

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CABINET

MONDAY 24 OCTOBER 2022

Councillors Present: Mayor Philip Glanville in the Chair

Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble (Vice-Chair),
Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr Mete Coban,
Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas,
Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie,
Cllr Carole Williams, Cllr Caroline Woodley,
Cllr Yvonne Maxwell,

Other Councillors Present: Cllr Alastair Binnie-Lubbock and Cllr Zoe Garbett

Apologies: Councillor Guy Nicholson, Councillor Sem Moema
and Councillor Sade Etti

Officers in Attendance: : Dawn Carter-Mcdonald, Director of Legal, Democratic and
Electoral Services
Jessica Feeney, Governance Services Officer
Ian Williams, Group Director Finance and Corporate
Resources
Mark Carroll, Chief Executive
Helen Woodland, Group Director Adults, Health and
Integration
Rickardo Hyatt, Group Director Climate Homes and
Economy

Also in Attendance: Cathy Philpot, Motorcycle Action Group

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Nicolson, Councillor Etti and Councillor Moema.

2 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

3 Declarations of interest - Members to declare as appropriate

There were no declarations of interest.

4 Notice of intention to conduct business in private, any representations received and the response to any such representations

There were none.

5 Questions/Deputations

Question received from Mr Benjamin Counsell to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm.

‘Much is being made by the council about LTNs tackling climate change, but where is the evidence that LTNs reduce the amount of overall fuel burnt, rather than simply deterring a small proportion of short journeys by making everyone else drive further and queue longer, resulting in an overall increase in fuel burnt? LTNs demonstrably increase traffic, pollution and congestion on boundary roads which are often bus routes. The slowness of bus services is a common reason for people not choosing to travel by bus. Why does the council choose to slow them further by funnelling all the traffic into bus routes? Given that buses disproportionately serve poorer members of the community, surely undermining the viability of buses increases inequalities.’

A written response was provided to the Questioner as set out below:

Dear Benjamin

Thank you for your question intended for the September Cabinet meeting regarding Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs). As you’re aware, following the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and in line with protocols, the Cabinet meeting went ahead with only urgent items on the agenda, to reflect the fact that we were in a period of national mourning; all questions and non-essential business were removed from the agenda. As a result, I understand you were offered a written response which you agreed to.

This is a common fear when residential road closures are installed which assumes that trips which used to pass along a road simply divert to other roads in the immediately surrounding area and problems are shifted to those other roads. This misses the fact that roads are designed for different purposes. Roads in residential areas are not designed to carry through traffic which is better accommodated on main roads. It also misses the phenomenon of ‘traffic evaporation’ where some short car trips will not divert when the journey becomes slightly less convenient because of road closure. Instead the person making the trip might decide to walk or cycle instead of using a car or they might decide not to make the trip at all.

The concept of “traffic evaporation” reflects the fact that, when changes such as modal filters and low traffic neighbourhoods are introduced, some drivers change their travel choices to alternative forms of transport, while others (i.e. through-traffic) make diversions further away to avoid the locality altogether.

The concept was established in academic research carried out by Sally Cairns, Carmen Hass-Klau, and Phil Goodwin in 1998 and followed up in 2002 and has since been widely observed in scheme evaluations. Cairns et al looked at 70 case studies and found that in half of the case studies examined, where road space for traffic was reduced, there was an 11% reduction in the number of vehicles across the whole area, including on the main roads.

Initial analysis of the impact of the LTNs in Hackney have seen a significant drop in the number of trips within the LTNs. The same analysis did show some roads experiencing higher levels of traffic. However, the analysis points to evidence of an overall reduction in traffic volume on the boundary and main roads across Hackney. Air quality modelling based on traffic counts shows that this reduction in traffic has improved air quality at all modelled receptors.

Monday 24 October 2022

To understand whether the schemes have had an overall impact on bus passengers, bus speeds have been analysed using pre-pandemic performance as a benchmark. Bus speeds increased during each of the lockdown periods and decreased in between when traffic returned to the roads.

At the end of the 2nd lockdown in mid-2021, with the LTNs still in place, speeds had broadly returned to pre-COVID levels closely shadowing broader London trends. On a borough-level, the bus speeds in Hackney track the trajectory of bus speeds across London and do not show an impact from the introduction of LTNs on speeds.

I hope that this response is helpful, but if you have any further questions please do come back to me.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mete Coban
Cabinet member for environment and transport

Deputation received from Cathy Philpot on behalf of the Motorcycle Action Group.

