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

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to be held in THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG at 7.00 p.m. on WEDNESDAY, 15 JANUARY 2020

Will Tuckley
Chief Executive
Public Information

Attendance at meetings.
The public are welcome to attend meetings of the Council. However seating is limited and offered on a first come first served basis and meetings tend to reach full capacity.

Audio/Visual recording of meetings.
The Council will be filming the meeting for presentation on the website. Should you wish to film the meeting, please contact the Committee Officer shown on the agenda front page.

Mobile telephones
Please switch your mobile telephone on to silent mode whilst in the meeting.

Access information for the Town Hall, Mulberry Place.

Bus: Routes: D3, D6, D7, D8, 15, 108, and 115 all stop near the Town Hall.
Docklands Light Railway: Nearest stations are:
East India: Head across the bridge and then through the complex to the Town Hall, Mulberry Place
Blackwall station: Across the bus station then turn right to the back of the Town Hall complex, through the gates and archway to the Town Hall.
Tube: The closest tube stations are Canning Town and Canary Wharf
Car Parking: There is limited visitor pay and display parking at the Town Hall (free from 6pm)

If you are viewing this on line:(http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/content_pages/contact_us.aspx)

Meeting access/special requirements.
The Town Hall is accessible to people with special needs. There are accessible toilets, lifts to venues. Disabled parking bays and an induction loop system for people with hearing difficulties are available. Documents can be made available in large print, Braille or audio version. For further information, contact the Officers shown on the front of the agenda

Fire alarm
If the fire alarm sounds please leave the building immediately by the nearest available fire exit without deviating to collect belongings. Fire wardens will direct you to the exits and to the fire assembly point. If you are unable to use the stairs, a member of staff will direct you to a safe area. The meeting will reconvene if it is safe to do so, otherwise it will stand adjourned.

Electronic agendas reports and minutes.
Copies of agendas, reports and minutes for council meetings can also be found on our website from day of publication.

To access this, click www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee and search for the relevant committee and meeting date.

Agendas are available at the Town Hall, Libraries, Idea Centres and One Stop Shops and on the Mod.Gov, iPad and Android apps.
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

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

3. MINUTES

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 13th November 2019.

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

5. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

The Council Procedure Rules provide for a maximum of four petitions to be discussed at an Ordinary Meeting of the Council.

The attached report presents the received petitions to be discussed. Should any additional petitions be received they will be listed to be noted but not discussed.
6. **MAYOR’S REPORT**

The Council’s Constitution provides for the Elected Mayor to give a report at each Ordinary Council Meeting.

A maximum of six minutes is allowed for the Elected Mayor’s report.

Following which the Speaker of the Council will invite:

- The leader of the opposition group to respond for up to two minutes should he so wish.
- The Mayor to respond to the leader of the opposition for up to two minutes.

7. **ADMINISTRATION MOTION DEBATE**  

To debate a Motion submitted by the Administration in accordance with Rules 11 and 13 of the Council’s Constitution. The debate will last for a maximum of 30 minutes.

8. **OPPOSITION MOTION DEBATE**  

To debate a Motion submitted by the Opposition Group in accordance with Rules 11 and 13 of the Council’s Constitution. The debate will last for a maximum of 30 minutes.

9. **TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

The questions which have been received from Councillors to be put at this Council meeting are set out in the attached report. A maximum period of 30 minutes is allocated to this agenda item.

10. **REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND THE COUNCIL’S COMMITTEES**

10.1 Report of Cabinet: Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits  

10.2 Report of Cabinet: Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule  

10.3 Report of the General Purposes Committee: Delegation of Role to London Councils’ Transport and Environment Committee (LC TEC)  

10.4 Report of the General Purposes Committee: Polling districts and polling places review 2019
11. OTHER BUSINESS

12. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The motions submitted by Councillors for debate at this meeting are set out in the attached report.
DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - NOTE FROM THE MONITORING OFFICER

This note is for guidance only. For further details please consult the Members’ Code of Conduct at Part C Section 31 of the Council’s Constitution.

Please note that the question of whether a Member has an interest in any matter, and whether or not that interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, is for that Member to decide. Advice is available from officers as listed below but they cannot make the decision for the Member. If in doubt as to the nature of an interest it is advisable to seek advice prior to attending a meeting.

Interests and Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs)

You may have an interest in any business of the authority where that business relates to or is likely to affect any of the persons, bodies or matters listed in section 22 and 23 of the Code of Conduct; and might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of yourself, a member of your family or a person with whom you have a close association, to a greater extent than the majority of other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward affected.

Where set out in the Code you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing of any such interest, for inclusion in the Register of Members’ Interests which is available for public inspection and on the Council’s Website.

Once you have recorded an interest in the Register, you are not then required to declare that interest at each meeting where the business is discussed, unless the interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI).

A DPI is defined in Regulations as a pecuniary interest of any of the descriptions listed at Appendix A overleaf. Please note that a Member’s DPIs include his/her own relevant interests and also those of his/her spouse or civil partner; or a person with whom the Member is living as husband and wife; or a person with whom the Member is living as if they were civil partners; if the Member is aware that that other person has the interest.

Effect of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest on participation at meetings

Where you have a DPI in any business of the Council you must, unless you have obtained a dispensation from the authority’s Monitoring Officer following consideration by the Standards Advisory Committee:-
- not seek to improperly influence a decision about that business; and
- not exercise executive functions in relation to that business.

If you are present at a meeting where that business is discussed, you must:-
- Disclose to the meeting the existence and nature of the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, if later; and
- Leave the room (including any public viewing area) for the duration of consideration and decision on the item and not seek to influence the debate or decision
When declaring a DPI, Members should specify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which the interest relates. This procedure is designed to assist the public’s understanding of the meeting and to enable a full record to be made in the minutes of the meeting.

Where you have a DPI in any business of the authority which is not included in the Member’s register of interests and you attend a meeting of the authority at which the business is considered, in addition to disclosing the interest to that meeting, you must also within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the Register.

**Further advice**

For further advice please contact:-
Asmat Hussain, Corporate Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer. Tel 020 7364 4800
**APPENDIX A: Definition of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest**

(Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, Reg 2 and Schedule)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Prescribed description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment, office, trade, profession or vacation</td>
<td>Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the relevant authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by the Member in carrying out duties as a member, or towards the election expenses of the Member. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contracts | Any contract which is made between the relevant person (or a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest) and the relevant authority—
(a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
(b) which has not been fully discharged. |
| Land | Any beneficial interest in land which is within the area of the relevant authority. |
| Licences | Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer. |
| Corporate tenancies | Any tenancy where (to the Member’s knowledge)—
(a) the landlord is the relevant authority; and
(b) the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest. |
| Securities | Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where—
(a) that body (to the Member’s knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the relevant authority; and
(b) either—

(i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or

(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class. |
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LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Members Present:

Mayor John Biggs
Councillor Faroque Ahmed
Councillor Rajib Ahmed
Councillor Sabina Akhtar
Councillor Sufia Alam
Councillor Amina Ali
Councillor Shah Ameen
Councillor Asma Begum
Councillor Rachel Blake
Councillor Kevin Brady
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury
Councillor Shad Chowdhury
Councillor Dipa Das
Councillor David Edgar
Councillor Marc Francis
Councillor Peter Golds
Councillor Danny Hassell
Councillor Mohammed Ahibb Hossain
Councillor Asma Islam
Councillor Sirajul Islam
Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Tarik Khan
Councillor Ayas Miah
Councillor Harun Miah
Councillor Puru Miah
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE
Councillor Victoria Obaze
Councillor Mohammed Pappu
Councillor John Pierce
Councillor Leema Qureshi
Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Candida Ronald
Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan
Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Councillor Val Whitehead
Councillor Bex White
Councillor Andrew Wood

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Victoria Obaze in the Chair

The Speaker of the Council reported that since the previous Council meeting in September, she had participated in a variety of engagements. These included:

- The London in Bloom Awards, where Tower Hamlets received a number of awards.
- Black History Month events - including attending the opening of the Nollywood Film Festival and holding a charity dinner.
- National Democracy week events to highlight the importance of democracy and what it means.
- A sea cadet event commemorating the Battle of Trafalgar followed by the Annual Civic Service in Westminster Abbey.
- Participating in Remembrance Services and fundraising activities for the Poppy Appeal.
- A meeting with the Princess Royal, Princess Anne at a lunch to mark the Corporation of Trinity House links with the City of London.
• Meeting with the Duchess of Cornwall on her visit to Mulberry School for Girls.
• A range of other events, including the Costermongers’ Harvest Festival and parade and a charity cycle ride for the 2021 census.

Looking ahead, the Speaker drew attention to her forthcoming Charity Ball on Wednesday 4th December 2019, and looked forward to visiting schools in the Borough.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of:

• Councillor Mufeedah Bustin
• Councillor James King
• Councillor Ehtasham Haque
• Councillor Kyrsten Perry
• Councillor Eve McQuillian
• Councillor Dan Tomlinson

Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillor John Pierce.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

The following Councillors declared a Non-Disclosable Pecuniary interest that the Council has decided should be registered:

• Councillor Asma Begum - agenda item 8.1, Member Question regarding the London City Airport. This was on the basis that Councillor Begum was an Authority appointed Member of the London City Airport Consultative Committee.

• Councillor Asma Islam - agenda item 8.1, Member Question regarding the London City Airport. This was on the basis that Councillor Islam was a Trustee of the London City Airport Fund

• Councillor Bex White agenda item 8.1, Member Question regarding the London City Airport. This was on the basis that she lived under the flight path of the airport.

Following a request from a large number of Members who had interests in agenda item 11.1 (Motion regarding restoring Fairness to the Leaseholder System) the Monitoring Officer agreed to grant a dispensation to Councillors with a leaseholder Interest in respect of the item, under Section C, Paragraph 32 of the Code of Conduct for Members.

As a result of this, Councillors with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item did not need to declare this and would be able to stay in the meeting room, participate in the discussion and vote on the item.
3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the unrestricted minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on Wednesday 18 September 2019 be confirmed as a correct record the Speaker be authorised to sign them accordingly.

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

On behalf of Chief Executive, the Corporate Director, Health, Adults and Community, Denise Radley made a number of announcements.

With great regret, she reported the sad passing of Andy Scott, the Council’s Head of Economic Development. His funeral took place yesterday.

Turning to staffing matters, she was pleased to welcome to the Council, Michael Rourke - as the new Divisional Director, Property and Major Programmes.

She was also pleased to report that the Council had been shortlisted for:

- A number of Local Government Chronical Awards covering: the Council’s Air Quality Action Plan, care services, the Exploitation Team, the Communities Driving Change programme, the Public Health Asthma Partnership and communications for Children’s Services

- An award for Communications Team of the year.

It was also reported that the Commination Team recently won a Government Communication Service award for their Summer Activities Campaign.

5. **TO RECEIVE PETITIONS**

5.1 Petition regarding Save Our Youth Centre

Geneva Blissett addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners, and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Danny Hassell, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People then responded to the matters raised in the petition. He advised of a new initiative to deliver street based activities in the Bow West area to ensure the continued availability of youth services, following the decommissioning of the provider for the Youth Centre.

He also advised that the Council is currently carrying out a review of youth services, with the longer term aim of providing more detached youth work as well as youth hubs.
RESOLVED:

1. That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Children and Culture, for a written response within 28 days.

5.2 Petition regarding Trees for Mile End

Nicholas Caulkett addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners, and responded to questions from Members. Councillor David Edgar, Cabinet Member for Environment then responded to the matters raised in the petition.

He reported that the Council recognised the importance of tree planting in helping address climate change. A tree survey had been carried out by the Council recently. This revealed that some of the areas identify in the petition would require additional work.

He also noted that the Liveable Streets programme contained measures to improve the look and feel of the Borough’s streets. He welcomed the petitioners involvement in the next phase of the programme.

RESOLVED:

1. That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Place for a written response within 28 days.

5.3 Petition regarding Anti - Social Behaviour issues in Jolly’s Green Areas.

Redwan Shuhel and Tony Harrison addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners, and responded to questions from Members. Mayor John Biggs then responded to the matters raised in the petition. The Mayor expressed a commitment to take action to address the issues raised in the Petition given the impact that the issues highlighted had on people lives. He undertook to arrange a meeting with the Petitioners to further look at the issues.

RESOLVED:

1. That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Health, Adults & Community for a written response within 28 days.

5.4 Petition regarding residential permits for all Electric Car Drivers

Love Oyeniran addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners, and responded to questions from Members. Councillor David Edgar, Cabinet Member for Environment then responded to the matters raised in the petition.

He advised that the Council recognised the need to improve air quality and remained committed to carrying out a wide range of measures to achieve this. Recent initiatives included:
• Working with partners to implement the Council’s Air Quality Action Plan to prevent such activities as engine idling outside schools.
• Redesigning street layouts through the Liveable Street programme.
• Measures to promote the use of low emission vehicles.

He also advised that there was simply a lack of space in the Borough to allow additional vehicles to park outside car free developments as requested by the petition.

RESOLVED:

1. That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Place for a written response within 28 days.

5.5 Petition regarding Bartlett Park and planning consultations.

RESOLVED:

1. That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Place for a written response within 28 days.

6. MAYOR’S REPORT

The Mayor presented his report to the Council. Following which:

• Councillor Andrew Wood, Leader of the Conservative Group, responded briefly to the Mayor’s report.
• The Mayor responded briefly

7. OPPOSITION MOTION DEBATE

7. Opposition Motion for Debate from the Conservative Group - regarding the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework

Councillor Andrew Wood moved and Councillor Peter Golds seconded the motion as printed in the agenda.

Councillor Rachel Blake moved and Councillor Danny Hassell seconded the following amendment to the motion to be debated as tabled:

\[\text{Added text underlined} \]
\[\text{Deleted text scored out.}\]

This Council notes:

That the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan said in his introduction “without a plan in place, this growth is causing unacceptable impacts on existing local communities from construction in the short term to provision of the necessary supporting facilities for these developments in the long term.”

The introduction also said, “Unique amongst London’s Opportunity Areas, the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar is currently experiencing intense development pressure, mainly in the form of new, very high density housing.”

That the OAPF contains three growth scenarios for new homes in the area (the wards of Island Gardens, Canary Wharf, Blackwall & Cubitt Town and Poplar):

- Baseline 31,000 extra homes
- High growth 38,000 extra homes
- Maximum growth 49,000 extra homes

+ office space for an additional 110,000 jobs in each scenario

That these are the largest combined OAPF targets in London.

That the new London Plan has a target of 29,000 new homes in the same area + 110,000 new jobs.

That the new Tower Hamlets Council Local Plan has a minimum target of 30,601 new homes between 2016 and 2031 in the same Area (56% of all new housing in Tower Hamlets)

This Council further notes:

- The council’s youth service operates a dedicated youth hub at Andrews Wharf, which has over the last summer been supplemented by additional capacity from the Rapid Response Team. In addition there are services and activities provided by the voluntary sector at Alpha Grove Community Centre. Isle of Dogs is also home to Streets of Growth who will be receiving money from the LCF. More specifically the LCF also includes funding for the Canaan Project which provides activities for young women aged 11-19 on the Isle of Dogs. Working with George Green’s school and Café Forever we offer activities including cooking, craft, sports, and inspirational workshops at our weekly lunch and after school clubs as well as opportunities to join us for regular trips.

- That the Alpha Square primary school is no longer required by this Council although construction started in October

- The government commitment to fund 60 capital costs for new youth centres nationally but sadly not the ongoing staffing costs for hardworking youth workers who provide life-changing support and services.
That the Isle of Dogs & South Poplar area has only two small youth centres, at St Andrews Wharf in Island Gardens and Poplar Spotlight. There are none planned in Canary Wharf and Blackwall & Cubitt Town wards despite both wards being the main focus of new residential growth.

The large amounts of allocated, unspent S106 & Community Infrastructure levy which is programmed for new investment.

The more than £167 millions of grant money paid by government (New Homes Bonus) to help support high growth which has been reduced by central government.

The Council is concerned that:

The GLA commissioned Development Infrastructure Finding Study (DIFS) which accompanies the OAPF says that forecast the following amounts (£’000) should have been spent from anticipated from April 2017 onwards on Infrastructure 'Gross' Costs in the Low/Baseline Growth option (excluding DLR Upgrade & Rotherhithe bridge costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>First five years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>£2,728</td>
<td>£11,08</td>
<td>£8,838</td>
<td>£11,838</td>
<td>£11,838</td>
<td>£46,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Local Connections</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£9,806</td>
<td>£18,756</td>
<td>£23,830</td>
<td>£17,164</td>
<td>£69,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>£28,94</td>
<td>£28,94</td>
<td>£28,94</td>
<td>£28,94</td>
<td>£28,94</td>
<td>£144,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire, Ambulance, Police, CCTV</td>
<td>£2,930</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£7,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£23,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>£738</td>
<td>£738</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£17,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Low</td>
<td>£41,771</td>
<td>£56,86</td>
<td>£68,241</td>
<td>£76,315</td>
<td>£69,649</td>
<td>£312,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period LBTH has undertaken it's own detailed forecasting for school places resulting in 98% of families getting their first choice of primary school.

Local Government does not have the necessary powers to direct primary care spending, despite the powers to plan for additional health infrastructure.
That with the exception of some spending on the new South Dock bridge that none of it has been spent or is likely to be spent soon despite development continuing and new planning applications being submitted.

That the total estimated ‘all-in’ infrastructure costs between 2017 and 2042 are in each growth scenario:

Baseline £1,604 million  
High growth £1,756 million  
Maximum growth £1,840 million

The Council resolves:

- To report on the newly established set-up an internal LBTH team to leading on the programme of infrastructure development required to support this growth paid for by New Homes Bonus
- To report on ask the GLA & TfL to committed staff to supporting this growth in the same way that they have done at Old Oak Common and the Royal Docks which have much lower housing and jobs targets
- To support a cross sector campaign to supporting the work Canary Wharf Group are doing in trying to increase transport capacity to the area given that even the Elizabeth line is not sufficient to support this level of planned growth
- To responsibly programme, allocate and spend Community Infrastructure Levy and income from Section 106 agreements to the areas with the more significant infrastructure pressures including for example the South Dock Bridge and planned new primary schools commit to only spending Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 money earn’t in the OAPF area in the area as required by the DIFS, given the forecast funding deficits and lack of clarity over whether the rest of the money will come from
- To review youth services in the borough, including the location of youth centres, reaching out to all young people to ensure the best possible outcomes in the context of declining resources in Local Government. Build a new youth centre in one of the sites with planning permission for a school and to partner with the Youth Zone charity in order to reduce the operating cost impact on the general fund

The amendment was put to the vote and agreed

Following debate, the motion as amended was put to the vote and was agreed.

RESOLVED:

That the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan said in his introduction “without a plan in place, this growth is causing unacceptable impacts on existing local communities from construction in the short term to provision of the necessary supporting facilities for these developments in the long term.”

The introduction also said, “Unique amongst London’s Opportunity Areas, the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar is currently experiencing intense development pressure, mainly in the form of new, very high density housing.”

That the OAPF contains three growth scenarios for new homes in the area (the wards of Island Gardens, Canary Wharf, Blackwall & Cubitt Town and Poplar):

- Baseline 31,000 extra homes
- High growth 38,000 extra homes
- Maximum growth 49,000 extra homes

+ office space for an additional 110,000 jobs in each scenario

That these are the largest combined OAPF targets in London.

That the new London Plan has a target of 29,000 new homes in the same area + 110,000 new jobs.

That the new Tower Hamlets Council Local Plan has a minimum target of 30,601 new homes between 2016 and 2031 in the same area (56% of all new housing in Tower Hamlets)

**This Council further notes:**

- The council’s youth service operates a dedicated youth hub at Andrews Wharf, which has over the last summer been supplemented by additional capacity from the Rapid Response Team. In addition there are services and activities provided by the voluntary sector at Alpha Grove Community Centre. Isle of Dogs is also home to Streets of Growth who will be receiving money from the LCF. More specifically the LCF also includes funding for the Canaan Project which provides activities for young women aged 11-19 on the Isle of Dogs. Working with George Green’s school and Café Forever we offer activities including cooking, craft, sports, and inspirational workshops at our weekly lunch and after school clubs as well as opportunities to join us for regular trips.

- That the Alpha Square primary school is no longer required by this Council although construction started in October

- The government commitment to fund 60 capital costs for new youth centres nationally but sadly not the ongoing staffing costs for hardworking youth workers who provide life-changing support and services
- The large amounts of allocated, unspent S106 & Community Infrastructure levy which is programmed for new investment
- The more than £167 millions of grant money paid by government (New Homes Bonus) to help support high growth which has been reduced by central government.

The Council is concerned that:

The GLA commissioned Development Infrastructure Finding Study (DIFS) which accompanies the OAPF forecast the following amounts (£'000) anticipated from April 2017 onwards on Infrastructure ‘Gross’ Costs in the Low/Baseline Growth option (excluding DLR Upgrade & Rotherhithe bridge costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/2021</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>First five years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>£2,728</td>
<td>£11,088</td>
<td>£8,838</td>
<td>£11,838</td>
<td>£11,838</td>
<td>£46,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Local Connections</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£9,806</td>
<td>£18,756</td>
<td>£23,830</td>
<td>£17,164</td>
<td>£69,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>£28,946</td>
<td>£28,946</td>
<td>£28,946</td>
<td>£28,946</td>
<td>£28,946</td>
<td>£144,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire, Ambulance, Police, CCTV</td>
<td>£2,930</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£1,526</td>
<td>£7,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£4,764</td>
<td>£23,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>£738</td>
<td>£738</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£5,411</td>
<td>£17,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Low</td>
<td>£41,771</td>
<td>£56,868</td>
<td>£68,241</td>
<td>£76,315</td>
<td>£69,649</td>
<td>£312,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period LBTH has undertaken its own detailed forecasting for school places resulting in 98% of families getting their first choice of primary school.

