


Non-Executive Report of the: COUNCIL 22 March 2017	
Report of: Graham White, Acting Corporate Director, Governance	Classification: Unrestricted
Motions submitted by Members of the Council	

Originating Officer(s)	Matthew Mannion, Committee Services Manager, Democratic Services.
Wards affected	All wards

SUMMARY

1. Nine motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 13 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 22 March 2017.
2. The motions submitted are listed overleaf. In accordance with the protocol agreed by the Council on 21st May 2008, the motions are listed by turns, one from each group, continuing in rotation until all motions submitted are included. The rotation starts with any group(s) whose motion(s) were 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in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.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.

12.1 Motion regarding the future of the Tower Hamlets Youth Service

Proposer: Councillor Gulam Robbani

Seconded: Councillor Oliur Rahman

This Council notes that:

1. Former Mayor Lutfur Rahman had a positive vision for the Youth Service which was expressed, for example, at the Cabinet in April 2012:

“He considered that what really mattered were the young people of Tower Hamlets who represented the future of the Borough and that youth services were provided that benefited them. It was his intention as Mayor that young people in Tower Hamlets received the best youth services and best education possible.”

2. That the main motivations of bringing the Youth Service back in-house were:

- to save money on duplicating management functions and re-invest it in the front line of the service;
- to respond to the Government’s localism agenda;
- to strengthen the Council’s partnership agenda;
- to obtain extra value by, for example, the youth service working effectively.

3. That although bringing the Service back in-house was a decision of the Executive Mayor, councillors were able to discuss the transfer openly within Council structures – for example, Cllr Oliur Rahman was able to explain the decision to the April meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at which Cllr Rachael Saunders declared a personal interest on this item as she had “been in receipt of information from some of the service providers managing the contract in question.”

This Council further notes that:

1. The current Mayor’s intention to make a fundamental change in the way that the Youth Service is run (initially on an interim basis) was not mentioned at the Cabinet on 10th May 2016, although planning must have been well underway by then.

2. The Mayor’s intention to make this fundamental change was set out in a briefing paper from the Mayor’s office dated 12th May 2016 which was circulated to all councillors.

3. This paper stated that the interim delivery plan would begin in July, which clearly precludes any wider member involvement (indeed, the paper refers to the decision having been developed in discussion with John Biggs and Cllr Saunders) and a future delivery model will be in place from April 2017 (and there will be full member involvement in options for this model, but how this will happen is not explained).

4. This paper also stated that a gap analysis is underway with a view to there being a programme of procurement and commissioning in June 2016 targeted at local third sector organisations.

5. This paper also states that it is the intention to offer youth services for the rest of this financial year from only eight venues in the borough – despite the fact that youth are often very reluctant to travel far to a formal provision. The paper states that the Council intends to offer an outreach service to encourage you to travel to the formal provision and also to rely, in the interim, on whatever additional services are provided in an un-co-ordinated manner by local charities or voluntary organisations.

This Council further notes that:

1. The Mayor's decision was revealed at the Council's Annual Meeting on 18th May 2016 by Cllr Rachael Saunders in what appeared to be an unplanned announcement. This included Cllr Saunders reading out an email from her mobile phone but not saying who had sent her the email (in sad contrast to her previous openness about who was briefing her).

2. Cllr Saunders stated that "The service has faced allegations of fraud and corruption" and other serious allegations. She also said that "Investigations into these serious allegations are ongoing," and that the Youth Service does not have the capacity to deliver as much as it has in the past. She stated that "we" were working out a service plan which would be based on reduced capacity and on when that had been developed would consideration be given to identifying and filling gaps. She expected the identification of gaps to be finished by June (a couple of weeks after she was speaking) – but did not mention John Biggs's intention to fill these gaps by contracting out parts of the service to third sector organisations (or who, in the event of this being done, would manage these organisations).

3. The Council Communications Office issued a press release on 26th May referring to the change only having been prompted by "historic shortcoming". This announced that an interim delivery model would be adopted "by the summer". It gave details of the interim delivery model and stated that young people's views had been listened to throughout the review process. (The members have yet to see a concrete tangible and evidence of that)

4. There have been a number of reports in the local press since the Council AGM which have reported the detail of various allegations – presumably either on the basis of their own imaginations or on the basis of briefings from unknown parties in the Council which have not been shared with all councillors.

