

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL**

**HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2010**

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

**Members Present:**

Mayor Lutfur Rahman	Councillor Ann Jackson
Councillor Helal Abbas	Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed	Councillor Dr. Emma Jones
Councillor Kabir Ahmed	Councillor Anwar Khan
Councillor Ohid Ahmed	Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Rajib Ahmed	Councillor Aminur Khan
Councillor Rofique U Ahmed	Councillor Rania Khan
Councillor Shelina Aktar	Councillor Anna Lynch
Councillor Shahed Ali	Councillor Harun Miah
Councillor Tim Archer	Councillor Mohammed Abdul Mukit MBE
Councillor Abdul Asad	Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer
Councillor Craig Aston	Councillor Lesley Pavitt
Councillor Lutfu Begum	Councillor Joshua Peck
Councillor Mizan Chaudhury	Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	Councillor Oliur Rahman
Councillor Zara Davis	Councillor Rachael Saunders
Councillor Stephanie Eaton	Councillor David Snowdon
Councillor David Edgar	Councillor Gloria Thienel
Councillor Marc Francis	Councillor Bill Turner
Councillor Judith Gardiner	Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Carlo Gibbs	Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Peter Golds	Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	Councillor Amy Whitelock
Councillor Sirajul Islam	

The meeting opened at 7.37 p.m.

**The Chair of Council, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman, in the Chair**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillors Carli Harper-Penman, Shiria Khatun, Mohammed Maium Miah and Kosru Uddin.

**RESOLVED**

That the apologies be noted.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Type of interest</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Helal Abbas	5	Personal	Constitution Working Party member
Kabir Ahmed	12.5	Personal	I hold my surgeries at the Rich Mix Centre
Rofique Uddin Ahmed	12.5	Personal	Bancroft History Library and Archive is in my Ward
Mizanur Chaudhury	12.5	Personal	Council representative on Rich Mix
Stephanie Eaton	6.2.1 and 12.3	Personal	I am a leaseholder of a property for which the freehold is owned by Island Homes
Peter Golds	5	Personal	Constitution Working Party member
Ann Jackson	5	Personal	Constitution Working Party member
Denise Jones	5	Personal	Constitution Working Party member
Denise Jones	12.5	Personal	Trustee of Rich Mix
Oliur Rahman	6.2.1 and 12.3	Personal	Island Homes is my landlord
Rachael Saunders	12.5	Personal	Council representative on Rich Mix
Amy Whitelock	12.5	Personal	Bancroft History Library and Archive is in my Ward

**3. MINUTES****RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the ordinary Council meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2010 be confirmed as a correct record of the proceedings and the Chair of Council be authorised to sign them accordingly.

**4. TO RECEIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Chief Executive reported to the Council on the result of the Mayoral election held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010. The Chair of Council invited the elected Mayor, Lutfur Rahman, to address the council meeting. The Mayor

addressed the meeting and announced that he had appointed Councillor Ohid Ahmed as his Deputy Mayor.

## 5. REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION

Councillor Joshua Peck presented the recommendations of the Constitution Working Party. In doing so, Councillor Peck also **MOVED** and Councillor Ann Jackson **SECONDED** a tabled **amendment** to the report - "That the report of the Constitution Working Party be agreed subject to the following amendments:-

- At paragraph 5.37 - Delete '£74,995' and replace with '£65,000';
- At paragraph 5.8 – Add further sentence at the end "**It is proposed that Tower Hamlets' constitution should not provide for the appointment by the Elected Mayor of Councillors to any paid positions (including external bodies) other than those of the Executive (Cabinet) Members**";
- Add an additional constitutional provision under the 'Civic and Ceremonial Duties' section 'The former Mayoral Car and Chauffeur will be available only for civic duties and for the sole use of the Chair or Deputy Chair of Council'; and
- Amend the relevant sections of Appendix A in accordance with the above."

After discussion, the amendment moved by Councillor Joshua Peck was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED** and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED** a further amendment as follows:-

"That item 5.20; Petitions and Deputations – That a time limit of forty minutes be allowed for petitions and deputations so that a maximum of four petitions and/or deputations may be submitted and heard in front of Full Council;

Item 5.24; Public Participation – general – In the event of a member of the public submitting a question or petition to the Council, having previously submitted one or other to one of the previous two Council meetings, then that question should be placed behind other public questions and petitions that may have been submitted by other members of the public;

Item 5.37; The Mayor's and members' Remuneration – That the Elected Mayor's allowance of £65,000 p.a. be paid with effect from 25<sup>th</sup> October 2010."

After further discussion, the amendment moved by Councillor Peter Golds was put to the vote and was **defeated**.

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

## **RESOLVED**

1. That subject to (a) – (d) below, changes be agreed to the Council's Constitution as set out in the schedule at Appendix A to the report to take effect immediately with the exception of the proposed changes to the arrangements for petitions, deputations and public questions at the Council meeting, which will take effect at the conclusion of the current meeting;
  - (a) At paragraph 5.37 of the report - Delete '£74,995' and replace with '£65,000';
  - (b) At paragraph 5.8 – Add further sentence at the end **“It is proposed that Tower Hamlets’ constitution should not provide for the appointment by the Elected Mayor of Councillors to any paid positions (including external bodies) other than those of the Executive (Cabinet) Members”**;
  - (c) Add an additional constitutional provision under the ‘Civic and Ceremonial Duties’ section ‘The former Mayoral Car and Chauffeur will be available only for civic duties and for the sole use of the Chair or Deputy Chair of Council’; and
  - (d) Appendix A - Amend the relevant sections in accordance with the above.
2. That the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be authorised to amend the text of the Constitution as necessary to give effect to the agreed changes.

## **6. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS OR DEPUTATIONS**

### **6.1 PETITIONS**

No petitions were received for this meeting.

### **6.2 DEPUTATIONS**

#### **6.2.1 Deputation regarding Island Homes**

At the invitation of the Mayor, Mr. Antony Lane and Ms. Jenny Fisher addressed the meeting on behalf of the deputation. Mr Lane and Ms Fisher spoke in support of the motion submitted by Councillor Peter Golds and Councillor David Snowdon included at item 12.3 of the agenda. They then responded to questions from Members of the Council.

Mayor Lutfur Rahman, said that he was sorry that Mr. Lane and Ms. Fisher had had to bring their concerns to the meeting. The Mayor was concerned that the Housing Associations had gone back on the agreements. He would ask officers to suspend One Housing Group as a preferred development partner if they did not honour the promises made.

### **RESOLVED**

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

### **Change to order of business**

At this point, Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED** and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED** – “That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be changed to allow item 12.3 to be considered as the next item of business.”

