



London Borough of Hackney Council
Municipal Year 2020/21
held remotely
Wednesday, 24th February, 2021 at 7.00pm

Councillors in Attendance:

Mayor Glanville

Cllr Kam Adams - Speaker (Chair)

Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Polly Billington, Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Kofo David, Deputy Speaker - 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 Michael Levy, Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Anna Lynch, Cllr Yvonne

Maxwell, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr Sem Moema, Cllr Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze, Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr Samuel Pallis, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Emma Plouviez, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Deputy Mayor Rebecca Rennison, Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Gilbert Smyth, Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Patrick Spence, Cllr Simche Steinberger, Cllr Vincent Stops, Cllr Jessica Webb, Cllr Carole Williams, Cllr Caroline Woodley and Cllr Penny Wrout

Officer Contact: Andrew Spragg, Governance Services

This meeting was live streamed and can be viewed at :
<https://youtu.be/CpKFctpyDkw>

Councillor Kam Adams (The Speaker) in the Chair

1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from and/or on behalf of Councillors:

Lateness: Councillors Adejare, Hanson, and Deputy Mayor Rennison

2. Speaker's Announcements

2.1 The Speaker announced with great sadness that since the last Full Council meeting three former Councillor colleagues had passed away. Each served the borough with distinction and in the very best traditions of public service. The Speaker commented that he was sure that all colleagues would wish to join him in paying tribute to them and he was aware that the Mayor would be paying his own tributes in his speech at Item 8.

2.2 The Speaker announced the loss of former Councillor Maureen Colquhoun, who had represented Wenlock residents in Shoreditch in the 1980s. She made history as the UK's first openly lesbian MP, and she rightly occupied an important place in the history of LGBT rights movement. Councillor Colquhoun battled against discrimination and was a powerful advocate for women's rights campaigning for the abolition of women's prisons, creche facilities at political conferences and the decriminalisation of prostitution.

2.3 The Speaker announced the loss of former Councillor Patrick Kodikara, who was also an advocate for civil rights. He served as a Hackney councillor from 1982 to 1986 and worked tirelessly for racial equality as a member of Hackney Community Relations Council, Hackney Asian Association and the Hackney Committee Against Racism.

2.4 The Speaker announced the loss of former Councillor Sylvia Anderson who served the borough with distinction as a Liberal Democrat Councillor from 1998 to 2002. She cared passionately about her community in Stoke Newington and was an active member of Clissold Park Users Group.

2.5 The Speaker, on behalf of the whole Council, offered their friends and families the Council's deepest sympathy and sincere condolences. The Speaker asked Members to join him in a minute's silence to commemorate the dedication and huge contribution Councillor Maureen Colquhoun, Councillor Patrick Kodikara and Councillor Sylvia Anderson had made to the borough of Hackney. A one minute silence was observed.

- 2.6 The Speaker further reported that in the past year, a number of colleagues had stepped down from service, and he paid tribute to them, thanking Councillor Tom Rahily, Councillor Feryal Clark, Councillor Jon Burke and Councillor Aron Klein for all their hard work.
- 2.7 The Speaker also reported that this meeting would also be his last full meeting as Speaker, and he placed on record his thanks to officers for all the support he had received in his role.
- 2.8 The Speaker also encouraged all Councillors to participate in an upcoming 5k walk in aid of the Hackney Foodbank. This walk could be done independently in one's own neighbourhood with a participant's own route, and as a family or living group, with routes being shared by various tracking apps. Every participant would receive a free organic cotton T-shirt. He asked Councillors who might be interested in joining the walk to send the Speaker an email at speaker@hackney.gov.uk

3. Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 There were no interests declared.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting of Full Council held on Wednesday, 27 January 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings, subject to the following amendments:
- i. The inclusion of Councillor Papier in the attendance record for the meeting; and
 - ii. Clarification to be given in writing to the Chief Whip of the Minority Group with regard to those Members voting/not voting or not in attendance at Item 9 of the minutes in relation to the Calculation of 2021/22 Council Tax Base and Local Business Rate.

5. Deputation: Implementation and Enforcement of Road Safety Measures at Hackney New Primary School

- 5.1 Councillor Billington introduced the deputation and the Speaker welcomed Rachel Rah to the meeting.
- 5.2 Ms Rah informed the meeting that the Hackney New Primary School was located at the junction of Downham Road and Kingsland Road both being very busy and dangerous, with parents having witnessed dangerous driving and near misses. Ms Rah advised that despite the school being open for over 1.5 years, the roads were still lacking basic road safety measures including:
- School children crossing signs
 - Yellow zig zags
 - 20mph signs and speed control measures
 - A cycle lane on Downham Road
 - Bike box advance stop at the junction
 - A School Street on Enfield Road

- The possibility of a parklet near to the school
- 5.3 Ms Rah further reported that there had also been persistent problems with illegal parking on public space outside the school between Kingsland Road and Enfield Road, which was aided by a dropped kerb to Kingsland Road which had not been removed from the past site and was contrary to the planning consent. Ms Rah further commented that trees required by the planning consent had not been planted.
- 5.4 Ms Rah, on behalf of parents, wanted the Council to urgently implement and/or enforce all of the above measures and work with TfL to urgently remove the dropped kerb to Kingsland Road and implement signage and markings on this TfL road, together with better parking enforcement and a 'parklet' to improve public space on Enfield Road.
- 5.6 The Speaker thanked Ms Rah for her address and asked if there were any questions or comments from Members.
- Councillor Stops commented that the physical measures on Downham Road, as highlighted by Ms Rah, would be most effective to stop the traffic issues, and that the existing road bumps needed to be properly upgraded to proper road humps, and asked in terms of the requested measures which was the main priority from the parents' perspective. In response Ms Rah commented that anything that controlled traffic, and gave a clear indication that the school was located there, together with all of the requested measures outlined would considerably assist in traffic calming.
 - Councillors Woodley and Deputy Mayor Bramble welcomed the traffic requests and concerns expressed by Ms Rah, and appreciated the considerable work with local ward Councillors, and that Hackney's Child First principles were being upheld, and the hope that all the measures would be implemented as soon as possible to reduce traffic around and outside schools, and a hope for the possible locating of a parklet also.
- 5.7 The Speaker asked that Mayor Glanville respond to the deputation.

Mayor Glanville in responding to the deputation thanked both Councillor Billington and Rachel Rah for taking the time to raise the traffic concerns and in summary advised that :

- He had been extremely concerned to learn about the road safety concerns raised, especially given the proximity to Hackney New Primary School
- He noted that that a meeting had taken place on 11 January to discuss a range of possible options to address the road safety concerns raised, which had been attended by representatives from the school, and a parent representative, and ward Councillors Peters and Councillor Billington;
- He provided assurances that the concerns raised had been referred to senior council officers, who were currently working to explore possible solutions, involving local ward councillors, parents and the school, and in particular were exploring the possibility of a School Street on Enfield Road, which was supported by the school.
- The Council would be exploring the possibility of adding School location to the programme of School Streets in the new financial year, and also devising a short and long term plan for Downham Road to address the issues raised;

- There would be a number of other short term measures implemented - including the refresh of the double yellow lines, 20mph road markings painted along Downham Road, School Keep Clear markings,
- As part of the LIP funding for 20/21, to carry out a feasibility study along Downham Road with the study to consider the possibility of introducing additional measures such as an advance cycle box, cycle lane and improvements to the pedestrian crossing points, as part of the long term goals for this road.
- The Council was currently liaising with TfL regarding the plans for Downham Road given the interaction with Kingsland Road, which was a red route.
- The issue of the dropped kerb to Kingsland Road as advised by Ms Rah had been raised with TfL directly, and their advice that they would liaise with Council to resolve the issue with cars parking on the footway by removing the dropped kerb whilst allowing suitable access for emergency vehicles.
- Regarding parklets - a process was being developed to allow applications for a parklet and relevant officers would be in to contact with Ms Rah to explain how to apply
- An offer to personally meet with Ms Rah, the school and other concerned parents and staff to discuss these issues in more detail and a hope that the response provided assurances that were sought.

The deputation, having concluded, the Speaker thanked Ms Rah for her attendance.

6. Questions from Members of the Public

Responses to questions that were not taken at the meeting due to non attendance and/or time constraints are attached at **Appendix B**

6.1 Question from Ms Inez Miszczyk to Mayor Glanville

What steps were taken to protect vulnerable people during the covid crisis?

Ms Miszczyk was not present at the meeting. A written response would be provided as set out in **Appendix A**

6.2 Question from Mr Christopher Sills to Mayor Glanville

How many new homes are currently under construction in Woodberry Down and how many of them, if any, are social housing and affordable homes? Are any tenders due to be issued before the 6th of May 2021 and if so please could you give me the same details as above?

Response

Mayor Glanville advised that there were two phases on Woodberry Down under construction, these phases were part of the Council's estate regeneration partnership project with Berkeley Homes, Notting Hill Genesis, Woodberry Down Community Organisation and the Manor House Development Trust.

Members were informed that the pace of delivery had been increased, Phase Three was on site as Phase Two was almost complete. The review of Phase Three last year increased the number of genuinely affordable homes in the current phase, and also doubled the number of social rented homes being built as part of Phase 3. This resulted in more existing Woodberry Down tenants getting their new homes they need quicker.