5. That as a result of the way the Mayor and relevant Cabinet Members have dealt with this issue, it is entirely unclear what is happening to the youth service – which has led to a great deal of serious concern among service users and in the wider community.

This Council believes that:

1. If and when there are allegations of corruption or other serious malpractice, these should be investigated in accordance with Council procedures and individuals should be dealt with appropriately. (Independent Group fully supports this approach and have publicly offered to work together for the benefit of young people of Tower Hamlets).

2. That if a service is to be reviewed in order to spend or save money by cutting certain provisions, and/or deliver the service more efficiently or effectively, this should be discussed openly, including with councillors and services users and the wider community rather than playing politics or blame-game.

3. (1) and (2) above should not be confused.

This Council further believes that:

1. The current position, in which the Administration appears to have responded to allegations against individuals by pre-emptively altering the service as a whole, and in which the Youth Service is to be run on an interim delivery model based on reduced capacity and enhanced by some sort of ad-hoc procurement, is ill thought out and poorly planned.
2. The interim service delivery model will, for the rest of this financial year, lead to an increase in Anti-Social Behaviour across the Borough – to the irritation of the whole community, for whom this is already a massive problem.
3. The interim service delivery model will, for the rest of this financial year, incur a risk of extra spending on management and quality assurance of the service – risks which have not been addressed in the little documentation available or in such public statements as have emerged.

This Council resolves that:

1. The current Mayor, John Biggs, should honour his commitment to govern in a transparent manner and he should put on the public record a full account of what has been going on, including what allegations have been made, when these were made, by whom and how - and critically how these are being investigated (releasing as much information as is possible without compromising the investigations or the individuals concerned); what prompted the service review and how it took place; and what his intentions are towards the service.
2. The current Mayor, John Biggs, to immediately stop any further work to drastically reduce and cut the Youth Service provision in the name of interim delivery model and engage in a serious, open, transparent consultation with the young people, residents and stakeholders.
3. The current Mayor, John Biggs, to reverse the decision to close unprecedented number of Youth Centres and look for an alternative way to provide effective, efficient and fit-for-purpose Borough-wide localised youth service provision.
4. The current Mayor, John Biggs, must keep the Youth Service in-house rather than privatising or contracting it out.
5. In the event that the current Mayor, John Biggs, should not agree to do think again, he must issue a statement clarifying how he intends to procure a service to fill in the gaps from the third sector, given that the Commissioners have been running grant-making functions; and he must also issue a comprehensive statement covering which of his chosen eight venues will pick up delivering the service previously provided by centres which John Biggs and Cllr Saunders have closed and how service users whose centres have been closed are expected to access the replacement services, including details of travel arrangements, etc.

12.2 Motion on the process of awarding grants in the aftermath of the lifting of directions.

Proposed by: Cllr Peter Golds

Seconded by: Cllr Andrew Wood

This council notes that the allocation of grants has now been returned from the Commissioners by the Secretary of State to the Council.

The council notes that this has been achieved by the hard work of officers and a number of elected members who have acted in accordance with the emerging Best Value Programme to achieve transparency in the process.

The council further notes that prior to this year there were three detailed examinations into the allocation of grants by the former administration namely, the PwC Best Value Inspection of 2014, the Election Court of 2015 and the January 2016 hearing which refused the application by Lutfur Rahman to seek a Judicial Review into the findings of the election court which disqualified him in relation to grants and bribery.

In each of these examinations the grants process as practised by the former administration was found to be seriously in breach of procedure.

The Council notes:

The PwC Best Value Inspection of November 2014 in relation to grants states in paragraph 2.7:

“In relation to the matter of grant making, we conclude that the Authority is failing to comply with its best value duty.”

In addition paragraph 2.7 subsection c states:

“Grants have been awarded to organisations which were ruled ineligible or which did not meet the required evaluation score”

The Council further notes:

That in the landmark Judgement of April 23rd 2015, former Mayor Lutfur Rahman and his election Agent were discharged from office on seven counts of corrupt and illegal practices, including bribery, involving the allocation of grants

The issue of bribery in relation to grants is itemised in paragraphs 483 and 484 of the Judgement:

483. Given that, on these and other issues, the court has been asked to accept the evidence of Mr Rahman and Mr Choudhury as being truthful, it is not without significance that they have been caught out in obvious and, ultimately, unnecessary falsehoods.