Deputation: Parking permits review 2022

The proposals for powered two wheeler (PTW) parking charges in the most recent consultation ‘Have your say on the future of parking permit prices’, are not fair, proportionate, rational or evidenced based. The assumption has been made that a regime that applies to cars can be mapped across to PTWs, leading to massive overcharging of PTWs. This is a result of the flawed decision by Hackney to align PTW charging with car parking charges in February 2021, which itself was based on incorrect information:

- The entire banding structure and the way it is applied to PTWs is inappropriate. Although many PTW manufacturers report CO₂ emissions, these are not recorded by the DVLA for most PTWs. The majority of PTWs will therefore be charged according to their engine size under this structure, which does not bear the same relationship with emissions as in cars.
- The proposed bands set out in the consultation overestimate PTW emissions, as they appear to be based on car emissions so are inevitably not applicable to PTWs. For example, the most popular PTW in the UK falling within band 11 is the BMW R1250 GS, for which the manufacturer reports CO₂ emissions of 110 g/km, far below the 191-225 g/km range for this band as stated in the permit price tables. This discrepancy would mean a rider paying £433 in year 5 for a residents pass, as opposed to £136.
- Under the proposed charges e-PTWs and e-cars will be charged the same. The justification for the charges for electric cars is that they are a significant source of non-exhaust particulate emissions. Whilst this may be true for electric cars, which are often heavier and larger than standard ICE cars, the same does not apply for e-PTWs. Non-exhaust PM emissions, such as brake and tyre wear are roughly proportional to the weight of a vehicle, e-PTWs are much lighter than electric cars. In fact, the combined weight of an e-PTW and rider is far closer to that of a pedal cycle and rider, than to an e-car and driver.
- In addition, the argument is made that pedal cycles paying for parking in cycle hangars should not pay more than any cars. In application to electric PTWs however this is not comparable as there is no plan to install equivalent hangars for PTWs.

Pedal cycles do not in fact pay for using parking facilities such as on-street cycle racks and bollards, which are comparable to facilities available for PTWs.

- The overall charging structure does not take into account a number of relevant factors including space taken up and effect on congestion, both of which are fundamental to effects on pollution and road danger.
- Combining emission and space impacts the proposals overcharge PTW riders by around a factor of 30, effectively asking riders to massively subsidise car parking in the Borough.

Additional concerns:

- The relevant councillors and officers have not engaged sufficiently on this
- The consultation was done in such a way as was unlikely for PTW riders to understand that the charges will apply to them. The lack of any efforts to engage with PTW riders until the final day of the consultation period seriously undermines the consultation process itself.
- The charges represent a massive and unaffordable increase for riders, in the middle of a cost of living crisis

Response from Councillor Coban

I would like to thank you for your deputation, about the listening exercise undertaken by Hackney Council this summer, about permit prices in Hackney.

As I have stated previously, I recognise the important role that motorcycles, scooters and mopeds play in the Hackney economy, but we also recognise that all forms of vehicles, including motorbikes, produce emissions, and that a significant number of people commute into work in Hackney by motorbike each day.

As part of our strong commitment to improving local air quality and tackling the climate emergency, and following a full, six-month long public consultation in 2020, Cabinet agreed 18 months ago to place motorcycles on the same footing as all other vehicles, with permit prices based solely on the emissions they produce, as recorded by the DVLA.

These changes will allow businesses, delivery riders and other organisations that provide valuable services to continue to do so, while also discouraging the use of motorbikes for commuting, which contribute to local emissions.

In regard to the concerns you have raised, the final banding structure put forward for approval by Cabinet today recognises that there is a need to provide a wider range of charging bands for vehicles, including powered two wheelers, where permit prices are calculated on engine size. The final proposals now include 7 engine size charging bands, which will ensure fair charges for owners of mopeds and motorbikes.

This change, together with the move to a 13 band charging structure, will provide the right incentives for drivers of the most polluting vehicles to consider whether to keep using their vehicles in the longer term. This approach is also fair and proportionate - under it, the least polluting vehicles, including most powered two wheelers, will see permit charges seven to ten times less than drivers of the most polluting vehicles.

In relation to charges for electrically Powered Two Wheelers, electric cars, and electric bikes, we believe that our decision to treat all vehicles, in a consistent and fair way will

- over time - lead to a growth in cycling, including the use of e-cycles, as drivers and riders alike make the switch to e-bikes, as well as cycling, and using public transport. These changes will benefit the borough as a whole, and the same rationale applies to our commitment to ensure that parking permit charges are not less than secure cycle parking storage.

On the point you raised about the space that scooters and motorbikes take up, I'm aware that officers have explained previously that Hackney Council has a long-standing policy of basing permit prices solely on the tailpipe CO2 emissions, with a surcharge for diesel vehicles, in order to encourage all residents and businesses to opt for the cleanest vehicle they can. The size of a vehicle has never been a factor that is taken into account.

