



Meeting of the

TOWER HAMLETS COUNCIL

Wednesday, 11th July 2012 at 7.30 p.m.

(or at the rise of the Extraordinary Council Meeting
scheduled for 7.00 p.m., if later)

A G E N D A

VENUE

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

If you require any further information relating to this meeting, would like to request a large print, Braille or audio version of this document, or would like to discuss access arrangements or any other special requirements, please contact:

John S Williams, Service Head, Democratic Services
Tel: 020 7364 4204, E-mail: johns.williams@towerhamlets.gov.uk



Chief Executive's
Directorate

Democratic Services
Tower Hamlets Town Hall
Mulberry Place
5 Clove Crescent
London E14 2BG

Tel **020 7364 4204**
Fax **020 7364 3232**

www.towerhamlets.gov.uk

**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** on **WEDNESDAY, 11TH JULY 2012**, at **7.30 P.M.**, or at the rise of the Extraordinary Council Meeting scheduled for 7.00 p.m., if later.

Isabella Freeman
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services)

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY, 11TH JULY 2012

7.30 p.m. (or at the rise of the Extraordinary Council Meeting, if later)

PAGE
NUMBER

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1 - 2

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 Chief Executive.

3. MINUTES

3 - 152

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the following meetings of the Council:-

- Ordinary Meeting, 25th January 2012 (draft minutes revised in accordance with Members' comments at the previous meeting)
- Budget Meeting, 22nd February 2012
- Annual Meeting, 16th May 2012
- Ordinary Meeting, 16th May 2012
- Extraordinary Meeting, 18th June 2012

The draft minutes are attached.

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

5. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS

Items 5.1 to 5.3 - Petitions for presentation

153 – 156

The Council Procedure Rules provide for a maximum of three petitions to be presented at an Ordinary Meeting of the Council. The deadline for submission of petitions to this meeting is noon on Thursday 5th July. However, as at 3rd July the maximum number of three petitions had already been received.

The petitions received for presentation at this meeting are set out in the attached report.

Item 5.4: Petition for debate

157 - 162

In addition to the above, the Council's Petition Scheme, adopted in July 2010 in accordance with the provisions of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, provides that where a petition includes at least 2,000 signatures, the petitioners may request that a debate is held about the petition at the full Council meeting.

A petition containing 2,403 signatures has been received on the subject of **Youth Service Delivery**.

The text of the petition and guidance on the format for the debate on this matter are set out in the attached report. A maximum total of 18 minutes is allocated for this agenda item.

6. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

163 - 166

The questions which have been received from members of the public for this Council meeting are set out in the attached report.

A maximum period of 20 minutes is allocated to this agenda item.

7. MAYOR'S REPORT

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

A maximum of five minutes is allowed for the Elected Mayor's report, following which the Speaker of Council will give the respective political group leaders an opportunity to respond for up to one minute each if they wish.

8. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

167 - 172

The questions which have been received from Councillors to be put at this meeting are set out in the attached report.

A maximum period of 30 minutes is allocated to this agenda item.

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

9.1 Community Safety Plan 2012/13

To adopt the Community Safety Plan for 2012/13. Report to follow.

Council on 18th June 2012 considered the proposals of the Executive for the Community Safety Plan 2012/13. The Council agreed a number of amendments that it wished to make to the draft Plan and in accordance with the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules, these were referred back to the Mayor and Executive for consideration.

The proposals of the Mayor and Executive for the Community Safety Plan 2012/13, including any revisions to those proposals made by the Executive following consideration of the amendments agreed by the Council, will be re-circulated to Members following the Cabinet meeting on 4th July 2012.

In the event that the Executive does not accept all of the amendments agreed by the Council on 18th June, the Council may at this meeting amend the Plan in line with those amendments subject to the amendment(s) being supported by two-thirds of those Members present and voting on the matter.

9.2 Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

173 - 184

To receive the Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2011/12.

The Annual Report is attached.

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

11. OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Review of proportionality and allocation of places on committees

185 - 188

To undertake a review of proportionality and agree the allocation of places on committees and panels following a change in the political composition of the Council.

The report of the Service Head, Democratic Services is attached.

12. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

189 - 206

The motions submitted by Councillors for debate at this meeting are set out in the attached report.

13. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

In view of the content of the remaining items on the agenda, the Council is recommended to adopt the following motion:

“That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted contains information defined as Exempt in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.”

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL SECTION (PINK)

The Exempt/Confidential (pink) papers for consideration at the meeting will contain information which is commercially, legally or personally sensitive and should not be divulged to third parties. If you do not wish to retain these papers after the meeting please hand them to the Committee Officer present.

14. EXEMPT MINUTES

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the exempt (restricted) minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting on 16th May 2012 and the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 18th June 2012 (to follow).

Agenda Item 2

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - NOTE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

This note is guidance only. Members should consult the Council's Code of Conduct for further details. Note: Only Members can decide if they have an interest therefore they must make their own decision. If in doubt as to the nature of an interest it is advisable to seek advice **prior** to attending at a meeting.

Declaration of interests for Members

Where Members have a personal interest in any business of the authority as described in paragraph 4 of the Council's Code of Conduct (contained in part 5 of the Council's Constitution) then s/he must disclose this personal interest as in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Code. Members must disclose the existence and nature of the interest at the start of the meeting and certainly no later than the commencement of the item or where the interest becomes apparent.

You have a **personal interest** in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- (a) An interest that you must **register**
- (b) An interest that is not on the register, but where the well-being or financial position of you, members of your family, or people with whom you have a close association, is likely to be affected by the business of your authority more than it would affect the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision.

Where a personal interest is declared a Member may stay and take part in the debate and decision on that item.

What constitutes a prejudicial interest? - Please refer to paragraph 6 of the adopted Code of Conduct.

Your personal interest will also be a prejudicial interest in a matter if (a), (b) and either (c) or (d) below apply:-

- (a) A member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think that your personal interests are so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interests; AND
- (b) The matter does not fall within one of the exempt categories of decision listed in paragraph 6.2 of the Code; AND EITHER
- (c) The matter affects your financial position or the financial interest of a body with which you are associated; or
- (d) The matter relates to the determination of a licensing or regulatory application

The key points to remember if you have a prejudicial interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting:-

- i. You must declare that you have a prejudicial interest, and the nature of that interest, as soon as that interest becomes apparent to you; and
- ii. You must leave the room for the duration of consideration and decision on the item and not seek to influence the debate or decision unless (iv) below applies; and

- iii. You must not seek to improperly influence a decision in which you have a prejudicial interest.
- iv. If Members of the public are allowed to speak or make representations at the meeting, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, by statutory right or otherwise (e.g. planning or licensing committees), you can declare your prejudicial interest but make representations. However, you must immediately leave the room once you have finished your representations and answered questions (if any). You cannot remain in the meeting or in the public gallery during the debate or decision on the matter.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 25 JANUARY 2012

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

Members Present:

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

The meeting commenced at 7.36 p.m.

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury, in the Chair

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Shelina Aktar, Anna Lynch and Mohammed Abdul Mukit, MBE.

RESOLVED

That the apologies for absence be noted.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item	Type of interest	Reason
Cllr Kabir Ahmed	5.3	Personal	Resident of affected area.
Cllr Lutfa Begum	12.5	Personal	I am a member of RCN and NMC.
Cllr Zara Davis	12.6	Personal	I am a Trustee of the Dockland Settlements, which currently accommodates a free school.
Cllr Carlo Gibbs	9.1	Personal	I help to administer schemes to reduce underage drinking including Challenge 25 and Community Alcohol Partnerships in my role at the WSTA.
Cllr Denise Jones	8.8	Personal	I am a trustee of the Rich Mix Cultural Centre.
Cllr Shiria Khatun	12.2	Personal	Husband is a locum employee of Poplar Harca.
Cllr Joshua Peck	12.4	Personal	Employer has a contract with LOCOG.
Cllr Joshua Peck	12.13	Personal	Employer has a contract with LOCOG.
Cllr Rachael Saunders	8.8	Personal	I am a Board member of the Rich Mix Cultural Centre.
Cllr Helal Uddin	12.2	Personal	My employer is linked to Poplar Harca who are mentioned in the motion
Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman	12.5	Personal	Employed by NHS.

3. MINUTES

Councillor Joshua Peck referred to agenda item 5.2, Page 10 of the minutes and stated that it was necessary to delete the sentence: "The decision to sell the site was taken by the previous administration" as in his view this comment had not been made at the meeting.

Councillor Peter Golds referred to item 5.1 on Page 9 of the minutes and stated that the petitioners did not receive a written reply within 28 days as indicated.

RESOLVED

That subject to the amendment of item 5.2 as above, the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 29th November 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and the Speaker be authorised to sign them accordingly.

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

No announcements were made at the meeting.

5. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS**5.1 Petition from Wapping Allotments Association:**

Ms Amanda Day and a colleague addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources, then responded to the issues raised. Legal restrictions and controls had been put in place when the land had been given to the Council. Nevertheless, Councillor Choudhury was keen to assist the Association and would be happy to meet to discuss the matter further.

RESOLVED

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

5.2 Petition regarding environmental proposals for the canal side, Ocean Estate:

Ms Brenda Daley and Mr Derek England addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing, then responded to the issues raised. She indicated that she had spoken to Officers and all flats that had a shed would be allocated a replacement. She undertook to work with the petitioners and stated that full consultation would take place with residents on the matter of proposals for garages and sheds for the affected blocks.

RESOLVED

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

5.3 Petition regarding antisocial behaviour in the area of Vallance Road:

Mr Donald Martin and Ms Hannah McHalick addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor, then responded to the issues raised. He stated that he was fully aware of problems in the area and had been working with the Police and other agencies to effect a solution. The Police had already taken action and the Weavers Fields gates were being locked at night and patrols increased by the Police and THEOs. He indicated that he would be seeking further meetings between Officers and residents to determine further action.

RESOLVED

That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED**, and Councillor Rania Khan **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.14 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.14 Sexual Exploitation

Councillor Rania Khan **MOVED**, and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, the motion as printed in the report.

After debate, Councillor Rachael Saunders **MOVED**, and Councillor Alibor Choudhury **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put.” The Procedural Motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The motion as printed in the agenda was then put to the vote and was **agreed** with no Member voting against. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED**This Council notes:**

1. That despite the abolition of slavery over 200 years ago, modern forms of trading in human beings continue, particularly for the purposes of sexual exploitation, forced labour, domestic slavery or organised crime.
2. That 80,000 people are trafficked each year, 80% of which are women and children.
3. That in the UK many thousands of individuals are bought and sold as commodities and forced into modern-day slavery.
4. That Tower Hamlets Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) does excellent work focussing on the protection and welfare of children and young people.
5. That the Metropolitan Police have set up a Trafficking Helpline, working with some local authorities to launch raids and closing down brothels, gathering intelligence on known trafficking gangs/groups and working with their home countries.

This Council believes:

1. That schools should be encouraged to incorporate the topic into their curricula to raise awareness among students.
2. That the efforts made by individuals, business, organisations, the police, government and educational institutions to raise awareness of human trafficking and to oppose such trafficking actively; are to be commended

This Council resolves:

1. To express its support for the work that ECPAT UK (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and the Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes) is doing around the UK to promote the rights of children and for the measures the organisation is taking to protect them from commercial and sexual exploitation and abuse.
2. To acknowledge the potential impact of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games on trafficking, in the context of a possible increase of people entering the UK due to human trafficking, and to work with LOCOG, other Olympic agencies and the police to counteract this.

6. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**6.1 Question from Miss Sultana Begum:**

What does the Mayor think about the Conservative Mayor Boris Johnson's recent rises in London transport fares?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

Ken Livingstone as part of his draft manifesto for Mayor of London has announced on his 'Ken for London' website that... he will cut fares by 5% in the process and saving the average London transport user over £800 over 4 years.

A key part of the 'One Tower Hamlets' Community Plan is to tackle poverty and protect the environment and people's health.

Increases in public transport fares can adversely impact on social inclusion and people's economic wellbeing, particularly for poorer sections of the community.

Tower Hamlets Council's Transport Planning Strategy (2011-2031), using data from Transport for London, indicates that public transport trips account for 37% of total trips in the borough with 21% of all trips by car, 15% by bus, 40% by walking and 2% by cycling.

Therefore, many residents of the borough rely on public transport, for example, to get to work, shopping, visit family and friends.

Increases in bus, tube, train and DLR fares can also encourage more people to go by car rather than travel in healthier, greener ways to the detriment of the quality of life for all in Tower Hamlets and the rest of London.

The recent increases in fares in London will impact on residents by making public transport less affordable and potentially reducing the attractiveness of bus, tube, DLR and rail services as a greener form of travel for local people.

As Tower Hamlets is ranked as the third most deprived local authority area in the country, after Hackney and Newham, any increases in public transport fares will significantly impact on people going to work and making other important journeys, particularly those having to live on the minimum wage or welfare benefits.

Summary of supplementary question from Miss Sultana Begum

Does the Lead Member have a view on Boris Johnson's argument that Ken Livingstone's proposal to use excess TfL revenue to reduce public transport fares is not realistic?

Summary of Councillor Shahed Ali's response to the supplementary question

I will need to look at this in detail before making full comments but would make the point that, since Ken Livingstone left as Mayor of London, the cost of a single bus journey has gone from 90p to £1.35.

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motions 12.1 and 12.9 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.1 Public transport and unaffordable fares

Councillor Fozol Miah **MOVED** and Councillor Harun Miah **SECONDED**, the motion as printed in the agenda.

Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED**, and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED**, a **tabled** amendment to the motion as follows:-

“Delete all after ‘This Council notes that’ and insert:

- Prior to the 2000 Mayoral election, Ken Livingstone's Mayoral election manifesto stated “I will freeze bus and tube fares in real terms for four years.” In January 2004, the single bus fare outside zone 1 was increased by 43% and cash fares on the Tube rose by 25%.
- Prior to the 2004 Mayoral election, Ken Livingstone promised fares would not increase above the rate of inflation. In September 2004 he announced that Tube fares would rise at 1% above inflation and bus fares at 10% above inflation. A single bus fare was increased by 20%. Ken Livingstone has since admitted in his memoirs that “I decided to increase the fares before the [2004] election”.
- Prior to the 2008 Mayoral election, Ken Livingstone promised to freeze Tube fares in real terms. Leaked emails have since shown that Mr Livingstone had already in 2007 approved higher than real term Tube increases.
- “Mr Livingstone is wrong to claim there's a £729m surplus, and there is no separate budget for investment projects. If he cuts fares, TfL expects to lose £1.12bn in income from fares – and that's a hole he wouldn't be able to plug without hitting the day-to-day funding for London's transport or taking money from investment projects.”
- “How he'd do that is up to him, but it could mean that tube and bus route upgrades are delayed, or TfL could be forced to shed some staff

members. Any mayoral candidate can raid the TfL's coffers to cut fares. But cutting fares could mean cutting investment – which London's transport system has been sorely starved of for decades.”

This Council believes that:

- Boris Johnson's fare restructuring is fair, and will bring long overdue Tube and transport infrastructure upgrades.
- Ken Livingstone's argument that fare reductions can be paid for from a TFL surplus is misleading, as the latest TFL business plan shows all of the operational surplus in the next four years will be spent on capital projects.
- Ken Livingstone's promises on Tube and bus fare increases have no credibility, and that his latest proposals are yet another cynical promise waiting to be broken.

This Council resolves:

- To support Boris Johnson's plans to upgrade London's transport infrastructure and Tube network.”

Following debate, the amendment moved by Councillor Golds was put to the vote and was **defeated**.

Following further debate, Councillor Joshua Peck **MOVED** and Councillor Alibor Choudhury **SECONDED** a procedural motion: 'That under Procedure Rule 14.1.10, the question be now put.' The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The substantive motion as printed in the agenda was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes that:

- 1) the importance of encouraging use of public transport to limit pollution in London and to save on use of fossil fuels which increase global warming
- 2) people on lower incomes are particularly dependent on public transport to ensure they can gain access for themselves and their families of the benefits of living in London
- 3) many people have seen or are seeing no rise in their incomes despite the fact inflation is over 5% and this is cutting their living standards
- 4) Tory Mayor of London Boris Johnson is committed to raising fares on public transport in London year on year by 1% above inflation, despite falling living

standards for many, particularly on lower incomes across the capital and in Tower Hamlets in particular

5) Ken Livingstone, the only candidate who realistically can be expected to replace the Tory mayor Boris Johnson in elections in May 2012, has promised to reduce fares by 5% if elected with no increase in fares in 2013.

This Council believes that:

1) the rise in fares proposed by the Tory Mayor Boris Johnson will have a severe effect on the living standards in London particularly of those on lower incomes

2) the rise in fares proposed by Tory Mayor Boris Johnson will discourage use of public transport

3) a reduction in fares rather than an increase is both affordable and desirable

This Council supports:

The plans announced by Ken Livingstone to reduce fares if elected next May.

12.9 Support Ken Livingstone's fair deal for transport

Councillor Rabina Khan **MOVED**, and Councillor Shafiqul Haque **SECONDED**, the motion as printed in the agenda.

Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED**, and Councillor Tim Archer **SECONDED**, a **tabled** amendment to the motion. The text of the amendment was the same as that moved by Councillor Golds at motion 12.1 above.

Following debate, the amendment moved by Councillor Golds was put to the vote and was **defeated**.

Following further debate, the substantive motion as printed in the agenda was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

1. That from January 2012 there has been a steep rise in bus, tube and rail fares under Tory Mayor Boris Johnson

2. That under the Tory mayor the cost of a single bus ticket has risen by a massive 50 per cent since 2008, whilst the price of a monthly zone 1-2 Travelcard is up 21% costing £230.40 per year more, and the price of zones 1-6 Travelcard is up a fifth.

3. That a key part of the "One Tower Hamlets" Community Plan is to tackle poverty and protect the environment and peoples' health.
4. That increases in public transport fares can adversely impact on social inclusion, mobility and people's economic well being, particularly for poorer sections of our community.
5. That increases in bus, tube, train and DLR fares can also encourage more people to use cars rather than public transport and therefore contribute to increased congestion and poorer air quality.

This Council believes:

1. That Boris Johnson's transport policies are hurting our residents.
2. That we should support initiatives that seeks to reduce the costs of using public transport.
3. That Ken Livingstone's manifesto pledge to cut fares immediately by 7%, to freeze them the next year and saving the average London Transport user £1000 over 4 years is good news for residents in Tower Hamlets and to be welcomed.

This Council resolves:

To support Ken Livingstone's campaign to make fares affordable for Londoners.

6.2 Question from Mr Len Aldis:

Could the Mayor update me on his conversations with LOCOG regarding the controversial sponsorship of the Olympic Games by Dow Chemical?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Thank you Len for your question. The issue of LOCOG accepting sponsorship from Dow Chemical is causing widespread concern in view of Dow's connections with the Union Carbide - Bhopal disaster which cost the lives of up to 25,000 people.

A joint letter was sent on behalf of the Mayor, Cllr Josh Peck (Labour Group), Fozol Miah (Respect Group) and Stephanie Eaton (Lib Dem) to Lord Coe expressing the view that it besmirched the reputation of the Olympics for it to have any association with Dow Chemicals.

Unfortunately, Lord Coe's letter in response might well have been written for him by Dow Chemical's public relations department.

In his reply Lord Coe stated that Dow had no responsibilities in relation to the Bhopal disaster as 'they did not own or operate the Union Carbide India

Limited Plant that was the site of the 1984 disaster'. He goes on to say that 'Dow is an industry leader in terms of operating with the highest standards of ethics and sustainability' and that LOCOG 'stand behind' Dow 'both as a worldwide sponsor of the Olympic movement and as a supplier to LOCOG'.

The fact is that Dow Chemical bought Union Carbide they knew that Union Carbide was wanted on criminal charges pertaining to the Bhopal disaster. It is my view, and that of a wide array of public figures in this country and internationally, that Dow therefore has a responsibility to the victims of the Bhopal disaster.

Until it honours that responsibility any association with Dow puts a blemish on the 2012 Olympics which we are all looking forward to, and which we all want to ensure are a great success.

The Olympic ideal aspires to the best in fair play and ethics. LOCOG's association with Dow diminishes those high ideals and aspirations.

Summary of supplementary question from Mr Len Aldis

I have visited Vietnam many times over the years and have seen many people affected after the war there by exposure to Agent Orange that was produced by Dow Chemical. I have since raised this with the Mayor and other agencies on behalf of organisations in Vietnam who were requesting help. I took a letter from those organisations to Lord Coe's office asking that Dow Chemical be dropped as an Olympic sponsor, as they had been instrumental in creating three generations of disabled people in Vietnam. Their sponsorship was regarded by the Vietnamese people as an affront. Lord Coe's response was therefore also an insult to them.

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Rania Khan **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – "That under Procedure Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.13 to be considered as next business."

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

12.13 Dow Chemical, Bhopal and the Olympic Park

Councillor Lutfa Begum **MOVED**, and Councillor Rania Khan **SECONDED**, the motion as printed in the agenda.

After debate, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman **MOVED**, and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – "That under Procedural Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put." The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The motion as printed in the agenda was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

This meeting notes:

1. That on December 12 2011 Mayor Lutfur Rahman, Cllr Josh Peck (Labour Group), Fozol Miah (Respect Group) and Stephanie Eaton (Lib Dem) sent a joint letter to Lord Sebastian Coe, Chairman of the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) expressing concern over its decision to accept sponsorship for the Olympic Games from Dow Chemical, in light of its associations with the Union Carbide/Bhopal disaster.

2. That in a reply to that letter Lord Coe stated 'Dow is an industry leader in terms of operating with the highest standards of ethics and sustainability' and that LOCOG 'stand behind' Dow 'both as a worldwide sponsor of the Olympic movement and as a supplier to LOCOG'.

3. That Lord Coe also stated that Dow Chemical had no responsibilities in relation to the Bhopal disaster as 'they did not own or operate the Union Carbide India Limited Plant that was the site of the 1984 disaster'.

4. That due to campaign pressure Dow Chemical has agreed to remove all its branding from Britain's Olympic stadium.

This meeting believes:

1. That when Dow Chemical bought Union Carbide they knew that Union Carbide were wanted on criminal charges pertaining to the Bhopal disaster.

2. That Dow therefore has a responsibility to the victims of the Bhopal disaster.

3. That any association with Dow tarnishes the name and reputation of the Olympics.

This meeting resolves:

To maintain pressure on LOCOG to drop Dow Chemical as a partner for the 2012 Olympics.

6.3 Question from Ms Catherine Tuitt:

In light of the Stephen Lawrence case concluding with two convictions, what further steps will the Mayor be taking to monitor, and eradicate, racial and hate crime and promote equality in the borough?

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you for your question and welcome to the Council meeting. I know that you are one of those people who can stand up against all forms of racism and injustice, for equal rights and social justice. This is where you are different and you are true Labour, not like the imposters sitting in front of me.

Tackling discrimination and hate is a fundamental part of the Council's approach to building One Tower Hamlets. In developing our work on tackling hate crime we have taken on the recommendations of the McPherson report into the death of Stephen Lawrence. One of the recommendations of the McPherson report was to provide additional reporting means for victims of racism.

In response to this we have worked with the local Police to develop 12 Third Party Reporting Centres in the borough. These are key sites in the borough where victims are likely to attend. We will continue to maintain these centres and provide regular training to the Centre staff so that they can take reports sensitively and appropriately. We continue to promote the centres through effective publicity and outreach work.

This work is complimented by our No Place for Hate pledge which continues to gain support from individuals and organisations in the borough. It has a key role in encouraging everyone in the local community to join forces with the Council and take a stand against hate crime.

Tower Hamlets has a strong network of No Place for Hate Champions, a network of people trained in Hate Crime and supported by the Council to take action on hate crime. They have had many successes in raising awareness of hate crime, promoting reporting and ensuring that the message is widely spread in the community. Our No Place for Hate outreach work reaches far and wide, through attending key community events and forums across the borough, reaching hundreds of different groups of people each year. The Tower Hamlets No Place for Hate Board ensures that there is an effective partnership structure in place to deal with hate crime. It maintains an action plan of work on hate crime, to which Council and partner agencies contribute.

The monthly Tower Hamlets' Hate Incidents Panel (HIP) meets monthly and is seen as a model of best practice in aiming to co-ordinate and review a top quality service provision across partners, for hate crime incidents. It also provides a forum for effective information sharing and enables appropriate actions to be taken to increase public safety.

Other key aspects of our work include the provision of a 24 hour Free phone reporting facility for victims of hate crime (0800 138 0521).

Further work planned for 2012 includes: -

- Production and distribution of an up to date Hate Crime Manual which assists professionals and volunteers to identify hate crime at an early stage and sign post victims appropriately.

- Providing refresher Hate Crime Training for the Council Call Centre staff who answer the Hate Crime hotline.
- Provision of Hate Crime training will be made available to all Council staff.
- Training of staff in charities and voluntary organisations in the borough including Tower Hamlets MIND (mental health charity).
- Training of Police and other key agencies on how to make referrals to the HIP
- We will continue to develop our approach in response to trends identified through analysis of hate crime data and engagement with communities.

Thank you for coming and again for all the good work that you do.

Summary of supplementary question from Ms Catherine Tuitt

Thank you for your comments – as you have mentioned a top quality service delivery, can I have your assurance that there will be increased resources to maintain the level of this activity in the Borough? Looking at issues included on your agenda, race and hate crime includes anti-Semitism as well as Islamophobia and human trafficking.

Summary of Councillor Ohid Ahmed's reply to the supplementary question

Thank you again, I can assure you that all necessary resources will be made available to address this problem.

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.11 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.11 Remembering Stephen Lawrence

Councillor Abdul Asad **MOVED**, and Councillor Kabir Ahmed **SECONDED**, the motion as printed in the agenda.

After debate, Councillor Abdul Asad **MOVED**, and Councillor Kabir Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

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

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

1. That after eighteen years the Stephen Lawrence case has finally seen some resolution with two men convicted for his murder.
2. The dignity with which the Lawrence family have led their campaign.
3. That Stephen Lawrence's murder highlights that there are people, albeit a tiny minority, who harbour a deep racism and may even be capable of terrible, violent acts.
4. The fact that Tower Hamlets is a multi cultural, multi racial borough, where the overwhelming majority of people work and live together happily, should not allow for any complacency.
5. That the Stephen Lawrence case also highlights the insidious nature of racism and how it can infect and distort the workings of institutions.
6. That among the findings of the Macpherson Inquiry was a clear conclusion about the existence of institutional racism in the police service and other public sector organizations.
7. That the Stephen Lawrence Centre in Deptford is facing closure due to lack of funding.

This Council believes:

That we owe it to the legacy of Stephen Lawrence and the hard work of the Lawrence family to strengthen our commitment to tackling institutional discrimination and exclusion and confronting all prejudices, inequalities and unfair treatment whether as a result of gender, sexuality, age, race, disability, religious affiliation, belief or class.

This Council resolves:

1. To write to the Lawrence Family on behalf of all councillors in an expression of support and solidarity.
2. To continue to campaign against all forms of discrimination and hatred.
3. To explore all we can do to help the Stephen Lawrence Centre to continue its important work.

Point of Order

At this point Councillor Joshua Peck rose on a point of order. He stated that it was extremely sad that a debate on which there was absolute unanimity across the chamber, had started with a statement from the Deputy Mayor that Councillor Peck found to be outrageous and unacceptable. Councillor Peck stated that the Deputy Mayor had said to Ms Tuitt 'you stand up to racism, you don't accept any racism, you are different to those opposite' and he felt that the clear implication of this was that the members of the Labour Group failed to stand up to racism and accept racism.

Councillor Peck further stated that at the last full Council meeting, the Deputy Mayor had also made an allegation that councillors were trying to amend the constitution simply for the reason that the Mayor was Bangladeshi. This was again a clear accusation that members of the Council were racist. He had received a rather thin, three line apology for that from the Deputy Mayor dated today, three months after the event. Councillor Peck felt that the Deputy Mayor's further comments at the current meeting showed that apology to be worthless. He proposed that the Deputy Mayor's comments be recorded verbatim in the minutes of the meeting and he invited the Deputy Mayor to apologise and withdraw his remarks.

Councillor Peter Golds stated that he also found the Deputy Mayor's allegations made at the previous meeting about members of the Council to be outrageous. He sought an apology and supported Councillor Peck's request that the Deputy Mayor's comments be recorded in the minutes.

Point of Personal Explanation

Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor rose to make a point of personal explanation. He stated that if the Speaker had not stopped him from completing his speech at the last meeting, the current situation would not have arisen. He had written to Councillor Peck and Councillor Golds regarding that meeting but if those councillors wished to take the matter further he would be happy to do so and challenge this issue.

In relation to the current debate, Councillor Ahmed stated that Councillor Peck should stop playing petty politics. He had said to the public questioner, Ms Tuitt that she was true Labour, rather than some in the chamber who were imposter Labour. Councillor Ahmed stated that this was nothing different from what he had said before.

The Speaker of the Council stated that the comments made by Members had been noted.

6.4 Question from Ms Syeda Nasima:

What steps is the Mayor taking to respond to the demand in the community for Bengali language teaching in mainstream primary schools in Tower Hamlets?

Response by Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Thank you for your question. I am pleased to see the enthusiasm of parents for mother-tongue teaching in our primary schools. This has been greatly expressed through a number of signed petition sheets addressed to individual schools in the borough.

Our Members are talking to senior officers, schools and governors about refreshing the current strategy. Formal consultation will take place at the Head Teachers' Forum and Heads Consultative meeting this term.

Our borough is introducing Level 1 and Level 2 courses in Bengali for class teachers and Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to build schools' capacity. However, we as a Local Authority have no power to instruct schools on the issue of choosing a subject. It is an internal matter and schools decide independently, in consultation with their staff, parents and governors.

(No supplementary question was asked.)

7. MAYOR'S REPORT

The Mayor made his report to the Council meeting, referring firstly to the recent Child Poverty Action report which showed that 52% of children in the Borough lived below the poverty line. The Mayor stated that this must be reduced as a priority issue and that previous reductions in poverty that had been enabled under a Labour Government were under threat because of cuts made by the Conservative-led administration.

The Mayor considered that a further main priority area must be to protect residents of the Borough from the austerity cuts, to promote jobs and education maximise entry into apprenticeships. He added that 868 Olympics jobs had been secured for local people and his administration was working to achieve more.

The Mayor pointed out that, since the last Council meeting, two of the killers of Stephen Lawrence had been convicted and he was pleased to support the related motion on the agenda. He commended the dignity shown by the Lawrence family over the 18 years since Stephen's murder.

That period had also seen much work on changing Police interaction with minorities and the Mayor particularly mentioned the new Metropolitan Police Commissioner's plans in relation to stop and search measures. Much progress had been made on tackling racism but it was still essential to remain vigilant.

The Mayor commented out that the coming month would see the start of the Chinese Year of the Dragon and he added that the Borough had been enriched by the presence of the Chinese community.

