spaces into those areas with the lowest levels of car ownership and the highest levels of air pollution which he felt was an absolute disgrace. The Mayor added that the opposition then wanted to cut the largest piece of green investment in their own wards with a review of the capital pass scheme. The Mayor assured Councillor Steinberger that there were toilets in the pass scheme as he used them in the past. In the amendments to the budget the opposition made several references to the ward forums and accountability, the Mayor raised concerns about the opposition's proposals to remove ward forums. This would make the council less accountable to its residents and, a bit like the opposition's Hackney Life proposals, would mean council news reaching fewer residents. The Mayor believed that the opposition's proposals were a shambles from beginning to the end.

- 9.15 Councillor Odze began by assuring the Mayor that he had seen the spelling mistake that he eluded to earlier but for the sake of printing it again and using more paper he decided to leave it. On the Springfield Park issue the Councillor highlighted that there was no mention in their amendments about cutting anything, it was actually a misprint, the toilets that had been referred to were on the lower not the upper level as the councillor was a member of the steering group on the regeneration of Springfield Park. What was being asked for was toilets on the lower level for those with young children and for disabled people who found it difficult to access the upper level especially if they enter the park from the other side. Currently there was no funding for this work and Councillor Odze had suggested that once side by side when there was the move to the new site it could be included as part of the work. Councillor Odze reiterated that the opposition were not seeking any cuts in the funding for the Springfield Park they were just trying to make sure that the funding that was there was being used efficiently. Referring to the beginning of the Mayor's statement about austerity, Councillor Odze reminded the council, as he done so on many occasions in the past at council, that austerity was put into place as a direct result of the policies of the former Chancellor of Exchequer Gordon Brown, evidence of which was shown with the note left by Labour's ex-Treasury Secretary Liam Byrne for his successor, that stated that there was no money left. Councillor Odze commented on the Mayor's comments about the number of new trees being placed in the borough were not going to be placed in the same way that lamp posts were and that this time around a bit of common sense was used and not starting in one place and going every 20 yards. Regarding the use of LED bulbs, Councillor Odze clarified that he knew they were energy efficient but sometimes you had to 'cut your coat to suit your cloth' as the council was now in a time of financial restrictions and the opposition wanted to know how long it would take for those bulbs, which were expensive, how long would it take for the borough to get the benefit of those bulbs?

The council moved to a recorded vote for the proposed amendment to the budget.

Vote:

Yes: 3
No: 48
Abstentions: 0

The council next moved to a discussion on the Mayor's budget.

- 9.16 Councillor Stops began the discussion by referring to page 291 of the budget regarding 'the highest standards of urban design'. The councillor spoke of how over many years he had talked in the council chamber about urban design because it was important to the people of Hackney. The budget talks about the young persons' agenda, the older persons' agenda, the disable persons' agenda etc and there were some great examples in Hackney and Councillor Stops hoped that Hackney would not lose its reputation for good urban design. The councillor referred to Mare Street and how a few years ago renowned Danish architect and urban design consultant, Jan Gehl, had spoken to him and had talked about Hackney Central and how a great city street it was. The councillor saw this as a testament to some of the work that had been done over the years. Councillor Stops cited the Narrowway as an another good example of urban design where it was people and place. There was great urban design across the borough, Dalston and Kingsland and Church Street were cited as other good examples of this by Councillor Stops. Church Street was seen as a good place to work, rest and play and again it was about people and place. Councillor Stops contrasted this with awful examples of urban design, e.g. in parts of Whitechapel. Councillor Stops concluded that Hackney had an aspiration to uphold its reputation for good urban design and it was hoped that this would continue.
- 9.17 Councillor Robert Chapman spoke about the role of the Pensions Committee and its contribution to the budget. The councillor in the past had spoken to the council regarding the issue of risk and the councillor highlighted that in the budget that the council was well on the way to reaching its targets and was at this stage well ahead. The main focus of Councillor's Chapman's comments were on the overall financial performance of the council. The councillor thanked the Mayor for his kind recognition earlier of the work of the Pensions Committee and then went on to highlight some of the markers. Currently Hackney Council's asset level was at a record high of £1.7 million and actuarial variation level had just got up to 92 percent, up from 77 percent in 2016. As result of this there had been a reduction in the employer's contribution to the council with, over the last three years, make a saving of £14 million. This saving has been made available in the council budget across education, housing and other frontline services and has a significant effect on the financial stresses that the council has faced and has also helped offset the impact of government cuts as a result of austerity which would help the council to deliver its own manifesto. For the further the council has announced a further saving of £1.7 million which would help to balance the budget this year and there would be further savings over the next two years. Councillor Chapman concluded that the council was obligated to provide a strong financial performance and value for money. The employer's contribution to the pension was a significant part of the budget and the council would seek to reduce it where it could. Councillor Chapman thanked the council for its support for this work and the Pensions Committee would strive to ensure that this work was at the forefront of everything it did in the future.
- 9.18 Mayor Glanville replied by first expressing his disappointment that there had not been a fuller debate on the budget in council. The Mayor thanked the Councillor Stops and Councillor Chapman for their contributions. The Mayor, responding to Councillor Odze's comments, first confirmed that investment in LED lights was saving the council £70,000 a year in revenue funding before which had transformed Hackney with modest early takings in savings. Over time those