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

### **12.3 Motion proposed by Councillor Peter Golds regarding Island Homes**

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

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**, with no Member voting against. Accordingly it was:-

### **RESOLVED**

This council notes:

1. The ongoing concerns of Island Homes residents in the management structure of their Housing Association
2. The fact that the board of Island Homes, while having a majority of residents, does not have representatives elected by the residents of the Island Homes estates
3. That the Barkantine Management Team (BMT) has been deprived of its office by Island Homes since the board was suspended in 2008.
4. The motion approved by Full Council on 9 December 2009 calling for the Lead Member for Housing to press Island Homes for further reforms to bring governance standards in line with those expected by Island Homes residents

This council believes:

1. That the London Borough of Tower Hamlets has an ongoing responsibility towards the residents of the Island Homes estates due to the mistakes made in the transfer process, which resulted in the Transfer Document not fully reflecting the promises made in the Offer Document

This council resolves that:

1. The Lead Member for Housing should take renewed and additional steps to seek a resolution to the dispute over board membership between Island Homes Residents and Island Homes
2. The Lead Member for Housing should report back on progress made at the next meeting of Full Council.

## **7. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

### **7.1 Question from Mr. Nigel Kirby re: Delivery arrangements at Roman Road East shops**

“Has the Council’s Town Centre Project Coordinator or the Roman Road East Regeneration Steering Group chaired by Cllr Joshua Peck looked into the delivery practicalities for the Roman Road East shops? We now have both Iceland and Poundland lorries turning in to Anglo Road and reversing half the length of Cardigan Road to make their deliveries. The Iceland lorries have been doing this for 18 months already. This is illegal and highly dangerous, noisy and disruptive, but despite residents raising the matter with both local Councillors and direct with the Head of Traffic and Transportation, we are still waiting for officers to come and investigate.”

#### **Response of the Mayor**

The Roman Road Town Centre Coordinator has investigated the situation and advises that the changes of use involved did not require any new planning application nor was any consultation required. Consequently changes in servicing arrangements could not be enforced through the planning process.

Officers in both Parking Enforcement and Transportation & Highways are aware that current practice causes disturbance to residents and have investigated the potential for taking enforcement action against these vehicles. There is however a point closure at the north end of Cardigan Road which forces vehicles to turn around, and for larger vehicles the only point at which they can do this is at Anglo Road. Whilst on non-market days these shops should be able to load directly from Roman Road, with no need to use Cardigan Road at all,

the closure of that street during market hours means there is little alternative available to the current practice.

As no planning restrictions currently apply, the only alternative is for officers to approach the management of these stores direct to seek their cooperation in trying to modify and better manage servicing arrangements for the benefit of surrounding residents - essentially exploring their ability to restrict deliveries to non-market days and introducing enforcement of the current activity on those days if they fail to do so.

The Roman Road Implementation Group is seeking to take future development proposals into account alongside existing practicalities in delivering public realm improvements in this area. This includes an area review of traffic management arrangements which has recently been commissioned and which could offer better access routes and servicing arrangements for businesses on Roman Road itself.

#### **Summary of supplementary question from Mr. Kirby:**

Under the Section 106 agreement for Gladstone Place, £35K was earmarked for a raised pavement. There was no consultation with residents on this and HGVs use the kerbs. Wasn't this a waste of money?

#### **Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I will look into this matter further to see if it can be rectified.

### **8. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

The Chair of Council gave Members a few moments to read through the tabled replies.

#### **8.1 Question from Councillor Bill Turner**

"Does the Lead Member agree with me that the decision to re-route the 2012 Olympic Marathon away from the East End was a betrayal of the very principles which won the bid for London and can she update me on what action the Council are taking to try and reverse this decision?"

#### **Response of the Mayor:**

Indeed I do agree with the Member for Mile End and Globe Town that the decision to change the route of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic marathons is a betrayal of the principles of the bid and of the support that Tower Hamlets has provided to the London 2012 Olympics.

Following receipt of the letter (25<sup>th</sup> August 2010) from LOCOG advising the Council of the decision to re-route the marathon the Council has

- Corresponded with LOCOG outlining our concerns and requesting the detailed evidence which formed the basis for that decision so that we can review and challenge the basis for the decision
- Commenced a media and Public Relations campaign which has included
  - Articles in various media
  - On-line petition
  - Support from prominent politicians including Tessa Jowell former Olympics Minister and Ken Livingstone
  - Letters to influential media from the Leader with support and signature of the Mayors of Newham and Hackney, and local Members of Parliament
  - Published through the Council's web site the letter exchanges between the Council and LOCOG concerning the withdrawal of the walk race events from the Borough and the withdrawal of the marathon events to demonstrate the lack of consultation with and disregard shown to the Borough and its residents
  - Standard e-mail to send to Lord Coe, Jeremy Hunt (Olympics Minister) and the Mayor of London accessible via the web pages

and is

- Taking legal advice on the decision made

Overall the Council will continue its media, PR and lobbying campaign to maintain awareness of the issue and pressure on LOCOG whilst making the case for re-examination of the decision through the usual professional channels including legal offices if appropriate.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Bill Turner:**

I am pleased that Mayor Rahman agrees with the majority group about the disgraceful decision to re-route the marathon. Can I have a commitment from Mayor Rahman that he will meet with Boris Jonson to discuss the comments he made about the borough and urge him to support the return of the marathon to East London?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I have already written to the Leaders of the Olympic host boroughs reinforcing my commitment to ensuring that this Council has a full and robust role as a key partner in the delivery of the Olympic Games and to Paul Deighton, Chief Executive of the London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games and will be meeting with the LOCOG as a priority.



I will also be attending the host boroughs meeting on Friday to make clear my commitment to the delivery of a successful Olympic Games for Tower Hamlets.

## 8.2 **Question from Councillor Craig Aston**

“What discussions has Tower Hamlets Council had with British Waterways regarding doubling the number of berths in the already overcrowded Limehouse Basin?”

### **Response of the Mayor:**

British Waterways made a formal request on 16 October to enter into pre-application advice from the Council in respect of two proposals in Limehouse Basin:

- "Change of use of 22 (20%) of the 106 berths to full residential use".
- "Change of use of marina to allow a mixed use of both leisure and residential berths".

British Waterways benefit from certain permitted development rights to carry out works without needing to apply for permission. Officers will check which aspects of the proposals require planning permission and check the relevant planning history before arranging to meet British Waterways to discuss the merits of their proposals and provide advice on conformity with planning policy and other material considerations.

In accordance with the Council's pre-application procedures and Statement of Community Involvement, British Waterways have been advised to carry out public consultation on their proposals at the earliest opportunity so that the views of local residents can be taken into account when officers issue the advice.

The pre-application advice process is best practice but is not statutory. If a planning application is submitted, the Council will carry out statutory public consultation including neighbour notification.

### **Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Craig Aston:**

Thank you for the written answer. Will the Mayor ensure that there is adequate consultation with residents on the British Waterways proposals?

### **Summary of the Mayor's response:**

Absolutely. Any formal application needs to have consultation and we will want to protect the interests of our residents. The Council and officers will ensure this happens, so yes as I would like to see better use of our waterways.

### 8.3 Question from Councillor Carlo Gibbs

“Can the Lead Member give us an update on the likely impact of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review on the Council’s finances?”

#### **Response of the Mayor:**

The Government made its Spending Review announcement on 20th October and set out some headline figures for local government. Under the Government's plans, Government departments will be providing 26% less grant to local authorities by the end of the Spending Review period in 2014/15 and a large proportion of that will need to be found next year in 2011/12.