The Leader of the Majority Group and Leaders of the Minority Groups each responded briefly to the Mayor's report.

8. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The Speaker indicated that the meeting would now move to questions from Councillors.

Councillor Judith Gardiner put the first question on the order paper and the Mayor indicated that Councillor Rabina Khan would respond.

Point of Order

At this point, Councillor Peck stated that in accordance with decisions regarding the Constitution made at the last Council meeting, the Mayor should respond personally to all questions asked, rather than nominating Cabinet members to do so.

Following discussion on the matter, the Speaker at **9.15 p.m.** declared the meeting **adjourned** so that Officers' advice might be obtained. The meeting **reconvened** at **9.40 p.m.** Ms Isabella Freeman, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) advised the Council that, in accordance with the valid amendments to the Constitution made at the last meeting, the Council could require that questions are put to the Mayor and could prevent Cabinet Members from responding on the Mayor's behalf, although the Mayor could not be obliged to answer questions personally at the meeting.

The Mayor commented that he had appointed to the Cabinet very able and experienced Lead Members to take charge of service provision and who would be involved with him in addressing matters included in their portfolios. He urged Councillors to work with him for the benefit of the wider community. However, if the Council would not agree to Cabinet Members replying to questions in the Chamber, he would publish written answers to Members' questions at an appropriate time of his choosing.

Procedural Motion

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED**, and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion - "That under Procedure Rule 14.1.14, Rule 13.1 be suspended to allow the following urgent motion to be debated:-

"We condemn both the Tory and Labour groups for their time wasting tactics and blatant disregard for the public who have come to listen to Council affairs that affect their lives."

More than 10 Members rose from their seats to request a recorded vote on the procedural motion in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4. A recorded vote was therefore taken and Members indicated their votes as follows:-

For the motion (15 Councillors)

Councillor Kabir Ahmed
Councillor Ohid Ahmed
Councillor Rofique Uddin Ahmed
Councillor Shahed Ali
Councillor Abdul Asad
Councillor Lutfu Begum
Councillor Alibor Choudhury
Councillor Shafiqul Haque
Councillor Aminur Khan
Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Rania Khan
Councillor Fozol Miah
Councillor Harun Miah
Councillor Maium Miah
Councillor Oliur Rahman

Against the motion (33 Councillors)

Councillor Joshua Peck
Councillor Peter Golds
Councillor Helal Abbas
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed
Councillor Rajib Ahmed
Councillor Timothy Archer
Councillor Craig Aston
Councillor Zara Davis
Councillor Stephanie Eaton
Councillor David Edgar
Councillor Marc Francis
Councillor Judith Gardiner
Councillor Carlo Gibbs
Councillor Carli Harper-Penman
Councillor Sirajul Islam
Councillor Ann Jackson
Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor Dr Emma Jones
Councillor Anwar Khan
Councillor Shiria Khatun
Councillor Ahmed Omer
Councillor Lesley Pavitt
Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Rachael Saunders
Councillor David Snowdon
Councillor Gloria Thienel
Councillor Bill Turner

Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Kosru Uddin
Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Councillor Amy Whitelock
Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury (Speaker of Council)

Abstained (nil Councillors)

The procedural motion was accordingly **defeated**.

The following questions 8.1 to 8.16, 8.18 and 8.20 to 8.21 (and where indicated, supplementary questions) were then put by Members. In response in each case the Mayor re-iterated that if the Council would not accept a response from his Cabinet Member, he would provide a written answer subsequently at a time of his choosing.

Questions 8.17 and 8.19 were not put at the meeting as the respective members asking the questions were not present when their question was reached. Questions 8.22 to 8.25 were not put at the meeting due to the time limit for the item having expired.

[Note: The written responses that were subsequently provided to all questions, and where applicable to supplementary questions put at the meeting, are attached at Appendix A to these minutes.]

8.1 Question from Councillor Judith Gardiner:

The Government has recently announced that it will be changing the law to make unauthorised subletting a criminal offence. What extra measures will the Mayor be taking to crack down on this and other abuses of the allocation process to ensure that those in genuine housing need are not disadvantaged or taken advantage of by cheats?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Judith Gardiner

Why does the Mayor feel it is so hard to answer in public a simple question that will affect the lives of many tenants in the Borough? Is it because it affects a councillor close to him who is absent from today's meeting?

8.2 Question from Councillor Peter Golds:

Does the Mayor support the Government's announcement that it will seek to criminalise sub-letting of socially rented property?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Peter Golds

In addition to the case of the councillor already mentioned, what are your comments on a case in Cable Street where a resident complaining of an illegal sub-letting was informed by Social Services that persons moving furniture into a flat were the tenant's carers? And how does the Mayor justify a millionaire living in a Peabody Housing property who also owns a house elsewhere?

8.3 Question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman:

Housing Benefit changes will have a profound impact on our residents and it will lead to some having to leave the borough because the housing allowance will not cover their full rent. Can the Mayor inform the Council the number of meetings he has had with the Minister responsible for these changes to highlight the impact on residents of Tower Hamlets?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

As no answer has been given, I shall assume there was no meeting. I do not feel it is appropriate for the Mayor to sit there smiling and not answer the questions. If he does not want to answer he can take a break and leave the Council Chamber. The Prime Minister and Mayor of London answer questions personally, why is the Mayor refusing to do so?

8.4 Question from Councillor Fozol Miah:

Will the Mayor and lead member celebrate with me the bringing to justice of two of Stephen Lawrence's killers and congratulate all those involved in achieving this and above all Neville and Doreen Lawrence, but also regret that police incompetence, racism and maybe even corruption botched the original enquiry and may lead to his other murderers continuing to evade justice, and will they also agree that, whilst there have been significant improvements in policing in London since the landmark Macpherson report, there are still serious problems, for example in the abuse of "stop and search" powers and in the lack of ethnic minority appointment to senior management positions in the Metropolitan Police, and will they agree to make representations to the new Commissioner and to the borough commander that the concept of "total" policing should include making the police reflect at all levels of the force and, above all, respect all of the communities they police?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Fozol Miah

My question was also directed to the Cabinet Member.

8.5 Question from Councillor Lesley Pavitt:

Can the Mayor please tell me why the number of complaints about One Stop Shops went up by 29% in the first half of 2011/12?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Lesley Pavitt

Tower Hamlets people don't complain unless they have real cause. What are you going to do about the inevitable increase in complaints when the Rushmead Office is closed and people will have to travel much further to access Council services?

8.6 Question from Councillor Zara Davis:

Why has the Mayor ignored the motion agreed by Full Council in September 2011, which resolved that "Sir John McDougal Gardens, Millwall Park and Island Gardens will remain solely for the use of residents and community groups for the purposes of recreation, leisure and sports?"

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Zara Davis

It is disappointing the Mayor will not justify his actions in view of the petition signed by many hundreds of residents. Has he considered the full implications of hiring out parks, such as damage caused, restriction of residents' use, areas being cordoned off and thus making it harder for residents to stay active; and the likely increase of childhood obesity from resulting lack of exercise?

8.7 Question from Councillor Shiria Khatun:

Can the Mayor tell this Council what is being done to increase recycling in the borough?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Shiria Khatun

Does the Mayor share my concern that the proposed £15 charge for bulky waste collection risks littering the Borough with discarded mattresses, sofas and other polluting debris?

8.8 Question from Councillor Maium Miah:

Can the Mayor inform the Council on whether the Rich Mix Centre has repaid its £850,000 short-term loan, as agreed by Michael Keith when he was Council Leader?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Maium Miah

Will the Mayor answer my question?

8.9 Question from Councillor Helal Uddin:

How does the Mayor justify the recently announced significant rent rise, which will hit tenants already struggling with rising costs in other utilities, falling wages and benefit changes, and rising fees and charges for parking and other Council Services, and what measures will he be taking to mitigate its effect?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Helal Uddin

I would have expected the Mayor to have said what action he will be taking. Do I therefore assume there are no measures planned?

8.10 Question from Councillor David Snowdon:

Will the Mayor please outline what measures he is taking to promote the teaching of history in Tower Hamlets schools?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor David Snowdon

Did the Mayor study GCSE history at school?

8.11 Question from Councillor Kosru Uddin:

Following the EDL visit and the riots last year and lack of involvement of THEOs in supporting the borough's residents, has a revised strategy been agreed in terms of THEOs involvement in community safety if future disturbances on the scale witnessed last year were to be repeated?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Kosru Uddin

£258,600 has been identified for funding activities in the Borough to combat the highest levels of gang and youth violence for 20 years. In what innovative ways will this be spent and how will value for money be achieved?

8.12 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton to the Deputy Mayor:

Would the Deputy Mayor agree that the 41% increase in burglary over the past 12 months in Bethnal Green North is a serious concern and would he join with me to urge the Borough Commander and the BGN Safer Neighbourhood Team to undertake an immediate review of the ward and implement burglary prevention measures in the ward?

Summary of supplementary question by Councillor Stephanie Eaton

Is the Deputy Mayor aware that the nearest branch of Victim Support is based at Waltham Forest and does he support a branch being opened nearer to Tower Hamlets?

8.13 Question from Councillor Carlo Gibbs:

Can the Mayor please tell me how many visits were made by residents to Rushmead One Stop Shop last year regarding Housing Benefit?

Summary of supplemental question by Councillor Carlo Gibbs

Residents attending the meeting are dismayed that these questions are being made a joke. People are facing a significant lowering of benefits and are losing a One Stop Shop where they could obtain advice. Will the Mayor make a commitment to review the decision to close Rushmead One Stop Shop?

8.14 Question from Councillor Gloria Thienel:

Considering the rising incidents of metal theft from public memorials; how many incidents of metal theft from a public memorial in Tower Hamlets has taken place in the last year, will the Mayor please inform the Council what measures he has taken to ensure that war memorials are protected in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Gloria Thienel

Will the Mayor look at taking part in the pilot initiative that will stop scrap dealers from dealing in cash for scrap metal?

8.15 Question from Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed:

Can the Mayor tell me how many jobs so far have been taken up by Tower Hamlets residents as a result of the deal made between him and LOCOG?

Summary of Supplementary question from Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed

At the last Full Council meeting, the Lead Member said that only 30 jobs had been secured – what is the position now?

8.16 Question from Councillor Harun Miah:

Will the Mayor and the lead member agree with me that the Private Finance Initiative was an unnecessary accounting trick which has not produced value for money for the taxpayer but has instead lumbered taxpayers with very large

and potentially unsustainable future debts and could they confirm which PFI schemes imposed on Tower Hamlets schools have run into financing problems, what the implications are of these problems and what the council is doing to sort these problems out?

(No supplementary question was asked)

8.18 Question from Councillor Craig Aston:

Will the Mayor provide an update on energy efficiency in the Town Hall building?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Craig Aston

On the standard European energy rating scale of A-G, this building is in Band G. What are the implications of this in terms of extra energy costs?

8.20 Question from Councillor Lutfa Begum:

What has been done to help overcrowded families who are reluctant to move to Car Free Properties?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Lutfa Begum

Some social housing developments have their own car parking. Will the Mayor seek to include this in street parking to achieve more spaces?

8.21 Question from Councillor Tim Archer:

Will the Mayor provide an update on the progress of the motion agreed by full Council on 15 September 2010, to bring the Henry Moore statue back to the borough and explain to the Council why this is taking so long, what meetings/discussions have taken place and will the statue be back in time for the Olympics?

(Councillor Timothy Archer stated that he would send a supplementary question to the Mayor in written form)

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

9.1 Substance Misuse Strategy

The Council considered the report of the Cabinet at its meeting dated 7th December 2011, incorporating the report of the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture, proposing the adoption of a Borough-wide Substance Misuse Strategy.

Councillor Ohid Ahmed **MOVED** and Councillor Kabir Ahmed **SECONDED** the recommendations as contained in the report.

After debate Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1 the question be now put.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

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

RESOLVED

That the Substance Misuse Strategy be adopted as set out at Appendix 1 to the report of the Cabinet (CAB 054/112) and included at pages 71 to 156 of the Council agenda.

Procedural Motion

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow item 11.1 on this agenda to be considered as the next business.”

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

9.2 London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003 (Section 16) - report of the Cabinet Meeting on 11th January 2012

The Council considered the Cabinet report dated 11th January 2012, incorporating the report of the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture, in relation to Section 16 of the London Local Authorities Act 2003, concerning vehicles driving over the footway.

Councillor Shahed Ali **MOVED** and Councillor Shafiqul Haque **SECONDED**, the recommendations as contained in the report.

After debate, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put.”

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

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

RESOLVED

That it be determined that Section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003 will come into operation in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets on 1st May 2012.

9.3 Proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution - report of the General Purposes Committee, 17th January 2012

The Council considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) proposing amendments to the Council's Constitution as recommended by the General Purposes Committee at its meeting held on 17th January 2012. The report, which was circulated with the supplementary agenda, superceded that which had been included in the original agenda papers.

The Council noted that the supplementary report had not been circulated with the Council agenda in accordance with the timescales set out in the Authority's constitution because the meeting of the General Purposes Committee reported therein took place after the agenda was sent to print. The report was nevertheless recommended for consideration at this meeting because the constitutional matters set out in the report required urgent resolution to enable the implementation of the decisions previously made by the Council and, in relation to the Budget Council procedures, to ensure these were in place before the Budget Council Meeting 2012.

The report was introduced by Mr John S. Williams, Service Head, Democratic Services and appropriate advice was provided by Ms Isabella Freeman, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services), in particular drawing the Council's attention to the statutory officers' comments on the proposals regarding (i) recorded votes and (ii) virements.

Councillor Shiria Khatun **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED** the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee as set out in the report circulated with the supplementary agenda.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Peck **MOVED** a **tabled** amendment as follows:-

"Delete points 11.5 and 11.6 and insert:-

'This Council instructs the Interim Chief Executive to make arrangements for a working group comprising a representative of the Executive, the majority and the other political groupings, senior officers and an independent adviser to consider the budget making and virement arrangements of the Council and make recommendations to a meeting of the next non-budget Full Council through the appropriate channel'."

Councillor David Edgar **SECONDED** the amendment moved by Councillor Peck.

Councillor Craig Aston **MOVED**, and Councillor David Snowdon **SECONDED**, a further tabled amendment as follows:-

“1. That the proposed amendment to Council Procedure Rule 17.4 at part 4.1 of the Constitution be deleted.

2. To delete the word ‘ten’ in Council Procedure Rule 17.4 at part 4.1 of the Constitution and substitute the word ‘six’.

3. To amend Council Procedure Rule 17.4 at part 4.1 of the Constitution to add at the end:

‘No recorded vote may be called on motions under Council Procedure Rules 14.1.10, 15.11.4 and 15.12.1 (that is, motions that the question be now put).’”

Extension of time limit for the meeting

Councillor David Snowdon **MOVED** and Councillor Zara Davis **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 15.11.7 the meeting be extended until completion of the current agenda item.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Procedural Motion

Following debate, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman **MOVED** and Councillor Bill Turner **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put.” The procedural motion was then put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The Service Head, Democratic Services advised the Council that Members should now consider and vote in turn on each recommendation contained in the report. Amendments to each recommendation could be proposed in the usual manner.

At the appropriate point during the Council’s consideration, the amendments previously moved by Councillors Peck and Snowdon respectively were put to the vote.

The amendment moved by Councillor Peck was **agreed**.

The amendment moved by Councillor Snowdon was **defeated**.

Each section of the substantive motion as amended was then put to the vote in turn and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

1. That the deadline for amendments for the Budget Council meeting be brought forward to 9.15 a.m. on the working day before the budget meeting and the amendments be circulated to the Mayor and all Councillors, with any officer comments that are available, at least 24 hours before the meeting.
2. That the Budget Council Procedure Rules at paragraph 4.2 of Part 4.1 of the Constitution be amended as follows in relation to the first Budget Council meeting:
 - (a) Other than amendments notified in advance as above, no further substantial amendment may normally be moved at the budget meeting but the Council may, subject to the advice of the Monitoring Officer, Section 151 Officer and Head of Paid Service, agree that an amendment without notice can be debated.
 - (b) The Speaker will remind the Council at the start of the meeting of the importance where possible of all amendments being moved at the beginning of the debate or as soon as the need for the amendment is identified; and before moving to the 'right of reply' and voting stage of the meeting will give a final invitation for any further amendments. No new amendment may be proposed once the call for the vote has commenced.
 - (c) At the first Budget Council meeting, if a new amendment is moved during the final 30 minutes of the time allocated for the meeting, the meeting will automatically be extended by up to 30 minutes to enable that amendment to be debated before the guillotine procedure comes into operation. This will apply even if a previous extension has already been agreed.
 - (d) At the end of the 30 minutes if the debate is not complete, the guillotine process will come into operation in the normal way and the vote will proceed on the amendments and substantive motion the meeting will conclude, unless the Monitoring Officer and Section 151 officer advise the Speaker that the matter has not been sufficiently discussed – in this case the meeting will continue to consider any outstanding amendment(s) and any further amendments that may arise directly as a consequence of those amendments only.
 - (e) Nothing in the above provisions should extend the meeting beyond a total duration of five hours, at which point the guillotine process shall come into operation.
3. That the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules at Part 4.3 of the Constitution be amended as follows:-
 - (a) The adoption or approval of the plan or strategy is the responsibility of the full Council;

(b) The Mayor as the Executive has responsibility for preparing the draft plan or strategy for submission to the full Council; and

(c) If the Council wishes to amend the Mayor's proposals in relation to the items included in the Budget and Policy Framework only, the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 set out the dispute resolution procedure to be followed. The Council must inform the Mayor of any objections which it has to his proposals (i.e. the amendments it wishes to agree) and must give the Mayor at least five working days to reconsider his proposals and re-submit them (amended or not, with reasons) to a further Council meeting. If at this further meeting the Council still wishes to amend the Mayor's revised proposals, such a decision requires a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. If no valid amendment at the further meeting receives two-thirds support, the Mayor's proposals are deemed adopted in accordance with the regulations.

4. That the position of Deputy Chair of Council be re-designated as 'Deputy Speaker'.

5. That Council Procedure Rule 27.1 be amended to state:-

'No photography or video or audio recording of any kind by Members, guests or members of the public may take place at any Council meeting without the express permission of the Speaker. The Council may determine that the proceedings of the Council Meeting shall be audio recorded by the officers and those recordings stored in accordance with a policy agreed by the Council and accessed by any member on request, for their own use, including publication. Such requests to be made in writing to the Monitoring Officer.'

6. That Council Procedure Council Procedure Rule 17.4 at part 4.1 of the Constitution be amended as follows:

'Recorded vote. If twenty Members present at the meeting request it by rising from their seats, the names for and against the motion or amendment or abstaining from voting will be taken down in writing and entered into the minutes.'

7. That the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in relation to the Financial Procedure Rules as set out in Paragraphs 11.5 and 11.6 of the report be deleted; and

8. That this Council instructs the Interim Chief Executive to make arrangements for a working group comprising a representative of the Executive, the majority and the other political groupings, senior officers and an independent adviser to consider the budget making and virement arrangements of the Council and make recommendations to a meeting of the next non-budget Full Council through the appropriate channel.

9. That the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be authorised to amend the text of the Constitution as necessary to give effect to the changes agreed at 1-8 above.

[Note from Clerk: Following the meeting, Councillors Tim Archer, Craig Aston, Zara Davis, Peter Golds, Dr Emma Jones, David Snowdon and Gloria Thienel each requested that their vote against resolution 6 above be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.]

Time limit for the meeting

At this point, the Service Head, Democratic Services informed the Council that the time limit for the meeting had been reached. In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.2, the Council then voted on each remaining item of formal business (except motions on notice at agenda item 12) without further debate and the Speaker then declared the meeting closed.

9.4 Recruitment of Chief Executive - update

The Council received the report of the Human Resources Committee dated 18th January 2012, concerning the progress made in the recruitment to the post of Chief Executive and proposing the extension of the current interim appointment pending completion of that process.

The report had not been circulated with the Council agenda in accordance with the timescales set out in the Authority's constitution because the meeting of the Human Resources Committee reported therein took place after the agenda was despatched. The report was nevertheless considered at the meeting in order to ensure that there was no delay to the recruitment process for the post of Chief Executive and to ensure continuity of the interim appointment.

RESOLVED

1. That the update on progress and the revised timetable for the recruitment to the post of Chief Executive be noted.
2. That in view of the revised timetable, the appointment of Aman Dalvi, Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, as Interim Chief Executive (Head of the Paid Service) be extended until the Annual Council Meeting in May 2012.

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

There was no business under this heading.

11. OTHER BUSINESS**11.1 Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy 2011/12**

The Council received the report of the Corporate Director, Resources proposing the adoption of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement; Revised Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement.

RESOLVED

1. That the Treasury Management Strategy Statement be adopted as set out in sections 6-10 of Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director, Resources.
2. That the Revised Annual Investment Strategy be adopted as set out in section 11 of Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director, Resources.
3. That the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement be adopted as set out in section 12 of Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director, Resources.

12. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Motions 12.1, 12.9, 12.11, 12.13 and 12.14 had been debated earlier in the meeting.

Motions 12.2; 12.3; 12.4; 12.5; 12.6; 12.7; 12.8; 12.10; 12.12; 12.15; 12.16 and 12.17 were not considered due to the time limit being reached. Tabled amendments to motions 12.4; 12.5; 12.6; 12.10 and 12.12 were not moved, accordingly.

The meeting ended at 11.20 p.m.

Speaker of the Council

APPENDIX A**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)****WRITTEN RESPONSES PROVIDED AFTER THE COUNCIL MEETING****8.1 Question from Councillor Judith Gardiner:**

The Government has recently announced that it will be changing the law to make unauthorised subletting a criminal offence. What extra measures will the Mayor be taking to crack down on this and other abuses of the allocation process to ensure that those in genuine housing need are not disadvantaged or taken advantage of by cheats?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Judith Gardiner

Why does the Mayor feel it is so hard to answer in public a simple question that will affect the lives of many tenants in the Borough? Is it because it affects a councillor close to him who is absent from today's meeting?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

The Mayor and I regard the unauthorised subletting of Council Housing as an extremely serious concern. I believe that Council Housing should always be used by those who need it the most. In a borough such as ours with a huge need for affordable housing it is vital that all our housing goes to those with the highest need.

This is why we have a dedicated Fraud Team who tackle unauthorised subletting. The team's efforts since October 2010 have resulted in 69 properties being identified as sub-let or subsequently abandoned, these being recovered for return to the Lettings Pool. Our team is recognised as an example of good practice and has also provided training to staff within Tower Hamlets Homes and is working with other local authorities.

To complement the above, the Housing Options Service has its own, Fraud Team that focuses on sub-letting of Homeless Temporary Accommodation. The Homeless Team has separately identified and recovered 27 units of temporary accommodation. They have also provided showcase training to other London boroughs.

The criminalisation of unauthorised subletting however will give the Council no extra powers to tackle unauthorised subletting. I am concerned that this is a knee jerk reaction from the Conservative government which will not actually reduce levels of subletting. It would be more helpful to provide more resources to Councils' Fraud Teams to tackle this through channels proven to work.

Some opposition councillors have claimed that the Mayor is unwilling to provide them with answers to the questions asked at Full Council.

This is not the case.

At Full Council meetings, the Mayor's approach has always been to deliver a verbal statement updating members on the progress his administration is making, and then allow his cabinet members to answer questions specific to their portfolios.

We are a strong cabinet, who invest long hours, remarkable intellect and hard work dealing with issues in minute detail on a day to day basis. We are well placed and will continue to answer questions specific to our portfolios.

8.2 Question from Councillor Peter Golds:

Does the Mayor support the Government's announcement that it will seek to criminalise sub-letting of socially rented property?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Peter Golds

In addition to the case of the councillor already mentioned, what are your comments on a case in Cable Street where a resident complaining of an illegal sub-letting was informed by Social Services that persons moving furniture into a flat were the tenant's carers? And how does the Mayor justify a millionaire living in a Peabody Housing property who also owns a house elsewhere?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

The Government proposals only move matters from the civil to the criminal arena and do not add more powers for the council to deal with unauthorised sub-letting.

The Mayor and I take any such abuse extremely seriously and will be very interested to see the detailed proposals to see if they will actually deter tenants from sub-letting their homes without consent.

All Housing Association tenancies are covered by statute, notably the Housing Acts of 1988 and 1996 with regard to secure and assured tenancies. All Housing Associations are required to enter into a tenancy agreement with individual tenants, which will set out each side's rights and responsibilities through a set of terms and conditions.

Conditions relating to income and property ownership may not necessarily be covered by the tenancy agreements. It will be the responsibility of individual Housing Associations to take legal action against a tenant if they are in breach of their tenancy agreement.

With regard to the Cable Street matter you raise without exact details this can not be verified or investigated further.

8.3 Question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman:

Housing Benefit changes will have a profound impact on our residents and it will lead to some having to leave the borough because the housing allowance will not cover their full rent. Can the Mayor inform the Council the number of meetings he has had with the Minister responsible for these changes to highlight the impact on residents of Tower Hamlets?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

As no answer has been given, I shall assume there was no meeting. I do not feel it is appropriate for the Mayor to sit there smiling and not answer the questions. If he does not want to answer he can take a break and leave the Council Chamber. The Prime Minister and Mayor of London answer questions personally, why is the Mayor refusing to do so?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

The Mayor and I are extremely concerned by the changes to housing benefit. Almost a year ago as Cabinet Member for Housing I presented a motion to this Council which laid a marker down on this administration's views on the Coalition's appalling measures.

We are already seeing the impact of these changes on families in the borough. Some families are already reluctant to move to larger homes due to the housing allowance cap and are choosing to stay in overcrowded circumstances.

These changes will impact across all the services in the council as well as our partner organisations. This is why I have asked our central research team to coordinate a high level and innovative group to collate the impact this is having across all Council and partner services.

I have also had several meetings with organisations such as Shelter, TELCO and Z2K to discuss a coordinated response. I have also ensured that the Tenant's Federation are fully aware of the changes and have held workshops with them.

Next month we are holding a congress with key Partners, including RSLs, the Police, Schools, the Third Sector and to look at the impact of this in a holistic way and plan ways we can combat the changes and mitigate the impact to our residents. This process is to build a coalition of concerned individuals and institutions, who care deeply about the residents of this borough. We will collect a solid evidence base of the impact across the borough.

We know that millionaire ministers are responsible for pushing through these reforms. They have no idea how most people in this country live. In fact Lord Freud, the minister responsible for benefit change, isn't even elected.

We will have far more of an impact working together. We will demonstrate that individuals and organisations from across this borough oppose these vicious cuts. And we do so, not simply on a whim, but because they are damaging our community and our residents.

It is not the case that the Mayor is unwilling to provide answers to the questions asked at Full Council.

At Full Council meetings, the Mayor's approach has always been to deliver a verbal statement updating members on the progress his administration is making, and then allow his cabinet members to answer questions specific to their portfolios.

We are a strong cabinet, who invest long hours, remarkable intellect and hard work dealing with issues in minute detail on a day to day basis. We are well placed and will continue to answer questions specific to our portfolios.

8.4 Question from Councillor Fozol Miah:

Will the Mayor and lead member celebrate with me the bringing to justice of two of Stephen Lawrence's killers and congratulate all those involved in achieving this and above all Neville and Doreen Lawrence, but also regret that police incompetence, racism and maybe even corruption botched the original enquiry and may lead to his other murderers continuing to evade justice, and will they also agree that, whilst there have been significant improvements in policing in London since the landmark Macpherson report, there are still serious problems, for example in the abuse of "stop and search" powers and in the lack of ethnic minority appointment to senior management positions in the Metropolitan Police, and will they agree to make representations to the new Commissioner and to the borough commander that the concept of "total" policing should include making the police reflect at all levels of the force and, above all, respect all of the communities they police?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Fozol Miah

My question was also directed to the Cabinet Member.

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you Cllr Miah for your question.

The Mayor and all councillors welcome the conviction of two of the killers of Stephen Lawrence.

Everyone also feels a sense of admiration for the Lawrence family for the tenacity, courage and dignity with which they have conducted themselves in the 18 years since Stephen's death.

It is a recognised fact, not least within the Metropolitan Police itself, that police incompetence, corruption and institutionalised racism combined to deny the Lawrence family justice at the time of Stephen's murder. Much work has been done to improve the Metropolitan police but as the recent events surrounding the killing of Mark Duggan and the ensuing riots in Tottenham, there is work still to be done.

One area that definitely needs addressing is the widespread sense of grievance in the black community over the use of stop and search. I welcome the comments of Bernard Hogan-Howe, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, in which he expressed his concern about the disproportionate use of stop and search. I welcome also his plan to halve the number of random stops and searches it conducts in an attempt to improve relations with black and other ethnic minority communities.

Any perception that policing is targeting or discriminating against any community is obviously detrimental to police-community relations and the Council. We are sensitive to picking up on concerns about stop and search in the borough. The Tower Hamlets Stop & Search Forum continues to meet quarterly and engages representatives of the community in a constructive dialogue with the Police around Stop and Search. It reviews the data on stop and search in the borough and is able to challenge the Police on matters of concern. It is attended by a diverse range of individuals, including those representing BME and youth communities. Further work is currently underway to develop a Tower Hamlets stop and search forum specifically for young people.

The Police themselves acknowledge the failings of the past and the fact that they still have work to do. Only by working more closely with the Police can we help them on this journey. The Council's Domestic Violence and Hate Crime Team work closely with Tower Hamlets Police Community Safety Unit, who take all forms of hate crime very seriously and the partnership relationship is very strong. They are dedicated partners in attending and contributing to the Council run Hate Incident Panel and also the Strategic Tower Hamlets No Place for Hate Forum.

8.5 Question from Councillor Lesley Pavitt:

Can the Mayor please tell me why the number of complaints about One Stop Shops went up by 29% in the first half of 2011/12?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Lesley Pavitt

Tower Hamlets people don't complain unless they have real cause. What are you going to do about the inevitable increase in complaints when the

Rushmead Office is closed and people will have to travel much further to access Council services?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Thank you for your question.

Over the last two years there has been no discernible increase in complaints regarding one stop shops. Indeed the most recent quarter (ending 31 Dec 2011) had the fewest number of complaints for 20 months (just 9).

The highest number of complaints received in the preceding period was 18. This was in the second quarter of 2010/11. The first quarter of 2011/12 saw 17 complaints, but this dropped to just 10 in the second quarter. There is also no discernible pattern to the nature of complaints received though parking related questions usually account for the majority of concerns.

While all complaints are a source of disappointment and learning, Members should draw some comfort from the fact that this financial year we have received just 38 complaints about our one stop shops.

After consultation with the Trade Unions and residents there is now no specific proposal to close the One Stop Shop at Rushmead.