Local Government does not have the necessary powers to direct primary care spending, despite the powers to plan for additional health infrastructure.

That with the exception of some spending on the new South Dock bridge that none of it has been spent or is likely to be spent soon despite development continuing and new planning applications being submitted.

That the total estimated ‘all-in’ infrastructure costs between 2017 and 2042 are in each growth scenario:

Baseline £1,604 million
High growth £1,756 million
Maximum growth £1,840 million

The Council resolves:

- To report on the newly established internal LBTH team leading on the programme of infrastructure development required to support this growth

- To report on the GLA & TfL committed staff supporting this growth in the same way that they have done at Old Oak Common and the Royal Docks which have much lower housing and jobs targets

- To support a cross sector campaign to increase transport capacity to the area given that even the Elizabeth line is not sufficient to support this level of planned growth

- To responsibly programme, allocate and spend Community Infrastructure Levy and income from Section 106 agreements to the areas with the more significant infrastructure pressures including for example the South Dock Bridge and planned new primary schools

- To review youth services in the borough, including the location of youth centres, reaching out to all young people to ensure the best possible outcomes in the context of declining resources in Local Government.

Amendment to Motion on the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Faroque Ahmed</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sabina Akhtar</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sufia Alam</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amina Ali</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Shah Ameen</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Asma Begum</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor John Biggs</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Rachel Blake</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Brady</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kahar Chowdhury</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Shad Chowdhury</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Dipa Das</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Edgar</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Marc Francis</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Peter Golds</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Danny Hassell</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mohammed Ahbab Hossain</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Asma Islam</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sirajul Islam</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Denise Jones</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Rabina Khan</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tarik Khan</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ayas Miah</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Victoria Obaze</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCILOR Mohammed Pappu  For
Councillor John Pierce  For
Councillor Leema Qureshi  For
Councillor Candida Ronald  For
Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan  For
Councillor Helal Uddin  For
Councillor Abdal Ullah  For
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman  For
Councillor Val Whitehead  For
Councillor Bex White  For
Councillor Andrew Wood  Against

Carried

| Motion as amended the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Councillor Faroque Ahmed         | For                           |
| Councillor Sabina Akhtar         | For                           |
| Councillor Sufia Alam            | For                           |
| Councillor Amina Ali             | For                           |
| Councillor Shah Ameen            | For                           |
| Councillor Asma Begum            | For                           |
| Mayor John Biggs                 | For                           |
| Councillor Rachel Blake          | For                           |
| Councillor Kevin Brady           | For                           |
| Councillor Kahar Chowdhury       | For                           |
| Councillor Shad Chowdhury        | For                           |
| Councillor Dipa Das              | For                           |
| Councillor David Edgar           | For                           |
| Councillor Marc Francis          | For                           |
| Councillor Peter Golds           | Against                       |
| Councillor Danny Hassell         | For                           |
| Councillor Mohammed Ahbab Hossain| For                           |
| Councillor Asma Islam            | For                           |
| Councillor Sirajul Islam         | For                           |
| Councillor Denise Jones          | For                           |
| Councillor Rabina Khan           | Abstain                       |
| Councillor Tarik Khan            | For                           |
| Councillor Ayas Miah             | For                           |
| Councillor Harun Miah            | For                           |
| Councillor Victoria Obaze        | For                           |
| Councillor Mohammed Pappu        | For                           |
| Councillor John Pierce           | For                           |
| Councillor Leema Qureshi         | For                           |
| Councillor Zenith Rahman         | For                           |
| Councillor Candida Ronald        | For                           |
| Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan| For                         |
| Councillor Helal Uddin           | For                           |
| Councillor Abdal Ullah           | For                           |
8. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The following questions and in each case supplementary questions were put (except where indicated) and were responded to by the Mayor or relevant Executive Member.

8.2 Question from Councillor Andrew Wood:

The government has announced funding nationally for 60 new youth centres, we have primary schools with planning permission that we do not want anymore and only two small youth centres in the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar area, it is not now time to build a new youth centre for the fastest growing place in the UK?

Response of Councillor Danny Hassell, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People:

First of all we covered the difference between capital and revenue. The Government has announced funding for 60 new youth centres. I am not quite sure how they think they are going to run, presumably on empty. But it is important to note that even according to DfE’s analysis, the new investment they are providing for youth centres falls far short of the cuts in youth services that have been made since 2010. Because of the choices made by this Administration, Tower Hamlets still has one of the biggest and best funded youth services in London. In dozens of venues across the Borough, we offer over 400 hours of high quality activity every single week, including from eight hubs, 10 additional commissioned services, three specialist youth projects and 16 additional grant funded youth projects, which will be funded from the Local Community Fund. We are always looking at suitable options for delivering youth work. We would be happy to consider any options that Councillor Wood would like to suggest to be fed into our review of youth services so we can continue to provide a good quality youth service for all of our young people across the Borough.

No supplementary question was asked.

8.3 Question from Councillor Kahar Chowdhury:

Can the lead member please provide information on primary school results this year?

Response of Councillor Danny Hassell, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People:
I am very pleased to report an excellent set of results for Tower Hamlets Primary schools this year. The results provisionally for key stage two show 71% of pupils have achieved the expected level of results in reading writing and maths compared to 65% nationally and 61% in London. Once again, we are beating London and the national average. We continue to close the gap in the early years foundation stage with the national average and for the first time, we have exceeded the national results in reading Year 1. We are incredibly proud of everything that our schools continue to achieve. Despite the fact that in Tower Hamlets, schools will be on average £730 per pupil worse off than they were in 2015/16 despite the Governments pledges on school funding.

Supplementary question from Councillor Kahar Chowdhury:

Thanks for providing an overview of the overall picture. When we look at individual schools, some are below the national average in terms of their achievements. Therefore, can you confirm what resources were put into those schools to achieve or exceed the national average?

Councillor Danny Hassell’s response to supplementary question:

I am very pleased to say we are working very closely with all our schools. We are very lucky that the schools in Tower Hamlets work in collaboration, rather than competition. Because of that strong spirit of collaboration, and peer to peer school improvements, we have well embedded systems of identifying just the schools that Councillor Chowdhury mentioned, that might need some additional help and support to improve their leadership. We do that though schools working together and through our school improvement partnership – the Education Partnership, which we continue to fund as a Council. We continue to monitor all schools looking at a whole range of risk factors not just school results, but also changes in leadership, their governance and funding. We will continue to ensure we have high aspirations of all our schools and children.

8.4 Question from Councillor Peter Golds:

Will the Mayor explain, in the light of the third elected councillor in seven years being convicted for housing fraud, what steps are being taken to protect against this and to ensure the integrity of the majority of members who serve the community properly and legally and to the best of their abilities?

Response of Mayor John Biggs:

Anybody who commits any crime or fraud, irrespective of if they are a Councillor or any other public representative, should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law – that is what we have done and will continue to do. Our Fraud Team investigates all allegations. To encourage members of the public, staff and Councillors to report any concerns, a dedicated hot line exists and a secure email has been made available. We are also subscribing through London Government, to a new pan Borough system, under which we will use the latest technology, such as data scrapping, to try to put together
information on individuals, to help detect fraud not in a sinister way but to find out contradictions about where people live, what they are doing and how we can ensure that public assets, particularly public housing, are protected in the public interest.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Peter Golds:**

I would observe that the overwhelming majority of people who serve and have served on this Council are scrupulously honest and people of integrity. What concerns me is that if you have rotten apples we all get tarnished by it.

Would the Mayor consider a thorough review of the internal housing programme so that internally we cannot have this corruption again. As we have pointed out, in a very short period we have had three people, all of whom were elected Councillors and corrupted the housing system for their own advantage. Therefore, would you consider an investigation of systems that could be put in place to prevent that in the future?

**Mayor John Biggs response to supplementary question:**

You raise quite a complex question with a hint of accusation behind it. I am not convinced that we have an endemic web of corruption or whatever you may be insinuating. I am very happy if you want to write to me with a detailed proposal and suggest what problems you might think might be with the system, to look into that. Certainly, I have regularly conversations and our excellent Chair of Audit has conversations with auditors and with professionals about how we can better detect fraud. We recently had a conversation about parking, for example, where the possession of a parking permit is quite a valuable asset in our Borough and we need to make sure that people who have it are entitled to it. I want to make sure that everyone is treated equally. However I also recognise that if you are a publicly elected representative, an even higher standard should be expected of you of a total scrupulous, fairness and transparency about your motives being in the public interest.

**8.5 Question from Councillor Sufia Alam:**

What assessment has the council made about the impact of the government’s recent school funding announcements on schools in Tower Hamlets?

**Response of Councillor Danny Hassell, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People:**

The Government has awarded the minimum possible uplift of 1.84% per pupil known as the funding floor which is designed to offset inflation, however when we take into account the schools pay award which is above 2%, in fact our schools are getting a real terms cut. Government funding quite clearly is not keeping up with demand. We saw last year an overspend of £7 million on our school funding, largely as a result of high needs funding which has not kept pace with demand. New national figures from the National Education Union...
shown that schools in Tower Hamlets have lost out on £110 million of funding between 2015 and 2020, that is the equivalent of £735 per pupil.

No supplementary question was asked.

8.6 Question from Councillor Faroque Ahmed:

With the Town Hall soon moving to the Royal London site and cross rail opening soon, Whitechapel would be the gateway to our borough. Can the Mayor or the Lead Member inform us what we are doing to help improve the markets and the environment around the new Town Hall?

Response of Councillor Motin Uz – Zaman, Cabinet Member for Work and Economic Growth:

The Council has been working hard to ensure that the environment around the new Town Hall, Whitechapel is improved. As a result a senior meeting called by the Mayor, with the Deputy Mayor of London, Rajesh Agrawal, senior Council officers and TfL met to look at how we can improve that area and making sure that Crossrail was on time. Following on from that meeting, certain things were discussed including enforcement action for the Whitechapel Road Market. I can tell you that signs have been installed to ensure that the graffiti vans are taken out. You will also know that there is a lot of fly tipping that goes on and we are looking at how we can ensure that those enforcements are taking place.

Supplementary question from Councillor Faroque Ahmed:

I am confused here about the market the opposite side of the new Town Hall. My question is: how likely is it to be delivered on time and are there any plans in place to uplift the market?

Councillor Motin Uz – Zaman’s response to supplementary question:

The land opposite belongs to TfL. As you know, they are short of money to even deliver Crossrail, so one of the things we need to look at with our partners and developers is ways of improving the physical infrastructure of Whitechapel. Clearly, it will be the gateway to the Town Hall. We also note that there is a lot of fly tipping that’s happening there. The Council is looking to increase the fine to £400 to anyone doing this. Currently, it is £80 and it is not deterring anyone. We are also looking at CCTV cameras to find anyone doing this and to prosecute them.

8.7 Question from Councillor Leema Qureshi:

The first 1,001 days are crucial to a child’s development. Can the Lead Member please update the council on what we are doing to ensure children have a healthy start to life?
Response of Councillor Danny Hassell, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People:

The Council is committed to providing “every chance for every child” to have a great start in life. That’s why we are working together with our partners across the Tower Hamlets Together Partnership to deliver on that promise. As a result of that work we are delivering a Maternal and Early Childhood Sustained Home-visiting (MECSH) Programme, which is a more intensive health visiting programme for those at risk of poor maternal health. We have got our family nurse partnership to support first time mothers, under the age of 21 or targeted up to 24.

We recently launched our new Partnership Strategy for early years which has a focus on a number of areas. The first one is around: speech, communication and language needs. The second one is around using new methods of family identification to provide earlier support. We have seen that with our Early Help Pilot, which we will be rolling out across the Borough. Other measures include: using the training offered through the Community Education Provider network to have a better understanding of the impact of early experiences on behaviour; and using our Restorative Practice to ensure all of our workers working with our families are doing so in a way that provides a critical friend supporting them build sustainable change.

No supplementary question was asked.

8.8 Question from Councillor Marc Francis:
Will the Lead Member for Adults Services publish the service review report which has led to the proposal to end the meals on wheels service for pensioners and disabled people?

Response of Councillor Amina Ali, Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing:

The number of people receiving a welfare meal at home has fallen from 350 in 2015 to 160 in June 2019. We need to note that we have been heavily subsiding these meals as we pay £11 per meal but charge £3.50 to residents. In the face of a decade of government cuts, we need to be thoughtful about how we use our limited resources to help residents and this has meant looking at supporting people’s nutritional needs in a different way. It should also be noted that all current service users will continue to receive the service until they have the assessment. Service users will then be offered the most appropriate support from community services which offer lunch for some of them. For example, some may be able to attend Luncheon Clubs, often run by voluntary organisations. Others might have needs so will need support in their home to make sure they had a meal in their home. Others might receive help purchasing a chilled or a frozen meal from a different supplier.
Everyone who receives the service will be having a home visit to assess and review their needs and we remain committed to delivering a service and our duty of care.

The changes to Welfare Meals are part of the wider review of the Council’s contract services and an update will be published when it comes to Cabinet later this month.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Marc Francis:**

The recommendations in the report that went to the Cabinet on 27th February 2019 stated that Adults Services would undertake further work to assess alternative delivery options and the future operation function of the central production unit. The findings of this work will be subject to a future report to the Cabinet and the outcome of the consultation on Adults Services will be reported back via a full report which will set out the preferred options. This decision has already been implemented and the Corporate Director confirmed that at the Health Scrutiny Sub Committee last week. Can the Lead Member give us a commitment that this decision will be rescinded and brought back to Cabinet so it can be subject to proper democratic scrutiny in accordance with this Council’s Constitution as confirmed by the decision of Mayor in Cabinet on the 27 February 2019

**Councillor Amina Ali’s response to supplementary question:**

A full report on contact services including Meals on Wheels did come to the Cabinet in February 2019 and a further report with an update will be coming to Cabinet at the end of this month and that is a guarantee.

**8.9 Question from Councillor Abdal Ullah**

Will the Mayor reconsider the restrictions being put upon local residents of my ward? The ‘bus gate’ is a great idea to stop rat-runners however its introduction will limit the free movement of local residents. We welcome the Liveable Streets programme to Wapping and look forward to working to improve our streets and encourage people to walk and cycle, however the ‘bus gate’ restrictions will have an impact by adding further delays and congestion to locals residents who have to use cars.

**Response of Mayor John Biggs:**

Your constituents can rest assured that you and Councillor Denise Jones have been vocal advocates for them on the Bus Gate. The gate is due to operate from 5:30am to 10:30am and from 4pm to 7pm, at peak times when there is rat running in the area. The question you are asking is whether we should review the system to benefit residents locally who are inconvenienced or have to use their cars. I note there has been a number of requests for this. The purpose of having an experimental period is that we want to hear from residents and people affected by the proposals to see how it needs to be tuned to ensure that it minimises disruption to local lives while maximising the benefit to the local environment. I am happy to hear the representations and if
there are ongoing difficulties, we can modify the scheme. However if it beds in successfully, we will be able to invest in more environment improvements along Wapping High Street which will further improve the quality of life including more greenery, wider pavements and improved crossing facilities.

No supplementary question was asked

8.11 Question from Councillor Asma Islam:

Can the Mayor please update members on the mitigations introduced as part of the Local Community Fund to support organisations whose funding ended once the mainstream grants programme ended, and how these measures will support service users?

Response of Councillor Candida Ronald, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector:

An update report on the Local Community Fund mitigation and Transition came to the Grants Determination Sub – Committee on 6th November 2019. That report contained details of the two new themes for the Small Grants Programme relating: to Access and Participation supporting VCS groups run for and led by BME community groups; and community support for Older people aimed at community led groups for elders. We have extended funding for Mainstream Grants (MSG) lunch clubs and community language projects to give time for them to apply for the new small grants themes. The Emergency Fund has been redesigned as a VCS Contingency Fund to enable organisations funded by MSG up to 30th September to apply for transitional support, if they can fulfil the criteria and demonstrate a realistic chance of alternative funding. Other mitigations are set out in the report that went to the Grants Determination Sub – Committee. In common with other Local Authorities this Council’s budget is under extraordinary pressure, but we remain committed to supporting local organisations and look forward to them delivering great outcomes for our residents.

No supplementary question was asked

8.12 Question from Councillor Val Whitehead:

What were the key findings of the Child Poverty Action Group’s report on the impacts of Universal Credit in Tower Hamlets and how will the council be responding to the recommendations?

Response of Councillor Rachel Blake, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Planning Air Quality and Tackling Poverty:

The Child Poverty Action Group report recognised the work that Tower Hamlets was doing. We have been leading the way in on our response to Universal Credit. However, it did highlight a number of recommendations in three key areas to best address the impact of Universal Credit. Firstly, we will be continuing to invest in high quality welfare advice through the Local Community Fund, as well as through our Universal Credit Outreach Team,
which is funded through the Tackling Poverty Programme. Secondly we will continue to develop our digital offer so that we can reach out to people using Universal Credit. Lastly, we have accepted the changes recommended to the Crisis Grants scheme, and will continue to work with partners to develop the scheme to ensure it is as effective as possible.

Supplementary question from Councillor Val Whitehead:
What options are currently available for residents in a financial crisis?

Councillor Rachel Blake’s response to supplementary question

Several years ago the crisis fund scheme was devolved to Local Government and is also unfunded by National Government. Because of Tower Hamlets commitment to those that are most vulnerable, we have protected a crisis fund in Tower Hamlets and the new Policy Institute has found that it is the most generous in London with several Boroughs having to abandon theirs due to Government cuts. We have allocated in most years £7000 to those in crisis and we will continue to do so even though there are deep challenges with local government funding

8.13 Question from Councillor Tarik Khan:
Can the Mayor or Cabinet Member update members on the Liveable Streets programme and the proposals for Bethnal Green?

Response of Mayor John Biggs:

I want to thank you and your fellow Weavers and St Peters Wards Councillors on your work on supporting this. There is a set of proposals and the underlying reason for this is that over 21 thousand vehicles each day, travel through Bethnal Green. Of those 57% are travelling through the area without stopping. That means that there are over 12,000 non local vehicles travelling through Bethnal Green roads each day. Our proposals are designed to reduce this rat running by a number of strategically placed closed and one way systems. For example Arnold Circus would be completely pedestrianised creating a new public space. We are very aware of the concerns and anxieties this may cause. So we want to listen to people through the consultation and hear about the impact that these changes may have on their lives

Supplementary question from Councillor Tarik Khan:
What engagement has taken place to inform the public about the proposals in Bethnal Green?

Mayor John Biggs response to supplementary question

Every household should have received a brochure that summarises the changes. There have been a number of well attended workshops and public meetings and meetings with schools and businesses. We are inviting people to submit comments by email, and by other methods. The five Councillors in
the area will be actively engaging with residents across the Bethan Green area to understand their concerns. The next public consultation meeting is taking place tomorrow, at the Professional Development Centre

8.14 Question from Councillor Rabina Khan:

Will the Mayor agree to ensure that applications for medical priority on the basis of ASD should be assessed by a specialist medical assessor with a specific understanding of ASD and to ensure that, where necessary, such applications for medical priority should be entitled to automatic OT visit?

Response of Councillor Sirajul Islam, Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing:

The council is committed to making Tower Hamlets Autism Friendly working in partnership with health providers and the third sector.

The Council and Clinical Commissioning Group have in place a 5 year partnership Strategy to address the needs of autistic adults in the borough. This runs to 2022.

Housing Options Occupational Therapists (OT) who have experience working with ASD and children complete the housing needs assessment and make housing recommendations aimed to reduce or manage risks. ASD referrals made up approximately 35% of all housing need referrals coming to OT team as at May 2019. Every case is different. If necessary, home visits are conducted.

Housing Options OT also are in the process of developing a new report form for parents of ASD children who apply for re-housing and an assessment pack.

We have also included autism in the Tower Hamlets Housing Strategy to ensure that when new homes are designed and commissioned, the needs of those with autism are taken into account.

Highest priority is given to severe cases of ASD. Families are usually recommended ground floor only accommodation, which in most cases places them in Band 1A.

No supplementary question was asked

Questions 8.1, and 8.10 were not put due to the absence of the questioner. A written response would be provided to the questions. (Note the written responses are included in Appendix A to these minutes)
9. REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEES


The Council considered a report of the Mayor in Cabinet on the proposed revised Gambling Policy for 2019-22.

RESOLVED:

1. That the revised Gambling Policy for 2019-22 be adopted.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Waiver of 6 Month Councillor Attendance Rule (Sec. 85 of the Local Government Act 1972)

The Council considered a report on the proposal to waive the 6-month attendance rule for Councillor Mufeedah Bustin’s maternity leave.

RESOLVED:

1. That Councillor Mufeedah Bustin’s period of office be extended beyond the six month period of non-attendance provided for within Section 85 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds of being on maternity leave.

2. That Council approve the requested extension of time to expire on 31 May 2020.

3. That Councillor Eve McQuillan be appointed as the Mayoral Advisor for Tackling Poverty and Inequalities for the duration of Councillor Mufeedah Bustin’s maternity leave.
11. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

11.1 Motion regarding Restoring Fairness to the Leasehold System.

Councillor Peter Golds moved and Councillor Andrew Wood seconded the motion as printed in the agenda.

Councillor Sirajul Islam moved and Councillor Rachel Blake seconded the following amendment to the motion to be debated as tabled:

Added text underlined
Deleted text scored out.

This Council notes:

There is a need for Tower Hamlets Council to promote fairness and transparency for the growing number of leaseholders in our borough and to address the unfair practices that exist in the leaseholder market.

For over two decades issues regarding the unfairness of leasehold tenure in England and Wales have been raised by ministers from all governments.

Currently the Law Commission are considering a range of options for reforming the law on enfranchisement to make it easier, quicker, and cheaper for leaseholders to buy their freehold or extend their lease, for future implementation.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) launched an investigation into the leasehold system in June 2019 following concerns from MPs and consumer groups, looking at potential mis-selling and potential unfair terms.