In respect of the level of consultation on the proposals, it simply isn't true to say that there has been insufficient engagement. The proposals on motorcycle charges were consulted on for 6 months in 2020, and received feedback from almost 5,000 people, including submissions from riders living, working, and commuting into Hackney. In addition, consultation on the Parking and Enforcement Plan 2022-27, has seen over 8,000 responses. These response rates highlight the lengths that we have gone to as a council to engage with the public on these issues, and I know that you and other campaigners have had regular communications with officers and myself over the last few months on these issues. This feedback has been taken into account, together with the feedback from other groups, ahead being submitted to Cabinet this evening.

If pressed on NOx and Euro standards you may have noted that we have not proposed the implementation of any additional charges based on NOx, nor have we used the Euro standards to apply such charges, and as such, the concerns you have raised around these points do not impact upon permit prices. Indeed we recognise that PTWs are better for the environment than larger, more polluting vehicles, and this is reflected in the permit prices set out in our emissions-based charging scheme.

People that need their motorbikes to be able to commute into work could be charged as much as £14,000 a year to park their bike Hackney Council has long been clear in its aim to discourage commuters travelling to work by any form of private vehicle. As part of the package of measures my colleagues and I agreed last February, we agreed to introduce maximum stay restrictions in all solo motorcycle bays, which will discourage their use by commuters, and provide more secure parking for powered two wheelers needing to make deliveries, or visit residents or businesses.

These changes mean that the £14,000 a year figure quoted is inaccurate, as it is based on the assumption that motorcyclists will be able to pay and park for 10 hours a day for those who want to commute to work, which won't be possible in future.

This won't prevent commuting by bike for those that wish to continue doing so, as a number of private car parks exist in Hackney and neighbouring boroughs, but we will not facilitate commuter parking on Hackney's streets. This will not only reduce emissions, but it will also free up much needed space for local residents and businesses, particularly in Shoreditch and Hoxton, where kerbspace is at a premium.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 12 September 2022, were approved.

7 Hackney Youth Parliament Presentation

The Hackney Youth Parliament were invited to make their presentation highlighting the following points:

- The structure of the teams, which consists of 6 Elected Leaders, 3 Deputy Leaders, 2 Young Speakers
- Information around the 3 forums, Education and Youth Participation, Mental Health and Life after Covid.
- Further details on the current projects which included the Hackney Central Regenerations Plan, Takeover Challenge and Democracy Week Learning Packs were shared.
- The Youth Parliament highlighted the Black History Month Events and the Hackney Youth Parliament Debates in the Council Chamber of the Town Hall.

The Mayor and Cabinet Thanked the Youth Parliament for their ongoing work.

8 Capital Update and Property Disposals And Acquisitions Report - Key Decision No: FCR S087

Mayor Phillip Glanville introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

- I. That the scheme for Chief Executives as set out in section 11.1 be given approval as follows:

Stoke Newington Library Refurbishment: Spend approval of £4,400k in 2022/23 is requested to fund the refurbishment of this site.
- II. That the scheme for Climate, Homes & Economy as set out in section 11.2 be given approval as follows:
 - Highways Planned Maintenance 2022/23: Spend approval of £4,000k in 2022/23 is requested to continue to deliver the 2022/23 Planned Maintenance Highways Programme at various locations across the borough.
 - Highways Surface Water Drainage 2022/23: Spend approval of £280k in 2022/23 is requested to facilitate the delivery of the 2022/23 water drainage programme at various locations across the borough.
 - Planned Bridge Maintenance 2022/23: Spend approval of £300k in 2022/23 is requested for the continuation of the 5 year Bridge Maintenance Programme in the borough.

- **LED Lighting Highway 2022/23:** Spend approval of £1,250k in 2022/23 is requested to continue the upgrade of the highway's lighting across the entire borough.
- **Street Lighting Upgrades 2022/23:** Spend approval of £195k in 2022/23 is requested to upgrade the existing street lights located across the entire borough.
- **Developing Borough Infrastructure 2022/23:** Spend approval of £600k in 2022/23 is requested to fund to improve the public realm in four identified sites namely Ridley Road Market, Fairchild Gardens and Spring Hill.
- **Road Safety Programme 2022/23 & 2023/24:** Spend approval of £772k (£400k in 2022/23 and £372k in 2023/24) is requested to fund the public realm improvement works on four identified roads namely Albion Road, Downham Road, Cricketfield Road and Pembury Road.
- **Electric Vehicles (EVs) Charging Points Roll Out Programme:** Resource and spend approval of £893k (£112k in 2022/23, £223k in 2023/24, £223k in 2024/25, £223k in 2025/26 and £112k in 2026/27) is requested to fund the roll out programme of residential on-street Electric Vehicles (EVs) charging points across the borough.