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

savings would accrue. The Mayor added that use of LED bulbs would lead to lower energy use (60% use) and less maintenance costs. The council was also using LED bulbs as they often provided better lighting and reduce the wider carbon environmental impact. Mayor Glanville acknowledged Councillor Stops' comments and the Mayor responded that the budget and council policy would continue to invest in a high quality public realm and the Mayor fully commended the work of Councillor Stops in delivering those schemes in partnership with Councillor Clarke, council officers and the legacy that Councillor Burke was building on. The Mayor recognised that he differed with Councillor Stops on Wick Road, which the Mayor believed was an excellent example of a public realm – it had reduced community severance, had led to car parking spaces, it improved one of the bus routes, segregated cycling and new trees in that area. The Mayor look forward to seeing similar schemes in the future and the Mayor insisted that the council never wanted to clutter the public realm given the leadership that already been shown on this. The Mayor echoed Councillor Chapman's earlier comments that without that commitment to reducing the pension scheme that the council had then the council would not have got to the 92 percent rate and the council would not have been able to safeguard the scheme for council workers. The Mayor and Councillor Chapman would agree that the Pensions Committee was a good example of open democracy in the borough. The Mayor concluded by commending the budget to council.

On a recorded vote there being:

Vote:

For:	47
Against:	3
Abstentions:	0

RESOLVED

Council is recommended:

- 3.2.1 To bring forward into 2020/21 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £15m**
- 3.2.2 To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1, below.**
- 3.2.3 To note that the budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan attached at Appendix 11.**

- 3.2.4 To note that in line with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources, is of the view that:

The General Fund balances of £15.0m and the level of reserves, particularly in relation to capital, are adequate to meet the Council's financial needs for 2020/21 and that considering the economic uncertainty they should not fall below this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest audited Accounts as at 31 March 2019, 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 £15m by 31 March 2020 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 2020/21. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2019/20 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2019 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.

- 3.2.5 To approve the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 8 for implementation from 1st April 2020.

- 3.2.6 To continue the policy requiring the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to seek to mitigate the impact of significant changes to either resources, such as Top Up Grant changes, or expenditure requirements.

- 3.2.7 To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 20th January 2020.

- 3.2.8 To authorise the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to implement any virements required to allocate provision for demand and growth pressures set out in this report subject to the appropriate evidence base being provided.

- 3.2.9 To approve:

The allocation of resources to the 2020/21 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7.

The allocation of resources to the 2020/21 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 20th 2020.

- 3.2.10 To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2020/21.

- 3.2.11 To agree the prudential indicators for Capital Expenditure and the Capital Financing Requirement, the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for External Debt, the Affordability prudential indicators and the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators for 2020/21 as set out in paragraph 25, and Appendix 3.**
- 3.2.12 To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £552m agreed above for 2020/21 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003. Further reassurance about the robustness of the budget is the confirmation that the Council's borrowings are within the boundaries of prudential guidelines.**
- 3.2.13 To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.**
- 3.2.14 To note that at its meeting on 20 January 2020 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2020/21 financial year as 74,386 in accordance with regulations made under section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The Council Tax Base is the total number of properties in each of the eight council tax bands A to H converted to an equivalent number of band D properties.**
- 3.2.15(1) To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.**