The council notes the number of leasehold properties within the borough and fully supports a fairer, more transparent system for leaseholders nationally.

This council further notes:

Problems with some leases are becoming increasingly onerous to those purchasing a leasehold flat or house. While a leasehold may be presented as a cheaper option than buying the freehold, it is not always clear to the leaseholder what additional medium or long-term costs they may face.

Some of the problems experienced by leaseholders are:

- Doubling ground rents: paying an increasing and continuing ground rent, which makes some leaseholders unable to sell their home due to difficulties securing a mortgage;
- Excessive and unjustified service or administration fees: paying potential fees for permissions to make alterations to a property or covenants in a lease; and

- Difficulty buying the freehold: the financial impact of extending the lease or buying the freehold from the developer after moving in;

- Lack of transparency: information is not always clear to leaseholders when purchasing to leaseholds.

These costs can total thousands of pounds more than envisaged at the point of sale.

In addition, where developers sell on the freehold interest to a third party after a leaseholder has moved into a new build house, consumers can find that they are faced with significant legal and surveyor costs where they want to purchase the freehold. Such transfers can take place without the leaseholder being informed.

The council supports a small number of leaseholders who contact officers directly however in the vast majority of cases leaseholders are advised to raise issues with their freeholder or managing agent, and to contact the Leasehold Advisory Service who provide free advice on service charges, extending a lease, and buying the freehold. Where there is a dispute, the leaseholder is advised to contact the Housing Ombudsman.

Tower Hamlets Homes launched its ‘New Deal for Leaseholders’ in June 2017 to give better payment terms and consultation for major works, access to partner services, clearer details about rights and responsibilities and better digital services.

This Council resolves that:

- Support for commonhold ownership for flats, in preference to leasehold title ownership should be encouraged.

- The Cabinet Member should update members on the CMA review into the leaseholder system when it has been completed.

- That council officers should hold a discussion with developers should be encouraged to deliver about commonhold ownership, not leasehold and that the council explores ways of encouraging that via the existing planning system, at the next bi-annual Developers Forum following the conclusion of the CMA review.

- That the council supports should signpost advice for leaseholders looking to buy their freehold often against freeholders who are unwilling to negotiate fairly.
The council explores ways in how we can support continue to signpost leaseholders with to more information from expert agencies about service charges, their calculation, how to complain and to what support is available to them against the occasional in respect of unscrupulous landlords.

Councillor Peter Golds and Councillor Andrew Wood indicted that they accepted the amendment to the motion.

The motion as amended was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

This Council notes:

There is a need for Tower Hamlets Council to promote fairness and transparency for the growing number of leaseholders in our borough and to address the unfair practices that exist in the leaseholder market.

For over two decades issues regarding the unfairness of leasehold tenure in England and Wales have been raised by ministers from all governments.

Currently the Law Commission are considering a range of options for reforming the law on enfranchisement to make it easier, quicker, and cheaper for leaseholders to buy their freehold or extend their lease, for future implementation.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) launched an investigation into the leasehold system in June 2019 following concerns from MPs and consumer groups, looking at potential mis-selling and potential unfair terms.

The council notes the number of leasehold properties within the borough and fully supports a fairer, more transparent system for leaseholders nationally.

This council further notes:

Problems with some leases are becoming increasingly onerous to those purchasing a leasehold flat or house. While a leasehold may be presented as a cheaper option than buying the freehold, it is not always clear to the leaseholder what additional medium or long-term costs they may face.

Some of the problems experienced by leaseholders are:

- Doubling ground rents: paying an increasing and continuing ground rent, which makes some leaseholders unable to sell their home due to difficulties securing a mortgage;
- Excessive and unjustified service or administration fees: paying potential fees for permissions to make alterations to a property or covenants in a lease; and
- Difficulty buying the freehold: the financial impact of extending the lease or buying the freehold from the developer after moving in;

- Lack of transparency: information is not always clear to leaseholders when purchasing to leaseholds.

These costs can total thousands of pounds more than envisaged at the point of sale.

In addition, where developers sell on the freehold interest to a third party after a leaseholder has moved into a new build house, consumers can find that they are faced with significant legal and surveyor costs where they want to purchase the freehold. Such transfers can take place without the leaseholder being informed.

The council supports a small number of leaseholders who contact officers directly however in the vast majority of cases leaseholders are advised to raise issues with their freeholder or managing agent, and to contact the Leasehold Advisory Service who provide free advice on service charges, extending a lease, and buying the freehold. Where there is a dispute, the leaseholder is advised to contact the Housing Ombudsman.

Tower Hamlets Homes launched its ‘New Deal for Leaseholders’ in June 2017 to give better payment terms and consultation for major works, access to partner services, clearer details about rights and responsibilities and better digital services.

**This Council resolves that:**

- The Cabinet Member should update members on the CMA review into the leaseholder system when it has been completed.

- That council officers should hold a discussion with developers about commonhold ownership at the next bi-annual Developers Forum following the conclusion of the CMA review.

- That the council should signpost advice for leaseholders looking to buy their freehold often against freeholders who are unwilling to negotiate fairly.

- The council explores ways in how we can continue to signpost leaseholders to more information from expert agencies about service charges, their calculation, how to complain and what support is available to them in respect of unscrupulous landlords.
11.2 Motion regarding Autism in Housing

Councillor Rabina Khan moved the motion as printed in the agenda.

Councillor Sirajul Islam moved and Councillor Amina Ali seconded the following amendment to the motion to be debated as tabled.

*Added text underlined
Deleted text scored out.*

**This Council Notes:**

1. That Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a wide-ranging and complex condition, which has far-reaching effects on an individual’s life and that of their families and others involved in their lives. Autism is regarded as a disability under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA). However, high-functioning autism (Asperger’s) is often seen as an invisible disability.

2. Sufferers have diverse physical and psychological requirements, so the home environment and the available facilities are therefore crucial to the wellbeing of families with a member on the ASD spectrum. Some ASD sufferers rely heavily on routine and structure and can suffer from extreme anxiety when they face any major upheaval or changes.

3. Many families with one or more members on the ASD spectrum are living in wholly inadequate properties, which do not meet their needs, yet they are not being given medical priority to enable them to be rehoused.

4. Under the DDA, reasonable steps must be taken by councils, housing associations and landlords to address the barriers that may be experienced by disabled tenants.

5. Adults with ASD may feel isolated, but do not have the social skills to enable them to connect with other people. They may not know how to behave appropriately with neighbours of others in the community and some have obsessive or ritualistic behaviours, which can seem challenging to others.

6. The new local Housing Strategy has specifically recognised the needs of people with learning difficulty and autism and contains a commitment to work to support the development of an Accommodation Plan for People with Learning Disabilities and those on the ASD spectrum.

7. However, it does not go far enough in properly assessing the forms submitted by those who have applied for medical priority, especially when there is overwhelming evidence from doctors, health departments and other professionals to support the applications.
This Council Believes:

1. That the Council has a duty to support and assist people with ASD to enable them to access appropriate living conditions.

2. It recognises that every case is different and there can be a variety of complex needs specific to each case.

3. Some children with ASD have very little awareness of their own safety and that of others, so full assessments should be carried out to ensure that adaptations are made where necessary to protect the families concerned.

4. Through our Choice Based Lettings scheme each case will be assessed so applicants are awarded priority based on this and can then bid for properties they deem are suitable for their individual needs. Priority must be given to families where the ASD sufferer does not have their own bedroom, as they need their own space and it is important that they do not disturb their siblings/other family members and vice versa. There should also be adequate toilet/bathroom facilities.

5. Many people with ASD need a calming environment, as some have a higher sensitivity to noise, light, heat or smell. Placing a family with an ASD member in a property next to a busy train line, for example, would not be suitable.

This Council Resolves:

1. To fulfil its vision in its Autism Strategy for Adults 2017-22 of ensuring that: "All adults with autism are able to live fulfilling and rewarding lives within a society that accepts and understands them. They can get a diagnosis and access support if they need it, and they can depend on mainstream public services to treat them fairly as individuals, helping them make the most of their talents."

2. To ensure that applications for medical priority on the basis of ASD should be assessed by an appropriate, trained assessor and where appropriate receive a home visit by a specialist medical assessor with a specific understanding of ASD.

3. To ensure that, where necessary, such applications for medical priority should be entitled to automatic OT visit.

Councillor Rabina Khan indicated that she accepted the amendment to the motion.
The motion as amended was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

This Council Notes:

1. That Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a wide-ranging and complex condition, which has far-reaching effects on an individual’s life and that of their families and others involved in their lives. Autism is regarded as a disability under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA). However, high-functioning autism (Asperger's) is often seen as an invisible disability.

2. Sufferers have diverse physical and psychological requirements, so the home environment and the available facilities are therefore crucial to the wellbeing of families with a member on the ASD spectrum. Some ASD sufferers rely heavily on routine and structure and can suffer from extreme anxiety when they face any major upheaval or changes.

3. Many families with one or more members on the ASD spectrum are living in wholly inadequate properties, which do not meet their needs, yet they are not being given medical priority to enable them to be rehoused.

4. Under the DDA, reasonable steps must be taken by councils, housing associations and landlords to address the barriers that may be experienced by disabled tenants.

5. Adults with ASD may feel isolated, but do not have the social skills to enable them to connect with other people. They may not know how to behave appropriately with neighbours of others in the community and some have obsessive or ritualistic behaviours, which can seem challenging to others.

6. The new local Housing Strategy has specifically recognised the needs of people with learning difficulty and autism and contains a commitment to work to support the development of an Accommodation Plan for People with Learning Disabilities and those on the ASD spectrum.

7. However, it does not go far enough in properly assessing the forms submitted by those who have applied for medical priority, especially when there is overwhelming evidence from doctors, health departments and other professionals to support the applications.

This Council Believes:

1. That the Council has a duty to support and assist people with ASD to enable them to access appropriate living conditions.

2. It recognises that every case is different and there can be a variety of complex needs specific to each case.
3. Some children with ASD have very little awareness of their own safety and that of others, so full assessments should be carried out to ensure that adaptations are made where necessary to protect the families concerned.

4. Through our Choice Based Lettings scheme each case will be assessed so applicants are awarded priority based on this and can then bid for properties they deem are suitable for their individual needs.

5. Many people with ASD need a calming environment, as some have a higher sensitivity to noise, light, heat or smell.

This Council Resolves:

1. To fulfil its vision in its Autism Strategy for Adults 2017-22 of ensuring that: “All adults with autism are able to live fulfilling and rewarding lives within a society that accepts and understands them. They can get a diagnosis and access support if they need it, and they can depend on mainstream public services to treat them fairly as individuals, helping them make the most of their talents.”

2. To ensure that applications for medical priority on the basis of ASD should be assessed by an appropriate, trained assessor and where appropriate receive a home visit.

The meeting ended at 9.25 p.m.

Speaker of the Council
APPENDIX A – WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION THAT WAS NOT PUT AT THE FULL COUNCIL MEETING (13th NOVEMBER 2019)

8.1 Question from Councillor Eve McQuillan

How did the council respond to the London City Airport consultation on its expansion proposals?

Response from Deputy Mayor for Planning, Air Quality and Tackling Poverty, Cllr Rachel Blake:

The council responded to London City Airport Draft Masterplan Consultation and expressed our strong view that increasing the numbers of flights coming in and out of London City Airport would have a major negative impact on the health and wellbeing of our residents and result in unacceptable noise levels and exacerbating the effects of climate change.

The removal of the 24 hours closure of the airport on weekend would have severe impact on residents’ quality of life due to the increased noise levels and exposure to air pollution. Our response argued strongly in favour of retaining the current weekend respite as it is.

Reflecting our commitment to protect residents quality of life and the fact the council has declared a climate emergency we urged the airport to further commit themselves to limiting the amount of emissions from their operations, recognising that many of our residents already live in areas with unacceptable levels of air quality.

I would be happy to provide a full copy of our response.

8.10 Question from Councillor Kyrsten Perry

Can the lead member inform us what we are doing to ensure young people growing up in Tower Hamlets are provided with the right skills to obtain employment?

Response from Cabinet Member for Work and Economic Growth, Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman:

Thank you for your question Cllr Perry – it gives me an opportunity to talk about all the great work the council is doing in this area.

Last month, we launched our Children and Families Strategy, and our Learning and Achievement Strategy. You’ll be pleased to know that both of these strategies aim to ensure that our young people have the skills to prepare for the future and the support they need to pursue their aspirations.

Our WorkPath programme provides a great amount of support to young people. This includes careers advice, access to apprenticeships and work experience.
In the last financial year, Workpath and Young Workpath helped 515 young people find employment or apprenticeships. And we’ve helped another 230 young people already this year.

We also have a range of additional measures to help care leavers develop skills and find work.

Through all of these initiatives, the council brings together a wide range of agencies, organisations and local business to deliver the best outcomes for children, young people and families.

This is just some of the work we are doing to help young people achieve their potential and I think we should be very proud of our record.
SUMMARY

1. This report sets out details of the valid petitions submitted for presentation at the Council meeting on Wednesday 15\textsuperscript{th} January 2020.

2. The Council’s Constitution provides for up to four petitions to be heard at each ordinary Council meeting. These are taken in order of receipt, except that petitions for debate (those in excess of 2,000 signatures) will take precedence. Should more than four petitions be received, all remaining petitions will be listed to be formally noted by Council.

3. Three petitions have been received for presentation at the meeting and the following process applies to these petitions:
   
   a. Petitioners may address the meeting for no more than 3 minutes.
   b. Members may then question the petitioners for a further 4 minutes.
   c. Finally, the Speaker will invite the Mayor or (at the Mayor’s discretion) the relevant Lead Member or Committee Chair to respond to the petition for up to 2 minutes. The petition will then be referred to the relevant Corporate Director for attention who will provide a written response within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

4. Members, other than a Cabinet Member or Committee Chair responding at the end of the item, should confine their contributions to questions and not make statements or attempt to debate.

5. For Petition listed as to be noted, petitioners may not address the meeting. The Speaker will state where they will go for a full response.

6. Responses to all petitions will be sent to the lead petitioner and displayed on the Council’s website.
PETITIONS TO BE HEARD

5.1 Petition regarding Free Speech on Palestine submitted by Sybil Cock and others.

We the undersigned petition the council to (1) Adopt the following clarification to the IHRA statement of 19 September 2018. This will safeguard our right to campaign for Palestine in Tower Hamlets. This is important in the light of the refusal of the council to allow the Big Ride for Palestine to hold its welcome Rally in a borough park in July 2019. It is not antisemitic, without additional evidence, :To suggest that it displays anti-Jewish prejudice to criticise the Government of Israel; :To criticise Zionism as a political ideology :To describe any policy or law or practices of the state of Israel as racist, including acts leading to Palestinian dispossession as part of the establishment of the state :To define Israel as an apartheid state :To advocate Boycott Divestment and Sanctions against Israel. (2) Recognise the state of Palestine: Educate residents on the plight of the Palestinian people and their struggle for dignity and self-determination.

5.2 Petition regarding Residents vehicles and Taxis access through the Wapping Bus Gate during operating times submitted by Gina Hayden and others.

We the undersigned petition the council to make Wapping residents' vehicles and taxis exempt during the operating times of the bus gate in Wapping. Currently only buses and bicycles will be exempt during operating times (weekdays 5.30am - 10.30am and 4pm - 7pm). However, this decision by the Council severely restricts the movement and access of Wapping residents at peak times to and from work and schools. The Council's decision to make only buses and bicycles exempt from moving freely through Wapping furthermore ignores and contradicts the findings of the consultation report (Document Reference: 5318 Date 15.05.19) whose findings clearly indicate that 68% of Wapping residents and 52 - 74% of total respondents are in favour of residents' vehicles and taxis being exempt from the bus gate during operating times.

5.3 Petition regarding Stop the Burdett Road Entrapment submitted by Sumaia Begum and others.

Transport for London and Tower Hamlets Council are proposing to ban vehicles turning into St Pauls Way, Burdett Road and Mile End Road. This leaves Tower Hamlets residents trapped and forced to take alternative routes increasing journey times. Tower Hamlets residents & businesses are demanding that the proposals are cancelled. We are growing tired of increased journey times. The proposals will lead to gridlock traffic on our roads. Whilst we do support walking and cycling across Tower Hamlets this should not be at the expense of increasing journey times for drivers through banning vehicle turns on vital parts of our network. The banned turns will severely effect residents, businesses and several schools across St Pauls Way, Devons Road and Burdett Road.
PETITIONS TO BE NOTED

There are none.
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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 motion submitted is listed overleaf. The Administration Motion is submitted by the Labour Group.

3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council or its partners has a direct responsibility. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.

4. Notice of any proposed amendments to the Motions must be given to the Monitoring Officer by Noon the day before the meeting.

MOTION
Set out overleaf is the motion that has been submitted.
This Council notes:

1. That Universal Credit (UC) has fundamentally failed as a social security system and has caused hardship wherever it is rolled out;

2. Councils are not recognised partners for Universal Credit in the way they are for Housing Benefit and receive no funding to check Universal Credit claims as they are managed by Department for Work and Pensions (DWP);

3. New figures and case studies from Tower Hamlets Council which highlight just how flawed the Universal Credit system is:
   a. Over 700 errors flagged to the DWP by this council alone since April 2018 – these errors resulted in £335k in overpayments and £215k in underpayments;
   b. In many cases council staff have had to refer the DWP to their own regulations;
   c. In February 2019 LBTH Housing Benefit assessors identified an obvious contrived tenancy between family members and notified the DWP that UC housing element should not be paid. The council issued four notifications to DWP before they stopped the payment which resulted in a £18k overpayment;
   d. A lone parent placed in temporary accommodation had claimed UC, but the DWP did not understand its own rules (which the DWP had changed) and argued that the council should be paying Housing Benefit. The case took from January to September to resolve and eventually the DWP acknowledged their mistake and awarded £15k UC.

4. The Council commissioned the Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) to research the experiences of Tower Hamlets’ families with children in receipt of universal credit. A qualitative research study between October 2018 and July 2019 found:
   a. 79% of responses included some negative sentiment about universal credit;
   b. The transition to Universal Credit has been problematic, and that claimants found making and managing claims using the online system difficult;
   c. Claimants often had problems with Universal Credit payments, finding they varied and were often miscalculated or unexpectedly stopped;
   d. Stakeholders highlighted the monthly payment system, Advance Payment Arrangements and deductions as problematic for claimants;
   e. Claimants and stakeholders had negative experiences of JobCentrePlus (JCP) and interactions with the DWP. “A lack of support, training and awareness among JCP staff seems to have resulted in an absence of dignity for claimants, while stakeholders complained of poor communications with the DWP”;
   f. Many claimants were struggling to get by with the amount of universal credit they received, and were in debt and arrears as a result of being on universal credit. This is exacerbated by the system of payment in arrears and the five-week wait at the start of claims;
   g. Universal credit was seen to have had a negative impact on children.
5. That Tower Hamlets Council has established a multi-million pound Tackling Poverty Fund and is working in partnership with CPAG to understand the impact of Universal Credit in Tower Hamlets and to deliver welfare advice in a local food bank which delivered £230k in income maximisation for residents in its first 5 months.

This Council believes:

1. That social security should lift people out of poverty, but Universal Credit is leaving people in debt and arrears, forcing many people to turn to food banks to survive;

2. Social security should support people rather than driving them into poverty;

3. That Universal Credit is not fit for purpose and is having a severely detrimental impact on residents in Tower Hamlets;

4. That Universal Credit should be scrapped and replaced with a new social security system that will support our residents rather than drive them into poverty.

This Council resolves:

1. To support calls for Universal Credit to be scrapped and replaced;

2. To campaign for emergency mitigation to be introduced, including scrapping the two-child limit and the benefit cap;

3. To ask the Cabinet Member to update members on how the council is responding to the recommendations set out in CPAG’s report.
SUMMARY

1. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for time at each Ordinary Council meeting for the discussion of one 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 motion submitted is listed overleaf. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, submission of the Opposition Motion for Debate will alternate in sequence between the opposition groups. This Opposition Motion is submitted by the Conservative Group.

3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council or its partners has a direct responsibility. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.

4. Notice of any proposed amendments to the Motions must be given to the Monitoring Officer by Noon the day before the meeting.

MOTION

Set out overleaf is the motion that has been submitted.
8 – Opposition Motion by the Conservative Group – regarding the Queens Speech and Manifesto Commitments

Proposer: Councillor Andrew Wood
Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

This Council notes:

- The election on the 12th December 2019 of a new majority Conservative government.
- A Queens Speech on the 19th December 2019 containing a large number of proposed Bills, some of direct relevance and interest to Tower Hamlets Council.
- That the government was elected with a new manifesto containing a number of sections of direct relevance and interest to Tower Hamlets Council as noted below.
- The increase in the Public Works Loan Board interest rate from 1.82% to 2.82% in October 2019.

This Council further notes:

That the new Conservative manifesto & Queens Speech contains a number of sections directly relevant to Tower Hamlets. Some examples (but not limited to) include:

“*We will maintain our commitment to a Right to Buy for all council tenants. We will also maintain the voluntary Right to Buy scheme agreed with housing associations. Following the successful voluntary pilot scheme in the Midlands, we will evaluate new pilot areas in order to spread the dream of home ownership to even more people.*”

For example we in Tower Hamlets could ask to be one of the new pilot areas in order to ensure that the new voluntary scheme works in London.

“As *Boris Johnson has promised, we will bring forward a Social Housing White Paper which will set out further measures to empower tenants and support the continued supply of social homes. This will include measures to provide greater redress, better regulation and improve the quality of social housing.*”

We in Tower Hamlets need to be influencing this White Paper given both the large stock of existing as well as the large number of new build social homes we have which bring with them unique issues.

“*Infrastructure first. We will amend planning rules so that the infrastructure – roads, schools, GP surgeries – comes before people move into new homes*”

Given that Tower Hamlets is the most important deliverer of new homes in the country (exemplified by a record 10th year of New Homes Bonus receipts) this is a critically important for us to ensure that those new planning rules work for us here in Tower Hamlets.