III. To approve the purchase of 2a Woodberry Grove, N4 1SN.

IV. Delegated authority to the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to settle all the commercial terms of the transaction.

V. Paid the stamp duty (SDLT) due on the purchase.

VI. Authorised the Director of Legal and Governance Services to prepare, agree, settle and sign the necessary legal documentation to effect the proposals contained in this report and to enter into any other ancillary legal documentation as required.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The decisions required are necessary in order that the schemes within the Council's approved Capital programme can be delivered and to approve the property proposals as set out in this report.

In most cases, resources have already been allocated to the schemes as part of the budget setting exercise but spending approval is required in order for the scheme to proceed. Where, however, resources have not previously been allocated, resource approval is requested in this report.

To facilitate financial management and control of the Council's finances.

Proposed Purchase of 2a Woodberry Grove, N4 1SN: As outlined within the report, there is a significant need to expand the stock of social housing in Hackney and retain as well as increase the provision of temporary accommodation. As set out within Part 7 of the Housing Act 1996, the Council has a statutory duty to provide interim temporary accommodation to homeless households to whom it has a duty to provide permanent housing. Currently, meeting this statutory duty requires using expensive

nightly let and/or spot purchased accommodation. The acquisition of the Hostel secures the continued provision of this vital accommodation.

9 2022/23 Overall Financial Position Report - August 2022 - Key Decision No: FCR S088

Councillor Chapman introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

- I. Approved GLL and the Council continuing to implement decarbonisation and energy saving initiatives that, where possible, do not impact on the customers experience of the leisure centres;**
- II. Approved the Council using its existing Leisure Management Contract surplus share in conjunction with the other recommended options as a fund that can be drawn down from to ensure the Contract remains cost neutral or in a small surplus to minimise the impact of fees and charges increases on leisure centre customers; and**
- III. Approved the introduction of a 4% increase in all leisure centre fees and charges, with the exception of concessions that will remain at their current level, as soon as possible (giving 30 days notice to leisure centre customers). Then, if necessary and required, introduce a further fees and charges increase of 5.4% on 1 April 2023, with the exception of concessions that would remain at their existing level, as part of the annual fees and charges process.**
- IV. Approved the principles and process for determining Council intervention to support struggling VCS organisations as set out in Appendix 3**
- V. Approved the use of £198,000 from the voluntary sector grants programme reserves and underspend for the award of grants in 2022/23**
- VI. Delegated authority to approve the grant awards for intervention to the Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, adult social care, voluntary sector and leisure**
- VII. Noted that the Council will be distributing a further £2.8m Household Support Funding to households in the most need with food, energy and water bills.**
- VIII. Noted that Hackney has recently joined the Co-Operative Councils Innovation Network.**
- IX. Noted the update on the overall financial position for August covering the General Fund and HRA**

REASONS FOR DECISION

To facilitate financial management and control of the Council's finances and to implement the leisure centre, and voluntary and community centre organisations support recommendations

10 Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) Review 2021-26 - Key Decision No: NH S075

Councillor Coban introduced the report.

Councillor Garbett was invited to ask a question. Councillor Garbett questioned will other factors such as impact of congestions and cradle degrade environmental impact and resource use, now be considered within the allocation of parking fees. Given that electric vehicles are now chargeable would it be possible to consider the other factors. Councillor Coban said that the parking and enforcement plan's aim was to move towards an emission based charging model, the council have undertook lots of different research and information an liaison with residents and it was felt this was a very fair and proportionate of moving into an emission based charged model. Councillor Coban explained that the other factors had been considered.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet:

I. Approved the Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) 2022-27, as set out in Appendix 1a and 1b, for adoption.

II. Delegated authority to:

- **The Group Director for Climate, Homes and Economy,**
- **Strategic Director, for Sustainability and Public Realm, and**
- **Head of Parking, Markets, and Street Trading Service.**

- to amend the objectives set out in the PEP, in consultation with the lead Cabinet Member with responsibility for Parking, to ensure that it continues to reflect any changes in legislation or other council policies

III. Delegated authority to:

- **The Group Director for Climate, Homes and Economy,**
- **Strategic Director for Sustainability and Public Realm, and**
- **Head of Parking, Markets, and Street Trading Service.**

- to amend the PEP, including but not limited to the delivery of the recommendations, policies, terms and conditions, product limits, and pricing. This will ensure the delivery of the PEP, including its objectives by the dates set out in the report, and enable continuous progress in improving air quality, reducing CO₂ emissions, improving customer service, reducing fraud, and delivering more efficient services.

