



Meeting of the

TOWER HAMLETS COUNCIL

Wednesday, 27 January 2010 at 7.30 p.m.

A G E N D A

VENUE

Council Chamber, 1st Floor,
Town Hall, Mulberry Place,
5 Clove Crescent,
London E14 2BG

If you require any further information relating to this meeting, would like to request a large print, Braille or audio version of this document, or would like to discuss access arrangements or any other special requirements, please contact:

John S Williams, Service Head, Democratic Services
Tel: 020 7364 4204, E-mail: johns.williams@towerhamlets.gov.uk



Chief Executive's
Directorate

Democratic Services
Tower Hamlets Town Hall
Mulberry Place
5 Clove Crescent
London E14 2BG

Tel 020 7364 4204
Fax 020 7364 3232

www.towerhamlets.gov.uk

**TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER
HAMLETS**

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to be held in **THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG** at 7.30 p.m. on **WEDNESDAY, 27 JANUARY 2010**

Dr Kevan Collins
Chief Executive

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY, 27 JANUARY 2010

7.30 p.m.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To note any declarations of interest made by Members, including those restricting Members from voting on the questions detailed in Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992. See attached note from the Chief Executive.

3. MINUTES

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 9th December 2009.

**PAGE
NUMBER**
3 - 36

4. TO RECEIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) FROM THE MAYOR, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

(a) Tower Hamlets Young Mayor 2010

5. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS OR DEPUTATIONS

37 - 40

The valid petitions and deputations received for presentation to the meeting are set out in the report at agenda item 5.

Any further valid petitions or deputations received before the deadline in the Council's constitution will be tabled at the meeting.

6. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

41 - 42

(Maximum of 30 minutes allowed)

The questions which have been received are set out in agenda item 6 attached.

7. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL **43 - 50**

(Maximum of 30 minutes allowed)

The questions which have been received are set out in agenda item 7 attached.

8. REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEES

There is no business to consider under this item.

9. TO RECEIVE REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ON JOINT ARRANGEMENTS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS (IF ANY)

There is no business to consider under this item.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

There is no business to consider under this item.

11. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL **51 - 62**

The motions submitted by Members of the Council for debate at this meeting are attached at agenda item 11.

Agenda Item 2

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - NOTE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

This note is guidance only. Members should consult the Council's Code of Conduct for further details. Note: Only Members can decide if they have an interest therefore they must make their own decision. If in doubt as to the nature of an interest it is advisable to seek advice **prior** to attending at a meeting.

Declaration of interests for Members

Where Members have a personal interest in any business of the authority as described in paragraph 4 of the Council's Code of Conduct (contained in part 5 of the Council's Constitution) then s/he must disclose this personal interest as in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Code. Members must disclose the existence and nature of the interest at the start of the meeting and certainly no later than the commencement of the item or where the interest becomes apparent.

You have a **personal interest** in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- (a) An interest that you must **register**
- (b) An interest that is not on the register, but where the well-being or financial position of you, members of your family, or people with whom you have a close association, is likely to be affected by the business of your authority more than it would affect the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision.

Where a personal interest is declared a Member may stay and take part in the debate and decision on that item.

What constitutes a prejudicial interest? - Please refer to paragraph 6 of the adopted Code of Conduct.

Your personal interest will also be a prejudicial interest in a matter if (a), (b) and either (c) or (d) below apply:-

- (a) A member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think that your personal interests are so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interests; AND
- (b) The matter does not fall within one of the exempt categories of decision listed in paragraph 6.2 of the Code; AND EITHER
- (c) The matter affects your financial position or the financial interest of a body with which you are associated; or
- (d) The matter relates to the determination of a licensing or regulatory application

The key points to remember if you have a prejudicial interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting:-

- i. You must declare that you have a prejudicial interest, and the nature of that interest, as soon as that interest becomes apparent to you; and
- ii. You must leave the room for the duration of consideration and decision on the item and not seek to influence the debate or decision unless (iv) below applies; and

- iii. You must not seek to improperly influence a decision in which you have a prejudicial interest.
- iv. If Members of the public are allowed to speak or make representations at the meeting, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, by statutory right or otherwise (e.g. planning or licensing committees), you can declare your prejudicial interest but make representations. However, you must immediately leave the room once you have finished your representations and answered questions (if any). You cannot remain in the meeting or in the public gallery during the debate or decision on the matter.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2009

**THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5
CLOVE CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Helal Abbas	Councillor Ahmed Hussain
Councillor Ohid Ahmed	Councillor Waiseul Islam
Councillor Anwara Ali	Councillor Ann Jackson
Councillor Shahed Ali	Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor M. Shahid Ali	Councillor Dr. Emma Jones
Councillor Tim Archer	Councillor Azizur Rahman Khan
Councillor Abdul Asad	Councillor Rania Khan
Councillor Lutfu Begum	Councillor Abdul Matin
Councillor Philip Briscoe	Councillor Abjol Miah
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	Councillor Fozol Miah
Councillor Stephanie Eaton	Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer
Councillor Rupert Eckhardt	Councillor Joshua Peck
Councillor Marc Francis	Councillor Lutfur Rahman
Councillor Peter Golds	Councillor Oliur Rahman
Councillor Fazlul Haque	Councillor Muhammad Abdullah Salique
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	Councillor A A Sardar
Councillor Carli Harper-Penman	Councillor Rachael Saunders
Councillor Clair Hawkins	Councillor David Snowdon
Councillor Alexander Heslop	Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Shirley Houghton	Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

The meeting opened at 7.32 p.m.

The Mayor, Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer, in the Chair

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Rajib Ahmed, Rofique Ahmed, Sirajul Islam, Shiria Khatun, Harun Miah, Abdul Munim, Tim O'Flaherty, Mamun Rashid, Bill Turner, Dulal Uddin and Salim Ullah; and for lateness from Councillor Rania Khan.

RESOLVED

That the apologies for absence and lateness be noted.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors made declarations of interest in items included on the agenda as follows:

Councillor	Item	Type of interest	Reason
Helal Abbas	11.10	Personal	Member of the Tower Hamlets Credit Union
Ohid Ahmed	5.1.1	Personal	Ward Councillor, resident and I know the campaigner
Ohid Ahmed	5.2.2.	Personal	Ward Councillor for the area and a resident of the named streets
Ohid Ahmed	8.1	Personal	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation Board Member
Ohid Ahmed	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Ohid Ahmed	11.4	Personal	Lead Member and Carbon Reduction Board Member
Ohid Ahmed	11.5	Personal	Ward Councillor for the area and a resident of the named streets
Ohid Ahmed	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Ohid Ahmed	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
Ohid Ahmed	11.11	Personal	Beneficiaries of NHS service
Ohid Ahmed	11.13	Personal	Leaseholder of an RSL
Rofique Ahmed	11.3	Personal	Parking permit holder
Rofique Ahmed	11.8	Personal	Parking permit holder
Rofique Ahmed	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder of an RSL
Rofique Ahmed	11.13	Personal	Leaseholder of an RSL & I sit on the ORT Board
Dr. Anwara Ali	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Dr. Anwara Ali	11.7	Prejudicial	NHS GP
Dr. Anwara Ali	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Dr. Anwara Ali	11.11	Prejudicial	NHS GP
Shahed Ali	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Shahed Ali	11.6	Personal	Passenger using London City Airport
Shahed Ali	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Shahed Ali	11.9	Personal	Council tenant

Mohammed Shahid Ali	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Mohammed Shahid Ali	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Abdul Asad	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Abdul Asad	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Abdul Asad	11.10	Personal	Member of the Co-operative party
Lutfu Begum	11.7	Personal	Employed by NHS
Lutfu Begum	10.1	Personal	Limehouse Ward Councillor
Lutfu Begum	11.11	Personal	Employed by NHS
Alibor Choudhury	11.10	Personal	I am a member of the Co-operative Party
Stephanie Eaton	5.1.2	Personal	Ward councillor involved in discussions about the use of the premises
Stephanie Eaton	5.2.1	Personal	Leaseholder of property owned by Island Homes
Stephanie Eaton	11.2	Personal	Leaseholder of property owned by Island Homes
Stephanie Eaton	11.10	Personal	Husband a member of the Co-operative party
Marc Francis	11.4	Personal	Live in a car free development
Marc Francis	11.8	Personal	Live in a car free development
Fazlul Haque	11.3	Personal	Parking permit holder
Fazlul Haque	11.7	Personal	Patient at medical centre
Fazlul Haque	11.8	Personal	Parking permit holder
Fazlul Haque	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder of an RSL
Fazlul Haque	11.11	Personal	Patient at medical centre
Fazlul Haque	11.13	Personal	Leaseholder of an RSL & I sit on the board of Tower Hamlets Homes
Shafiqul Haque	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Shafiqul Haque	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Shafiqul Haque	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
Shafiqul Haque	11.10	Personal	Member of the Co-operative Party
Shafiqul Haque	11.11	Personal	
Shafiqul Haque	11.13	Personal	Member of Tower Hamlets Homes Board (THCH Board)
Carli Harper-Penman	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder

Carli Harper-Penman	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Carli Harper-Penman	11.10	Personal	Member of Co-operative Party
Carli Harper-Penman	11.12	Personal	University of London Alumni
Alex Heslop	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Alex Heslop	11.10	Personal	Member of the Co-operative party, Tower Hamlets Community Credit Union and Tower Hamlets Co-operative Development Agency
Ahmed Hussain	11.7	Personal	Employed in NHS
Ahmed Hussain	11.11	Personal	Employed in NHS
Sirajul Islam	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Sirajul Islam	11.7	Personal	I am Foundation Trust member for Barts and the London NHS Trust
Sirajul Islam	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Sirajul Islam	11.11	Personal	I am Foundation Trust member for Barts and the London NHS Trust
Waiseul Islam	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Denise Jones	11.7	Personal	Non executive board member, of the NHS Tower Hamlets PCT
Azizur Rahman Khan	5.12	Personal	Ward councillor involved in discussions about the use of the premises
Joshua Peck	11.6	Personal	My employer has a contract with a company owned by the owner of London City Airport. The contract is unrelated to City Airport.
Oliur Rahman	5.2.2	Personal	Resident of Island Homes
Oliur Rahman	11.2	Personal	Resident of Island Homes
Oliur Rahman	11.3	Personal	Resident of RSL
Oliur Rahman	11.9	Personal	Resident of RSL
Oliur Rahman	11.10	Personal	Member of the Co-operative Party
Mohammad Abdullah Salique	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Mohammad Abdullah Salique	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder

Mohammad Abdullah Salique	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
Mohammad Abdullah Salique	11.13	Personal	Board Member of Tower Hamlets Community Housing (THCH)
A. A. Sardar	5.1.1	Personal	Member of Poplar Harca Board
A. A. Sardar	11.3	Personal	Council parking permit holder
A. A. Sardar	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
A. A. Sardar	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
A. A. Sardar	11.13	Personal	Member of Poplar Harca Board
Rachael Saunders	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
Rachael Saunders	11.12	Personal	Ward councillor
Rachael Saunders	11.13	Personal	Sit on EEH Board & Leaseholder
Abdal Ullah	11.7	Personal	Non-executive member on Barts Board
Abdal Ullah	11.11	Personal	Non-executive member on Barts Board
Motin Uz-Zaman	11.7	Personal	Employed by the NHS
Motin Uz-Zaman	11.8	Personal	Council parking permit holder
Motin Uz-Zaman	11.9	Personal	Leaseholder
Motin Uz-Zaman	11.12	Personal	Ward Councillor
Motin Uz-Zaman	11.13	Personal	Council representative on East End Homes

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 14th October 2009 and the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 2nd December 2009 be confirmed as correct records of the proceedings and the Mayor be authorised to sign them accordingly.