8.6 Question from Councillor Zara Davis:

Why has the Mayor ignored the motion agreed by Full Council in September 2011, which resolved that "Sir John McDougal Gardens, Millwall Park and Island Gardens will remain solely for the use of residents and community groups for the purposes of recreation, leisure and sports?"

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Zara Davis

It is disappointing the Mayor will not justify his actions in view of the petition signed by many hundreds of residents. Has he considered the full implications of hiring out parks, such as damage caused, restriction of residents' use, areas being cordoned off and thus making it harder for residents to stay active; and the likely increase of childhood obesity from resulting lack of exercise?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Thank you for your question.

The Full Council Motion had financial implications and was therefore referred back to Cabinet for consideration.

Whilst we understand local concern we remain committed to using parks across the borough for events.

May I reassure you on a number of points:

- The Council is currently carrying out a feasibility study to look at which parks may be suitable for different types of activity. I will ensure that resident's concerns on the types of events are taken into account.
- Events will be held in parks across the borough, not just in Isle of Dogs parks.
- The number of events taking place will be subject to an upper limit.
- No park will be completely shut to the public at any time as hires will be restricted to designated areas within the park.
- Any necessary repairs to grass areas or other damage will be covered by deposits taken from the hirer.
- A contribution of all income raised will be spent on improving and maintaining the parks so that residents will benefit from these events.

Many other London boroughs have similar policies which make commercial use of their parks.

I would also like to take this opportunity to remind councillors why we in the Council have been forced to look at our parks and other assets and find ways we can make more revenue from them. This is not a position we would choose to be in. The Conservative led coalition cuts have reduced our funding by £72m. This administration is committed to ensuring there are no cuts to frontline services. We have maintained our Youth Service, Children's Centres and Ideas Stores. We are continuing to build and improve our council housing. All these are services which we know are extremely important to our residents. However in order to continue to support these services we have to find ways to increase revenue from our existing assets.

I have considered the implications and believe it is better to have income from events that contribute to community cohesion than to make cuts to essential services and local people jobless. There will be bond arrangements in place to ensure that, should any damage occur, it will be repaired at the hirers cost. There will always be public access so no one need miss out on their exercise.

8.7 Question from Councillor Shiria Khatun:

Can the Mayor tell this Council what is being done to increase recycling in the borough?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Shiria Khatun

Does the Mayor share my concern that the proposed £15 charge for bulky waste collection risks littering the Borough with discarded mattresses, sofas and other polluting debris?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question.

This administration is continually striving to improve the borough's recycling performance.

Our current recycling performance for Q1 is 29.5% against a target value of 27.26%.

We have undertaken a review of our recycling disposal contract to allow the Council to collect a greater range of materials that previously would have gone to landfill.

A recycling campaign will be launched that supports our overall recycling strategy.

In addition to this, we have successfully secured external funding to improve recycling across the borough. Part of this will be used to purchase a new recycling refuse collection vehicle.

The remainder of this funding is being used in partnership with Poplar HARCA to:

- Improve underground recycling storage facilities
- Extend the availability of underground recycling storage facilities
- Initiate an education program focused on decreasing contamination of recycled waste
- And canvas residents to review the location and availability of on street recycling bins

Recycling effectively involves a combination of having useful means of recycling as well as informing and engaging residents for the maximum impact across the Borough.

I am confident that the Borough's recycling performance will further improve with the strategies being implemented.

I do not have any concerns that introducing a very modest charge for bulky waste will increase littering in the Borough. A majority of London Councils have already introduced charging for bulky waste and have not seen any increases in fly tipping or littering. It should also be noted that the Council has an excellent enforcement policy that is used when necessary.

8.8 Question from Councillor Maium Miah:

Can the Mayor inform the Council on whether the Rich Mix Centre has repaid its £850,000 short-term loan, as agreed by Michael Keith when he was Council Leader?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Maium Miah

Will the Mayor answer my question?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Thank you for your question.

The Legal Department is currently working on this matter, however no repayment has been made as of yet.

At Full Council meetings, the Mayor's approach has always been to deliver a verbal statement updating members on the progress of his administration, and then allow cabinet members to answer questions specific to our portfolios.

We are a strong cabinet, who invest long hours, remarkable intellect and hard work dealing with issues in minute detail on a day to day basis. We are well placed and will continue to answer questions specific to our portfolios.

8.9 Question from Councillor Helal Uddin:

How does the Mayor justify the recently announced significant rent rise, which will hit tenants already struggling with rising costs in other utilities, falling wages and benefit changes, and rising fees and charges for parking and other Council Services, and what measures will he be taking to mitigate its effect?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Helal Uddin

I would have expected the Mayor to have said what action he will be taking. Do I therefore assume there are no measures planned?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

The Mayor and I are extremely concerned by the financial difficulties facing our residents as a consequence of Government policy. This is why we have taken the decision to freeze the Council Tax for the second year in succession – with an average saving of over £40 for each household.

However I must remind Councillors that the Housing Revenue Account is a separate account which must be balanced without cross subsidy from the general fund.

This Government's policy has forced us to increase rents through their national social rent policy, which has assumed Tower Hamlets will increase its rents – next year and in future years, well in excess of the rate of inflation. What I can also assure Members is that the actual rent increase will be well below this Government's guideline rent increase. Moreover all Councils are being forced to raise rents and ours are amongst the lowest increases.

Finally, all our residents on Housing Benefit will still have their rent covered, even with Central Government cuts. To limit rent rises we have ensured that

THH delivers significant savings, without damaging the delivery of our Decent Homes Programme.

I am confident that following the changes made to the THH Board we will see an improvement in efficiencies.

The Mayor and I have worked to ensure that the rent rise is as low as possible, given the settlement from central government and our ambitious improvements programme. The Mayor's proposed budget is designed to protect services and keep more money in residents' pockets: We have frozen Council Tax; residents fees and charges have been largely frozen or are only rising inline with inflation; we are investigating the creation of an energy co-op which will reduce residents' bills and we are extending our London Living Wage policy to our contractors.

8.10 Question from Councillor David Snowdon:

Will the Mayor please outline what measures he is taking to promote the teaching of history in Tower Hamlets schools?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor David Snowdon

Did the Mayor study GCSE history at school?

Response by Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Thank you for your question.

I agree that the teaching of history in schools is extremely important; however the responsibility for this rests with the schools.

Unfortunately we have no funding or resources to promote the specific teaching of history in our schools.

However we have funded 1:1 tuition at both GCSE and A-level for all subjects. We know that this support helps pupils to feel able to take on subjects which are more intellectually challenging, including history.

The Mayor studied both O-Level and A-Level History.

8.11 Question from Councillor Kosru Uddin:

Following the EDL visit and the riots last year and lack of involvement of THEOs in supporting the borough's residents, has a revised strategy been agreed in terms of THEOs involvement in community safety if future disturbances on the scale witnessed last year were to be repeated?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Kosru Uddin

£258,600 has been identified for funding activities in the Borough to combat the highest levels of gang and youth violence for 20 years. In what innovative ways will this be spent and how will value for money be achieved?

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you for your question but it is not correct to maintain that THEO's were not involved in supporting the Boroughs residents during the EDL visit or the riots.

It is important to remember that THEO's are not riot police. This is a specialist police role.

But during these incidents THEO's were deployed in consultation with the Police to undertake high visibility patrols in areas of the Borough, report any problems through pre arranged command channels and provide reassurance to residents. All deployment decisions form part of a joint tasking process involving the Police.

At the height of the riot disturbances the police told everybody to stay off the street so that specially trained police officers could deal with the street violence.

The Service Head Safer Communities was in constant contact with the Borough Commander and his Team Leaders throughout the episode, assessing and providing the local authority response. At the end of this episode the Service Head met with the senior police staff to assess the borough response.

Whilst it is recognised that the police service struggled to provide sufficient police officers across London during the riot it was recognised that the local authority had performed well across a range of areas including the THEO's, The Civil Contingency Team, CCTV, Rapid Response Team, and emergency response team.

8.12 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton to the Deputy Mayor:

Would the Deputy Mayor agree that the 41% increase in burglary over the past 12 months in Bethnal Green North is a serious concern and would he join with me to urge the Borough Commander and the BGN Safer Neighbourhood Team to undertake an immediate review of the ward and implement burglary prevention measures in the ward?

Summary of supplementary question by Councillor Stephanie Eaton

Is the Deputy Mayor aware that the nearest branch of Victim Support is based at Waltham Forest and does he support a branch being opened nearer to Tower Hamlets?

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you for your question.

Any increase in burglary is obviously a concern and the Council and its partners are working tirelessly to address it.

There are a number of factors which impact upon this particular performance indicator. The current economic climate and levels of unemployment are just two of these factors.

It is encouraging to note that the overall trend for burglary since August 2011 has decreased by 23% resulting in the Borough performing better than many other London Authorities.

Through the close partnership working with the police a number of new initiatives have been launched:

- a dedicated burglary reporting system
- a project to proactively detect offenders and improve investigate techniques
- a programme of high impact operations planned over the next 6 months
- a new offender management unit which has a particular focus on targeting 'top offenders' in the Borough

Whilst it is disappointing that rates of burglary have increased in Bethnal Green north every effort is being made to address this trend.

I raised this in a meeting with the Borough Commander recently and have urged him to report back to me in due course the outcomes of the measures I have referred to above and I would be happy to feed the result of this conversation back to you.

Both the Council and the Police work exceptionally closely with victim support on a number of levels. As an Authority we fund specific Domestic Violence Advisors specifically for victims of Tower Hamlets and this work is undertaken in the Borough. In addition the police work closely with the service referring victims of crime to them.

We will continue to fund Domestic Violence Advisors.

8.13 Question from Councillor Carlo Gibbs:

Can the Mayor please tell me how many visits were made by residents to Rushmead One Stop Shop last year regarding Housing Benefit?

Summary of supplemental question by Councillor Carlo Gibbs

Residents attending the meeting are dismayed that these questions are being made a joke. People are facing a significant lowering of benefits and are losing a One Stop Shop where they could obtain advice. Will the Mayor make a commitment to review the decision to close Rushmead One Stop Shop?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Thank you for your question.

A total of 20068 housing benefit enquiries have been managed through the Rushmead OSS in 2011/12. Members should be aware that the monthly average number of visits has halved over the course of the year.

After consultation with residents and Trade Unions there is now no specific proposal to close the One Stop Shop at Rushmead.

8.14 Question from Councillor Gloria Thienel:

Considering the rising incidents of metal theft from public memorials; how many incidents of metal theft from a public memorial in Tower Hamlets has taken place in the last year, will the Mayor please inform the Council what measures he has taken to ensure that war memorials are protected in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Gloria Thienel

Will the Mayor look at taking part in the pilot initiative that will stop scrap dealers from dealing in cash for scrap metal?

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you for your question.

Firstly, I would like to stress that the Mayor and I take any disrespectful behaviour towards War Memorials extremely seriously. I am sure that all Members will agree with me that the people who undertake these thefts are completely despicable.

Whilst there are very few War Memorials in the Borough that are on Council land and therefore the responsibility of the Council we will work with our THEOs, CCTV network and the Police to ensure that we maintain vigilance and continue to protect these important memorials.

I would like to reassure Members that I have received no reports of thefts of this nature.

I think it may be helpful to set out the requirements we already have in place for controlling scrap metal. Dealing in scrap metal is controlled by the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 1964 and all scrap metal dealers trading in Tower Hamlets must register with the Council. Registration lasts three years and must be renewed if the registered person wishes to carry on as a dealer.

To register a dealer must provide the following information: full name and address or the address of the principal office; the address of each place in the borough that is being used to store scrap metal; if the business is carried out from a residence and if premises are used for a scrap metal business but not as a scrap metal store, notice of this and the address of the premises. Any alterations to this information must be notified within 28 days.

Every scrap metal dealer must keep a book detailing all scrap metal received at that place and all scrap metal either processed or dispatched from that place. These details include (for all metal received) the description and weight of the metal, the date and time of receipt of the metal; the name and address of the person the metal is received from, either the price of the scrap metal or its estimated value and the registration mark of any vehicle used to deliver the scrap metal.

Details also have to be kept for processed scrap metal, including the description and weight of the metal, the date of dispatch or processing and the process applied, where scrap metal is dispatched for sale or exchange, the name and address of the person to whom it is sold or exchanged and the consideration for which it is sold or exchanged and where scrap metal is dispatched or processed other than for sale, its estimated value before being dispatched or exchanged.

The Government is looking to strengthen these requirements, especially with regard to the traceability of both the materials and the seller. Our Trading Standards Team has been involved in partnership action with local and transport police to audit and inspect local scrap metal dealers and would be willing to be involved in any further action that seeks to curtail the sale of stolen metal.

8.15 Question from Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed:

Can the Mayor tell me how many jobs so far have been taken up by Tower Hamlets residents as a result of the deal made between him and LOCOG?

Summary of Supplementary question from Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed

At the last Full Council meeting, the Lead Member said that only 30 jobs had been secured – what is the position now?

Response by Councillor Shafiqul Haque, Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills

Thank you for your question.

I am pleased to be able to report that as of the 10th January 2012, six hundred and sixty three (663) job offers had been made to Tower Hamlets residents by LOCOG contractors.

I am also pleased to report that in addition to the job offers made by Games contractors two hundred and five (205) Tower Hamlets residents are employed directly by LOCOG which represents 8.7% of LOCOG's total workforce.

We are holding another Olympic Job Fair later this month to help residents to apply.

8.16 Question from Councillor Harun Miah:

Will the Mayor and the lead member agree with me that the Private Finance Initiative was an unnecessary accounting trick which has not produced value for money for the taxpayer but has instead lumbered taxpayers with very large and potentially unsustainable future debts and could they confirm which PFI schemes imposed on Tower Hamlets schools have run into financing problems, what the implications are of these problems and what the council is doing to sort these problems out?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Thank you for your question.

PFI was, and continues to be, an option for securing significant investment in public sector capital projects. Individual projects need to be assessed on their own merits for value for money.

There are currently no financing problems relating to PFI schemes of Tower Hamlets schools. There is however an issue with updating the financing model to ensure the right level of schools contributions and contributions from the Dedicated Schools Grant for the financing of the Grouped Schools PFI contract.

Officers have been discussing the options with the 24 schools in the PFI contract and with Schools Forum. These discussions will shortly be brought to a conclusion and officers will bring a report to Cabinet before the end of the financial year, to regularise the position to ensure that the PFI account balances by contract end in 2027.

8.17 Question from Councillor Anna Lynch:

Can the Mayor tell me how many times he has met ministers of the Department for Health in the last six months, on what occasions and what issues he raised on each occasion?

Response by Councillor Abdul Asad, Cabinet Member Health and Wellbeing

Thank you for your question.

The Mayor has not met with ministers of the Department of Health in the last six months.

The Mayor has sent a joint letter, with Aman Dalvi, to raise concerns expressed by Cabinet and CMT around the proposed merger of Barts and the London, Whipps Cross and Newham General Hospitals. In particular, the lack of consultation with the community and concerns over reduction to services.

8.18 Question from Councillor Craig Aston:

Will the Mayor provide an update on energy efficiency in the Town Hall building?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Craig Aston

On the standard European energy rating scale of A-G, this building is in Band G. What are the implications of this in terms of extra energy costs?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Thank you for your question.

Our Town Hall has an unfortunately low level of energy efficiency. It is considered a 'G' according to the Display Energy Certificate (DEC). This is a typical rating for this type of building and construction type.

The council has a Carbon Management Plan in place to improve the energy efficiency and reduce energy usage in all of its operational buildings.

The refurbishment of Mulberry Place will include energy efficiency improvements such as low energy lightings, energy efficient ventilation systems and better Building Energy Management System for the plant room. Initial discussions with the contractors have indicated that an energy reduction of 30% could be achieved. The new ICT systems will significantly reduce the energy consumption by the current IT equipment.

As the council does not own Mulberry Place, it is limited to the improvements it could make taking in to consideration the pay back period for the investment and the length of time remaining in the lease.

For those buildings that are in the ownership of the council we are investigating the RE: FIT project managed by the LDA. The RE: FIT project provides a commercial model for public bodies to implement energy efficiency

improvements to their buildings, reducing energy consumption and carbon emissions

The 'G' rating on the display energy certificate is an indication on how much energy is being used to operate the building, it does not directly relate to a building's energy cost effectiveness.

The typical benchmark rating for a building like the Town Hall would be 100 which is a 'D' rating, presently Mulberry is showing 173. The refurbishments, which will include the high energy consumers such as lighting, ventilation and IT systems, will all have an implication on energy cost but because of the nature of this type of building we would not expect a significant reduction in rating. The refurbishments are unlikely to generate a real price reduction in energy costs because of the volatility of the market and predicted price increases.

8.19 Question from Councillor Zenith Rahman:

Given the reductions he has already made in street cleaning in the borough, what measures is the Mayor taking to ensure that the increasingly filthy streets will not negatively impact on Tower Hamlets securing City Status?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question but I believe you are mistaken. Not only do the streets of Tower Hamlets continue to be clean, there has been a marked improvement in the level of street cleanliness over the past 12 months. In fact I am happy to announce that our streets are demonstrably cleaner than they have ever been before. So clean in fact that the City of Paris has recently sent over a delegation to see how it is done for the money. I am confident that our street cleansing service will play its part to increase our chances of gaining city status.

I receive regular reports detailing the Council's performance in key areas of service delivery.

The Mayor has repeatedly made it clear that the cleanliness of streets is one of this Council's main priorities. So far it is pleasing to note that our partners Veolia have constantly met their targets that have been set for them.

Not only do we set challenging targets for Veolia but we also undertake a number of educational and promotional activities to dissuade people from littering.

The Mayor has also recently invested in 1200 litter bins across the Borough and introduced the new 'find it fix it' teams to react to littering hot spots that may occur irregularly across our Borough.

Our bid for City Status will not simply be based on the excellent public services we provide but also on the basis that Tower Hamlets is, and has

been for centuries, an engine room for the economy and wellbeing of the United Kingdom.

It is important for us to note that this borough is one of the 3 central business districts in the heart of London along side Westminster, and the square mile of the Corporation of London, both of which are already cities.

We expect the result of our city status submission to be known shortly.

8.20 Question from Councillor Lutfa Begum:

What has been done to help overcrowded families who are reluctant to move to Car Free Properties?

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Lutfa Begum

Some social housing developments have their own car parking. Will the Mayor seek to include this in street parking to achieve more spaces?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

The Mayor requested the development of a Permit Transfer Scheme (PTS) which was introduced in September 2011. This scheme allows for those families who move to retain one on-street resident car parking permit subject to certain criteria being met.

The introduction of the PTS fulfils a Mayoral priority to help some larger families move from overcrowded accommodation into more suitable social rented car free homes, whilst at the same time balancing the need to encourage healthier, greener lifestyles to improve the quality of life for all our communities living and working in the borough.

Additionally, where on-site car parking is provided in future housing schemes, it is the intention through the planning process to allocate, for the first time, an equitable proportion to affordable family homes.

In addition to the PTS, the Council is continuing to work to improve all transport modes in the borough, including expanding our car club, walking and cycling networks, as well as working with TfL to improve public transport in the borough

Whilst the allocation of designated parking bays on housing estates are under the control of the Registered Social Landlords, encouraging RSLs to widen the use of their parking spaces would be of benefit to residents in the borough. The Council's parking service is seeking a dialogue with the RSL's on a number of issues. The Mayor and I have asked them to raise the possibility of introducing shared bays on estate roads where on street demand for permit bays regularly exceeds supply.

It would be for the Council, through Tower Hamlets Homes and the Registered Providers (RPs) in the Borough to decide whether they wished to designate parking bays on estate roads for use by Tower Hamlets on-street residents' permit holders. The Council's Parking Service will be in dialogue with the RPs on a number of issues raised in the recent Parking Service Scrutiny and I have asked them to raise the possibility of introducing shared bays (estate permit or on-street residents' permit) on estate roads where on-street demand for permit bays regularly exceeds supply. Responsibility for enforcing any such bays would remain with the RPs. Members will recall that currently, while there may be local variations, in each of the Boroughs four CPZs there is more or less parity between the number of resident's permits and on-street bays where they can be used.

As part of the LBTH consultation draft Managing Development Plan Document (MDDPD), where on-site car parking is provided in future housing schemes, it is the intention through the planning process to allocate an equitable proportion of these parking spaces to affordable family homes.

In addition, the Council is also continuing to work to improve all transport modes in the borough, including expanding our car club, TfL Cycle Hire Scheme, walking and cycling networks, as well as working with TfL to improve public transport in the borough.

8.21 Question from Councillor Tim Archer:

Will the Mayor provide an update on the progress of the motion agreed by full Council on 15 September 2010, to bring the Henry Moore statue back to the borough and explain to the Council why this is taking so long, what meetings/discussions have taken place and will the statue be back in time for the Olympics?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Thank you for your question.

The Yorkshire Sculpture Park was advised of the Council's intention to make alternative arrangements for the sculpture and initial discussions have taken place with Canary Wharf Management Group.

Alternative locations are still being explored, the most appropriate being Victoria Park where works are still underway.

In view of the very real risk of theft of artworks for scrap metal; as evidenced by the recent theft of a large Barbara Hepworth sculpture from Dulwich Park in South London, and indeed the question by Cllr Thienel, we will not make new arrangements for this sculpture until we are absolutely certain that we are making the right choice.

8.22 Question from Councillor Kabir Ahmed:

Could the Mayor tell us what has been the impact of his significant investment in tackling drugs and anti-social behaviour?

Response by Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor

Thank you for your question.

The Council Funded Police Partnership Taskforce has worked closely with the Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers (THEOs) to bring about significant reductions in Anti-Social Behaviour.

By Police and Council measures, for example, the last full months data (December) shows a decrease in anti-social behaviour (ASB) of 22.4%. Within this are significant reductions in particular areas such as an 81% decrease in ASB related to street drinking.

The team undertakes regular drugs and weapons sweeps through which it has recovered money, drugs and weapons.

In the last month alone, the team has shut down 3 cannabis factories, seized 9 vehicles and recovered drugs with a street value of £100,000. A number of problem licensed premises have had their licenses revoked and have been shut down.

In total since the launch of the Taskforce, the partnership has achieved 286 arrests, 2676 stop and searches, 172 cannabis warnings, 24 penalty notices for disorder and 19 seized vehicles.

It has received positive feedback from residents, for example recently, its work on drug dealing around Beaumont square.

A recent Police operation in the Borough resulted in a drug dealing gang being arrested and receiving a total of 53 years imprisonment.

Dealer a day remains a priority and to date in the current financial year 298 dealers have been arrested.

8.23 Question from Councillor Dr Emma Jones:

How many people sacked from Tower Hamlets employment have accidentally continued to be paid in the past year?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Thank you for your question.

There have been no overpayments to dismissed employees.

8.24 Question from Councillor Aminur Khan:

How has the Mayor progressed on his pledge to make sure Registered Social Landlords deliver on their service agreements?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

We use a variety of methods to ensure that Registered Providers (RPs) working in Tower Hamlets are delivering on their service agreements.

RPs who received stock from the Council under the Housing Choice programme, submit a detailed monitoring return to the council once every six months. This report indicates the progress that each RP is making towards delivering the promises made to tenants and leaseholders, when the ownership of the estate was transferred from the Council. Indicators monitored include progress on delivering the investment promised, delivering the Decent Homes Standard, progress on new build developments, estate improvement works, and Governance arrangements.

In May 2010, the Council selected 16 preferred development partners following a rigorous selection process. This initiative enables the Council to have better control over the quality of properties being built in the borough as well as making Registered Providers more accountable for the services delivered to the residents that occupy them. Council representatives meet with developing partners on a regular basis to monitor the progress of their schemes and discuss any management issues brought to our attention.

Where areas of under performance are identified, we work in partnership with the RP both individually and collectively to improve their services and monitor their progress. On an individual level, we achieve this through regular meetings and developing action plans for improvement which is monitored on a regular basis.

Collectively we improve service provision through the work we do as part of the Tower Hamlets Housing Forum (THHF). We are going to work with THHF to develop a set of common housing management standards, which will enable us to hold providers to account for their performance on a standardised basis.

The Council has also agreed a range of 'local offers' with RPs in the Borough, which set out a clear set of standards which all RPs have agreed deliver to Tower Hamlets residents in specific service areas. These 'offers' were developed with residents based on the areas of the service delivery they were most concerned about. These 'offers' are currently being monitored through a Resident's Scrutiny Panel which meets on a regular basis to advise on the how the Local Offers are being implemented in the various Housing Associations and make recommendations for improvement.

8.25 Question from Councillor Shafiqul Haque to the Cabinet Member for Housing:

Many housing estates in the borough are benefiting from regeneration. I would like to thank the Mayor for bringing this much needed investment. However many of our leaseholders are suffering in the current financial climate, with increasing inflation, fuel prices and worries around employment. How are we ensuring that leaseholders will be charged fairly for any major works?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question.

For regeneration initiatives to be successful in the borough, the interests of all residents are considered, such as tenants and private home owners, including council leaseholders.

In the current financial climate, there are challenging funding issues, but also strategies to ensure that, as far as possible, whilst lasting improvements are made, the existing communities are not disadvantaged.

It is recognised that leaseholders have specific concerns in the present economic climate, whether they live in the homes they own or sub-let them as private landlords.

Each social landlord, whether Tower Hamlets Council or a Registered Provider (Housing Association), will work with the homeowners affected by its regeneration initiatives.

Leaseholders are required to pay a pro-rata proportion of the cost of qualifying works under the terms of their leases. Before works commence leaseholders are presented with an indicative cost of the works to be done to their particular blocks - subject to the final account upon completion of the works - through the standard Section 20 Notice. Leaseholders then have the right to respond to their particular landlord on any issues or observations they wish to raise.

Leaseholders should also benefit from reduced fuel costs where works are devised to make homes in blocks more energy efficient.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL (BUDGET MEETING)

HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2012

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

Members Present:

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

The meeting commenced at 7.36 p.m.

The Speaker of Council, Councillor Mizanur Chaudhury, in the Chair

Before commencing the formal business of the meeting, the Speaker commended to all Members their support for and/or participation in, the sponsored run to be held on 3rd March 2012 in aid of the 'Stairway to heaven' memorial which honoured of all those who died in the Bethnal Green Tube Station disaster on 3rd March 1943.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in items included on the agenda for the meeting as follows:-

Councillor	Item	Type of interest	Reason
Cllr Rajib Ahmed	5.1	Personal	Ward Councillor, East India & Lansbury (includes Ailsa Street)
Cllr Abdul Asad	5.1	Personal	Employed by a youth service provider
Cllr Lutfa Begum	5.1	Personal	Ward Councillor, Limehouse and Member of RCN and NMC
Cllr Marc Francis	5.1	Personal	Council-appointed representative on Mudchute Farm Association Board
Cllr Peter Golds	5.1	Personal	Council-nominated representative to Green Candle Dance Co.
Cllr Shiria Khatun	5.1	Personal	Ward Councillor, East India & Lansbury (includes Ailsa Street); and personal interest in 'Capitalise' organisation.
Cllr Joshua Peck	5.1	Personal	Council-appointed representative on the Greenwich and Docklands Festival

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

No announcements were made at the meeting.

4. TO RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS

No petitions were received at the meeting.

5. BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2012/13

5.1 Report of the Cabinet Meeting of 8th February 2012

Mayor Lutfur Rahman introduced his Executive's revised budget proposals as set out in the report of the Cabinet meeting on 8th February 2012, which was circulated to Members in the supplementary agenda. The Mayor commented

that his main priority was to protect the Borough and the most vulnerable sections of the community from the Government's cuts agenda and to give value for money. He intended to continue the provision of free home care for the elderly; maintain youth centre provision; ensure that no libraries or youth facilities were closed and protect lower-waged staff. The proposals would also protect the level of voluntary sector grants and would ensure that Council Tax would be frozen for the third year in succession.

The Mayor thanked those Members who had contributed to the development of his budget proposals and/or proposed the amendments that he had agreed to incorporate at the Cabinet meeting.

Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED**, and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, the budget proposals of the Mayor and Executive.

Three budget amendments were tabled and moved in accordance with Procedure Rule 2A.8 as follows:

- (i) Amendment **MOVED** by Councillor Anwar Khan and **SECONDED** by Councillor Carlo Gibbs as set out at Annex A to these minutes;
- (ii) Amendment **MOVED** by Councillor David Snowdon and **SECONDED** by Councillor Zara Davis as set out at Annex B to these minutes;
- (iii) Amendment **MOVED** by Councillor Kabir Ahmed and **SECONDED** by Councillor Maium Miah as set out at Annex C to these minutes.

Following debate on the Mayor's proposals and the above amendments, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED**, and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a further amendment without notice proposing additional savings and income opportunities as follows:-

"This Council Notes:

1. On SRAs:

- a) There are currently two levels of SRA for the leaders of groups with over 6 Councillors: The leader of a group with 6 members receives £5,531 p.a., whilst the leader of a group with 7 or more councillors receives £10,174 p.a. (These arrangements do not include the leader of the majority group, who received an SRA at the same level as a Cabinet Member.)
- b) Currently there is only 1 group in Council with over 6 Councillors.
- c) That the leader of this group's current SRA is £10,174 p.a. over and above the basic allowance of £10,065.
- d) This is higher than the recommended level by the Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors in London or £2,368 to £8,852 p.a.
- e) This is far higher than in comparative boroughs Lewisham and Newham, where the SRA is £5,275 and £3,621 p.a..

2. On Events in Parks:
 - a) Currently all our large scale events are held in Victoria Park.
 - b) There are currently no events held in Millwall Park, despite it being one of the largest parks in the borough.

This Council believes:

1. On SRAs:
 - a) The two tiered system is unnecessary and not supported by the Independent Panel's recommendation.
 - b) In a year in which we have seen falling incomes for many, elected representatives should ensure that their remuneration is reasonable, as indicated by the Independent Panel's recommendations and comparative boroughs.
2. On Events in Parks:
 - a) Events in parks provide a vital source of income, both to support the maintenance of the parks and to fund community festivals and events.
 - b) Currently Victoria Park takes the strain of hosting these events.
 - c) The borough has a few other large parks capable of hosting events, which could help distribute events more evenly around the borough.
 - d) Millwall Park is the biggest park in the south of the borough, it is also bordered by ASDA and the DLR, reducing the number of residents directly affected by noise.

This Council resolves:

1. On SRAs:
 - a) To bring the SRA of the leader of any group other than the majority group in line with the recommendation of the Independent Panel and other comparative Councils.
 - b) That this level of SRA should be the same level as for a Committee Chair, at £5,531 p.a.. This would create a saving of £4,643.
2. On Events in Parks:
 - a) That the number of event days in Victoria Park be reduced by 1 and that a maximum of 4 events should be held in Millwall Park.
 - b) This will yield a revenue increase from events in parks of at least £30,000.

Total revenue made available to meet the budget gap: £34,643."

Adjournment

The Speaker adjourned the meeting at 9.10 p.m. so that officers' advice could be sought in relation to the above proposed amendment. The meeting reconvened at 9.30 p.m.