In addition the Government has announced that capital grants from Government departments to local authorities will reduce by 45%. This will make it very hard for Councils to respond to the needs of a growing population, such as we have in Tower Hamlets.

It is clear that local government has been one of the areas of the public sector hardest hit by the Spending Review, despite the fact that local authorities provide services that are important to the daily lives of everyone and are vital to the lives of society's most vulnerable.

The Council will not know how much of the national 'pot' it will receive until detailed grant announcements are made, and those are expected early in December.

The Cabinet's priority is to protect front-line services where we can and we agreed a number of initiatives in August to help us achieve that.

We are also lobbying Government to try and make sure we get a settlement that doesn't mean a double whammy for Tower Hamlets - a tight Spending Review settlement coupled with a reduction in our share of the national pot.

#### **Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Carlo Gibbs:**

Isn't it the case that the CSR cuts are driven by ideology and this borough will be the hardest hit with cuts to social housing and other budgets, raising demands on our services at the same time as reducing our capacity to respond. Can you give an assurance that you will continue Labour's work to protect services from this?

#### **Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I will work with those necessary. The reductions will be front ended and there will be a £30M spending reduction in the first year. I will provide a full briefing on how to tackle this at the first Cabinet meeting.

**8.4 Question from Councillor Mohammed Maium Miah**

Cllr Miah was not in attendance at the meeting and a written response would be provided.

**8.5 Question from Councillor Anna Lynch**

“Does the Lead Member agree with several GP’s, RCN and the BMA, that the proposals outlined in the Coalition Government’s NHS White Paper to greatly increase the marketisation of the health service will not increase patient outcomes, provide value for money or greater integration of health and social care and are therefore a ‘dangerous leap in the dark’ for patients such as those in Tower Hamlets?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

The Health White Paper, 'Equity and Excellence: liberating the NHS' was published on 12 July 2010 and signals the most radical restructuring of the NHS since its inception. To develop proposals further the Department of Health held a widespread consultation which closed on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and the Council is currently awaiting their response.

The White Paper signals new responsibilities for Local Authorities on Public Health to be followed up by a further White Paper in December. The Council welcomes the proposed changes to Public Health and health improvement becoming a Local Authority led activity given the health challenges in the Borough.

The government’s radical reshaping of health services will transform how health care is commissioned and hands local government a wealth of new powers and responsibilities.

The policy agenda is far reaching and the timetable for implementation ambitious given the scale of change and the context of increasing financial pressures facing the service. There is a strong track record with partnership working between the Local Authority and the NHS and the Council is working hard to make sure these changes work for the people of Tower Hamlets. Officers are already working closely with the PCT to plan the transition arrangements and the Mayor and myself will now be involved in taking these discussions forward.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Anna Lynch:**

Thank you for your answer. As a registered health care professional, I am appalled by changes to health care policy as described in the White Paper. Can you commit that the talent that we have in the PCT will be

kept and this borough will be protected as this will affect the poorest people in the borough?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I will be meeting with GP representatives as soon as possible to better understand the implication of change and to ensure the progress made is protected and assured.

**8.6 Question from Councillor Peter Golds**

"The annual cost of electricity in Mulberry Place is £533,000 per year and in Anchorage House £216,000 per year. Anchorage House has "intelligent lighting which is motion sensitive". This appears not to be so in Mulberry Place which is regularly lit up through the night and weekends. What is the reason for this, bearing in mind the ongoing financial discrepancy?"

**Response of the Mayor:**

Steps have been taken to ensure there is a reduction in energy consumption in Mulberry Place. The landlords as part of their responsibilities check all floors at night via their security guard and also double check the timer clocks to ensure they are correctly set for night time and weekend usage. They can however, be overridden by occupiers who either stay late or work at weekends.

We have asked the landlords to ensure all equipment is working as it should and that all time clocks are set correctly. The Council's Facilities Management team has reviewed usage and a report from a specialist energy saving company has been obtained. The cost of electrical for Mulberry Place from April to September 2010 stands at £177,000, a reduction on last year's cost.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Peter Golds:**

It is helpful to have these answers and I thank you for this. The cost of electricity at Mulberry Place has dropped but I am informed by people passing the building at weekends and from my own experience that the lights are on constantly for 24 hours. Can we take some sanction if the landlords do not deliver on their commitments?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I want to see the costs taken down across the borough. I am glad to see that the costs have come gone down in the last six months.

**8.7 Question from Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury**

“Can the Lead Member tell me what action the Council is taking to tackle the problem of illegal sub-letting in the Borough?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

Working with Local Housing Partners, the council has launched a campaign to tackle people illegally sub-letting a council or Housing Association property. The Council, which bid for Government funding to tackle the problem, has established a new Anti Fraud Team to crack down on illegal Subletting in May 2010

Sourcing Government funding the Risk Management team with the Resources Directorate has created three temporary posts to look specifically at cases of Subletting in Tower Hamlets Homes (THH) and the other Registered Social Landlords working within Tower Hamlets.

The team work directly to the Head of Audit Services and all three staff have a background in either Housing Benefit Investigations or Housing Management and were recruited and placed in post by May 2010. Each member of the team was given a 6 month contract which has been extended recently.

The team has the following objectives:-

- Identify social housing fraud cases;
- Assist/recover unlawfully public sector (ALMO and RSL) occupied properties (Secure and Assured tenancies);
- Build up working relations with THH and RSLs to joint manage social housing fraud;
- Deal with associated fraud matters arising from un lawful occupancy work including Housing Benefit Irregularities, Parking Permit abuse etc; and
- Identify weaknesses and learn and improve systems to prevent un-lawful occupancy.

Since the team has been set up, it has generated 158 cases, which 20 properties have been recovered within the borough, 4 are subject to Notices To Quit and 45 additional cases are been actively pursued for benefit issues.

The Councils Hotline for Fraud is 0800 528 0294 and email address - [anti-fraud@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:anti-fraud@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

Tenancy audit checks are carried out regularly by THH Staff which work closely with the Council's Fraud Team. In the period of April to September this year 736 tenancy audits were carried out which has lead to the discovery of 17 sublet properties which are currently going

through the legal process. All checks are based on intelligence and are not target related.

Leaseholders are legally allowed to sublet and are required to notify the Freeholder. If a leaseholder does not inform THH then legal action can be taken however in most circumstances once the leaseholder is advised of the breach they always remedy it by advising THH of the sublet.

In the past, Leaseholder Services have worked in partnership with Homeless Services, Letting and Environmental Housing Team to address overcrowding in Leasehold properties, but the overall remit of responsibility for HMO enforcement is with the LBTH Health and Housing Team HMO and breach is enforced by London Borough of Tower Hamlets Health and Housing Team. They have a team that deal with applications for HMO license and any suspected breach by Leaseholders

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury:**

This is an important service and we have many people in Housing need. The Audit Commission has confirmed the value of this kind of investigation. Do we have these investigators?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

Sub-letting is a problem in this borough. It is a top priority of my administration to deliver the maximum number of affordable homes and thank you for your question.

**8.8 Question from Councillor Dr. Emma Jones**

"The Council recently decided to withdraw access to Victoria Park for British Military Fitness (BMF) members on weekday evenings. BMF have used the park in the evenings for the past 2 years and provided a safe environment for residents to exercise outdoors in the evenings. Why has this access now been withdrawn?"