484. Where does this bring us when considering this aspect of bribery?

What has been proved may be summarised as follows:

a) the administration of grants was firmly in the personal hands of Mr Rahman, assisted by his two cronies, Councillors Asad and Choudhury;

b) in administering the grants policy, Mr Rahman acted in total disregard of the Council's officers, its members and, almost certainly, the law;

c) grants were increased, substantially and unjustifiably, from the amounts recommended by officers who had properly carried out the Council's investigation and assessment procedure;

d) large grants were made to organisations who were totally ineligible or who failed to meet the threshold for eligibility;

e) grants were made to organisations that had not applied for them;

f) the careful attempts of PwC to marry up grants to ascertainable levels of deprivation and need in the Borough had resulted in the conclusion that it was impossible to do so: grants were not based on need;

g) the lion's share of grants went to organisations that were run by and/or for the Bangladeshi community;

h) the main thrust of Mr Rahman's political campaigning both as leader of the Council and later as Mayor was to target the Bangladeshi community and to convince that community that loyalty to the community meant loyalty to him;

i) even within the Bangladeshi community, grants were targeted at the wards where support for Mr Rahman and his candidates was strongest while wards where their chances of success were slim lost out.

That in January 2016, Lord Justice Lloyd-Jones sitting with Justice Supperstone in refusing the application for permission to apply for Judicial Review, of the Judgement of the Election Court in so far as it related to grants said:

"The conclusion of the Commissioner was that a man in control of a fund of money not his own, who corruptly uses his control to make payments from the fund for the purposes of inducing people to vote for him, is within the opening words of section 113(2) and commits the offence of bribery. I agree. I can see no basis on which the challenge based on the interpretation of section 113(5) and its application to the facts as found by the Commissioner could have any realistic prospect of success"

The Council welcomes the commitment by the current administration following the lifting of directions; grants will be undertaken in a transparent fashion with full cross party involvement in public.

The council seeks to ensure that in future all grants are made for the benefit of the many varied communities that make up the borough and not for the benefit of the political administration, as was laid out forcefully by the Best Value Inspection and the legal process of the Election Court and the refusal by Lord Justice Lloyd Jones to refer the decision of the Election Court with respect to bribery, to Judicial Review.

The Council resolves:

The Council further resolves that all grants should be for the wider benefit of the various communities and not those who manage grant applications and that all applicants understand the legal situation before applying for grants.

The Council believes that in seeking improved management of grants, understanding of the law and proper training will ensure that the matters which caused the Election Court will not happen again and that the lessons which will benefit local government in general, have been learned from the period of direction that was in place in Tower Hamlets.

12.3 Motion regarding my Tower Hamlets Card regarding My Tower Hamlets Card

Proposer: Councillor Rabina Khan

Seconded: Councillor Shafi Ahmed

The Council Notes:

1. The population of Tower Hamlets is projected to increase by around 66,700 residents over the next decade. In 2016 population was 297,800 but is projected to grow to 364,500 by 2026.
2. The population projections estimate that the number of households living in Tower Hamlets will rise from 120,600 in 2016 to 156,000 in 2026 – an increase of around 35,400 households over the next ten years.
3. In Tower Hamlets, 60 per cent of all children in poverty live in couple families and the remaining 40 per cent live in lone parent families.
4. Tower Hamlets has the highest percentage of both children (39 per cent) and older people (50 per cent) living in income deprived households in England.

The Council Further Notes:

1. One quarter of Tower Hamlets residents are income deprived - the borough is ranked 6th highest in England on this measure, and highest in London.
2. According to the Centre for Economics and Business Research the cost of raising a child to the age of 21 has jumped to £230,000, or more than the price of an average semi-detached house in Britain, according to new research.
3. It further concluded that parents will spend more than £70,000 for childcare and babysitting alone, and spend another £74,000 on education-related expenses such as uniforms, school lunches, text books and school trips.
4. Half of older people in the borough live in income deprived households and that more, older people live in social housing in Tower Hamlets than in London and England and mortality rates for the 65-74 age group are higher than in London and England.
5. Half of older people in the borough live in income deprived households and 90% do not eat the recommended amount of fruit & vegetables.