Following the adjournment, the Monitoring Officer advised the Council that the part of the proposed amendment that related to Events in Parks was an

executive matter and therefore out of scope for the Council meeting. The proposal in relation to Special Responsibility Allowances was in order but represented a new amendment which could only be accepted for debate by a majority vote of the Council. The Speaker then put to the vote the proposal that section 1. of Councillor Choudhury's amendment be accepted for debate and this was **defeated**.

Adjournment

Following further debate, the Speaker adjourned the meeting at 9.35 p.m. at the request of the Mayor, to enable consideration of the tabled amendments. The meeting reconvened at 9.50 p.m.

Following the adjournment the Mayor amended his budget proposals (i) by accepting in full the amendment proposed by Councillors Kabir Ahmed and Maium Miah; and (ii) by accepting some elements of the amendment proposed by Councillors Anwar Khan and Carlo Gibbs. The full list of changes accepted by the Mayor is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

In relation to some other elements of the amendment proposed by Councillors Anwar Khan and Carlo Gibbs, which the Mayor was not able to include in his revised budget proposal, he nevertheless indicated further that he intended to:-

- Request the Interim Corporate Director, Children, Schools and Families and the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture, to deliver the feasibility study for afterschool patrols within existing resources.
- Undertake a review of insulation and fuel poverty issues in partnership with Labour Councillors.
- Give further consideration to the proposals in relation to the Register of Landlords, and the use of the New Homes Bonus for Decent Homes works, and ask officers to bring a paper on these matters to the next Cabinet meeting.
- Investigate further the proposal regarding internships for local residents and how this might be delivered through the PCOP process.
- Ask officers to look further into the concerns raised by the Labour Group around parking permits and the CLC budget for bulk waste collection, rat control and charges to business for external furniture and signage, and bring a report to the next Cabinet meeting on these matters.
- Ask officers also to submit a report to the next Cabinet meeting to clarify matters on Domiciliary Care Services, about which the Mayor believed there was a misunderstanding.

Finally, the Mayor stated that he did not accept any elements of the amendment proposed by Councillors David Snowdon and Zara Davis.

Adjournment

The Speaker adjourned the meeting at 10.02 p.m. at the request of the Group Leaders to enable consideration of the Mayor's statement. The meeting reconvened at 10.20 p.m.

Following the adjournment, Councillor Joshua Peck indicated that in the light of the changes made by the Mayor to his budget proposals, the amendment proposed by Councillors Anwar Khan and Carlo Gibbs was withdrawn and replaced by a new amendment, **MOVED** by Councillor Peck and **SECONDED** by Councillor Carlo Gibbs, as follows:

"This Council Notes:

The Mayor has accepted the vast majority of Labour amendments to protect the vulnerable and welcomes these changes.

This Council Further Notes:

That residents are often forced to refuse much needed new homes in Car Free developments because they need a car.

This Council Resolves:

To call on the Mayor to implement extended car free developments to one and two bedroom properties."

At this point, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED**, a procedural motion – "That under Procedure Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put." The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Following the Mayor's right of reply, the tabled amendment proposed by Councillors David Snowdon and Zara Davis was put to the vote and was **defeated**.

The further amendment proposed by Councillors Joshua Peck and Carlo Gibbs as set out above was then put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Finally the substantive motion, being the Mayor and Executive's budget proposals as amended, was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The Monitoring Officer informed the Council of advice from the Section 151 Officer that the decisions taken by the Council would have the effect of reducing the General Reserves by £762,000.

Accordingly, it was **RESOLVED**

A. General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax Requirement 2012/13

1. That the revised budget proposals of the Mayor and Executive, included in the Budget 2012/13 Document Pack, amended as set out in the report of the Mayor in Cabinet of 8th February and further amended as at Appendix 1 to these minutes, be agreed.
2. That a General Fund revenue budget of £292.265m and a total Council Tax Requirement for Tower Hamlets in 2012/13 of £80.43m be agreed as set out in the table below:-

Service	Revised Base 2011-12 £'000	Savings		Growth £'000	Earmarked Reserves £'000	Total Budget 2012-13 £'000
		Approved £'000	New £'000			
Adults Health & Wellbeing	99,463	(3,329)	(801)	1,213	(1,100)	95,446
Children, Schools and Families	60,812	(2,627)	(150)	285	(618)	57,702
Communities, Localities and Culture	61,437	(4,355)	(1,075)	2,358	(1,017)	57,348
Development & Renewal	31,359	(1,228)	(165)	74	(30)	30,010
Resources	21,948	(858)	(2,630)	10	(10)	18,460
Chief Executives	8,535	(348)	(303)	55	(464)	7,475
Net Service Costs	283,554	(12,745)	(5,124)	3,995	(3,239)	266,441
Other Net Costs						
Capital Charges	11,055		(1,445)	400		10,010
Levies	2,415					2,415
Pensions	12,151			1,250		13,401
Other Corporate Costs	8,269	(1,125)	(217)	360	2,154	9,441
Total Other Net costs	33,890	(1,125)	(1,662)	2,010	2,154	35,267
Core Grants	(10,391)		(3,647)			(14,038)
Reserves						
General Fund	3,000		(3,000)			-
Earmarked	907				1,188	2,095
General Fund (Smoothing)	-				(1,600)	(1,600)
Inflation	-			4,100		4,100
Total Financing Requirement	310,960	(13,870)	(13,433)	10,105	(1,497)	292,265
Formula Grant	(229,673)			17,838		(211,835)
Council Tax	(81,287)	(725)		1,582		(80,430)
Total Financing	(310,960)	(725)	-	19,420	-	(292,265)

3. That a Council Tax be agreed for Tower Hamlets in 2012/13 of £885.52 at Band D resulting in a Council Tax for all other band taxpayers, before any discounts, and excluding the GLA precept, as set out in the table below:-

BAND	PROPERTY VALUE		RATIO TO BAND D	LBTH COUNCIL TAX FOR EACH BAND
	FROM £	TO £		
A	0	40,000	⁶ / ₉	£590.35
B	40,001	52,000	⁷ / ₉	£688.74
C	52,001	68,000	⁸ / ₉	£787.13
D	68,001	88,000	⁹ / ₉	£885.52
E	88,001	120,000	¹¹ / ₉	£1,082.30
F	120,001	160,000	¹³ / ₉	£1,279.08
G	160,001	320,000	¹⁵ / ₉	£1,475.87
H	320,001	and over	¹⁸ / ₉	£1,771.04

4. That for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in 2012/13:-

- (a) The Council Tax for Band D taxpayers, before any discounts, and including the GLA precept, shall be £1,192.24 as shown below:-

	£
	(Band D, No Discounts)
LBTH	885.52
GLA	306.72
Total	1,192.24

- (b) The Council Tax for taxpayers in all other bands, before any discounts, and including the GLA precept, shall be as detailed in the table below:-

BAND	PROPERTY VALUE		RATIO TO BAND D	LBTH £	GLA £	TOTAL £
	FROM £	TO £				
A	0	40,000	⁶ / ₉	590.35	204.48	794.83
B	40,001	52,000	⁷ / ₉	688.74	238.56	927.30
C	52,001	68,000	⁸ / ₉	787.13	272.64	1,059.77
D	68,001	88,000	⁹ / ₉	885.52	306.72	1,192.24
E	88,001	120,000	¹¹ / ₉	1,082.30	374.88	1,457.18
F	120,001	160,000	¹³ / ₉	1,279.08	443.04	1,722.12
G	160,001	320,000	¹⁵ / ₉	1,475.87	511.20	1,987.07
H	320,001	and over	¹⁸ / ₉	1,771.04	613.44	2,384.48

5. That the statutory calculations of this Authority's Council Tax Requirement in 2012/13, as undertaken by the Chief Financial Officer in accordance with the requirements of Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, be agreed as attached at Appendix 2 to these minutes.

6. That the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the Annual Investment Strategy and the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement be approved as presented to Cabinet on 8th February 2012 and contained in the supplementary agenda pack for the Budget Council meeting on 22nd February 2012.

7. That the General Fund Capital and Revenue Budgets and Medium Term Financial Plan 2012-2015 as amended by the alternative options agreed by the Mayor in Cabinet on 8th February and as further amended at Appendix 1 to these minutes, be approved as summarized in the tables below:-

Summary Draft Medium Term Financial Plan 2012-15

	2011-12 £'000	2012-13 £'000	2013-14 £'000	2014-15 £'000
Net Service Costs	335,048	320,444	309,426	294,462
Growth Savings	9,787	5,645	4,734	3,745
Approved	(28,870)	(14,595)	(12,102)	0
New	0	(9,786)	(13,681)	(6,427)
Inflation	4,479	4,100	7,100	6,400
Core Grants	(10,391)	(14,038)	(14,070)	(16,070)
Earmarked Reserves	907	2,095	(300)	0
General Fund Reserves	0	(1,600)	8,306	(8,963)
Total Funding Requirement	<u>310,960</u>	<u>292,265</u>	<u>289,413</u>	<u>273,147</u>
Formula Grant	(229,673)	(211,835)	(209,411)	(191,077)
Council Tax	(81,287)	(80,430)	(80,002)	(82,070)
Total Funding	<u>(310,960)</u>	<u>(292,265)</u>	<u>(289,413)</u>	<u>(273,147)</u>

Detailed analysis of the Medium Term Financial Plan by service area 2012/13 to 2014/15

Service	Base	Savings		Growth	Earmarked	Total	Savings		Growth	Earmarked	Total	Savings		Growth	Earmarked	Total
	2011-12	Approved	New		Reserves	2012-13	Approved	New		Reserves	2013-14	Approved	New		Reserves	2014-15
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Adults Health & Wellbeing	99,463	(3,329)	(801)	1,213	(1,100)	95,446	(2,529)	(2,205)	1,452	(200)	91,964		(900)	1,600	(300)	92,364
Children, Schools and Families	60,812	(2,627)	(150)	285	(618)	57,702	(1,810)	(5)	(180)		55,707		(960)	(100)		54,647
Communities, Localities and Culture	61,437	(4,355)	(1,075)	2,358	(1,017)	57,348	(3,757)	(1,495)	1,232	(860)	52,468	(150)	(200)	1,245	(565)	52,798
Development & Renewal	31,359	(1,228)	(165)	74	(30)	30,010	(2,716)	(2,701)	(20)	(475)	24,098		(1,534)			22,564
Resources	21,948	(858)	(2,630)	10	(10)	18,460	(299)	(907)			17,254		(230)			17,024
Chief Executives	8,535	(348)	(303)	55	(464)	7,475	(187)	(100)			7,188		(100)			7,088
Net Service Costs	283,554	(12,745)	(5,124)	3,995	(3,239)	266,441	(11,298)	(7,413)	2,827	(1,535)	248,603	(150)	(3,924)	2,745	(865)	246,485
Other Net Costs																
Capital Charges	11,055		(1,445)	400		10,010			1,000		11,010			1,000		12,010
Leases	2,415					2,415					2,415					2,415
Pensions	12,151			1,250		13,401			1,250		14,651					14,651
Other Corporate Costs	8,269	(1,125)	(217)	360	2,154	9,441	(125)	(1,434)	(360)		7,522		(2,503)			5,019
Total Other Net costs	33,890	(1,125)	(1,662)	2,010	2,154	35,267	(125)	(1,434)	1,890		35,598		(2,503)	1,000		34,095
Core Grants Reserves	(10,391)		(3,647)			(14,038)		(32)			(14,070)		(2,000)			(16,070)
General Fund	3,000		(3,000)			-					-					-
Earmarked General Fund (Smoothing)	907				1,188	2,095		(3,400)		1,005	(300)				300	-
Inflation	-			4,100	(1,600)	(1,600)				9,203	8,306				(17,269)	(8,904)
Total Financing Requirement	310,960	(13,870)	(13,433)	10,105	(1,497)	292,265	(11,423)	(12,279)	12,177	8,673	289,413	(150)	(8,427)	10,145	(17,834)	273,147
Formula Grant	(229,673)			17,838		(211,835)			2,424		(209,411)			18,334		(191,077)
Council Tax	(81,287)	(725)		1,582		(80,430)	(554)		982		(80,002)			(2,068)		(82,070)
Total Financing	(310,960)	(725)	-	19,420	-	(292,265)	(554)	-	3,406	-	(289,413)	-	-	16,266	-	(273,147)

8. That the Council notes the Mayor has accepted the vast majority of Labour amendments to protect the vulnerable and welcomes these changes.
9. That the Council further notes that residents are often forced to refuse much needed new homes in Car Free developments because they need a car.
10. That the Council resolves to call on the Mayor to implement extended car free developments to one and two bedroom properties.

The meeting ended at 10.30 p.m.

Speaker,
Council

APPENDIX 1

BUDGET AMENDMENTS – 2012/13 BUDGET COUNCIL MEETING

Proposals accepted by the Mayor from tabled amendment (i), moved by Councillors Anwar Khan and Carlo Gibbs:

Savings	Saving in 2012/13
Reduce refreshments at meetings	£2,400
Delete Olympics Ambassador SRA after Olympics	£3,880
Delete funding (earmarked reserves) for feasibility study for afterschool patrols and complete study using existing officer time	£10,000
Reduce discretionary spend on taxis for officers	£15,000
Reduce all spend on taxis for members (leaving £6,000 to fund a lease car for use of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker on official visits)	£9,000
Reduce communications spend by D&R and CLC	£30,000
Reduce funding on award ceremonies and staff conferences by holding them at council facilities	£30,000

Spend	Costs 2012/13
Commission debt support and advice for 150 cases (NB: provider to be sourced through normal procurement process)	(£24,000)
Restore funding to Greenwich & Docklands festival	(£25,000)
Fund a 0.5 FTE Mental health worker for care leavers	(£25,000)
Live streaming of council meetings	(£25,000)
Fund a "Violence Against Women and Girls" worker	(£50,000)
Give a one off staff award of £250 for low paid council staff	(£115,000)
Give a £50 Council Tax rebate to pensioners	(£245,000)

Proposals accepted by the Mayor from tabled amendment (iii), moved by Councillors Kabir Ahmed and Maium Miah:

- To allocate £260,000 to support a Mayor's Aim Higher Scheme for 1 year, with a commitment to find funds for it to be an ongoing provision.
- To allocate a one-off sum of £20,000 to support the development of a London Living Rent Accreditation scheme.
- To double the Service Level Agreements for Mudchute Farm and Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park next year, with a commitment to find funds for this to be an ongoing process. [Note: Budgetary effect in 2012/13 = £63k.]

Use of General Reserves contribution consequent on the above:
£762,000 (rounded)

APPENDIX 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS
COUNCIL FEBRUARY 2012
BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX STATUTORY CALCULATIONS

SETTING THE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX FOR THE COUNCIL'S AREA

1. That the revenue estimates for 2012/2013 be approved.
2. That it be noted that, at its meeting on 11th January 2012, Cabinet calculated 90,828 as its Council Tax base for the year 2012/2013 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]
3. **That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2012/13 in accordance with Section 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended and the Local Authorities (Alteration of Requisite Calculations) (England) Regulations 2011:**
 - (a) £1,185,721,000 Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of The Act. [Gross Expenditure]
 - (b) £1,105,291,000 Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of The Act. [Gross Income]
 - (c) £80,430,000 Being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of The Act, as its council tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of The Act). [Council Tax Requirement]
 - (d) £885.52 Being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (2 above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of The Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. [Council Tax]

(e)	VALUATION BAND	LBTH £
	A	590.35
	B	688.74
	C	787.13
	D	885.52
	E	1,082.30
	F	1,279.08
	G	1,475.87
	H	1,771.04

Being the amount given by multiplying the amount at 3(d) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of The Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of The Act, as the amount to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2012/13 the Greater London Authority has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:-

VALUATION BAND	GLA £
A	204.48
B	238.56
C	272.64
D	306.72
E	374.88
F	443.04
G	511.20
H	613.44

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(d) and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2012/13 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

VALUATION BAND	TOTAL COUNCIL TAX £
A	794.83
B	927.30
C	1,059.77
D	1,192.24
E	1,457.18
F	1,722.12
G	1,987.07
H	2,384.48

6. New government regulation now requires a local authority to conduct a referendum where if compared with the previous year, they set council tax increases that are “excessive”. Under current legislation and in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Council tax set by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for 2012/13 is not deemed to be excessive.

ANNEX A**AMENDMENT TO AGENDA ITEM 5.1: BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2012/13****Amendment proposed by: Councillor Anwar Khan****Amendment seconded by: Councillor Carlo Gibbs****This council notes:**

- UK economic growth since the coalition came to power nearly 2 years ago has been just 1.1%, compared with 1.2% in the second quarter of 2010 at the end of the Labour Government
- The UK jobless rate stands at 2.69million or 8.5%, its worst level since 1995 and an increase of over 200,000 since the coalition came to power. The increase in unemployment has hit women and young people particularly hard with youth unemployment now standing at over 1 million
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Government's ideologically driven cuts, including a reduction in our formula grant by 16.8%, have damaged the UK's economic growth, increased unemployment and hit the most vulnerable in society
- The Government's planned changes to housing benefits, council tax benefit, legal aid and other proposals will have a particularly heavy impact on Tower Hamlets residents
- That it is the council's responsibility to show leadership in the face of these damaging changes in order to best protect and support our residents
- That Mayor Rahman's budget fails to reduce wasteful spending, cuts frontline services, fails to protect the vulnerable and will leave the streets of Tower Hamlets dirtier than when he was elected.

This council believes that:**Supporting the vulnerable**

- Reductions in funding in last year's budget for the in-house Homecare team aimed at running down the in-house team by 2015 risk significantly reducing the quality of care received by the most vulnerable people in our community
- Mayor Rahman should use the next year to identify funding to keep a high quality in-house Homecare team to serve the needs of the most vulnerable service users beyond 2015
- Housing Benefit changes being implemented by the Conservative/Liberal Democrat government will result in many residents falling into debt
- As Corporate Parents the Council has a responsibility to prioritise the needs of our children in care
- Tower Hamlets has one of the highest levels of domestic violence in the country and incidents of rape are on the rise across London, and that more needs to be done to support vulnerable women and girls
- Pensioners in the borough face rising food and fuel costs and high inflation, increasing their cost of living and reducing their quality of life

Housing

- Many residents in the privately rented sector live in poor quality housing as a result of rogue landlords
- The Mayor's Decent Homes programme does not significantly address poor insulation and fuel poverty and completing work without improving the thermal efficiency of properties could result in many experiencing worse cold, damp and condensation problems

- Residents are often forced to refuse much needed new homes in Car Free developments because they need a car

Employment

- Many young people in Tower Hamlets cannot afford to undertake internships that could improve their employability
- The lowest paid Council staff should benefit from the same one-off £250 payment that national government workers were awarded

Environment

- Cuts to frontline cleanliness services – including reductions in street sweeping last year, and charging for bulk waste and pest control – will result in a dirtier borough and an increase in vermin
- The Mayor has proposed to fund a reduction in charges for car parking permits in properties with multiple cars, whilst many residents are denied a parking permit for even one car when they are offered a property in a Car Free development

Transparency and value for money

- The Town Hall is inaccessible to many residents and in order to increase transparency the council should live stream council meetings
- The use of taxis by members and officers and refreshment at meetings should be curtailed to more acceptable levels

This council resolves to implement the following amendments:

Savings	Saving in 2012/13
Reduce refreshments at meetings	£2,400
Delete Olympics Ambassador SRA after Olympics	£3,880
Delete funding for feasibility study for afterschool patrols and complete study using existing officer time	£10,000
Delete avenue of trees proposal	£10,000
Delete signposting to HMRC and replace with information in Business Rates mailer	£10,000
Reduce discretionary spend on taxis for officers	£15,000
Reduce all spend on taxis for members (leaving £6,000 to fund a lease car for use of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker on official visits)	£9,000
Reduce communications spend by D&R and CLC	£30,000
Reduce funding on award ceremonies and staff conferences by holding them at council facilities	£30,000
Delete energy co-op feasibility and complete study using existing officer time	£30,000
Delete additional Liberal Democrat spend on advertising in East End Life	£30,000
Use of reserves contribution	£328,720
Total	£509,000

Spend	Costs 2012/13
Register of Housing Landlords – self-funding paid for by an admin fee, to be made compulsory for all landlords wishing to receive Local Housing Allowance payments	£0
Ring-fence £1m of New Homes Bonus out of the £10million allocated to Decent Homes for insulation to reduce condensation, damp and fuel poverty	£0
Ring fence any increase in New Homes Bonus income above projected levels (up to £1m) to Decent Homes reserve	£0
Commission debt support and advice for 150 case through Capitalise service	(£24,000)
Restore funding to Greenwich & Docklands festival	(£25,000)
Fund a 0.5 FTE Mental health worker for care leavers	(£25,000)
Live streaming of council meetings	(£25,000)
Fund a “Violence Against Women and Girls” worker	(£50,000)
Ring fence £56k from future S106 monies to support 20 residents to undertake unpaid internships, paying the living wage for up to 3 months	£0
Give a one off staff award of £250 for low paid council staff	(£115,000)
Give a £50 Council Tax rebate to pensioners	(£245,000)
Total	(£509,000)

This council further resolves:

- To call on the Mayor to implement the following amendments to the budget

Changes to parking permits	
Increase cost of second permit to £30	£90,360
Keep £150 additional cost of 3rd permit	£40,800
Extend Car Free Devevelopment permits to 1 and 2 bedroom properties	£8,000
Total	£139,160

Changes to CLC budget	
Keep first bulk waste collection free	(£115,000)
Not charging for rat control	£0
Reduce rates charged to business for external furniture and signage	(£24,160)
Total	(£139,160)

ANNEX B**AMENDMENT TO AGENDA ITEM 5.1: BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2012/13**

Amendment proposed by: Cllr David Snowdon

Amendment seconded by: Cllr Zara Davis

This Council Believes That:

1. Local residents are opposed to the commercialisation of our parks and open spaces, and would welcome the elimination of all targets to raise income from them.
2. Bulk waste disposable charges are a stealth tax to which residents are opposed.
3. Bulk waste disposable charges would lead to an increase in fly tipping, which would go against Council policy to make Tower Hamlets a Cleaner, Greener Borough.
4. Library's are an important element of Lifelong Learning, and making draconian cuts to the book fund will result in residents of the Borough receiving poorer library provision.
5. In order to protect front line services and save our open spaces from commercialisation, savings are necessary in a still bloated Town Hall budget.
6. Councillors should lead by example, and take a cut in their allowances to save Tower Hamlets library services and save our parks from commercialisation.
7. Contracting an outside company to water pot plants in Tower Hamlets building is an outrageous waste of public money.
8. Council Officers should follow Eric Pickles' lead an "Adopt A Pot Plant"

This Council calls upon the Executive to make reductions in income as follows:

Description	2012/13 Baseline	2013/14	Notes
Events In Parks	£200,000	£290,000 (2012/13 +£90,000)	Remove all provision for revenue from events in parks. Should the Mayor press ahead with holding events in parks despite it being the clear will of Full Council that parks should not be used in this way, all income generated under this budget line shall be used to employ permanent ground staff to repair the damage to our parks.
Bulk Waste Disposal Targets	£150,000	£150,000 (2012/13 +£0)	Remove all provision for bulk waste disposal charges. Should the Mayor press ahead with charging for bulk waste removal charges despite it being the clear will of Full Council they should not be implemented, this income stream will be allocated to rebates equivalent to charges for households affected.
Spending Per Year	£350,000	£440,000	
Cumulative Spend	£350,000	£790,000	

This Council Will:

1. Reverse the Executive's proposed decrease in spending (library book fund)

Library Book Fund	0	£200,000 (2012/13 +£200,000)	Reverse cuts to the Library Books fund.
Spending Per Year	£0	£200,000	
Cumulative Spend	£0	£200,000	

2. Implement the following cuts to council spending

Description	Savings in 2012/13	Savings in 2013/14	Notes
Staffing Budget	£30,000	£120,000 (2012/13 +£90,000)	Make savings in staffing budget (topslimed). The Council requests the Executive investigate reductions in senior staff salaries before generating savings from lower grade salaries.
Advertising	£92,500	£92,500 (2012/13 +£0)	Assume £850,000 outturn in 2011/12. Cut statutory advertising by 5% through better advert design Cut best practice advertising by 10% Cut non statutory advertising by 20% All TV Advertising to be stopped
Subscriptions	£7,000	£82,150 (2012/13 +£75,150)	Give notice on: LGIU subscription costs £11,350 Randalls Parliamentary Service – c. £10,000 (due August 2012) LGA - £55,000 Plain English campaign - £3,300 Association for Public Service Excellence - £2,500
Mayor's Executive Office	£26,600	£26,600 (2012/13 +£0)	Reduce spend on consultants / contractors/Comensura temporary staff by 20%
Pot plants	£22,416	£22,416 (2012/13 +£0)	Reduction in FM budget equivalent to pot plant spend. End contract in 2013. Investigate how much it would cost to bring this contract to a speedy and early end.
Dexter House	£15,271	£15,271 (2012/13 +£0)	Stop booking Dexter House for internal events – use Council facilities instead
Tower Hamlets Now 'e-zine)	£15,000	£15,000 (2012/13 +£0)	Cut all costs associated with e-zine (including 25% of PO3 officer). Use cascading e-mail communication system instead

Conferences	£4,000	£4,000 (2012/13 +£0)	Estimated cost in 2011/20 is £20,000 Reduce spending by 20%
Newspapers, Journals, Periodicals	£5,000	£5,000 (2012/13 +£0)	Reduce spending on subscriptions by 5%
Sponsorship	£2,500	£7,500 (2012/13 +£5,000)	Generate commercial sponsorship for events run by Tower Hamlets Council (eg. Fireworks, sporting events, cultural events)
Olympics Related Advertising	£30,000	£0	Cancel spend agreed at February cabinet to provide 6 double pages of adverts in EEL during Olympics
Councillors Allowances	£51,331	£51,331 (2012/13 +£0)	Cut all Councillor Basic Allowances by 10% in 2012/13 and maintain them at this level in 2013/14
Rationalise Committee Structure	£16,593	£16,593 (2012/13 +£0)	Delete Olympics Ambassador SRA. Merge Pensions, Audit and General Purposes Committees (with SRA for new Finance and General Purposes Committee set at £7,557)
Cut SRAs by 10%	£31,662	£31,662 (2012/13 +£0)	Cut all remaining SRAs by 10% in 2012/13 and maintain them at this level in 2013/14
Reduce Bounties Paid to Estate Agents by 15%	£75,052	£75,052	Reduce discretionary bounties paid to estate agents for finding properties by 15%.
Savings Per Year	£424,925	£565,075	
Cumulative	£424,925	£990,000	

ANNEX C**AMENDMENT TO AGENDA ITEM 5.1: BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2012/13****Amendment proposed by: Cllr Kabir Ahmed****Amendment seconded by: Cllr Maium Miah**

This Council notes the progressive budget proposals from Mayor Rahman and his administration, which will see:

1. No closures of Leisure Centres, Children's Centres, Youth Services, Libraries or Ideas Stores
2. Protection for the elderly and vulnerable, including free homecare
3. The protection of frontline and low paid staff
4. 17 additional police officers
5. The Mayor's Education Award to replace the scrapped EMA scheme

This Council notes the following economic challenges and central government failings:

1. The unprecedented funding cuts from the Conservative led Coalition Government, which for 2012/2013 will see a funding reduction of 27% and a funding gap from 2011/2012 to 2014/2015 of £100m.
2. The current record high levels of youth unemployment: According to national figures released earlier this year, one in five young people are not in employment, education or training and a quarter of a million have been unemployed for over a year.
3. The complete cut in Aim Higher Funding. The Labour Government's Aim Higher programme's £136m budget was scrapped in July 2011. This programme helped young people from low income families and from families in which no one had attended higher education, to access university places.
4. The massive changes to welfare benefit, including to housing benefit, which will make living in the borough unaffordable for many families who have lived here for generations, and will make our aspiration to create a Tower Hamlets for everyone, much harder to achieve.

This Council notes the following excellent progress made in education and the support the Mayor and administration have provided locally for education:

1. Our excellent education results: This year we were the second most improved borough nationally, with 61.4% of students in the borough achieving at least five A* to C grades including English and Maths, the highest ever figure for Tower Hamlets.
2. The ongoing support for our young people and their educational progress, including the Mayor's Education Award, 1:1 tuition at GCSE and A-Level and support for early GCSEs.

This Council Notes the following concerning the borough's environment and green spaces:

1. That as one of the Olympic host boroughs we have benefited from investment into the borough's green spaces, including the refurbishment of Altab Ali Park and Victoria Park, and the renovation of Mile End Stadium.
2. The borough has one of the highest population densities in London, one of the highest levels of high-rise housing and high levels of overcrowding.

This Council Notes the following resource implications:

1. The Council currently has a healthy level of reserves, expected to be £144m in March this year.
2. The emerging risks and opportunities, as identified by the Director of Resources and laid out on appendix 6.1.

This Council Believes:

1. That these risks and opportunities must be balanced responsibly with the needs of Tower Hamlets residents and the opportunity to invest in the borough's future.

This Council Resolves:

1. Due to the timing of these proposals it is suggested that expenditure be increased in the following areas, with funding allocated for the year 12/13 from reserves, with a commitment to mainstreaming funds for these proposals, where appropriate, in light of next year's grant settlement from Central Government.

In relation to employment and raising aspiration

Allocate £260k to support a Mayor's Aim Higher Scheme for 1 year, with a commitment to find funds for it to be an ongoing provision.

- This will provide a budget to fund new council employees tasked to work with, and in, schools, as well as funding for advice, training programmes, away days, workshops and masterclasses.
- The aim of the service will be to raise the higher education and career aspirations of young people in Tower Hamlets. As well as help young people from low income families, and from families in which no one has attended higher education, to access places at higher education and the bursaries available.

In relation to unaffordable living costs

Allocate a one-off sum of £20,000 to support the development of a London Living Rent Accreditation scheme.

- This will further investigate the proposals made by Shelter on creating a scheme that links rent to earnings. This would keep Tower Hamlets at the forefront of the provision of affordable housing and see our

borough as a leader in this area, as we were with the London Living Wage.

In relation to the borough's green spaces

Double the Service Level Agreements for Mudchute Farm and Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park next year, with a commitment to find funds for this to be an ongoing increase.

- This will support the excellent work of two community organisations.
- This will help ensure the ongoing provision of high standard green amenity space for the people of the borough.
- In Mudchute Farm the use of these additional funds will support their delivery of services for young people, to ensure more young people access open spaces, outdoor play and volunteering.
- In Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park the use of these additional funds will support their biodiversity training, volunteering programmes and their after school club, as well as help maintain the site to a high standard for the use and enjoyment by residents.

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 MAY 2012

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

Members Present:

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

The meeting commenced at 7.12 p.m.