**Response of the Mayor:**

British Military Fitness is a commercial company and they operate under an annually agreed licence with the Council. The terms and conditions of their operation are therefore reviewed on an annual basis.

Victoria Park has set opening and closing times and British Military Fitness have always been aware of these. In general we would not permit a commercial organisation to have sole rights of entry or use of a public park which was otherwise not available to the general public or

any other organisation who may wish to claim that they should have access agreed for their individual benefit.

In terms of agreeing a licence this year with British Military Fitness we offered them alternative venues within Tower Hamlets which had the advantage of being unlocked sites and also had a higher level of lighting. BMF operate across a number of London Boroughs and venues and therefore are flexible in terms of how they operate and offer their activities.

Rather than operate from an alternative site within Tower Hamlets they took a commercial decision to provide their mid week sessions from London Fields within the London Borough of Hackney. They will continue to operate their Saturday morning sessions from Victoria Park during the winter months.

British Military Fitness is a commercial company and they operate under an annually agreed licence with the Council. The terms and conditions of their operation are therefore reviewed on an annual basis.

Victoria Park has set opening and closing times and British Military Fitness have always been aware of these. In general we would not permit a commercial organisation to have sole rights of entry or use of a public park which was otherwise not available to the general public or any other organisation who may wish to claim that they should have access agreed for their individual benefit.

In terms of agreeing a licence this year with British Military Fitness we offered them alternative venues within Tower Hamlets which had the advantage of being unlocked sites and also had a higher level of lighting. BMF operate across a number of London Boroughs and venues and therefore are flexible in terms of how they operate and offer their activities.

Rather than operate from an alternative site within Tower Hamlets they took a commercial decision to provide their mid week sessions from London Fields within the London Borough of Hackney. They will continue to operate their Saturday morning sessions from Victoria Park during the winter months. After the winter months they will be returning to Victoria Park to run their evening classes.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Dr. Emma Jones:**

Thank you for the response. Do you agree that Tower Hamlets should accept BMF's offer of payment for their sessions in Victoria Park?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I would like to go away and look at this in more detail.

### 8.9 Question from Councillor Amy Whitelock

“Can the Lead Member tell me what impact the introduction of the Equality Act will have on tackling inequality in Tower Hamlets?”

#### **Response of the Mayor:**

The Equality Act 2010 aims to provide a modern, single legal framework with clear, streamlined law that will be more effective at tackling disadvantage and discrimination.

The bulk of the Equality Act 2010 came into force at the beginning of October 2010 and the new public sector duty will come into force in April 2011. The new duty aims to give public authorities much greater flexibility at a local level to determine how inequality is tackled, placing greater emphasis on outcomes rather than outputs and process. It will require public authorities to demonstrate that local equality priorities are underpinned by a robust analysis of inequality in the locality. The new duty will also require localities to give due regard to socio-economic inequality when setting priorities.

Greater freedom for public bodies will be accompanied with greater accountability to citizens requiring localities to ensure that the right framework is in place which empowers citizens to scrutinise the data and evidence on how inequality is addressed.

Implementation of the Equality Act and preparations for the new public sector duties are embodied in the Council's new Single Equality Framework (SEF). The Single Equality Framework (SEF) adopts a new approach to tackling some of our most significant, complex and persistent issues of inequality.

The aim of the Framework is to two fold:

- To identify priority areas of persistent inequality and develop effective strategies to tackle them, and;
- To ensure that the Council has the resources, structures and processes in place to realise our overarching commitment to promote equality

We know that to achieve the step change necessary to tackle deep seated inequality, we need to recognise that this arises from an interplay of factors which combine to create real barriers to equality of opportunity and outcome. In the past equalities legislation has focused on individual equality strands of race, gender, disability, age, religion/belief and sexual orientation. However in Tower Hamlets we know that to develop effective interventions we need to understand how a variety of factors shape life chances and that poverty has a defining impact on a range of outcomes.



Through the Framework we will investigate the determinants of unequal outcomes beyond individual equality strands and aim to understand the relationship between the strands and other circumstances that drive poor outcomes including socio-economic disadvantage. We will explore whether the interventions that we have in place can tackle the drivers of inequality to deliver the outcomes we look to achieve in the long term. To enable us to target these areas of persistent inequality, the Single Equality Framework identifies two priority areas for 2010/11, which are:

**Economic inactivity amongst Bangladeshi and Somali women** This work stream will contribute to the development of the Local Economic Assessment and Employment Strategy to put in place measures to ensure that our core employment interventions are able to address the of worklessness amongst women in the borough.

It will do so by building into the Local Economic Assessment a robust analysis of the complex interplay of factors that drive worklessness amongst women. Through action research we will apply a reflective process of problem solving led by stakeholders including workless Bangladeshi and Somali women to test out interventions to support women into work during 2010/11.

The findings of the Local economic Assessment and the action research will be incorporated into the refresh of the Council's Employment Strategy and inform the direction of future interventions.

**Independence and dignity for older people and vulnerable adults.** This work stream will form part of the three year Transforming Social Care programme which aims to put service users at the heart of the decision making process about how they are supported, and enabling them to have more choice and control, so that they can get support that is personalised to meet their individual needs.

During 2010/11 we will identify the steps we need to take to ensure that all service users, but especially those at greatest risk of marginalisation and exclusion, are enabled to live their own lives as they wish, confident that services are of high quality, are safe and promote their own individual needs for independence, well-being and dignity.

The new requirements of the Act have been recognised and we are working to ensure that the organisation is fully equipped to handle the changes that come into effect as a result of the Equality Act 2010. Human Resources is in the process of:

- Reviewing policies to check whether any amendments will need to be made to cover the extension to the other protected characteristics, and ensure the revised procedures are communicated to employees;

- Identifying where gender pay information is held in order to ensure we are able to bring this together and publish the necessary information within the given timetable;
- Reviewing recruitment procedures to check that they are consistent with the restrictions on asking questions about health before job offers are made. Application packs are also being revised to ensure that this new provision is complied with and more information than is necessary is not obtained.

Plans are in place for further work with senior managers and the Corporate Equalities Steering Group to prepare for the new public sector duties which are currently being consulted on and will inform the continuing development of the SEF.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Amy Whitelock:**

Thank you for the response. Do you agree with me that it is appalling that the Fawcett Society had to take the Government to court for not taking into account the impact of the cuts on women, particularly given the spending review will hit women twice as hard as men? Can the Mayor give a commitment that a full and public Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out on his budget proposals?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

Yes to the latter re: the Equalities Impact Assessment. I was elected to serve the people regardless of their ethnicity and background. This is a strong step towards achieving our goal of One Tower Hamlets.

**8.10 Question from Councillor Zara Davis**

“What has been achieved by the Tower Hamlets Olympics Ambassador since this role was created?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

The Olympic Ambassador has represented the Council at public and private events to talk to residents about the London 2012 Games and inspire resident involvement and engagement with London 2012 in support of the Council's objective for 70% of residents to feel positive about the impact of the London Olympics. The Olympic Ambassador also provides a conduit for residents at meetings such as the ODA residents meeting to easily and quickly raise any issues with an elected member.