4. TO RECEIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) FROM THE MAYOR, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

(1) CAA and Children's/Adult Services assessments

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lutfur Rahman, informed Members of the positive assessments that had been taking place. He said that the Council

was helping people to be more independent at home and providing more services. He also thanked his fellow Cabinet Members and Members across the Council and staff for all their hard work in being able to achieve this.

5. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS OR DEPUTATIONS

PETITIONS

5.1.1 Petition re: Amenities in Poplar

At the invitation of the Mayor, Ms Sumaia Mashal and Ms Crissy Townsend addressed the meeting in support of the petition. They both then responded to questions from the Members of the Council.

Councillor Marc Francis, Lead Member for Housing and Development, said that Poplar was not missing from any maps of Councillors on his side of the Chamber. The Council's Local Development Framework, if submitted to the Secretary of State, set out the basis to guide and control development across Tower Hamlets over the next 15 years. This would include new social rented housing for local families and single people, the identification of Poplar and Poplar Riverside (Aberfeldy) as places for regeneration, family housing around Bartlett Park, and other housing in and around Chrisp Street, Poplar Riverside would be a location for family housing with improved access to the rest of Poplar, Bromley-by-Bow would also see many new homes and Poplar and Bromley also required improved infrastructure, including new health facilities, schools, public transport.

A feasibility study to re-open Poplar Baths as a swimming pool and dry sports court was being undertaken and he had seen for himself on a recent visit the poor condition that the building was in. The Council were already investing £250,000 to secure it from further deterioration. It was also working with Poplar HARCA on plans to redevelopment Chrisp Street Market. Councillor Francis assured residents that Labour councillors are absolutely committed to the regeneration of Poplar to ensure it becomes a great place to live.

RESOLVED

That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

5.1.2 Petition re: 73 Bishops Way

The petition was withdrawn.

DEPUTATIONS

5.2.1 Deputation re: Island Homes

Change to order of business

At this point, Councillor Marc Francis **MOVED** and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED** – “That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be changed to allow motion 11.2 to be considered after item 5.2.1.”

On being put to the vote, the procedural motion was **agreed**.

At the invitation of the Mayor, Ms Jenny Fisher addressed the meeting in support of the deputation. Ms. Fisher then responded to questions from Members of the Council.

Councillor Marc Francis, Lead Member for Housing and Development, said he would respond in detail during the debate but he had one correction to make – in fact the TSA have spoken to representatives of the estates of Island Homes.

RESOLVED

That the deputation be referred to the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

11.2 Motion submitted by Councillor Tim Archer regarding Island Homes

The motion as printed in the agenda was **MOVED** by Councillor Tim Archer and **SECONDED** by Councillor David Snowdon.

Councillor Marc Francis then **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** an **AMENDMENT** – “That all words in the published motion be deleted and replaced with:-

This Council recalls that:

- In 2005, the London Borough of Tower Hamlets transferred council homes on the Barkantine, Kingsbridge, Samuda and St. John’s estates to Toynbee Housing Association, as Toynbee Island Homes;
- In the Offer Document on which tenants voted, Toynbee Island Homes was to be established with a Board of fifteen members, eight of whom were residents, comprising one tenant and one leaseholder from each estate;
- It passed a motion in October 2008, which expressed concern at ONE Housing Group’s refusal to provide a “road map” for the re-instatement of a resident-majority Board at Island Homes following the Board’s suspension in May 2008;

- It authorised the Lead Member for Housing and Development to make formal representations to the Housing Corporation, the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Housing Minister and to consider legal action against ONE Housing Group.

This Council notes that:

- In the year since then, the Lead Member has attended three public meetings of Island Homes' residents and met with their representatives on other occasions, and written to residents on the estates;
- Officers have advised that there is little prospect of the council successfully challenging ONE Housing Group over its failure to adhere to the promise made in the Offer Document for a resident-majority Board, because this was omitted from the legal Transfer Agreement;
- The Lead Member for Housing and Development has apologised to Island Homes' residents for the failure of the Council to properly protect their interests;
- The Lead Member has made representations to the Housing Minister and Housing Corporation/Tenants Services Authority, calling for their intervention to restore the resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes;
- As a result of the Minister's intervention and the work of the new Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, three additional residents were added to the Board of Island Homes in July 2009 and the Chief Executive of ONE Housing Group has agreed to restore the resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes by the end of December 2009;
- Work to bring the flats of Island Homes' tenants up to the Decent Homes Standard, with new kitchens and bathrooms has been continuing, and consultation has started in plans to improve the communal areas of the four estates.

This Council believes that:

- It is wrong for ONE Housing Group to use the Interim Board to rubber stamp fundamental changes to the nature of service delivery to tenants and leaseholders of Island Homes;
- While the restoration of a resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes is progressed, their appointment directly by ONE Housing Group is not in conformity with the process promised in the Offer Document;
- ONE Housing Group should allow each local "Estate Management Organisation (EMO) to adopt its own method of selection of the two resident Board members from the estate to sit on the Board";
- A "Tenant's Friend" may be beneficial to the EMOs/TRAs to help them hold the Board of Island Homes to account for the quality of services provided and major works to be carried out.

This Council resolves to:

- Make further representations to the Housing Minister and TSA explaining why these present governance arrangements still fall short of those promised to residents in the Offer Document;

- Make further representations to ONE Housing Group to request that each local EMO be given the opportunity to adopt its own method of selection of the two resident Board members from their estate to sit on the Island Homes Board;
- Press ONE Housing Group to bring in a fully independent "Tenant's Friend" to work with the EMO/TRAs; and
- Require the Lead Member for Housing and Development to give a written report to councillors and residents on progress on the above in advance of the next full Council meeting."

On being put to the vote, the amendment was **agreed**.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was

RESOLVED

This Council recalls that:

- In 2005, the London Borough of Tower Hamlets transferred council homes on the Barkantine, Kingsbridge, Samuda and St. John's estates to Toynbee Housing Association, as Toynbee Island Homes;
- In the Offer Document on which tenants voted, Toynbee Island Homes was to be established with a Board of fifteen members, eight of whom were residents, comprising one tenant and one leaseholder from each estate;
- It passed a motion in October 2008, which expressed concern at ONE Housing Group's refusal to provide a "road map" for the re-instatement of a resident-majority Board at Island Homes following the Board's suspension in May 2008;
- It authorised the Lead Member for Housing and Development to make formal representations to the Housing Corporation, the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Housing Minister and to consider legal action against ONE Housing Group.

This Council notes that:

- In the year since then, the Lead Member has attended three public meetings of Island Homes' residents and met with their representatives on other occasions, and written to residents on the estates;
- Officers have advised that there is little prospect of the council successfully challenging ONE Housing Group over its failure to adhere to the promise made in the Offer Document for a resident-majority Board, because this was omitted from the legal Transfer Agreement;
- The Lead Member for Housing and Development has apologised to Island Homes' residents for the failure of the Council to properly protect their interests;
- The Lead Member has made representations to the Housing Minister and Housing Corporation/Tenants Services Authority, calling for their intervention to restore the resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes;

- As a result of the Minister's intervention and the work of the new Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, three additional residents were added to the Board of Island Homes in July 2009 and the Chief Executive of ONE Housing Group has agreed to restore the resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes by the end of December 2009;
- Work to bring the flats of Island Homes' tenants up to the Decent Homes Standard, with new kitchens and bathrooms has been continuing, and consultation has started in plans to improve the communal areas of the four estates.

This Council believes that:

- It is wrong for ONE Housing Group to use the Interim Board to rubber stamp fundamental changes to the nature of service delivery to tenants and leaseholders of Island Homes;
- While the restoration of a resident-majority on the Board of Island Homes is progressed, their appointment directly by ONE Housing Group is not in conformity with the process promised in the Offer Document;
- ONE Housing Group should allow each local "Estate Management Organisation (EMO) to adopt its own method of selection of the two resident Board members from the estate to sit on the Board";
- A "Tenant's Friend" may be beneficial to the EMOs/TRAs to help them hold the Board of Island Homes to account for the quality of services provided and major works to be carried out.

This Council resolves to:

- Make further representations to the Housing Minister and TSA explaining why these present governance arrangements still fall short of those promised to residents in the Offer Document;
- Make further representations to ONE Housing Group to request that each local EMO be given the opportunity to adopt its own method of selection of the two resident Board members from their estate to sit on the Island Homes Board;
- Press ONE Housing Group to bring in a fully independent "Tenant's Friend" to work with the EMO/TRAs; and
- Require the Lead Member for Housing and Development to give a written report to councillors and residents on progress on the above in advance of the next full Council meeting."

Additional deputation and change to order of business

AT this point, Councillor Lutfur Rahman **MOVED** and Councillor Abdal Ullah **SECONDED** – "That under Procedure Rule 14.1.4, the Council agree to suspend Rule 20.1 to enable an additional deputation from TELCO re: the Strangers into Citizen Campaign to be heard and that under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be changed to allow the additional deputation to be heard immediately and motion 11.1 to be considered as the next following item of business."

The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Deputation re: Strangers into Citizens Campaign

At the invitation of the Mayor, Mr. Neil Jameson addressed the meeting in support of the deputation. Mr. Jameson then responded to questions from Members of the Council.

RESOLVED

That the deputation be referred to the Assistant Chief Executive for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

11.1 Motion submitted by Councillor Lutfur Rahman re: Strangers into Citizens Campaign

The motion as printed in the agenda was **MOVED** by Councillor Lutfur Rahman and was **SECONDED** by Councillor Marc Francis.

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was unanimously **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

That the Government is committed to tightening UK border controls and introducing new monitoring and assessment systems into the immigration process.

That the Home Office estimates that there are currently around 500,000 irregular migrants living and working in Britain, around 400,000 of them in London.

The contribution of irregular migrants to the national and regional economy.

That in the current economic crisis, irregular migrants are more vulnerable than ever to exploitation and abuse.

That the "strangers into citizens" campaign, orchestrated by London Citizens, has cross-party support from Councils, MPs and both the current and former Mayors of London.

This Council resolves:

To publicly support London Citizen's "Strangers into Citizens" campaign for the one-off regularization of long-term irregular migrants.

To encourage other Local Authorities to do so.

Urges the Government to adopt the Strangers into Citizens proposal for an earned right of residence subject to and in accordance with the tests applied to other migrants.