Across Phases Two and Three, 564 genuinely affordable homes were due to be built – 233 for social rent and 331 shared ownership homes – alongside 904 homes for sale to pay for them in the absence of sufficient government funding for social housing. By the end of 2021, the remaining 301 homes in Phase 2 were due to be completed. By 2024, the first social homes in Phase 3 were due to be ready for Woodberry Down residents to move into.

Mayor Glanville expressed that the Council was committed to reviewing the master plan for future phases, acting as a robust partner to see more affordable homes delivered, and working with the local community at every step of the way.

Mr Sills was assured that there were no new tenders due to be issued before the 6th May by Hackney Council, although Mayor Glanville declared that he could not speak on behalf of the Berkleys Supply Chain.

Supplementary question

How many social homes were being built in the current phase?

Response

Mayor Glanville advised that in Phase Two there were 7/8 large family homes and across Phases Two and Three, 564 genuinely affordable homes – 233 for social rent and 331 shared ownership homes.

6.3 Question from Mr Ahmet Bulutoglu to Mayor Glanville

The Council is committed to monitoring any parking stress as a result of planned changes in Zone T. Will the Council commit to undertaking an environmental and equalities assessment of the current situation before the parking hours change so that any resulting deterioration can be quantified?

Response

Mayor Glanville thanked Mr Bulutoglu for coming back to Council to ask his question and apologised that his last question wasn't reached at the last Council Meeting. Mr Bututoglu was assured that every time a decision was made to change to a CPZ, time, equality and environmental impacts were fully considered. It was highlighted that the change to the hours of Zone T was due to be implemented on 22 March.

Members were informed that an independent Parking stress survey was just one part of the analysis process, traffic flow, road safety data and air quality data was also analysed. Mayor Glanville stated that the change in hours would be effective

in deterring all-day commuter and displacement parking which were the primary causes of parking stress, however it was shared that the council were committed to undertake an independent parking stress survey 6 months after the change.

The parking stress survey reviews the effect of the reduced hours in practice and identifies any negative impact since implementation. The findings of the survey would be used to inform decision making as to whether further action would be required should high levels of parking stress be evident. If the parking stress survey revealed a significant impact, a full Equality Impact Assessment would be carried out.

Supplementary question

The compromised hours would have met all the needs of the community and a large number of residents were in support of the hours. Why did Council officers ignore the views of this many residents?

Response

The Mayor stated that decisions such as these were always very difficult to take and that the hours decided on were very balanced and compromised. Taking all the responses from the consultation it was felt that this was the right decision to take given the parking stresses.

6.4 Question from Lynne Troughton to Mayor Glanville

Could the Mayor please update us on the implementation of traffic calming measures in Kings Park, recognising residents' longstanding calls to address rat running; and any proposed steps to address the additional pressure the LTN's and school streets have placed on Ashenden, Colne and Roding Roads, and Adley Street?

Response

Mayor Glanville thanked Lynne Troughton for her question. The Mayor highlighted that residents in Kings Park had been asking for a number of years for steps to address rat running in the south of the ward. The rat running was impacting on two local schools, posing threats to children and also causing long queues of cars.

Mayor Glanville shared that he had heard first hand from residents and ward councillors of the impact the traffic was having, officers met with residents to discuss the options for traffic calming in this part of the ward and plans had been confirmed to bring these forward.

Members were informed that Hackney Council took the opportunity to build on existing work by implementing Experimental Traffic Orders – which allowed the council to implement schemes whilst consulting on them at the same time.

In November last year, the Council carried out traffic surveys in and around the LTN, including on Roding Road, Adley Street and Ashenden Road. Further traffic surveys were due to take place this year in April/May to compare and would help

understand traffic flow impacts. Traffic data, environmental impacts, the opinion of local residents, would fully inform the council's decision on whether to make LTNs permanent.

Mayor Glanville advised that in the meantime the scheme remained open and flexible to any amendments, and continued to welcome comments from residents about how they could be improved.

6.5 Question from Zoe Garbett to Mayor Glanville

Residents report a democratic deficit in how public consultations are conducted by the Council; particularly regarding building on green spaces. Residents are feeling let down and feel that the council is failing to listen to them. How does the Council plan to improve transparency and rigor to restore trust?

Response

Deputy Mayor Rennison thanked Zoe Garbett for bringing her question to Council. It was stated that Hackney Council ensures to engage with residents at every stage of the process – from engaging on all elements of the design, to ensuring council tenants whose current homes don't meet their needs get first choice to move into new homes being built where they live.

Members were informed that Hackney's consultation approach went far beyond the statutory requirements set out in the planning process, examples of this included the Kings Crescent regeneration and the new Council homes at the Frampton Park Estate which residents started moving into last month.

Deputy Mayor Rennison stated that despite the challenges caused by the coronavirus crisis, the Council continued to tailor an engagement approach to ensure that residents could continue to meaningfully input into plans, so that building of new Council homes was not delayed. Deputy Mayor Rennison continued by explaining that if the Council halted plans every time a resident raised concerns, it would delay building homes to tackle the housing crisis. Instead the Council worked with communities to find solutions to concerns and in collaboration with Hackney residents, reconfigure green areas on estates as part of these plans, to improve public spaces for everyone, and importantly with no net loss of green space.

Supplementary Question

Zoe Garbett thanked Deputy Mayor Rennison for the response and questioned how the Council would respond to residents who felt that their voices were not being heard and held to account in conjunction with the health benefits that were well documented with regard to provision and access to green space.

Response

Deputy Mayor Rennison said there were a number of things that could be looked at, as the Council generally sought to engage to improve on green spaces across Hackney estates, which included everything from tree planting to increasing

biodiversity, creating shared space for residents and the public realm and natural space. Deputy Mayor Rennison agreed to take the question away to look at how the Council could improve at communicating what the council was trying to achieve when investing in the green vision in estates and new homes.

6.6 Question from Elizabeth Sills to Deputy Mayor Rennison

Do you agree with the letter published in the February edition of Hackney Citizen on the reorganisation of the Housing department? Would you agree that a Council question my father asked in January 2020 is of particular concern, and decisions on the same subject taken in 1988-1990 should be re-implemented?

Ms Sills was not present at the meeting. A written response would be provided as set out in **Appendix A**

6.7 Question from Augusta Itua to Mayor Glanville

What actions will Hackney Council take to address the concerns raised by current and former residents of Ridley Villas Hostel about the poor living conditions and unfit accommodation provided to them by the local authority?

Response

Deputy Mayor Rennison advised that Ridley Villas was a privately owned hostel and was not directly managed by the Council. Rather, it was subject to a mandatory HMO license, and was routinely inspected annually by the Council's Private Sector Housing Team under the Pan London Setting the Standards scheme (STS) and also upon receipt of any complaint, with the exception of last year due to Covid restrictions. Under its HMO license Ridley Villas were required to meet a number of standards which were set out in detail on the Council's website.

It was highlighted that, wherever possible, Hackney's Temporary Accommodation service aimed to place homeless individuals in the Council's own directly managed accommodation, where good quality offer, and better control standards could be provided. Hackney only used the hostel on an ad hoc basis when other reasonable options were exhausted. The Council was working proactively to increase its own in-house temporary accommodation capacity for single people, reducing the need to rely on private providers like Ridley Villas.

Members were notified that 93 unit hostels were delivered last summer and a further 28 units were due to be delivered in the first quarter of 2021. The service was currently working to deliver a further 83 bespoke accommodation units for single homeless individuals. The Council would continue to work with Ridley Villas to improve its accommodation offer and discussions had taken place regarding how the property could be improved to enable continued use over the longer term.

Supplementary Question

Has the Council carried out any assessments of the dwelling with regards to the HMO obligations and has the landlord been contacted and asked to comply with

the relevant HMO regulations? If the landlord is not compliant with the HMO requirements, what action will the Council take?

Response

Deputy Mayor Rennison requested that the supplementary question be sent in as a further enquiry, as it required a joint portfolio response by Deputy Mayor Rennison and Councillor Moema.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, the Speaker advised that the allocated 30 minutes for this item had come to an end.

7. Questions from Members of the Council

In accordance with the Council's constitution, the Speaker advised that the allocated 30 minutes for this item had come to an end. Written responses would be provided for the remaining four questions as contained within **Appendix B**

7.1 Question from Councillor Polly Billington to Mayor Glanville

Can the Mayor tell us how the Council is marking LGBTQ+ History month in a way that not only celebrates Hackney as a place for everyone, but also reminds us of the struggles of LGBTQ+ people here in this borough who have gone before us, fighting simply to love and be loved?

Response

Councillor Williams advised that the Council was marking LGBTQ+ History month by hosting events that focused on LGBTQ+ stories, narratives, histories and ensuring that the Council used the time to amplify the voices of the community and continue to highlight Hackney as a place where everyone's voices are heard and celebrated.

It was shared that Hackney Libraries had hosted events exploring the works of LGBTQ+ authors and poets, they also showcased books that residents could borrow from the libraries or on social media that focused on LGBTQ+ stories. Hackney Archives shared material from their collections pertaining to Hackney's LGBTQ+ history which addressed the violence and stigma that the community endured as well as showcasing artefacts that instigated change and sought to dispel myths and stereotypes.

The Council was also promoting LGBTQ+ focused events in the borough and those organised by individuals/organisations affiliated with the borough as well as opportunities and resources on social media platforms and in the local newspaper.

Councillor Williams and the Mayor shared that they continued to raise these issues at the very highest level of Government and recently wrote to the Women and Equalities Minister Liz Truss, calling for urgent and greatly needed reform of the Gender Recognition Act.