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

- (a) £1,157.900m being the expenditure which the authority estimates it will incur in the year in performing its functions and will charge to a revenue account, other than a BID Revenue Account, for the year in accordance with proper practices.**
- (b) £2m being such allowance as the authority estimates will be appropriate for contingencies in relation to amounts to be charged or credited to a revenue account for the year in accordance with proper practices.**
- (c) £nil being the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will be appropriate to raise in the year for meeting its estimated future expenditure.**
- (d) £nil being such financial reserves as are sufficient to meet so much of the amount estimated by the authority to be a revenue account deficit for any earlier financial year as has not already been provided for.**

- (e) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the 1988 Act, and
- (f) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its general fund to its collection fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(5) of the 1988 Act and charged to a revenue account for the year.

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

- (a) £1,069.036m 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) £3.118m being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with section 97(3) of the 1988 Act.
- (c) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(4) of the 1988 Act and will be credited to a revenue account for the year, and
- (d) £nil being the amount of the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will use in order to provide for the items mentioned in subsection (2) (a), (b), (e) and (f) above.

3.2.17 £87.746m being the amount by which the aggregate calculated under subsection (1) above exceeds that calculated under subsection (2) above, the authority calculates the amount equal to the difference; and the amount so calculated is its Council Tax Requirement for the year.

3.2.18 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, £1,179.61 as the basic amount of its council tax for the year

3.2.19 That the Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council tax for 2020/21 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

HACKNEY							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£786.40	£917.48	£1,048.54	£1,179.61	£1,441.74	£1,703.88	£1,966.01	£2,359.22

3.2.20 That it be noted that for 2020/21 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 - GLA							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£221.38	£258.28	£295.17	£332.07	£405.86	£479.66	£553.45	£664.14

3.2.21 That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3.2.19 and 3.2.20 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for 2020/21 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.

VALUATION BANDS - COMBINED HACKNEY AND GLA							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£1,007.78	£1,175.76	£1,343.71	£1,511.68	£1,847.60	£2,183.54	£2,519.46	£3,023.36

Note: Subject to GLA confirmation of precept on 24 February 2020

3.2.22 To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.16 to 3.2.18 that Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2020/21 be £87.746m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,179.61 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,511.68 including the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept. An analysis of the tax base total Band D Council Tax across Council Tax Bands is shown in 3.2.21 above and an exemplification of the taxbase and discounts by band, is shown in Appendix 5.

3.2.23 To agree that in accordance with principles approved under section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and the new provisions included in the Localism Act 2011, the increase in the Council's Council Tax requirement for 2020/21 as shown at Appendix 9 is not excessive (4% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.

3.2.24 To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2020/21 to 2022/23, set out at Appendix 3.

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

3.2.26 To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in paragraphs 25.21-25.31 below.

10 Annual Pay Policy Statement

10.1 The draft annual pay policy statement for 2020/21 was agreed by council.

RESOLVED

That the annual Pay Policy Statement be approved.

11 Executive Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and Partnership Response to Escalation in Serious Violence

11.1 The Speaker asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety to introduced the report before Council.

11.2 Councillor Selman in introducing the report as the Cabinet Member for Community Safety welcome the scrutiny commission's review report on tackling serious violence, which rightly was one of the top priorities for this administration and a key concern for Hackney's residents. Councillor Selman welcomed the considered way that the Commission approached the complex topic as well as the time and expertise contributed by officers to the review.

11.3 Councillor Selman stressed that it was quite simply not acceptable that Hackney was seeing lives lost to violence. There were no words that could truly do justice to that harm - the potential lost, the families permanently devastated and the broader ripple out impact within Hackney's community, and it was right that the Commission therefore chose to prioritise this area for review.

11.4 Councillor Selman commented that the Commission recognised that given the multiple areas with roles to play in preventing and tackling serious violence, there were a number of focusses the review could have taken, however the Commission chose to focus primarily on serious violence linked to gang related activity, in recognition of the particular severity of violence of this nature.