5.2.2 Deputation re: Heavy Goods Vehicles in Oban Street and Portree Street

Change to order of business

At this point, Councillor Ohid Ahmed **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** – “That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be changed to allow motion 11.5 to be considered after item 5.2.2.

On being put to the vote, the procedural motion was **agreed**.

At the invitation of the Mayor, Mr. Carmel Tonna addressed the meeting in support of the deputation. Mr. Tonna then responded to questions from Members of the Council.

Councillor Abdal Ullah, Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener thanked Mr. Tonna for bringing the deputation to the Council meeting. He said that he had been to the area in question that day and seen the problems for himself and added that signage had been put up to make the lorry drivers aware of access in Oban Street and Portree Street.

RESOLVED

That the deputation be referred to the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

11.5 Motion submitted by Councillor Ohid Ahmed regarding Heavy Goods Vehicles on Oban Street

The motion as printed in the agenda was **MOVED** by Councillor Ohid Ahmed and **SECONDED** by Councillor Lutfur Rahman.

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and it was **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

That the area around Oban Street, Leven Road and Abbotts Road is being used by cars and heavy goods vehicles as a shortcut to the A12 and A13.

That these are residential streets, often with cars parked on both sides, and as such are not a safe route for large Lorries to take. There are so many cars already damaged by Lorries.

That the air quality of the area is already affected by the proximity of the A13 and is being further damaged by the presence of these large vehicles, causing illness and respiratory problems for many residents, especially the very old and the very young.

Residents living in Abbotts Road, Leven Road or Oban Street find difficulties not open their window.

That the presence of these large vehicles is a threat to the personal safety of the many young children who play in the area and that there have already been several narrow escapes and that it is only a matter of time before a serious incident occurs.

This Council resolves:

To make the area around Oban Street, Leven Road and Abbotts Road “access only” and to fine or otherwise penalise heavy goods vehicle drivers and others who use these streets as a “rat run” by heavy goods vehicles.

6. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

6.1 Question from Ms. Caroline Kerswell to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

“Following the recent horrendous attack along the canal in Mile End, what is the Council doing to ensure our safety?”

Response by the Lead Member, Councillor Abdal Ullah

It seems that you are new to the borough and not familiar with our successful work in this area. The Council are working in close partnership with Metropolitan Police to tackle all crime and anti social behaviour that impact on our community. In relation to this specific incident the crime is being investigated by a dedicated team of officers and the area in which it happened has been identified to receive additional police patrols from the rapid response team and safer neighbourhood teams.

More generally the Council has purchased additional police officers for the community, the participatory budgeting scheme has also purchased some additional police officers for some safer neighbourhood teams, and the Council has introduced highly visible neighbourhood enforcement officers. All of these resources are now subject to a joint tasking process between the police and the local authority to ensure that they patrol areas of concern.

Summary of supplementary question from Ms. Kerswell:

Congratulations to the Police on the work that has been undertaken and for charging two people in connection with this crime. But crime rates are on the rise and there was another serious stabbing the weekend before last. Does this not illustrate that more money is needed for crime prevention and can you open the Police Station at Bow Road around the clock?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

We have consistently invested in this area and a great deal has been achieved. We have introduced the Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers, or 'THEOs' and we take pride in them. We have also secured an extra 20 police officers patrolling the streets of Tower Hamlets. You have moved into a very safe borough.

6.2 Question from Ms. Gloria Thienel to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

"Re: the stabbing on Seyssel Street and Saundersness Road. Given the two stabbings within 200 yards of each other and within two months of each other on the Isle of Dogs, what is the council doing to stop dangerous crime getting out of control?"

Response by the Lead Member, Councillor Abdal Ullah

The local authority and the police work in a close partnership to tackle crime & anti social behaviour across the borough. In the last year the local authority has made some significant investments to ensure that we continue to see and experience the significant reductions in crime & anti social behaviour.

Last year the total crime reduction of this borough amounted to 17% of the overall reduction in crime for London. As a council we are committed to continue the drive to reduce crime. You will be aware that the council has purchased additional police officers for the community, the participatory budgeting scheme has also purchased some additional police officers for some safer neighbourhood teams, and the council has introduced highly visible neighbourhood enforcement officers. All of these resources are now subject to a joint tasking process between the police and the local authority to ensure that they patrol areas of concern.

Summary of supplementary question from Ms. Thienel:

Why in a year from September 2008 to September 2009 in Blackwall and Cubitt Town has the crime rate gone up by 45%? There are lights on in the Police Station 24 hours a day but it is only open from 10am to 6pm.

Summary of Lead Member's response:

In my experience it is not keeping Police Stations open 24 hours a day that reduces crime, it is getting more police officers onto the streets as we have done across the borough, building confidence of local residents as they see the officers patrolling, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.

6.3 Question from Mr. Terry McGrenera to the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Joshua Peck

"Why was it necessary to hire a photographer costing over £17,000 to take four photos as part of the Tower Hamlets Together publicity promotion and allocate the campaign an overall £140,000 budget whilst at the same time running the One Tower Hamlets Campaign? What's next, a One Tower Hamlets Together campaign?"

Response by the Lead Member, Councillor Joshua Peck

'One Tower Hamlets' is an overarching theme of the refreshed Community Plan, it is not a campaign. One Tower Hamlets describes our commitment to:

- reduce poverty and inequality
- bring local communities closer together and:
- strengthen local leadership.

Tower Hamlets Together is a public awareness and 'call to action' campaign aimed at promoting local people and communities, highlighting the ways in which residents and business work together with the council to deliver on the commitment described above.

It is incorrect to suggest that four photographs were supplied by Rankin for the campaign. The agreement is for ten portraits and the fee for the photographs was £3,000 plus VAT. The remainder of the charges was for two days of shooting and photographic retouching, studio fees, stylist and make up, accessories, retouching and expenses.

The Council, through its agents successfully managed to significantly reduce Rankin's fees allowing it to use the services of one of the world's leading international photographers. The overall cost of the 18 month campaign is not viewed by the council as being excessive.

Summary of supplementary question from Mr. McGrenera:

It was not the face of big brother following me everywhere but that of Crissy Townsend who features on a poster. Is Crissy Townsend a prospective Labour Party candidate for next year's local elections?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

The campaign is an 18 month long campaign and will not run during the election. The first resident featured was our Young Mayor and it is entirely appropriate to celebrate the contribution made by our young people and other local residents. I cannot tell you if Crissy Townsend will be a candidate as the selections have not yet taken place.

6.4 Question from Ms. Claire Palmer to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

"Could you please clarify the council policy on gated developments including whether there are any exceptions to the policy?"

Response by the Lead Member, Councillor Marc Francis

Councillors on this side of the Chamber recognise the anxiety many people feel about their safety in today's urban environment. That desire is not just limited to new people moving into Tower Hamlets. It applies just as much to council and housing association tenants and leaseholders who request new and improved Door Entry Systems, concierges and CCTV.

The Council's current policy on gated communities is contained in Policy DV3 – Accessibility and Inclusive Design – of the Council's Interim Planning Guidance 2007. It resists restrictive access, stating:

"Development should improve permeability and connectivity with the surrounding area."

"The Council will not support developments with restrictive access, resulting in gated communities with no public through linkages to avoid segregation and ensure permeability of the public street and footpath network."

Our new LDF – Core Strategy, which as I said earlier is up for debate later this evening, says the Council will:

"Discourage developments which create gated communities which restrict pedestrian access."

That said, each development proposal obviously needs to be judged on its merits and the principle of public access and connectivity must be balanced with the need to ensure development happens.

Summary of supplementary question from Ms. Palmer:

There seems to be a differing policy between private and social housing estates. Some social housing developments have gates but

some private properties have been declined. Could you please explain the inconsistency?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

That is not accurate and the examples you have given are not what would be commonly described as gated developments. The Council treats the needs and anxieties of all local residents equally, whether in privately-owned or social housing. As I have said, the new LDF Core Strategy document sets guidelines within which each development is considered on its own merits.

6.5 Question from Mr. Alan Tucker to the Lead Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

"I understand the council intends to put community buildings on proper lease agreements by March 2010.

Charities and voluntary groups are concerned that they may face costs and legal hurdles that they cannot afford to take on.

I believe that the Council should support these groups and see them for the service that they provide to the community, rather than as an income stream.

Are formal lease agreements really suitable for these groups? What will happen if a residents' group collapses - will the Council step in to take over the responsibility for the building? Those responsibilities should not fall on volunteers. There is a risk that karate clubs, children's dance classes and all the other little community groups will simply stop.

I would be grateful if the Council could explain its policy on community buildings for next year."

Response by the Lead Member, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

The Council is putting agreements in place to ensure properties are properly managed and that the health and safety of users and visitors are safeguarded.

For existing users there will be no change to any charges pending adoption of the Third Sector Strategy relating to community buildings which will address the issue of rents and funding.

No supplementary question was asked.

6.6 Question from Mr. Nicholas Hudart to the Lead Member for Culture, Councillor Rofique Ahmed

"I would like to ask the Council about the Arts Pavilion in the Mile End Park.

One of the reasons why I love the Bethnal Green and Bow area is the amount of Art Galleries and studios. The eclectic mix of styles and innovative new talent make the area a wonderful place to live.

But when I pass the Arts Pavilion it is always closed. I would like to know why such an expensive building never open and why has so much money been wasted for what is seemingly a white elephant?

In such an arts rich borough why is this valuable resource not being used?

Will the Council please make this resource available for local artists and let the community enjoy it? Can we take it out of council control and let a local arts group use it?"

Response by Lead Member (Councillor Abdal Ullah in Cllr Rofique Ahmed's absence)

Unlike Tower Hamlets' other parks and open spaces the strategic development of Mile End Park is managed by a Trust that has charitable status. The day to day management of all aspects of the Park rests with the Council, which also helps to fund it.

The Pavilion has had a full exhibition programme from May to December, with further exhibitions earlier in the year and several exhibitions already in the diary for next year. They include exhibitions by local school children and students as well as commercial exhibitions. The opening times are at the discretion of the organising artist, but all artists ensure that their exhibition is open on the weekend as this is the peak viewing time. It has always been available for local artists to hire.

Mile End Park is always looking at ways to improve its facilities and would be open to any discussion with community or private gallery owners. However it is unlikely that a community gallery could afford the rent and overheads required to take responsibility for the building and equally unlikely that a private gallery would allow community work in its programme.

Summary of supplementary question from Mr. Hudart:

I have a letter from the Director of the Mile End Pavilion that was sent to Cllr Peter Golds stating that there is virtually a full programme but whenever I drive past it is closed. Will you publish in East End Life what is on in the Arts Pavilion?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

I am glad that you recognise the value of publicising events in East End Life. I would point out that the most recent exhibition, which ended in November, attracted 700 visitors to the Arts Pavilion.

7. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**7.1 Question from Councillor Waiseul Islam to the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Dr. Anwara Ali**

Can the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing tell us what provisions have been made to improve the lives of older people in the borough?

