

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 McGreenera 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. McGreenera:

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