The Council Believes;

1. That the cost of household of living in for residents in Tower Hamlets poses a financial challenge with food, clothes, rent, house prices, keeping warm and transport ever increasing.
2. The Council like councils across the country has to make savings but people's needs must be at the heart of a council budget and driving the cost of household of living will support residents in a time of financial constraint.

3. Tower Hamlets has a thriving economy worth £6bn per annum and the business and enterprise economy is one of the most significant contributors to this growth and performance.

The Council Resolves;

1. To introduce a membership scheme called My Tower Hamlets Card for Tower Hamlets residents offering local discounts and savings to make the most of the borough they live in.
2. My Tower Hamlets Card will help drive the cost of household living down for residents by enabling residents to access discounts on purchases at supermarkets, local businesses and leisure facilities.
3. My Tower Hamlets Card will be open to businesses to promote and grow their business among the current Tower Hamlets approximate 297,000 residents through the scheme and for future population growth.
4. My Tower Hamlets Card will be a free scheme open to businesses and Tower Hamlets residents.
5. A Project Team is set up to develop the My Tower Hamlets Card scheme with a cross-party representation and to set out how the council and its partners can encourage and support enterprise and entrepreneurial participation as members of the scheme to increase opportunity, prosperity and mobility for Tower Hamlets residents and to increase business growth.

12.4 Motion regarding Scrap the Fee for Domestic Violence Victims

Proposer: Councillor Shiria Khatun

Seconded: Councillor Rachael Saunders

This Council notes:

1. Violence against women and girls (VAWG) is abuse targeted at women or girls because of their gender and it affects women and girls disproportionately but men can be abused too. VAWG has a major impact on the physical safety, health and emotional well-being of individuals, and impacts on families, carers, children and the community as a whole.
2. Domestic abuse is any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults who are, or who have been, intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality. This includes violence such as female genital mutilation, so-called 'honour' crimes, forced marriage, and acts of gender-based violence.
3. National statistics have not changed for decades. Two women are killed every week in England and Wales by a current or former partner. One in four women will experience domestic violence in their lifetimes.
4. Legal Aid is a lifeline for women fleeing domestic abuse. It helps them to protect themselves, their children and secure their financial situation. Yet due to Government changes to the rules for women to qualify for legal aid, they now need to provide a prescribed piece of evidence to prove they have been subjected to abuse.
5. One of the accepted forms of evidence is a letter from a GP. However some GPs charge a fee – in some cases as much as £75 – to produce that letter.
6. Tower Hamlets Council agreed a Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy at a meeting in December 2016.
7. That despite government cuts meaning we have to save £1 for every £6 we currently spend, no funding was cut from the budget for the Tower Hamlets Domestic Violence team in the Mayor's 2016/17 budget, and funding has been protected in the Mayor's three-year budget agreed for 2017-2020.

This Council believes:

1. That it is everyone's responsibility to stop domestic violence and abuse and it is our ambition that people treat one another with respect and compassion.
2. No GP should charge victims of domestic abuse for a letter they need to access legal aid. It's unfair. It's immoral. And it has to stop.

This Council resolves:

1. To support the Scrap the Fee campaign, which was established by Tom Watson MP following a plea from Wythenshawe Safe Spots.
2. To request our local GP surgeries to voluntarily scrap the fee.

3. To ask Mayor Biggs to write to the Home Secretary, calling on the Government to scrap this unfair and unjust charge, by bringing this service back under the NHS contract.

12.5 Motion regarding Manchester Road traffic

Proposer: Councillor Chris Chapman

Seconder: Councillor Andrew Wood

This council notes that Labour controlled Manchester City Council has cancelled the 20 mph speed limit which was undergoing trial in the Gorton, Fallowfield and Rusholme areas of the City which are within the Manchester Gorton constituency.

Manchester City council officers carried out a long-term evaluation of the first phase - finding it has cut speeds by just 0.7mph and in some areas speed has actually increased.

As a result the scheme has been cancelled returning £700,000 to be used for the benefit of City residents.

The council further notes that Manchester Road, E14 suffers from the same problems of these roads in the area of Manchester Gorton. Traffic speed is hardly reduced and there are many incidents of speeding as some drivers overtake drivers travelling at 20mph.