Recent examples of activity include visits to five schools, hosting a young persons event to celebrate the end of the Winter Olympics, speaking at an event at the Rich Mix to celebrate two years to go, and

accompanying the Olympics roving unit to after school clubs to talk about London 2012 and encourage young people to take up sports.

Having an Olympic Ambassador has also provided us with a consistent spokesperson on issues related to London 2012 and the Council, allowing us to respond to media enquiries and comment on Olympic issues/stories quickly. Finally it has added gravitas to schemes such as the Idea Store 2012 Champions and the recruitment of school based 2012 champions whom are all part of a coherent structure underneath the Council's Olympic Ambassador – with the goal of encouraging residents to get involved in and celebrate the Games.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Zara Davis:**

Thank you for your answer. I find it ludicrous that since we have created the Olympic Ambassador role we have lost two Olympic events. Can you assure me that you will not be resurrecting this useless position?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I will be meeting with the Chief Executive of the London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games and the Olympics Ambassador to maximise the outcome of the 2012 Olympic games for the residents of Tower Hamlets.

**8.11 Question from Councillor Rajib Ahmed**

“How many families in Tower Hamlets are likely to be affected by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government's cuts to Child Benefit?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

The Government has recently announced a number of changes to Child Benefit.

Rates are to be frozen for three years from April 2011, and thereafter rates will be up-rated using the Consumer Prices Index rather than the Retail Prices Index. The freezing of benefit will reduce the value of Child Benefit in real terms over the next three years. The move to CPI up-rating is expected to lead to lower benefits in the years ahead.

Both these measures will have an impact on all families receiving Child Benefit. Latest data show that in August 2009, 27,245 families in Tower Hamlets were receiving Child Benefit on behalf of 55,955 children. The real fall in the value of Child Benefit will have a bigger impact on families in Tower Hamlets than elsewhere because of the borough's high rate of child poverty, and larger family size.

More recently, the Government has announced the withdrawal of Child Benefit from households with a higher rate taxpayer from 2013. This will have an impact on those families with at least one person earning more than £43,875 per annum. Nationally, HM Treasury has estimated that this will lead to 15 per cent of UK families losing Child Benefit. Locally, the impact is likely to be less severe than this, given the high proportion of low income families in the borough.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Rajib Ahmed:**

It is a shame that the Lib Dems/Conservatives are making so many cuts to child benefits. What are you doing to stop these cuts?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I will be working with all parties to ensure that the most vulnerable are not put at risk.

**8.12 Question from Councillor Gloria Thienel**

"The major roads circulating the Isle of Dogs remain in a bad state of repair, despite the almost continuous work by utilities causing delays and hold ups to residents and visitors.

Rather than spend millions of pounds of public money on vanity projects such as Rich Mix, the people of the Isle of Dogs would prefer to have safe and usable roads, as promised by Labour earlier this year. Will the administration undertake this work?"

**Response of the Mayor:**

The roads circulating the Isle of Dogs, namely Westferry Road and Manchester Road / Preston's Road, are Principal A roads and as such their condition is surveyed annually. Funding is awarded by Transport for London for maintenance of these roads on a London-wide prioritisation basis through the Local implementation Plan funding. In 2010/11, £46,000 out of a £215,000 allocation for principal road maintenance was ringfenced to Manchester Road and the section between Friars Mead and Amsterdam Road will be resurfaced in the next few months.

Further funding for Preston's Road is anticipated in 2011/12.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Gloria Thienel:**

Thank you for the response. Despite the petition that was brought to Council from residents, Stebondale Street has not been fully resurfaced, only half of it. The part that you are proposing for

Manchester Road is a tiny fraction. Someone should take a ride around the Island and see how bad it all is.

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I am more than willing to meet with you and the officers to discuss this.

**8.13 Question from Councillor Zenith Rahman**

“Can the Lead Member explain the importance of the Council's recently adopted Conservation Strategy and how it will protect the heritage?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

The Council's new Conservation Strategy will pro-actively guide the care of the Borough's outstanding and extensive cultural heritage of buildings, townscape and archaeology by setting clear goals for the protection of this heritage. It will drive initiatives around the conservation, reuse and enhancement of historic buildings and places, particularly in bringing forward regeneration. It highlights how the built heritage can promote social inclusion, enhance local identity and protect the environment

The Strategy aligns the Council's care of the historic environment with the Government's recently issued new Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5). One of the key recommendations in PPS5 is for the development of a positive pre-active strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, which the Strategy fulfils. The Strategy is one of the first of its kind nationally and has the full support of the Government's Advisers at English Heritage.

The Strategy will also assist in promoting the care of the heritage in delivering the Council's Local Development Framework which is aligned with the priorities of the Community Plan 2020; the Conservation Strategy particularly supports the theme of 'A Great Place to Live'.

*No supplementary question was asked.*

**8.14 Question from Councillor David Snowdon**

“May I have itemised details of the overall cost of the core strategy, including the cost of external consultants, consultation events and production? In addition may I have the same information from the rejected strategy?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

The Table below provides a detailed breakdown of all costs associated with the production of the Core Strategy, recently found sound by the Planning Inspectorate and adopted by Council.

We are currently in communication with other London Boroughs to benchmark the cost of the Core Strategy with the equivalent elsewhere.

The Core Strategy is a legal requirement of Local Authorities, and the newly adopted Core Strategy provides an up to date planning policy framework needed to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, affordable housing and employment for the Borough up to 2025. It is also a powerful tool in securing planning obligations and Section 106 contributions for the funding of essential infrastructure such as transport, health facilities, schools and open space.

Printing	£82,104.00
Legal Fees	£4,670.00
Consultancy & staff costs	£1,445,242
Design Fees	£10,145.00
Translation Fees	£3,070.00
General Fees	£15,876.00
Transport	£311.00
Postage	£2,819.00
Events & Hall Hire	£4,058.00
Advertising	£31,487.00
Meetings	£4,771.00
Staff Costs	£767,133.42

The total budget for the three financial years during which the core Strategy was produced is £2,037,409 (of which £721,174 was obtained through grants and fees). The total costs of the Core Strategy was £1,604,553, leaving a positive variance of £432,856.

Information regarding the “rejected strategy” (interpreted as the Interim Planning Guidance, adopted by council as material consideration in 2007) is not readily available as it will take considerable officer time to compile from historic budget data.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor David Snowdon:**

Thank you for the response. Will you be looking to make any changes to the Core Strategy and in particular the plans for affordable housing?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I am not able to go into the specifics, but I do agree that especially in the context of the drastic cuts imposed by the Tories, we need to minimise reliance on outside consultants except where absolutely necessary

**8.15 Question from Councillor Ann Jackson**

“Can the Lead Member give an update on any progress with the proposed sale of homes on the Crown Estate since the last meeting?”

**Response of the Mayor:**

Following the close of the consultation process in March 2010, the Board of the Crown Estate considered the responses received from stakeholders and announced over the summer that they had decided to proceed with the sale of their freehold interest in the 1300 properties they currently manage.