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Mizan Chaudhury, in the Chair

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Mizan Chaudhury, addressed the meeting about his year in office. He thanked all Members for pledging their faith in him as a young Councillor and commented that he had done his best to attend all possible engagements. He had had many rewarding experiences, including lunch with Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh; had met Sir David Attenborough; planted a tree in Poplar Park; welcomed new citizens from all over the world in citizenship ceremonies; and participated in the Lord Mayor's Parade.

Councillor Chaudhury added that he had been particularly excited by the achievements of young people in the Borough and had attended graduation and awards ceremonies. The recent civic awards had provided examples of outstanding people in the Borough, including young achievers under 25. He had worked with the City Gateway and had participated in several events in Brick Lane and the Canary Wharf East Wintergarden. Through his charity he had raised some £22,000 which would benefit charities for women and young people – he thanked all who had made contributions.

Councillor Chaudhury continued that he had attended many non-political events and had made two visits to Bangladesh, representing Tower Hamlets at the first World Conference in Dhaka, where he had met Members of Parliament, Mayors, Civil Servants, the Chamber of Commerce and the Press. He concluded by thanking the staff of the Civic Office for their support throughout the year.

Councillor Joshua Peck thanked Councillor Mizan Chaudhury for the work he had undertaken in raising money and in an ambassadorial role. He congratulated him on his work in upholding the special nature of the office of First Citizen, which was older than the existing Borough and had been held by many auspicious persons. Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Peter Golds and Fozol Miah also addressed the meeting on the excellent manner in which Councillor Chaudhury had represented the Borough.

The Speaker then called for nominations to serve as Speaker of Tower Hamlets Council for the coming year.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Joshua Peck, **SECONDED** by Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman and

RESOLVED

That Councillor Rajib Ahmed be elected to serve as Speaker of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council until the Annual Council Meeting in May 2013.

Councillor Joshua Peck and Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman then came forward to witness the Speaker of the Council signing the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Rajib Ahmed, in the Chair

The incoming Speaker thanked Councillor Mizan Chaudhury for his hard work over the last year. He then thanked Members of the Council for their confidence in electing him and he was humbled by their support and excited at the opportunity to be the Borough's First Citizen, which marked a most auspicious moment in his life.

He commented that Tower Hamlets was home to many communities that worked together in harmony and was one of the most culturally diverse areas in the country. The challenges facing the borough were changing fast and more must be achieved with limited resources, particularly to ensure the best start for children and caring for the elderly. The community put much trust in Councillors, so it was Members' duty to ensure that every decision made and pound spent was in the interests of improving residents' quality of life.

The Speaker indicated that he had chosen three charities to support during his term of office. These were SOUL (Social Organisation for Utility and Leisure), which united people through sports and leisure; THESIS Trust, an education support charity; and DEESHA, an organisation which delivers English for speakers of other languages through an adult learning programme for women unable to access mainstream education and training.

The Speaker concluded by stating that it was his privilege and honour to act as Speaker of the Council and he looked forward to working with Councillors from all political parties.

4. ELECTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER

The Speaker sought nominations to serve as Deputy Speaker of the Council for the forthcoming municipal year.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Joshua Peck, **SECONDED** by Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman and

RESOLVED

That Councillor Lesley Pavitt be elected to serve as Deputy Speaker of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council until the Annual Council Meeting in May 2013.

5. TO RECEIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE SPEAKER OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Speaker welcomed to their first Council meeting, Councillor Gulam Robbani and Councillor John Pierce who had been elected in recent by-elections to serve as Members for Spitalfields & Banglatown and Weavers Wards respectively. The Speaker congratulated the Councillors on their election and expressed the hope that they would find their period of service on the authority rewarding.

RESOLVED

That the Speaker's announcement be noted.

6. MAYOR'S EXECUTIVE SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The Mayor's report, setting out the Executive Scheme of Delegation and the arrangements for executive decision making by the Mayor and Cabinet Members, was tabled as attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

RESOLVED

That the Mayor's report be noted.

7. PROPORTIONALITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEES

The Council considered the review of proportionality, the establishment of committees and the allocation of places on those committees for the coming year.

RESOLVED

1. That the review of proportionality as set out in the report of the Service Head, Democratic Services, be noted.
2. That committees and panels be established for the municipal year 2012/13, and places be allocated on those committees and panels, as set out in the table below:-

Committee	Total	Labour	Conser- vative	Respect	Un- grouped
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (plus 6 co-optees)	9	6	1	1	1
Health Scrutiny Panel	7	5	1		1
Appeals Committee	9	6	1		2

Audit Committee	7	5	1		1
Development Committee	7	4	1	1	1
Strategic Development Committee	9	5	2		2
General Purposes Committee	7	4	1		2
Human Resources Committee	7	4	1		2
Licensing Committee	15	9	2	1	3
Pensions Committee	7	5	1		1
Standards Advisory Committee (from 1.7.12) (plus 7 co-optees)	7	4	1	1	1

3. That the existing Standards Committee (not subject to proportionality) be re-established for the period until the effective date of the new Standards regime (i.e. until 30th June 2012).
4. That the membership of the new Standards Advisory Committee to be established from 1st July 2012 include Councillors as listed in the table shown in resolution (2) above (who may not include the Mayor or more than one other Cabinet Member); and up to seven co-opted (i.e. non-Councillor) members, one of whom shall chair the Advisory Committee; and that Article 9 of the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.

8. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES AND PANELS OF THE COUNCIL

A schedule was tabled setting out the nominations received from the political groups of Councillors to serve as (a) chairs and (b) members of the committees and panels established by the Council.

The Service Head, Democratic Services, advised the Council of one correction to the tabled schedule (in relation to the Standards Committee) and an additional nomination that had been received for membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Joshua Peck advised that the Labour Group's nominated deputies for the Standards Advisory Committee were intended also to serve as deputies on the existing Standards Committee that would continue until the new Standards regime came into effect.

RESOLVED

1. That the chairs of committee and other positions of responsibility be appointed as listed at Appendix B to these minutes.
2. That the members and deputy members be appointed to the committee and panels of the Council and any other bodies for the Municipal Year 2012/13 as set out at Appendix C to these minutes.
3. That in relation to any unfilled places within the seats allocated to a particular political group, it be noted that the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) has delegated authority subsequently to agree the appointments to those places in accordance with nominations from the relevant political group.
4. That in relation to any 'ungrouped' positions remaining unfilled, the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be authorised to invite expressions of interest from the ungrouped Councillors and to make appointments to those positions following consultation with the Members concerned and the Speaker of the Council.

9. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2012/13

The Council considered the draft calendar of meetings for the forthcoming municipal year.

The Interim Chief Executive advised the Council of one change to the draft calendar of meetings that had been circulated with the agenda. The Standards Committee would not now meet on 29th May and 27th June 2012 but would instead meet on 12th June 2012, to discuss the proposed new Standards arrangements.

RESOLVED

That subject to the above amendments, the proposed calendar of meetings for the municipal year 2012/13 be approved as set out at Appendix D to this decision sheet.

The meeting ended at 7.40 p.m.

Speaker of the Council

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS
ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING - WEDNESDAY 16th MAY 2012
TABLED PAPER – AGENDA ITEM 6
MAYOR’S EXECUTIVE SCHEME OF DELEGATION

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Executive Procedure Rules at Part 4.4 of the Council’s Constitution provide for the Mayor to delegate specific executive functions to:-
- the Executive as a whole (the Cabinet);
 - a committee of the Executive or an individual member of the Executive;
 - an officer;
 - an area committee;
 - a ward councillor (only in accordance with s.236 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007);
 - joint arrangements; or
 - another local authority.
- 1.2 The Mayor may amend or revoke any delegation of an executive function at any time.
- 1.3 The Mayor is required to present to the Annual Council Meeting, and if delegations are made or varied between Annual Meetings to present to the Monitoring Officer, a written record of delegations made by him (‘the Executive Scheme of Delegation’). This document must contain the following information in so far as it relates to executive functions:
- (a) The extent of any authority delegated to any individual Executive Member or ward councillor including details of the limitation on their authority;
 - (b) The terms of reference and constitution of such Executive Committees as the Mayor appoints and the names of Executive Members appointed to them;
 - (c) The nature and extent of any delegation of executive functions to area Committees, any other authority or any joint

arrangements and the names of those Executive Members appointed to any joint Committee for the coming year; and

- (d) The nature and extent of any delegation of executive functions to officers not already specified in Part 3 of the Constitution, with details of any limitation on that delegation and the title of the officer to whom the delegation is made.

- 1.4 In accordance with the above requirements the Executive Scheme of Delegation agreed by the Mayor to apply with effect from 16th May 2012 is set out below.

PART A - EXECUTIVE SCHEME OF DELEGATION

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this Executive Scheme of Delegation is to:-
- be clear about who can make which executive decisions including Key Decisions;
 - facilitate the smooth running of Council business;
 - ensure that the Mayor is able to provide effective strategic leadership for the overall policy direction of the Council and to promote partnership working with other agencies; and that officers take responsibility for operational matters and policy implementation

2. THE CONSTITUTION

- 2.1 Once presented by the Mayor to the Annual Council Meeting or to the Monitoring Officer, this Executive Scheme of Delegation will form part of the Council's Constitution and will be appended to it. Its provisions apply alongside the Rules of Procedure and Access to Information provisions included in the Constitution.

3. AMENDMENTS TO THE EXECUTIVE SCHEME OF DELEGATION

- 3.1 This Scheme of Delegation remains in force for the term of office of the Mayor unless and until it is amended or revoked by the Mayor in accordance with Part 4.4 of the Constitution.

4. NON-EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

- 4.1 No delegated power in this Executive Scheme of Delegation applies to any decision that relates to a matter that is not an Executive function

either by law or by the allocation of local choice functions under the Council's Constitution.

5. THE COMPOSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE

- 5.1 The Executive shall consist of ten people, namely the Mayor and nine Councillors as set out below:-

Name	Ward	Portfolio
Mayor Lutfur Rahman	N/A	Mayor
Councillor Ohid Ahmed	East India & Lansbury	Deputy Mayor
Councillor Rofique Ahmed	Mile End & Globe Town	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
Councillor Shahed Ali	Whitechapel	Cabinet Member for Environment
Councillor Abdul Asad	Whitechapel	Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	Shadwell	Cabinet Member for Resources
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	St. Katharine's & Wapping	Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills
Councillor Rabina Khan	Shadwell	Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Rania Khan	Bromley-by-Bow	Cabinet Member for Culture
Councillor Oliur Rahman	St Dunstan's & Stepney Green	Cabinet Member for Children's Services

6. DELEGATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE

- 6.1 The Mayor has not delegated any decision-making powers to the Executive acting collectively.
- 6.2 The Mayor may, in accordance with Part 4.4 of the Council's Constitution, appoint such committees of the Executive as he considers appropriate from time to time, but he does not appoint any such committees at this time.
- 6.3 Subject to the Mayor's prerogative to make decisions on all matters relating to all his statutory powers, the Mayor delegates to each Cabinet Member individually the power to make decisions on matters within their portfolio after consultation with the Mayor and subject to the Mayor raising no objection to the proposed decision. Any such decision by a cabinet member will be subject to a written report and the same procedure as applies to mayoral executive decisions.

- 6.4 In accordance with section 14 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000 (as amended) any arrangements made by the Mayor for the discharge of an executive function by an executive member, committee or officer are not to prevent the Mayor from exercising that function.

7. DELEGATIONS TO OFFICERS

- 7.1 The Mayor has delegated to officers decision making powers in relation to Executive functions as set out at Parts 3 and 8 of the Council's Constitution.

8. OTHER DELEGATIONS

- 8.1 The Mayor has not delegated any powers to any area committee, or to any ward Councillor in accordance with s.236 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- 8.2 The Mayor has delegated powers to joint arrangements with other local authorities as set out in Article 11 of the Council's Constitution
- 8.3 Subject to 8.2 above, the Mayor has not delegated any powers to any other local authority.

PART B - PROCESS FOR EXECUTIVE DECISION MAKING BY THE MAYOR OR A CABINET MEMBER

1. Where an Executive decision, including a Key Decision, falls to be made and either:-
- (i) authority to make that decision has not been delegated by the Mayor under this Executive Scheme of Delegation; or
 - (ii) authority has been delegated but the person or body with delegated powers declines to exercise those powers; or
 - (iii) authority has been delegated but the Mayor nevertheless decides to take the decision himself,
- the decision shall be made by the Mayor individually, after consultation with the Chief Executive, the Monitoring Officer, the Corporate Director, Resources and such other Corporate Director(s) or Cabinet Member(s) the Mayor may determine.
2. Executive decisions (including Key Decisions) to be taken by the Mayor in accordance with paragraph 1 above shall either be taken:-

- (a) at a formal meeting of the Executive, notice of which has been given in accordance with Part 4.4 of the Constitution and to which the Access to Information Rules at Part 4.2 of the Constitution shall apply; or
- (b) in accordance with the procedure at 5 below.
3. In the case of a decision taken at a formal meeting of the Executive, the Mayor will take the decision having received written and oral advice from appropriate officers and consulted those members of the Executive present. In the event that a meeting of the Executive is not quorate, the Mayor may still take any necessary decisions having consulted any Executive members present. All Mayoral decisions taken at a formal meeting of the Executive shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
4. The Cabinet Meeting is not authorised to exercise the Mayor's powers in the absence of the Mayor. If the Mayor is unable to act for any reason, and only in those circumstances, the Deputy Mayor is authorised to exercise the Mayor's powers.
5. The Mayor may at his discretion make a decision in relation to an Executive function, including a Key Decision, alone and outside the context of a meeting of the Executive. In relation to any decision made by the Mayor under this provision:-
- (i) The decision may only be made following consideration by the Mayor of a full report by the relevant officer(s) containing all relevant information, options and recommendations in the same format as would be required if the decision were to be taken at a meeting of the Executive;
 - (ii) In the case of a Key Decision as defined in Article 13 of the Constitution, the provisions of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in relation to prior publication on the Forward Plan, and the provisions of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules in relation to call-in, including the rules regarding urgent decisions, shall apply; and
 - (iii) The decision shall not be made until the Mayor has confirmed his agreement by signing a Mayoral Decision Proforma (example attached) which has first been completed with all relevant information and signed by the relevant Chief Officers.
6. All Mayoral decisions taken in accordance with paragraph 5 above shall be:-
- (i) Recorded in a log held by the Service Head, Democratic Services and available for public inspection; and
 - (ii) Published on the Council's website;

save that no information that in the opinion of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) is 'exempt' or 'confidential' as defined in the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules shall be published, included in the decision notice or available for public inspection.

7. Any decision taken by an individual Cabinet Member in relation to any matter delegated to him/her in accordance with section 6 of the Mayor's Executive Scheme of Delegation shall:-

(i) be subject to the same process and rules as a Mayoral decision in accordance with paragraphs 5 and 6 above; and

(ii) not be made until the Mayor has confirmed in writing that he has no objection to the decision.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1972 SECTION 100D (AS AMENDED)
LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Brief description of background papers:

**Name and telephone number of holder
and address where open to inspection**

- None

APPENDIX B**Appointment of Committee Chairs and other positions of responsibility****1. Committee Chairs**

Article 8 of the Council's Constitution states that 'the Council will appoint a Member to serve as Chair of each Committee that it appoints under this Article. If the Council does not, the Committee may appoint a Chair from amongst the Members appointed to the Committee by the Council. Each Committee may appoint a Vice-Chair from amongst its Members.'

In accordance with the above, the Council is requested to appoint the Chairs of the committees listed below, to serve for the remainder of the municipal year 2012/13 (or until either they resign the position, are no longer a member of the Council or the Committee concerned or a successor is appointed, whichever is the sooner).

Any nominations received at the time of printing are listed below and any further nominations received subsequently will be reported verbally.

Committee	Nominations received for Chair
Appeals Committee	Cllr Bill Turner (Lab)
Audit Committee	Cllr Carlo Gibbs (Lab)
Development/Strategic Development Committee	Cllr Helal Abbas (Lab)
General Purposes Committee	Cllr Shiria Khatun (Lab)
Human Resources Committee	Cllr Md Abdul Mukit, MBE (Lab)
Licensing Committee	Cllr Carli Harper-Penman (Lab)
Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Ann Jackson (Lab)
Pensions Committee	Cllr Zenith Rahman (Lab)

2. Other positions of responsibility

Olympics Ambassador (until the end of the Olympic & Paralympic Games)	Cllr Mizan Chaudhury (Lab)
---	----------------------------

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS
APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES 2012-2013
AS AGREED AT THE ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING – 16th MAY 2012

APPEALS COMMITTEE (Nine members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (6)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (2)</i>
Cllr Bill Turner (Chair) Cllr Khales Uddin Ahmed Cllr Mizan Chaudhury Cllr Ann Jackson Cllr Lesley Pavitt Cllr John Pierce (Deputies:- Cllr Anwar Khan Cllr Carli Harper-Penman Cllr Carlo Gibbs)	Cllr Gloria Thienel Deputies:- Cllr Peter Golds Cllr Dr Emma Jones	n/a	Cllr Rabina Khan (Ind) (1 vacancy)

AUDIT COMMITTEE (Seven members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (5)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (1)</i>
Cllr Carlo Gibbs (Chair) Cllr Anwar Khan Cllr Abdal Ullah Cllr Khaless Uddin Ahmed Cllr Carli Harper-Penman Deputies:- Cllr Marc Francis Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman Cllr David Edgar	Cllr Craig Aston Deputies:- Cllr David Snowdon	n/a	Cllr Stephanie Eaton (LD)

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (Seven members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (4)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (1)</i>	<i>Others (1)</i>
Cllr Helal Abbas (Chair) Cllr Anwar Khan Cllr Kosru Uddin Cllr Shiria Khatun Deputies:- Cllr Bill Turner Cllr Helal Uddin Cllr Denise Jones	Cllr Craig Aston Deputies:- Cllr Dr Emma Jones Cllr Tim Archer Cllr Peter Golds	(1 vacancy)	Cllr Maium Miah (Ind)

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (Nine members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (5)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (2)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (2)</i>
Cllr Helal Abbas (Chair) Cllr Carlo Gibbs Cllr Bill Turner Cllr Helal Uddin Cllr Judith Gardiner Deputies:- Cllr Denise Jones Cllr Kosru Uddin Cllr Shiria Khatun	Cllr Dr Emma Jones Cllr Zara Davis Deputies:- Cllr Tim Archer Cllr Gloria Thienel Cllr Peter Golds	n/a	Cllr Stephanie Eaton (LD) (1 vacancy)

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE (Seven members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (4)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (2)</i>
<p>Cllr Shiria Khatun (Chair) Cllr John Pierce Cllr David Edgar Cllr Ahmed Omer</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr Joshua Peck Cllr Motin Uz-Zamanj Cllr Khaled Uddin Ahmed</p>	<p>Cllr Peter Golds</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr David Snowdon Cllr Craig Aston</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Cllr Aminur Khan (Ind) Cllr Lutfa Begum (Ind)</p>

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE (Seven members of the Council)			
<i>Labour Group (4)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (2)</i>
Cllr Md. Abdul Mukit, MBE (Chair) Cllr Rajib Ahmed Cllr Zenith Rahman Cllr John Pierce Deputies:- Cllr Joshua Peck Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman Cllr Helal Uddin	Cllr Gloria Thienel Deputies:- Cllr Craig Aston Cllr Peter Golds	n/a	Cllr Rania Khan (Ind) Cllr Ohid Ahmed (Ind)

LICENSING COMMITTEE (Fifteen Members of the Council) (No Deputies permitted)			
<i>Labour Group (9)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (2)</i>	<i>Respect Group (1)</i>	<i>Others (3)</i>
Cllr Carli Harper-Penman (Chair) Cllr Amy Whitelock Cllr Khales Uddin Ahmed Cllr Sirajul Islam Cllr Rajib Ahmed Cllr Marc Francis Cllr Mizan Chaudhury Cllr Denise Jones Cllr Anwar Khan	Cllr Peter Golds Cllr David Snowdon	(1 vacancy)	Cllr Gulam Robbani (Ind) Cllr Lutfa Begum (Ind) (1 vacancy)

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (Nine members of the Council plus six co-opted members)				
Labour Group (6)	Conservative Group (1)	Respect Group (1)	Others (1)	Co-opted Members (for information – to be appointed by Overview & Scrutiny Committee)
Cllr Ann Jackson (Chair) Cllr Sirajul Islam Cllr Helal Uddin Cllr Rachael Saunders Cllr Amy Whitelock Cllr Judith Gardiner Deputies:- TBC	Cllr Tim Archer Deputies:- Cllr Peter Golds Cllr David Snowdon	Cllr Fozol Miah Deputy:- Cllr Harun Miah	Cllr Stephanie Eaton (LD)	Mr Mushfique Uddin – Muslim Community representative Vacancy – Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster representative Canon Michael Ainsworth - Church of England Diocese representative Parent Governor representatives:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Jake Kemp • Revd James Olanipekun • Memory Kampiyamo

<p align="center">HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL (Nominations for information - Panel to be appointed by Overview & Scrutiny Committee) (Seven members of the Council)</p>			
<i>Labour Group (5)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (1)</i>
<p>Cllr Rachael Saunders Cllr Denise Jones Cllr Lesley Pavitt Cllr Md. Abdul Mukit, MBE Cllr Abdal Ullah</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr Amy Whitelock Cllr Zenith Rahman Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman</p>	<p>Cllr Dr Emma Jones</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr Peter Golds</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Cllr Gulam Robbani (Ind)</p> <p>Co-opted Members:- To be appointed by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee</p>

<p align="center">PENSIONS COMMITTEE (Seven Members of the Council)</p>			
<i>Labour Group (5)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (0)</i>	<i>Others (1)</i>
<p>Cllr Zenith Rahman (Chair) Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman Cllr Abdal Ullah Cllr Marc Francis Cllr Shiria Khatun</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr Carli Harper-Penman Cllr Carlo Gibbs Cllr Helal Abbas</p>	<p>Cllr Craig Aston</p> <p>Deputies:- Cllr Tim Archer Cllr David Snowdon</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Cllr Oliur Rahman (Ind)</p> <p>Co-opted Members:-</p> <p>Mr Frank West (non-voting trade union representative)</p> <p>Mr John Gray (non-voting admitted bodies representative)</p>

STANDARDS COMMITTEE (until 30th June 2012)

(Not subject to proportionality rules. Six Members of the Council (who may not include the Mayor or more than one other Cabinet Member) - three from the majority group, two from the largest minority group and one from another minority group, plus nine Independent Members)

<i>Labour Group (3)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (2)</i>	<i>Respect Group (1)</i>	<i>Others (0)</i>	<i>Independent Members</i>
Cllr Carli Harper-Penman Cllr Zenith Rahman Cllr Rachael Saunders Deputies:- Cllr Joshua Peck Cllr Amy Whitelock Cllr Anwar Khan	Cllr Zara Davis (1 vacancy) Deputies:- Cllr Gloria Thienel	(1 vacancy)	n/a	Mr. P O'Connor Mr D. Johnson Mr. B. Lowe Mr. M. Rowe Ms. S. Bagum Mr. E. Pemberton Ms. S. Rossiter (2 vacancies)

STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (from 1st July 2012)
 (Seven Members of the Council (who may not include the Mayor or more than one other Cabinet Member),
 plus up to seven co-opted members)

<i>Labour Group (4)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group (1)</i>	<i>Others (1)</i>	<i>Co-opted Members</i>
Cllr Carli Harper-Penman Cllr Rachael Saunders Cllr Sirajul Islam Cllr David Edgar Deputies:- Cllr Joshua Peck Cllr Amy Whitelock Cllr Anwar Khan	Cllr Zara Davis Deputies:- Cllr Gloria Thienel Cllr David Snowdon	(1 vacancy)	Cllr Rania Khan (Ind)	Mr. P O'Connor Mr D. Johnson Mr. B. Lowe Mr. M. Rowe Ms. S. Bagum Mr. E. Pemberton Ms. S. Rossiter (2 vacancies)

ADOPTION PANEL			
(To comprise two Social Workers, one elected Member, three Independent Persons and to include one man and one woman, up to a maximum of ten persons)			
<i>Labour Group</i>	<i>Conservative Group</i>	<i>Respect Group</i>	<i>Others</i>
Cllr Bill Turner	-	-	-

FOSTERING PANEL			
(To comprise two Social Workers, one elected Member and four Independent Persons, up to a maximum of ten persons)			
<i>Labour Group</i>	<i>Conservative Group</i>	<i>Respect Group</i>	<i>Others</i>
Cllr Lesley Pavitt	-	-	-

CORPORATE PARENTING STEERING GROUP (Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, two other Councillors, a Corporate Director and two Young People’s Representatives)			
<i>Labour Group</i>	<i>Conservative Group</i>	<i>Respect Group</i>	<i>Others</i>
Cllr Bill Turner	-	-	Cllr Oliur Rahman Cllr Alibor Choudhury

STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (SACRE) (To comprise members appointed by the LEA)			
<i>Labour Group (2)</i>	<i>Conservative Group (1)</i>	<i>Respect Group</i>	<i>Others</i>
Cllr Judith Gardiner 1 vacancy	Cllr Peter Golds	-	-

TO NOTE POLITICAL GROUP APPOINTMENTS

Labour Group		Leader of the Labour Group	-	Councillor Joshua Peck
		Deputy Leader of the Labour Group	-	Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Conservative Group	-	Leader of the Conservative Group	-	Councillor Peter Golds
		Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group	-	Councillor David Snowdon
Respect Group	-	Leader of the Respect Group	-	Councillor Fozol Miah
		Deputy Leader of the Respect Group	-	Councillor Harun Miah

APPENDIX D: CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR THE 2012/2013 MUNICIPAL YEAR (AGREED BY THE COUNCIL 16.05.12)

	USUAL MEETING DAY	MAY '12	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY' 13
COUNCIL	WEDNESDAY (7.30pm)	16 (7.00 AGM and 7.45 Ord)	tbc (e/o)	11		19		28		23	20 (budget)	6 (Prov 2 nd budget)	17	22 (AGM)
CABINET	WEDNESDAY (5.30 pm)	9	20	4 and 25		5	3	7	5	9	6	13	10	8
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY CTTEE	TUESDAY (7.00pm)	8	19	3 and 24 (5.30)		4	2	6	4	8	5	12	9	7
HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL	TUESDAY (6.30pm)		26			11		13		22			23	
STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	THURSDAY (7.00pm)	31		5	16 (5.30)	27		8	13	24		7	18	(7 June)
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	WEDNESDAY (7.00pm)	9	6	10 (Tues)	15 (5.30)	12	10	14	12	16	13	13	11 (Thurs)	15
LICENSING COMMITTEE	TUESDAY (7.00pm)	29				11			18			19		
LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE	TUESDAY OR THURSDAY (6.30pm)	15	7, 19	5, 19, 24 (5.30)	14 (5.30), 23	13, 25	9, 25	8, 20	6, 18	10, 22	7, 19	7, 19	4, 16	2, 16
STANDARDS CTTEE (STANDARDS ADVISORY CTTEE from 1.7.12)	TUESDAY (7.30pm)	10	12	17			9			15			16	

Page 11

	USUAL MEETING DAY	MAY '12	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY' 13
APPEALS COMMITTEE	MONDAY OR TUESDAY (7.00pm)	14, 28	12, 25	9, 23 (5.30)	14 (5.30), 28	10, 24	8, 23	5, 19	3, 17	7, 21	4, 18	5, 18	8, 22	14
GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE	WEDNESDAY (7.30pm)		13			13 (Thurs)			19			27		
AUDIT COMMITTEE	TUESDAY (7.00pm)		26			25			11			26		
HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE	WEDNESDAY (7.30pm)			18			24			17 (Thurs)			24	
PENSIONS COMMITTEE	THURSDAY (7.30pm)		14			20		15			21			
INVESTMENT PANEL	THURSDAY (5.30pm)		14			20		15			21			
KING GEORGE'S FIELD CHARITY BOARD	WEDNESDAY (6.30pm)	8 (Tues)		18				21			13			

NOTES:

- OTHER MEETINGS including Appointments Sub-Committee arranged on an ad hoc basis as required.
- BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX SETTING: Statutory deadline 11th March. Date of meeting set to enable receipt of GLA precept information.
- ELECTIONS: GLA Elections – 3rd May 2012
- Diamond Jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II – Tuesday 5th June 2012 (and Spring Bank Holiday for 28th May 2012 moved to Monday 4th June 2012)
- RAMADAN provisional dates: 20th July 2012 – 18th August 2012 (to be confirmed)
- Olympics – 27th July 2012 – 12th August 2012; Paralympics – 29th August 2012 – 9th September 2012
- ROSH HASHANAH - 17th & 18th September 2012; YOM KIPPUR – 26th September 2012
- EID-UL-ADHA provisional date: 26th – 29th October 2012 , ASHURA: 24th November 2012
- EASTER 2013: Good Friday 29th March 2013, Easter Monday 1st April 2013.

* Additional meetings scheduled for existing Standards Committee in May/June 2012 to conclude outstanding business before the new standards regime comes into effect in July. Remaining dates subject to Council agreeing the establishment of the new Standards Advisory Committee.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

HELD AT 7.45 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 16 MAY 2012

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

Members Present:

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

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m.