Response of the Lead Member

Supporting older people is a priority for this administration. The Council is proud to have one of the top performing adult social care services in the country and provides a particularly high level of support for the most needy older people to remain living in their own homes. The Council also supports an extensive range of third sector activity for older people including commissioning lunch clubs across the Borough and at the November Cabinet meeting additional funding for new lunch clubs was agreed. We have invested significantly in LinkAge Plus since the two year DWP pilot finished in June 2008. This network of organisations provides a wide range of opportunities for older people, including access to advice on benefits and a wide range of social activities. It is open to all older people in the Borough and reaches out to those who are not in contact with other services. Between September 2008 and June 2009, the LinkAge Plus Partnership received 1,145 new referrals. The Council is one of a very small number of Councils who do not charge residents for Home Care services and telecare services have expanded significantly since they were also made a free service. The Council has won a Beacon Award this year for its active engagement with older citizens, and it is through this continued engagement that we will develop robust plans for the future as the population ages. In the New Year the next round of "You Decide" participatory budget events will be held and will include a menu of options that local residents will be able to choose from to invest in services for older people in their LAP area.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Waiseul Islam:

Could the Lead Member let us know the outcome of the Care Quality Commission assessment of our services in Tower Hamlets?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

The inspection has taken place and myself, Councillor Lutfur Rahman and the Corporate Director were interviewed. The outcome is confidential at the current time but I am confident that the Commission will find our services to be of a very good quality and that we will retain our high rating.

7.2 Question from Councillor Tim Archer to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Following on from the hugely successfully Police Public meeting on the Isle of Dogs, organised by the Isle of Dogs Councillors and the Police, will the Lead Member join me in firstly thanking the Police for their commitment to this meeting, but also agree with me that these Public meetings are important and should be replicated on a quarterly basis throughout the Borough?

Response of the Lead Member:

As Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener I would indeed join in thanking the police for their commitment to this meeting. Any form of community engagement by the police, the local authority, or any of our other partners should be encouraged to ensure that we understand local concerns and that the community are aware of the significant amount of quality of work that is undertaken on their behalf.

This is but one of a number of public events that we and our partners engage in, including Ward panels and LAP meetings, and I would encourage everybody to attend and engage in the variety of meetings that take place across the borough.

The Council has provided two extra police officers on the Isle of Dogs and they will be most effective out on the street, not sitting in the police station.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Tim Archer:

I don't think that the Lead Member answered my question. For information the police station is staffed by civilian officers, not operational police who would otherwise be on the beat. There has been an increase in crime on the Isle of Dogs with three stabbings in the last two months. Why are we not getting our fair share of the additional police, none of whom are in Blackwall and Cubitt Town where crime has gone up by 45%?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

The police must respond to the situation where they are most needed. The Council has taken the initiative in this area to secure additional

resources and I will bring this matter to the attention of the next JET meeting. Three stabbings is three too many but compared to other boroughs we have not seen a significant increase in this type of crime.

7.3 Question from Councillor Fazlul Haque to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Can the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener let us how well the borough is doing in terms of crime when compared to other London Boroughs?

Response of the Lead Member:

In March this year this borough was one of only two boroughs that achieved every crime reduction target that was set. Our overall crime reduction contributed to 17% of the overall London reduction.

The work required to bench mark this borough against other boroughs will take some time and it is not possible to produce it for this meeting. However, it is possible to highlight MPS performance, the north area of London area in which Tower Hamlets is clustered and Tower Hamlets.

Most serious violence offences

The Metropolitan Police as a whole has a current 1% increase against a target of a 4.3% reduction. The north area of London currently has a 0.4% reduction. Tower Hamlets currently has a 4.8% reduction against a target of 3% (17 fewer offences)

Serious Acquisitive Crime

The Metropolitan police have a current overall reduction of 2.6% against a target of 2.5%. The north area of London currently has a 10% reduction. Tower Hamlets currently has a 22.8% reduction against a Target of 1.8% (879 fewer offences from this time last year).

Within the serious acquisitive crime category we have personal robbery, Burglary and motor vehicle crime

Robbery

The Metropolitan Police has a 0.6% increase; North area of London has an 8.9% decrease; and Tower Hamlets has a 17.5% decrease (120 fewer offences than this time last year).

Burglary

The Metropolitan Police has a 9.8 increase; North area of London has a 1% decrease; and Tower Hamlets has a 7% decrease

Theft from Motor Vehicles

Metropolitan Police 8.8% reduction; North area of London has a 16% reduction; Tower Hamlets has a 33.3% reduction (582 fewer offences than this time last year)

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Fazlul Haque:

It would be useful to get the data for the type of crime by age group. Gun and knife crime has increased. What strategy is in place to address this?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

Remember that young people are also victims of crime. Our rapid response has ensured that we have not seen an epidemic of knife crime as in some boroughs. It is emerging that dangerous dogs are now becoming a serious problem and early action is also being taken to address this following the recent scrutiny review on the subject.

7.4 Question from Councillor Abjol Miah to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

Does the Lead Member agree that a significant number of people have successfully bid for or bought properties on so-called "car free" developments without being aware of or properly informed of their "car free" status and that others have been discouraged from bidding or buying these properties because of their status and does the lead member also agree that it is not an adequate response to offer some who have been deceived into bidding for these properties alternative accommodation when they have settled into these homes, especially after a long period of uncertainty generated by homelessness and would the lead member also agree that the proposal as yet unconfirmed to allow existing residents permit holders to take their permits with them in moving to properties on these developments, whilst a welcome development, is an inadequate response to the problems posed by these developments?

Response of the Lead Member:

Labour councillors on this side of the Chamber recognised the impact of the "Car Free Zone" policy in forcing badly housed families to choose between the new home they need and the car they rely on long before George Galloway took it up as his latest cause celebre. That is why they passed a motion asking me to resolve the situation more than a year ago. And it is why officers have come forward with a compromise solution now.

Before I explain that solution, I have to remind Members that there are around 21,000 Resident Street Parking Spaces in Tower Hamlets. And there is already a similar number of Resident Permit holders. In that context, the Car Free Zone policy has a positive value and benefit in managing the impact of new development on existing residents, by enabling them to continue to park near their home.

Thousands of residents live in flats subject to a CFZ agreement and many more such flats are due to be completed in the next year or so. George Galloway's demand would be a recipe for parking madness in Tower Hamlets and should be rejected outright.

However, changes must be made to the policy to mitigate its impact on existing Resident Parking Permit holders. That is why Labour councillors have asked officers to consult on and gather evidence as to whether the policy can lawfully be amended so that exceptions can be made to the car-free policy where justified in particular circumstances and/or on the individual merits.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Abjol Miah:

Is the Lead Member aware that there are a large number of residents of car free developments who were initially granted residents' parking permits only to have them summarily withdrawn later and that the only response from the Council has been to offer alternative accommodation, although the family is now settled in their new residence? And is he aware that some residents are facing extortionate charges for estate parking in car free zones and that this is a completely unacceptable and scandalous situation for many residents to be in? Does he agree that those residents of car free zones who have been subject to misinformation and to an initial allocation of residents' permits should now be provided with parking permits?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

This question symbolises the utter emptiness at the heart of the Respect Party. Tower Hamlets suffers from poor air quality due to high levels of through traffic and it is the children and vulnerable older people of this Borough that suffer most.

In 2006, Respect used to challenge Labour councillors on what we were doing to protect the environment. Today, George Galloway's international jet setting probably gives him the worst Carbon Footprint of anyone in Tower Hamlets and his call for us to hand out thousands of new Resident Parking Permits is a recipe for parking wars all over the Borough. Coming, as it does, at the same time as the UN [World] Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Galloway's policy is a disgrace.

His refusal to acknowledge that local councils have a duty to take a lead to encourage low carbon lifestyles places him alongside the Luddites who deny the dangers of global warming. I have confidence that the people of Poplar & Limehouse will tell Galloway exactly what they think of him and his politics next May.

7.5 Question from Councillor Muhammad Abdullah Salique to the Lead Member of Housing and Development

Can the Lead Member for Housing and Development tell us why the Council denied planning permission to the proposed Columbus Tower on the Isle of Dogs and whether he feels that London Mayor Boris Johnson's decision to overrule the Council is a breach of Boris' pledge to "protect London's Skyline?"

Response of the Lead Member:

The Council's Strategic Development Committee determined to refuse this application in June and August 2009. In summary, colleagues considered that the proposed 63-storey, 242 metre high tower by virtue of its design, scale and massing would detract from the setting of nearby Grade I and Grade II listed buildings and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the West India Quay Conservation Area. English Heritage, British Waterways and CABE also had doubts about this tall building's relationship with the listed buildings, conservation area and area generally because of its scale. In short, whilst a very well designed building, it was in the wrong place.

The Mayor took the unique decision to 'call in' and determine personally this application on the basis that the refusal would have a significant impact on implementation of the London Plan. The 'call in' hearing was held on 7th October 2009. Council officers detailed our concerns and residents spoke against it. Unbelievably, the Mayor approved it anyway, saying it actually enhanced the Conservation Area. This despite the fact that Columbus Tower is 57 storeys higher than any other building in the Conservation Area. Bungling Boris Johnson's decision is not just a breach of his "pledge", it is another Tory betrayal of the people of the Isle of Dogs.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Salique:

Did Councillor Francis receive any representations from the Tower Hamlets Conservative Members and were they for or against the application at the meeting?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

I cannot tell you now how they voted on the night of the committee but I can tell you that Mayor Boris Johnson has decided to use his power in favour of a 63 storey high building in or immediately adjoining a conservation area. Cllr Salique is quite right, in his time as Chair of the Development Committee, it focussed tall buildings like this in a few small areas. Now it seems that, while Cllr Archer busies himself opposing plans for desperately-needed new family-sized social rented housing, Bullingdon Boris will be sticking sixty storey towers all over the place. Where next? Tredegar Conservation Area? Fairfield Conservation Area? Jesus Green Conservation Area?

Labour's record on planning and development might not be perfect but Boris has showed us all what he wants to turn the East End into in future.

7.6 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Could the Lead Member comment on the disturbing increase in recorded rape, sexual offences and violence against the person in Tower Hamlets over the past year?

Response of the Lead Member:

The Tower Hamlets Police scorecard dated 11 October provides the following information on performance on a rolling 12 month period. This shows the following:

- Rape: 44 offences reported (31 in the previous year) an increase of 13 offences, or 44%.
- Other serious sexual offences reported: 84 offences (114 in the previous year) a reduction of 30 offences, or 26%
- Most serious violent offences reported: 287 (312 in the previous year) a reduction of 25 offences or 8%
- Assault with injury offences reported: 6,374 (6100 in the previous year) an increase of 274 or 2.5%

As with all crime reporting figures it is important to exercise caution in reviewing this data - further analysis would be needed to identify if there are any specific patterns emerging that might explain why some kinds of offences appear to be increasing while others are reducing. Work is currently under way to look at this. It is also important to note that while in percentage terms the increase in rape offences is alarming, this actually represents 13 cases, while serious sexual offences have reduced by 30 in the same period. This does not give any reason for complacency however, as we know that sexual violence is traumatic and deeply damaging for victims. No level is acceptable. The Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership continues to prioritise action on sexual violence through its Violent Crime Programme which includes specific work on rape and sexual assaults, and the police have challenging targets to reach for sanctions in sexual violence cases. Sexual offences are significantly under-reported, so the police figures represent only a proportion of the sexual offences being committed. Encouraging victims to report sexual assaults remains a priority.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Eaton:

There has been an increase in rape which is a real concern. I am not suggesting that it is going to be easy to resolve and there are factors such as the decline in the economy and rising unemployment levels. But will you task the Delivery Group to make violent sexual crime a priority?