Bids were invited from prospective purchasers across the public and private sector imposing some important conditions on any future sale. These conditions included the continuation of key worker lettings on the estates at the current level (approx 9 out of 10 new lettings), a commitment to retain the current rent framework and protected tenancy terms and conditions.

The Board also introduced a new quality threshold to assess prospective purchasers' experience and expertise in managing mixed tenure housing that they would use when considering proposals submitted for the future management of the 4 estates.

At the same time the Board announced they had reopened the Choice Based Lettings scheme.

In September the Board confirmed they had selected a prospective purchaser, which we now understand to be Peabody Housing Association that met the required criteria.

This announcement prompted a second round of consultation that will take place during October where Residents will be invited to meet Peabody representatives first hand and hear their plans for the future management of their estates. The Board will also make summary copies available of the Associations policies, practices and track record so residents and stakeholders can familiarise themselves with the Associations' background.

Once the feedback from the consultation process has been analysed and any further concerns raised given due consideration, the Crown

Estate Board will make a final decision as to whether to complete the sale to Peabody Housing Association.

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Ann Jackson:**

Thank you for your response. There is an issue about key workers' and the current rent changes possibly meaning them being squeezed out of their homes. We are going to have to work even harder to hold on to these. Can you assure us that you will work hard to retain these homes for residents and key workers?

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I am strongly committed to affordable and publicly owned housing. I strongly support any moves to protect the residents of the Crown Estates and am more than happy to meet with you to discuss a way forward

**8.16 Question from Councillor Tim Archer**

"Why has the council spent £46,000 on a consultant to agree funds for elders lunch clubs?"

**Response of the Mayor:**

Lunch clubs are highly valued by older people in the Borough giving them an opportunity to socialise as well as to eat a hot meal. As part of the Cabinet priority of supporting older people members identified resources to fund additional lunch clubs in wards where there was little or no current provision.

In the last 9 months the additional funding has enabled the opening of 13 new lunch clubs offering lunches on 41 sessions per week, making an additional 615 places available in the borough on a weekly basis.

To set up these additional lunch clubs has been a significant amount of work. It involved talking to local Councillors about their knowledge of local organisations and premises; extensive research with local community organisations to establish interest in running lunch clubs; advertising for expressions of interest; ensuring suitable premises are used; ensuring that staff and volunteers have had the appropriate training in food hygiene; and negotiating and drafting contracts.

To achieve this it was always anticipated that additional short term staffing would be required in the Adults Health and Wellbeing Commissioning Team. This was factored into the funding proposal that Cabinet agreed on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2009. The Council recruited a short term worker, who worked for a nine-month period (November 2009 through to 31st August 2010) to set up the new lunch clubs. Now that the new clubs are established that temporary appointment has ceased.



**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Tim Archer:**

Thank you for your response. It is shocking that £40K was spent on a consultant to sort out £200K. This is an example of waste. I would like you to look into this so that it does not happen again.

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

I want to look to the future and not unpick pick past decisions

**8.17 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton**

"How many (a) social rented homes and (b) low cost home ownership homes were built in the London borough of Tower Hamlets in each year from 2005-6 to 2008-9, and how many households were on the Borough's housing waiting list in each year?"

**Response of the Mayor:**

	<b>Rent units built</b>	<b>Low cost Home Ownership</b>	<b>Total new homes built</b>	<b>Total households on LBTH waiting list at start of year</b>
<b>2005/06</b>	705	307	1,009	17,302
<b>2006/07</b>	759	277	1,036	18,881
<b>2007/08</b>	688	543	1,231	19,872
<b>2008/09</b>	453	511	964	21,729

**Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton:**

Thank you for your response. Is the Mayor satisfied with these figures how will the Mayor's housing policy differ from that of the previous administration.

**Summary of the Mayor's response:**

Housing is my number one concern. I'm proud to say that Tower Hamlets is building more affordable homes than any other borough in the country. On the campaign trail it was great to see the bulldozers moving in on the Ocean estate where we will see 2000 affordable homes in the next few years. I'm confident we'll see similar progress in Blackwall Reach very soon

Of course, we need to do more and I'm happy to meet with you and other members to discuss new ways to tackle this massive problem.

**9. REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEES**

There was no business to be considered under this heading.

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

There was no business to be considered under this heading.

**11. OTHER BUSINESS****11.1 Review of proportionality and allocation of places on committees and panels**

The Chair of Council, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman, asked if Members agreed the recommendations set out in the tabled report. On being put to the vote these were agreed, with no Member voting against. Accordingly it was:-

**RESOLVED**

1. That the review of proportionality be noted and the allocation of seats on committees and panels for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2010/11 be agreed as set out at paragraph 4.2 of the report.
2. That Members and deputies be appointed to serve on those committees and panels in accordance with nominations from the political groups to be notified to the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services)
3. That in relation to the positions allocated to 'ungrouped' Councillors, the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be authorised to invite expressions of interest from those Councillors for appointment to the positions available and to make appointments to those positions following consultation with the Members concerned and the Chair of Council.

**11.2 Executive decisions taken under special urgency provisions****RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

**12. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL****Additional item and change to order of business**

At this point, Councillor Ohid Ahmed **MOVED** and Councillor Alibor Choudhury **SECONDED** – “That under Rule 27.1, Rule 13.1 be suspended to allow an urgent motion on Bancroft History Library and Archive to be considered.”

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

A further procedural motion was then **MOVED** by Councillor Ohid Ahmed and **SECONDED** by Councillor Oliur Rahman – “That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied so that the motion on Bancroft History Library and Archive be considered as the next item of business.”

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

**12.5 Additional Motion proposed by Councillor Ohid Ahmed regarding Bancroft History Library and Archive**

Councillor Ohid Ahmed **MOVED** and Councillor Rabina Khan **SECONDED** the following tabled motion –

“This Council notes that:

- In October 2008, the Cabinet decided not to proceed with the disposal of the Bancroft Local History & Archive, but to invest in its refurbishment as a focal point for the heritage of the East End, with an additional sum of £250,000 provided to make the building safe;
- In 2009, the Cabinet was faced with a difficult choice between using Accelerated Delivery Funding for Bancroft Library and kick starting the project to renovate Poplar Baths, and agreed to commit to the latter, while asking officers to identify other potential sources of funding for the former;
- In the spring, council officers identified a potential sum of up to £350,000 as being available for Bancroft from the £2.093 million contribution towards “*cultural, social and community products and for the provision of workspace off site*” in the Section 106 agreement for 32-42 Bethnal Green Road;
- A sum of £500,000 was agreed in Section 106 contributions from the former Peugeot site (438-490 Mile End Road) towards the Bancroft Library or other library facilities.

This Council believes that:

- The East End has a rich heritage that should be safeguarded and celebrated;
- The Bancroft Local History Library and Archive should be the focal point of that heritage;

- The fabric of its building needs further repairs and access to the library should be enhanced;
- The former Lead Member for Culture should not have requested the withdrawal of £350,000 funding from Bancroft in favour of the Rich Mix Centre;
- The decision on this request should have been made in Cabinet, not SDC.