7.2 Question from Councillor Selman to Mayor Glanville

Last month the Mayor of London formally endorsed the plans for the third phase of the Woodberry Down regeneration, including the building of nearly 600 new homes, including 117 for social rent, a new public park, 175 new trees and 29 tennis courts of open space. Please could the Mayor of Hackney provide an update on how the scheme is now progressing?

Response

The Mayor was pleased to share that good progress was being made on Phase 3 to deliver much needed housing in the north of the borough. Work started late last year to demolish two of the buildings on site – the former Happy Man pub and the old council offices at 440 Seven Sisters Road. At the same time preparatory works were carried out to safely remove asbestos containing materials from the residential blocks prior to their demolition.

The last resident in the current phase of the regeneration was successfully rehoused just before Christmas and demolition of the now vacant residential blocks was underway.

The Mayor confirmed that there were now enough new social rented homes being built in the current phases of construction to re-house all of the existing Secure Tenants in Phase 4 and 5, and that the first residents would be moving into their new homes in the current phase at the end of 2024.

The Mayor highlighted that part of the agreement with Berkeley Homes meant that the first blocks to be completed would all be social rented, shared ownership or shared equity homes. Furthermore, all of the existing resident leaseholders in Phase 4 would have the opportunity to buy a shared equity home in the current Phase 3.

It was added that the latest phase also contributed significantly to the council's plans to rebuild a greener Hackney. This included a brand new park, 175 new trees of different maturities, over 4,000 square metres of biodiverse green and brown roofs, 1,100 new cycle parking spaces and a new energy centre to provide low-carbon heat.

Supplementary Question

The developer is currently required to submit a full new energy strategy and also a low carbon transition plan, would the Mayor be able to set out how he and the regeneration team are working with Berkeley Homes to set out how they are ensuring that the energy centre is going to be a main use of sustainable resources?

Response

The Mayor thanked Councillor Selman for her detailed question on the energy centre and explained that the work was ongoing and different options were being explored such as waste heat from the enfield energy plant and the possibility of the

contribution from the underground of the reservoir. It was stated that in the short term Hackney needed a greener center in phase 3 for serving those existing residents, therefore air source heat pump technology was being explored to ensure that the next phase of 600 homes did not just rely on boilers.

7.3 Question from Councillor Race to Mayor Glanville

Can the Mayor please provide an update on construction progress of the new Britannia Leisure Centre and the new Shoreditch Park school?

Response

Mayor Glanville explained that both sites remained open during the third government lockdown with COVID protection measures in place such as weekly lateral flow testing, mandatory wearing of face masks, temperature checks and social distancing. Deliveries of materials were challenging together with a small reduction in site labour as a result of the pandemic.

For Phase 1a, Britannia Leisure centre the main pool tiling was now complete and the leisure water flume had been installed. The reception area's final finishes were underway and the roofing was complete and fully waterproof. The sports hall was progressing well with flooring currently being installed. Commissioning of services was on programme with 'heating on' in some spaces and the filling of the pools and testing was due to commence shortly. The Leisure Centre was on track to open in late Spring / early Summer 2021.

Members were informed that works to the south of the building were largely complete for Phase 1b. All external cladding, windows, roof finishes, balustrading and fencing were complete. Many classrooms were now complete and locked for snagging, the main focus now was on dry lining and plastering to upper levels. The School was on track to be completed in the summer in advance of opening in September 2021.

Supplementary Question

Along with the new secondary school and leisure centre, Shoreditch Park is also seeing further investments, please could the Mayor set out how much investment is going into Hoxton East and Shoreditch ward.

Response

The Mayor shared that the school and the new leisure center was a result of a 110 million pound direct investment which included public realm and heat network improvements. Also there was an additional 5 million pound investment in Shoreditch park and the Adventure Playground. In Phase 2a new social housing was being built as part of the Britannia work linked to investment in primary schools - this represented £40 million investment in public infrastructure.

7.4 Question from Councillor Adejare to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

There are businesses in my ward that are struggling in this pandemic and I hear the Government saying that Councils are not distributing business grants, that they are sitting on the money and not getting it to businesses. Can the Cabinet lead on economic regeneration tell me is Hackney sitting on the money?

Response

Councillor Nicholson stated that the Council was not sitting on funds, and the council was distributing the business grant funding to businesses as quickly as possible to support them during the pandemic. In spring and summer 2020 the Council distributed over £71million of grant funding to local businesses.

To date over £3.7million of grant funding from a total of £10.5m Local Restrictions Support Grant funding (for the period covering 17th October 2020 - 4th January 2021) had been distributed to businesses with more funding being distributed to businesses every week and this would continue at pace until the grant funding had been paid to all eligible businesses.

Members were informed that the national lockdown funding payments were due to be made in March and April. The timeline on when payments would be made to the businesses for the various grant programmes could be found on the Council's website.

Supplementary Question

What are we doing to help businesses and individuals in Dalston that are self-employed who are not being helped by this government, what is Hackney Council doing to help these people?

Response

Councillor Nicholson shared that local government, including Hackney Council, called on central government for the flexibility to shape the local business support grants, which was something that the government had not predetermined or set previously. Councillor Nicholson added that Hackney Council had been targeting support to working people who were running businesses but not business rate payers, £4.5 million in grants had been distributed to 649 businesses, a further £10 million was also due to be distributed, focusing on micro small businesses, charities and nurseries and market traders.

7.5 Question from Councillor Sade Etti to the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care and Leisure

There are reports that historical pharmaceutical activities have generated a lack of trust and fear amongst ethnic minority communities. Can the cabinet lead for health explain what the Council is doing to encourage the take up of vaccination?

Response

Councillor Kennedy expressed that racism was a public health issue. Hackney's Director of Public Health, Dr Sandra Husbands, co-signed a letter with her fellow public health directors last week on how public health teams across the capital were supporting Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.

Locally in Hackney a lot of work had been carried out to address low vaccine uptake in Black and Ethnic Minority communities, including surveying residents, 1-2-1 phone calls and online focus groups. Data highlighted that Black and Asian residents were less likely to take the vaccine than White British residents.

Hackney Council addressed concerns through virtual community conversations on the virus, four pages of covid info was published in Hackney Life, a booklet was being developed to be distributed to all homes, utilising Hackney's network of 127 community champions through regular meetings and whatsapp broadcast groups. Councilor Kennedy explained that these actions would help share trusted credible messages directly into Hackney's diverse communities.

For Jewish Orthodox Communities, Hackney Council helped the NHS with a community takeover event at the John Scott vaccination centre run by Jewish health charity Hatzola, where 350 people received the vaccine. Three pages of content in local Jewish newspapers were also due to be published answering community specific concerns that had been asked via the Orthodox Jewish helpline.

7.6 Question from Councillor Peters to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Housing Needs and Supply

Could the Cabinet Member for housing needs bring us up to speed on the plans to finally introduce free wifi and broadband into our temporary accommodation hostels and community halls?

Response

Councillor McKenzie explained that the Council was working to improve digital connectivity, address digital exclusion and ensure more reliable full-fibre connectivity across Hackney's Council estates and community facilities. Colleagues were also working closely with the Benefits and Housing Needs Service and the Community Halls team to ensure that free connectivity was provided to temporary accommodation hostels and community halls. Councillor McKenzie shared that the aim was to provide full fibre gigabit connectivity for free in perpetuity so that service users can access the internet at no cost.

Councillor McKenzie shared that most community halls and hostels were due to be connected up within the first 18 months of the programme. The Council pledged to ensure a consistent standard of connectivity and WiFi at hostels and Free WiFi in community halls which would be provided to local tenants who might be unable to afford internet access in their own homes.

It was highlighted that the better broadband programme would also offer discounts to housing tenants who were most in need so they could afford to sign up to broadband services in their own homes and provide free connections to Hackney's Children's Centres and Housing with Care schemes.

7.7 Question from Councillor Snell to the Mayoral Advisor for Private Renting and Housing Affordability

Could the Cabinet Member for private renters let us know what the Council is doing to support Hackney residents - leaseholders and private tenants - who are affected by the cladding scandal and get combustible cladding off the buildings they live in?

Response

Councillor Moema shared that following the cladding and fire safety scandal Hackney Council strongly felt that the Government's legislation and regulations were at fault, not individual homeowners. It was stated that leaseholders and shared owners should not be liable to pay for a problem that they did not create, nor should vital safety repairs be withheld due to this issue.

Hackney Council continued to invest to ensure that Hackney's buildings met the highest fire safety standards, even those without any fire risks or statutory requirements to do so. The Council made it very clear that any cladding and fire safety issues were to be paid for and remedied by building owners and developers not individual homeowners.

Councillor Moema shared that legal notices had been served on 248 blocks within Hackney, the notices encouraged owners to inform the Council of any cladding and also allowed the Council to liaise with homeowners where cladding was required to be removed. The Council's Private Sector Housing Team also carried out a forensic examination on three large tower blocks in partnership with the LGA, this resulted in enforcement notices being serviced on two blocks and remedial works were underway.