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Rajib Ahmed, in the Chair

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in items included on the agenda for the meeting as follows:-

Councillor	Item	Type of interest	Reason
Cllr Helal Abbas	12.1	Personal	I am a Ward Member in the area/matter to which the motion relates.
Cllr Helal Abbas	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter; and I am a Board Member of Tower Hamlets Community Housing
Cllr Kabir Ahmed	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Khaled U Ahmed	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Khaled U Ahmed	12.1	Personal	I am a member of the Licensing Committee.
Cllr Khaled U Ahmed	12.7	Personal	I am a Ward Member for the organisation providing youth services.
Cllr Ohid Ahmed	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Ohid Ahmed	9.1	Personal	I am a supporter of the campaign against a waste development station in Ailsa Street.
Cllr Rajib Ahmed	9.1	Personal	I am a supporter of the campaign against a waste development station in Ailsa Street.
Cllr Rofique Ahmed	9.4	Personal	I currently have a pension with LGPS.
Cllr Abdul Asad	9.3 & 12.7	Prejudicial	I am employed by youth service providers.
Cllr Abdul Asad	9.4	Personal	I currently have a pension with LGPS.
Cllr Mizan Chaudhury	12.1	Personal	I am a member of the Licensing Committee.
Cllr Alibor Choudhury	12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Stephanie Eaton	6.3	Personal	I am a leaseholder in the area of the Island Homes Housing Association.
Cllr David Edgar	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter

Cllr David Edgar	9.4	Personal	I have a pension with LGPS
Cllr Marc Francis	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter and am a Board member of Old Ford Housing Association.
Cllr Carlo Gibbs	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter and am a Board member of Tower Hamlets Community Housing.
Cllr Carlo Gibbs	12.1	Personal	I help to administer Challenge 25 and Community Alcohol Partnerships in my role at the WSTA.
Cllr Shafiqul Haque	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Shafiqul Haque	9.4	Personal	I have a pension with LGPS
Cllr Carli Harper-Penman	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter and am Director of Communications & Affairs for a regional housing provider.
Cllr Sirajul Islam	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter and am a Council tenant.
Cllr Sirajul Islam	12.9	Personal	I am a Board member of Tower Hamlets Community Housing.
Cllr Ann Jackson	5.1	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Denise Jones	5.3	Personal	I am a School Governor of Mulberry Girls School.
Cllr Denise Jones	9.2	Personal	I am a Director of Eastside Books Ltd
Cllr Rabina Khan	5.3	Personal	I am a Ward Member in the area/matter to which the question relates; and a governor of Mulberry School
Cllr Rabina Khan	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Rania Khan	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter

Cllr Shiria Khatun	9.1	Personal	I am a supporter of the campaign against a waste development station in Ailsa Street.
Cllr Fozol Miah	12.1	Personal	Ward Councillor
Cllr Md. Abdul Mukit	12.9	Personal	Board Member, Registered Social Landlord
Cllr Lesley Pavitt	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr Joshua Peck	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter
Cllr John Pierce	12.8	Personal	I work for the National Housing Federation which is the trade body for housing associations in England.
Cllr Oliur Rahman	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter.
Cllr Oliur Rahman	9.2 & 12.11	Personal	I am employed in the Employment Service.
Cllr Rachael Saunders	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter and am a THH leaseholder.
Cllr Gloria Thienal	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I am an RSL leaseholder
Cllr Bill Turner	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter.
Cllr Bill Turner	9.4	Personal	I have a pension with LGPS
Cllr Bill Turner	12.1	Personal	I am a member of the Licensing Committee.
Cllr Helal Uddin	12.7	Personal	I work for a youth service provider
Cllr Kosru Uddin	12.1	Personal	I work for the Department of Work & Pensions.
Cllr Motin Uz-Zaman	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter; and Board Member, Tower Hamlets Community Housing.
Cllr Amy Whitelock	5.1 & 12.9	Personal	I have signed the Residents Charter.
Cllr Amy Whitelock	12.14	Personal	I am an employee of Mind, one of the organisations which runs the Time to Change campaign.

RESOLVED

1. That the declarations of interests made be noted; and

2. That the Monitoring Officer issue guidance in due course on changes to the rules regarding registration and declaration of interests by Members, pursuant to the Localism Act 2011.

3. MINUTES

Members raised a number of queries regarding the content of the draft minutes. In particular (i) Members felt that the minutes should more clearly record that the Mayor did not provide oral answers to Members' Questions at the 25th January meeting and that the written answers included were provided subsequently; (ii) Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman stated that in reply to his question, on a matter of importance to the borough, the Mayor had stated that Councillor Uz-Zaman was 'only a councillor'; and (iii) Councillor Joshua Peck stated that the minutes did not accurately record the points of order and related Member comments that followed the public question from Ms Catherine Tuitt, despite the Council having agreed that these would be included.

The Service Head, Democratic Services reminded Members that the minutes were not intended to be a verbatim record of the discussion, but primarily a record of the motions and amendments proposed and seconded at the meeting and the decisions taken. Nevertheless the draft minutes would be amended to address the points raised above.

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 25th January 2012 and the Budget Meeting of the Council held on 22nd February 2012 be not agreed but be referred for consideration to the next meeting of the Council, amended to incorporate matters raised by Members.

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

No announcements were made at the meeting.

5. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

5.1 Petition from Tower Hamlets Federation of TRAs regarding a Residents Charter

Mr Phil Sedler addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing, then responded to the issues raised. Councillor Khan stated that she met regularly with TRA representatives in view of regular criticisms regarding social landlords, so as

to find out how the Mayor and his administration might best give support. She was proud that the Borough was at the forefront of social housing provision and delighted to see tenants and residents living in social housing coming together and spelling out, in the Residents Charter, the basis standards that social landlords should uphold.

Although the Council had no direct control over Registered Providers, it could exercise influence through partnership arrangements, and Councillor Khan was committed to keeping tenants and residents at the heart of Council housing policy, and to resisting the Government's reforms to rents and tenancies that would alter the hard-won rights of social housing tenants.

RESOLVED

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

Procedural Motion

At this point, Councillor Rania Khan moved, and Councillor Alibor Choudhury seconded, a procedural motion – "That under Procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.9 to be considered as next business."

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

5.2 Petition from Messrs Glyn Robbins, Guy Shennan and others regarding Veolia

Mr Guy Shennan addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members.

Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment, welcomed the petition and responded to the issues raised. Councillor Ali commented that he shared the petitioners' concerns about the Israeli military occupation Palestinian territories. It was in that spirit that he and his colleagues fully supported the Council motion passed in February 2011, criticising Veolia's involvement in illegal Israeli settlements in the Palestinian West Bank.

Councillor Shahed Ali indicated that the Mayor had acted on that motion and had met senior Veolia officers who had given assurances that Veolia was in the process of divesting itself of all business interests in the area. Councillor Ali added that he would be happy to meet representatives of the campaign to discuss the current situation and their concerns.

RESOLVED

That the petition be referred to the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

5.3 Petition from residents of Hainton Close regarding activities of a disruptive nature at Mulberry School for Girls

Mr Ralph Candlish, representing the residents of Hainton Close, addressed the meeting on behalf of the petitioners and responded to questions from Members. Mr Candlish stated that since the petition was raised, there had been some response from Parkwood Leisure, the PFI contractor. However, there were still three important issues that had not so far been addressed:- rogue balls, levels of noise and intrusive lights.

Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, responded to the petition. He stated that officers had already written to the petitioners addressing their concerns and that local residents had been in discussions with investigating officers from the antisocial behaviour team. The facilities of the school were managed by the PFI contractor, which included the arrangements for out of hours use of such facilities and officers had made strong representations to the contractors on the matters raised. Councillor Rahman stated that he was aware of how upsetting noise and other disruptions could be and he was committed to ensuring that controls were put in place.

RESOLVED

That the petition be referred to the Acting Corporate Director, Children, Schools and Families for a written response on any outstanding matters within 28 days.

6. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**6.1 Question from Mr Brian Nicholson, Secretary, London Dockers Athletic & Social Club**

At the last Council meeting Tower Hamlets was described as a grotty borough. Can the Mayor tell us what he is doing about street cleansing and public realm improvements across the borough?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question. I am pleased to announce that in the past 12 months we have improved the cleansing of our streets to the highest levels it has ever been.

We have also introduced two 'Find it Fix it' teams to proactively resolve environmental issues by reacting to littering hot spots that may occur irregularly across the borough.

We have also introduced the new dog fouling cleansing service and purchased 500 new litter bins of which there will be an increase of 300 by this year.

In addition we have piloted the removal of all the trade waste bins which used to block our pavements from our busiest roads by replacing them with time banded sack collections. This pilot scheme was so successful that we have rolled out the programme across the borough and improved the look and feel of our streets

Finally, a number of educational and promotional activities are also undertaken to dissuade people from littering.

All of this has led to a huge improvement in our public realm and demonstrates the Mayor's electoral pledge to make the borough cleaner and safer.

(No supplementary question was put)

6.2 Question from Mr Paplu Kaledur

Can the Mayor update this meeting how many young people from Tower Hamlets have received the Education Maintenance Awards since its inception, and does he believe the Government is supporting young people with its current policy on EMA?'

Response by Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Thank you for your question. So far 1,600 students have applied for the Mayor's Education Award which we introduced to plug the funding gap left by the termination by the Government of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). 700 students have received a payment and more payments will be made.

This shows that our students need all the support they can get.

The EMA scheme had a positive impact on our students in Tower Hamlets and the Mayor's Education Award is designed to keep those dreams alive. This Award will ensure that poverty will not hold back our young people's ambitions.

Finally, no, I don't think the government is supporting young people with the abolition of EMA across the country.

(No supplementary question was put)

6.3 Question from Mr Aminur Rahman

How will the Mayor ensure that residents' rights will be protected with the intended merger of Island Homes and One Housing?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question. We have taken a very proactive approach to managing this transition.

Officers have been meeting regularly with senior staff in One Housing. At these meetings officers have raised concerns that both the Council and residents have about the merger.

A detailed action plan has been developed to manage these concerns and we will be keeping a close eye on this to ensure residents concerns are addressed during this transition.

(No supplementary question was put)

7. MAYOR'S REPORT

The Mayor made his report to the Council meeting, adding his congratulations to the newly-appointed Speaker and his appreciation for the work of the outgoing Speaker. He further expressed congratulations to the two new Councillors, with hopes that they would enjoy their terms of office.

The Mayor commented that the economic crisis continued to create fear and hardship across Europe and that the position could get much worse before any improvement. Elected Members needed to work together to help the community in these times and the phrase as stated by the Prime Minister that "we are all in it together" should focus politicians in clearing up the mess that governments had created.

Residents in this Borough faced particularly difficult times and were relying on Councillors to deliver the means for creating jobs. Over 1500 jobs had been secured arising from the Olympic Games, which had produced fantastic opportunities for the Borough. As many residents as possible should be helped to feel they were part of this once-in-a-lifetime occasion, and tickets had been purchased with money recovered from the proceeds of crime to help them attend Olympic events.

The Borough also had strong connections with the imminent Queen's Jubilee. Queen Victoria had opened Victoria park in 1849 and the Mayor, with colleagues, had opened important improvement works there over the last week.

The Mayor concluded by stating that the future involved making many difficult decisions and all Members should work together for the benefit of residents.

The Leader of the Majority Group and Leaders of the Minority Groups each responded briefly to the Mayor's report.

8. TO RECEIVE WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The Service Head, Democratic Services, referred to points made earlier by Members with regard to the Mayor's responses to questions and indicated that the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation notified to the Annual Council Meeting earlier that evening allowed the Mayor to delegate responsibility for replies to Cabinet members where these fell within their delegated portfolios.

The questions below and in each case (except where indicated) a supplementary question were put and were answered by the relevant Executive Member.

8.1 Question from Councillor Carli Harper-Penman:

Following the recent announcement by the Ministry of Defence that a high velocity missile system is to be located within the Bow Quarter, can the Mayor update Council about the discussions that have taken place with the MoD and the steps that he will be taking to ensure that residents of Tower Hamlets are not endangered or unduly inconvenienced by the presence of such a system?

Response by Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

The Ministry of Defence did provide a verbal briefing to the Acting Chief Executive that confirmed that they were considering the possibility of installing missiles in the borough along with several other boroughs. This information was provided under strict secrecy.

The Acting Chief Executive expressed concern directly to the MoD that it should do all it can to minimise risk to local people.

However the Council has no powers to prevent the installation of these weapons in our borough.

Clearly having armed ordnance in a residential area, however well managed, must raise concerns with the immediate local population. We will vigorously support local residents in making representations to Government and to the MoD and by raising directly their concerns where we can.

Ward councillors formed part of the discussions on this issue.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Carli Harper-Penman

Poor communications around this whole issue has created worries for residents. At a meeting with the Interim Chief Executive I was informed that the MoD would write to residents apologising for the way in which the matter had been handled. Do you agree it is unacceptable that no such letter has yet been issued to residents?

Summary of response to the supplementary question

Yes, a letter has already been sent to the MoD in those terms.

8.2 Question from Councillor David Snowdon:

Will the Mayor urge Social Landlords in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to publish all their spending over £500, in line with Viridian and Home Group's example?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

The Mayor and I absolutely agree that Social Landlords should publish their spending over £500.

However we don't think this call for transparency goes far enough.

I was interested to read last week George Monbiot's article demanding that freedom of information laws should be extended to the private sector. The national government is pushing forward an agenda which involves the greater involvement of the private sector in public service delivery. We are all realising the drastic impact the Health and Social Care Bill will have on the NHS and the financial benefits that will be reaped for large companies.

We often talk in politics that rights come with responsibilities. Well, it is only right that the privileged access to public contracts comes with greater responsibility in terms of scrutiny.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor David Snowdon

Social Landlords should be bound by the same rules as local councils. Can I have an undertaking that Social Landlords will only be used as Preferred Development Partners if they sign up to the same degree of transparency that applies to this Council?

Summary of response to supplementary question

Yes, the Mayor and I agree that Social Landlords should publish details of items of expenditure of more than £500.

8.3 Question from Councillor Shiria Khatun:

Can the Mayor explain what he has done regarding his proposed charges for bulk rubbish collection & rat control?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

We as a Council have agreed that a £15 charge is introduced for bulk waste collections in 2012/13.

In order to minimise any adverse impact of this proposal to vulnerable residents within the borough, two free collections per year will be offered to those in receipt of Housing Benefit.

It has never been our intention to introduce charges for rat treatment in the current financial year. It is proposed to introduce charges from April 2013, although most social housing tenants will continue to receive free treatment since their landlords have block treatment agreements with the Council.

(No supplementary question was put)

8.4 Question from Councillor Fozol Miah:

Would the Mayor join with me in congratulating the former MP for Bethnal Green and Bow, George Galloway, on his landslide victory in the Bradford West by-election and would he agree with me that this extraordinary election result, gained in one of the shortest by-election campaigns ever as a result of the choice of the Labour Party, shows enormous dissatisfaction with the old established parties and a desire for change, a desire expressed in Tower Hamlets in the election of an independent mayor for Tower Hamlets and the election of Respect and an independent councillor in successive by-elections in the Spitalfields and Banglatown ward?

Response by Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

I think this and the recent local election results, and the fact that Ed Miliband is riding high in the polls, reflect to different degrees increasing frustration among the voters about the impact of austerity.

The more anti-austerity voices we have in parliament and local councils the better.

Unfortunately, another expression of the current climate is a cynicism about politics.

It is important that we redouble our efforts to re-engage people that are disaffected from the democratic process.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Fozol Miah

It is a matter of regret that the Labour candidate Ken Livingstone failed narrowly in his bid to become Mayor of London. Does the Mayor share my disappointment that Tower Hamlets Labour Party members decided not to campaign strongly for him?

Summary of response to supplementary question

I agree with you and this was very regrettable. On election day I was surprised to see many Labour councillors and activists campaigning only in one ward.

8.5 Question from Councillor Bill Turner:

Will the Mayor outline the numbers of children on roll at the new free schools in the borough who are eligible for free school meals? Do any other organisations with which the Council has an existing relationship in other ways propose to open free schools in the borough, and if so what discussions has the Council had with such organisations. Does he support or oppose any such plans which they may have and does he share the view of the Labour Group that the universal provision of excellent comprehensive education is the best way of ensuring that our children get the education they need?

Response by Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

The numbers of children enrolled in Free Schools on free school meals is not provided to the local authority but to the Department of Education who will not allow this information to be released to us for publication.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Bill Turner

I accept that the DfE have been less than helpful but given that there are a number of free schools in the borough and it is clear that they are not serving the whole community, may I suggest that you write in strong terms to the DfE asking that the Council should have details of these figures?

Summary of response to supplementary question

I share many of Councillor Turner's views on this matter and have shared a number of phone conversations with him. I will send a letter jointly with the Mayor asking for the information requested. He may be aware that information published on a blog in relation to one of the free schools in the borough suggests that school has just 2% of pupils entitled to free school meals, compared to the borough average of 48%.

8.6 Question from Councillor Peter Golds:

Will the Mayor inform the council when he decided to install speed humps on Jesus Green, E2, and what consultation took place for this particular proposal?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

It is crucial that the young and elderly are free from the fear of traffic accidents.

We have asked officers to investigate the concerns of local residents regarding speeding vehicles in this area.

Based on their assessment of the situation, officers will bring forward recommendations and proposals for local consultation.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Peter Golds

Thank you, but what was happening in this area at the time to cause the Mayor to issue an instruction to officers to install speed humps, or to claim that he did so? When was that instruction given, was it far from 3rd May 2012?

Summary of response to supplementary question

Officers have been asked to investigate concerns raised by local residents and when that investigation is complete, we will be informed of the outcome.

8.7 Question from Councillor Ann Jackson:

Can the Mayor detail how the Council is supporting residents who are affected by the Government's reduction in rent and council tax benefit?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

Thank you for your question. As lead member for housing, the Mayor and I are extremely concerned about the impact the government welfare cuts will have on local residents.

First, I would like to reassure you that this year's budget absorbed the central government cut to Council benefit.

In terms of Welfare Benefit changes, the Mayor and I have taken a lead role in ensuring the Council and partners are prepared for the impact central government changes will have on residents in the borough.

We have developed a partnership approach, drawing in RSLs, advice agencies, THH and all Council directorates. This approach was initiated through the Welfare Reform Congress where many of our partners signed up

to a Welfare Reform Pledge. It is now being furthered by a cross organisation officer group.

Some of the mitigating actions we are proposing include: Using our discretionary housing payments, contacting residents both through letters and home visits, staff briefings, working with advice services and liaising with landlords and others.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Ann Jackson

Has Tower Hamlets been late in starting to deal with this issue and has the Mayor met Ministers yet for discussions?

Summary of response to supplementary question

We have not been late in recognising the issues. It is essential that we have all the relevant information before approaching the Minister.

8.8 Question from Councillor Harun Miah

Would the Mayor agree with me that drug use and dependency constitutes a major threat to the well-being of our young people in Tower Hamlets and would he also agree that there has to be a multi-faceted approach if we are to get on top of this problem, including education, job opportunities for young people as well as the appropriate use of the criminal law and would he outline recent initiatives on this matter?

Response by Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Thank you for your question. I agree that drug use and dependency constitutes a threat to the well-being of our young people and their families in Tower Hamlets.

Our multi-agency approach includes a range of interventions to support young people including education, training and job opportunities.

We have developed a strategy which sets out how we will develop services for young people which will focus on prevention, early intervention, targeted and specialist services.

The provision of education and job opportunities for young people is central to the Mayor's priorities and this administration continues to ensure that young people become well-rounded adults, who are committed to learning and development and contribute to economic prosperity.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Harun Miah

Thank you. In the current economic situation, how long will these measures continue to be provided?

Summary of response to supplementary question

We will continue to monitor budgetary issues but I would assure you that these services will continue to be provided as long as they can be financially accommodated. And we will be looking further at how to give young people support to ensure they become good citizens.

8.9 Question from Councillor Rachael Saunders:

On what basis did the Mayor make his decision to close the in house domiciliary homecare service?

Response by Councillor Abdul Asad, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing

The decision to change the in-house domiciliary homecare service was decided under this administration and supported by the Labour Group. The Mayor agreed with this plan and put it into my budget in February 2011.

Referrals to the in house service for longer term packages of care were ended in October 2009, and the volume of longer term care provided by the in house service has therefore been reducing since that time.

A lot of work has been going on behind the scenes to ensure good services for our elderly residents. That is why this Council has been awarded for the last six years an excellent service rating and we will continue to improve the quality of our services.

Summary of supplementary question from Councillor Rachael Saunders

It is exactly because our in-house service is award-winning that I appeal to you not to close it. Previously the decision was taken in 2009 to accept no further referrals to the in-house homecare service. Since then, reablement and personalisation have become a reality and since then service users have told us that what some of them want is a reliable in-house service that will be there year on year regardless of changes in contracts. Labour has listened and we now have an explicit policy to maintain a small in-house service. Why will you not listen to those service users?

Summary of response to supplementary question

Thank you. The externalisation policy of domiciliary care was agreed in 2004 under a Labour-controlled Council and since then the Council has been making plans to ensure that residents continue to receive good services. In terms of any individual cases, I would be happy to discuss these outside of this meeting.

Questions 8.10 to 8.22 were not put as the time allowed for this agenda item had expired. Written responses subsequently provided for each question are attached as Appendix A to these minutes.

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

9.1 Local Development Framework (LDF): Managing Development - Development Plan Document and Fish Island Area Action Plan submission to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination

The Council considered the report of the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, finalising work on Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which were to form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy as adopted in September 2010, and which comprised:

- Managing Development – Development Plan Document (DPD) and
- Fish Island - Area Action Plan (AAP)

Councillor Rabina Khan **MOVED** and Councillor Shafiqul Haque **SECONDED** the recommendations as contained in the report.

Councillor Sirajul Islam requested that all Members of the Council be provided with details of any minor amendments made to the final documents. The Cabinet Member confirmed that this would be done.

After debate, the report recommendations were put to the vote and were **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

1. That the Managing Development DPD and Fish Island AAP be approved as attached at Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of the report, incorporating the minor amendments detailed at Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of the report, for submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
2. That approval be given to the submission of the documents which support the Managing Development DPD and Fish Island AAP (Appendices 5 to 9) and have been developed in accordance with regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. These are:
 - (a) the Sustainability Appraisal reports;
 - (b) the proposals map;
 - (c) the Statements of Engagement;
 - (d) copies of representations made and the Council's response
 - (e) the Equalities Assessments; and
 - (f) the evidence base.

- 3 That the Corporate Director of Development and Renewal be authorised, after consultation with the Mayor and Lead Member for Housing, to make any appropriate and necessary minor amendments to the Managing Development DPD and Fish Island AAP and their supporting evidence base prior to submission to the Secretary of State.
4. That details of any amendments made under resolution (3) above be provided to all Members.

9.2 Enterprise Strategy

The Council considered the report of the Cabinet at its meeting of 8th February 2012, incorporating the report of the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, proposing the approval of the Enterprise Strategy for the Borough.

Councillor Shafiqul Haque **MOVED** and Councillor Rania Khan **SECONDED** the recommendations as contained in the report.

After debate, the report recommendations were put to the vote and were **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

That the Enterprise Strategy be approved as set out in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report (CAB 068/112), attached as Appendix A to the Council report.

9.3 Community Safety Plan 2012/13

The Council considered the report of the Cabinet at its meeting of 4th April 2012, incorporating the report of the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture proposing the adoption of the Borough-wide Community Safety Plan for 2012-13.

Councillor Ohid Ahmed **MOVED** and Councillor Alibor Choudhury **SECONDED** the recommendations as contained in the report.

During debate on the matter, Members raised a number of concerns regarding the content of the draft Plan, including:

- The plan includes aspirations and aims but is weak on actual actions to achieve these
- The section on Drugs and Alcohol concentrates almost entirely on drug abuse whereas more harm is often caused by alcohol
- The section on integrated offender management also includes little in the way of concrete actions.
- There needs to be more focus on how offenders can access settled accommodation and employment particularly in current conditions

- Cohesion and Hate Crime: (i) The 'we will' statements at page 244 relate to 2011/12; (ii) bullet points at p.245 inadequately represent councillors' role in community cohesion and leadership, which is not restricted to scrutiny and its role in the budget process
- Youth Offending Team (p.237) – inadequate information included on poor recent inspection.
- Stop & Search – there is not enough information on the negative aspects of this particularly for some parts of the community; and inadequate data on demographic breakdown (e.g. Somali community excluded)
- Not enough detail on the practical plans to address antisocial behaviour during the Olympics period.

Councillor Judith Gardiner **MOVED** an amendment – “That the draft Plan be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for more detailed discussion”. However, the Service Head, Democratic Services, advised the Council that, as the Plan formed part of the Policy Framework, any proposed amendments would have to be notified to the Mayor for his consideration.

No motion was moved to refer the draft Plan back to the Mayor but Councillor Peter Golds **MOVED** and Councillor David Snowdon **SECONDED** an amendment to defer this matter to the proposed Extraordinary Council Meeting to be held in June 2012. On being put to the vote, this amendment was **carried** and accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

That consideration of the draft Community Safety Plan 2012/13 be deferred to the next meeting of the Council in the light of the matters raised by Councillors during the debate.

9.4 Pay Policy

The Council considered the report of the Human Resources Committee of 29th February 2012 proposing the adoption of the Council's Pay Policy Statement.

The Chair of the Human Resources Committee, Councillor Md. Abdul Mukit, MBE, **MOVED** and Councillor Joshua Peck **SECONDED** an amendment to the report as follows:-

“That the Pay Policy Statement be adopted as attached at Appendix A to the report of the Human Resources Committee, subject to the amendment of Section 11.3 (Negotiated Exits – Settlements) to provide that any proposed settlement under that section shall be subject to the agreement of the Human Resources Committee.”

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

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

RESOLVED

That the Pay Policy Statement be adopted as attached at Appendix A to the report of the Human Resources Committee, subject to the amendment of Section 11.3 (Negotiated Exits – Settlements) to provide that any proposed settlement under that section shall be subject to the agreement of the Human Resources Committee.

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

Nil items.

11. OTHER BUSINESS**11.1 Scheme of Members' Allowances 2012/13**

The Council considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services proposing the re-adoption of the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2012/13.

Councillor Oliur Rahman **MOVED** and Councillor Kabir Ahmed **SECONDED** an amendment regarding the maximum hourly sum payable under the scheme for a Dependent Carer's Allowance as this was below the London Living Wage. Councillor Joshua Peck endorsed the intention behind the amendment but considered that this should be subject to further work as the allowance was intended as a contribution towards costs incurred, not a salary level. He suggested that the Human Resources Committee should be asked to look into the matter and report back. Councillor Oliur Rahman agreed to this suggestion and the Council:-

RESOLVED

1. That the Members' Allowances Scheme at Part 6 of the Constitution be re-adopted for 2012/13, subject to minor amendments to reflect the changes to the Standards regime introduced as a result of the Localism Act 2011; and
2. That accordingly the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Members' Allowances Scheme 2012 be adopted as set out at Appendix 'A' to the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services).
3. That the Human Resources Committee be requested to give consideration to the maximum hourly amount payable under the Dependants' Carers Allowance (Section 9 of the report) in view of this Council's commitment to the London Living Wage, and report back.

11.2 The Amended Standards Regime

The Interim Chief Executive indicated that this report had been withdrawn for further consultation with Members and others and consideration at an Extraordinary Council Meeting to be held in June 2012.

11.3 Report on Executive Decisions precluded from 'Call-in' on grounds of urgency

The Council considered a report on decisions taken by the Cabinet on grounds of urgency under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17.1.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

12. TO CONSIDER MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Procedural Motion

At the commencement of this agenda item Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Ohid Ahmed **SECONDED** a procedural motion – “That under procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow agenda item 14 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.1 Motion on Licensing and anti-social behaviour on and around Brick Lane

Councillor Helal Abbas **MOVED** and Councillor Bill Turner **SECONDED** the motion as printed in the agenda.

After debate the motion as printed in the agenda was put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

- The complaints by many residents who live around Spitalfields that the number of late night alcohol licences on and around Brick Lane is resulting in an unacceptable level of alcohol-related crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour locally, including late night noise, urination and vomiting on doorsteps, and violence.
- The request by police that the Council, as the licensing authority, adopt a saturation policy for the Brick Lane area

- That a draft saturation policy for the Brick Lane area was taken to the Licensing Committee in September 2011, but has progressed no further, awaiting the publication of guidance on Cumulate Impact Policies by the government
- That other measures, as well as the proposed saturation policy, could benefit local residents.

This Council resolves:

- To support a Five Point Plan to tackle the problem that includes:
 - A Saturation Policy for the Brick Lane area being brought forward for the consideration of the Licensing Committee as soon as possible after publication of the awaited government guidance
 - The adoption of Challenge 25 as a mandatory condition on all TH licences to the statement of licensing policy
 - Setting up a "Brick Lane Alcohol Partnership" including the trade, police, council and voluntary or community groups to better co-ordinate action, share information and build working relationships between relevant stakeholders (to be contained within existing budgets)
 - Giving police powers to implement section 30 dispersal orders from 10pm to 5am Thursday – Saturday in the immediate vicinity of Brick Lane, allowing them limited powers to move groups on where they have reasonable grounds
 - Consideration of introducing pop-up/temporary urinals, as used in Westminster, on Friday and Saturday nights, and consulting on a bye-law to increase the fine for public urination to level 2 on the Standard Scale (£500).

[Note from clerk: Proposed revisions to the Licensing Policy Statement must be the subject of consultation under Section 5 (3) of the Licensing Act 2003. In addition, as one of the strategies included in the Council's Policy Framework, revisions to the Licensing Policy Statement must be developed with the involvement of the Executive and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, prior to adoption by the Council. Therefore to the extent that the resolution above involves changes to the Licensing Policy, the effect of the resolution is not to change the Policy at this stage, but to call on officers to commence a consultation process on the proposed amendments, for subsequent report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Executive and Council.]

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Carlo Gibbs **MOVED** and Councillor Bill Turner **SECONDED** a procedural motion – That under Procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.4 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.4 Open Spaces Strategy

Councillor Carlo Gibbs **MOVED** and Councillor Amy Whitelock **SECONDED** the motion as printed in the agenda.

After debate, the motion as printed in the agenda was put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED

This Council notes:

- The decision of Council on 8 December 2010 that put limits on the use of Victoria Park for commercial events, whilst still recognising that some events should still be allowed
- The decision of Council on 21 December 2011 that Sir John McDougal Gardens, Millwall Park and Island Gardens should not be made available for commercial events.

This Council further notes:

- The decision of the Mayor to ignore the decision of Council
- The Mayor's decision to cancel the free community event Paradise Gardens and the popular annual fireworks event in Victoria Park
- That the Open Spaces Strategy is reserved to Full Council and does not currently contain a section on Commercial Events in the borough's Parks

This Council resolves:

- To amend the Open Spaces Strategy to include a section on Commercial Events in parks, to reflect the prior decisions of Council, that:
- In regards to Victoria Park
 - Limits the number of large commercial music events in the park to six days each year;
 - Prevents the park being used for commercial events on consecutive weekends throughout the summer, with at least two weekends free after a weekend of events;
 - Sets a closing time for events to 10pm;
 - Sets a reduced noise levels for commercial events.

- In regards to Sir John McDougal Gardens, Millwall Park and Island Gardens
 - prevents the holding of commercial events.
- In regards to the gardens at Trinity Square:
 - allow the use for weddings but prevent the holding of other commercial events.
- To exclude the Live Site events in Victoria Park in 2012 from the above.

[Note from clerk: The Open Space Strategy is one of the plans and strategies included in the Council's Policy Framework. Any proposed amendment to the Open Space Strategy must follow the procedure set out in the Council's Constitution for developing the Policy Framework including publication of the proposals by the Executive; inclusion in the Forward Plan of the timescale and arrangements for consultation including with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Therefore to the extent that the above resolution involves changes to the Open Space Strategy, the effect of the resolution is not to amend the Strategy at this stage, but to call on the Mayor to include the amendments proposed in the draft Open Space Strategy for consultation and subsequent report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Executive and Council.]

Change to Order of Business

At this point, Councillor Rachael Saunders **MOVED** and Councillor Bill Turner **SECONDED** a procedural motion – That under Procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow motion 12.7 to be considered as next business.”

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

12.7 Youth Services

Councillor Rachael Saunders **MOVED** and Councillor Helal Uddin **SECONDED** the motion as printed in the agenda.

