



# COUNCIL

---

**Wednesday, 18 July 2018 at 7.00 p.m.**

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

## **AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS**

For further information including the Membership of this body and public information, see the main agenda.

**PAGE  
NUMBER(S)**


**8. ADMINISTRATION MOTION DEBATE**

**3 - 6**

**9. OPPOSITION MOTION DEBATE**

**7 - 12**

# Agenda Item 8

Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>COUNCIL</b>  18 July 2018	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Asmat Hussain, Corporate Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
<b>Amendments to Motion for debate submitted by the Administration</b>	

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

## SUMMARY

1. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for time at each Ordinary Council meeting for the discussion of one specific Motion submitted by the Administration. The debate will follow the rules of debate at Council Procedure Rule 13 and will last no more than 30 minutes.
2. The Administration Motion is submitted by the Labour Group and is listed at Item 8 of the main agenda pack.
3. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for amendments to the Administration motion to be submitted to the Monitoring Officer by Noon the day before the meeting. The content of amendments must comply with Council Procedure Rule 13.6.
4. One amendment to the Administration Motion was received by the Monitoring Officer by the above deadline and is set out overleaf.

## **Amendment to the Administration Motion regarding Celebrating 70 years of the NHS**

**Proposer:** Councillor Andrew Wood

**Seconded:** Councillor Peter Golds

Insert new item 2

On 10th June 1940 a Committee was appointed by the Coalition Government to report on social insurance and allied services. The report, published in December 1942, identified the five giant evils in society as “Squalor, ignorance, want, idleness and disease.” It proposed comprehensive and far reaching solutions to these problems and became a “best seller.”

The King’s Speech to Parliament on 24 November 1943 said;

“My Ministers will present to you their views and proposals regarding an enlarged and unified system of social insurance, a comprehensive health service and a new scheme of workmen’s compensation.” (Column 9 Hansard, 24 November 1943)

Insert new item 3

The three major political parties contesting the 1945 election all included comprehensive proposals for Health and National Insurance within their manifesto commitments. That for the Conservative Party said:

“The health services of the country will be made available to all citizens. Everyone will contribute to the cost, and no one will be denied the attention, the treatment or the appliances he requires because he cannot afford them.”

Following Labour’s victory they were able to implement their manifesto commitments.

Renumber items 2 as item 3 and item 3 as item 4.

Amendment to item 3 under this council further notes (replace with):

During the lifetime of the National Health Service there have been Conservative Governments for 42 years who have, after 1952, always increased expenditure on the Health Service on year on basis and were responsible for launching the post war expansion of new hospitals.

All parties in Government have sought to undertake this, during often turbulent economic circumstances. The exceptional year was during the Labour Government of 1974-79 when in 1977-78, at a time when public spending was being cut as part of the IMF austerity measures, expenditure was reduced.

Amend Item 5 to read (replace with)

The concerns of the East London Health and Care partnership need to be examined and addressed, particularly in light of the recent announcement of the 20 billion health bonus announced by the government.

Delete items 6 and 7.

After "This council believes" delete items 2 and 3.

Amend item 4 to read

This council welcomes the increased funding of 3.4% announced by the Government.

Last sentence


To celebrate the invaluable contribution the NHS and its staff have made over the last 70 years, and to work with colleagues and partners to safeguard the future of the NHS.

Replace with

To celebrate the invaluable contribution the NHS and its staff have made over the last 70 years, and to work with colleagues and partners to ensure that the NHS continues to deliver outstanding care.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 9

Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>COUNCIL</b>  18 July 2018	 <b>TOWER HAMLETS</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Asmat Hussain, Corporate Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
<b>Amendments to Motion for debate submitted by an Opposition Group</b>	

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

## SUMMARY

1. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for time at each Ordinary Council meeting for the discussion of one specific Motion submitted by an Opposition Group. The debate will follow the rules of debate at Council Procedure Rule 13 and will last no more than 30 minutes.
2. The Opposition Motion for Debate from the Conservative Group is listed at Item 9 of the main agenda pack.
3. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for amendments to the Opposition motion to be submitted to the Monitoring Officer by Noon the day before the meeting. The content of amendments must comply with Council Procedure Rule 13.6.
4. One amendment to the Administration Motion was received by the Monitoring Officer by the above deadline and is set out overleaf.

## **Amendment to Opposition Motion regarding Isle of Dogs & South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework**

Proposer: Councillor Rachel Blake  
Seconder: Mayor John Biggs

(Deleted text scored out, added text underlined)

The Council notes:

The release of the Isle of Dogs & South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework in May 2018 together with the accompanying Transport Strategy, Local Connections Strategy and the Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS).

This contains the following total forecasts for the number of new homes in the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar area (Poplar, Blackwall & Cubitt Town, Canary Wharf, Island Gardens wards) by 2041.

Low 312,000 (19,500 permitted and 11,500 future potential, with 23,000 existing)  
High 387,000 (19,500 permitted and 18,500 future potential, with 23,000 existing)  
Maximum 49,000 (19,500 permitted and 29,500 future potential, with 23,000 existing)

Plus 110,000 new jobs in all three options

The Council further notes that in the same area that:

- The draft LBTH Local Plan sets a minimum housing target of 30,601 new homes
- The draft GLA London Plan sets a minimum housing target of 29,000 new homes

That the GLA is responding to the draft LBTH Local Plan evidence by reducing the overall target for new homes in the GLA emerging London Plan.