Councillor Moema shared that the Council were meeting with Housing Association Directors and Chief Executives in order to enforce the Council's position that responsibility and payment of repairs should not be passed onto residents. The Council were also meeting with Housing Association residents in order to support them where necessary. The Council also provided the opportunity for the Council to act on behalf of homeowners if they were experiencing difficulties with their landlords.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, the Speaker advised that the allocated 30 minutes for this item had come to an end. Written responses would be provided for the remaining three questions as contained within **Appendix B**

8. Elected Mayor's Statement

8.1 Mayor Glanville addressed Council as follows - the main speech of the Mayor is available in the virtual recording which can be accessed in the meeting recording link shown above:

With regard to the continuing pandemic:

- That it had been almost exactly a year since the Council had met physically in the Council chamber, with the past year changing the country and the borough forever, with the loss of 450 much loved fellow residents, 170 since the start of 2021, from Covid. Some of those tragic losses could have been avoided had the Government acted sooner over the last three lockdowns. Because of these tragedies, and the strain on local public services, the Prime Minister's cautious plans for reopening the country and its economy, was welcomed; the Prime Minister's remarks of the previous Monday of not "buccaneering with people's lives" would be remembered and accounted for.
- The Government's need to offer more support, and give clarity to further announced restrictions, as no information / clarity has been given about the package of support to assist, with the Council continuing to lobby for that support, and ahead of the Budget the following week, a call on the Chancellor to:
 - i. extend business rate and VAT relief, and introduce a new round of business grants;
 - ii. extend furlough, and agree to rule-out a furlough cliff-edge that could threaten tens of thousands of jobs in Hackney; and
 - iii. end the social insecurity system in this country – keep the £20 universal credit uplift.

Without those measures many Hackney residents would struggle to follow the rules, simply because they did not have the financial means to do so.

- The Council was stepping up to make sure its schools were safe for children to return to and get the education they desperately needed, and to support any secondary school that felt the need to open in a phased approach.
- The Council was working hard with schools to roll-out rapid testing and other safety measures, and the Mayor was looking forward to a virtual visit to Stoke Newington School the following morning with the Shadow Education Team, to see the hard-work of the Council and schools in action.
- To expand the network of Rapid Test sites - the Mayor advising of his own testing every week and his urging everyone to do the same, and also as a Council to continue to urge and encourage residents to get the vaccine when

their turn came, and particularly the importance for the 9,000 more Hackney residents advised to shield until the end of March.

- The Mayor's, fellow members and officers' collective participation in several vaccination events to date, encouraging all residents to take up vaccinations when offered through the media, the Hackney Giving team led by HCVS network of vcs organisations.
- Over the coming months, as the one-year anniversary of the start of the crisis was reached, and Council staff being told to work from home, to reflect as a Council on how it would memorialise its staff, friends, families and neighbours that had been lost in the pandemic, who would always be remembered.

Condolences

As advised by the Speaker since the previous Full Council meeting, the loss of three former councillors that had each made historic contributions to the borough.

- To highlight during LGBT History Month, the former Hackney Councillor Maureen Colquhoun, and her inspiration in her pivotal role in the representation of women and LGBT people in politics as the UK's first openly lesbian MP, and being too often forgotten. Councillor Colquhoun's trailblazing life of public service and activism, which opened up paths for others to later follow, including himself as a proud, openly gay Mayor. The Council's thoughts went out to Maureen's family and friends during this difficult time, and a promise that the Borough would remember Maureen as an often overlooked local and national Labour, LGBT and feminist icon who had never lost that passion.
- To highlight the loss of former Councillor Patrick Kodikara - a trailblazer in the fight for racial justice, and the country's first Black director of social services in Camden in 1983, who served as a Hackney Councillor from 1978, bringing energy and engagement to serving the borough, working for racial equality in Hackney's diverse community, and as Chair of Social Services, pursuing a radical and progressive agenda, which included the then controversial practice of ensuring that children were adopted by people of the same race and religion wherever possible, a practice that was now widely accepted as important and appropriate for a child's welfare. The Council's thoughts and condolences went out to his family for their loss.
- To highlight the loss of former Councillor Sylvia Anderson - Liberal Democrat Councillor and active campaigner for the Party since the 1970s across north London, who cared deeply about her community and particularly worked hard to make Stoke Newington a better place, together with her campaigns to secure lottery funding for Clissold Park, against rat running, and fighting for housing improvements; the Council's recognition of the sense of loss by local Lib Dem activists and thanking Terry Stacy - former leader of Islington for advising of Sylvia's passing, with all Councillors agreeing that Stoke Newington and Hackney had lost a local champion, and that thoughts went out to Sylvia's family and friends.

Other matters

Cabinet Appointments from 1 March 2021

To welcome the new additions to Cabinet to meet ambitious goals, and support Hackney's communities, to rebuild a fairer and greener Hackney, and variations to existing Cabinet Member Portfolios:

- Councillor Nicholson becoming Deputy Mayor and taking on housing supply, during Councillor Rennison's maternity leave.
- Councillor Mete Coban taking on much of former Councillor Burke's portfolio, and lead Hackney's ambitious decarbonisation agenda as Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm.
- Councillor Rob Chapman becoming Cabinet Member for Finance during Councillor Rennison's maternity leave.
- Councillor Sade Etti becoming Mayoral Adviser for Homelessness, Housing Needs and Rough Sleeping during Councillor Rennison's leave.
- Councillor Caroline Woodley taking on trees, parks and green spaces and will become Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years, Parks and Green Spaces and Play
- Councillor Sem Moema, in championing the rights of private renters and leaseholders so effectively, who was also taking on an expanded portfolio including Housing Strategy.

Other matters

- The evening's debate in Parliament of MPs voting / debating the Fire Safety Bill, noting that too many Hackney leaseholders had been placed in an invidious position because of Government inaction over the cladding scandal, with leaseholders in Hackney being hit with huge bills, and left facing the prospect of not being able to sell their home and move, bankruptcy, and now loan repayments to the Government, for works that were not their fault, with the extra funding promised by Government not scratching the surface of some of those bills.
- The continual fight in conjunction with Councillor Moema for greater rights for the leaseholders affected and caught up in the situation, noting the Government's opportunity to vote to ban all remediation charges for leaseholders once and for all, and to address this injustice for all affected Hackney leaseholders.

8.2 In response to the Mayor's statement, Councillor Steinberger addressed Council, raising the following points:

- The sad loss of three former Councillors was something to be marked and recognised and whilst he had not known two of them and their contribution to the Borough, he had known former Councillor Sylvia Anderson and had often met with her and discussed issues, and her campaigns for better housing and the stopping of rat runs - and her continuing care and support for Hackney had been evident even after she was no longer a Councillor.
- The continued COVID pandemic and the worries and concerns of when the crisis may end and life would return to normal, together with sharing the

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

Mayor's sentiments in terms of the loss of so many people in the Borough, but that there should not be second guessing on issues of science as referred to in terms of progress against the covid virus and vaccination.

- The issue of the recent resignation of a Mayor of London Adviser Toyin Agbetu in light of remarks expressed by the individual of a racist nature and if there were any implications for the Borough where the former advisor may be employed or still sit on local groups / bodies.
- Best wishes, and thanks to the Chief Executive - Tim Shields - who had recently announced his intention to retire in May of 2021 for his support over the years.
- Thanks and best wishes to Deputy Mayor Rennison at the commencement of her maternity leave, and praising her as an excellent and true Councillor, and looked forward to her return to the Council after her maternity leave.
- Welcoming the appointments of Councillor Chapman, Coban, and Etti to the Cabinet and wishing them well in their new appointments.
- Concerns at decisions taken in a rapid sense over the 12 month period of the COVID situation and the need for accountability of many seemingly imposed decisions by the Mayor and his administration, as to whether some had been necessary - together with questioning whether the Council should take a look at the current Mayoral system in light of those concerns and to ask the current system was working and whether the Council should not return to the previous system of Committees, given the question of Mr Sills who had been unable to ask a question at the last Council meeting, and his expressed concern too of 'what was going on'.
- A hope that all members would be able to meet in person at the next Full Council meeting.

Mayor Glanville thanked Councillor Steinberger, on behalf of Councillor Levy, for his comments and responded:

- The Council's condolences had been passed to former Councillor Anderson's family for their loss, and reiterating his earlier comments as to her work.
- The comments / thanks to the Chief Executive - Tim Shields - and that he would also be paying tribute to his work and time as Chief Executive, and Director of Finance.
- Recognising the stirring work and excellence of the soon to be departing David Maher from the CCG and public health contribution in the community.
- Remarking on the actual failures of Central government in the past 12 months in terms of the pandemic crisis, and their failure to effectively implement track and trace, countered by the Council's efforts in conjunction with the NHS to ensure a clear message was given wherever possible.
- Not second guessing science but seeking guidance during the recent primary schools reopening, and no clear / accurate guidance from central government on how this should be managed and attempting to ensure a better localised

response on this and other covid related issues.

- In mentioning the recent Cabinet appointments, adding the unintended not mentioned appointment of Councillor Guy Nicholson as Deputy Mayor, and taking on the portfolio of housing supply and managing the housing review programme during Councillor Rennison's maternity cover.
- Reference to the question raised by former Councillor Sills at the previous meeting and the previous correspondence and engagement with Mr Sills on traffic and other issues.
- In relation to reference to imposition - this was not imposition but local leadership in implementing of decisions/taking on and moving forward on issues affecting the Borough positively and effectively.
- In respect of the current Mayor and Cabinet system, the Mayoral system was a decision of the people of Hackney, and that the operation of the Mayor and Cabinet system allowed for openness and transparency, and that the Mayor's leadership was clear and not imposed, but robust, with the full support and cooperation of the appointed Cabinet.
- That Toyin Agbetu was not an employee of the Council and had been involved in some work in connection with the Authority, and that the Council was in the process of reviewing the situation as a result of becoming aware of the allegations in the press.