After debate, Councillor Alibor Choudhury **MOVED** and Councillor Kabir Ahmed **SECONDED** a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1.10 the question be now put.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

The motion as printed in the agenda was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly it was:-

RESOLVED**This Council notes:**

- That the executive Mayor has decided to take the Council's youth service contracts in house.
- That the reasons given for this decision included assertions that money would be saved if the council staff rather than the third sector organisations and schools managed the provider contracts.
- That no evidence has been given for this, and no firm numbers given.
- That the decision is not in line with the principles set out in the current Tower Hamlets Children and Young People's Plan.
- That the current providers add significant value to the contracts they hold through supporting services within their own HR and IT and through running additional youth services with their own resources.
- That youth services across Tower Hamlets have improved significantly since they were first contracted out, through effective partnership working.

This Council believes:

- That in tough times it is right to work with partners to seek savings and efficiencies, and wrong to undermine relationships and act unilaterally.
- That the best youth services support educational attainment and equip our young people to lead their communities. Youth services are there to support excellence not just tackle ASB.
- That resources should reflect need, with the greatest resources for areas with the greatest youth population.
- That effective hyper local partnerships have been developed between youth services, schools, health services, employers and others through locally based management of services.
- That currently our young people are able to shape and lead their own services. This must be strengthened, not weakened, in any future model.
- That the targets that the contractors currently report against should continue to be publicly reported against if the service is taken in house.

This Council resolves:

- To oppose bringing the youth service in house at this point.
- To call on the Mayor to:-
 - Work with providers to identify efficiencies in partnership; and
 - Run a full consultation with providers and young people before decisions about the future of the youth service are made.

Change to Order of Business

At this point Councillor Carli Harper-Penman **MOVED** and Councillor Helal Abbas **SECONDED** a procedural motion – “That under Procedural Rule 14.1.3 the order of business be varied to allow agenda item 13 to be considered as next business, followed by an exempt Emergency Motion to be moved in Part 2, followed by agenda item 14.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Extension of time limit for the meeting

Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman **MOVED** and Councillor Bill Turner **SECONDED** a procedural motion – “That under Procedure Rule 15.11.7 the meeting be extended for up to an additional 30 minutes to enable consideration of agenda item 14.” The procedural motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

Motions 12.2; 12.3; 12.5; 12.6; 12.8; 12.9; 12.10; 12.11; 12.12; 12.13; 12.14 and 12.15 were not considered due to the time limit for the meeting being reached.

13. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**RESOLVED**

That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted contains information defined as Exempt in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Urgent motion – Recruitment to the post of Chief Executive

The Council agreed to consider an urgent motion that was tabled regarding the above matter.

Councillor Carli Harper-Penman **MOVED** and Councillor Anwar Khan **SECONDED** the tabled motion.

The urgent motion recommended the Council (inter alia) to reaffirm the process agreed by the Human Resources Committee on 18th January 2012 to require a unanimous decision by the Appointments Sub-Committee; to note that no recommendation had been made to the Council by the Sub-Committee; to note the previous officer advice that other options exist; and to ask officers to report back to the June 2012 Extraordinary Council Meeting on options for both recruitment and interim arrangements.

The urgent motion also proposed management arrangements to apply until the June Council meeting, under which the Corporate Management Team would jointly lead the Council, with one officer assuming the role of Head of Paid Service.

Following debate, the urgent motion was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

14. APPOINTMENT TO THE POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE (HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)

The Council considered an exempt report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) in relation to the appointment to the post of Chief Executive.

The recommendations in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) were put to the vote and were **defeated**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

That the recommendations in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be not agreed.

[Note from clerk: the effect of the above decisions is that no appointment was made at the meeting to the post of Chief Executive (Head of Paid Service).

The meeting ended at 11.37 p.m.

Speaker of the Council

APPENDIX A**WRITTEN RESPONSES PROVIDED AFTER THE MEETING TO MEMBERS'
QUESTIONS 8.10 – 8.22****8.10 Question from Councillor Craig Aston:**

Will the Mayor provide an update on the status of the Limehouse Library building and site?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Limehouse Library was formally declared surplus to Council requirement by Cabinet on 12 January 2011 and officers were given authority to dispose of the property in the open market.

The property was openly and widely marketed by external agents on 9 May 2011.

A range of bids were received on 17 June 2011. All the due process was followed and the highest possible bidder was secured.

However the top bid and a number of other bids were withdrawn and due to the non-performance of the preferred bidder the transaction was aborted by the Council.

The property was re-marketed on 16 January 2012 and best and final bids were received on 24 February 2012.

8.11 Question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman:

Can the Mayor inform the Council, if he or a member of his family (including brother) has been involved in collecting Postal Ballots from residents in Spitalfields Ward?

Response by Mayor Lutfur Rahman

The answer is no.

As Mayor, I encourage local people to fully participate in the democratic process and postal voting is one of the ways to express their democratic choice.

The current electoral law facilitates people to vote in one of a number of ways including by post.

8.12 Question from Councillor Kabir Ahmed

Following the judgement by the Local Government Standards in England Tribunal to uphold this Council's Standard Committee decision to suspend the last Leader of the Council; does the Mayor agree with me that the Leader of the Labour Group has done nothing about this? And does he also agree with me that Cllr. Abbas should apologise to restore public faith, and to ensure there is not any abuse of power, bringing the office and the council into disrepute by breaching staff member protocol?

Response by Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

I agree that the Labour Group leader has failed to act on this matter.

The Council's constitution clearly stipulates the code of conduct for members of staff and councillors.

An outside independent body had upheld the decision of this Council's Standards Committee to suspend Cllr Abbas.

Rules are there for all of us to follow. It is disappointing that Cllr Abbas has not done the right thing and apologised to the Council and local people.

8.13 Question from Councillor Lesley Pavitt

I would like to ask the Mayor whether in view of the fact that we have a young persons' mayor he has considered having an older persons' mayor as well?

Response by Councillor Abdul Asad, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing

Thank you for your question. I think there is a real case for an Older Person's Mayor or Champion and we are seriously considering that idea.

In view of the scale of Government spending cuts there is a real danger is that social care and services for older people will suffer.

We would do everything in our power to ensure that is not the case and we are proud of our record in protecting services for the elderly.

However, we are not complacent and are determined to ensure our older residents have the strongest possible voice; and that our administration is completely aware of their needs.

8.14 Question from Councillor Tim Archer:

Will the Mayor give details to the Council on the sale of Poplar Town Hall situated on Poplar High Street?

Response by Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources

Poplar Town Hall was formally declared surplus to Council requirement by Cabinet on 12 January 2011 and officers were given authority to dispose of the property in the open market.

The property was openly and widely marketed by external agents on 9 May 2011 a wide range of bids were received on 8 July 2011.

The property was sold to the highest bidder. The transaction completed on 11 November 2011.

8.15 Question from Councillor Dr Stephanie Eaton:

What specific type of surface to air missiles does the Ministry of Defence propose to install on the Lexington building in Bow? If these are to be Starstreak II missiles with three projectiles to increase the probability of impact with an unauthorised aircraft, what is the impact on people and property on the ground of the projectiles that do not impact on the target? What powers if any does the Council have to oppose or veto the installation of these missiles?

Response by Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

Thank you to Councillor Eaton for your question.

The Council is not provided directly with any technical information regarding the type of surface to air missiles being deployed as part of the Olympic Games security plan.

I know that you share our concerns that regardless of the type of missile, their use over a populated area would represent a significant hazard.

The Council has no powers to veto such installations which are, unfortunately, a feature of modern Olympic Games security. Neither are we provided with any information about rules of engagement governing how or under what scenarios they will be used.

8.16 Question from Councillor Zara Davis:

How much has the Council spent on purchasing Olympic tickets?

Response by Mayor Lutfur Rahman

Thank you for your question. Due to LOCOG publicity rules, we were unable to promote this initiative. However, because of your intervention and the publicity this generated, I am pleased to say that on the 1st day over 200 people have applied for the tickets.

The Council has spent £35,125 (+VAT) on purchasing Olympic tickets.

The Mayor and I are committed to maximising opportunities for local residents to experience the Olympic Games and to ensuring as many local people can secure tickets as possible.

Tower Hamlets Council ordered the full 400 tickets offered. These are to be made available by the Mayor free to residents of the Borough.

All 400 tickets will be made available to residents through a transparent process due to launch in the coming weeks. Tickets have been paid for with money given by the Police from the proceeds of crime, and other boroughs have also done the same.

8.17 Question from Councillor Lutfu Begum

Housing shortages and overcrowding remains one of the most pressing needs for local residents, can the Mayor update this meeting how many houses he has built? And will any Tower Hamlets residents suffer the fate that some Newham residents have due to the government's welfare reform changes by moving 100 miles from the borough?

Response by Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing

To date 2010 new build affordable homes have been completed.

The Government's Welfare Reform proposals are particularly harsh and their impact places serious challenges on all London councils in their efforts to source affordable accommodation locally.

Certainly, some councils seem less inclined than others to work to mitigate this impact but the Mayor and Lead Member for Housing in Tower Hamlets are able to confirm the efforts of the Council's Housing Options Service in working with private sector landlords and tenants in the borough to prevent homelessness and so keep families in their homes.

The Housing Options Service has so far been successful in both preventing homelessness and avoiding the use of non-London accommodation. Just

how long that success can be maintained depends on the extent and impact of the progressive roll out of the Government's Welfare reforms.

8.18 Question from Councillor Gloria Thienel:

Are there any proposals by the council to rent out our Council Charity Collection bins to private companies for profit?

Response by Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment

The Council does not own any charity bins. All bins in the borough are owned by charities.

However, I would like to state that I would urge residents to drop their clothes off at charity shops and not to use charity bins.

Clothes donated to charity shops are sold per item, clothes donated to bins are sold by weight by private companies. This means charities gain far more income through their shops than the bins. Donations to bins earn private companies a profit.

8.19 Question from Councillor Gulam Robbani

How will the Mayor ensure that any disruption to local people is minimised by using Victoria Park as a live site during the 2012 Games?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

Inevitably when a once-in-a-lifetime event such as the Olympics in London takes place, there will be some disruption, but the council is working with its partners to ensure that any impact is minimal.

The contract with the promoters of the Live Sites (including Victoria Park) includes the Council, the Greater London Authority and the Royal Parks and we have all signed up to do all we can to prevent disruption or minimise it.

The contract contains conditions of use that set out clearly controls for noise levels and other issues of concern such as keeping the park clean.

8.20 Question from Councillor Dr Emma Jones:

How many residents have contacted the Council this year about the amount of time taken for land searches to be processed when buying or selling property?

Response by Councillor Rofique Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration

According to directorate records, to date there have been eight recorded enquiries received by our Planning and Building Control Department regarding the length of time taken to process land searches.

8.21 Question from Councillor Maium Miah

With less than 100 days to the greatest show on earth, can the mayor update us how the council is preparing for the Olympic Games, and how Tower Hamlets residents will benefit from the Games?

Response by Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture

1,541 job offers have been made to Tower Hamlets residents by LOCOG contractors so far and this figure is set to rise further. In addition, 1,668 Tower Hamlets residents have worked on the construction of the Olympic Park site over the past 5 years. 249 Tower Hamlets residents are employed directly by LOCOG which represents 8.2% of LOCOG's total workforce.

External investment has been attracted to Mile End Park Leisure Centre to upgrade the athletics facilities to international competition standard.

In addition, the Council has secured £5m of Public Realm improvement funding to bring about improvements to Whitechapel via the HS2012 initiative, Grove Road and improvements to Fish Island access.

These improvements will deliver a lasting economic benefit to the local economy.

8.22 Question from Councillor Aminur Khan

ASB and fear of crime remains one of the main concerns for local people, can the Mayor update us on the work of the THEOs?

Response by Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed

The council recognises that the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour remains a real concern for the community.

38 police officers have been acquired to combat this issue.

Although significant achievements have been made in reducing the number of reported incidents, we know that people still express a desire to see a more visible enforcement presence.

The introduction of the THEO's two years ago was a direct response to such concerns. The THEOs have enabled the Council to directly determine where and when the officers are deployed, dealing with incidents which would unfortunately not always be dealt with by the police due to competing priorities.

The annual resident's survey results demonstrate the positive impact the officers are having.

Community Safety is a priority for the Council and therefore additional THEOs will be patrolling the community over the next few months.

Since the introduction of the drinking controlled zone the officers have made 2595 alcohol seizures. In the first 3 months of this year they have made 381 seizures and if this is placed against alcohol related ASB reports there has been a reduction of 29% against the same time last year.

The officers are currently working closely with Tower Hamlets Homes and they will shortly assist with the council response to noise related ASB through the night.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL – EXTRAORDINARY MEETING

HELD AT 7.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 18 JUNE 2012

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

Members Present:

Mayor Lutfur Rahman	Councillor Dr. Emma Jones
Councillor Helal Abbas	Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Khaled Uddin Ahmed	Councillor Anwar Khan
Councillor Kabir Ahmed	Councillor Aminur Khan
Councillor Ohid Ahmed	Councillor Rania Khan
Councillor Rajib Ahmed	Councillor Shiria Khatun
Councillor Rofique U Ahmed	Councillor Harun Miah
Councillor Shahed Ali	Councillor Md. Maium Miah
Councillor Tim Archer	Councillor Fozol Miah
Councillor Abdul Asad	Councillor Mohammed Abdul Mukit MBE
Councillor Craig Aston	Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer
Councillor Lutfu Begum	Councillor Lesley Pavitt
Councillor Mizan Chaudhury	Councillor Joshua Peck
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	Councillor John Pierce
Councillor Zara Davis	Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Marc Francis	Councillor Oliur Rahman
Councillor Judith Gardiner	Councillor Gulam Robbani
Councillor Carlo Gibbs	Councillor Rachael Saunders
Councillor Peter Golds	Councillor Gloria Thienel
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	Councillor Bill Turner
Councillor Carli Harper-Penman	Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Sirajul Islam	Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Ann Jackson	Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Councillor Denise Jones	Councillor Amy Whitelock

The meeting commenced at 7.38 p.m.

The Speaker of the Council, Councillor Rajib Ahmed, in the Chair

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Stephanie Eaton, David Edgar, David Snowdon and Kosru Uddin.

RESOLVED

That the apologies for absence be noted.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors declared interests in items included on the agenda for the meeting as follows:-

Councillor	Item	Type of interest	Reason
Cllr Kabir Ahmed	6	Personal	Party to legal correspondence on the matter
Cllr Abdul Asad	4	Personal	Employed by youth service provider at Bishop Challoner School

Point of Personal Explanation

Councillor Ohid Ahmed stated that he had been asked by Councillors Peter Golds and Joshua Peck to give an apology for comments he made at a previous Council meeting. Councillor Ahmed stated that he had previously explained that if the previous Speaker of the Council had allowed him to finish his speech at the meeting concerned then the situation would not have arisen. Nevertheless, Councillor Ahmed stated that he had written to the Councillors and made it clear that he did not accuse any of them personally of racism. If his remarks had inadvertently given that impression then Councillor Ahmed was sorry for that.

3. LOCALISM ACT 2011 - THE AMENDED STANDARDS REGIME

The Council considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) proposing arrangements for the adoption of an amended Standards regime as introduced by the Localism Act 2011.

The Council noted that an addendum report, which was circulated with the supplementary agenda, proposed additional amendments that had arisen due to:

- (i) Two Statutory Instruments made on 6th June 2012 in connection with the 2011 Act which gave further direction on the detail of the new regime, particularly in relation to the definition of a 'Disclosable Pecuniary Interest' and made provision for transitional arrangements; and
- (ii) The meeting of the Standards Committee on 12th June 2012, when further consideration had been given to the new arrangements and comments thereon submitted by the political groups and others.

The addendum report accordingly set out revised recommendations for the Council's consideration.

Councillor Ohid Ahmed moved, and Councillor Alibor Choudhury seconded, an amendment to the recommendations as follows:-

“That the words ‘and other faiths’ be inserted after the word ‘church’ in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.11 to the draft terms of reference of the Standards Advisory Committee.”

The amendment moved by Councillor Ohid Ahmed was put to the vote and was **agreed**.

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

RESOLVED

1. That agreement be given, with effect from 1st July 2012, to:-
 - (a) The establishment of a Standards Advisory Committee with revised terms of reference as set out in Appendix 1 to the addendum report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services), subject to the addition of the words “and other faiths” after the word “church” in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.11 of the revised terms of reference.
 - (b) The re-appointment of the current Independent Members of the Standards Committee, with the exception of the Independent Chair, as co-optees to the new Standards Advisory Committee.
 - (c) The adoption of the new Code of Member Conduct for the Council as set out in Appendix 3 to the addendum report.
 - (d) The revised arrangements for dealing with allegations of a breach of the Code of Conduct as set out in Appendix 2 to the addendum report.
2. That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make arrangements to advertise for, and together with an Appointments Panel drawn from the Standards Advisory Committee in accordance with proportionality to take the necessary action to appoint, an Independent Person and a reserve Independent Person, whose appointments shall be confirmed by the Council.
3. That the existing Independent Chair of the Standards Committee, Mr Barry O’Connor, be appointed as the ‘Independent Person’ under the new arrangements, to serve until the completion of the recruitment process to that position.
4. That consequent on resolution 3 above, the existing Chair of the Standards Committee be not appointed at this stage as a co-opted member of the new Standards Advisory Committee but that he be invited to attend meetings of that Advisory Committee as an observer.

5. That the Monitoring Officer have authority to convene a Dispensations Sub-Committee of the Standards Advisory Committee, to consider and advise on applications from the Mayor, any Member or co-opted member for dispensations from the restrictions on participation in any matter in which there is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

4. COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 2012-13

The Council considered the report of the Cabinet meeting of 4th April 2012, incorporating the report of the Corporate Director, Communities, Localities and Culture, proposing the adoption of a Borough-wide Community Safety Plan for 2012-13. The Community Safety Plan was one of the plans and strategies that make up the Council's Policy Framework and was therefore required to be adopted by the full Council.

Councillor Abdal Ullah moved, and Councillor Judith Gardiner seconded, a tabled amendment as follows:-

“This Council notes:

- There continues to be serious public concern about the levels of crime in Tower Hamlets.
- Incidents of serious violent crime and serious acquisitive crime have increased over the past year.
- The proposed Community Safety Plan contains very few targets or measurable criteria for success, therefore allowing little oversight.
- The proposed Community Safety Plan does not clearly focus on the issues of most importance to local residents, those of serious violent crime and serious acquisitive crime.

This Council believes:

- Every step should be taken to combat criminality in Tower Hamlets.
- Priorities for community safety in Tower Hamlets should be clear and measurable in order to maintain public support and oversight.
- It is the role of every elected representative to work towards a safer community.

This Council therefore resolves to amend the report as follows:

- Delete the second bullet point on page 31, (“Exploit the Mayor’s role as a unifying figure via the Citizen Engagement Strategy”).
- Delete “through scrutiny and its role in the budget process” from the third bullet point on page 31.

- To add a new page after page 3, in the same font, size and layout as page 3, stating:

Note from Tower Hamlets Councillors

Tower Hamlets councillors represent residents living in all corners of our borough and so every day we hear about the crime and anti-social behaviour experienced by local people.

We know that for too many of our residents, Tower Hamlets doesn't feel safe enough, and that too many people are still the victims of crime and anti-social behaviour.

That's why we were concerned that this Community Safety Plan did not seem to recognise this reality. Undoubtedly a lot of good work has been done by the Council, the police, housing providers and others in tackling crime and ASB, and every year there are lots of successes.

But despite that good work, some types of crime are rising. In the last year, both serious violent crime and serious acquisitive crime have gone up. At the same time, residents' concern about drug-use and dealing, drunk or rowdy behaviour, and vandalism, graffiti and criminal damage has also risen.

In a year when visitors from all over the world are coming to East London to enjoy the Olympics, the Community Safety Partnership needs to be better than ever at identifying the risks and causes of crime and ASB, and putting in place challenging targets and strategies for reducing them. Whilst there is clearly good work being done by the partnership, Tower Hamlets councillors were disappointed that this Community Safety Plan contained few targets, had very little in the way of concrete plans and didn't reflect the concerns that residents raise with us. It also is of great concern that the Plan does not set out a clearer strategy for halting the rise in serious violent and acquisitive crime and reducing the fear of crime in our borough.

As councillors we have opposed police counter closures planned for the borough, called for action to tackle drink-related ASB around Brick Lane and united against the threat to order in our borough posed by extremists – yet none of this is reflected in the plan.

We hope that, despite this, the Community Safety Partnership will work effectively this year to address the concerns of our community. We also hope that the Partnership will make more of an effort to use the expertise and knowledge we have, as representatives of our whole borough, in doing so.

Tower Hamlets councillors"

Following debate, the amendment moved by Councillor Abdal Ullah was put to the vote and was **agreed**. The substantive motion as amended was then put to the vote and was **agreed**. Accordingly, it was:-

RESOLVED

That the draft Community Safety Plan 2012-13 be referred back to the Executive for further consideration in the light of the amendment agreed by the Council in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules.

5. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted contains information defined as Exempt in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

6. APPOINTMENT TO POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE (HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)

It was agreed that consideration of this matter be deferred to an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council to be held immediately prior to the next Ordinary Council meeting on 11th July 2012.

7. MOTION REGARDING THE DISCIPLINARY POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND MONITORING OFFICER

Councillor Anwar Khan moved, and Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman seconded, the circulated motion.

Following debate the motion, including the revised Policy and Procedure as amended in accordance with the comments of the Monitoring Officer, was put to the vote and was agreed.

The meeting ended at 8.48 p.m.

Speaker,
Council

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

PETITIONS

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. The Council's constitution as amended provides that a maximum of three petitions are received at any meeting. These are taken in order of receipt. This report sets out the valid petitions submitted for presentation at the Council meeting on Wednesday 11th July 2012.
2. The deadline for receipt of petitions for this meeting is noon on Thursday 5th July. However, at the time of agenda despatch three petitions had already been received as set out overleaf which is the maximum number to be heard.
3. In each case the petitioners may address the meeting for no more than three minutes. Members may then question the petitioners for a further four minutes. Finally, the relevant Cabinet Member or Chair of Committee may respond to the petition for up to three minutes.
4. Any outstanding issues will be referred to the relevant Corporate Director for attention who will respond to those outstanding issues in writing within 28 days.
5. Members should confine their contributions to questions and answers and not make statements or attempt to debate.

5.1 Petition from Nahida Rashid, Mrs H Ali, Tajul Islam and Shamsul Hoque and signed by 89 persons regarding ‘Attack on Bengali as a mother tongue teaching-learning at Langdon Park Secondary School’:

“We would like to draw your attention to our serious concern on the issue of our children’s Bengali language learning at Langdon Park Secondary School. With regret we find that the school administration has been trying to marginalise Bengali learning by discouraging the children to choose Bengali as an MFL subject of learning. The time-table of the school has been one of the factors for children to opt-out for subjects other than Bengali. The permanent Bengali teacher has been marginalised and put in a situation so that she goes for early retirement. The entire scenario has become one that can be considered as an institutional attack on Bengali as a mother tongue teaching.

You know as well as we know that the teaching of Bengali should be made available at any cost in a school where 90% children come from families where home-language is Bengali. Opportunity for learning our mother tongue Bengali is not only our right and entitlement but also an instrument for our socio-cultural emancipation. We cannot keep quiet when such a plot has been matured through the direct support of the head teacher of the school.

May we therefore request you to please intervene into the situation and order for a independent investigation so that teaching-learning of Bengali at Langdon Park Secondary School can be resumed in full sewing in the interest of safeguarding the entitlement of our children to learn their mother tongue and achieve higher in the future career.

We look forward to your kind action and hearing from you soon.”

5.2 Petition from Emily Sawyer and signed by 47 persons plus others online regarding the ‘Residents Solidarity Campaign’:

“Since the beginning of 2012, the police in Tower Hamlets have been targeting women involved in street-based prostitution with arrests, displacement and threats of ASBOs in an effort to ‘clean up’ the streets for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Many of the women have had early experiences of abuse and violence; they have been groomed or forced into prostitution. For the vast majority, prostitution is a choice of ‘no choice’. In addition, they experience high levels of sexual and physical violence on the streets and in their intimate relationships. They are faced with homelessness, drug addictions and poverty.

We call on the police and the council to stop this victimisation and instead to focus on those who buy sex (kerb-crawlers), those who perpetrate violence against women and those who exploit them (abusive partners and drug dealers).

This campaign has been supported by Toynbee Hall.”

5.3 Petition from Mr A S Alom and signed by 39 persons regarding ‘Sex and Relationship Education (SRE)’:

“We, the undersigned, are concerned about SRE (Sex and Relationships Education) provision in Tower Hamlets (TH).

We are calling on the Local Authority (LA) to support our campaign in defending our rights as parents and opposing the premature sexualisation of young children through explicit teaching of SRE in TH schools.

We call upon the LA, head teachers and governing bodies to:

1. Consult effectively with parents on the SRE policy and the content of SRE within the school;
2. Take steps to ensure that if sex education is taught to any pupils that it is done in a way that is culturally appropriate;
3. Respect and value the role of parents as the primary educators of their children in matters of sex and relationships;
4. Consider a review of the approach and practices in supporting schools in the teaching and learning of SRE; and
5. Facilitate an urgent meeting with the Mayor and Cabinet member to reassure us as parents on the teaching of SRE to our children.”

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Council	Date: 11th July 2012	Classification: Unrestricted	Agenda Item No. 5.4
Report of: Service Head, Democratic Services		Title: PETITION DEBATE: YOUTH SERVICE CHANGES Wards: All	

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Council's Petition Scheme, adopted in July 2010 in accordance with the provisions of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, provides that where a petition includes the names, addresses and signatures of at least 2,000 persons who live, work or study in the borough, the petitioners may request that a debate be held about the petition at the full Council meeting. This is distinct from the long-standing provision in the Council's Constitution that a petition with at least 30 signatures may be presented to (but not debated by) the Council.
- 1.2 The full relevant extract from the Petition Scheme is attached at Appendix A.
- 1.3 A petition containing 2,403 signatures has been received on the subject of changes to the Youth Service. The petitioners have requested that the petition be debated by the Council. The text of the petition is as follows:-

"No to Youth Service Delivery Proposals:

Tower Hamlets Council is proposing to bring its Youth Services back 'in house', delivering services themselves rather than in partnership with organisations they have been working with to deliver services, some for over 10 years. They say this will achieve better 'localism' and that the community will be more engaged in better services this way. We disagree.

We the undersigned believe that the proposal to transfer the Youth Service 'in house' should be rejected.

We believe the Youth Service in its current form offers greater variety, with more structured and accredited provision, reaching a far greater cross section of the community than it did previously when it was run in house by the Local Authority. We believe that the alternative proposal to re-tender the contracts and keep delivery of Youth Services in the community is the best way forward for young people of the borough."

- 1.4 The Council is invited to debate this matter. As this is the first such 'petition debate' under the new scheme, the following guidance is provided on the format of the debate:-

- As set out in the Petition Scheme, the maximum total time for this agenda item is 18 minutes.
- At the start of the agenda item, the Speaker will invite the petitioners to present their petition for a maximum of three minutes. There is no provision for any further public speaking on the matter.
- The Speaker will then open the debate and ask if any Member wishes to speak on the matter. All speeches are limited to a maximum of three minutes and any Member may speak only once during the debate.
- During his or her speech any Member may move a motion for the Council's consideration relevant to matters in the petition.
- Because the subject matter of the petition – decisions regarding the youth service – is an executive function, the Council does not have powers to override any executive decision of the Mayor or substitute its own decision. The Council may however pass a motion expressing a view on the matter or referring the matter to the Mayor, calling on him to take some action, or consider or reconsider a decision, with recommendations to inform that consideration. Officers will advise on the constitutional validity of any motion that may be moved
- The Speaker will invite the Mayor or (at the Mayor's discretion) a Cabinet Member to respond to the matters raised during the debate, before a vote is taken on any motion that may be moved.
- If no motion is moved during the debate, the petition will stand referred to the relevant Corporate Director for a written response.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION – CABINET DECISION AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY CONSIDERATION

- 2.1 The matters raised in the petition have already been the subject of discussion and decision at two meetings of the Cabinet and a call-in reference by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Cabinet decision, 14th March 2012

- 2.2 The Mayor in Cabinet made the following decision on 14th March 2012:-
1. That the youth service be brought back in-house and the location of both the Youth Service and Community Languages Service be considered.
 2. That the opportunity offered by an in-house system to align the service more closely to community safety, health and leisure services within the council be taken, strengthening the ties to the partnership and push for localisation.

3. That the service's compliance with the national MI system is retained; and
4. That the management of the service is transferred to CLC.

Call-in and referral to Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 3rd April 2012

- 2.3 The above decision was "called-In" for further consideration in accordance with the provisions of Part 4 of the Council's Constitution by Councillors Khales Uddin Ahmed, Helal Uddin Abbas, Anwar Khan, Bill Turner and Denise Jones. The call-in requisition gave the following reasons for the Call-in:

A core part of effective localism is working with locally based partners, and the current youth service contracts have been effective in achieving local buy-in and joint partnership working. Effective localism will not be achieved through pulling delivery services out of our local communities into Mulberry Place;

The success of the current youth services has been substantially based on partnership working. Effective partnership working is based on good relationships and trust. This trust has been undermined by the way the issue has been handled, with one current provider being surprised to learn about the proposal to bring the service in-house, as they had no warning that their contract might not be renewed. Goodwill has helped existing resources go further so far – i.e. OFHA has its own IT, HR, Legal and Finance services which support the youth service at no cost to the borough;

Outcomes have significantly improved since the youth service was contracted out, with greater variety, more structured and accredited provision reaching a far greater cross section of the community, than it did previously when it was run in-house;

We recognise the need to save money, and believe that it would be better to work in partnership with current providers to achieve savings rather than disrupt a currently successful model;

We are concerned that the original Cabinet decision did not include in writing, any commitments on how an in-house service would be operate in the borough. We believe that a good in-house service would run services in local settings across the whole of the borough, with greater concentration of resources in areas of greater economic need;

We believe that local partners with strong community credibility and existing successful democratic and involvement structures, are well placed to deliver excellent services, especially as they already integrate leadership of young people in delivering and shaping services. Then is not as effective when done borough-wide;

There has been no consultation with some current providers on these proposals;

The paper states that this model is intended to improve localism, but gives no specifics on how this will be achieved. The current providers are already doing excellent work in localised partnerships, i.e. Poplar HARCA working with the NHS and St Paul's Way School; and OFHA achieving excellent outcomes working with public health i.e. obesity.

We are concerned that despite the need to make savings, the financial outcome of the Cabinet report remains unclear, with no stated savings targets and significant unknown variables such as the cost of hiring venues if current relationships are disrupted.