Reason for decision

The Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) provides the policy framework for effective parking management within Hackney. The scope of the proposed PEP is necessarily broad, in part reflecting the complex and challenging linkages between parking and transport, environmental, economic and planning issues. It presents a series of policy recommendations that will be developed and implemented over its lifespan.

Hackney's original PEP was agreed upon by Cabinet in January 2005, with subsequent editions approved in November 2009, and April 2016. This iteration was consulted on for 13 weeks during August and November 2021, followed by a further listening exercise in June and July this year.

The Council's Parking, Markets, and Street Trading Service (referred to as Parking Services throughout this document), has developed the latest edition of the PEP to address the challenges and opportunities around parking over the next five years, including the need to improve air quality, tackle the climate change emergency, and support the transition to electric vehicles by residents who drive. Each chapter within the proposed PEP explains the parking policy or initiative with a description and some background information. It also presents a series of recommendations to be developed during the lifespan of the PEP.

This report (sections 5 to 9) concentrates on the recommendations in the proposed PEP 2022-27 that were amended, recommended without support, or discontinued. All other recommendations supported through the consultation process can be found in appendix 2a and 2b - PEP consultation results and listening exercise feedback.

The PEP 2022-27, its objectives, recommendations, and policies work alongside other council-wide initiatives such as; Hackney, a Place for everyone - Corporate Plan 2018-22, the refresh Corporate Plan 2020-22 including Rebuilding a better Hackney, Rebuilding Greener, and the Emergency Transport Plan, Hackney's Transport Strategy 2015-25 and its supplementary Liveable Neighbourhood Plan 2015-25, the Sustainable Community Strategy 2018-28, Air Quality Action Plan 2021-25, the Local Implementation Plan 2019-22, the Local Plan 2033 (LP33) and the London Mayor's Transport Strategy (2018).

Each strategy or plan plays an important part in delivering the Council's commitment to our climate emergency declaration made in 2019, where the Council has pledged to not be a net contributor to climate change by 2040.

11 Revision of London Borough of Hackney's Contaminated Land Strategy - Key Decision No: NH S068

Councillor Coban introduced the report.

Councillor Garbett was invited to ask a question, the following points were raised.

1. Paragraph 4.3 within the report was referenced, it was questioned why responses were not received and who were the stakeholder that were asked.
2. Brownfields sites have been seen as lesser to the greenbelt in term of bio diversity and will there be scope for that to be reviewed.
3. How recommendation will be taken on board around the planning process.

Councillor Coban responded to say,

1. That he would speak with Planning as to who the stakeholders were and why a response was not received on the draft strategy.
2. It was explained that the Strategy would be continuously reviewed and evolve with policies, it was agreed that this was something that could be looked at going forward.
3. Agreed that a discussion would take with Planning on how to take forward the recommendations.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

- I. Approved the draft Contaminated Land Strategy (2022-2030) for adoption and publication.**
- II. Delegated authority to the Strategic Director of Sustainability & Public Realm, in consultation with the relevant cabinet member, to approve any future consultations and / or amendments relating to the Contaminated Land Strategy.**

Reason for decision

The Council has a statutory obligation under Part 2A to identify and inspect land within its boundaries where it suspects contamination is, or may be, causing unacceptable risks to human health, property or the wider environment.

In order to comply with the regulations, the Council is required to develop, implement and periodically review a risk-based inspection strategy outlining how contamination will be dealt with. Hackney's original strategy was published in 2001, and since then, we have been working to that Strategy. The Draft Strategy takes account of the current status and prevailing circumstances regarding contaminated land within the borough.

No formal statutory consultation on revisions to a Contaminated Land Strategy is required under Part 2A. However, owing to the length of time that had passed since the previous version was adopted, relevant stakeholders and the public were provided with an opportunity to comment on the Draft Strategy. The opportunity was advertised in Hackney Today, which is delivered to every Hackney household. Key stakeholders were also contacted through direct email communication and hard copies were made available in the Town Hall and borough libraries. The opportunity to submit comments was provided during the period 9 May 2022 to 17 June 2022.

No comments on the Draft Strategy were received from the public, nor any of the key stakeholders. Further to the period of consultation, the Draft Strategy has been fully updated and is now submitted to Cabinet for adoption.

12 City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2021/22 - Key Decision No: AHI S120

Councillor Kennedy introduced the report and Dr Adi Cooper was invited to speak on the item.

REOLVED:

This report was for information only.

13 Hackney Libraries Strategy 2022 - 2026 - Key Decision No: CHE S124

Councillor Kennedy introduced the report.