The meeting adjourned for a five minute break. A roll call was taken at the resumption of the meeting.

9. 2021-22 Budget Report

- 9.1 The Mayor informed the meeting of the proposed adoption of the 2021/22 budget. (The following points summarise those comments - the full details are available on the visual recording of the meeting).

In commenting on the various aspects of the budget as outlined below The Mayor placed on record his thanks to the Council's finance team for their incredible work in helping to deliver a balanced budget, namely Ian Williams, Jackie Moylan and Russell Harvey

The main summary of the Mayor's budget proposals were as follows:

- The current crisis having changed the country and the borough forever with the coronavirus being the greatest challenge faced in a generation, with the country likely responding to the impacts of the virus and the efforts to control it for years to come, including Council services, where staff had worked tirelessly to keep the borough safe, and paying tribute to Hackney Council staff, and over 1,000 local volunteers who had helped the borough through these challenges.
- Time lost as a community, with some residents losing jobs, businesses and livelihoods, and some residents' health affected both physically and mentally.

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

- The importance of highlighting everything achieved with Hackney Council having responded to the crisis, and stepping in where the Government failed to do so.
- Establishing the Hackney Food Service, and with local charities delivering 15,000 food parcels to shielding families during the first lockdown, and 3,000 hot meals and 2,000 food parcels a week.
- Maintaining Hackney's investment in the voluntary sector, advice and domestic abuse services.
- Delivering truly borough-changing projects in the past 12 months, and the near completion of the new Britannia Leisure Centre and City of London Academy, in Shoreditch Park, and 200 genuinely affordable new Council homes, and the planting of 1,000 new trees on streets.
- £6 million worth of services brought back in-house through the insourcing strategy by bringing in the £5.6million Parking Enforcement contract, away from private contractors, with another 6 services also to come back in.
- Providing integrated adult skills and employment services to ensure that Hackney residents would get the help they need if they have lost their job or needed more support.
- Spending an additional £58 million than the annual budget in 2020/21 with £54 million responding to the coronavirus pandemic, with the shortfall in 2020/21, without Government support, being equal to nearly half of the entire Government cuts to Hackney's budget since 2010.
- The pressure on the Council increased in October 2020 by organised criminals who targeted the Council with a cyberattack, noting that £2 million had been set aside to help rebuild the digital systems.
- Despite government grant funding to help in 2020/21, a requirement to make £11 million of savings. Yet despite this, the budget would remain true to Hackney's values by maintaining frontline services, ensuring value for money, supporting the most vulnerable, investing and insourcing services, and making Hackney more sustainable.
- An increased Council Tax of 4.99% to raise £4.3million to continue to run the services that residents needed, with an average household bill increase of less than £1 a week, being one of the lowest Council Tax bills in London, recognising that whilst it was a difficult time to increase, the £26million investment in our CTRS scheme would be maintained with 27,000 households benefiting from an 85% reduction in their bill, while pensioners and care leavers would pay no Council Tax at all, and setting aside a further £1.4 million so residents that qualified for CTRS would get a further £60 off their bill.
- Investment of £500k to directly help the poorest residents, families in food poverty to access fresh, healthy food, a commitment to the principle that no-one should be blocked from receiving support because of where they were from, a further £100k into hardship grant schemes for people with no

recourse to public funds, with further £100k investment to the Discretionary Crisis Fund to help residents in financial crisis

- An additional £300k into the attainment of Hackney's children and young people, specifically for groups historically underachieving, to reduce exclusion and assist with the transition between primary and secondary schools, and continued spend of £13.6 million on youth and early help services for families, including the four youth hubs, six adventure playgrounds and other satellite-based community provision, and making Hackney healthier with £5 million of investment in two new primary care facilities in the Borough.
- Investment in frontline services, proven to be the fourth emergency service throughout this pandemic, £1.75million in libraries and archives (£440k more than last year) including £800k on the Stoke Newington Library refurbishment and £150k on the Hackney Museum refurbishment.
- Rebuilding a Greener borough by spending £2.3 million over three years to switch the remaining street lights to energy-saving, LED bulbs resulting in saving energy costs and reducing electricity consumption through streetlights by 60%, and with the municipal energy company Hackney Light and Power investment of £200k in the Green Homes Fund to roll out free home insulation, helping lower energy bills and emissions for thousands of local residents, and a further £700k to deliver solar panel installation on the Council's existing roof space assets.
- An investment of £13.5 million being an increase of £5.2 million on the previous year to manage and maintain Hackney's 58 parks, gardens, leisure facilities and green spaces including £3.5 million into Abney Park, £1.25million in refurbishing play areas (£900k more than last year), £52k in installing more water fountains, and £30k in improving biodiversity in the Borough, like wildflower meadows on verges and estates.
- By the end of 2021 having 44 School Streets throughout the borough, and moving to fortnightly waste collection to reduce emissions of approximately 3,000 tonnes of CO₂eq associated with incinerating black bag waste

The Mayor concluded by stating that the proposed budget met the administration's manifesto pledges to the people of Hackney, while also going further, recognising the challenges and tackling them, and setting-out Hackney's own 'roadmap' to rebuild a better Hackney.

9.2 The Opposition Chief Whip - Councillor Steinberger - responded to the proposed budget and advised that he was moving the circulated amendment to the budget proposals and making a number of points - the following in summary - and detailing a proposed amendment to the proposed budget as appended at **Appendix C**.

- Thanking Finance officers Ian Williams and Jackie Moylan for their support and assistance in what was a difficult task tyomundrrtake in providing an alternative budget.

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

- Concerns that that a particular portfolio had now been held by four different people in the past 18 months and concerns given the importance of the portfolio of management of this area.
- The contradictions of the CPZ consultation showed a 64% wish for the operating hours to be reduced and considerable concerns expressed that views were being ignored, together with no consideration of any Jewish Holidays during the consultation period.
- The issue of trees being planted across the Borough and concerns of the dying trees on the Woodberry Down Estate, and the big tree issue also
- The amendments proposed to savings across the Borough given the current COVID crisis.
- The issues of residents not receiving benefits now for up to 6 months and this being blamed on COVID and the cyber attack.
- That in commending the amended budget to the Council, a hope that in future the administration would work with the minority group in the formation of the proposed budget.

Councillor Odze advised that he would be seconding the proposed amendment to the proposed budget and would reserve his right to speak until others had contributed to the debate.

- 9.3 The Speaker, in asking if there were any points / comments, advised the Mayor that his response should be given at the end of the debate. Contributions to the debate were, in summary, as follows:

Deputy Mayor Bramble

- Commenting on efforts of Local Government during the COVID crisis to maintain services and assist in conjunction with the voluntary sector/local businesses, and recognising a loss of 60p in the pound since 2010 of government support, with people's spending reduced 8% in real terms.
- The loss of educational support through the reduction in in the education support grant and the investment by the Council of £300k for the purpose of supporting children particularly looking at underachievement, exclusion, and support in transition from primary to secondary education, and this continued support by the Council despite the of the Government letting the Council and its children down continually.

Councillor Peters

- Given the late submission of the amendments to the budget proposals, and there being no opportunity to discuss the proposals with officers to validate some of the amendments, it would not be possible to give consideration to the proposals given the complexities of those proposals.

9.4 Councillor Odze, as seconder to the amendment to the budget proposals commented:

- To rebut the comments in regard to consideration of the amendment as throughout the process of meeting with the Director of Finance and his deputy, they had clearly throughout the process of considering the proposed amendments advised whether the contents therein were within the framework of the law and acceptable amendments, and any breach in statutory provision or what would not be permissible would not be included in the amendment;
- Two main issues relating to future reviews namely street closures and creation of school streets and the detrimental and arbitrary decisions to enforce street closures, and the subsequent serious effects on people with health and disability issues in these area, and the effects of the school streets proposals especially on main roads where schools were located and the overall effects on all children in the Borough;
- The consequences of low traffic neighbourhoods on the poor and not the rich and disadvantaging both elderly and disabled people, and by discontinuing with the proposals this would save money and also allow time to review the proposals sensibly.

Councillor Nicholson

- That whilst the amendment had been tabled in the best of intentions and signed off as a legal set of amendments, some concern at the proposal to cut some of the investment into libraries possibly equating to the loss of some £500k for the likes of Stamford Hill Library.

9.5 The Speaker asked Mayor Glanville to respond to the amendment to the budget proposals. Mayor Glanville responded in summary:

- That reference to the lack of technical support in compiling the amended budget proposals should have featured more so and values in setting an amended budget instead of under achieving proposals which would affect not only areas such as Hackney Central and Shoreditch, but also the area of Stamford Hill.
- That almost all of the 23 budget amendments proposed were the same as those recommended for 2020/21 affecting those in food poverty, and vulnerable , and that the proposals were extremely poor, and that by ceasing to invest in highways. Infrastructure, matters like LED lighting, this would cost the Council more in the long run, with the amendment proposals not being a budget of hope but one of despair.

The amendment to the proposed budget as outlined and as appears at Appendix C was **MOVED** by Councillor Simche Steinberger and seconded by Councillor Harvey Odze.

On a recorded vote :

there being 2 for : Councillors Odze & Steinberger,

and 47 against : Councillors Adams, Adejare, Bell, Billington, Bramble, Cameron, Chapman, Chauhan, Coban, Conway, David, Desmond, Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Garasia, Glanville, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, Joseph, Kennedy, Lufkin, Lynch, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahon, Moema, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Patrick, Pallis, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Race, Rathbone, Rennison, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Spence, Stops, Webb, Woodley, Wrout

And no abstentions,

The amendment to the **MOTION** was lost, and therefore the amendment to the proposed budget was not carried.