11.5 Councillor Selman further commented that the review found that the IGU was delivering excellent work and that its co-located model was enabling a joined up approach with a focus on preventing and diverting individuals away from involvement in criminal activity and exploitation by gangs. But importantly they

had also made a number of welcomed recommendations for how work could be further improved, and that the Council would be pleased to know that work on implementing these had already begun - for example:

- In relation to recommendation five regarding mental health pathways for older young people, Hackney had recently successfully secured funding from the Violence Reduction Unit to recruit a mental health professional to be embedded within the team to ensure tailored mental health support.
- In relation to recommendation three re increased transparency, building on the work over the last year and a half to appoint two Community Engagement officers whose work included building trust and engagement within the community throughout the year, and members were due to meet with the Borough's Youth Independent Advisory Group in March to further explore how transparency and communication could be further improved in relation to a unit who from the outside had sought to put trust and consistency at the heart of what they do.
- On recommendation nine in relation to employment pathways for the IGU cohort, a joint options paper had been produced by officers in Employment & Skills and Community Safety to be completed by 1 April 2020 for Cllr William's and her consideration.

11.6 Councillor Selman went on to say that as the Review noted, the IGU was only one part of its solution, and commented that anyone who had spent any time listening to the experiences of young people and communities dealing with the aftermath of serious violence knew this was about a much more complex picture of equalities, opportunities and fairness. Anyone who had spent any time looking at the data, knew that by the time young people came to the Youth Offending Team they had often experienced a range of issues including bereavement, abuse or violence (including domestic violence). Councillor Selman commented also about the £13million Hackney was investing in youth services including early help and prevention & diversion, contributing to the reduction in young people entering the youth justice system from 114 in 2016/17 to 81 in 2018/19, and it was the changes being made to how things were being done through the Trusted Relationships Detached Outreach Team and contextual safeguarding.

11.7 Councillor Selman commented that it was also Hackney's VAWG strategy under which Hackney along with Waltham Forest were the first local authorities to adopt the safer together model aimed at enhancing the safety and wellbeing of children in households experiencing domestic violence, and that it was putting young voices at the heart of solutions through the Young Futures Commission, together with the work of Councillor Williams around employment and skills to create the kind of real opportunities that provide inspiring routes for our fantastic, talented young people, and the work of Councillor Bramble through the Young Black Men's programme to tackle entrenched inequalities, and the work of many of Hackney's front line officers who along with colleagues in the voluntary & community sector that work tirelessly day in and day out to keep Hackney's young people safe and who were deeply, personally impacted whenever a life was lost.

- 11.8 In conclusion Councillor Selman advised that ultimately the Council should be seeking not to need a gangs unit, or a knife crime strategy - violence should not be considered inevitable and until it was evident to see it vastly reduced and no more lives lost, there will remain much, much more to do, and which it was why Councillor Selman welcomed the report, with its positive endorsement of the work to date but importantly its recommendations for the future. Councillor Selman stressed her commitment to working with officers and partners to progress both recommendations and much more in Hackney's commitment to tackle serious violence and ensure that young people in Hackney have a right to grow up safe from harm and exploitation.
- 11.9 Councillor Odze raised a procedural motion for the council meeting to be extended by 15 minutes. The councillor was of the view this would allow the council to properly debate the agenda item as only designating the ten minutes, as currently set out on the council agenda, was a travesty.

Councillor Peters seconded the motion.

An additional 15 minutes was allocated to the agenda item.

- 11.10 Councillor Patrick believed that the report that had been submitted spoke for itself. She went on to thank those council members and officers particularly those members of the Scrutiny Panel who had worked on the report. A lot of the report recommendations had been agreed and that said a lot about all the work that was put into the report. The councillor gave a brief overview of some the recommendations e.g. closer cooperation. The councillor highlighted the report the issue around the misuse of data of the gangs matrix and how there had been investigation to the matter. The report had come back and stated that the council was exempt and the police had told the council they had drawn data from most boroughs and it had been concluded that the data had to be used more responsibly. Councillor Patrick thanked Tom Thorn for all his work for the Scrutiny Committee: Tom was soon to change roles in the council and move to another department.
- 11.11 Councillor Odze began by explaining why he put forward the procedural motion. It was because not only because of the whole item but if councillors look at the whole meeting agenda, which was a budget meeting, there had been half an hour on the budget of which 15 minutes was the mayor's proposals and 15 minutes for those councillors who wished to speak. The Councillor considered that to be a ridiculous situation. The budget was one of the most important items to be discussed and therefore things had to be arraigned at the proper time to allow time to debate the items. Councillor Odze added that this agenda item, safety, crime and violence was fundamental to all the local residents. Councillor Odze commented Councillor Patrick for all the work that she had put into the report, there had been a lot achieved. Councillor Odze added that he did not want to go into why the opposition were not involved in scrutiny anymore, the councillor considered it to be an old story. The councillor believed that all of the report was important and he was glad to hear that Councillor Selman had accepted all the recommendations as the Scrutiny Committee had put a lot of work into the report. The safety of local children and the elderly should be something that was taken for granted but unfortunately in this day and age it cannot, so the council had to do something about it therefore that was why the report was one step towards it. Time to debate a report like the