The Council invites the Mayor to follow the lead of his colleagues on Manchester City Council and lift the 20mph limit on Manchester Road, Isle of Dogs as has been done in Manchester Gorton.

12.6 Motion regarding Poplar HARCA Auction of 50 Social Dwellings

Proposer: Councillor Shah Alam

Seconded: Councillor Rabina Khan

The Council Notes

1. **Poplar HARCA** (Housing and Regeneration Community Association) is a housing landlord of about 9,000 homes in the Poplar Area.
2. Poplar HARCA was set up by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to regenerate the area, especially certain Council estates whose residents voted to transfer to the new body.
3. Parts of seven estates (about 4,500 homes) transferred to Poplar HARCA on 23rd March 1998.
4. The following year, tenants on further estates voted to remain with the Council. However, after a lengthy consultation of all Council estates in Tower Hamlets begun in 2002, several more estates in Poplar did transfer between 2005 and 2007.
5. In 2012 Poplar HARCA obtained planning permission for a joint redevelopment of the Aberfeldy Estate. The plans include 1,100 new homes and improved amenities to be provided over 12 years.
6. There have already been representations made to council meetings from Poplar HARCA residents regarding the astronomical increases in parking charges.
7. That in early February it emerged Poplar HARCA had proposed to sell 50 social dwellings by auction with 39 homes been sold on 13th February 2017.

The Council Welcomes;

1. Residents and Councillors who opposed the way in which Poplar HARCA sought to sell off social housing.
2. That Mayor John Biggs wrote a letter to Steve Stride (CEO) of Poplar HARCA on 7th February 2017 with concerns regarding the proposed sale of the 50 social dwellings.
3. In his letter the Mayor stated that he had been aware of the proposed sale several months ago but did not give a specific date. He further stated officers had offered that the council would purchase the social dwellings to use as temporary accommodation or through purchasing the long lease or freehold interest.

The Council further notes;

1. That the CEO of Poplar Harca sent an open letter to Councillors and stated; "In July 2016, we spoke with Mayor Biggs about our strategy to market-rent or sell empty less popular and expensive to repair properties."

2. The CEO also stated in the letter;
“...sunday night before the auction on the Monday morning we were hopeful that an agreement would be reached. But 7 months on, and without a binding agreement, Poplar HARCA could not risk a deal with the Council falling-through so we had to proceed to auction.”
3. That the Mayor Biggs knew about the proposed sale of the 50 properties but chose not to inform ward councillors in whose wards these properties were in.
4. That Mayor Biggs knew about the proposed sale of the 50 properties but chose not to bring a motion to Full Council to oppose the sale of social housing.
5. That Mayor Biggs states an offer was made to purchase the 50 properties but the CEO of Poplar HARCA states that no such deal was given as there was no binding agreement.
6. That since July 2016 Poplar HARCA has not been consulting with its residents as a social landlord but rather a developer landlord.

The Council Resolves;

1. To determine whether there was a binding agreement offered to Poplar HARCA and to provide written documentation to this effect.
2. That officers inform councillors of whether funding was given to Poplar HARCA from July 2016 until present including Right To Buy Receipts, New Homes Bonus and any CPOs granted to Poplar HARCA.
3. That all communication on this matter between Mayor Biggs and Poplar HARCA is provided to councillors of the ward in which the 50 properties are in.
4. That Mayor Biggs provides an explanation as to why he failed to inform ward councillors of the proposed sale of homes by Poplar HARCA and why he did not think it was important to bring a motion to Full Council opposing the sale of the properties.

12.7 Motion regarding School Funding

Proposer: Councillor Rachael Saunders

Seconder: Mayor John Biggs

This Council notes that:

1. Tower Hamlets is a place of huge diversity, and deprivation, and over the last 20 years families, schools, young people and the Council have come together to drive up standards through collaboration and through a determination to achieve excellence – backed by a Labour government which funded us appropriately. This is now at risk from Tory cuts.
2. The Government has proposed a new school funding formula, which will take money from poorer areas and reallocate it to wealthier areas.
3. The impact of the changes, included with other cost pressures, mean that schools in Tower Hamlets will have to save £18.8m by 2018/19, a 7.6% cut.
4. Schools in Tower Hamlets will lose £511 per pupil by 2018/19, making the borough the hardest hit in London.
5. Cumulatively schools across London will need to save £360m by 2018/19 under the new system – equivalent to 12,857 qualified teachers.
6. The Government's Budget 2017 included £360m for new free schools and grammar schools, but ignored the financial crisis that our existing schools face.