The substantive **MOTION** was put to the vote by the Mayor.

On a recorded vote :

there being 47 for :

Councillors Adams, Adejare, Bell, Billington, Bramble, Cameron, Chapman, Chauhan, Coban, Conway, David, Desmond, Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Garasia, Glanville, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, Joseph, Kennedy, Lufkin, Lynch, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahon, Moema, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Patrick, Pallis, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Race, Rathbone, Rennison, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Spence, Stops, Webb, Woodley, Wrout

And 2 against : Councillors Odze and Steinberger

And no abstentions,

the **MOTION** was carried.

(Councillors Levy, Papier, and Williams were not present during vote on either the amendment to the MOTION or the substantive MOTION on this item)

RESOLVED:

1. That it be agreed to bring forward into 2021/22 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £11.2m ;
2. That approval be given to the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1 of the report;
3. That it be noted that the budget was a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan included at Section 6 of the report.
4. That it be noted that in line with the requirements of the Local

Government Act 2003, the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources, was of the view that:

i. 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 2021/22 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 published 2019/20 Accounts and 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 Budget to maintain the balance at £11.2m by 31 March 2021 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 HRA balance has reduced from £15m in 2020-21 because of the need to set up a provision for Thames Water agency refunds but there is a plan to get back up to £15m by increasing the savings plan over the medium term to replenish reserves.

ii. The General Fund estimates are sufficiently robust to set a balanced budget for 2021/22. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2021/22 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2020 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.

5. That the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 8 of the report for implementation from 1st April 2021 be approved;

6. That it be agreed to continue the policy requiring the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to seek to mitigate the impact of significant changes to either resources or expenditure requirements;

7. That the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 25th January 2021 be noted;

8. That the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources be authorised to implement any virements required to allocate provision for demand and growth pressures set out in the report subject to the appropriate evidence base being provided;

9. That approval be given to :

i. The allocation of resources to the 2021/22 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7 of the report; and

ii. The allocation of resources to the 2021/22 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7 of the report, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 25th 2021;

10. That it be noted that the new capital expenditure proposals matched uncommitted resources for the year 2021/22;

11. That 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 Section 25 and Appendix 3 of the report be agreed;

12. That the authorised limit for external debt of £536m agreed in 11 above for 2021/22 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003 with further reassurance about the robustness of the budget being the confirmation that the Council's borrowings were within the boundaries of prudential guidelines;

13. That the continued to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position, be agreed;

14. That it be noted that at its meeting on 27 January 2021 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2021/22 financial year as 72,039 in accordance with regulations made under section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and that the Council Tax Base was the total number of properties in each of the eight council tax bands A to H converted to an equivalent number of band D properties;

15. That it be agreed that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2021/22 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.

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

(a) £1,199.503m 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) £18.171m being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the 1988 Act, and

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

16. That the authority calculated the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)

(a) £1,116.488m 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) £nil 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) £13.967m being the amount of the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will use in order to provide for the items mentioned in subsection (2) (a), (b), (e) and (f) above.

17. That it be agreed that £89.219m be the amount by which the aggregate calculated under subsection (i) above exceeds that calculated under subsection (2) above, the authority calculates the amount equal to the difference; and the amount so calculated is its Council Tax Requirement for the year;

18. That the amount at 17 above divided by the amount at 14 above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A of the Act, being £1,238.47 as the basic amount of its council tax for the year;

19. That in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council tax for 2021/22 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings:

Valuation Bands Hackney

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
825.65	963.25	1100.86	1238.47	1513.69	1788.91	2064.12	2476.95

20. That it be noted that for 2021/22 the Greater London Authority had stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, approval be given to each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands GLA

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
242.44	282.85	323.25	363.66	444.47	525.29	606.10	727.32

21. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 19 and 20 above, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, approval be given to setting the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for 2021/22 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below:

Valuation Bands Combined Hackney/GLA

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1068.09	1246.10	1424.11	1602.13	1958.16	2314.20	2670.22	3204.27

22. That in the event of any changes to the proposed levels of the GLA Precept as set out in.20above, following the consideration of its budget on 25 February 2021, that (a) authority be delegated to the Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources to reflect any amendments to the GLA Precept in the Council's Council Tax billing information and (b) that approval be given to convening a further meeting of full Council to consider any such amendments in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Finance Act 1992

23. That following agreement of resolutions 16 to 18 above, approval be given Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2021/22 be £89.219m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,238.47 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,602.13 including the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept, and that an analysis of the tax base total Band D Council Tax across Council Tax Bands shown in resolution 21 above and as detailed within the report and an exemplification of the taxbase and discounts by band, is shown in Appendix 5 of the report be noted;

24. 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 2021/22 as shown at Appendix 9 of the report was not excessive (5% or above) and therefore did not require the Council to hold a referendum;.

25. That the Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 to 2023/24, set out at Appendix 3 of the report be agreed;

26. That the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3 of the report be agreed; and

27. That approval be given to the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in paragraphs 25.21-25.26 of the report.

10. Amendments to the Council's Constitution

10.1 Councillor Odze and Deputy Mayor Bramble both thanked the Director of Legal and Governance and Officers for all their work carried out on the Amendments to the Council's Constitution.

10.2 Councillor Sharman highlighted the importance of the amendment to the Audit Committee, and how the Audit Committee would now report back to council on an annual basis.

RESOLVED:

That approval be given to the amendments to the procedure for motions, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, and the amendments to the Audit Committee terms of reference as set out in Appendix 4 of the report.

11. Dispensation Report

11.1 The Chief Executive introduced the report to Members.

RESOLVED:

That in accordance with Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, approval be given to Deputy Mayor Rennison's non-attendance at meetings until September 2021 to accommodate her maternity leave.

12. Calendar of Council Meetings

12.1 The Chief Executive introduced the report to Members

RESOLVED:

That the proposed Council meeting calendar for 2021/22, be noted.

13. Motion

- 13.1 Councillor Sade Etti and Councillor Lufkin introduced the Motion to Members, Deputy Mayor Bramble, Councillor Stops and Councillor Maxwell shared their support for the Motion.
- 13.2 Councillor Odze commended Councillor Etti and Councillor Maxwell on all their hard work carried out with the older community. Although Councillor Odze shared that he was unable to support the motion.

The Motion was passed as follows:

Hackney Council recognises the importance of place and belonging and that older residents feel that Hackney is a great place to live and grow old in. Council endorses the successful application to join the World Health Organisation's global network of age-friendly cities and communities and that there is ongoing attention to creating an age-friendly borough.

15% of our population in Hackney are over 55 years old and the recently approved Ageing Well Strategy shares the vision that residents feel empowered, informed, valued and supported; through age-friendly communities and services and specialist care if the need arises. Council celebrates the diversity of roles that older people in Hackney play, and the contribution they make to our local community.

Ageing is an experience that is unique and different to each individual. However, through the strategy's engagement work, notable consistent themes were highlighted as to what constitutes a better ageing experience for residents across the spectrum of adult age bands:

- being connected and engaged with society, tackling ageism and respected;
- keeping active physically, mentally and socially;
- a keenness to be empowered to take responsibility for individual own health where possible;
- the importance of feeling safe at home and out in the community;
- better access to information and communication;
- championing more age-friendly activity and infrastructure in our neighbourhoods.

It is around these themes and others that the council resolves to work with services, stakeholders, partners and residents to effect change that is tangible and makes a difference. At the heart of this work is co-production; and really considering both the needs and interests of this population.

Council commits to make Hackney age-friendly, and ultimately a place for everyone.

Council therefore resolves:

- To endorse Hackney's membership to the World Health Organisation's Global Network for age-friendly cities and communities.
- To embed the commitments of membership within the Council's ageing well approach and to involve older residents in this pursuit.

Proposed by: Councillor Sade Etti

Seconded by: Councillor Richard Lufkin

Voting:

For: Many

Abstentions: 1

RESOLVED: That the motion be carried.

Duration of meeting: 7pm – 10.10pm

APPENDIX A - Agenda item 6, Question from Members of the public.

6.1 Question from Ms Inez Miszczyk to Mayor Glanville

What steps were taken to protect vulnerable people during the covid crisis?

Response from Mayor Glanville

Thank you Mr Speaker, and my thanks to Inez for her question.

Our aim from the start of the pandemic was to go well beyond what the government expected us to do, so we were able to support people who were already vulnerable at the same time as meeting new needs as more people became impacted by Covid.

In March, we set up a volunteering hub and helped build connections between the Mutual Aid groups that had sprung up and the more formal community and voluntary organisations that already existed. We also unrestricted our grant funding of the voluntary sector so they were better able to support residents, and we provided rent free and rent deferral periods for organisations based in Council-owned buildings.

A single point of contact phone line was set up alongside an associated online form and we triaged needs for the most complex cases. Key to this was a food parcels offer and we worked alongside the volunteering hub to offer additional help with emergency food, non food essentials and prescription collections.

Hackney Council delivered over 22,000 food parcels to over 2,000 households in need during the first lockdown. 600 volunteers were engaged and managed by Volunteer Centre Hackney. 5,025 deliveries of medication were made by volunteers and 373 volunteers were placed in organisations helping Hackney residents. We estimate that a further 200,000 meals and food parcels were distributed by the voluntary and community sector, faith organisations and mutual aid groups. We also set up a dedicated helpline in the Orthodox Jewish community and worked with partners from the community to set up a Kosher food hub run by Bikur Cholim, who, with support from the Council, distributed 100 food parcels per week between April and July.