- one before the council was very important. The Councillor commended the report to council.
- 11.12 Councillor Moema also welcomed the report and its recommendations. The councillor spoke of how a few years ago she was sceptical of the approaches that had been taken but now she was reassured by what she had read in the report. The councillor hoped that the work of the scrutiny panel continued in the most positive way to maintain pressure on the cabinet and mayor so that issues raised could continue to be addressed in the communities in the borough.
- 11.13 Councillor Gordon spoke briefly responding to Councillor Odze's comments earlier. Councillor Gordon agreed with the comments about how important scrutiny was particularly in relation to this work. This work involved a very thorough examination, in public, using a lot of council resources. Councillor Gordon informed the opposition that they were welcome anytime to scrutiny meetings and that, as the council lead on scrutiny, her door was always open if they wanted to discuss their involvement in scrutiny.
- 11.14 Deputy Mayor Bramble welcomed the recommendations as set out in the report and echoed the comments already made by her fellow councillors. It was important to mention the positive approach the council was taking not just at the key end for young people and adults but also equally early intervention along that path it was important. It was not just part of the solution to get to the end point but it was also things that would be done before to get to that end point. Comments were welcomed about the importance of social care to close the gap but the Deputy Mayor felt quite strongly that especially young people were often stigmatised as criminals or thugs. The Deputy Mayor recalled how Councillor Selman for example had spoken to young people and it was apparent that they had a sense of fear that was not often echoed. It was important that the council acknowledged this. The Deputy Mayor concluded by commending the work of the council officers and Councillor Selman with their work on the report.
- 11.15 Mayor Glanville concurred with Councillor Odze that his commitment to scrutiny and the reports submitted to council was unwavering. It was felt that Councillor Selman aptly praised the wider leadership taken at the political level and what was underpinning that was the teams that were delivering this work. This work had taken a very sophisticated view at the challenges the communities face and Councillor Moema had played a critical part in this with her community facing severe challenges over the last couple of years. It was only through this partnership of the various groups and projects that was a real tribute to the teams involved in this work. The Mayor and Councillor Selman had really got to know the people involved in this work on the frontline who work with and know the young people who are most at risk. Mayor Glanville echoed the comments of Deputy Mayor Bramble, the biggest challenge in keeping the borough's young people safe whom were more likely to be victims of crime but it was not fundamentally about young people driving the crime wave that was across the boroughs and counties and was fuelling the rise in youth violence. The council's work and report was a sensitive response to these issues and Mayor paid tribute to those workers who were out on the streets night after night helping to keep the youth of today safe.
- 11.16 Councillor Selman thanked Councillor Odze's comments and it was hoped that this work could span across party lines. Echoing Deputy Mayor Bramble's comments

made earlier, a key part of this work was investment at an early stage. It was recognised that this was difficult to undertake particularly during a time of austerity. Councillor Selman welcomed Councillor Odze's support in putting pressure on central government to get funding for the various programmes outlined in the report.

RESOLVED

That the Executive Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and Partnership Response to Escalation in Serious Violence be agreed.