The Mayor invited Councillor Garbett to speak on the item, and the following questions were raised:

1. It was felt that the consultation was not fit for purpose as it did not set out the risk assessment of the proposals for fewer staff, or timetables, particularly for the holiday period. It was questioned if these would be provided and for the consultation to continue?
2. It was questioned if transforming the services first, and then reviewing the staffing requirements, would be considered rather than doing these at the same time?

Councillor Kennedy responded to the questions, as set out below.

2. The engagement at the moment with all staff is ongoing. In answer to the question that came through from the Unions tonight requesting that we stop the consultation, it would be entirely wrong to stop that consultation midway through it. We're actually doing what employment law requires for a restructure, which is talking to every member of staff, taking their views on the proposed restructure, and at the same time talking to the Unions. Members of staff are able to have a Union rep with them, or a friend or colleague can go in with them to those 1:1 engagements. You're right there have been concerns about the risk assessments, and wanting to see the risk assessments, and for that reason I've just had confirmation today that the full risk assessments will be shared with the Unions next week, when the two members of staff doing the main work on this return from half term holidays.
3. In terms of the worry about the staffing levels being too low, quite rightly the very excellent staff team working on this have benchmarked properly against staffing levels in statistically comparable London boroughs. We are proposing running our 8 libraries on 59 full time employees. A statistical comparator in the south of London runs 9 on 65 full time employees, and one just north of us runs 12 libraries on only 52 full time employees. What we are proposing is not in any way different to the staffing levels that work in other inner London boroughs. So I hope that provides you with some levels of assurance. We're not going to be an outlier. In fact in many ways we're going to move to be closer to the pack. At the moment we spend considerably more per head on our library service than most other London boroughs. So we're moving back into the pack and those risk assessments will be shared with staff. At the end of that engagement with all the staff, all those comments about "I'm not sure if this shift pattern works right for this library", will be taken into account in the final structure that will be taken forward for the start of the next financial year.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet approved Hackney's Libraries Strategy 2022-2026 and the associated service transformation which includes the new vision, objectives and service model.

Reason for decision

The new Libraries Strategy directly responds to the engagement with 8,450 residents, a Task and Finish Group of elected members, extensive consultation with library staff and strategic conversations with relevant cross-Council departments.

Feedback from the 'Our Libraries' public engagement campaign shows that residents want access to good quality reading materials and improved digital access to wifi, IT resources, information and study space, more flexible spaces for community use and better communication about what the library has to offer. While the provision of a wide range of books and digital access should remain at the core of the service, local people take the view that libraries must have a broad remit as community hubs for lifelong learning, arts and creativity and community health and wellbeing.

The strategy will drive the service forward as a strong collaborator - promoting inclusive, flexible and creative spaces across all libraries that will be utilised by residents as hubs for community wellbeing, cultural development and digital inclusion and will provide access to reading and lifelong learning opportunities. It will explore future options for extended opening hours and study spaces as well as capital investment to renovate and repair library buildings or, in the instance of Woodberry Down, to develop options for a new library provision.

The financial savings must be seen together with the service transformation and innovation required to deliver the ambitions of the new Libraries Strategy for this administration. The Library Strategy and the approved budget savings will only be achieved by a wholesale service transformation to redesign the service structure for staff and deliver the £250,000 savings approved as part of setting the budget in February 2022

14 Draft Climate Action Plan - Key Decision No: CHE S140

Councillor Coban introduced the report.

The Mayor invited Councillor Garbett to speak on the item, and the following questions were raised:

1. It was felt that the goals were not 'SMART', meaning they're not 'Specific' and they don't specifically say exactly what they're trying to achieve, and some of the objectives are vague, and some of the increases and decreases aren't quantified so don't show an annual breakdown. There is also no mention of a monitoring framework or how it will be specifically governed.
2. Given that the promised biodiversity isn't yet in place and sadly without these there isn't much assurance that the targets will be achieved. How do you intend to make sure that we're on track in delivering these intended plans?
3. It was felt that it was important to make sure there is clear community ownership of these plans but there is no mention of the 'People's Assembly' that was mentioned in your manifesto, so I wondered what the plans are for this?