Summary of Lead Member's response:

The figures speak for themselves. We need to work on encouraging more people to come forward to report these horrific crimes and, working with our partners, to support their needs; and I would ask that you join me in getting the necessary message to the community. I will come back to you with further information in due course.

7.7 Question from Councillor Alex Heslop to the Lead Member for Regeneration, Localisation and Community Partnerships, Councillor Rania Khan

Can the Lead member for Regeneration, Localisation and Community Partnerships please tell us what is being done to improve the area around the Roman Road market and support traders?

Response of the Lead Member:

The Improvement of Roman Road Market and the associated retail premises is being actively pursued in four ways.

Council input is being coordinated by the Roman Road Regeneration Group Chaired by the Deputy Leader. This Group brings together all of the professional and front line services relevant to Roman Road Regeneration activity.

The Council is also being very proactive in facilitating the co joining of Street traders and shop keepers into one local trade association. The Trade association will meet on the 10th of December.

The Trade and Shop Keepers Advice and Coaching Project - This is a trader lead initiative assisted by Vision One helping traders to improve product presentation, marketing and sales techniques.

Roman Road Public Realm Street Market Strategy. This will seek to improve pitch facilities, standards of market management and cleanliness and market profile.

No supplementary question was asked.

7.8 Question from Councillor Philip Briscoe to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lutfur Rahman

On what date was Councillor Waiseul Islam appointed as the Tower Hamlets representative on the London City Airport Consultative Committee, what process was adopted for the appointment and how many other candidates were considered for the role?

Response of the Lead Member;

Part 3.12.2 of the Council's Constitution delegates authority to the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) to make or amend an appointment to a position on a committee, panel or outside body in accordance with the nomination of a political group, where the position has previously been allocated by the Council to that group. That position was allocated to that.

In accordance with this procedure, Councillor Waiseul Islam's appointment to the London City Airport Consultative Committee was agreed by the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) on 13 November 2009 following receipt of Cllr Islam's nomination by the Labour Group, the position having been previously allocated to that group and Councillor Ann Jackson having served as the Council's representative on the Committee until her resignation in October 2009.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Briscoe:

You did not answer my question. On 21st October I received a written answer that Councillor Ann Jackson was still the representative. You quote paragraph 3.12.2 but I thought that the representative was from the Council and not the Tower Hamlets Labour Party. When was that change made and when did Labour Group make the nomination? People have been excluded from the process.

Summary of Lead Member's response:

I have answered. The appointment was made on 13th November 2009. The Constitution delegates the authority to the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) to make the appointment and it was agreed under this power following a nomination from the majority group.

In accordance with Rule 12.10 (expiry of time limit), questions 9 – 25 were not put. Written responses would be forwarded to the questioners.

Change in order of business

Councillor Joshua Peck **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** – "That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be changed to allow motion 11.6 to be considered as the next item of business.

On being put to the vote, the procedural motion was **agreed**.

11.6 Motion submitted by Councillor Philip Briscoe regarding the expansion of London City Airport

With the consent of the meeting Councillor Briscoe altered the wording of his motion as follows:

“This Council recognises residents concern over the expansion of London City Airport, and believes that the increased number of flights using the airport – and the associated noise nuisance and environmental impact – is detrimental to Tower Hamlets residents.

Therefore, this Council requests that the Chief Executive:

- Carries out an immediate investigation into what Tower Hamlets Council knew about London City Airport expansion and flight path changes, and what action was taken on the Council’s behalf.
- Writes to the Mayor of Newham, condemning the lack of consultation and their decision to allow further expansion of London City Airport, stressing the negative impact this decision has had on residents of Tower Hamlets.
- Write to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and NATS to ask what action they took to consult residents of Tower Hamlets on the changes to flight paths and London City expansion.

This Council requests that the Chief Executive reports his findings back to councillors at the earliest opportunity.”

Councillor Philip Briscoe **MOVED** and Councillor Peter Golds **SECONDED** the motion as above.

Councillor Marc Francis then **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** an **amendment** as follows:-

“Delete all and replace with:

This Council notes that:

- In 2006, London City Airport had a total of 79,436 aircraft movements
- Since then the airport has continued to expand and residents in some parts of the Borough, especially Poplar, Bow and the Isle of Dogs, are now suffering from a significant increase in the noise disturbance caused by planes to and from London City Airport flying overhead.

- In July 2009, the London Borough of Newham granted planning permission to increase London City Airport's total number of aircraft movements to 120,000 a year, a 50% increase on 2006 levels.
- This Council raised serious concerns on behalf of residents in its submissions to the July 2009 application but that this wasn't counted as a formal objection to the application.

This Council further notes that:

- London City Airport is now consulting on its Noise Action Plan 2009 – 2014 but that this plan proposes only limited measures to avoid, prevent or reduce noise.
- In response to complaints from other East London Boroughs, the Civil Aviation Authority is reviewing a new flight path and that, should this flight path be removed, flights over Tower Hamlets could increase further.

This Council resolves to:

- Oppose any further expansion of London City Airport
- To engage in discussions about flight paths with London City Airport, the Civil Aviation Authority and other partners to ensure that changes to flight paths don't materially disadvantage Tower Hamlets residents
- To publicise in East End Life the current consultation on the London City Airport Noise Action Plan 2009-14 and to encourage residents to make their views known to the airport
- To actively seek the views of residents about this issue to inform the Council's response to the consultation
- To respond to this consultation, highlighting the disturbance and nuisance being caused to residents by noise from the airport and to seek further noise reduction and mitigation measures as part of the plan."

On being put to the vote, the amendment was **agreed**.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes that:

- In 2006, London City Airport had a total of 79,436 aircraft movements
- Since then the airport has continued to expand and residents in some parts of the Borough, especially Poplar, Bow and the Isle of Dogs, are now

suffering from a significant increase in the noise disturbance caused by planes to and from London City Airport flying overhead.

- In July 2009, the London Borough of Newham granted planning permission to increase London City Airport's total number of aircraft movements to 120,000 a year, a 50% increase on 2006 levels.
- This Council raised serious concerns on behalf of residents in its submissions to the July 2009 application but that this wasn't counted as a formal objection to the application.

This Council further notes that:

- London City Airport is now consulting on its Noise Action Plan 2009 – 2014 but that this plan proposes only limited measures to avoid, prevent or reduce noise.
- In response to complaints from other East London Boroughs, the Civil Aviation Authority is reviewing a new flight path and that, should this flight path be removed, flights over Tower Hamlets could increase further.

This Council resolves:

- To oppose any further expansion of London City Airport
- To engage in discussions about flight paths with London City Airport, the Civil Aviation Authority and other partners to ensure that changes to flight paths don't materially disadvantage Tower Hamlets residents
- To publicise in East End Life the current consultation on the London City Airport Noise Action Plan 2009-14 and to encourage residents to make their views known to the airport
- To actively seek the views of residents about this issue to inform the Council's response to the consultation
- To respond to this consultation, highlighting the disturbance and nuisance being caused to residents by noise from the airport and to seek further noise reduction and mitigation measures as part of the plan.

8. REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEES

8.1 Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy: Towards a Sound Core Strategy

The meeting considered a report on the Local Development Framework – Core Strategy.

Councillor Marc Francis **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** the recommendations as set out in the report.

After discussion the recommendations were put to the vote and were **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

1. That the supporting evidence base and information for the Local Development Framework Core Strategy submitted for consideration by the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal (included in Appendices 2, 3 and 4 to the report of the Corporate Director), to be submitted alongside the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State, be noted.
2. That the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, as submitted for consideration by the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal (included at Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director), be approved for submission to the Secretary of State.

8.2 Gambling Act 2005 - Three Year Review of Gambling Policy

The meeting considered a report on the three year review of the Gambling Policy required under the Gambling Act 2005. A paper setting out the results of consultation and a correction to the circulated document was tabled.

Councillor Abdal Ullah **MOVED** and Councillor Lutfur Rahman **SECONDED** the recommendation as set out in the report from Cabinet.

On being put to the vote the recommendations were **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

That the Gambling Policy be approved as attached at Appendix 1 to the report of the Cabinet subject to the inclusion of the amended page 26 and Appendix 3 (consultation results) as tabled at the meeting.

9. TO RECEIVE REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ON JOINT ARRANGEMENTS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS (IF ANY)

There was no business under this agenda item.

10. OTHER BUSINESS**10.1 Executive decisions taken under special urgency provisions**

Councillor Luftur Rahman **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED** the recommendation as set out in the report.

The recommendation was put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

That the report of the Leader of the Council be noted.

11. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Motions 11.1, 11.2, 11.5 and 11.6 had been considered at earlier points in the meeting.

The Mayor then closed the meeting in accordance with Rule 9 (Duration of meeting).

Motions 11.3, 11.4, 11.7 – 11.13 as listed below were not considered due to lack of time, the meeting having closed in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 (Duration of meeting).

11.3 Motion submitted by Councillor Abjol Miah regarding 'car free' developments

11.4 Motion submitted by Councillor Stephanie Eaton regarding reducing carbon emissions by 10% in 2010

11.7 Motion submitted by Councillor Fozol Miah regarding crisis in the National Health Service

11.8 Motion submitted by Councillor Marc Francis regarding 'car free zone' developments

11.9 Motion submitted by Councillor Harun Miah regarding overcrowding strategy

11.10 Motion submitted by Councillor Alex Heslop regarding support for the co-operative and social enterprise sector

11.11 Motion submitted by Councillor Abdul Munim regarding patients' rights

11.12 Motion submitted by Councillor Dulal Uddin regarding St. Paul's Way Community School

11.13 Motion submitted by Councillor Mamun Rashid regarding making Registered Social Landlords accountable

The meeting ended at 10.32 p.m.

Chair,
Council

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 27TH JANUARY 2010

PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. The Council's constitution provides that a maximum of six deputations and petitions in total are received at any meeting. These are taken in order of receipt within each category. This report sets out the valid petitions and deputations so far submitted by members of the public for presentation at the Council meeting on Wednesday 27th January 2010.
2. The deadline for receipt of deputations and petitions for this meeting is noon on Thursday 21st January 2010. Details of any further deputations or petitions received before the deadline will be tabled at the meeting.
3. In each case the members of the deputation/petitioners may address the meeting for no more than three minutes. Members may then question the deputation/petitioners for a further three minutes. The relevant Lead Member or Chair of Committee may then respond to the deputation or petition for up to three minutes.
4. Any outstanding issues will be referred to the relevant Corporate Director for attention who will respond to those outstanding issues in writing within 28 days.
5. Members should confine their contributions to questions and answers and not make statements or attempt to debate.