A council-funded hardship scheme for people with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) was delivered by Family Action and the CAB distributing £45,000 of hardship grants. We have also supported NRPF rough sleepers.

As the first lockdown ended, we prepared for the second wave. We kept our Here to Help phone line running to take and make welfare calls. Working closely with a wide range of community organisations we set up the Community Partnerships Network to help us support residents. This has meant the council and VCS organisations were ready to scale up support as we went into the second and third lockdowns. The network now operates at scale delivering over 3000 meals a week

and 2000 food parcels or grocery top ups. They also take daily referrals from the phone line. By building a network we have been able to attract well over £300,000 of external funding (including over £20,000 raised over Christmas from individual donations) and also improved the way food surplus is brought into the borough and distributed.

We are distributing vouchers (£45 in total for each child) to 2,200 under 5s through our children's centres and to the 12,000 children on our free school meal register through our schools. We have also set up a fuel voucher scheme with the Citizens Advice Bureau and worked with organisations in the Orthodox Jewish community to reach families who might not be on the free school meals register.

Adult Services has of course continued to provide social care to those with care needs throughout the pandemic. This includes: supporting people to come out of hospital safely, responding to safeguarding concerns, supporting carers including via Carers First's virtual support services and completing welfare checks on vulnerable people. We have provided and continue to provide PPE and infection control support for all our care homes. Residents there have now all been offered their first dose of Covid vaccine.

A tough eleven months Mr Speaker but one in which we continue to support vulnerable residents through the dark times and on into the hope provided by falling case rates and rising vaccination numbers.

6.6 Question from Elizabeth Sills to Deputy Mayor Rennison

Do you agree with the letter published in the February edition of Hackney Citizen on the reorganisation of the Housing department? Would you agree that a Council question my father asked in January 2020 is of particular concern, and decisions on the same subject taken in 1988-1990 should be re-implemented?

Response from Deputy Mayor Rennison

I note that this is a multi-part question and I am not immediately clear as to its focus, so I hope I have correctly interpreted it as being about the Council's current Lettings Policy consultation?

As you will be aware, Hackney is at the eye of the storm of the housing crisis which this Government has presided over and with its continued assault on social housing actively worsened.

We have over three thousand households that are homeless and living in temporary accommodation. At the current rate of properties becoming available, it would take nearly five years just to house those currently homeless, not to count all those continuing to present in housing need and those with urgent medical and other needs. This is despite almost half of all homes in Hackney being for social rent.

As demand has grown and supply shrunk, the Council's allocations system – designed to give people choice, flexibility and a meaningful say in the place they call home – has increasingly struggled to meet the needs of the people it is there

to help. Indeed, it has become misleading in terms of people's likely prospect of finding a home.

With 11,000 bids received for every 100 homes that become available, thousands of households put time, effort and emotional energy into their search for a home, often without a realistic chance of benefitting.

We are consulting on creating a simpler, more transparent housing register, better suited to the situation in Hackney today. At a time of increasing demand and reduced supply, the Council must ensure that the limited stock of social housing that becomes available goes to those in greatest need while also investing in advice and support for all those unlikely to access a home through the housing register.

At the same time, we continue to do all we can to bring properties back into use here in Hackney as well as build new social rent homes. This includes everything from our own building programme, to the Mayor's Challenge Fund and our work with housing associations, our Right to Buy buyback scheme and our open offer to landlords to work with us and ensure no property sits empty - reinforced by the changes we've introduced to Council Tax to ensure higher rates for homes sat empty for a year or more.

We are doing all we can to help Hackney residents find a place to call home and will continue to do so going forwards.

APPENDIX B - Agenda item 7, Questions from Members

Responses to questions that were not taken at the meeting due to non attendance and/or time constraints

7.8 Question from Councillor Katie Hanson to the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

Over the last year, residents across Hackney have volunteered thousands of hours to support the borough's Coronavirus pandemic response. Can the Cabinet Member for Volunteering please outline what plans the Council has to mark their contribution and to express our deepest gratitude for all they have done?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

We're incredibly proud of our brilliant voluntary and community sector and the local mutual aid groups who have rallied around to support residents in need at this difficult time.

Not only have volunteers played a key role in supporting their communities at this difficult time, but they have also helped take the strain off our NHS and other frontline services that we all rely on.

I would like to take this opportunity to give a huge thanks to them for their tireless work and dedication to supporting Hackney's communities, despite facing significant challenges themselves as a result of the pandemic.

Our work to support the VCS

We have worked closely with our voluntary and community sector partners since the start of the pandemic to support the community response to Covid-19. This includes:

- Launching a £370k coronavirus support package to support the VCS, including:
 - Funding an accelerated small grants programme to support hyper-local and grassroots' responses to the pandemic
 - Committing to matching donations to Hackney Council for Voluntary Services' Hackney Giving coronavirus support fund
 - Providing further financial support to organisations to mitigate the long-term impacts that coronavirus will have on the VCS
- We were the first local authority to commit to the London Funders' Community Response Fund, which was set up to support the coronavirus response in the capital. By aligning with this fund, we are providing local organisations with a better chance of being funded by other funding organisations in London. We are now aligning grants for 2021/22 with the CRF to maintain maximum

exposure for Hackney organisations to the London-wide funders.

- Setting up a Volunteering Hub in partnership with Volunteer Centre Hackney, which saw over 1,000 DBS-checked volunteers deployed to areas where they're most needed
- We submitted evidence to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport's review into the impact of the pandemic on the charity sector, in partnership with Hackney Council for Voluntary Services
- We have worked with local voluntary organisations and groups to ensure that food parcels for shielding and vulnerable residents meet dietary and culturally specific requirements
- We are supporting Volunteer Centre Hackney to train and support over 120 volunteers and frontline workers to communicate key public health messaging to people within their communities through Hackney's Community Champions' programme

Upcoming volunteering campaign

Next month, we will be launching a campaign in partnership with Volunteer Centre Hackney to further acknowledge and recognise the incredible role that volunteers and voluntary and community organisations have played in supporting local communities throughout the pandemic, despite facing significant challenges and hardship themselves as a result of the coronavirus crisis.

This will include:

- Profiles and feature pieces on local volunteers and VCS organisations to be shared through Council channels, particularly our Council-owned publication Hackney Life, social media and our e-newsletter
- A joint blog from the Mayor and Volunteer Centre Hackney thanking volunteers for the work they've been doing to support their neighbours and communities at this difficult time, despite facing challenges themselves as a result of the pandemic
- Creating a media toolkit for voluntary organisations and supporting them to share the work that they've been doing throughout the pandemic

7.9 Question from Councillor Ian Rathbone to Mayor Glanville

Could the Cabinet lead on transport please give an update on the situation regarding Dunlace Road E5 problems with the build-up of traffic queues of vehicles using the road to get through to Chatsworth road and then out of Hackney?

Response from Mayor Glanville

Council officers met with residents and Councillor Rathbone last year and made a commitment to investigate their concerns.

The Council has undertaken traffic surveys to record the number of vehicles and queue lengths in Dunlace Road as they approach the junction with Chatsworth Road.

A video survey was also carried out to understand why traffic could be having trouble exiting Dunlace Road into Chatsworth Road.

The surveys themselves were carried out over a seven day period, throughout the first week of November 2020. This enabled us to gain an accurate picture of traffic movements in the area and enabled us to ascertain whether the traffic issues occurred on a particular day, for example is it a weekday issue or is there also an issue at the weekend.

The information received from these surveys has now been studied and we are now looking at several options to help reduce the impact of traffic in Dunlace Road whilst maintaining as much as possible the current conditions in the neighbouring roads.

We are investigating a number of options of which the more appropriate ones will be subject to consultation with local residents before a final design is chosen.

The Mayor understood that the Council was investigating a number of options of which the more appropriate ones would be subject to consultation with local residents before a final design is chosen. Officers will be providing updates and Councillor Coban would be happy to hold a session, alongside officers, to discuss this when he is in post.

7.10 Question from Councillor Stops to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

A generation of Hackney pedestrians have had to put up with Council sponsored advertising boards on the pavement. On 31 August 2021 the contract expires and these boards are to be removed. Can the Cabinet Member please assure me this is in train and we can get some of our pavements back and have a consistent position on advertising on the pavement?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

The Council is committed to a more greener and sustainable future with a number of initiatives. The units are not sponsored by the Council, but the contract allows a supplier to lease a space on our pavements to promote branded content.

Town centre and borough wide public realm changes have undergone considerable change since the start of the current contract. The Council's policies reflect this change, and have driven a number of programmes to address accessibility and other concerns over the lifetime of this contract. The number of units has not increased since the start of the contract, and represent a small percentage of public realm items overall.

The Council only uses these units for public information only, and they form an important part of our overall communications mix. While we have a number of alternative digital channels like email and social media there are still a number of

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

residents who face a number of costs and challenges accessing internet based services. These units provide the Council with a low cost alternative way to provide service based, special events, and more recently vital public health information.

In line with the Council's public realm improvement approach, we are currently reviewing the contract, including options to reduce the overall number of physical units. Officers shall ensure compliance with the relevant protocols and procedures, in the event of the submission of any planning applications that are deemed necessary.