This Council therefore resolves:

- To support the Mayor in his proposal that all £500,000 of the Section 106 from the Peugeot site development should be earmarked to the Bancroft Local History Library and Archive;
- To urge the Mayor to work with the Strategic Development Committee and review the allocation of Section 106 resources and secure the future of Bancroft Library and archives;
- That a report should be brought to the next full Council meeting for debate and consideration to help inform the Mayor's decisions on this matter."

Councillor David Edgar **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED** an amendment to the motion – "To delete that the fourth and fifth bullet points under "this Council believes"; and under "this Council therefore resolves", to delete the reference to the Strategic Development Committee."

After discussion, the amendment was put to the vote and was **defeated**.

Councillor Shahed Ali sought advice on whether the Mayor had powers to instruct the Strategic Development Committee. In response Ms. Isabella Freeman, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) stated that the Mayor did not have powers to do so."

Following further debate, Councillor Oliur Rahman **MOVED** and Councillor Alibor Choudhury **SECONDED** – "That under Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put."

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

Councillor Denise Jones rose to give a point of personal explanation under Rule 15.14. She had declared a personal interest as a Board Member of Rich Mix. Councillor Jones stated that it was never the case that the Bancroft History Library and Archives would be sold; and that she had not asked for £330k to be moved.

At this point, ten or more Members rose from their seats to request a recorded vote. A recorded vote was therefore held on the original motion as follows:

*For the motion: (28)*

Councillor Peter Golds  
Councillor Ohid Ahmed  
Councillor Rofique Uddin Ahmed

Councillor Shelina Aktar  
Councillor Tim Archer  
Councillor Abdul Asad  
Councillor Craig Aston  
Councillor Lutfu Begum  
Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury  
Councillor Alibor Choudhury  
Councillor Zara Davis  
Councillor Stephanie Eaton  
Councillor Marc Francis  
Councillor Carlo Gibbs  
Councillor Shafiqul Haque  
Councillor Sirajul Islam  
Councillor Dr. Emma Jones  
Councillor Aminur Khan  
Councillor Rabina Khan  
Councillor Rania Khan  
Councillor Mohammed Abdul Mukit  
Councillor Ahmed Omer  
Councillor Oliur Rahman  
Councillor David Snowdon  
Councillor Gloria Thienel  
Councillor Helal Uddin  
Councillor Abdal Ullah  
Councillor Amy Whitelock

*Against the motion: (0)*

*Abstained: (16)*

Councillor Helal Abbas  
Councillor Kabir Ahmed  
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed  
Councillor Rajib Ahmed  
Councillor Shahed Ali  
Councillor David Edgar  
Councillor Judith Gardiner  
Councillor Ann Jackson  
Councillor Denise Jones  
Councillor Anwar Khan  
Councillor Anna Lynch  
Councillor Joshua Peck  
Councillor Zenith Rahman  
Councillor Rachael Saunders  
Councillor Bill Turner  
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

The motion was therefore **carried**. Accordingly it was:-

**RESOLVED**

This Council notes that:

- In October 2008, the Cabinet decided not to proceed with the disposal of the Bancroft Local History & Archive, but to invest in its refurbishment as a focal point for the heritage of the East End, with an additional sum of £250,000 provided to make the building safe;
- In 2009, the Cabinet was faced with a difficult choice between using Accelerated Delivery Funding for Bancroft Library and kick starting the project to renovate Poplar Baths, and agreed to commit to the latter, while asking officers to identify other potential sources of funding for the former;
- In the spring, council officers identified a potential sum of up to £350,000 as being available for Bancroft from the £2.093 million contribution towards *“cultural, social and community products and for the provision of workspace off site”* in the Section 106 agreement for 32-42 Bethnal Green Road;
- A sum of £500,000 was agreed in Section 106 contributions from the former Peugeot site (438-490 Mile End Road) towards the Bancroft Library or other library facilities.

This Council believes that:

- The East End has a rich heritage that should be safeguarded and celebrated;
- The Bancroft Local History Library and Archive should be the focal point of that heritage;
- The fabric of its building needs further repairs and access to the library should be enhanced;
- The former Lead Member for Culture should not have requested the withdrawal of £350,000 funding from Bancroft in favour of the Rich Mix Centre;
- The decision on this request should have been made in Cabinet, not SDC.

This Council therefore resolves:

- To support the Mayor in his proposal that all £500,000 of the Section 106 from the Peugeot site development should be earmarked to the Bancroft Local History Library and Archive;
- To urge the Mayor to work with the Strategic Development Committee and review the allocation of Section 106 resources and secure the future of Bancroft Library and archives;
- That a report should be brought to the next full Council meeting for debate and consideration to help inform the Mayor’s decisions on this matter.

**Proposal to change the order of business**

At this point, Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED** and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED** – “That under Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied so that Motion 12.2 be taken as the next item of business.”

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

### **12.1 Motion proposed by Stephanie Eaton regarding Child Poverty in Tower Hamlets**

The motion as printed in the agenda was **MOVED** by Councillor Stephanie Eaton and **SECONDED** by Councillor Peter Golds.

Councillor David Edgar **MOVED** and Councillor Rachael Saunders **SECONDED**, a tabled **AMENDMENT** to the motion as follows:-

“Replace ‘This Council notes with sadness that:’ with ‘This Council notes’

Add:

#### **This Council further notes that:**

1. This Council’s previous commitment to tackling child poverty was recognised through a Beacon award and Corporate Commitment to Tackling London Child Poverty Award.
2. Data on child poverty in the borough from 2008 (the most recent available) shows a 6.6% reduction in the proportion of children living in poverty in Tower Hamlets from 2007. This reduction of 6.6% was the largest reduction of all local authorities in the country.

After ‘This Council welcomes’ add

#### **This Council is concerned**

- That the Institute of Fiscal Studies has said that the Government’s spending review is regressive and that *“Across every income group, families with children are the biggest losers.”* and
- That the Child Poverty Action Group has said that the Spending Review *‘will almost certainly add to, rather than reduce, child poverty’*
- By the discontinuation by the Government of the Child Development Grant (CDG) pilot and the reduction by 50% of revenue allocated to Tower Hamlets for Play Pathfinder.
- That without the pupil premium the schools budget will in fact reduce in real terms to 2015

- By the proposal by the Department for Education to remove the additional funding currently received by schools for addressing the learning needs of Bangladeshi children

**This Council further notes:**

- That overall the impact of these changes is as yet unknown but could result in a reduction rather than increase in funding.

Under 'This Council will' add:

- Continue to work to reduce child poverty in Tower Hamlets, including by lobbying ministers to increase funding for children in the borough overall."

Following debate, the amendment moved by Councillor David Edgar was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Oliur Rahman **SECONDED** – That under Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put."