5.1 PETITIONS

Two petitions have been received at the time of printing as set out below:-

5.1.1 **Petition from Ms Carol Smith and Mr. Ashab Ahmed and others regarding the development proposals in Broomfield Street known as Site A:**

“We, the undersigned residents of the Broomfield Street and surrounding area, wish to object to some of the development proposals for the area from Poplar Harca, specifically the proposals on the area known as site A in Broomfield Street which would involve the construction of three five bedroom homes. We believe these will be detrimental to the amenity for the following reasons: a) they will make an already overcrowded area more overcrowded; b) they will adversely block the view of existing homes opposite this site; c) they will mean that car parking will become an even bigger problem than it already is as there is very limited parking space in this area; d) with an increase in the number of residents, noise problems, already quite acute, will increase. For these reasons we believe that Poplar Harca should abandon the current plans for site A development.”

5.1.2 **Petition from Ms. Selda Bicer and others re: the withdrawal of parking permits at 38 & 40 Horseferry Road and 53 Narrow Street :**

“We the undersigned hereby request that this petition is accepted on behalf of all the residents at Horseferry Road and Narrow Street.

Resident permits/scratch cards have been issued to the residents of Horseferry Road since December 2020 and subsequently every year thereafter. In September 2009, a resident went to purchase a new permit and was told that ‘Horseferry Road’ is now a ‘car free zone’. No resident or leaseholder ever signed up to a car free development and no documentation was ever issued. There has never been or isn’t any mention of a car free zone within any tenancy agreement or leaseholders agreement.

We the residents request that the permits/scratch cards to be re-instated.”

5.2 DEPUTATIONS

Two deputations have been received at the time of printing as set out below:-

5.2.1 Deputation from Mrs. Gloria Thienel and others regarding East End Homes Leaseholders & Freeholders Association (Motion 11.4 refers)

“The Tower Hamlets residents whose names, addresses and signatures appear below, request that a deputation be heard at the full Council meeting on 27th January 2010.

The deputation will ask Members to press for full recognition of East End Homes Leaseholders & Freeholders Association by East End Homes Ltd.

A motion has been put by Councillor Tim Archer, Conservative Councillor for Blackwall and Cubitt Town, as follows:

This Council notes:

- The increasing dissatisfaction being registered by leaseholders and freeholders of East End Homes
- The formation of the borough-wide East End Homes Leaseholders and Freeholders Association.
- That East End Homes have refused to recognise this important group of leaseholders

This Council believes:

- That leaseholders need to be treated fairly and equitably, as demonstrated by the Council’s own Independent Audit of Leaseholder Service Charges, and its ongoing commitment to the dispute resolution process.

This Council resolves to:

- Encourage in the strongest possible way East End Homes to recognise the East End Homes Leaseholders and Freeholders Association and to commit to working positively with them to resolve leaseholder issues.”

5.2.2 Deputation from Mr. Mahbub (Mamun) Alam and others regarding Pitsea Estate youth facilities (Motion 11.11 refers)

“We, the undersigned residents of the Pitsea Estate and vicinity, would like the council to establish appropriate facilities for young people, in particular by offering them a location indoors in which they can engage in constructive activities and schemes. We believe this will help keep young people off the streets and out of trouble and will provide positive alternatives. Currently there are three arches in Lipton Road that are disused or under-used. We believe a portakabin in one of these arches would be a good way to both

utilise the unused space and provide a location for a youth club. Lukin Street residents have a youth club like this and it is doing very well. Pitsea Estate has a large number of young people living there who would benefit from the initiative suggested.”

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 27TH JANUARY 2010

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions submitted by members of the public, for response by the appropriate Lead Member at the Council Meeting on 27th January 2010.
2. The Council's Constitution provides a maximum time limit of thirty minutes for this item.
3. A questioner who has put a question in person may also put one brief supplementary question without notice to the Member who has replied to his or her original question. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original or the reply. Supplementary questions and Members' responses to written and supplementary questions are each limited to two minutes.
4. Any question which cannot be dealt with during the thirty minutes allocated for public questions, either because of lack of time or because of non-attendance of the questioner or the Member to whom it was put, will be dealt with by way of a written answer.
5. Unless the Mayor decides otherwise, no discussion will take place on any question, but any Member of the Council may move, without discussion, that the matter raised by a question be referred for consideration to the Cabinet or the appropriate Committee or Sub-Committee.

QUESTIONS

Five questions have been submitted as set out below:-

6.1 Question from Ms. Caroline Kerswell to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah:

“In light of my recent attack by a Rottweiler, I want to know what the council are doing about dangerous dogs. Apparently there are only four animal wardens in the area and you did not issue a single fine for the dog fouling last year. Is there any plans to re-examine this policy and put further budget aside? My police call was never even responded on and I had to contact the dog warden separately.”

6.2 Question from Mr. Terry McGrenera to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah:

“Is the claim that recycling rates “rockets” over the past year just a lot of rubbish?”

6.3 Question from Mr. Azir Uddin to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis:

“Does this council agree that where, as in John Smith Mews E14, the residents almost unanimously want to retain the existing parking regime involving a key and gate, the landlords One Housing Group, should not introduce unilaterally a new system involving pay permits and clamping and agree to write to One Housing Group expressing this opinion?”

6.4 Question from Mr. Md. Rahmet Ullah to the Lead Member for Employment and Skills, Councillor Oliur Rahman:

“This council is investing considerable time and money in helping residents to find work in these tough times. But as the economy has changed, so have the jobs on offer. What is being done to ensure that those getting placements and training are being set up for the jobs that are available today, and not those that were available before the recession?”

6.5 Question from Ms. Amy Whitelock to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lutfur Rahman:

“To ask the Leader what action the Council has taken to support local residents’ campaign to persuade Transport for London to restore the door-to-door bus service between Bow and the Tesco supermarket at Bromley-by-Bow?”

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 27TH JANUARY 2010

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions submitted by Members of the Council for response by Members of the Executive at the Council meeting on Wednesday 27th January 2010.
2. Questions are limited to one per Member per meeting, plus one supplementary question unless the Member has indicated that only a written reply is required and in these circumstances a supplementary question is not permitted.
3. Oral responses are time limited to one minute. Supplementary questions and responses are also time limited to one minute each.
4. There is a time limit of thirty minutes for consideration of Members' questions with no extension of time allowed and any question not answered within this time will be dealt with by way of a written response. The Mayor will decide the time allocated to each question.
5. Members must confine their contributions to questions and answers and not make statements or attempt to debate.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

25 questions have been received from Members of the Council as follows:-

7.1 Question from Councillor Rachael Saunders to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

Is the Lead Member aware of the crime and environmental problems caused by the continuing problem of derelict scaffolded properties on Ropery Street, including the recent theft of lead from the roofs of homes adjacent to the scaffolded properties? Can he assure me that the properties are being disposed of and will be made fully safe within the next few months and will be brought back into use very soon?

7.2 Question from Councillor Tim Archer to the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Joshua Peck

What is the current budget and personnel count for the Council's communications department?

7.3 Question from Councillor Alibor Choudhury to the Lead Member for Children, Schools and Families, Councillor Abdul Asad

Can the Lead Member for Children, Schools and Families give us an outline of how GCSE results have improved over the last four years, whether there has been any comparable improvement in other boroughs whose GCSE results were below par four years ago and what plans there are to ensure that the improvement continues?

7.4 Question from Councillor Abjol Miah to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

Would the Lead Member agree with me that it is extremely regrettable that the London Fire Brigade has effectively withdrawn its lift rescue service from Tower Hamlets residents trapped in lifts, that the claim that this lift rescue service was excessively costly is based on a false premise and that the Council will now have to bear additional costs of providing an emergency lift rescue service, and will the Lead Member also agree that the replacement Council lift rescue service is inadequate to the needs of Tower Hamlets residents in only having a target rescue time of two hours maximum, especially in a borough with such a high number of high rise blocks and so many lifts which have lacked adequate investment to keep them in good working order, and that a two hour entrapment in a lift will be extremely distressing especially to older residents and children?

7.5 Question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman to the Lead Member for Regeneration, Localisation and Community Partnerships, Councillor Rania Khan

Can the Lead Member give us a breakdown by ward of how last year's participatory budgeting money was spent, how well she feels the projects on which it was spent have delivered value for money and whether there are any plans to extent the range of services on offer for this year's YouDecide events?

7.6 Question from Councillor Tim O'Flaherty to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Could the Lead Member advise me how many households were affected by rubbish, recycling and bulk waste removals being missed or late during the bad weather in December 2009 and January 2010?

7.7 Question from Councillor Clair Hawkins to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Can the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener tell us what lessons were learned from the heavy snow experienced in London in early 2009 and how these lessons have been applied to the recent cold snap?

7.8 Question from Councillor Dr. Emma Jones to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

What steps is the Council taking to prevent further damage to the memorial sculpture in the Memorial Garden, Wapping High Street and to prevent the ongoing anti-social behaviour in the gardens?

7.9 Question from Councillor Waiseul Islam to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

How much social housing has the Council delivered for overcrowded and homeless people in the last four years?

7.10 Question from Councillor Dulal Uddin to the Lead Member for Culture and Leisure, Councillor Rofique Ahmed

Would the Lead Member agree with me that it is a matter of extreme regret that Poplar Baths remains unused, derelict and deteriorating after so many years, that the disuse of this facility is a major loss to the community and could the Lead Member say why this important facility has lain derelict and

disused for so long and what plans currently exist to bring it back into use as a facility of the community in Poplar and Limehouse?

7.11 Question from Councillor Muhammad Abdullah Salique to the Lead Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

Can the Lead Member for Resources and Performance tell us which economic group is most likely to be adversely affected by the bus fare rises agreed by the Tory Mayor of London?

7.12 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton to the Lead Member for Children, Schools and Families, Councillor Abdul Asad

Could the Lead Member advise me how many posts are currently being recruited in Children's Social Care; and the average and highest caseload of officers working in Children's Social Care?

7.13 Question from Councillor Lutfa Begum to the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Joshua Peck

Can the Deputy Leader tell us what is being done to reduce the carbon footprint of the Council and how this compares to other inner London local authorities?

7.14 Question from Councillor David Snowdon to the Lead Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

Who in the Council is responsible for approving advertising expenditure for job adverts in local and national newspapers?

7.15 Question from Councillor Mamun Rashid to the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Joshua Peck

Would the Lead Member agree with me that it is entirely reprehensible that political leaders and representatives such as the MP for Poplar and Canning Town Jim Fitzpatrick, should have attacked the principle that it is the bride and groom and their respective families who should have the right to determine the form in which their wedding celebrations and ceremonies should take place, that it is particularly regrettable that this attack was focused on Muslim weddings in particular, and that this attack can only fuel Islamophobia and undermine community cohesion and would the Lead Member in particular join with me in opposing any proposal, such as that made by Jim Fitzpatrick, that legislation should be introduced to outlaw the right of bride and groom to have men and women seated separately at wedding ceremonies and celebrations?