That development while slowing has not stopped and that ~~new~~ schemes are at pre-application or formal application stage ~~being considered on Poplar high street, Marsh Wall, Skylines, Westferry Printworks, Quay House and that One Housing Group has initiated discussions on potentially re-developing the future of four identified sites on the island, which could involve some re-development.~~



The Council notes that the Development Infrastructure Funding Study is recommending the following investment in new infrastructure (gross spend).

£'000

<b><u>By</u></b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/2021</b>	<b>2021/2022</b>	<b>First five years</b>
<b><u>Category of Spending</u></b>						
Utilities	£2,728	£11,088	£8,838	£11,838	£11,838	<b>£46,330</b>
Transport & Local Connections	£139	£9,806	£18,756	£23,830	£17,164	<b>£69,695</b>
Education	£28,946	£28,946	£28,946	£28,946	£28,946	<b>£144,730</b>
Fire, Ambulance, Police, CCTV	£2,930	£0	£0	£0	£0	<b>£2,930</b>
Health	£1,526	£1,526	£1,526	£1,526	£1,526	<b>£7,630</b>
Leisure	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	<b>£23,820</b>
Community facilities	£738	£738	£5,411	£5,411	£5,411	<b>£17,709</b>
<b>Total Low</b>	<b>£41,771</b>	<b>£56,868</b>	<b>£68,241</b>	<b>£76,315</b>	<b>£69,649</b>	<b>£312,844</b>
<b><u>By Priority of Spending</u></b>						
Critical	£2,450	£17,310	£20,310	£18,185	£20,185	<b>£78,440</b>
Essential	£35,974	£39,141	£47,314	£55,313	£48,147	<b>£225,889</b>
High	£3,347	£417	£417	£917	£417	<b>£5,515</b>
Desirable	£0	£0	£200	£1,900	£900	<b>£3,000</b>
	<b>£41,771</b>	<b>£56,868</b>	<b>£68,241</b>	<b>£76,315</b>	<b>£69,649</b>	<b>£312,844</b>

Of note is that most of the ~~2017/18~~ spending did not happen and that with the exception of the ~~South Dock bridge~~ none of the ~~2018/19~~ spending is underway.

That the Council has already identified infrastructure investment in the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar area:

- South Dock Bridge preparation and feasibility
- Crossharbour DLR improvements

The OAPF confirms the following investment is already committed by Transport for London and LB Tower Hamlets:

- New higher capacity DLR trains, running every 2 minutes at peak times
- Bus service and reliability enhancements
- 2018 opening of Elizabeth Line
- Major Capital Investment in Delivering Healthy Streets
- Investing in the Cycle Network and CS3

That the DIFS describes the priorities as follows:

1. Critical enabling. This category includes all infrastructure that is critical to facilitate a development. Without these works development cannot proceed.
2. Essential mitigation. This category includes all infrastructure that we believe is necessary to mitigate the impacts arising from the development.
3. High priority. This category includes all infrastructure that support wider strategic or site-specific objectives which are set out in planning policy but would not necessarily prevent development from occurring, although that would need to be considered on a case by case basis
4. Desirable. This defines all projects that are deemed to be of benefit but would not prevent, on balance, the development from occurring or from being acceptable if they were not taken forward.

That these growth numbers and the infrastructure required are unprecedented within London and therefore require ~~an unprecedented response reminiscent of the London Docklands Development Corporation~~ robust intervention from Local, Regional and National Government to step up to the challenge.

That the Mayor has already established:

- Construction Engagement Forum on the Isle of Dogs
- Framework for allocating infrastructure funding

That the Neighbourhood Plan for the Isle of Dogs was recommended for refusal by an Independent Examiner because of a 'fundamental flaw in the plan' where 'the infrastructure evidence is simply not robust or proportionate to support a key policy'.

The Council therefore calls on the Mayor to:

- Respond to the GLA's Opportunity Area Planning Framework consultation setting out preferred terms of an LBTH Delivery Board.
- Work with the GLA to identify maximum feasible delivery resources for infrastructure in the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Area for the benefit of current and future residents.
- Work with the GLA family, Developers and Utilities providers to ensure that disruption caused by construction is minimised for current and future residents
- Continue to monitor the evidence base for the infrastructure need for the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Area.

- ~~Set up the recommended LBTH Delivery Board which will include the GLA, TfL, developers and representatives from the community~~
- ~~Set up the Community Development Panel who will nominate representatives to sit on the main LBTH Delivery Board~~
- ~~Set up the recommended dedicated Delivery Team whose sole responsibility will be to deliver infrastructure / projects as outlined in the documents~~
- ~~Set up the Utility Providers Forum~~
- ~~Set up the Developer Forum~~
- ~~Establish a Construction Charter~~
- ~~Initiate the recommended Future Studies (p119 of the OAPF) which the GLA describe as urgent~~

In addition, if the Critical Enabling works described as “Without these works development cannot proceed,” are not undertaken then new planning applications be refused on the grounds of cumulative over-development.

This page is intentionally left blank