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

The substantive motion as amended was then put to the vote and was **agreed**, with no Member voting against. Accordingly it was:-

**RESOLVED**

**This Council notes:**

1. Tower Hamlets has the highest levels of child poverty in the country.
2. Using the National Indicator 116 measure (the proportion of children who live in families in receipt of out of work means-tested benefits and those families in receipt of tax credits where their reported income is less than 60% of the median income) 48% of children in the borough live in poverty.
3. Alongside this 66% of children live in low income households – the Child Poverty Act 2010 makes a commitment to reduce this to 10% nationally.
4. 50% of children are in benefit dependent families.
5. 33% of families live on less than £20,000 per year.
6. Tower Hamlets has the highest free school meals entitlement in the UK (52% of children)

**This Council further notes that:**

1. This Council's previous commitment to tackling child poverty was recognised through a Beacon award and Corporate Commitment to



## Tackling London Child Poverty Award.

2. Data on child poverty in the borough from 2008 (the most recent available) shows a 6.6% reduction in the proportion of children living in poverty in Tower Hamlets from 2007. This reduction of 6.6% was the largest reduction of all local authorities in the country.

**This Council welcomes:**

The £7bn package for supporting children announced by the government which includes measures to ensure:

1. All disadvantaged two-year-olds will have an entitlement to 15 hours a week of pre-school education, in addition to the 15 hours already available to those aged three and four. The cash will go to the poorest 20% of children nationally of whom many will be in Tower Hamlets.
2. Schools will receive additional funds to offer targeted help to every pupil eligible for free school meals.
3. The vast bulk of the £7bn fairness premium – roughly £5bn – will be devoted to the pupil premium.
4. Schools will be entitled to spend the money as they see fit, for instance on catch-up classes for struggling pupils.

**This Council is concerned**

- That the Institute of Fiscal Studies has said that the Government's spending review is regressive and that *"Across every income group, families with children are the biggest losers."* and
- That the Child Poverty Action Group has said that the Spending Review *'will almost certainly add to, rather than reduce, child poverty'*
- By the discontinuation by the Government of the Child Development Grant (CDG) pilot and the reduction by 50% of revenue allocated to Tower Hamlets for Play Pathfinder.
- That without the pupil premium the schools budget will in fact reduce in real terms to 2015
- By the proposal by the Department for Education to remove the additional funding currently received by schools for addressing the learning needs of Bangladeshi children

**This Council notes:**

These measures will make a substantial and verifiable difference to the lives of the youngest and poorest people in our Borough.

**This Council further notes:**

- That overall the impact of these changes is as yet unknown but could result in a reduction rather than increase in funding.

**This Council will:**

- Work with Ministers and officials to ensure that correct information is supplied quickly and accurately to the Department of Education so that the children of Tower Hamlets can benefit from these proposals as soon as possible and the Borough can start to alleviate the unacceptable levels of child poverty.
- Continue to work to reduce child poverty in Tower Hamlets, including by lobbying ministers to increase funding for children in the borough overall.

**Proposed additional motion**

At this point Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Rania Khan **SECONDED** a procedural motion – “That under Rule 27.1, Rule 13.1 be suspended to enable an urgent motion on a £100 Council Tax Rebate for Pensioners to be considered.”

The Chair of Council, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman informed the Council that the proposed motion gave rise to financial implications. Therefore in the event that the Council agreed to debate the motion and should the Council be minded to agree the motion, it would be necessary for the Council’s recommendations on the matter to be the subject of a report to the Cabinet.

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

**12.2 Motion proposed by Councillor David Snowdon regarding publication of licensed hours and conditions imposed**

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

The motion was put to the vote and it was **agreed**, with no Member voting against. Accordingly it was:-

**RESOLVED**

This council notes:

- The significant resident interest in the licensing function of Tower Hamlets Council amongst residents of the Borough.
- The large number of licensing reviews and refused applications which result from breaches in licensed hours.

- The difficulty faced by local residents in finding out the details of the licensed hours of pubs, clubs and venues offering late night refreshment in Tower Hamlets.
- That there is no single repository on the Tower Hamlets website giving the details of the licensed hours in force, and that to find the licensed hours residents must either note them down from the official notice in the premises or locate the decision note from a licensing committee meeting.
- Other authorities offer online databases of the licensed hours in force, including Elmbridge, Southampton, the East Riding of Yorkshire and Woking.

This council believes:

- That residents have a right to easily accessible information on licensed hours.
- That it is not appropriate that residents should be asked to enter a licensed premises in order to note down their licensed hours, given that residents may already feel intimidated by the premises.
- That increased transparency in hours will lead to increased resident involvement in the licensing process, and help to limit the harm caused by breaches of the law.

This council resolves:

- To provide an online “one-stop-shop” which will provide details of all licenses granted by the licensing committee or officers acting under delegated power for licensable activities within the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
- This online service will include a list of licensed establishments, searchable by name of establishment, type of establishment, ward and street. When an establishment is selected, the full licensed hours, together with any conditions imposed will then be displayed.
- This online service will have an accompanying map, upon which will be plotted licensed premises in the Borough. The map used will have suitable resolution to see individual streets within the Borough. When an establishment is selected on the map, the full licensed hours, together with any conditions imposed will then be displayed.
- This service will be available by January 1 2011.

**12.4 Motion proposed by Councillor Dr. Emma Jones regarding location of meetings**

The motion as printed in the agenda was **MOVED** by Councillor Dr. Emma Jones and **SECONDED** by Councillor David Snowdon.

Councillor Joshua Peck **MOVED**, and Councillor Helal Abbas **SECONDED** a tabled **AMENDMENT** as follows:-

“Delete all and replace with:

This Council notes that:

- Recent Cabinet Meetings have been held in venues across the Borough.
- That the agendas for some committees contain items which cover several LAP’s and are organised by officer deadlines.
- That some committees, such as Licensing Sub Committee take place more frequently than others.

This Council believes that:

- Increasing the amount of meetings that take place outside of the Town Hall gives residents greater opportunities to take part in the decision making processes and should be encouraged.
- That there may be practical, financial or procedural reasons why some committees cannot be moved outside of the Town Hall.

This Council resolves that:

- To call on the Executive Mayor to continue to hold his Cabinet meetings around the Borough
- To commit to holding future Council meetings around the Borough with the Council responsible for agreeing venues.
- To ask officers to investigate the financial, practical and procedural implications of holding Development, Strategic Development, Licensing and Overview and Scrutiny meetings at venues across the Borough in future.
- To ask for a report to be presented at the next Council meeting.”

Councillor Dr. Emma Jones and Councillor David Snowdon indicated that they accepted the amendment and varied their motion accordingly.

The motion as varied was put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

**RESOLVED**

This Council notes that:

- Recent Cabinet Meetings have been held in venues across the Borough.
- That the agendas for some committees contain items which cover several LAP's and are organised by officer deadlines.
- That some committees, such as Licensing Sub Committee take place more frequently than others.

This Council believes that:

- Increasing the amount of meetings that take place outside of the Town Hall gives residents greater opportunities to take part in the decision making processes and should be encouraged.
- That there may be practical, financial or procedural reasons why some committees cannot be moved outside of the Town Hall.

This Council resolves that:

- To call on the Executive Mayor to continue to hold his Cabinet meetings around the Borough
- To commit to holding future Council meetings around the Borough with the Council responsible for agreeing venues.
- To ask officers to investigate the financial, practical and procedural implications of holding Development, Strategic Development, Licensing and Overview and Scrutiny meetings at venues across the Borough in future.
- To ask for a report to be presented at the next Council meeting.

The meeting ended at 10.25 p.m.

Chair,  
Council

This page is intentionally left blank