This Council believes:

1. The new funding formula won't bring about fairer school funding across the country. Instead, it will further cut funding from schools already struggling with education cuts.
2. The new formula will put the progress made by our schools in jeopardy by punishing pupils from the poorest areas and harming social mobility.
3. That schools in Tower Hamlets deserve to be fairly and properly funded.

This Council resolves:

1. To call on Mayor Biggs to write to the Department for Education, highlighting the threat to progress that the school funding changes represent.
2. To support the Mayor's campaign to challenge these unfair and deeply damaging cuts to schools in Tower Hamlets.

12.8 Motion on spending S106, New Homes Bonus and Community Infrastructure Levy

Proposer: Councillor Andrew Wood

Seconder: Councillor Julia Dockerill

This council notes that the Council currently has;

£82 millions of unspent S106 as at the end of January 2017

£24 millions of Community Infrastructure Levy in the bank and is expecting at least £76 million from already approved developments and has received over one hundred million pounds of New Homes Bonus from the government as a reward for building the most new homes in the country every year since the inception of the reward programme.

That much of this cash is disproportionality as a result of development in the City Fringe, Wapping, Poplar, Limehouse and the Isle of Dogs.

The Council further notes:

The frustration of local communities subject to years and even decades of construction who are repeatedly told there is no cash when evidently there is.

Even new communities like at London City Island are shocked that £1 million of S106 that they paid for when acquiring their apartments is being spent at Hackney Wick, miles away and not locally to benefit them.

That New Homes Bonus is a one-off source of funds that should be spent to prepare the Borough for the population growth generated by those new developments

That only when Cabinet reports are issued do we find out where the money is actually going to be spent.

The Council resolves:

That the Council has to pro-actively involve communities and local organisations in the spending of that money.

That the Council uses some of its huge reserves to engage on a temporary basis project managers to work with the community, local organisations and Officers to deliver projects that will benefit all residents in those areas most impacted by construction or which are most in need of extra infrastructure capacity.

That S106 funds can be re-purposed with the agreement of the developer many of whom we know would be happy to do so.

12.9 Motion regarding Value Nurseries, Children's Centres and Youth Services Campaigners' Voices

Proposer: Councillor Abdul Asad

Seconder: Councillor Rabina Khan

The Council Notes:

1. Mayor John Biggs' second budget was passed on 22nd February which he describes as a "**progressive and compassionate**" budget.
2. 24 Votes for the budget, 18 against, 1 abstention
3. The Council in the budget risk assessment stated that the cuts would be met with "significant public resistance."
3. 3 Petitions were submitted by members of the public on 22nd February related to cuts to Children's Centres, Youth Services and Nurseries.
4. Over 10,000 people signed various petitions related to the cuts to Children's Centres, Careers Services, and Youth Centres and against the privatisation of Tower Hamlets Nurseries.

The Council Welcomes:

1. The representatives who spoke on behalf of the 3 petitions presented to the Budget Full Council on 22nd February 2017 were women apart from one man.
2. The representation of women taking a stand in Tower Hamlets for their rights and services and fits into this year's International Women's Day theme #BeBoldForChange
3. Their valuable contributions brought to light the importance of need for mothers, carers and children who need Children's Centres as a life line for children to thrive and have a head start in life.
4. That Tower Hamlets run nurseries are a valuable service that should be retained and not privatised.
5. The Careers Centre saves tax payers 59 million pounds by keeping youth unemployment down based on research undertaken by the University of York.
6. That the Youth Services has experienced extensive cutbacks including the closure of 18 youth centres
7. The restructure of the Youth Service has introduced INFLEXIBLE WORKING HOURS. Part-time youth workers will be forced to take full-time positions or as job share; new working hours are proposed from 2pm-10pm which discriminates against workers with families, single parent households, carers or those with additional responsibilities.

The Council Resolves:

1. Mayor John Biggs is “**compassionate**” and meet with all the petitioners who represent over 10,000 people in Tower Hamlets to find “**progressive**” ways of ensuring these vital services are protected.