“In particular, we will make the UK the leading global hub for life sciences after Brexit.”

We should work with the government to make the Life Sciences centre in Whitechapel the leading centre in London if not the country.

“We will invest £1 billion in completing a fast-charging network to ensure that everyone is within 30 miles of a rapid electric vehicle charging station.”
With more than 40,000 vehicles registered in Tower Hamlets it is clear that we need to substantially expand the charging network as a new generation of electric vehicles arrive so we should be aggressively bidding for a share of this money.

There are many more similar examples in the manifesto and Queens Speech which we need to explore.

This Council resolves:

Following the election of a new majority Conservative government Tower Hamlets to set up a new working group (modelled on the Tower Hamlets Brexit Commission) to work with other London Boroughs, the GLA and London MPs to secure the interests of London as an integral part of one nation.

That this group should seek to constructively engage with the new governments legislative agenda in order to ensure that the voice of Tower Hamlets specifically and other London Boroughs more generally are heard in the legislative process to ensure that those new Acts of Parliament work effectively here.

That as a first step that we write to Sajid Javid and Robert Jenrick seeking a change to the Public Works Loan Board interest rate policy. We should request that borrowing to invest in building much needed new Council homes and new infrastructure should be charged at a lower interest rate then borrowing to buy commercial properties to generate a financial return for local authorities.
Questions submitted by Members of the Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originating Officer(s)</th>
<th>Matthew Mannion, Head of Democratic Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards affected</td>
<td>All wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions that were submitted by Members of the Council for response by the Mayor, the Speaker or the Chair of a Committee or Sub-Committee at the Council meeting on Wednesday 15 January 2020.

2. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.4, questions relating to Executive functions and decisions taken by the Mayor are put to the Mayor unless he delegates such a decision to another Member, who will therefore be responsible for answering the question. In the absence of the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor will answer questions directed to the Mayor.

3. Questions are limited to one per Member per meeting, plus one supplementary question unless the Member has indicated that only a written reply is required and in these circumstances a supplementary question is not permitted. Oral responses are time limited to one minute. Supplementary questions and responses are also time limited to one minute each.

4. Council Procedure Rule 10.7 provides for an answer to take the form of a written answer circulated to the questioner, a reference to a published work or a direct oral answer.

5. There is a time limit of thirty minutes at the Council meeting for consideration of Members’ questions with no extension of time allowed and any questions not put within this time are dealt with by way of written responses.

6. Members must confine their contributions to questions and answers and not make statements or attempt to debate.
MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS

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

9.1 Question from Councillor Dipa Das

Can the Mayor update members on the pledge to welcome 10 unaccompanied child refugees to our borough, under the Dubs scheme?

9.2 Question from Councillor Peter Golds

Will the Mayor comment on how the Council will use the recently announced £5.1 million homeless grant from government?

9.3 Question from Councillor Sufia Alam

How is the Council preparing for any forthcoming inspection of Youth Justice Services?

9.4 Question from Councillor Andrew Wood

Has the council been involved in or signed off on the large salary increases granted by Veolia to staff before they transfer to Tower Hamlets Council from the 1st April 2020?

9.5 Question from Councillor Kyrsten Perry

What steps are we taking as a Council to tackle the climate emergency?

9.6 Question from Councillor Shah Ameen

Can we have an update from the cabinet member on the two recent fatal incidents in Whitechapel ward and what the police and the council are doing to improve confidence amongst residents?

9.7 Question from Councillor Leema Qureshi

What progress has been made against the commitment to plant 1,000 trees across the borough?

9.8 Question from Councillor Mohammed Pappu

When will the identified changes that are urgently needed regarding parking around City Island & Orchard place be implemented?

9.9 Question from Councillor Denise Jones

With continued austerity for local government, what level of savings is Tower Hamlets required to make over the coming years and is there any indication from the new Conservative Government that this situation will improve any time soon?

9.10 Question from Councillor Puru Miah

Can the Mayor please give an update on the implementation in the Council of the All-Party Parliamentary Groups Islamophobia definition, passed by the Council in March?
9.11 Question from Councillor Val Whitehead

What action will the Mayor and lead Member take to ensure Clarion Housing improve their contact centre and repair service which is causing severe detriment to our Bow residents?

9.12 Question from Councillor Dan Tomlinson

How are discussions with Transport for London progressing with respect to the construction of new pedestrian crossings over the A12 at Bromley-by-Bow? This scheme has been consulted on, developer contributions are available for it, and yet there has been little sign of progress over the past year.

9.13 Question from Councillor John Pierce

What actions has the Mayor of Tower Hamlets taken to tackle anti-social behaviour in the Boundary Estate?

9.14 Question from Councillor James King

Can I have an update on the process and funding thereof of the structural repair of Malting and Brewster Houses?

9.15 Question from Councillor Marc Francis

Will the Lead Member for Housing Services explain the rationale for the proposal to scrap Band 3 of the Choice Based Lettings scheme effectively denying those 8,000 households the chance of a move to social housing in Tower Hamlets unless they become disabled, homeless or overcrowded?

9.16 Question from Councillor Asma Islam

The Conservative Party’s general election manifesto promised to ‘continue the roll-out of Universal Credit’ – does the Mayor think this is the right thing to do given the impact of universal credit on residents in Tower Hamlets?

9.17 Question from Councillor Kahar Chowdhury

A study from the Institute for Public Policy Research, has found that social security payments are now at their lowest level since the launch of the welfare state, and the Trussell Trust reveals that the demand for food banks has risen by 3,772% over the last decade. What steps is the council taking to mitigate some of the worst impacts of the benefit changes in Tower Hamlets.

9.18 Question from Councillor Rabina Khan

The community language service campaign held another meeting in December 2019 raising concerns that the service may not be running as promised by the Mayor? Will the service be running as previously?
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The attached report was presented to Cabinet on Wednesday 27 November 2019 where the Mayor agreed to forward the report to Council for decision.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1. The Council is recommended to adopt the Local Plan recommendations as set out in the main report.
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Executive Summary
The Local Plan sets out a vision, strategic priorities and a spatial planning policy framework for development in the Borough. Its purpose is to direct the determination of planning applications and positively plan for the development and infrastructure requirements to meet the needs of existing and future communities. The Local Plan has been through an extensive preparation process, including evidence base collection, public consultation and independent examination.

On 21 February 2018, full Council approved the Local Plan (submission version) to be submitted to the Secretary of State for an Examination in Public (EiP) (see Appendix 4). Upon Submission, the Secretary of State appointed an independent Planning Inspector to undertake the EiP which ran from 6 to 21 September and 11 to 12 October 2018. The Inspector’s Final Report (see Appendix 1) was received on the 20 September 2019 and has been published on the Council’s web site. The report concludes that the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant, subject to a number of modifications. The modifications were consulted on by the Inspector from 29 March to 9 May 2019.

It is now necessary to adopt the Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits (Local Plan) to ensure the Council has a robust and up-to-date spatial planning policy framework. Once adopted, the Local Plan will replace the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Managing Development Document (2013).

Recommendations:
The full Council is recommended to:

1. Note that the Local Plan has been subject to further amendments (following its submission to the Inspector in February 2018) as part of the independent public examination, as described in:
a. the Inspector’s Final Report (see appendix 1), and;
b. schedule of main and additional modifications (see appendix 2).


3. Adopt the Local Plan, including the modifications recommended by the Inspector and the additional minor modifications proposed by officers, in accordance with Section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.


5. Authorise the Corporate Director of Place in consultation with the Mayor and Lead Member for Planning, Air Quality and Tackling Poverty to make typographical amendments to the plan prior to its publication to improve cross-referencing (e.g. paragraph numbering, page re-numbering) and typographical errors.

6. Agree to revoke the Council’s current adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Managing Development Document (2013). It is recommended that the current adopted Plans are revoked following the statutory six week legal challenge period of the Local Plan adoption.

7. Note that Cabinet has agreed to revoke the following Council’s supplementary/Interim planning documents, subject to adoption of the Local Plan by the full Council (see appendix 3 for a full SPD review). The following documents will be removed as planning policy guidance to ensure an effective and efficient development management process. It will be revoked following the statutory six week legal challenge period of the Local Plan adoption.

   c. Former Whitechapel Masterplan (2007)
   g. South Quay Masterplan (2015)

1. **REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

1.1 The Local Plan is a statutory requirement as set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Section 19 sets out specific matters to which the local planning authority must have regard when preparing a local plan. Regulations 8 and 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Local
Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 prescribe the general form and content of local plans and adopted policies maps, while regulation 10 states what additional matters local planning authorities must have regard to when drafting their local plans.

1.2 The Local Plan is necessary to ensure that an up-to-date planning framework is in place to support the borough’s growth. The Local Plan will ensure:

a. new developments meet the needs of the borough and designed to the highest standards; and
b. key sites deliver infrastructure to support an increasing population – including new schools, health facilities and local parks.

1.3 On receipt of the Inspector’s Final Report, the Council must consider whether to adopt the Local Plan. If the Council decides to adopt the Local Plan then it must accept the Inspector’s recommendations if the plan is to be deemed ‘sound’ and have full weight.

1.4 The adoption of the Local Plan will provide the Council with updated and detailed policies and guidance to determine planning applications and manage development. The Local Plan has been developed to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the London Plan (2016).

1.5 The document will replace the Council’ current Local Plan which consists of the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Managing Development Document (2013). Although relatively recent documents, the introduction of new housing and job targets through the London Plan, along with recent changes to national planning policy and legislation requires the Council to bring forward a new Local Plan to manage increased growth and respond to emerging trends.

2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

OPTION A: RETAIN THE EXISTING LOCAL PLAN

2.1 The current Local Plan has not planned for sufficient infrastructure such as schools, open space and transport to meet the needs arising from the borough’s revised annual housing target and projected employment growth set out in the London Plan.

2.2 Without a new and up-to-date Local Plan in place, there is a risk that development will not come forward in a coordinated manner, making it difficult to deliver the social and physical infrastructure necessary to support the anticipated number of new homes and jobs. By not allocating sufficient sites, the borough could miss out on the benefits of growth to the detriment of local people.

2.3 The evidence on which the current Local Plan is based is becoming
increasingly out-of-date. The National Planning Policy Framework and London Plan would become default policies on matters not addressed within the existing Local Plan, meaning local circumstances would not necessarily be reflected to guide planning applications and decisions.

2.4 It also means that in some cases the Council’s ability to successfully defend refusals at appeal would be compromised.

**OPTION B: REJECT THE FINDINGS OF THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDED SCHEDULE OF MAIN MODIFICATIONS AND WITHDRAW THE LOCAL PLAN**

2.5 The Inspector’s main modifications are required to make the plan sound. The Local Plan cannot be legally adopted unless these changes are made. The Council does not have to accept these changes and could decide to withdraw rather than adopt the Local Plan. Subsequently, the Council can revisit the Local Plan to prepare a new plan. It should be noted this option would take approximately four years from inception through to adoption and incur significant costs. This represents an inefficient use of public funds and resources.

2.6 In addition to the cost, further delaying an up-to-date Local Plan would pose a significant risk to the long term growth and prosperity of the borough, as set out in paragraph 2.1 to 2.4.

3. **DETAILS OF THE REPORT**

**Background**

3.1 The Tower Hamlets Local Plan is the borough’s key planning document and is a statutory requirement. It sets out the authority’s policies (however expressed) relating to the development and use of land in their area. With a view to guiding future growth and investment, as well as secure benefits from new developments, such as transport improvements, new open spaces and affordable housing. It covers a fifteen year period, from 2016 until 2031. More specifically, it sets out:

   a. a vision of what the borough will look and feel like in 2031;
   b. a series of objectives and supporting actions on how the benefits of this growth can be shared across the borough;
   c. a range of policies to inform and positively shape future development and investment decisions, such as new homes, jobs and supporting infrastructure;
   d. a series of priorities and principles that will guide and inform the future development of the borough’s individual places and key sites;
   e. a map showing the designations such as protected open space and the sites where new development will take place; and
   f. details on how we will implement and monitor these policies.
Local Plan Development Process

3.2 The Local Plan was prepared in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which requires the Local Plan to be:

a. consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the London Plan (2016);
b. underpinned by relevant and proportionate evidence base to inform content;
c. supported by options testing to explore alternative scenarios and implications of different policies or site allocations;
d. informed by a consultation and engagement process with the community and key stakeholders, including appraising the options of draft policies and site allocations;
e. supported by an Integrated Impact Assessment, which also includes the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Equalities Impact Assessment to review the policies and site allocations; and
f. examined in public by an independent Planning Inspector.

Consultation

3.3 The process for the preparation of the Local Plan is set out in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The report recommending submission to the SoS was considered by Members Advisory Board, Cabinet and full Council in February 2018. It outlined the extensive consultation and engagement process which was undertaken. The Tower Hamlets Local Plan process of preparation is summarised in table 1 below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key stages</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Purpose / nature of stage</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Early engagement            | Our Borough, Our Plan: A New Local Plan First Steps' | Regulation 18 | • Review of new and emerging policy and legislation, market changes, political priorities etc.  
• Outline scope of the plan  
• Key challenges / opportunities | 130 reps were received which contained 1,235 individual comments. |
| Preferred approach          | Tower Hamlets Draft Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing Benefits | Regulation 18 | • Draft version included policies and site allocations.  
• Public drop-in events, area-specific workshops and bespoke meetings with specific groups (e.g. the Youth Council)  
• Press and social media advertised | 103 reps were received which contained 908 individual comments. |
| Publication                 | Tower Hamlets Draft Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing Benefits | Regulation 19 | • Formal comments were sought on the final draft Local Plan.  
• In September 2017, Cabinet and Full Council gave approval to go out to formal consultation.  
• Comments were focussed on soundness and legal compliance  
• Public workshops  
• Press and social media advertised | 126 reps were received which contained 948 separate comments |
3.4 The Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with the relevant bodies in the process of preparing the Local Plan. The Council has also undertaken extensive consultation and engagement with the community in accordance with the Council’s SCI and national legislation.

3.5 The consultation and engagement process has shaped and informed the development of the Local Plan. The Local Plan represents a collaborative approach between the Council and key external stakeholders (including statutory agencies, landowners and residents).

### Submission

3.6 The Local Plan (submission version) was presented to full Council on 21 February 2018 for approval to submit to the Secretary of State. In accordance with regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council submitted the Local Plan, including supporting evidence base, to the Secretary of State on 28 February 2018 to undertake an independent examination into the soundness of the document.

### Examination

3.7 The Secretary of State appointed an independent Planning Inspector (Mrs Christa Masters) to conduct the independent public examination of the Local Plan to ensure it meets the requirements set out in national policy and legislation.

3.8 The examination hearing sessions took place over two stages (6-21 September and 10-11 October 2018). The structure of the hearings focused on specific topics that were determined by the Inspector for further examination. The hearings were attended by key representors, including landowners, GLA, English Heritage and representatives of the local community.

3.9 Officers from the Plan Making Team presented both verbal and written evidence (in some cases supported by Counsel) to demonstrate the
soundness of the Local Plan, with assistance from other service areas such as education, infrastructure, open space, housing, public health, waste, transport and enterprise. The hearing sessions were also open to the public. Organisations and individuals (e.g. developers, landowners and other stakeholders) who had responded to the regulation 19 consultation were also invited to take part in the hearing sessions.

3.10 Following the hearing sessions, the Planning Inspector proposed a number of changes (known as “main modifications”) to the Local Plan in the light of these discussions. Main modifications are changes the inspector deems necessary to make the plan sound.

3.11 The Planning Inspector invited comments on the main modifications between Monday 25 March and Thursday 9 May 2019. Comments were sought on the content of the main modifications (soundness) and the way in which they had been prepared (legal compliance).

3.12 Alongside these changes, comments were also invited on:

a. the proposed changes to the Policies Map (as a consequence of the main modifications); and
b. the appraisal of the social, economic and environmental impacts of the main modifications (known as the Integrated Impact Assessment).

3.13 Whilst not forming part of the consultation, officers proposed a number of additional modifications to improve the clarity of the Local Plan. A schedule of these changes is attached at appendix 2. None of these changes will fundamentally alter the substance or strategic direction of the Local Plan. Additional modifications are largely confined to typographical/grammatical amendments, factual updates, additional clarification or editorial changes to improve the clarity of the plan as a whole.

3.14 It should be noted that following the hearing sessions, National Planning Policy Framework (2012) was revised and published in July 2018 and updated in February 2019. National Planning Policy Framework (2019) includes a transitional arrangement in paragraph 214 whereby, for the purpose of examining the Plan, the policies in the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework applied. Therefore, throughout this report, National Planning Policy Framework (2012) is referenced.

Inspector’s Report

3.15 The Inspector’s Final Report (appendix 1) was received on the 20 September 2019. The Inspector concluded that, subject to a number of main modifications, the Tower Hamlets Local Plan (submission version) satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework as well as meeting all aspects of legal compliance and the duty to cooperate. It therefore provides
an appropriate basis to guide the future planning and development of the 
borough, subject the main modifications.

3.16 To adopt Local Plan, the Council is required to accept the Inspector’s 
recommended main modifications in order to meet legal and statutory 
requirements to ensure the Local Plan is ‘sound’. These main modifications, 
together with additional minor modifications that the Council consulted on are 
set out in appendix 2.

3.17 The Inspector’s changes do not include any new policies, designations, 
targets or significant amendments to the content of the plan and the proposed 
development sites have been retained.

3.18 The Inspector’s Final Report has been published on the Council’s web site.

Next Steps

3.19 The main modifications and the additional modifications will be consolidated 
into a desktop version of the final Local Plan (see appendix 5(a-j)).

3.20 Subject to full Council adopting the Local Plan, it will be finalised and 
published on the Council’s web site and made available in the borough’s Idea 
Stores, libraries and planning reception at the Town Hall. The Local Plan will 
carry full weight in the determination of planning applications and will become 
part of the borough’s development plan alongside the London Plan and any 
relevant neighbourhood plans.

3.21 The Council will need to prepare an Adoption Statement to accompany the 
Local Plan in accordance with regulation 26 of the Town and Country 
Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Adoption 
Statement sets out:

a. date which the Local Plan was adopted;
b. modifications following the submission version (February 2018); and 
c. notice that any person aggrieved by the process can make an application 
to the High Court within 6 weeks from the date of adoption.

3.22 Following adoption of the Local Plan there will be a statutory six week legal 
challenge period. The six weeks will commence from the date of adoption 
which will be the full Council meeting.

3.23 Under section 113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, an 
application can be made within six weeks of adoption to the High Court to 
quash a Local Plan (either in whole or part). However, we can still put full 
weight on the policies in the plan during the challenge period.

3.24 In the event of such a challenge, a further report will be presented to Cabinet 
and full Council to provide a suitable update on the expected process and 
associated risks.
3.25 Following the challenge period, the current adopted policies within the Local Plan (Core Strategy (2010) and Managing Development Document (2013)) would need to be removed in order to facilitate an efficient planning policy framework. These policies will be deemed superseded following the adoption of the new Local Plan and the challenge period.

4. **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 In carrying out the function of preparing a Local Plan, regard must be given to the duty to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010. The duty (as set out at section 149 of the 2010 act) requires the council, when exercising its functions, to have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate discrimination (both direct and indirect discrimination), harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under the act, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a ‘protected characteristic’ and those who do not share that protected characteristic. The protected characteristics and groups are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, gender, religion or belief, sexual orientation and marriage/civil partnership status.

4.2 As the Local Plan is a Borough wide document that will potentially impact on all of those who live, work and visit the Borough. In order to consider the potential equalities impacts of these policies, the Council’s Equalities Impact Assessment process was undertaken of the Local Plan. This is a two-stage approach to the analysis of equality issues and based on the Equality Analysis Quality Assurance Checklist, a Full Equalities Impact Assessment was not deemed necessary as the Local Plan exhibited due regard to the Council’s Public Sector Equality Duty. The approach to this assessment was discussed with the Council’s Senior Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer (Equality) officer at the time who confirmed that completion of the QA checklist was sufficient. The review of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan came to the same conclusion, as did the review following the main modifications of the Plan. Steps were taken to ensure due regard for the nine protected groups was embedded in the process to produce, and the policies of, the Local Plan as it continued to develop. There are policies in the Local Plan which, while not focussed on people who share one or more of the nine Protected Characteristics identified under the Equality Act 2010, could have significant positive effects. These include policies relating to housing, employment, transport and mobility and inclusive design. The provision of adaptable and accessible housing will bring positive outcomes for the disabled and others. The safeguarding and provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers are also positive.

4.3 A suggestion arising from undertaking the Equality Analysis Quality Assurance Checklist at the Regulation 18 stage was that the officers considering consulting with or briefing other groups meeting during the consultation period on the Draft Local Plan, e.g. groups identified in the Council’s Single Equality Framework, e.g. Community Forums, Local Voices and other relevant local groups if they were meeting during the period over which the document was being consulted on. The Council agreed with this
recommendation and undertook additional consultation at Regulation 18 stage. At the Regulation 19 stage, contacts were made with all groups contacted at the Regulation 18 stage. The approach to this assessment was discussed with the Council’s Senior Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer (Equality) officer at the time who confirmed that completion of the QA checklist was sufficient. The review of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan has come to the same conclusion.

4.4 Equalities has been embedded into the policies of the Local Plan so that it is at the heart of the decision making process on the determination of planning applications. Part 3 of the Local Plan sets out a strategy for delivering sustainable growth across the borough, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that the built environment is accessible (especially to those with physical impairments) and promotes community safety and cohesion. This will help to ensure the continued delivery of ‘One Tower Hamlets’ - a place where people from all backgrounds are able to have their voice heard and share equal life chances.

5. OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are either not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:

- Best Value Implications,
- Consultations,
- Environmental (including air quality),
- Risk Management,
- Crime Reduction,
- Safeguarding,
- Data Protection / Privacy Impact Assessment.