7.16 Question from Councillor Abdul Matin to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

What is the level of confidence in the Police in Tower Hamlets and how does this compare with other London Boroughs?

7.17 Question from Councillor Peter Golds to the Lead Member for Culture and Leisure, Councillor Rofique Ahmed

What steps are the Council taking, apart from erecting hoardings, to bring the Poplar Baths buildings back into the public realm?

7.18 Question from Councillor Fozol Miah to the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Dr. Anwara Ali

Would the Lead Member agree with me that in the answer to my question on patients rights tabled at the last full Council meeting it was quite bizarre that it was claimed that there was no record of patients being removed from GP lists in the borough except by accident and would the Lead Member accept that there are examples of patients being removed from GP lists at the Limehouse Practice, Stepney Health Clinic and the Spitalfields Practice where those patients all have legitimate grievances over their removal and that despite the fact the Council has no direct responsibility for the operation of GP practices it is entirely appropriate for the Council to take a position on the lack of formal rights and processes for patients to appeal against their removal from GP practice lists, where these removals are based on false accusations, and that the Government should legislate to provide patients with formal rights and processes with which to appeal against their removal from GP lists and the consequent loss of medical support?

7.19 Question from Councillor Azizur Rahman Khan to the Lead Member for Children, Schools and Families, Councillor Abdul Asad

What is being done to address the concerns identified in the latest Ofsted report about the low educational achievement of white children at age 16 in the Borough's schools?

7.20 Question from Councillor Rupert Eckhardt to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

What contingency plans have been made and what budget will be available to deal with the damage caused to roads in the borough by the recent cold weather?

7.21 Question from Councillor Harun Miah to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

Would the Lead Member join with me in expressing profound regret at the failure of the recent Copenhagen conference on climate change to agree tough and binding limits on greenhouse emissions and agree with me that this failure increases the responsibility on the government and local councils to do all in their power to limit energy use in order to limit greenhouse emissions in Britain, that energy consumption in Tower Hamlets would be very significantly reduced if a massive programme of investment to insulate and double glaze all properties across the borough and that this would also contribute to reducing fuel poverty and that it remains a matter of concern that so many lights and other forms of energy consumption are left on in council buildings when offices and electrical equipment are not being used?

7.22 Question from Councillor Ahmed Hussain to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

How many days' supply of grit and salt were held in store on January 1st 2010 and how often was grit and salt sold to other authorities by Tower Hamlets Council?

7.23 Question from Councillor Abdul Munim to the Lead Member for Housing and Development, Councillor Marc Francis

Would the Lead Member agree with me that leaseholders with registered social landlords have many legitimate grievances concerning value for money in their service charges and especially in relation to major works service charges which can be excessive because of a lack of investment in housing estates in the past and because of the lack of democratic accountability of registered social landlords, and that leaseholders therefore should have the right to organise themselves in the best ways they see fit in order to defend their legitimate interests and that legitimate leaseholder organisations may be either at a level below that of the estate, as on the Exmouth estate, or cross-borough as with East End Homes, well as estate-wide, and would the Lead Member agree to encourage registered social landlords to recognise all legitimate leaseholder organisations as partners with whom they should consult?

7.24 Question from Councillor Philip Briscoe to the Lead Member for Cleaner, Safer, Greener, Councillor Abdal Ullah

What plans are in place for Tower Hamlets to join the Boris Johnson-led scheme on roadwork permits?

7.25 Question from Councillor Shirley Houghton to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lutfur Rahman

I refer to question 7.22 of the last Council meeting asked about meeting start times and specifically what consultation (if any) was undertaken with the Members and the public to conclude that moving start times forward from 7.30pm would not impede their involvement in Council business.

Your response failed to disclose what consultation had been undertaken with the public before moving meetings to stop participation of working residents so I assume the answer is none.

Your response confirmed that the start time of Development Committee was agreed to be 7.30pm by full Council on 22 April 2009, and it was on that basis that I agreed to join the committee.

In respect of my question regarding what consultation had been undertaken with Members you stated that Members of the Development Committee had then expressed concerns that a 7.30 start was too late to hear all applications in one evening. This is not true. As a Member I was not consulted, the agenda for the first meeting was issued with a revised start time with no consultation whatsoever, indeed a very surprised Cllr Helal Abbas arrived at 7.25 for the first meeting, bemused that not only had it started but was also just closing.

Your original response stated "the Chair agreed" to move the start time.

Now, in respect of the Development Committee, please answer the question asked on December 9:

Who was it that the "the Chair agreed" with to move the meeting?;

Which Members were consulted before the meeting time was moved to 6.30?;

If any Members were consulted, why were all committee members not consulted?;

If any Members were consulted please provide a copy of the consultation note and the responses;

What public consultation was undertaken?; and

Given Development Committee meetings usually last for no longer than 1 hour, please explain why it would be difficult to hear all applications in one evening if the meetings started at 7.30, as they should, to allow working Councillors and residents time to arrive to participate?

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 27TH JANUARY 2010

**MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Twelve motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 13 for the Council meeting on Wednesday 27th January 2010.
2. In accordance with the protocol agreed by the Council on 21st May 2008, the order in which the motions are listed is by turns, one from each group, continuing in rotation until all motions submitted are included. The rotation starts with any group(s) not reached at the previous meeting.
3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council has a responsibility or which affect the Borough. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months unless notice of motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.
4. There is no specific duration set for this agenda item and consideration of the attached motions may continue until the time limit for the meeting is reached. The guillotine procedure at Council Procedure Rule 9.2 does not apply to motions on notice and any of the attached motions which have not been put to the vote when the time limit for the meeting is reached will be deemed to have fallen. A motion which is not put to the vote at the current meeting may be resubmitted for the next meeting but is not automatically carried forward.

MOTIONS

Set out overleaf are the motions that have been submitted.

11.1 Parking policy in Tower Hamlets

Proposed: Councillor Abjol Miah

Seconded: Councillor Dulal Uddin

This Council notes that:

- a) the policy of ticketing, clamping and removal of vehicles in this borough is widely reviled by car owners as unjust
- b) around £5 million is raised annually from car owners through the issuing of penalty charge notices and retrievals from the car pound
- c) grievances include the draconian exercise of clamping and removal powers on Council and registered council estates
- d) lack of signage as to the parking restrictions in some areas of the borough
- e) confusion caused by the presence of parking restrictions on Sundays in some parts of the borough
- f) confusion caused by significant differences over the times of parking restrictions in different parts of the borough
- g) confusion caused by the welcome concession of allowing two hours free parking around market areas at market times
- h) the recent statement by the Council that “the length of time a car is parked before removal is immaterial”
- j) the opposition of the vast majority of residents on some estates, such as John Smith Mews, E14, to the introduction of a clamping system for parking on their estate
- k) penalty charge notices, decamping fees and retrieval fees are extremely high for those on lower incomes

This Council believes that:

- a) the primary purpose of the Council’s parking policy should be to enable residents and others with legitimate parking rights to park as conveniently as possible and to ensure that traffic is not blocked by parking
- b) the primary purpose should not be to punish car owners for minor transgressions of the rules
- c) the primary purpose should not be to raise funds for the Council by a punitive tax on some car owners

d) the Council and registered social landlords should not impose clamping and other parking penalties where the residents of an estate are clearly overwhelmingly opposed to those penalties

e) the parking policy should be applied with due respect to common sense and what is reasonable and unreasonable in the specific circumstances

f) the length of time a vehicle is parked in circumstances that transgress parking restrictions is material, as are the reasons why a vehicle might be temporarily parked in circumstances which transgress parking restrictions, and that car owners should be given a reasonable chance to remove their vehicles where such transgression has occurred

g) Tower Hamlets parking policy should be subject to a root and branch review to make it more reasonable, comprehensible and acceptable to car owners and users.

11.2 Reducing carbon emissions by 10% in 2010

Proposed: Councillor Stephanie Eaton

Seconded: Councillor Azizur Rahman Khan

This Council notes that:

1. Climate change predictions show that without severe cuts in greenhouse gas emissions, the world will be hit by drought, flooding and famine affecting all of us and the poorest countries in particular. Some of these countries are already suffering from the effects of climate change. This is an issue of social justice as well as a call to take environmental action.

2. Under the UK Climate Change Act 2008 the UK is due to cut its emissions by 34% by 2020, but that, according to many climate change scientists, a cut of 10% in 2010 is in line with what is now needed to avert devastating climate change.

3. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which meets in Copenhagen in December of this year, may be the world's last chance to negotiate a deal that will avert the worst consequences of climate change.

4. To ensure a breakthrough at the critical Copenhagen conference, government ministers need to know that the public supports more dramatic cuts in emissions than have been proposed to date.

5. Tower Hamlets borough has already signed up to the Local Area Agreement indicator 186 – per capita reduction in CO2 emissions in the local authority area.

This Council resolves:

1. To support the aims and ambitions of the 10:10 Campaign to reduce carbon emissions by 10% in 2010.

2. To sign up the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to the 10:10 Campaign and to institute a Borough wide information and publicity campaign to enable residents and local businesses to contribute to this goal of reducing emissions.

11.3 Olympic Legacy and Affordable Housing

Proposed: Councillor Marc Francis

Seconded: Councillor Lutfur Rahman

This Council notes:

- The commitment of the Government, Mayor of London and Olympic Delivery Organisation (ODA) to delivering a lasting legacy to the people of London resulting from the 2012 Games.
- The creation of the Olympic Legacy Company to deliver this pledge.
- The use of £1 billion of public money by the London Development Agency (LDA) to purchase land for the Olympic sites.
- That there are almost 100,000 households on council housing waiting lists in the five 'Olympic boroughs'.

Given this level of housing need, this Council believes:

- That the current policy of 35 per cent 'affordable' housing (split 50/50 between social rented and 'intermediate') is inadequate and unacceptable as only 17 per cent of the homes built are likely to be of benefit to those on housing waiting lists.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Call on the Government and Mayor of London to instruct the ODA and Olympic Legacy Company to require that 50 per cent of all new homes built on the Olympic site should be affordable (split 70/30 social rented, including council housing, and intermediate), in order to ensure a real housing legacy for Londoners.

11.4 East End Homes Leaseholders and Freeholders Association

Proposed: Councillor Tim Archer

Seconded: Councillor Peter Golds

This Council notes:

- The increasing dissatisfaction being registered by leaseholders and freeholders of Eastend Homes
- The number of recent LVT decisions that have gone against Eastend Homes or where Eastend Homes have not disputed the claim.
- The formation of the borough-wide Eastend Homes Leaseholders and Freeholders Association.

- That Eastend Homes have refused to recognise this important group of leaseholders.

This Council believes:

- That Leaseholders need to be treated fairly and equitably, as demonstrated by the Council's own Independent Audit of Leaseholder Service charges, and its on-going commitment to the Dispute resolution process.

This Council resolves to:

- Encourage in the strongest possible way Eastend Homes to recognise the Eastend Homes Leaseholders and Freeholders Association and to commit to working positively with them to resolve leaseholder issues.