Councillor Coban responded to the questions, as set out below:

1. One of the key things to recognise with the Climate Action Plan is that this isn't something that we put together yesterday; there has been lots of engagement that has led to the Climate Action Plan in its current form. Be it from the 'Citizens' Assembly' that we had earlier this year, last year the green recovery event, the endless engagement with Deputy Mayor Bramble, with myself and the Mayor, when we went to visit schools. There have been hundreds of people who have fed into the conversation, including businesses and many different partners, which has got the Climate Action Plan to where it is. It is

really important for us to recognise that that engagement has already taken place. But moving forward we are very committed to making sure that that engagement continues. It is something I am very passionate about. We're talking again with Deputy Mayor Bramble about what we can do to engage young people in schools. Young people have to be at the forefront of this conversation given that they're going to be living with the outcome of the climate crisis and will be mostly impacted by it. Talking also with people like Councillor Maxwell on how we engage some of our elderly in Hackney. We need to continue doing that. What I'd encourage all members to do, not just in this room but everyone, is really make sure that during that consultation process that they really encourage their residents to be part of this. It is an evolving piece and we need your input.

2. The question about goals, and them not being 'SMART' enough, slightly relates to the monitoring framework, also how we track how successful we are. There is a multi-layered element to how to answer your question, because it is very difficult to track some of the outcomes of the actions that we want to take. This is something that isn't just shared by Hackney Council but is a challenge we face across London, and across the UK. There are conversations that are happening through London Councils, and other mechanisms, where those monitoring frameworks are being explored. But one of the things we want to do as part of the Climate Action Plan is make sure that we have a robust monitoring framework that is going to supplement the Climate Action Plan, to make sure that we're able to go back to people to show to them the impact of the different actions being taken. The key thing to recognise with the monitoring framework is that there are lots of schemes that feed into the Climate Action Plan, for example if you think of it in the context of transport, when we are rolling out our low traffic neighbourhoods and modelling air quality, those monitoring frameworks are already happening for those individual schemes which form part of the wider Climate Action Plan. What we are essentially doing with the draft strategic plan is that strategic framework for the whole Council.
3. Biodiversity is recognised within the Climate Action Plan, and I know there were conversations around hiring a Biodiversity Officer for the Council. I need to revert back to find out where we are with that. We are absolutely committed to, on a scheme-by-scheme basis, to have those consultations and conversations with people and we'll continue to do that both through the consultation period, but also as we move forward as well. This definitely isn't the end of the conversation; this is a 3 year implementation plan and as technologies develop, the conversation develops, we'll continue to speak to people about how we can update this plan.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

- I. Approved the draft Climate Action Plan ahead of consultation**
- II. Requested approval to undertake consultation on the draft Climate Action Plan, over a ten week period to begin following Cabinet;**
- III. Agreed that officers bring back a report with the results of the consultation, and the amended and final Climate Action Plan in Spring 2023;**

IV. To rejoin UK100, thereby adopting a net zero 2030 target for Council emissions, following an internal assurance process.

Reason for decision

The climate and ecological crisis is having a significant negative impact in Hackney and across the world, through increased extreme weather events, such as flooding and extreme heat, that put communities, ecosystems and natural resources at risk. Without drastic reductions in emissions, and adaptation to higher rainfall and warmer temperatures, the impacts of climate change will continue to worsen - affecting our lives and those of future generations. In response, the Council declared a climate emergency in 2019, supported by an ambitious vision to rebuild a greener Hackney in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic.

Hackney has made progress in reducing emissions over the last decade. Since 2010, emissions from buildings and road transport in Hackney have fallen by about 27%. Consumption emissions - from the things we all buy and use - have fallen by about 10-15% in the UK overall. Nevertheless, without faster action, driven by ambitious policies and targets, we won't be able to protect communities and ecosystems from the effects of climate change.

Since we declared a climate emergency, we have led some of the UK's most innovative work to tackle climate change: ending the dominance of motor vehicle traffic across large parts of Hackney, switching our energy supply to 100% renewable and generating more renewable energy on our buildings. While the Council's emissions only account for about 5% of the borough's overall emissions, our climate emergency declaration commits us to a 45% reduction in Council emissions by 2030 and net zero - where we will no longer be a net contributor to climate change - by 2040.

Significant practical project delivery has happened to date and is ongoing, much of which would have formed part of the first phase of delivering a climate action plan, and has focused on achieving wider benefits rather than solely carbon reductions. Further detail of our phase 1 delivery of climate related actions can be found in the three annual reports on progress with our decarbonisation commitments (see background papers).

It is clear that our focus over the last couple of years on practical delivery is yielding significant benefits for the borough and its residents, noting there have been a number of awards made to the Council including: Keep Britain Tidy awards and Letsrecycle awards for the introduction of residual waste collection arrangements to street properties; Local Government Chronicle national award in the Climate Response category for the transport related work on LTNs and School Streets, and Council of the year in the London Energy Efficiency awards. Future activity must not only continue at pace but in an increasingly systematic fashion maximising impact as well as working more collaboratively with others to enable progress on boroughwide emissions.