Equalities

5.2 For the Local Plan, a screening opinion on the need to undertake a full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out as part of the Integrated Impact Assessment. This confirmed that a full Equalities Impact Assessment is not necessary because due regard is given to the council’s Public Sector Equality Duty within the emerging Local Plan.

5.3 Policies on safeguarding and provision of accommodation for gypsies and travellers and the provision of adaptable and accessible accommodation will bring positive outcomes for different groups, including the disabled. For the regulation 19 consultation, a wide range of groups and organisations from the voluntary and community sector were contacted (including those identified in the council’s Single Equality Framework) to invite them to participate in the preparation of the Local Plan process. Among them included representatives from the youth council, faith groups, local business forums, black and ethnic minority groups, health organisations and the network of organisations representing disabled people. Officers will continue to work with the council's
equalities team to ensure actions are undertaken to mitigate any impacts on the equality profile of those affected by the Local Plan.

**Best Value Implications**

5.4 Under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 the Council must make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. This is in addition to the duty under section 13 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to carry out a review of planning policies. The new Local Plan will enable the council to continue to ensure that the delivery of housing, infrastructure and other new development is optimised, and that social, economic and environmental benefits continue to be secured and shared across the borough and beyond. The development of sites following the policies and guidance contained within the new Local Plan will generate section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions, where relevant. This may include the delivery of new affordable housing, local enterprise and employment opportunities, public realm enhancements and transport infrastructure.

**Environmental**

5.5 Sustainability appraisal is a legal requirement for the preparation and development of a Local Plan. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, sustainability appraisals must comply with the requirements of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The SEA ensures environmental issues are incorporated into the Local Plan and assessed in decision-making throughout the entire plan-making process. The sustainability appraisal will be submitted to the secretary of state alongside the new Local Plan as part of the Integrated Impact Assessment.

5.6 The Local Plan will help ensure a greener environment in a number of ways, including:

- protecting and enhancing areas of open space and water space;
- promoting biodiversity;
- managing the impacts of construction on communities;
- reducing and minimising waste within developments;
- promoting sustainable transport options, such as new pedestrian and cycle routes; and
- ensuring new buildings and spaces meet the highest standards of environmental sustainability and design.

**Risk Management**

5.7 Throughout its preparation, the emerging Local Plan has been regularly reported and presented to a number of internal groups that consider risk management issues and mitigation measures. These have included:

- Local Plan: Internal Stakeholders Group;
5.8 The Corporate Leadership Team approved a Project Initiation Document (PID) in May 2015. Officers have worked collaboratively across the relevant services on developing the new Local Plan and its evidence base through CLT and a Local Plan Internal Stakeholder Group. The Mayor of Tower Hamlets and Lead Member for Strategic Development and Waste have been briefed frequently on the new Local Plan, providing significant input into the development of the Local Plan.

**Crime Reduction**

5.9 The Local Plan contains policies that seeks to ensure the design of developments minimises opportunities for crime and disorder and creates a safer and more secure environment. In particular, development will be required to incorporate the principles of ‘secured by design’ to improve safety and perception of safety for pedestrians and other users, without compromising the ability to create aesthetic and functional public spaces, such as crowded places.

6. **COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

6.1 There are no direct financial implications emanating from this report which recommends the adoption of the Local Plan. All costs incurred in developing this plan have been incurred in previous financial years.

6.2 There will be future financial implications for both income and expenditure as a result of the adoption of this Local Plan and its implementation when making planning decisions. There is an expectation that these implications will be managed within existing resource allocations.

7. **COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

7.1 The Local Government Act 2000 created the executive model of government whereby functions not reserved to Full Council are to be the responsibility of the Executive. Other functions and responsibilities are to be shared between Full Council and the Executive. Functions which are to be the shared responsibility of the Full Council and the Cabinet are those relating to the Council’s policy framework and budget. Development Plans are a shared responsibility. In cases where there is shared responsibility the law (The Local Authorities Functions and Responsibilities Regulations 2000 as amended by the 2005 Regulations in relation to Planning) provide that the decision making is shared so that the Executive makes proposals for Full Council to agree, reject or send back to Cabinet for different proposals.

7.2 Section 13 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the local planning authority to keep under review the matters which may be expected to affect the development of their area or the planning of its development. By section 17(3) of the same Act the authority must keep
under review their local development documents having regard to the results of any review carried out under section 13. Paragraph 2.2 of the report sets out the outcome of the reviews.

7.3 The Procedure for preparing and adopting a local plan is set out in section 19 to 24 of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and part 6 of the Local Plan Regulations 2012. In preparing the plan the Council has to have regard to the matters set out in section 19(2) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, among other matters. For a London Borough this list of matters includes, having regard to the London Plan, national policies and other LDDs adopted by the Council. This Report sets out how the Council has met these obligations. The NPPF sets out in detail other matters which ought to be addressed in local plans. For the purposes of this Local Plan the relevant NPPF was the 2012 edition. Finally, Part 6 of the Local plan Regulations set out other procedural requirements. Where a statement of Community Involvement is in place the process must comply with its requirements in addition to those of the Regulations. This report sets out how these requirements have been met.

7.4 Section 20 of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the Plan be submitted to independent examination. The report indicates that an Examination has taken place and that the Inspector has made recommendations.

7.5 To come into force the local plan has to be adopted by resolution of full council on the recommendation of the Executive. The full Council has the following options:

- Adopt the plan with any main recommendations recommended by the Inspector and any non-material modifications as required by the Council
- Defer adoption of the plan while asking the secretary of state to intervene under section 21 and to overrule the inspector
- Bring Judicial Review proceedings against the Inspector
- Withdraw the plan

This report is recommending the first option.

7.6 Under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Duty to conserve biodiversity), the local authority “must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”.

7.7 Under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) (Duty to consider crime and disorder implications), the local authority has a “duty …..to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment)…”
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7.8 Section 144 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, requires local planning authorities (to have regard to the London Mayor's Transport Strategy) in the exercise of all its functions.

7.9 This report shows how these various considerations have been taken into account.
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- N/A

Appendices
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- Appendix 3 – Supplementary/Interim Planning Document Review
- Appendix 4 – Submission version of the Local Plan
- Appendix 5(a-j) – Final desktop published version of the Local Plan 2031
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The attached report was presented to Cabinet on Wednesday 27 November 2019 where the Mayor agreed to forward it to Council for agreement.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1. The Council is recommended to:

   1. Adopt the Tower Hamlets Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.
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Adoption of a new Tower Hamlets Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule

Lead Member | Councillor Cllr Rachel Blake, Cabinet Member for Planning, Air Quality and Tackling Poverty
---|---
Originating Officer(s) | Matthew Pullen, Infrastructure Planning Manager
| Joshim Uddin, Development Viability Team Leader
Wards affected | All wards
Key Decision? | Yes
Decision Notice Published | 15 October 2019
Reason for Key Decision | The new CIL rate will generate additional funding to deliver much-needed infrastructure to support developments within the Borough.
Strategic Plan Priority / Outcome | A great place to live

Executive Summary

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a pound per square metre charge on most types of new development, charged to pay for supporting infrastructure. The rates currently chargeable in Tower Hamlets (which exclude the area of the borough within the London Legacy Development Corporation area which is subject to a separate charge) are set out in a Charging Schedule that was adopted by the Council in April 2015.

This item recommends the adoption of a new schedule subsequent to three separate public consultations and examination in public. The newly proposed Charging Schedule seeks to increase the rates the Council currently charges.

Recommendations:

The Mayor in Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Allow all relevant reporting and associated actions to take place for the full Council to formally adopt the new CIL Charging Schedule in accordance with The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, Regulation 25.

2. Note that there have been some minor amendments made subsequent to the examination in public (in respect of student housing and some minor
errors in the funding gap report). These amendments are not substantial or
affect the need for a Charging Schedule.

1 REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

1.1 The reason for the decision is to allow the Council to adopt the proposed CIL
Charging Schedule to maximise the funding to deliver much needed
supporting infrastructure.

1.2 The report from the examiner following examination in public examination
confirm that the proposed rate satisfies the requirements of Section 212 of the
Planning 2008 Act and meets the criteria for viability in the 2010 Regulations
(as amended). Therefore, the examiner recommended that the proposed
Charging Schedule be approved.

2 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

2.1 One alternative option would be to not seek to renew the Council’s CIL
Charging Schedule. This is not considered appropriate because it would not
be a reasonable response to the consultation. The review was carried out
because the Council has an infrastructure funding gap and as the
Independent Examiner has approved the reasons for the review the option of
not approving the new charge would have to be exceptional.

3 DETAILS OF THE REPORT

Background

What is CIL?

3.1 CIL is a pounds per square metre charge on most new development and must
be used to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of the area.
It can be used to provide new infrastructure, increase the capacity of existing
infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if that is necessary to
support development. Please note that the Council currently collects the
Mayor of London’s CIL as well as local CIL – this document only pertains to
the local CIL Charging Schedule.

3.2 CIL is payable on the commencement of relevant planning permissions. It
generally takes many months for any development to go from permission to
commencement and it can take up to three years for larger developments to
commence.

3.3 CIL is charged on most types of development and the CIL Regulations are
highly prescriptive on the way CIL is calculated and applied to development;
unlike with Section 106 Planning Obligations there is no negotiation.
However, developers may apply for relief from the CIL payment for affordable
housing dwellings or for developments by charity and, if permitted by the local authority, exceptional circumstances although the Council has never approved an application on this basis.

3.4 Seeking CIL contributions and Section 106 Planning Obligations to pay for the same type of infrastructure is generally prohibited (the only exception to this relates to financial contributions from development for Crossrail). The Council has a Regulation 123 List (within Appendix F) which identifies the types of projects on which the Council intends to spend its CIL.

How can a Charging Authority spend CIL?

3.5 It is the authority of the Executive to decide how to spend CIL. All expenditure decisions of the Council are the function of the Council’s Executive unless regulatory functions require otherwise. There are no regulatory restrictions on CIL in terms of who decides how these funding sources are spent. CIL was provided for in the Planning Act 2008. It is a financial charge that local authorities can levy on developments to help fund infrastructure such as schools, health, open space and transport facilities to support growth in an authority’s area. Please note that the proposals described in this document do not relate to how the Council will spend current or future CIL income.

How are CIL rates set?

3.6 A requirement of CIL rate setting is the need to demonstrate that the Council needs, in financial terms, to charge a CIL to deliver infrastructure to support development. Therefore, the Council must identify a funding gap in delivering infrastructure to support development. This information is set out in the Councils Supporting Evidence and Funding Gap report (October 2019).

3.7 CIL rates are based on what development across the borough can viably afford. The Council commissioned BNP Paribas Real Estate to undertake a Viability Study to establish the rates that can apply in Tower Hamlets’ Charging Authority Area. It should be noted that rates cannot be set to reflect the Council’s entire funding gap as CIL must be based on what development can viably afford. CIL is only one funding stream that should be utilised to fund infrastructure.

3.8 The Viability Study undertakes testing on generic development types across the borough as well as a number of selected “Strategic Sites” which are made up of a selection of the Council’s site allocations in the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits (submission version). The Viability Study takes account of all of the policy costs attached to the new Local Plan.

What is the process for adopting a new CIL Charging Schedule?

3.9 In order to implement a new Charging Schedule for Tower Hamlets, the CIL
Regulations 2010 (as amended) require that a Charging Schedule setting out CIL rates must be the subject of at least two stages of consultation – three consultations were held in total.

3.10 Guidance states that Charging Authorities should make these consultations at least 6 weeks long. Before the Charging Schedule can be adopted it must then be approved at a public examination and then adopted in a Full Council meeting.

A national review of the CIL process

3.11 In September 2019 the Government updated the guidance on CIL which includes the process of implementing new schedules.

3.12 The changes have removed the restriction on pooling more than 5 planning obligations towards a single piece of infrastructure, alongside the removal of the Regulation 123 List and its replacement with the annual Infrastructure Funding Statement.

3.13 The updated regulations relax the requirements for local authorities to consult on CIL charging schedules before adoption. Charging authorities will now be required to conduct one round of consultation, rather than the two rounds previously required.

3.14 However, the outcomes of the new regulations and the extent to which they apply do not impact the Council’s actions in adopting a new Charging Schedule. Officers do not consider it necessary to delay or postpone adoption as there are no material impacts impeding its ability to be approved.

Proposals

Proposed rates

3.15 The following table identifies the Council’s current CIL rates (in brackets) alongside the rates proposed (bold, red) in the new Charging Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development type</th>
<th>Proposed CIL rate per sq. m (GIA) of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Sale)</td>
<td>Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>City Fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Borough Wide, except Large Allocated Sites</th>
<th>Large Allocated Sites*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail (Except Convenience Supermarkets/ Superstores and Retail Warehousing)</td>
<td>(£70) £100</td>
<td>(£70) £100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Supermarkets/ Superstores and Retail Warehousing</td>
<td>Borough Wide, except Large Allocated Sites</td>
<td>Large Allocated Sites*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£120) £130</td>
<td>(Nil) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Borough Wide, except Large Allocated Sites</td>
<td>Large Allocated Sites*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£180) £190</td>
<td>(Nil) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Let at Market Rents</td>
<td>Borough Wide, except Large Allocated Sites</td>
<td>Large Allocated Sites*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£425) £450</td>
<td>(Nil) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Let at Below Market Rents</td>
<td>Borough Wide, except Large Allocated Sites</td>
<td>Large Allocated Sites*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Nil) Nil</td>
<td>(Nil) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Uses</td>
<td>Borough Wide</td>
<td>(Nil) Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that the Council’s current Charging Schedule has a nil rate for four sites (Wood Wharf, Westferry Printworks, Bishopsgate Goods Yard and London Dock) that were rated as such by the Examiner of the Council’s current Charging Schedule. The newly proposed Charging Schedule will not have any nil rated sites, every site including those previously nil rated will now be subject to CIL.

3.16 The Council’s Charging Schedule attached at Appendix B describes the rates proposed.

3.17 Whilst CIL income is very difficult to project, it is estimated that a new Charging Schedule could raise up to an additional £29m above the currently adopted CIL Charging Schedule for the Council up to the end of the year 2030/31.

4 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

4.1 An Equality Assurance Checklist was completed (October 2017) and referred to the Mayor in Cabinet in respect of the approval to consult before proceeding to examination and adoption of the new schedule. This Equality Assurance Checklist (which is attached at Appendix H) found that the proposal:
Does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share Protected Characteristics and no further actions are recommended at this stage.

4.2 Because the proposals have not changed in any way that would have any equalities implications, it has not been considered necessary to carry out another Equality Assurance Checklist.

5 OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are either not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:

- Best Value Implications,
- Consultations,
- Environmental (including air quality),
- Risk Management,
- Crime Reduction,
- Safeguarding.

5.2 The consultation(s) have been carried out in accordance of the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Council’s Statement of Community involvement.

5.3 The proposal has limited impact on best value implications and no safeguarding implications arise from the proposals.

5.4 In terms of risk management the proposals set out in this report seek to maximise the Council’s income through CIL. Maximising CIL income will help mitigate against the risk of the Council being unable to provide enough infrastructure to support development.

5.5 In terms of crime reduction implications proposals set out in this report seek to maximise the Council’s income through CIL. This will help the Council deliver infrastructure that might assist with the Council’s crime and disorder objectives.

5.6 In terms of environmental implications, the infrastructure delivered using the Council’s CIL can help the Council meet its sustainability and environmental objectives.

6 COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

6.1 The proposed rates in the new charging schedule would increase those currently charged. Additionally there are a number of sites that are currently
not subject to a CIL charge, which under the proposals would be. The current and proposed rates are set out in paragraph 3.15 and Appendix B.

6.2 Based on current development assumptions it is estimated that the proposed changes to the charging schedule could generate up to an additional £29m in the period 2020/21 to 2030/31. The total potential CIL income for the same period could be in the region of £224m.

6.3 The use of CIL income to fund specific infrastructure schemes would be considered as part of the Council’s capital governance arrangements.

6.4 In addition to the Tower Hamlets CIL, the Council is responsible for collecting Mayoral CIL payments on behalf of the London Mayor. The Mayoral CIL is independent of the Council’s CIL requirement.

7 COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES

7.1 This item seeks approval to approve a new CIL charging schedule following three separate public consultations and recommendations from an Inspector after Examination in Public. The proposed Charging Schedule would increase the rates the Council currently charges.

7.2 The decision making framing for this decision is to be found in Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended (“The Regulations”). The Act allows for the imposition of a charge known as the Community Infrastructure Levy (“CIL”) by a Charging Authority. The Council is a Charging Authority for these purposes. The Regulations provides a prescriptive staged process involving rounds of publication and consultation all of which the report indicates have been carried out. Legal Services has advised throughout those stages. Section 212 of the Act provides that a charging authority may approve a charging schedule only (a)if the examiner makes recommendations under section 212A(4) or (5), and (b)the charging authority has had regard to those recommendations and the examiner’s reasons for them. This report indicates that the Independent Examiner has recommended approval.

7.3 Attention is also drawn to section 13 and 14 of the Planning Act 2008 which provides that the Charging Authority in setting a charge must strike an appropriate balance between revenue maximisation on the one hand and the potentially adverse impact upon the viability of development on the other. The regulations also state that local authorities should take account of other sources of available funding for infrastructure when setting CIL rates.

7.4 Adopting the Charging Schedule is a non-executive function of the Full Council. Section 213 of the Planning Act further provides that a charging authority must approve a charging schedule (a) at a meeting of the authority, and (b) by a majority of votes of members present.
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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1. The attached report was presented to the General Purposes Committee on Tuesday 10 December 2019 who agreed to forward it to Council for approval.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

2.1. The Council is recommended to:

1. Approve the delegation of authority to London Councils to enable them to better support the boroughs in managing and delivering the provision of Electric Charge Points as set out in 3.5 of the main report.

2. Approve in principle the development of a new London-wide byelaw to control the operation of Dockless Cycle Hire Schemes within the Borough.

3. Authorise the Divisional Director, Public Realm to sign authorisation forms for both the above matters.
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Non-Executive Report of the:

Full Council
15 January 2020

Report of: Ann Sutcliffe, Corporate Director, Place

Classification: Open (Unrestricted)

Delegation of Role to London Councils’ Transport and Environment Committee (LC TEC)

| Originating Officer(s) | Dan Jones, Divisional Director, Public Realm  
Mehmet Mazhar, Business Manager Highways & Traffic  
Margaret Cooper, Head of Highways |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards affected</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Summary

This report advises Members of two new items being adopted by London Councils and seeks this Council’s approval to both. The first relates to establishing a London wide partnership to assist boroughs in the management and delivery of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (for residential and car club use) and the second to the development of a Londonwide bye-law to control Dockless Cycle Hire Schemes.

Note – this report was considered by the General Purposes Committee on 10 December 2019 and forwarded to Council for approval.

Recommendations:

The Full Council is recommended to:

1. Approve the delegation of authority to London Councils to enable them to better support the boroughs in managing and delivering the provision of Electric Charge Points as set out in 3.5 of this report.

2. Approve in principle the development of a new London-wide byelaw to control the operation of Dockless Cycle Hire Schemes within the Borough.

3. Authorise the Divisional Director, Public Realm to sign authorisation forms for both the above matters.

1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

1.1. To enable London Councils to provide a centralised delivery partnership and management resource to assist the boroughs in the installation of Electric
Charging Points throughout London.

1.2. To enable London Councils to develop a new Pan London bye law to control the operation of Dockless Cycle Hire Schemes within the borough.

2. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

2.1. Maintain status quo of only the Boroughs being responsible for this work in isolation of the rest of London.

2.2. Maintain status quo of having no effective legislation with which to control the spread of Dockless Cycle Hire schemes within the borough and across the capital.

3. **ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGE POINTS**

**Phase 1**

3.1 The London Councils / TfL GULCS (Go Ultra Low City Scheme) project team continues to support boroughs in their implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging points. This includes: establishing a framework contract for their delivery, managing funding allocations, dealing with technical queries regarding the procurement documents and organising events where boroughs can share knowledge and expertise. To date some 400 charge points have already been installed across London and over 800 are forecast to be installed by 31 March 2020. This compares to 35 Electric Vehicle Charge Points which have been installed in Tower Hamlets already, with 100 more planned for the current financial year.

3.2 The GULCS project team is also in the process of writing technical guidance, which will be the first in the country and relevant for everyone. This will be published and circulated to London boroughs and suppliers on the framework in March 2020

**Phase 2**

3.3 The original GULCS bid to Central Government for funding included an objective to provide a centralised delivery partnership and management resource for electric charge points, including a one stop shop for Londoners as part of the work streams for provision of electrical charge points for residential and car club use. This Phase Two work will be delivered under the arrangements which are now seeking approval.

3.4 The centralised approach would introduce a number of benefits including: economies of scale, a simplified process for customers and operators, and reduce the resource burden on local authorities, whilst allowing boroughs to retain control of the type, locations, and ownership of charge points. The One
Stop approach would provide a single website which would provide a central place for all Londoners to submit locations for charge points. Requests would be gathered centrally and sent straight to the relevant borough for consideration. The target is to set this up by the end of 2020.

3.5 The delivery partnership would not replace the authority which boroughs have to manage delivery of charge points throughout their areas which includes agreement of sites, installation timing and consultation processes. This coordination would save money, pool resources and expertise, and establish a consistent approach to delivery to support the ongoing work of the boroughs. It is now intended to proceed along these lines.

Amending the London Councils’ Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) Agreement

3.6 For London Councils’ TEC to take part in the development or management of a one stop shop coordination body, each of the 33 London local authorities participating in the TEC joint committee arrangements must delegate the exercise of additional functions to the joint committee. This requires the TEC constitution (Governing Agreement, dated 13 December 2001 (as amended)) to be varied.