APPENDIX C - Opposition Motion as referred to Minute Item 9

2021/22 Revenue Estimates and Council Tax

TABLED PAPER: Conservative Group Budget Amendment

This Council therefore amends as set out below the 2021/22 budget proposals, by proposing a reduction in the Hackney element of the Council Tax of £57.68 per Band D equivalent.

	£'000s
Proposed changes in capital expenditure	
Reduce investment in planned highways maintenance <i>Note: the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and the Director of Public Realm would strongly advise that this reduction is only maintained for one year and will need to be reversed as part of the development of the 2021/22 Budget</i>	(1,000)
Deferment of some of the planned investment in libraries	(500)
Rephasing of investment in Kings Hall over a longer time frame	(800)
Discontinue the tree planting programme	(200)
Rephasing of the programme of LED light bulb replacements	(380)
Sub-total of proposed changes in capital expenditure	(2,880)
Not implementing one-off spend on food poverty and ensure existing schemes available are fully utilised.	(500)
Removal of one-off spend on supporting under-achieving pupils	(300)
Review of members allowances with a view to reducing costs of the Cabinet by, for example capping of the Mayor's allowance and bringing an end to the current position whereby there are two deputy Mayors	(61)
Reviewing and reducing the highways maintenance revenue budget <i>Nb There is a risk that this investment may need to be replaced in the following year.</i>	(300)
Reducing revenue expenditure on tree maintenance and overall investment in this area. <i>Nb There is a risk that this investment may need to be replaced in the following year.</i>	(114)

TOTAL CHANGE IN BUDGET REQUIREMENT	(4,155)
---	----------------

Nb. the proposed change in capital expenditure (i.e. the £2,880k) will take the form of a one-off reduction in Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay to fund the reduction in Council tax as set out above.

Council therefore amends as follows the 2021/22 budget proposals, including a reduction in the Hackney element of the Council Tax of £57.68 per Band D equivalent. The Group Director of Finance & Corporate Resources advises that he can give the reassurances required by Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 with regard to the adequacy of the reserves and the robustness of the estimates on the basis of the notes included with the proposed amendments. It is also important to note that where resources identified above are only one off resources they can only be used to fund expenditure for one year. The proposed amendments set out above will generate a Council Tax Requirement of £85.064m, which equates to a Council Tax of £1,180.79 (£1.18 increase when compared to 2020/21) at the Band D level for Hackney purposes. When added to the proposals of the preceptor, the Greater London Authority, this would produce a total at band D level of £1,544.45 for residents, which equates to an overall £32.77 increase from 2020/21.

It should be noted that the Conservative Group do not agree with any increase in the GLA precept and indeed we believe that if we had a Conservative Mayor of London, there would be no increase in the GLA precept and we would therefore be able to limit the increase to £1.18 as set out above to residents.

The GLA should end inefficient and wasteful expenditure on schemes and projects that ignore the outcome of consultations. The GLA needs to account fully for the increase of £15 per Band D property in 2021/22 in respect of the "Police precept" (and an overall increase in Band D precept of £31.59) and explain how numbers of officers on the streets have or will have changed as a result of this additional tax.

A Conservative administration would undertake a root and branch review of the budget and would introduce an emergency budget to realign the Council's expenditure in line with a Conservative Mayor's priorities.

In addition to the proposed amendments set out above for 2021/22, the Conservative group proposes that the following reviews take place during 2021/22 in order to identify further efficiencies, to include:

- Consider revoking the policy change in respect of moving to two weekly bin collection and to reinstate weekly service across all of the borough. We believe that the two weekly bin collections reward those on estates where recycling rates are lowest whilst penalising those in other types of accommodation who already recycle waste. We would also reduce unnecessary expenditure on replacement bins.
- Ending the publication of the quarterly Hackney Today and Hackney Live which is produced eight times a year, replacing the previous fortnightly production and to explore more efficient means of publishing service information.
- Ending the implementation of public realm schemes relating to road closures and other traffic calming measures, which are ineffective, thereby reducing air pollution particularly around schools. Many such schemes have had an adverse impact on

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

the safety of local residents and other road users. We also believe that some of these schemes have had an adverse impact on local businesses and residents. Typical examples of wasted money are the super cycle highway at West Bank, works at Clapton Common and other road closures in the Stoke Newington area.

- A review of the way in which officers support members, ensuring efficiency and reduced cost of the support provided via direct contact with relevant officers across the Council as required review of street crossing patrols with a view to increasing the number across the borough to ensure the safety of children using our roads.
- A commitment to ensure that there are no reductions in the support of children in our schools with special education needs.
- A thorough research project to determine the feasibility of raising revenue income from advertisements on the council's recycling and refuse vehicle fleet.
- No further expenditure to be incurred on Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), including those not yet implemented. Further to this we would undertake a thorough analysis of income from CPZ's and how this is used in support of the Council's budget, ensuring it is used fully in accordance with the related statutory regulations. Ensure schemes are adapted for all communities and special dispensation for Churches, Synagogues and Mosques and Public Holidays.
- A review of the consultation process, particularly regarding CPZs, to ensure that every local resident and local business have a say unlike the new consultation process which limits responses per household and that the final decisions take full account of the views expressed by residents and business.
- Explore the possibility of removing estate parking charges to encourage residents of the estates to park on those estates with a view to freeing up parking capacity on surrounding roads in the borough for other users.
- A review of the application of s106 funds to ensure that those with some flexibility regarding their use are used most efficiently in pursuit of the Council's overall aims and objectives. In addition, a review of the application of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds to ensure a fairer distribution across schools in the borough.
- Review of schemes agreed with TfL as part of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) with a view to agreeing a re-prioritisation of funding in order to reduce calls on the Council's discretionary capital programme for general repairs. This review and any subsequent proposed changes to the approved LIP will need to be agreed by TfL. Further to this, we would encourage TfL to supply seating at all bus stops, available for those residents and users that have disabilities or unable to stand for prolonged periods of time. In addition, to ensure that no further cuts are made to the buses that run through Hackney, either in terms of their numbers or routes. Additionally, a Conservative administration would lobby the GLA to end the LIP programme.
- A review of the roads maintenance programme ensuring that repairs are not required to be repeated on the same roads and pathways within short timeframes and ensuring that works by the Council are fully coordinated with those of the utility companies. In particular we would cease projects at Morning Lane and Church Street.

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on:
Wednesday 24 February 2021**

- Explore options to combine the Planning and Enforcement services with other suitable boroughs to achieve efficiencies and better understanding of the approach to large families, alongside a full review of grants available to planning authorities in order to ensure these are fully exploited.
- Explore more fully the potential of providing some of our services to other Council's, thus maximising efficiencies further and generating income for the Council, e.g. provision of Registrar's service to Waltham Forest.
- A review of assistance to small business to ensure that optimum level of support is provided, focusing on areas such as increasing take up of small business rate relief. In addition, undertake a review and improve communication to ensure local businesses are aware of Covid-19 grants including those who do not have on-line access.
- Ensure that social care is delivered in a way that ensures the needs of all communities are respected and accommodated and ensure that all new funding streams, in light of Covid are fully explored and utilised.
- A review of the use of the corporate estate, ensuring that public areas are used to their full capacity and thus increasing revenue to the Council. This review will include specifically:
 - Review of the use of Stoke Newington Town Hall Assembly Rooms and the potential to provide parking for attendees at events such as large weddings. We believe that the lack of parking provision has led to potential users finding alternative accommodation, thereby reducing potential revenue income;
 - Review of the use of estate community halls with a view to increasing the use by residents of the borough;
 - Encourage schools to use suitable space for out of hours activities for residents in order to raise additional revenue income for further investment in the schools.
- End ward forums with immediate effect and use the monies thereby saved for social care.
- Review of the application of funds available to the Council for the implementation of Neighbourhood Forums, eg. In the Stamford Hill area, alongside a review of the Planning Service to ensure that consideration of applications for local neighbourhood forums are fair. It is currently very difficult to get local neighbourhood forums agreed by the London Borough of Hackney.
- A review of senior officer's salaries across the Council, particularly in respect of the senior management team.
- A review of members' allowances with a view to reducing costs of the cabinet and a recommendation to cap the Mayor's allowance at £50k per annum. We would bring to an end the current position whereby there are two deputy Mayors, thereby helping to reduce costs by £61k and increasing accountability.
- Implement independent scrutiny before planning enforcement actions are taken to ensure that cases with low risk of success and where there is not a robust public

interest argument are not taken forward.

- Discontinue the Standards Committee with immediate effect given this is no longer a legal requirement, whilst ensuring compliance with the requirements of the Localism Act and other statutory guidance. In any event, whilst the Committee exists, ensure that it does comply with those regulations.
- Further review of the Scrutiny arrangements with a view to revert to the previous system which was in place.
- Bearing in mind the increase to the GLA element of the Council Tax, to make representations to the Mayor of London regarding future scrutiny of expenditure on schemes within the Borough of Hackney, e.g the number of police officers on the streets.
- Improved oversight of value for money of leisure projects to avoid waste of resources, for example London Fields Lido and Clissold Leisure Centre.
- Pause on new initiatives which create additional concerns for residents during the Covid-19 period, for example road closures.
- Review of legal expenditure in relation to defending new policy decisions.

Overall, this budget is put forward within a limited context and were a Conservative administration to be elected we would undertake a zero-base budget review of all areas of spend.

Proposer: Councillor Simche Steinberger
Seconder: Councillor Harvey Odze