This draft Hackney Climate Action Plan (CAP) is the Council's first holistic plan to address the climate and ecological crisis, bringing together the various strands into

one overall document and as such is a key marker in consolidating our journey to net zero.

15 Eliminating Violence Against Women and Girls Hackney Strategy and Action Plan 2022 - 2025 - Key Decision No: CE S122

Councillor Fajana-Thomas introduced the report.

The Mayor invited Councillor Garbett to speak on the item, and the following questions were raised:

1. 1.3 on page 13 should speak more strongly to challenging negative attitudes and talk about universal up skilling to create a culture of non-tolerance, and I just wondered if that was happening?
2. On page 15, there was a need to really stress the importance of cultural competence services in the 'by and for' sector.
3. Councillor Garbett was concerned that although the equalities impact assessment in the cover sheet mentions marginalised groups, there was nothing actually specific in the strategy for sex workers or people seeking asylum who find it really difficult due to stigma and fear of deportation, to access services. It was questioned is this being considered?

Councillor Fajana-Thomas responded to the questions, as set out below:

1. Thanks for your contribution. I remember you were one of the colleagues that engaged with this consultation, and a few of your suggestions were incorporated into the strategy. But to answer your question in terms of wanting to be reassured that the work around challenging behavior is happening; yes, it is happening. Next week Hackney is having a foster, bystander, men ally training, and that is part of what we are doing to ensure that we are challenging. The purpose of that is to raise awareness amongst men, who are mostly the perpetrators of violence against women and girls, so they understand and know what to do in terms of changing culture. Young Hackney is working in our schools and I am proud of the work that Hackney Education is doing working with schools from young ages around boys' behavior around gender stereotypes.
2. We are talking about cultural sensitivity, and the way we support people is on the website, which tells you what we do in Hackney to support people, including refugees and asylum seekers. Everyone is supported, and just to reassure you, whilst they are not mentioned specifically if you look at the strategy it does mention that we will support everyone. Everyone who needs support, around either domestic abuse or violence against women and girls, we are supporting them and as part of that we are working with quite a lot of organisations that support black and global majority people, including with Latin American women and refugee centers. We do have robust organisations that are supporting and making sure that people who are coming to us are getting the support they need from us as a Council, and our partner organisations in the community.

RESOLVED:

That the Eliminating Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Hackney Strategy 2022-2025 was approved / endorsed.

Reason for decision

Sections 5-7 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 created Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) which have a duty to -

- reduce crime and disorder;
- prevent people from becoming involved in serious violence
- reduce instances of serious violence

In pursuance of these duties as they pertain to gender-based violence, the Council has been guided by the national Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy and the London MOPAC VAWG Strategy in having its own Hackney Strategy and Action Plan.

Approval of the *Eliminating VAWG Strategy* is in accordance with the principles of decision making in Article 13 of the Constitution:

Proportionality: Given the scale of the issue, it is proportionate for the Council to have an *Eliminating VAWG Strategy*

Due consultation: While the Council has not been required to conduct a public consultation it has consulted with members of the public, statutory and community agencies, Council staff and VAWG providers

Officer advice: It is the advice of the Lead Officer for Violence Against Women and Girls that the Council endorse the *Strategy*

Human rights: Prevention of domestic abuse and Violence Against Women and Girls is in accordance with the Council's commitment to human rights and there is no contradiction between the exercise of the *Strategy* and the Human Rights act 1996

Openness: The Council plans to publish and publicise its *Eliminating VAWG Strategy 2022-2025*. Its ongoing review and implementation involves groups from across the statutory and voluntary sectors in Hackney.

Clarity of aims: The *Strategy* sets out clearly the 4 key areas of work and accompanying priorities

Efficiency: The *Strategy* identifies and take forward areas of work already underway; their formal endorsement will not hinder the delivery of services and will assist a partnership approach

16 Changing the remit of Hackney Schools Group Board (HSGB) - for cabinet endorsement - Key Decision No: CE S121

Deputy Mayor Bramble introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet noted the change in remit of Hackney Schools Group Board (HSGB) as agreed by its members at the Board meeting of 14 July 2022. Please see Appendix 1 for the report that was presented to HSG Board members

That the Cabinet endorsed the new remit of

the HSG Board set out in Appendix 1.

Reason for decision

A formal endorsement from the Cabinet is required for the operation of the Board.

17 New items of unrestricted urgent business

There were no new items of unrestricted urgent business.

18 Exclusion of the press and public

There was no requirement to exclude the press and public.

19 New items of exempt urgent business

There were no new items of exempt urgent business.

Duration of the meeting: 6.00 - 7.50 pm