3.7 The amendment proposed to TEC is by way of an addition to the Part 3(D) Functions, inserting a new paragraph 2(b) as follows:

“(b)(i) The provision and operation of charging apparatus for electrically powered motor vehicles and/or the grant of permission to provide and operate charging apparatus for electrically powered motor vehicles under section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2013 PROVIDED THAT such provision and operation may only take place at locations first agreed by the Participating Council which is the highway authority for the affected road (or, where it is the highway authority for the affected road, TfL) AND PROVIDED FURTHER THAT any grant or other monies provided to LCTEC for the purpose of providing and/or operating charging apparatus for electrically powered motor vehicles shall be applied to any such provision and operation by LCTEC which shall be at no cost or expense to the Participating Councils unless first agreed.

(b)(ii) The exercise of powers under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 for the purposes of giving effect to the joint exercise of functions under Section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2013 by LCTEC, or otherwise for the purposes of supporting and facilitating the Participating Councils and/or TfL in their exercise of those functions, including but not limited to oversight and management of the arrangements

(b)(iii) For the purposes of exercising functions under (b)(i) and (b)(ii) above LCTEC may appoint TfL to act as its agent (subject to Part 7 of this Agreement applying to any such appointment, including its termination) and FOR THE
AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT the functions referred to at (b)(i) and (b)(ii) above may be exercised directly by LCTEC or pursuant to a contract or Service Level Agreement between LCTEC and TfL (or between LCTEC and another appropriate body) or through such servant, agent or contractor as LCTEC may appoint.

3.8 Tower Hamlets Council is now required to sign this delegation for London Councils to be the delegated authority to act on the borough’s behalf where necessary. This will ensure London Boroughs retain control of the project and are fully supported in the future roll out of electric vehicle charge points across London.

4. DOCKLESS CYCLE HIRE BYELAWS

4.1 The management of Dockless Cycle Hire Schemes in various areas of London has to date been ineffective in terms of the inability of local authorities to enforce indiscriminate parking and associated ASB, as well as being limited in geographical spread. There is currently no legislation which controls the operation of these schemes: to date some have been introduced in limited areas under a voluntary Service Agreement with the local authority but others have simply started operations. The only way in which local authorities can address the problems caused by bikes being left anywhere is to use highway obstruction legislation which is both slow and cumbersome.

4.2 After detailed discussions between all boroughs, TfL and London Councils, it has been agreed that London Councils should seek amendments to the TEC Agreement that would allow TEC to widen the scope of its current ability to make and promote a proposed pan-London byelaw on boroughs’ behalf to prohibit bike operators from parking dockless bikes other than at approved parking spaces. Local issues, such as how many or how few parking places to approve and where they should be located, are all left for individual boroughs to determine.

4.3 This will enable a shift away from the status quo, where Boroughs reach individual agreements with specific operators, and instead move to borderless operations throughout Greater London. At present there is no other legislation which can be applied to control the negative impacts of these schemes in boroughs which are not hosting a scheme.

4.4 This Council’s approval is required to enable London Councils to proceed to develop such a bye-law.

4.5 A new byelaw could be beneficial in terms of setting Londonwide standards through London Councils for:
- Minimum safety standards for bikes and scooters;
- Robust ways of tracking the whereabouts of all bikes;
- Set a penalty for a dockless operator committing the offence.
4.6 The bye law would also help each relevant local authority to ensure bikes may only be left in places agreed by them and make it an offence to park otherwise.

5. **CONCLUSION**

5.1 In order to ensure pan-London arrangements for both installation of electric vehicle charging points and a Dockless Cycle Hire byelaw, all Boroughs need to agree the proposals as outlined above. It is believed to be in the Borough’s best interests to be party to both of these amendments.

6. **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

There are no specific equality implications arising from these delegations of authority.

7. **OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The centralised approach intends to bring economies of scale, simplify the process for customers and operators and reduce the resource burden on local authorities, whilst allowing boroughs to retain control of the type, locations, and ownership of charge points.

8. **COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

8.1 There are no material financial implications emanating from this report.

8.2 The supply, installation and maintenance of the Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) electric charge points will be met by the external funding available from the GULCS programme with no funding required by LBTH.

8.3 LBTH would be the enforcing authority for the Dockless Byelaws. In the event of fines levied for non-compliance, LBTH would collect them. This income stream is not anticipated to be material. The byelaws will apply across London so there is a uniform approach, however, they will be enforced by individual boroughs. It is anticipated that there is capacity within existing resource to absorb this work without the need for additional staff and cost.

9. **COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

9.1 The TEC is a joint committee made under sections 73 and 74 Road Traffic Act 1991 (as amended by section 283 Greater London Authority Act 1999), sections 101(5) and 101(5B) and 102 Local Government Act 1972, section 20 Local Government Act 2000, the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) Regulations 20002, the Local Authorities (Goods and Services) Act 1970 and all other enabling powers where by London Boroughs and the GLA in the interests of achieving greater efficiency and economy in the use of their resources, delegated the functions to the Committee. The agreement has been amended a number of times since inception.
9.2 The TEC Agreement needs to be amended further to delegate the boroughs’ functions relating to making and promoting the pan-London dockless byelaw to TEC because none of the local authorities’ functions relating to the making of a pan-London byelaw for dockless bikes parking are currently delegated as functions of TEC and the Committee therefore does not currently have the legal authority to undertake this function on behalf of the London local authorities.

9.3 It is proposed that an appropriate amendment would be by way of an addition to the Part 3(D) Functions, inserting a new paragraph 2(c) as follows:

“(c)(i) the making of byelaws under section 235 of the Local Government Act 1972 (and, in respect of the City of London Corporation, under section 39 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1961) for the purpose of regulating dockless vehicles on the highway and/or public places (including by making it an offence for a dockless vehicle operator to cause or permit their dockless vehicle to be left on the highway or public place other than in an approved location), including taking all related steps to promote, make, amend and revoke any such byelaw.

(c)(ii) The exercise of powers under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 for the purposes of giving effect to (i) above, including but not limited to oversight and management of the arrangements (but excluding prosecution or other enforcement)

9.4 Amendments to Part 3(D) are not minor variations for the purposes of Clause 15 of the LCTEC Governing Agreement, but are made by the procedure set out in Paragraph 3(D) 1 of the LCTEC Agreement which provides an alternative process for delegating the exercise of functions to the joint committee without requiring a separate formal variation agreement to be agreed by each authority before the delegation to the joint committee is effective. The procedure was adopted under an earlier formal variation to the Governing Agreement with the consent of all the London local authorities and TfL and provides that the functions may be delegated by each London local authority to operate under the existing terms of the Governing Agreement “subject to consultation with the Participating Councils and the written agreement of each Participating Council”. (An updated copy of any amended Part 3(D) must also be provided).

9.5 The proposed delegation is highly restricted. It is not a transfer of the authorities’ powers in respect of dockless bikes parking to LC TEC but allows for LC TEC to make and promote a pan-London byelaw. There was no provision for this included when the LC TEC Agreement was first established.

9.6 Signing the amendment to the LC TEC Agreement does not mean any loss of control of local authority assets or powers. The extent of dockless bike parking and the enforcement of the byelaw would be a matter for local decision-making and control, at the discretion of each London borough. However, without all authorities signing the variation to the LC TEC
Agreement the Committee would be unable to take on the promotions and making of this new byelaw.

9.7 Council is able to agree the recommendation.

Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

None
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Polling districts and polling places review 2019

Executive Summary
As required by Representation of the People Act 1983 (as amended by the Electoral Administration Act 2006) all local authorities must review their UK Parliamentary polling districts and polling places at least once every four years and for Tower Hamlets this is now taking place. The review must be completed by 31 January 2020.

This report sets out recommendations for changes to polling districts and polling places as a result of the statutory review of polling districts and polling places undertaken in 2019. It also sets out a small number of recommendations arising from the review but that do no fall within the scope of a statutory review.

The report incorporates comments on draft recommendations made by the General Purpose Committee on 10 December 2019.

Recommendations:
The Council is recommended to:

1. agree the proposed changes to polling district boundaries within the wards of Canary Warf, Island Gardens, Spitalfields & Banglatown, and St Katharines & Wapping as set out in paragraphs 3.27 to 3.31;
2. subject to the availability of the venues, agree the proposed changes to polling places in the wards of Canary Warf, Spitalfields & Banglatown and Bow West as set out in paragraphs 3.32 to 3.34;
3. request the Electoral Registration Officer, on conclusion of the review, to make the necessary amendments to the polling districts and any consequential amendments arising from the review, to take effect from publication of the revised register on 1 December 2020;
4. note other recommendations arising from the review.
1. **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

1.1 As required by Representation of the People Act 1983 (as amended by the Electoral Administration Act 2006) all local authorities must review their UK Parliamentary polling districts and polling places at least once every five years and for Tower Hamlets this is now taking place.

1.2 The Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013 also introduced a change to the timing of compulsory reviews of UK Parliamentary polling districts and polling places. Compulsory reviews must be started and completed within the period of 16 months that starts on 1 October of every fifth year after 1 October 2013. This means that this review must be completed by the 31 January 2020.

2. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

2.1 This is a compulsory review covering the steps set out in Schedule A1 to the Representation of the People Act 1983 as set out in paragraph 3.1 below.

3. **DETAILS OF THE REPORT**

*Background information on undertaking a polling districts and polling places review*

3.1. Under Schedule A1 of the Representation of the People Act 1983, when carrying out a review, local authorities must:
- publish a notice of the holding of a review
- consult the (Acting) Returning Officer for every parliamentary constituency which is wholly or partly in its area
- publish all representations made by an (Acting) Returning Officer
- seek representations from such persons as it thinks have particular expertise in relation to access to premises or facilities for persons who have different forms of disability.
- on completion of a review, give reasons for its decisions and publish documentation relating to the review including correspondence, representations, minutes and details of the designation of polling districts and polling places within the local authority area as a result of the review.

3.2. The full list of Schedule A1 requirements can be found in the guidance published by the Electoral Commission on its website at [www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/electoral-administrator/polling-place-reviews](http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/electoral-administrator/polling-place-reviews).

3.3. Local authorities must comply with the following legislative requirements regarding the designation of polling districts and polling places:
- the council must designate a polling place for each polling district, unless the size or other circumstances of a polling district are such that the
situation of the polling stations does not materially affect the convenience of the electors

- the polling place must be an area in the district, unless special circumstances make it desirable to designate an area wholly or partly outside the district (for example, if no accessible polling place can be identified in the district)
- the polling place must be small enough to indicate to electors in different parts of the district how they will be able to reach the polling station

3.4. Local authorities must also comply with the following access requirements. As part of the review, they must:

- seek to ensure that all electors in a constituency in the local authority area have such reasonable facilities for voting as are practicable in the circumstances
- seek to ensure that so far as is reasonable and practicable every polling place for which it is responsible is accessible to electors who are disabled

3.5. The council must have regard to the accessibility to disabled persons of potential polling stations in any place which it is considering designating as a polling place or the designation of which as a polling place it is reviewing.

3.6. It is important to note that a polling districts and polling places review is not a review of ward boundaries but the polling districts that are the building blocks for each ward and of the polling places within them.

3.7. Polling districts and polling places for other elections (for example, local government, European or referenda) are not automatically part of the compulsory review. However, as polling districts and polling places for other elections are based on UK Parliamentary polling arrangements, the requirements of any other elections that are held within the local authority area have been taken into consideration as part of the review.

3.8. Following a review there is a right for some persons and bodies to appeal against reviews of polling districts and places to the Electoral Commission. Grounds for appeal and more information on who can appeal can be found on the Electoral Commission website www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/electoral-administrator/polling-place-reviews.

**Tower Hamlets review of polling districts and polling places 2019**

3.9. Terms of reference for the review can be found on the council website at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/PDreview2019.

3.10. The Notice of Review, including the timetable for the review, was published on 23 August 2019. It was made available in the Town Hall and on the council's website at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/PDreview2019.

3.11. The consultation period for the review began with the publication of the Notice of Review and ran for a period of 8 weeks until Friday 18 October 2019.
3.12. A letter, including the Notice of Review, seeking views on the current arrangements was sent to the (Acting) Returning Officer for the parliamentary constituencies of Bethnal Green and Bow and Poplar and Limehouse, all elected representatives for the area under review, local political parties, and to fifty nine organisations that work with local disabled people.

3.13. The council asked for representations on any changes that relevant stakeholders consider are required to the existing polling districts and polling places to ensure that these continue to reflect local requirements.

3.14. Information about the review was published on the consultation page of the council website. The council promoted the review through a press release, an article in Our East End and social media. Information about the review was published in the Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Services e-newsletter and the Accessible Transport Forum’s e-newsletter. Council staff were informed through Tower Hamlets Now and Manager Briefing. Information for councillors was published in the Members’ Briefing.

3.15. The (Acting) Returning Officer for the parliamentary constituencies of Bethnal Green and Bow and Poplar and Limehouse is a statutory consultee who is required to comment on the review. The representation of the (Acting) Returning Officer was received on 12 September 2019 and published on the council website on 13 September 2019.

3.16. Real, a local advocacy organisation run by and for disabled people, supported the review by organising a focus group seeking views from disabled people on their experience of voting in the borough. Council officers attended Tower Hamlets Accessibility Day on 3 October 2019 with twenty six survey forms completed by disabled people who attended.

3.17. As well as representations and consultation with disabled people, other information considered includes:

- Electorate figures, broken down to street level within wards and existing polling districts.
- Estimates of population change within the area both retrospective and prospective.
- New development and the approximate number of dwellings and expected population numbers for those areas.
- Details of current polling places and an indication as to their overall suitability for purpose.
- Comments and complaints regarding the current arrangements from the public, elected members or other bodies.
- Information gained from the existing and possible future polling station venue managers as to continued availability and suitability.
- Details of potential alternative buildings that might appear suitable.
3.18. Electorate statistics by polling district and polling place based on the revised Electoral Register 1 August 2019 were published on the council website at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/PDreview2019.

3.19. The electorate in some of the polling districts in Tower Hamlets has changed significantly in recent years and is likely to continue to change in the future. There may be a need to create further polling districts within the borough wards, redraw the polling district boundaries, add additional polling places, merge smaller polling places. It may be considered that the status quo is retained in some or all of the polling districts.

3.20. Each polling district has been evaluated in terms of the current electorate figure, the alignment with the borough ward boundaries, the impact of regeneration on the area, existing natural boundaries (major roads and waterways) and where necessary identifying suitable additional polling places or alternative polling places.

Representations received


3.22. Other representations received comprise three from private individuals and one from the Local Campaigns Forum of the Labour Party in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. These are published on the council website at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/PDreview2019.

Recommendations to full council relating to proposed changes to polling district boundaries and location of polling places

3.23. Modelling of the impact of proposed changes to polling district boundaries on the electorate can be found at Appendix A.

3.24. The figures for the existing polling districts are based on the register of electors as published on 1 November 2019. Modelling of the impact of proposed amendments has been made using an extract from the register of electors at 26 November 2019. This shows the projected electorate in each polling district if proposed boundary changes were agreed. The variation between the size of the current and projected electorate is partly a consequence of proposed boundary changes and partly a result of changes to the electoral register following the European Election and the recent General Election.

3.25. The register will now not be updated and published until 1 February 2020 following the postponement of the planned publication of the register on 1 December 2019.

3.26. Maps showing current and proposed boundary changes and polling places can be found at Appendix B.
Proposed changes to polling district boundaries

3.27. A proposal has been made that the boundaries between polling districts in Canary Warf ward are amended. The rationale given is that these would better reflect the natural communities in the ward, including the Barkentine Estate and the communities along the riverside and Millwall Outer Dock. Current and proposed boundaries are shown on the map of Canary Warf ward at Appendix B.

3.28. Modelling the impact of these proposals shows that the electorate for polling district CW3 would be increased to 6620. The maximum electorate per polling station is 2,500. If the boundary changes were made, the polling place for CW3 would need to be able to accommodate three polling stations. Following inspection of the proposed polling station for CW3 (Seven Mills Primary School) to assess its suitability, it is recommended that the council agrees the proposed changes to polling district boundaries in Canary Warf ward. It is further recommended that polling district boundaries in Canary Warf ward are kept under review.

3.29. A proposal has been made that the boundary between polling districts IG1 and IG2 is amended. The rationale given is that this would incorporate a single development comprising Vulcan Square and the south side of Britannia Road wholly within IG1. The proposed new boundary is shown on the map of Island Gardens ward at Appendix B. It is recommended that the council agrees to the proposed changes to the polling district boundaries in Island Gardens ward.

3.30. A proposal has been made that the boundaries between polling districts in Spitalfields and Banglatown ward are amended. The rationale given is that these would better reflect the geography of the ward and assist electors identify and access their polling places. The proposed new boundaries are shown on the map of Spitalfields & Banglatown ward at Appendix B. Only polling district SB4 remains unchanged by these proposals. It is recommended that the council agrees to the proposed changes to polling district boundaries in Spitalfields and Banglatown ward.

3.31. A proposal has been made that the boundaries between polling districts in St Katharine’s and Wapping ward are amended. The rationale given is that these would better reflect natural communities in the ward. The proposed new boundaries are shown on the map of St Katharine’s and Wapping ward at Appendix B. Only SK4 remains unchanged. It is recommended that the council agrees to the proposed changes to polling district boundaries in St. Katharine’s & Wapping ward.

Proposed changes to polling places

3.32. Alternative polling places are recommended for polling districts in Canary Warf ward:

- CW1 proposal to use a portacabin near the Tesco Express on Westferry Road/Cuba Street. The current polling place is the London Marriott Hotel Canary Warf.
• CW2 proposal to use Arnhem Warf Primary School. This would replace Seven Mills Primary School (which would fall within CW3 if the boundary changes at paragraph 3.27 are agreed).
• CW3 proposal to use Seven Mills Primary School which would fall within the proposed revised boundary of CW3.

3.33. Alternative polling places have been proposed for Spitalfields & Banglatown ward:
• It is recommended that Toynbee Hall replace Christchurch Primary School as the polling station for SB1.
• The current polling station in polling district SB3 is St Anne’s Primary School. If the polling district boundary changes at 3.27 are agreed then it is recommended that St Anne’s Primary School becomes the polling place for polling district SB2.
• If the polling district boundary changes at 3.27 are agreed then it is recommended that the Brady Centre becomes the polling place for polling district SB3.

3.34. It is recommended that in Bow West ward polling district BW3 Gateway Housing Association, Mile End Road replaces Epanios Ministries, Lichfield Road.

Other recommendations arising from the review

3.35. Consultation findings indicate that the council should consider alternative arrangements for polling in Bow West, polling district BW2. Two polling stations are currently provided on the first floor of Olga Primary School. Access for people who are unable to use stairs is by a lift which has to be operated by polling station staff. Whilst this arrangement meets basic requirements for access it requires an additional polling clerk to operate the lift. For security reasons voters require escorting in this part of the building.

3.36. Consultation findings indicate that the council should identify alternative arrangements for polling in Blackwall & Cubitt Town, polling district BC1 due to concerns about capacity and access. Two portacabins were used for the 12 December 2019 General Election with a separate polling station in each. This arrangement worked well and it is recommended that it is continued.

3.37. Review of the electorate and capacity within polling districts indicates that the council consider additional polling stations in the following polling places:

Blackwall & Cubitt Town
BC1 portacabin under East India DLR increase from 1 polling station to 2
BC2 Radisson Blu Hotel increase from 1 polling station to 2

Mile End
ME2 St Paul with St Luke Primary School increase from 1 polling station to 2
ME4 Stebon Primary School increase from 1 polling station to 2
ME5 St Mary & St Joseph RC Church increase from 1 polling station to 2
3.38. Maps showing possible polling district capacity issues and population projections to 2024 and to 2029 can be found at Appendix C.

3.39. The (Acting) Returning Officer in his representation suggested that an annual review of data from the electoral register is undertaken with a full review of polling district boundaries and facilities as required. Review of population projections has indicated that a number of wards and polling districts will experience significant population growth in the period up to 2024 (the date of the next statutory review) and beyond. These are shown on the map at Appendix C.

3.40. A number of recommendations arise from the consultation with disabled people. A summary of consultation findings can be found at Appendix D.

3.41. To give additional assurance of compliance with Section 16 of the Electoral Administration Act 2006, the Returning Officer and the Electoral Registration Officer should consider conducting an annual disability access audit of 20% of polling places using the checklist provided by the Electoral Commission in their Guidance. This should be with a view to auditing 80% of polling places before the next statutory review. Any changes recommended as a result of the audit should be made as soon as practicable. Outcomes for all polling places audited should be reported in the next statutory review of polling districts and polling places.

3.42. Electoral Services should review and update training for polling staff to ensure that deaf awareness is covered. Training should also cover awareness of the needs of people with more than one barrier to access, for example, someone who has a visual or hearing impairment and whose first language is not English.

3.43. Electoral Services should note and where reasonable and practicable make changes in relation to other issues highlighted during the public consultation – for example, making additional disabled parking places available and opening the western gate to Bonner Primary School to improve access to the polling place.

3.44. During consultation a proposal was received that three ward names be amended. This is outside the scope of a polling districts and polling places review. It requires a separate process as set out in Section 59 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The General Purposes Committee will receive a report setting out the process that must be followed and it is recommended that this formal process considering changing three ward names now be instigated separately.
4. **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

4.1. The Public Sector Equality Duty at s.149 Equality Act 2010 requires the council to have due regard to the following when exercising its functions:
- The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited under the Act;
- To advance equality of opportunity between those with a protected characteristic and those that do not share it; and
- To foster good relations between those with a protected characteristic and those that do not share it.

4.2. Local authorities have a duty to review the accessibility of all polling places to disabled voters and ensure that every polling place, and prospective polling place, for which it is responsible is accessible to disabled voters 'so far as is reasonable and practicable'.