11.5 Car Free Zones

Proposed: Councillor Dulal Uddin

Seconded: Councillor Abjol Miah

This Council welcomes:

- a) the acknowledgement by the Council that the so-called Car Free Zone policy has been flawed
- b) the proposal to abandon the blanket policy of excluding all residents of Car Free Zones from qualifying for residents parking permits and to allow those who already hold such permits to take them with them if they move to a Car Free Zone

This Council notes that:

- a) the Council's proposals to modify the so-called Car Free Zone policy will not help a variety of victims of this policy who were misled into moving to Car Free Zones such as Mrs Naasir and her family who are being asked to move yet again if they are to qualify for a residents permit in order to keep her car which enables her to transport her family safely and economically or Mr Golding who has part bought his property and will have to sell up or give up his black cab on which he depends for his income or Mr Mohamed who is being asked to pay £520 per year to park his car on his estate by his registered social landlord, or the residents of Horseferry Road who have had their permits suddenly and summarily withdrawn by the Council or many others who have been the victims of injustice in relation to this scheme
- b) the Council's proposals do not go nearly far enough therefore in addressing these multiple injustices
- c) Car Free Zones tend to discriminate in favour of wealthier residents and against less well off residents

d) Car Free Zones are not Car Free in that they often have estate parking although this may be restricted and expensive

This Council believes that:

a) there is a problem of parking capacity in the borough especially as Car Free Zones are not especially effective in relieving pressure on parking spaces because of widespread avoidance

b) there is an environmental problem arising from excessive car use

c) Car Free Zones have not been an effective or equitable way of dealing with these problems

d) Council officers urgently need to address the specific injustices that have been caused by the Car Free Zone policy including the discriminatory effects against the less well off and those with larger families and come back with much more radical policies than the damp squib announced at the last full Council meeting.

11.6 Reducing Carbon Emissions

Proposed: Councillor Ohid Ahmed

Seconded: Councillor Lutfur Rahman

This Council notes:-

Climate change is having severe consequences around the world and in particular having devastating effects in some of the poorest countries in the world.

Climate change is already happening in the UK – the ten hottest years on record have all been since 1990 and this winter has been the coldest for 30 years.

The Labour Government's 2008 Climate Change Act made Britain the first country in the world to set a legally binding 'carbon budget', aiming to cut UK emissions by 34% by 2020 and at least 80% by 2050 through investment in energy efficiency and clean energy technologies.

The leadership shown on this issue at the Copenhagen conference by Gordon Brown and Ed Milliband

The Labour Government has more than doubled spending on flood protection since 1997 and developed a heat wave plan in the NHS.

That action by local authorities is critical to the achievement of the Government climate change objectives and is uniquely placed to provide vision and leadership to the local communities by raising awareness and influencing behaviours.

This Council is already committed to:

Local Area Agreement indicator 186 – aiming for a reduction of 10 per cent per capita in CO2 emissions for residents.

A 25 per cent reduction of its own carbon emissions by 2012, 40 per cent by 2016 and 60 per cent by 2020.

This Council resolves:

To formally pledge its support for the 10:10 campaign, the aims of which it is already working towards

To increase awareness among residents of the importance of reducing carbon emissions – especially where doing so can also save money by reducing gas and heating bills.

To use the lessons learned in improving recycling from 7 per cent to over 30 per cent in just 3 years to encourage behavioural change from residents of all backgrounds.

11.7 Housing Policy

Proposed: Councillor Fozol Miah

Seconded: Councillor Abjol Miah

This Council notes that:

- a) there is a massive housing crisis in Tower Hamlets
- b) well over 20,000 are on the Council's housing waiting list
- c) an estimated 15,500 families are living in overcrowded conditions, half in social and half in private housing
- d) overcrowded and poor housing are a blight which it should be the highest priority to overcome in the early part of the 21st century
- e) that the director of Tower Hamlets Homes has recently expressed concern that even if THH gets 2 star status later this year, insufficient investment will be provided to bring the 60% of Council housing stock that does not meet the decent homes standard up to that standard
- f) that Tory Mayor Boris Johnson's target of 20,000 new social and affordable homes by 2011 will be missed
- g) that Tory Mayor Boris Johnson's target of a 60/40 mix between social and affordable housing is currently being missed

h) that most new housing in Tower Hamlets is not being built as social or affordable housing but instead is being built for purchase in the private sector at prices far beyond the means of the vast majority of Tower Hamlets current residents

j) that many Tower Hamlets residents will either continue to suffer poor and/or overcrowded housing or be forced to try and move out to the outer London boroughs to find adequate and affordable housing

This Council believes that:

a) proposals from both the Conservative and Labour Parties to cut Government investment in order to address the problem of the Government's deficit will have dire consequences for building the housing we need and bringing existing housing up to the decent homes standard in Tower Hamlets

b) we need more investment in social and above all Council housing and that this investment must not be at the expense of investment of repairs and improvement

c) the target for the amount of social housing being built in Tower Hamlets should be radically revised upwards in opposition to the position of Tory Mayor Boris Johnson

d) what we need above all is a crash programme of Council house building which will boost the construction industry and the economy and is the only way to realistically address the blight of overcrowding in Tower Hamlets.

11.8 Increasing access to transport for older residents

Proposed: Councillor Joshua Peck

Seconded: Councillor Dr. Anwara Ali

This Council notes:

That affordable and accessible transport is vital to ensuring that older people have full access to services and can live full and active lives.

That although considerable improvements have been made to transport infrastructure to improve access for older people, they still face significant barriers to using public transport such as:

- Access ramps on buses not working
- Dial-a-ride and Taxi Card services often do not tie up coherently with existing public transport infrastructure
- Overcrowding on buses and tubes discourages many older people from using public transport.

This Council further notes that the Olympic Delivery Authority has been praised by Age Concern for its plans to create an integrated and accessible transport strategy around the Olympic Games.

This Council resolves:

To review how transport services are provided to older people in the borough and to lobby TfL and other stakeholders where necessary to ensure that services are safe, accessible and provide a joined-up network for the borough's older residents.

To ensure that the needs of Tower Hamlets residents, especially older residents are communicated effectively to the ODA and to use any and all means at the Council's disposal to ensure that those needs are placed front and centre of the ODA's accessible transport strategy.

11.9 Boris Johnson's Fare Rises

Proposed: Councillor Harun Miah

Seconded: Councillor Abjol Miah

This Council notes that:

a) fares for many of the less well off residents of Tower Hamlets have been subject to a huge rise sanctioned by Tory Mayor Boris Johnson who has ultimate responsibility for Transport for London

b) fare rises have been particularly targeted on the less well off who use buses with much lower increases on other fares

c) Mayor Johnson claims the fare rises are necessary to raise funds and yet he had dropped plans for an Western extension of the Congestion Charge and to tax polluting vehicles both of which are possible ways of generating more revenue

This Council believes that commuters should be encouraged to use public transport, not discouraged in order to help protect the environment

This Council deplores the massive fare rises introduced in the last few days

This Council calls on the Greater London Assembly, Mayor Boris Johnson and Transport for London to go back to the drawing board and thoroughly revise the fare rises which are discriminating against the less well off here and in the rest of London.

11.10 Support for the co-operative and social enterprise sector

Proposed: Councillor Alex Heslop

Seconded: Councillor Denise Jones

This Council recognises that there is a diverse and healthy co-operative sector in Tower Hamlets with a combined turnover of approximately £50 million and also appreciates the important role that co-operatives and other social enterprises can play in community and economic regeneration initiatives. Although there are many successful co-operative enterprises operating in Tower Hamlets such as Tower

Hamlets Community Credit Union, Tower Hamlets CDA and Greenwich Leisure (effectively a workers co-op), as well as several food co-ops and housing co-operatives, there is not a single Council officer with a specific remit or indeed expertise for working with the co-operative & social enterprise sectors.

This Council resolves to do the following:

- Allocate responsibility for supporting the co-operative & social enterprise sectors to the Lead Member for Regeneration as well as a designated Council officer who will promote and support new mutual models for the provision of community services, including housing, pre-school childcare, residential and home care, recycling and leisure. Made possible through service reviews, externalising, or re-contracting services and procurement procedures.
- Organise an annual event to celebrate International Co-operatives Day in partnership with the local Co-operative Movement; this could also involve the Tower Hamlets Partnership and its Creating and Sharing Prosperity Community Plan Action Group.
- Develop procurement strategies that make a direct link between the Community Plan and other strategic objectives and contract specifications ensuring that community benefits can be fully integrated into the procurement process.
- Work with the Co-operative Sector and London Development Agency to improve access to finance and support for socially and mutually owned businesses.
- Work with staff and unions on a partnership basis in the creation of new cooperative services

11.11 Youth Facilities

Proposed: Councillor Mamun Rashid

Seconded: Councillor Abjol Miah

This Council notes that:

- a) the London Borough of Tower Hamlets has a much higher than average number of young people
- b) there are very high levels of unemployment for school leavers in Tower Hamlets
- c) many young people live in poor and overcrowded conditions
- d) many young people lack adequate youth facilities and opportunities for self-development on their estates

e) one such estate where adequate facilities are lacking is the Pitsea Estate in Shadwell ward

This Council regrets the closure of youth facilities by the Council in the past as a grievous and short-sighted policy

This Council believes that:

a) lack of good youth facilities and opportunities for self-development amongst young people will encourage anti-social behaviour

b) good youth facilities easily accessible to young people in the areas where they reside are a necessity not a luxury

c) urgent consideration should be given by officers to expanding youth provision on estates which currently lack those facilities, especially where local community activists are coming forward with concrete proposals.

11.12 Ocean regeneration and business uncertainty

Proposed: Councillor Abdul Munim

Seconded: Councillor Abjol Miah

This Council notes that:

a) the Ocean estate is to be the subject of a major regeneration project

b) this regeneration will involve the demolition of some existing buildings

c) demolition will include Marmora House on Ben Jonson Road which houses many local shops which provide essential services to the local community

d) shop owners and keepers in Ben Jonson Road recently received letters from a developer informing them of a planning application to redevelop the site where they have their shops

e) shop owners and keepers in Ben Jonson Road have spent many years building up their businesses and serving the community

f) the letter from the developer makes no reference to providing them with alternative facilities from which to operate after they have left the existing premises or for them to have the right to return to the newly established shop premises upon completion of the redevelopment

g) this is causing severe stress and concern to the business community in Ben Jonson Road and those residents who currently depend on these shops for important and vital services

h) shop owners and keepers have made submissions to the planning department asking that alternative premises from which their businesses can operate should be guaranteed and that they should have right of return once redevelopment has been completed

This Council welcomes any development and regeneration that will benefit the residents

This Council believes that:

a) regeneration and redevelopment must take place with full consultation with residents and shop owners and keepers serving those residents and with their consent

b) there have not been adequate reassurances to businesses and residents in Ben Jonson Road and its vicinity about the nature of the regeneration and redevelopment planned for this area.

c) discussions and consultation should take place as a matter of urgency with the business community in this area to hear their concerns and to develop plans to allay those concerns.