12 Amendments to the Constitution

- 12.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (MO) has carried out a review of the Council's Constitution. Approval was sought to agree the suggested changes as set out and to also delegate permission to the MO (in consultation with Deputy Mayor Bramble, portfolio holder for legal and governance and the Elected Mayor), to continue to carry out any inconsequential changes that might be necessary before the revised Constitution was published.
- 12.2 Councillor Odze began by commending the Monitoring Officer for the work that she had put into the amendments to the constitution. The councillor was of the view that this work was really a review of the constitution, it was moreover a way of stopping the constitution from contradicting itself and correcting silly errors. Councillor Odze reiterated that this was a lot of work, a page by page exercise that took some work behind the scenes as well as several meetings and it was felt that it was great loss with Suki Binjal going but the council was also gaining a good monitoring officer with the appointment of Dawn Carter-McDonald. Councillor Odze wished them both success in their jobs. The councillor highlighted in the report that it was just the first step and that the council had to go through a proper review of the constitution and make it fit for purpose and the 21st century.
- 12.3 Deputy Mayor Bramble echoed Councillor's Odze's comments in thanking Suki, council officers and those council members who had been involved in this work. Deputy Mayor Bramble highlighted that it was important to acknowledge that this was a cross party piece of work and it was important that with a council, mayor and cabinet two active cabinet members who wanted to be forward thinking and championing what the council was doing in the town hall to make it transparent and also make it about dialogue with the community and empower them to come and take part in that was important. The structure and the principles on how to do that must be more accessible and ensuring that the constitution is fit for purpose. Now this work had been completed it was now about making that work in the future even better.
- 12.4 Mayor Glanville echoed the comments of both Deputy Mayor Bramble and Councillor Odze in thanking Suki, council officers and those councillors who had been involved in this work. The mayor added that he would give written consent to this work as soon as possible after the council meeting and spoke of how this work had been a worthwhile exercise.

RESOLVED

- i. **That the changes proposed to the Council's Constitution as set out in the schedule of changes attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed; and**
- ii. **That authority be delegated to the Council's Monitoring Officer to continue to make any necessary inconsequential changes in consultation with Deputy Mayor Bramble and the Elected Mayor.**

13 Appointments to Committees

13.1 The report, as set out in the meeting papers, seeks to appoint Councillor Kofo David to the Licensing Committee and to the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission for the remainder of the municipal year 2019-2020. The membership of the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission was increased in October 2018 from eight members (seven majority members and one opposition member) to nine members (eight majority group member and one opposition group member) and the Commission had been carrying vacancy since then. The appointment to the Licensing Committee was to fill vacancy left by a resignation.

RESOLVED

- i. **That approval be given to the appointment of Cllr David to the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission; and**
- ii. **that approval be given to the appointment of Cllr David to the Licensing Committee to fill the current vacancy.**

14 Draft programme of Meetings 2020-2021

14.1 In advance of the Annual General Meeting (AGM) scheduled for 20 May 2020 at which, in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of the Constitution of the London Borough of Hackney, the AGM of the Council was required to approve a programme of ordinary meetings of the Council for the Municipal Year 2020/2021.

14.2 Mayor Glanville raised concerns that draft programme seemed to be moving away from the precedents of leaving Council to the midpoint in July. The Mayor highlighted that this has not been the custom in practice. He added that council cabinet meetings were on a Tuesday and it was understood in September, and again in October, full Council appeared to be in the middle of the month, both times in the middle of the month, which predated Cabinet, whose reports also have to go to Cabinet and Council. Mayor Glanville felt this was an obstacle and he highlighted as the majority group in control there would obviously be party meetings, which rely on significant alignment to work properly and hold the executive to account. Mayor Glanville requested that some work was undertaken to check some of these anomalies that he had highlighted.

Wednesday, 26th February, 2020

- 14.3 Councillor Odze spoke of how he was also going to raise a similar point to the Mayor about Council being before Cabinet. He added that he would be having a meeting with the Monitoring Officer in the future about the Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) and he would like to see its meeting dates included in the draft programme as SACRE was now a committee of the council.
- 14.4 The Speaker thanked the Mayor and Councillor Odze for their comments and recommended to the other councillors that if they had any further amendments to the draft programme they should contact Governance Services.

RESOLVED

That the draft schedule of meetings for the Municipal Year 2020/21 be received and noted, and that any comments, or proposed variations to the draft schedule by any Member be forwarded to governance services direct, and prior to the Annual Council meeting on 20 May 2020 where the proposed final schedule of meetings for the Municipal Year 2020/21 will be agreed.

Duration of the meeting: Times Not Specified