4.3. According to the Equalities and Human Rights Commission the duty to make reasonable adjustments comprises three requirements. For service providers and those exercising public functions, these requirements are:
- where a provision, criterion or practice puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage compared with those who are not disabled, to take reasonable steps to avoid that disadvantage.
- where a physical feature puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage compared with people who are not disabled to avoid that disadvantage or adopt a reasonable alternative method of providing the service or exercising the function.
- where not providing an auxiliary aid puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage compared with people who are not disabled, to provide that auxiliary aid.

4.4. An equality analysis has been prepared to inform the review. Recommendations from the equality analysis have been incorporated in section 3 above.

5. **OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The review follows steps set out in Schedule A1 of the Representation of the People Act 1983. It is informed by guidance issued by the Electoral Commission which sets out the appeals process following conclusion of the review. It is also guided by consultation principles issued by the Cabinet Office in July 2012 (as updated May 2018).

5.2 The council is required to publish all representations received in relation to the review. All representations have been published on the council website. Personal details have been redacted in line with the General Data Protection Regulation 2018.

5.3 The council may carry out an interim review and change some of their polling districts and polling places before the end of the five year review cycle. The
same processes should be undertaken for the affected areas as for the compulsory review.

6. **COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

   6.1 This report requests that the Council agree the recommendations arising from the review of polling districts and polling places in Tower Hamlets. Any costs arising from the implementation of review recommendations will be met from within existing budgets.

7. **COMMENTS OF LEGAL SERVICES**

   7.1 S.16 Electoral Administration Act 2006 (EAA) provides the amendments to the Representation of the People Act 1983 (ROTPA) requiring a review of polling places. S.18A to s.18E and Schedule A1 have consequently now been added to the ROTPA.

   7.2 S.18A ROTPA regards the polling districts for the parliamentary elections. Under this legislation a local authority must divide its area into polling districts for the purpose of these elections. All electors must have reasonable facilities for voting in each constituency within the area of the local authority. If there is an alteration made to the polling districts of each area, the registration officer for the district in question must make adaptations to the register of parliamentary electors which are necessary to take into account the alteration. Once a notice is published by the registration officer that such an adaptation has been made, the alteration comes into effect.

   7.3 S.18B ROTPA regards polling places for each polling district of a constituency. A relevant authority must designate polling places for the polling districts in its area and keep these polling places under review.

   7.4 S.18C ROTPA regards the review of polling districts and places which must take place before the end of a period of four years either starting from when the designation of the area (s.18C(3)) or the completion of the previous review (s.18C(4)).

   7.5 Circumstances where a representation is made to the Electoral Commission which may trigger a review is covered by s.18(D) ROTPA.

   7.6 Schedule A1 of the ROTPA contains the guidance for local authorities to follow before any review of the polling districts takes place. The requirements of Schedule A1 have been set out in p.3.9 of this report.

   7.7 In order to carry out its public sector equality duty under s.149 Equality Act 2010, local authorities must ensure that accessibility to all polling places is reasonable and practicable. This is also a rule covered by s.18B(c) ROTPA.
Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

Linked Reports

Polling districts and polling places review  Report to General Purposes Committee 8 October 2019

Polling districts and polling places review 2019  Report to General Purposes Committee 10 December 2019

Appendices

A. Modelling of the impact of proposed changes to polling district boundaries on the electorate
B. Maps showing proposed polling district boundary changes and proposed changes to polling places
C. Map showing possible polling district capacity issues with population projections to 2024.
D. Summary of findings from consultation with disabled people

Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)
List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report

Guidance on the review of polling districts and places  Electoral Commission

Documents relating to the review including submissions from consultees can be found on the council website: www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/PDreview2019

Officer contact details for documents:
Rob Curtis, Head of Electoral Services
Email: robert.curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk
Phone: 020 7364 3139
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>November register</th>
<th>Modelled</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canary Wharf</td>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Wharf</td>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>3013</td>
<td>1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Wharf</td>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>6620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 9171 10806 1635

**Polling Places**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>CW1</th>
<th>London Marriott Hotel Canary Wharf E14 4ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>Seven Mills Primary School, E14 8LY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>Docklands Community Organisation, E14 8PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>Portacabin near Tesco Express, E14 4QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>Arnhem Warf Primary School, E14 3RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>Seven Mills Primary School, E14 8LY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November register</th>
<th>Modelled</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island Gardens</td>
<td>IG1</td>
<td>3433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Gardens</td>
<td>IG2</td>
<td>3349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Gardens</td>
<td>IG3</td>
<td>2341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 9123 10542 1419

**No proposed changes to polling places**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>November register</th>
<th>Modelled</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spitalfields and Banglatown</td>
<td>SB1</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>3195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitalfields and Banglatown</td>
<td>SB2</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitalfields and Banglatown</td>
<td>SB3</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitalfields and Banglatown</td>
<td>SB4</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>1423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 8123 9919 1796

**Polling places**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>SB1</th>
<th>Christ Church CE Primary School, E1 6PU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SB2</td>
<td>Canon Barnett Primary School, E1 7RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SB3</td>
<td>St Anne's Catholic Primary School, E1 5AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SB4</td>
<td>Selby Street Community Centre, E1 5DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>SB1</td>
<td>Toynbee Hall, E1 6LS OR Holland Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>SB2</td>
<td>St Anne's Catholic Primary School, E1 5AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>SB3</td>
<td>Brady Arts and Community Centre, E1 5HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>SB4</td>
<td>Selby Street Community Centre, E1 5DF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>November register</th>
<th>Modelled</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Katharine’s and Wapping</td>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Katharine’s and Wapping</td>
<td>SK2</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Katharine’s and Wapping</td>
<td>SK3</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Katharine’s and Wapping</td>
<td>SK4</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>3079</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8267</td>
<td>9873</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No proposed changes to polling places

**Ward**                          **District**
Bow West                             No proposed changes to boundaries

**Polling places**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BW3</td>
<td>Army Reserve Centre OR Gateway HA, E3 4PB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polling Districts Review 2019

Proposed change to polling place for polling district BW3
Bow West ward
Proposed polling districts
Current polling districts
2014 wards

Polling Districts Review 2019
Proposed changes to polling district boundaries and polling places
Island Gardens ward
Polling Districts Review 2019
Proposed changes to polling district boundaries and polling places
Spitalfields and Banglatown ward
Polling Districts Review 2019
Proposed changes to polling district boundaries and polling places
St Katharines and Wapping ward
Population projections are for those over 18 and above. These do not take into account eligibility to vote.

Polling districts with capacity issues are those where the total electorate is within 500 of the total capacity taking into account the number of polling stations.

The numbers by the polling places indicates the number of polling stations at the polling place.
Wrote to all local groups working with disabled adults at start of consultation (combined Real / THCVS mailing lists)
Publicised through THCVS newsletters & Accessible Transport Forum newsletter
1 focus group 7 participants @ Real 3/09/19
1 attended Real steering group 5/09/19
1 stall Accessibility Day organised by Accessible Transport Forum (100+ attended) 10/10/19
Unable to attend Apasen event
26 surveys completed
22 said they knew where to go to vote
13 could name their polling place or the building / street
1 postal voter
13 separate polling stations named
23 said their polling place easy to get to
1 said no but gave no reason
1 postal voter
1 blank
23 said easy to access building
1 said no but gave no reason
1 postal voter
1 blank
17 said room well laid out
5 said room not well laid out (see comments below)
1 postal voter
3 blanks
22 said staff helpful
2 said staff not helpful (see comments)
1 postal voter
1 blank
When asked how we could make voting easier received following comments.

All good
If possible the ballot paper should be accessible in Braille for blind people. Postal votes could also be in Braille.
Good location
Increase font size on voting forms
Voting paper should be in large print
Very helpful staff at polling station. Suggestion: have disabled polling booths separate from normal polling booths for easier accessibility.
Easy to vote twice. No ID.
I get confused when all the cards come. Just tell me to vote now. The cards are not helpful.
Bigger signs
Friendly staff at polling station

Small space. Wear hearing aids
Basic disability equality training for staff. Basic deaf awareness training for staff. Thanks!
I find it easy how it is already set up. thank you.
Feedback from Dial a Ride passengers. On voting day why can't school buses be used to pick people up?
It is always a pleasure voting.
Relocate back to Gateway on Mile End Road so easy to vote on way to or from work. Epanios Church is more central to polling district but requires separate journey for most residents.
Stop different parties standing outside the polling station and hassling people when they go to vote.

THEMES FROM FOCUS GROUP
High levels of satisfaction with experience of voting.
Issues
Layout of polling place confusing - split channels mentioned twice
wheelchair accessible booth- not all booths accessible
Privacy in lower booths - maybe consider angling or screening
Some confusion about where to go to vote in person and where you can hand in a postal vote
Recognition of limitations facing election organisers
Space an issue in some polling places - East India portakabin mentioned
Positive feedback on support from staff
Parking at St Matthias School and Jack Dash House locked off. Could be used for disabled voters parking.
Generally positive feedback on access to buildings
May be more than one barrier to voting eg impairment and language barrier
One negative experience of staff when asked for explanation of how to vote
Lack of accessible information from parties about candidates eg manifestos
Finding some of the polling places not easy. Had to use Google maps
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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1. The attached report was presented to the Audit Committee on Thursday 14 November 2019. It is now presented to Council for noting.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

2.1. The Council is recommended to:

1. Note the contents of the treasury management activities and performance against targets for half year ending 30 September 2019; and

2. Note the Council’s investments as set out in Appendix 1 to the main report. The balance outstanding as at 30 September 2019 was £307.250m
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Summary

This Report is produced in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice

The Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Treasury Prudential Indicators, for 2019/20 were approved by Council on 19th February 2019 as required by the Local Government Act 2003. This report covers the period 1st April 2019 to 30th September 2019

Investment returns fluctuate in line with the bank of England base rate. Base rate is maintained at 0.75%.

The Council has substantial sums of money invested and is therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the impact of changing interest rates. The successful identification, monitoring and control of risk are therefore central to the Council’s treasury management strategy. Risk includes interest rate fluctuations and change to inflation.

The investment income budget set for 2019/20 was £4m and we are broadly on target.

For the 2018/19 budget, £100m of investments were set aside for investment in pooled funds. To date, £76m has been invested. Equity markets fell very sharply over the 3 months to 31 December 2018 and investment in pooled funds was paused due to high market volatility.

From the Benchmarking exercise a total return of 1.60% was achieved for the reporting period, which was 0.46% above the average for similar LAs return and 0.38% higher than the average return for all LAs.

The 7 day London Interbank Bid Rate (LIBID) is the performance measure for the Council’s investment returns and the return for year to date is 0.57%. For this reporting period, the investments portfolio returned 1.60%. This was better than the benchmarking average of 1.22%. More information on this can be found in section 3.6.

The credit worthiness of investments is maintained at –AA and the average credit score is 4.18 for this reporting period, signifying LBTH portfolio credit risk is lower than the benchmarking average.
Prudential Indicators (PI) and Treasury Management (TM) indicators have been fully complied with.

Over the reporting period, all treasury management (TM) activities have been carried out in accordance with the approved limits and the prudential indicators (PI) set out in the Council’s Treasury Management Strategy statement.

Recommendations:

Members are recommended to:

- note the contents of the treasury management activities and performance against targets for half year ending 30 September 2019; and
- note the Council’s investments as set out in Appendix 1. The balance outstanding as at 30 September 2019 was £307.250m

1. **REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

1.1 The Local Government Act 2003 and the Local Authorities (Capital Financing and Accounting) Regulations 2003 require that regular reports be submitted to the relevant Council Committee detailing the Council’s treasury management activities.

1.2 This report updates members on both the borrowing and investment decisions made by the Corporate Director, Resources under delegated authority in the context of prevailing economic conditions and considers the Council’s Treasury Management performance.

1.3 The regular reporting of treasury management activities assists Members to scrutinise officer decisions and monitor progress on the implementation of its investment strategy as approved by Full Council.

2. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

2.1 The Council is bound by legislation to have regard to the Treasury Management (TM) Code. The Code requires that the Council or a sub-committee of the Council (Audit Committee) should receive regular monitoring reports on treasury management activities. If the Council were to deviate from those requirements, there would need to be justifiable reason for doing so.

3. **DETAILS OF REPORT**

3.1 The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 require local authorities to have regard to the Treasury Management Code. The Treasury Management code requires that the Council or a sub-committee of the Council (Audit Committee) should receive regular monitoring reports on treasury management activities and risks.

3.2 Treasury management is defined as “the management of the Council’s investments and cash flows; its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks. Within reason, the Council can vary its treasury management strategy having regard to its own views about its appetite for risk in relation to the financial returns required.
3.3 The Treasury Management Strategy, Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision reports were included in the Budget Pack that was presented to Full Council on 19 February 2019.

3.4 ECONOMIC OUTLOOK AND INTEREST RATE FORECAST FROM ARLINGCLOSE

3.4.1 The global economy is entering a period of slower growth in response to political issues, primarily the trade policy stance of the US. The UK economy has displayed a marked slow-down in growth due to both Brexit uncertainty and the downturn in global activity. In response, global and UK interest rate expectations have eased dramatically.

3.4.2 There appears no near term resolution to the trade dispute between China and the US, a dispute that the US appears comfortable exacerbating further. With the 2020 presidential election a year away, Donald Trump is unlikely to change his stance.

3.4.3 Parliament appears to have frustrated UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson’s desire to exit the EU on 31st October. The probability of a no-deal EU exit in the immediate term has decreased, although a no-deal Brexit cannot be entirely ruled out for 2019 and the risk of this event remains for 2020. The risk of a general election in the near term has, however, increased.

3.4.4 UK economic growth has stalled despite a probable pick-up in growth in Q3 2019. The ONS reported a Q2 growth rate of -0.2%. The MPC has downgraded its growth forecasts for future years.

3.4.5 While the potential for divergent paths for UK monetary policy remain in the event of a withdrawal agreement, the weaker external environment severely limits potential upside movement in Bank Rate, while the slowing UK economy will place pressure on the MPC to loosen monetary policy.

3.4.6 Inflation remains around target, albeit displaying a surprising decline in August 2019. The tight labour market risks medium-term domestically-driven inflationary pressure. Slower global growth should reduce the prospect of externally driven inflationary pressure, although political turmoil could push up oil prices.

3.4.7 Central bank actions and geopolitical risks will continue to produce significant volatility in financial markets, including bond markets.

3.4.8 Although we have maintained our Bank Rate forecast at 0.75% for the foreseeable future, there are substantial risks to this forecast, dependant on Brexit outcomes and the evolution of the global economy.

3.4.9 Arlingclose judges that the risks are significantly weighted to the downside.

3.4.10 Gilt yields have fallen to historic lows. The risks to economic growth from global political uncertainty appear to have crystallised, dampening rate expectations and dragging yields lower.

3.4.11 We expect gilt yields to remain at low levels for the foreseeable future and judge the risks to be weighted to the downside. Volatility will continue to offer longer-term borrowing opportunities.
3.5 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2019/20

3.5.1 The Treasury Management Strategy was approved on 19th February 2019 by Council. The Strategy comprehensively outlined how the treasury function would operate throughout the financial year 2019/20 including the limits and criteria for selecting institutions to be used for the investment of surplus cash and the council’s policy on long-term borrowing and limits on debt. The Council complied with the strategy throughout the reporting period and all investments were made to counterparties within the Council’s approved lending list.

3.5.2 The Council’s current strategy is to maintain borrowing and investments below their underlying levels, known as internal borrowing, in order to reduce risk and keep interest costs low.

3.5.3 The treasury management position as at 30th September 2019 shown in table 2 below.

Table 2: Treasury Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31.03.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>Movement over the Year £m</th>
<th>30.09.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>31.09.19 Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term borrowing</strong></td>
<td>74.296</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.296</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term borrowing</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total borrowing</strong></td>
<td>74.296</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.296</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term investments</strong></td>
<td>73.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term investments</strong></td>
<td>273.500</td>
<td>(216.500)</td>
<td>57.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Borrowing Strategy during the period

3.5.4 The Council held £74.296m of external loans at 30th September 2019.

#### Table 3: Borrowing Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31.03.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>Movement over the Year £m</th>
<th>30.09.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>30.09.19 Rate %</th>
<th>30.09.19 WAM* years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>36.650</td>
<td>132.600</td>
<td>169.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments</strong></td>
<td>383.150</td>
<td><strong>(75.900)</strong></td>
<td>307.250</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net investments</strong></td>
<td>308.854</td>
<td><strong>(75.900)</strong></td>
<td>232.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighted average maturity

3.5.5 The Council takes a low risk approach to its borrowing strategy. This means that the principal objective when borrowing has been to strike an appropriate balance between securing low interest costs and achieving cost certainty over the period for which funds are required. The secondary objective being to have flexibility to renegotiate loans should the Council’s long-term plans change.

3.5.6 The Council redeemed £60m of its LOBO (Lender’s Option Borrower’s Option) loans during 2018/19 and partly re-financed this through Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) loans.

#### PWLB Rate Increase

3.5.7 On October 9th 2019 the Treasury increased the interest rate for the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) by one percentage point.

3.5.8 In a letter to council finance directors the Treasury’s Local Government & Reform team said the decision to increase the interest rate was taken because “some local authorities have substantially increased their use of the PWLB in recent months, as the cost of borrowing has fallen to record lows.” The letter said the government will monitor the impact of the change and keep its rates policy under review.

3.5.9 Our Treasury advisers, Arlingclose, have provided a funding update in which they set out that it is probable that local authorities will in future wish to investigate other sources of long-term borrowing, as, given the increase in PWLB rates, it is likely that there is now cheaper borrowing available to local authorities than PWLB.

3.5.10 One likely consequence is that if the Council decides to borrow from non PWLB sources it will face a more onerous and lengthy administrative process compared to arranging borrowing through the PWLB; local authorities will have to go through a rigorous process with much more disclosure and explanation, as private investors will look to scrutinise the credit worthiness of potential borrowers.
3.5.11 The Council will work closely with Arlingclose in future to understand the implications for the Council and its borrowing need.

**Investment Activity**

3.5.12 The Council holds significant invested funds, representing income received in advance of expenditure plus balances and reserves held. During the six-month period, the Council's investment balance ranged between £307m to £383m due to timing differences between income and expenditure. The investment position at this reporting period is shown in table 4 below.

3.5.13 Both the CIPFA Code and government guidance require the Council to invest its funds prudently, and to have regard to the security and liquidity of its investments before seeking the highest rate of return, or yield.

**Investments Outstanding & Maturity Structure**

3.5.14 The table below shows the amount of investments outstanding at the end of September 2019 split according to the financial sector.

3.5.15 The Council's objective when investing money is to strike an appropriate balance between risk and return, minimising the risk of incurring losses from defaults and the risk of receiving unsuitably low investment income. Given the increasing risk and falling returns from short-term unsecured bank investments, the Council has diversified into more secure and/or higher yielding asset classes by allocating £100m for strategic pooled investments and currently £76m has been invested as shown in Table 4 below.

### Table 4 Outstanding Investments by Financial Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Sector</th>
<th>31.03.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>Movement over the Year £m</th>
<th>30.09.19 Balance £m</th>
<th>% Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Banks</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Building Societies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (incl. local authorities)</td>
<td>145.500</td>
<td>(57.500)</td>
<td>88.000</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversea Banks</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>(80.000)</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds</td>
<td>36.650</td>
<td>46.600</td>
<td>83.250</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Investment Funds:</td>
<td>76.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76.000</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash plus funds</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-dated bond funds</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic bond funds</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Income funds</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property funds</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi asset income funds</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>383.150</strong></td>
<td><strong>(75.900)</strong></td>
<td><strong>307.250</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Report

3.5.16 The Council measures the financial performance of its treasury management activities both in terms of its impact on the revenue budget and its relationship to benchmark interest rates, as shown in table 5 below.

Table 5: Investment performance for financial year to 30th September 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>LBTH Performance</th>
<th>Benchmark Return</th>
<th>Over/(Under) Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Year 2018/19</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>(0.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Year 2019/20</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.17 The Council’s budgeted investment return for 2019/20 is **110 basis points** (1.10%) with average cash balance of £400m. This is based on placing £100m in pooled investments during 2018/19. There was a delay in placing these investments because of investment market sentiment over historically expensive investment values.

3.5.18 £76m was invested in pooled funds during 2018/19. The funds will be in place to deliver the full year savings target in 2019/20 onwards, however due to the nature of the funds, returns will fluctuate from year to year. The risk profile of these investments is an important consideration for the Committee, in order to achieve higher returns, there can be a need to accept higher levels of risk.

3.5.19 The investment performance for the reporting period is **160bps** with an average cash balance of £340m.

3.6 Investment Benchmarking

3.6.1 LBTH participates in a benchmarking club being run by Arlingclose to enable officers to compare the Council’s treasury management / investment returns against those of similar authorities. The model takes into account a combination of credit, duration and returns achieved over the duration, and it includes data from 139 local authorities. The progression of risk and return metrics are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Investment Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tower Hamlets</th>
<th>12 London &amp; Metropolitan Average</th>
<th>139 Local Authorities (LAs) Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 March 2019</td>
<td>30 Sept 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Investments</td>
<td>£307.2m</td>
<td>£231.3m</td>
<td>£67.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funds</td>
<td>£75.2m</td>
<td>£75.8m</td>
<td>£13.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Credit Score</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Credit Rating</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>AA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Counterparties &amp; Funds</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Exposed to Bail-in</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.6.2 As at 30th September 2019 LBTH investment portfolio delivered 0.94% for internal investment management, outperforming the benchmarking average of 0.87% and also the average return for 139 LAs of 0.83%, whilst for total return for total investments LBTH generated 1.60% outperforming the average return for 12 London Boroughs and Metropolitan Boroughs with return of 1.14% by 46bps, and outperforming the average return for 139 LAs with an average return of 1.22% by 38bps.

3.6.3 Our investment portfolio credit scores are better than the benchmark average of 4.46, signifying that LBTH's portfolio credit risk is lower than that of the others. As a consequence our investment portfolio credit worthiness was maintained at AA-, in line with the benchmark average.

3.6.4 The proportion of the portfolio investments exposed to bail-in is 53%, this level is significantly lower than the benchmark average of 72%. This means we have taken less bail-in risk on our investors compared to the others. Bail-in is rescuing a financial institution on the brink of failure by making its creditors and depositors take a loss on their holdings.

3.6.5 It can also be seen from the above table that the number of counterparties the Council had as at 30th September was 29. The number of counterparties the Council had investments with during the period is more than double the benchmarking average of 11. This demonstrates the Council reduces the counterparty risk and concentration risk of the investments portfolio significantly by investing with many quality institutions and local authorities. The lower average credit score compared to others reflects the lower risk of lending to Local Authorities.

3.7 Compliance Report

3.7.1 All treasury management activities undertaken from the beginning of the financial year 2019/20 to the this reporting period complied fully with the CIPFA Code of Practice and the Council’s approved Treasury Management Strategy.

3.7.2 Compliance with the authorised limit and operational boundary for external debt is set out in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Debt Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.03.19 Actual £m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Available within 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Available within 100 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days to Maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Investment Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funds - Income Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investments - Total Return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.3 The Council measures and manages its exposures to treasury management risks using a range of indicators.

3.7.4 **Security:** The Council has adopted a voluntary measure of its exposure to credit risk by monitoring the value-weighted average credit rating and credit score of its investment portfolio. This is calculated by applying a score to each investment (AAA=1, AA+=2, etc.) and taking the arithmetic average, weighted by the size of each investment. Unrated investments are assigned a score based on their perceived risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31.03.19 Actual</th>
<th>30.09.19 Actual</th>
<th>2019/20 Target</th>
<th>Complied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio average credit rating</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.5 **Liquidity:** The Council has adopted a voluntary measure of its exposure to liquidity risk by monitoring the amount of cash available to meet unexpected payments within a rolling three month period, without additional borrowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31.03.19 Actual</th>
<th>30.09.19 Actual</th>
<th>2019/20 Target</th>
<th>Complied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cash available within [3] months</td>
<td>£124.15m</td>
<td>£169.25m</td>
<td>£100m</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sum borrowed in past [3] months without prior notice</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.6 **Maturity Structure of Borrowing:** This indicator is set to control the Council’s exposure to refinancing risk. The upper and lower limits on the maturity structure of fixed rate borrowing were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30.09.19 Actual</th>
<th>Upper Limit</th>
<th>Lower Limit</th>
<th>Complied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 12 months</td>
<td>£1.004m</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months and within 24 months</td>
<td>£0.755m</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months and within 5 years</td>
<td>£2.825m</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and within 10 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and above</td>
<td>£68.709m</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.7 **Principal Sums Invested for Periods Longer than 364 days:** The purpose of this indicator is to control the Council’s exposure to the risk of incurring losses by seeking early repayment of its investments. The limits on the long-term principal sum invested to final maturities beyond the period end were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual principal invested beyond year end</td>
<td>£101m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit on principal invested beyond year end</td>
<td>£150m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Non-Treasury Investments

3.8.1 The definition of investments in CIPFA’s revised Treasury Management Code now covers all the financial assets of the Authority as well as other non-financial assets which the Authority holds primarily for financial return. For English Authorities: This is replicated in MHCLG’s Investment Guidance, in which the definition of investments is further broadened to also include all such assets held partially for financial return.

3.8.2 The Council currently does not have such investments.

4. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no equality implications directly arising from this report.

5. OTHER STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 This section of the report is used to highlight further specific statutory implications that are wither not covered in the main body of the report or are required to be highlighted to ensure decision makers give them proper consideration. Examples of other implications may be:

- Best Value implications
- Consultations
- Environmental (including air quality)
- Risk management
- Crime Reduction
- Safeguarding
- Data protection/ Privacy Impact Assessment

Best Value Implications

The Treasury Management Strategy and Investment Strategy and the arrangements put in place to monitor them should ensure that the Council optimises the use of its monetary resources within the constraints placed on the Council by statute, appropriate management of risk and operational requirements.

5.2 Assessment of value for money is achieved through:

- Monitoring against benchmarks
- Operating within budget

Risk Management

There is inevitably a degree of risk inherent in all treasury activity.

The Investment Strategy identifies the risk associated with different classes of investment instruments and sets the parameters within which treasury activities can be undertaken and controls and processes appropriate for that risk.
Treasury operations are undertaken by nominated officers within the parameters prescribed by the Treasury Management Policy Statement as approved by the Council.

The Council is ultimately responsible for risk management in relation to its treasury activities. However, in determining the risk and appropriate controls to put in place the Council has obtained independent advice from Arlingcose who specialise in Council treasury issues.

6  COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

6.1 This report provides an update on Treasury Management activities from April 2019 to September 2019.

6.2 The Council adopted a new approach to its investment activities in line with approvals given in the 2019/20 Treasury Management Strategy and its Medium Term Financial Strategy to increase the level of investment income it generates for 2019/20.

6.3 As at the 30th September 2019 the Council held an outstanding investments portfolio of £307.25m. The annual investment income budget is £4m and current estimates indicate that this is achievable.

7.  LEGAL COMMENTS

7.1 The Local Government Act 2003 provides a framework for the capital finance of local authorities. It provides a power to borrow and imposes a duty on local authorities to determine an affordable borrowing limit. It provides a power to invest. Fundamental to the operation of the scheme is an understanding that authorities will have regard to proper accounting practices recommended by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) in carrying out capital finance functions.


7.3 This noting report of the Corporate Director, Resources advises the Committee of the Council’s borrowing and investment activities for the half-year ending 30th September 2018 and is consistent with the key principles expressed in the Treasury Management Code. The Corporate Director, Resources has responsibility for overseeing the proper administration of the Council’s financial affairs, as required by section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 and is the appropriate officer to advise in relation to these matters.

7.4 When considering its approach to the treasury management matters set out in the report, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don’t (the public sector equality duty).
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## Appendix 1: Investments Outstanding as at 30th September 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Maturity</th>
<th>Counterparty</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Amount £m</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>Amundi MMF</td>
<td>MMF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen MMF</td>
<td>MMF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federated MMF</td>
<td>MMF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviva MMF</td>
<td>MMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>CCLA Diversified Income Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCLA Local Authorities Property Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payden &amp; Rygel Absolute Return Bond Funds</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threadneedle Global Equity Income Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threadneedle Strategic Bond Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threadneedle Sterling Short-Dated Corporate Bond Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investec, Diversified Income Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schroder Income Maximiser Fund</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp; G Global Dividend Fund (POOLED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp; G Optimal Income Fund (POOLED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp; G UK Income Distribution Fund (POOLED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp; G Strategic Corporate Bond Fund (POOLED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 Month</td>
<td>Newry, Mourne and Down District Council</td>
<td>25/10/2018</td>
<td>25/10/2019</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 Months</td>
<td>Payden &amp; Rygel Sterling Reserve Fund (POOLED)</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal London Enhanced Cash Plus Y (POOLED)</td>
<td>POOLED</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurrock Borough Council</td>
<td>08/11/2017</td>
<td>08/11/2019</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrexham County Borough Council</td>
<td>03/06/2019</td>
<td>03/21/2019</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia &amp; New Zealand Banking Group</td>
<td>04/06/2018</td>
<td>04/12/2019</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 Months</td>
<td>Santander</td>
<td>00/01/1900</td>
<td>CALL 95</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlesbrough Council</td>
<td>26/01/2018</td>
<td>27/01/2020</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>12/03/2019</td>
<td>12/03/2020</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isle of Wight Council</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>07/02/2020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9 Months</td>
<td>Lloyds TSB Bank</td>
<td>10/06/2019</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12 Months</td>
<td>Lancashire County Council</td>
<td>10/05/2019</td>
<td>10/11/2020</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>20/08/2018</td>
<td>20/08/2021</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Life</td>
<td>How long an asset, e.g. a Council building is likely to last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail-in</td>
<td>A bail-in is rescuing a financial institution on the brink of failure by making its creditors and depositors take a loss on their holdings rather than the government or taxpayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail-out</td>
<td>A bailout is a colloquial term for the provision of financial help to a corporation or country which otherwise would be on the brink of failure or bankruptcy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing Portfolio</td>
<td>A list of loans held by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing Requirements</td>
<td>The principal amount the Council requires to borrow to finance capital expenditure and loan redemptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalisation direction or regulations</td>
<td>Approval from central government to fund certain specified types of revenue expenditure from capital resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management</td>
<td>A professional code of Practice which regulates treasury management activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposits</td>
<td>A certificate of deposit (CD) is a time deposit, a financial product. CDs are similar to savings accounts in that they are insured and thus virtually risk free; they are &quot;money in the bank.&quot; They are different from savings accounts in that the CD has a specific, fixed term (often monthly, three months, six months, or one to five years) and, usually, a fixed interest rate. It is intended that the CD be held until maturity, at which time the money may be withdrawn together with the accrued interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial paper</td>
<td>Commercial paper is a money-market security issued (sold) by large corporations to obtain funds to meet short-term debt obligations (for example, payroll), and is backed only by an issuing bank or corporation's promise to pay the face amount on the maturity date specified on the note. Since it is not backed by collateral, only firms with excellent credit ratings from a recognized credit rating agency will be able to sell their commercial paper at a reasonable price. Commercial paper is usually sold at a discount from face value, and carries higher interest repayment rates than bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterparties</td>
<td>Organisations or Institutions the Council lends money to e.g. Banks; Local Authorities and MMFs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>A corporate bond is a bond issued by a corporation. It is a bond that a corporation issues to raise money effectively in order to expand its business. The term is usually applied to longer-term debt instruments, generally with a maturity date falling at least a year after their issue date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered bonds</td>
<td>A covered bond is a corporate bond with one important enhancement: recourse to a pool of assets that secures or &quot;covers&quot; the bond if the originator (usually a financial institution) becomes insolvent. These assets act as additional credit cover; they do not have any bearing on the contractual cash flow to the investor, as is the case with Securitized assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Prices Index</td>
<td>The main inflation rate used in the UK is the CPI. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Retail Prices Index (CPI &amp; RPI)</td>
<td>Chancellor of the Exchequer bases the UK inflation target on the CPI. The CPI inflation target is set at 2%. The CPI differs from the RPI in that CPI excludes housing costs. Also used is RPIX, which is a variation of RPI, one that removes mortgage interest payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Default Swap (CDS)</td>
<td>A kind of protection that can be purchased by MMF companies from insurance companies (for their investment) in exchange for a payoff if the organisation they have invested in does not repay the loan i.e. they default.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit watch</td>
<td>Variety of special programmes offered by credit rating agencies and financial institutions to monitor organisation/individual's (e.g. bank) credit report for any credit related changes. A credit watch allows the organisation/individuals to act on any red flags before they can have a detrimental effect on credit score/history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Arrangements</td>
<td>Methods of Financing such as finance leasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Ratings</td>
<td>A scoring system issued by credit rating agencies such as Fitch, Moody's and Standard &amp; Poor's that indicate the financial strength and other factors of a bank or similar Institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditworthiness</td>
<td>How highly rated an institution is according to its credit rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Management Office (DMO)</td>
<td>The DMO is an agency of the HM Treasury which is responsible for carrying out the Government's Debt Management Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Rescheduling</td>
<td>The refinancing of loans at different terms and rates to the original loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Method</td>
<td>The spread of the cost of an asset over its useful life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilt</td>
<td>Gilt-edged securities are bonds issued by certain national governments. The term is of British origin, and originally referred to the debt securities issued by the Bank of England, which had a gilt (or gilded) edge. Hence, they are known as gilt-edged securities, or gilts for short. Today the term is used in the United Kingdom as well as some Commonwealth nations, such as South Africa and India. However, when reference is made to &quot;gilts&quot;, what is generally meant is &quot;UK gilts,&quot; unless otherwise specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate exposures</td>
<td>A measure of the proportion of money invested and what impact movements in the financial markets would have on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
<td>Is an intergovernmental organisation which states its aims as to foster global monetary cooperation, secure financial stability, facilitate international trade, promote high employment and sustainable economic growth, and reduce poverty around the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired investment</td>
<td>An investment that has had a reduction in value to reflect changes that could impact significantly on the benefits expected from it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBID</td>
<td>The London Interbank Bid Rate – it is the interest rate at which major banks in London are willing to borrow (bid for) funds from each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Loans</td>
<td>Loans from banks available from the London Money Market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including LOBOS (Lender Option, Borrowing Option)</td>
<td>which enable the authority to take advantage of low fixed interest for a number of years before an agreed variable rate comes into force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Fund (MMF)</td>
<td>A 'pool' of different types of investments managed by a fund manager that invests in lightly liquid short term financial instruments with high credit rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Policy Committee (MPC)</td>
<td>Committee designated by the Bank of England, whose main role is to regulate interest rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)</td>
<td>This is the amount which must be set aside from the revenue budget each year to cover future repayment of loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Specified Investments</td>
<td>Investments deemed to have a greater element of risk such as investments for longer than one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>Cost of early repayment of loan to PWLB to compensate for any losses that they may incur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Indicators</td>
<td>Set of rules providing local authorities borrowing for funding capital projects under a professional code of practice developed by CIPFA and providing measures of affordability and prudence reflecting the Council’s Capital Expenditure, Debt and Treasury Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWLB</td>
<td>Public Works Loan Board, a statutory body whose function is to lend money to Local Authorities (LAs) and other prescribed bodies. The PWLB is normally the cheapest source of long term borrowing for LAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Easing (QE)</td>
<td>Quantitative easing (QE), also known as large-scale asset purchases, is an expansionary monetary policy whereby a central bank buys predetermined amounts of government bonds or other financial assets in order to stimulate the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Investments</td>
<td>Investments that meet the Council’s high credit quality criteria and are repayable within 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational bonds</td>
<td>Supranational bonds are issued by institutions that represent a number of countries, not just one. Thus, organisations that issue such bonds tend to be the World Bank or the European Investment Bank. The issuance of these bonds are for the purpose of promoting economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury bills (or T-bills)</td>
<td>Treasury bills (or T-bills) mature in one year or less. Like zero-coupon bonds, they do not pay interest prior to maturity; instead they are sold at a discount of the par value to create a positive yield to maturity. Many regard Treasury bills as the least risky investment available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrated institution</td>
<td>An institution that does not possess a credit rating from one of the main credit rating agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported Borrowing</td>
<td>Borrowing where costs are wholly financed by the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

1. Three motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 11 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 15th January 2020.

2. The motions submitted are listed overleaf. In accordance with the Council Procedure Rules, the motions alternate between the administration and the other Political Groups, with the Opposition Group motions starting with the largest Political Group not to have that meeting’s Opposition Motion Debate slot.

3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council has a responsibility or which affect the Borough. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.

4. There is no specific duration set for this agenda item and consideration of the attached motions may continue until the time limit for the meeting is reached. The guillotine procedure at Council Procedure Rule 9.2 does not apply to motions on notice and any of the attached motions which have not been put to the vote when the time limit for the meeting is reached will be deemed to have fallen. A motion which is not put to the vote at the current meeting may be resubmitted for the next meeting but is not automatically carried forward.

MOTIONS
Set out overleaf is the motions that have been submitted.
12.1 Motion regarding NJC pay

Proposer: Councillor Ehtasham Haque
Seconder: Councillor Tarik Khan

This Council notes

1. Local Government has endured central government funding cuts of nearly 50% since 2010.
2. Between 2010 and 2020, councils will have lost 60p out of every £1 they have received from central government.
3. The 2019 LGA survey of council finances found that 1 in 3 councils fear they will run out of funding to provide even their statutory, legal duties by 2022/23. This number rises to almost two thirds of councils by 2024/2025 or later.
4. The LGA estimates councils will face a funding gap of £8 billion by 2025.
5. Faced with these cuts from central government, the local government workforce has endured years of pay restraint with the majority of pay points losing 22 per cent of their value since 2009/10.
6. At the same time as seeing their pay go down in real terms, workers experience ever increasing workloads and persistent job insecurity. Across the UK, an estimated 876,000 jobs have been lost in local government since June 2010 – a reduction of 30 per cent. Local government has arguably been hit by more severe job losses than any other part of the public sector.
7. There has been a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up more than three quarters of the local government workforce.

This Council believes

1. Our workers are public service super heroes. They keep our communities clean, look after those in need and keep our towns and cities running.
2. Without the professionalism and dedication of our staff, the council services our residents rely on would not be deliverable.
3. Government funding has been cut to the extent that a proper pay rise could result in a reduction in local government services.
4. The government needs to take responsibility and fully fund increases in pay; it should not put the burden on local authorities whose funding been cut to the bone.

This Council resolves to

1. Note the pay claim submitted by GMB, UNISON and Unite on behalf of council and school workers for a £10 per hour minimum wage and a 10 per cent uplift across all other pay points in 2020/21, whilst recognising that local authorities as employers are bound by the results of any national negotiations undertaken by the unions and the NJC.
2. Call on the Local Government Association to make urgent representations to central government to fund the NJC pay claim.
3. Write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State to call for a pay increase for local government workers to be funded with new money from central government.
4. Meet with local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim.
5. Encourage all local government workers to join a union.
12.2 Motion regarding restoring faith in elected politicians

Proposed by: Councillor Peter Golds
Seconded by: Councillor Andrew Wood

The Council notes:

The imprisonment in November 2019 of former Councillor Mohammed Harun of Lansbury ward for defrauding the housing waiting list in the borough.

The jailing of three previous Councillors; Shahed Ali in 2016 for housing fraud, Shelina Akhtar in 2012 for benefits fraud and Nasir Uddin in 2006 for stealing money.

This council further notes:

That investigations continue into a number of elected politicians related to housing issues.

This council further notes:

That former Councillor Shahed Ali was jailed for five months for housing fraud.

That the Council further pursued Shahed Ali for the losses incurred and that a POCA Confiscation Order was made against him, as a result he had to pay £110,000 to Tower Hamlets Council and the government for money he made as a result of his fraud. He was also ordered to pay the council’s legal costs of £70,000.

That former Councillor Mohammed Harun was jailed for sixteen months and was required to pay the council £120,000 and additional legal costs of £17,000 to the council. The latter being reduced as the former councillor pleaded guilty as charged.

This Council believes:

That to restore the faith of people in their elected representatives the Council needs to:

1. “pour encourager les autres” ensure that any elected representative alleged to have committed fraud are not seen to receive any special favours.

2. That the Council needs to perform checks on elected representatives to ensure that declarations made prior to their election are correct and that due diligence has been seen to be undertaken.

This Council therefore recommends:

1. That any elected representatives who has previously shared anti-Semitic or other offensive material online disclose this to the relevant authority and that they make a public apology.

2. That the council makes clear that rules on stalking and harassment apply also to all elected representatives.

3. That any elected representatives facing fraud or other criminal charges is pursued to the fullest possible extent under the law and restitution sought for any crimes they may
have committed. That they receive no special favours for resigning as politicians as that is not a mitigation offered to other residents.

4. That the Council is clearer about the need to declare assets & financial interests outside of Tower Hamlets. That this includes where elected representatives are in receipt of benefits and social housing.

5. To perform a due diligence on all elected representatives of the people by:

   a. Checking the accuracy of information that they have provided on their nomination forms and register of interests after they are elected. Are they correct, are there any omissions?

   b. Checking that the register of interests represent economic interests and not just the place of employment. The register of interests should represent who is paying the salary and the organisation that has signed any contract of employment.

   c. Checking that they do live (or work) in Tower Hamlets and did so when elected.

   d. Confirming whether or not they have ever occupied Council housing while owning private property.

   e. To check that they have not committed benefit or other related fraud

That this work be carried out by the Councils fraud and internal audit team with the assistance where necessary of external bodies like the Department of Work & Pensions.

That if this is not legally enforceable that elected representatives voluntarily give their consent for these checks to be undertaken and that at the next full Council meeting a report be issued identifying those who have agreed to this check.
12.3 Motion regarding Housing and Homeless Households - Changing the one offer permanent home policy

Proposed by: Councillor Rabina Khan

The Council Notes:

- The average cost of a property in Tower Hamlets is now around 14 times what a typical essential worker earns.

- Tower Hamlets has the 12th highest average monthly rents in London, and one of the highest levels of poverty in the UK, with 44% of households in the Borough experiencing income poverty, high levels of deprivation and child poverty, and 67% of people living in the private rental sector living in fuel poverty.

- A key challenge is the ability to procure affordable private sector temporary accommodation to fulfil statutory duties to homeless households.

- There are nearly 2,000 households in temporary accommodation of which over 1,000 are housed outside the borough.

- Crisis defines Homelessness as follows: “Homelessness is about more than rooflessness. A home is not just a physical space; it also has a legal and social dimension. A home provides roots, identity, a sense of belonging and a place of emotional wellbeing. Homelessness is about the loss of all of these. It is an isolating and destructive experience and homeless people are some of the most vulnerable and socially excluded in our society”.

The Council Notes

- Homeless and overcrowded applicants are in Band 2 of the housing allocation register.

- Overcrowded applicants are entitled to three offers before been demoted for a year on the third refusal on an offer.

- Homeless applicants are entitled to only one offer and the right of homelessness duty is removed if an applicant refuses the offer.

- Only in exceptional cases is an offer withdrawn with the homelessness applicant retaining homeless priority.

- In other cases, a homeless applicant can only contend the offer once they have moved in to avoid the risk of homelessness duty been removed.

- A consultation on proposed changes to the way social housing is allocated took place in 2019.

- Significant changes proposed were made to Band 3.
The consultation did not consider the discrepancy Band 2 applicants have in the way offers are made i.e. overcrowded applicants receiving 3 offers and homeless applicants receiving one offer only

There are elected members who have had to raise enquiries on behalf of homeless applicants who after viewing properties did not think it would be suitable for them.

**The Council Resolves:**

The council consults on changes for Band 2 applicants which include homeless and overcrowded applicants to have access to the same number of offers or at least two offers.