2.4 The call-in Councillors proposed the following alternative course of action:

It is proposed that the Mayor and his advisory Cabinet Member seek a dialogue with the current service providers and with other interested partners, such as RSLs who already deliver youth services and to seek to develop a model of youth service delivery in partnership with local organisations continuing in their roles as contractual providers. This will require transparency around savings targets and allocation of resources. This dialogue should be time limited. We are confident that an outcome which achieves reasonable savings targets and maintains the added value, that partners and the young people who are currently taking leadership in the delivery of services and contribute to service provision, can be achieved.

We suggest that young people who use local services are consulted as part of this process, and that their views are analysed according to gender, ethnicity and geography.

2.5 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 3rd April 2012 endorsed the call-in and referred the decision back to the Cabinet for further consideration with the following comments:

- This decision is not being undertaken in the right way – there has been insufficient work done to clarify the potential risks, costs and benefits of a move to in-house management. It is therefore not clear what the benefits of this change are, or why it is being undertaken now and in such a hurry, with the contracts concerned due shortly for review and renewal.
- There is clearly significant concern from the community and providers about this change, and insufficient communication and consultation with providers before the report was published. Further consultation with providers, and with young people, should be done to understand their concerns, before progressing further with this decision.
- The Committee was disappointed by the negative comments about existing providers made by the Lead Member. If we are to continue our important partnership working with these providers we need to maintain good, constructive relationships with them.
- This report is another example of reports going to Cabinet, and to public view, with insufficient information on which to base a decision. This report has been tabled at too early a stage, and as such has upset the community

and providers and has the potential to affect the service it seeks to preserve.

- The lack of information and consultation on this has resulted in the decision being called in. The community feels wary of a decision seeming to have been taken without their involvement, with possible future effects that may not have been forecast due to lack of thoroughness now.

Cabinet decision 4th April 2012

- 2.6 At the Cabinet meeting on 4th April 2012, the comments, advice and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were noted. After further consideration of the matter, the Mayor in Cabinet re-affirmed his original decision in relation to Youth Service Delivery as at 2.2 above.

APPENDIX A – EXTRACT FROM THE COUNCIL’S PETITION SCHEME:

5. PRESENTATION OF A PETITION TO ELECTED COUNCILLORS

Subject to your petition containing sufficient signatures as set out below, you may request to present the petition to a meeting of elected councillors. There are a number of ways in which this can be done.

...

(b) Debate at a Council Meeting

If your petition includes the names, addresses and signatures of at least 2,000 persons who live, work or study in the borough you may request that a debate be held about the petition at the full Council meeting. The Council will endeavour to consider your petition at its next meeting, although on some occasions this may not be possible and consideration will then take place at the following meeting. We will tell you the date of the meeting at which the debate will take place once this is confirmed.

At the meeting, the petition organiser or another signatory to the petition will be given three minutes to present the petition. The person who presents the petition must live, work or study within the borough. The petition will then be debated by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes. Following the debate, the Council will decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. They may decide to take the action the petition requests, not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate, or to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee.

Where the issue is one on which the Council’s Executive (Cabinet) are required to make the final decision, the Council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision. As the petition organiser, you will receive written confirmation of this decision, which will also be published on our website.

In the event that two or more petitions which are substantially the same are received from different petition organisers, the Chief Executive may aggregate the number of valid signatures in each petition for the purpose of determining whether the threshold to trigger a Council debate of the matters raised has been reached if that is the wish of the petition organisers.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions submitted by members of the public, for response by the Mayor or appropriate Cabinet Member or committee chair at the Council Meeting on 11th July 2012.
2. The Council's Constitution sets a maximum time limit of twenty minutes for this item.
3. A questioner who has put a question in person may also put one brief supplementary question without notice to the Member who has replied to his or her original question. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply. Supplementary questions and Members' responses to written and supplementary questions are each limited to two minutes.
4. Any question which cannot be dealt with during the twenty minutes allocated for public questions, either because of lack of time or because of non-attendance of the questioner or the Member to whom it was put, will be dealt with by way of a written answer.
5. Unless the Speaker of Council decides otherwise, no discussion will take place on any question, but any Member of the Council may move, without discussion, that the matter raised by a question be referred for consideration by the Cabinet or the appropriate Committee or Sub-Committee.

QUESTIONS

Seven questions have been submitted as set out below:-

6.1 Question from Mr Steve Walker:

Given the high incidence of Tuberculosis in this borough, could the council take the necessary steps to introduce a by-law that would ban spitting in public?

6.2 Question from Mr Stuart Madewell:

Following the recent Weavers by-election when the Mayor supported the Respect candidate Abjol Miah can the Mayor please clarify what his views are in relation to Resident Social Landlords.

Does he agree that residents and councillors should be residents should be represented on the boards of Housing Associations or does he agree with Respect that Housing Associations are a form of privatisation that we should have nothing to do with?

6.3 Question from Ms Christine Whaite, Spitalfields Open Space; Chair, The Friends of Christ Church Spitalfields:

Does the Mayor agree that there is a lack of public open space in the borough, and please will he tell us what positive action he is taking to increase it for residents?

Specifically, is the Mayor aware that besides 350 letters to the planning department last year, the current petition requesting that the churchyard at Spitalfields be returned to public green open space has 600 signatures local, national and international, including those with expert knowledge? Is the Mayor willing to work alongside local people to find alternatives to meet educational needs **and** at the same time protect public open space and the historic environment; and what IMMEDIATE action is the Mayor taking to stop the terrible and unnecessary loss of this 2,500 sqm public open space, the Setting of Hawksmoor's finest work, Christ Church Spitalfields, in the most densely populated area of his borough?

6.4 Question from Mr S Mohammed:

Last month I read a shocking article on the front page of the Evening Standard alleging threats of violence against a female councillor. Why has the council failed to suspend this councillor who has clearly brought this authority into disrepute?

6.5 Question from Mr Amirul Islam:

We the residents are struggling with rising prices for gas and electricity. Living in a cold home is a huge health risk, particularly to the very young, the very old and other vulnerable groups. What is Mayor Rahman doing to tackle fuel poverty?

6.6 Question from Mr Iqbal Hussain:

What does the Mayor think about the coalition's recent moves to reform the welfare state?

6.7 Question from Ms Kathy McTasney:

Since 1998 Tower Hamlets has had a policy to promote a "workforce to reflect the community" What has the Council done to promote this?

In view of the Councils support for this policy, why when opportunity arose to appoint the first black CE did the Council make such a fuss?

Many of the workforce have been waiting for years for equality to be shown in this council however are we still living in the 1960's.

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Set out overleaf are the questions submitted by Members of the Council for response by the Executive at the Council meeting on Wednesday 11th July 2012.
2. 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.
3. Oral responses are time limited to one minute. Supplementary questions and responses are also time limited to one minute each.
4. There is a time limit of thirty minutes for consideration of Members' questions with no extension of time allowed and any question not answered within this time will be dealt with by way of a written response. The Speaker will decide the time allocated to each question.
5. Members must confine their contributions to questions and answers and not make statements or attempt to debate.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

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

8.1 Question from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman

Does the Mayor agree with me that the Baishaki Mela should be a celebration of all that is good about Tower Hamlets and that representatives of the Mela should at all times be respectful and courteous to all involved including representatives of the media?

8.2 Question from Councillor Tim Archer

Will the Mayor inform the council as to who the current occupiers of the old Poplar Town Hall, 117 Poplar High Street, are?

8.3 Question from Councillor John Pierce

What plans does the Mayor have to support active and representative resident groups to take over the running of unused buildings in Tower Hamlets such as the Dorset Library in Weavers Ward?

8.4 Question from Councillor Fozol Miah

Is the Mayor aware of the threat posed to the future of the Women's library in Aldgate and would he agree with me that this is an invaluable resource and asset to the people of Tower Hamlets and beyond who believe in the equality of women and their struggle for their basic human rights and would he agree to contact the library management and seek to work with them to do everything possible to secure its future?

8.5 Question from Councillor Anwar Khan

Recent statistics have shown that there are now almost 15 people chasing every job in Tower Hamlets. These figures are significantly worse than most other East London boroughs.

When will the Mayor produce a coherent plan to tackle joblessness?

8.6 Question from Councillor Peter Golds

Will the Mayor inform the council in light of the third censure for political imbalance by Ofcom as to his and his staffs' relationship with Channel S?

8.7 Question from Councillor Sirajul Islam

What is the Mayor doing to support the regeneration of Town centres in the borough?

8.8 Question from Councillor Harun Miah

Would the Mayor agree with me that there are many in Tower Hamlets and beyond who believe there has been little benefit from the Olympics in terms of sustainable employment or long-term regeneration, that there will be huge inconvenience and loss of security, that the Olympics is now completely dominated by multinational corporate interests and that such people should have the right to make their voices heard during the Olympics and would he also therefore agree to instruct officers to give permission for a peaceful demonstration to take place on the first Saturday of the Olympics, providing the police are also happy to allow it, processing from Mile End to end in Victoria Park?

8.9 Question from Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed

Can the Mayor confirm the total cost of the 400 Olympic tickets purchased by the Council and clarify where this funding came from?

8.10 Question from Councillor David Snowdon

Will the Mayor explain why despite ongoing public concern he continues to use the Borough's parks as a financial resource?

8.11 Question from Councillor Rachael Saunders

In his position as the Chair of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board what is the Mayor doing to tackle increased cancer waiting times for the people of Tower Hamlets?

8.12 Question from Councillor Kabir Ahmed

Members from the Labour group have developed a reputation for bringing the Council into disrepute. Following his suspension, the last Leader of the Council refused to apologise for his conduct towards a Council staff; and most recently another allegedly threatens a fellow female member in the Council Chamber. Does the Mayor agree with me that the Leader of the Labour group has failed to take any action against his Members and has therefore lost control of his group?

8.13 Question from Councillor Marc Francis

What plans he has to extend the mandatory licensing scheme for Houses in Multiple Occupation to smaller HMOs or introduce select licensing for all private rented sector properties?

8.14 Question from Councillor Zara Davis

During the Olympic period, there are a number of activities taking place in the borough, including the Live Site in Victoria Park and the German National Pavilion at the Museum of London Docklands. These activities will inevitably cause additional disruption to local residents, in particular noise disturbance. What is the Mayor doing to ensure that its Noise Nuisance team has sufficient capacity to meet the additional demands that residents are likely to be placing on this service during the Games?

8.15 Question from Councillor Shiria Khatun

What impact does the Mayor expect the introduction of charging for bulk rubbish collection to have on levels of street cleanliness?

8.16 Question from Councillor Stephanie Eaton

What progress is being made on having a workforce that reflects the community?

8.17 Question from Councillor Carlo Gibbs

Does the Mayor agree with me that the Government's Welfare Reforms scheduled over the coming year are the single most significant risk faced by the council? If so, can he outline exactly how much the council has set aside across all departments in order to meet the potential cost of these changes?

8.18 Question from Councillor Gloria Thienel

Will the Mayor account as to how he justifies an Olympics' All Areas road pass when the Meals on Wheels Service can't get to Wapping & other vulnerable people in our borough who will be suffering whilst the Mayor is driven around in his tax payer funded car?

8.19 Question from Councillor Mohammed Mukit

What measures is the Mayor taking to reduce anti-social behaviour, public urination and late night nuisance noise in the Brick Lane and Shoreditch area of Tower Hamlets?

8.20 Question from Councillor Maium Miah

At a time when families are feeling the pinch due to the failing economic policies of this government; what is the Mayor doing to recover the £850,000 loan from public funds to bankroll the Rich Mix Centre?

8.21 Question from Councillor Joshua Peck

How many visits to one stop shops in the last year were for visitors' scratch cards?

8.22 Question from Councillor Dr Emma Jones

What percentage of pupils in Tower Hamlets schools sit science A-Levels?

8.23 Question from Councillor Amy Whitelock

Given the Mayor's recent support for the Time to Change pledge on mental health run by Mind and Rethink Mental Illness, what steps is the council taking in relation to both awareness raising and service provision to reflect the commitment to this pledge?

8.24 Question from Councillor Gulam Robbani

What measures has the Mayor taken to ensure that our parks are not permanently damaged as a result of events that are taking place?

8.25 Question from Councillor Craig Aston

Will the Mayor give the cost incurred in developing the wildflower meadow in Victoria Park and the timescale for it being revealed to the public?

8.26 Question from Councillor Lutfa Begum

We are delighted with a once in lifetime opportunity to host the Olympic Games. Will the Mayor reassure residents that Tower Hamlets will not become gridlocked and grotty during the Games?

8.27 Question from Councillor Aminur Khan

Crime and community safety is a key concern for many residents; what is the Mayor doing to reassure local people that Tower Hamlets remains a safe and cohesive borough?

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Under the Council's Constitution, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee must report annually to the Council documenting the Committee's activities during the past year.
- 1.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered and approved its annual report for the year 2011-12 at the meeting of the Committee held on 19th June 2012. The annual report is attached for Members' information.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Council note the annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2011-12 as attached.

3. THE ANNUAL REPORT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

- 3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee co-ordinates all of the scrutiny activity within the Council. Alongside the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, there are six Scrutiny Lead Members. Under the Council's Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny must submit an annual report of its work to Council. This is attached.
- 3.2 The Annual Report outlines the work of both the Committee and the Scrutiny Leads and their working groups during the municipal year 2011-12. It highlights the range of scrutiny activity undertaken including performance monitoring, policy development, scrutiny of the budget, pre-decision scrutiny and call-in of Cabinet decisions.

4. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

4.1 By virtue of Section 21 Local Government Act 2000 the Council has a duty to deliver effective and robust overview and scrutiny of the discharge of executive functions through the medium of one or more Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

4.2 Article 6.03 (d) of the Constitution provides that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee must report annually to the Council on its work. This report fulfils that obligation.

5. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

5.1 This report provides a review of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's work in 2011-12. There are no financial implications arising from this report. However In the event that the Council agrees further action in response to this report then officers will be obliged to seek the appropriate financial approval before further financial commitments are made.

6. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Reducing inequality, promoting community cohesion and building community leadership are all central to the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. A number of pieces of work raised specific equalities issues including scrutiny of the budget, the scrutiny review of children's centres and the work to map consultation and engagement with service users in adult social care.

7. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

7.1 The content of this report has no implications for a greener environment.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT

8.1 There are no direct risk management actions arising from this report.

9. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

9.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee contributes to the efficiency of the council, particularly through its scrutiny of the budget process where the committee ensures services are achieving value for money.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

1. Chair's Foreword – Councillor Ann Jackson

- 1.1 This was the year when Tower Hamlets OSC had to continue to improve on its work and find a way to operate robustly within the mayoral model. We wanted to ensure we promoted the interests and wellbeing of the borough's residents at all times, and attempt to move away from the politically driven agendas that often characterise scrutiny in local government. I believe we've developed a positive and constructive way of working, which means the committee can provide effective and insightful scrutiny of the borough's independent executive mayor.
- 1.2 There was an increased number of call-ins this year which led to a number of interesting and considered debates in meetings. Decisions were often referred back to Cabinet with recommendations that we felt were in the best interests of residents and the organisation. Whilst the committee were sometimes frustrated by the lack of response to these recommendations, we are encouraged by the Mayor's recent commitment to considering these in more detail in the future.
- 1.3 In the year ahead, OSC would like the opportunity to contribute more to policy decisions, being consulted earlier in the policy development process earlier where possible. We hope that our scrutiny review work will also contribute to this process. We hope that more opportunities for non-executive councillors to engage in the decision-making process, and public debate at OSC on the key policy questions will have the additional benefit of reducing the number of decisions called-in.
- 1.4 Our model for the scrutinising the budget worked well and we intend to continue with it this year. I am keen that we develop other methods of scrutinising council services in as cost effective way as possible, improving value for money from scrutiny as well as services. I also want to us to focus on finding more creative ways to engage with residents, encouraging them to interact with OSC and contribute to policy development through our work. My own priority for the year ahead is to think about how the council can support enterprise and employment given the challenging economic circumstances the borough is facing. I hope we can involve residents in finding innovative solutions to these issues.
- 1.5 Finally, I would like to give thanks to officers and OSC members for all their hard work this past year; we achieved a really good outcome as a team, an excellent budget response and gained a lot of expertise in many portfolio areas as well. My thanks to you all.

2. Introduction to Overview and Scrutiny

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) has a range of functions which enable it to be a key part of local democratic accountability by holding the executive leadership and other local partners to account. The committee scrutinises key decisions referred by other councillors through the call-in process; reviews all the main strategic documents, and contributes to policy development through the scrutiny review process. One of its most important roles is in reviewing the budget put forward by the executive, ensuring value for money and equality of opportunity for all residents.
- 2.2 2011-12 was a challenging year for OSC. Having already made significant savings in 2010-11 in response to the Comprehensive Spending Review, the council had to make another round of unprecedented cuts to its budget. It therefore became even more important that OSC assist the overall process by scrutinising the savings proposals of individual directorates. The committee dedicated a significant proportion of its time to this task.
- 2.3 At the same time, the implementation from June 2011 of the restructure of the council-wide strategy, policy and performance function meant a reduction in the level of officer support available to OSC. This meant the committee had to review its working methods and the nature of its work programme. For example it was unable to do as many large scrutiny reviews as in previous years.
- 2.4 Developing an effective model for scrutiny in the mayoral model of governance continued to be a key challenge. Members have expressed concern that there is not sufficient public discussion of issues by the executive, which may have contributed to an increase in the number of call-ins.
- 2.5 To help draft this annual review, all OSC members have reflected on those things that have gone well, and those less well, as well as their key challenges and priorities for 2012-13. Their responses have been incorporated in this report.

3. Membership of OSC

- 3.1 Reflecting the overall political balance of the council the committee's membership comprised six Labour councillors, and one councillor each from the Conservative, Respect and Liberal Democrat parties.
- 3.2 As well as councillors there are six education co-optee positions on the committee including three positions for parent governors, and one each for the Church of England Diocese, the Roman Catholic Diocese and the Muslim community. In 2011-12 all the positions were filled with the exception of the Roman Catholic Diocese representative.

3.3 Six committee members were designated scrutiny leads and assigned a portfolio aligned to each directorate. The committee membership for 2011-12 was as follows:

- Cllr Ann Jackson (Labour), Chair
- Cllr Rachael Saunders (Labour), Vice-Chair and scrutiny lead for Adults Health and Wellbeing
- Cllr Amy Whitelock (Labour), scrutiny lead for Children Schools and Families
- Cllr Helal Uddin (Labour), scrutiny lead for Development and Renewal
- Cllr Sirajul Islam (Labour), scrutiny lead for Resources
- Cllr Zenith Rahman (Labour), scrutiny lead for Communities, Localities and Culture
- Cllr Tim Archer (Conservative), scrutiny lead for Chief Executive's
- Cllr Stephanie Eaton (Liberal Democrat)
- Cllr Fozol Miah (Respect)
- Rev James Olanipekun (parent governor)
- Jake Kemp (parent governor)
- Memory Kampiyawo (parent governor)
- Canon Michael Ainsworth (Church of England Diocese)
- Mushfique Uddin (Muslim community representative)

4. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011-12

4.1 The committee agreed its work programme following a workshop to discuss a range of options. Given the reduction in officer support, the committee agreed to undertake three scrutiny reviews, and then to use different, less resource intensive, methods to investigate other issues of concern and interest.

Budget

4.2 The committee agreed that their main priority was comprehensive and effective scrutiny of the budget setting process. Through discussions with the mayor, the lead member for Resources and corporate directors, and with the support of the Corporate Finance team, a process was agreed. OSC held separate meetings with each of the main service directorates (CLC, AHWB, CSF, D&R) to gain an overview and scrutinise their current budget and financial situation, and look ahead to their priorities and cost pressures for the next few years. Members therefore gained a more informed understanding of which service areas would be able to make savings or generate more income.

4.3 Each of the four meetings were chaired by the scrutiny lead for each directorate and attended by other OSC members. The respective lead member and/or the corporate director, supported by their lead finance officer, presented the following issues for question and debate:

- spending across different service areas, and by different category of expenditure (staff, premises, supplies, third party payments etc);
- cost drivers and pressures, for example, any anticipated increase in demand, impact of Government reforms or cost of supply including inflationary pressures;
- information on third party payments made in relation to commissioned services including the potential to make savings from these contracts;
- details of income, potential to generate further income, and any threats to this including changes to government grants;
- overall risks and opportunities faced by the directorate and any implications for the budget;
- progress against previously agreed savings targets.

4.4 The sessions were productive and by the end of each one, members had a thorough overview of each directorate's budgets, its challenges and the potential to make further savings. They were also keen to ensure the unintended consequences and equality impacts of spending decisions were fully explored. Members have said this greatly improved their ability to scrutinise the budget proposals once they were published, and led to improved public debate at OSC. With specific directorate scrutiny leads OSC was able to focus on key concerns which were submitted in writing for the mayor's consideration, with scrutiny leads pursuing them in detail throughout the process. This then equipped the chair to provide a sophisticated OSC perspective at the council budget-making meetings.

Children Schools and Families

4.5 Two issues were prioritised in relation to this portfolio – the impact of the recent restructure of children's centres and reports that there had been an increase in referrals to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). Cllr Whitelock's scrutiny review provided insight into the children's centres' restructure, and tested the perceptions amongst residents and members about its impact. By engaging senior managers and children's centre staff as well as parents the review was able to make recommendations about communication with members and parents, support for back office functions and staff resilience and proposals for protecting the service from further cuts.

4.6 The CAMHS service attended Health Scrutiny Panel to discuss referrals and its performance in general. Although the service was undergoing a restructure and was expected to find savings, members were reassured that performance remains good. The rise in referrals was attributed to a seasonal change at the end of the school year. As this was not unusual it was not a cause of concern to the service and therefore it was decided there was no need for HSP or OSC to investigate further.

4.7 Given the challenges facing the Children Schools and Families directorate and the scale of Government reforms in this area, Cllr

Whitelock also held regular meetings with the corporate director to monitor pressing issues and provide information scrutiny or input where appropriate, for example in relation to new academies and free schools, adoption rates and school inspections.

Communities Localities and Culture

- 4.8 The scrutiny lead for CLC, Cllr Zenith Rahman, identified street cleaning and arts and events for investigation. The directorate had made efficiency savings in the Veolia contract and there had been some changes to street cleaning services. Cllr Rahman therefore visited the street cleaning team and discussed the committee's concerns. She was reassured that there had been no significant impact on service delivery and chose not to pursue the issue further.
- 4.9 Cllr Rahman wished to understand the different cultural events that the Arts and Events team funded and supported. Initially, Cllr Rahman met with the team and received a presentation about their work. This then led to a challenge session, facilitated by the One Tower Hamlets team, which enabled members to explore the ways in which the arts and events service helped promote the principles of One Tower Hamlets: reducing inequality, promoting community cohesion and building community leadership. The session highlighted the wide ranging nature of the team's work and recommendations were about strengthening this work further.

Development and Renewal

- 4.10 Three key issues were identified as priorities. The first was the new affordable rent model, proposed as part of the Localism Act, which encouraged Registered Providers (RPs) to increase local rents to unaffordable levels. It was clear that a lot of work was being done by the directorate, working with RPs to mitigate the impact in the borough. Cllr Uddin therefore ensured he was regularly updated in his 1:1 meetings with the directorate senior managers. Continued scrutiny of this could form part of further work on welfare reform, already suggested as a key concern for 2012-13 by members and officers.
- 4.11 Secondly, members raised concerns about the council's lettings policies in relation to people with mental and physical health problems and their ability to access appropriate housing. To explore this issue, Cllr Uddin, together with Cllr Saunders, met with the Service Head for Housing Options, Colin Cormack.
- 4.12 Finally, asset management was identified as an area for review. Cllr Islam led a scrutiny review about how to achieve value for money and energy efficiency in the management of the councils' assets. The review's recommendations included proposals for moving towards a corporate landlord model, incentives for users of assets to reduce their energy use and increasing transparency of energy costs.

Adults Health and Wellbeing

4.13 There continues to be considerable change in the health and social care landscape, which Cllr Saunders and the Health Scrutiny Panel (HSP) have sought to understand and scrutinise throughout this year. HSP is discussed in more detail below, but the focus in relation to adult social care was to look at the engagement and voice of service users in the commissioning of services. Cllr Saunders therefore led two different pieces of work to explore this. The first was held at Toynbee Hall and service users, the groups which represent them, and other stakeholders were invited to discuss the changes in social care, particularly personalisation, and the extent to which service users felt engaged in the process. The outcomes were presented at OSC in March 2012, and will inform the health scrutiny work programme for 2012-13.

4.14 The second piece of work mapped all consultation and engagement activities in relation to adult social care to understand any issues or gap. Cllr Saunders met officers from the directorate and the One Tower Hamlets team and discussed the challenges and opportunities presented by the current complex model of consultation and engagement. They found that the system was dependent on feedback from formal groups and organisations known to the council but it was more challenging to gather the views of a broader range of people, particularly when considering services which are not based in specific buildings. Scrutiny's role in challenging the effectiveness of consultation and engagement mechanisms was discussed by HSP in April 2012 and it was agreed to consider incorporating this into the work programme for 2012-13. This could also include scrutiny of patient involvement structures of local health providers such as Barts Health NHS Trust.

Chief Executive's

4.15 Cllr Archer explored the costs associated with the production of East End Life (EEL) through meetings with the Head of Communications, Takki Sulaiman, and corporate finance. Cllr Archer considered the production budget for EEL and the income and expenditure assumptions the budget is based on. The costs and benefits of EEL were then considered in relation to the relevant law and guidance including the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity.

Resources

4.16 Although the budget was the key scrutiny issue, as discussed above, Cllr Islam also identified the continuing implementation of the workforce to reflect the community policy as a priority. He met with the lead member and officers responsible and agreed to collaborate with the current review and refresh of the strategy.

Call-ins

4.17 There was an increase in the number of call-ins with ten compared to five in 2010/11. The following reports were called-in:

- East End Life Review
- Mela: Transfer to community management
- Recording and webcasting of council meetings
- Victoria Park Live Site contract
- Olympic Games parking and traffic management
- Housing stock options appraisal
- Corporate and commercial events in parks
- New partnership structures
- Statement of community involvement
- Youth services delivery

Whilst members agreed that the call-in process led to interesting and constructive discussions, in public, about important issues, the committee felt they had a limited impact on the executive decision-making process. Of the 10 call-ins, 9 were referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration, but no decisions were reversed, with limited alternative or mitigating actions taken on board which can be frustrating for OSC members.

- 4.18 In May Cllr Jackson met the mayor to discuss these concerns. They agreed to amend the process to allow the mayor and his office more time to consider the alternative actions and his response at Cabinet. Whilst the mayor may not want to reverse the original decision, he may wish to take on board some of the comments and suggestions made by OSC.

Policy Framework

- 4.19 The committee plays an important role in scrutinising policy framework items, making comments and recommendations in relation to such items before they go to Cabinet and then full council. The committee considered four items:
- Open Spaces Strategy
 - Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents
 - Enterprise Strategy
 - Community Safety Plan

Scrutiny 'spotlights' and presentations at meetings

- 4.20 The committee were able to scrutinise and comment on a range of key policy and service issues through specific presentations and discussions, as well as the regular scrutiny 'spotlights', question and answer sessions with the mayor and lead members, senior officers and partners. In 2011-12 the committee heard from the following:
- lead member and Corporate Director for the Resources directorate on the upcoming Future Sourcing project which has now begun;
 - lead member and Corporate Director for Children Schools and Families on education and attainment and the new Children and Families Plan;
 - Service Head for One Tower Hamlets on the Equality Act 2010 and the new Public Sector Equality Duty;

- Borough Commander on local crime and policing issues;
- Transport for London on their planning for the Olympics and local impacts.

Other regular items

- 4.21 The committee receives a series of regular reports which support its performance management function and provide an overview of council activities. These are an important source of information for the committee which inform future work planning. These reports include:
- Complaints and freedom of information request report, received six monthly;
 - Strategic performance and corporate revenue and capital budget monitoring report, received quarterly;
 - Annual residents survey results
 - Regulation of Investigatory Powers (RIPA) reports, received quarterly;
 - OSC tracking report to provide progress against previous scrutiny review recommendations.

5. Health Scrutiny Panel 2011-12

- 5.1 Given the scale and pace of ongoing changes in the health sector, Health Scrutiny Panel faced a significant challenge in understanding what these will mean for local service provision. HSP therefore decided to keep a watching brief on the whole sector, focusing particularly on the ways in which councillors and residents can influence service development.
- 5.2 One of the most significant changes was the merger of the local NHS trusts: Barts and The London, Newham University Hospital and Whipps Cross. As details of the proposed merger appeared HSP members attended a series of stakeholder workshops which explained the drivers and the impact for residents. On three occasions senior managers from Barts and The London NHS Trust came to HSP to address concerns about the lack of consultation and engagement with residents and the impact on the quality of provision following such a large reorganisation. HSP considered other important changes in the health sector including:
- the development, role and priorities of the new Clinical Commissioning Group for Tower Hamlets;
 - the merger of Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust with other boroughs to form NHS East London and the City and more recently, NHS North East London and the City;
 - the development of the Health and Wellbeing Board, its relationship with HSP and its engagement sub-group;
 - the transition of the public health function to the local authority;
 - the development of Healthwatch, locally and nationally.

- 5.3 The continued focus on structural change meant there was less time to consider individual health issues. However, in addition to the adult social care issues highlighted above, the Panel also discussed the following:
- The Commissioning Strategic Plan for Tower Hamlets, produced jointly by NHS East London and the City and the Clinical Commissioning Group.
 - The Quality Accounts for the newly formed Barts Health NHS Trust, Mildmay Hospital and the East London Foundation Trust.
 - A presentation from the Care Quality Commission on its role in the local health and social care landscape and the ways in which they could work with HSP.
 - The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, a key document produced by Public Health which sets out current need in the borough and makes a series of recommendations.
 - An overview of local sexual health services
- 5.4 Finally, as part of the work to consider how residents can influence decision making in relation to local health and social care services, HSP co-hosted a health promotion and consultation event for residents of LAPs 5 and 6, organised by Tower Hamlets Involvement Network and held at the Burdett Neighbourhood Centre. The key objective was to consult service users about specific local health needs by discussing their experiences of health services. A report went to HSP in January and OSC in March 2012.

6. Conclusions and looking ahead to 2012-13

- 6.1 Feedback from OSC has indicated a broad agreement that, despite the challenges, 2011/12 has been a productive year with good quality debate on a broad range of issues. Allocating portfolios by directorates has enabled scrutiny leads to build up expertise and relationships with officers which should continue to improve the impact of scrutiny on the council's development.
- 6.2 In identifying priorities and challenges for the year ahead, members emphasised how important it will be for OSC to hold the mayor to account effectively and hope they will have more opportunities to discuss issues with him directly at OSC meetings in the new municipal year. The proposals outlined above in relation to call-ins, and the mayor's stated commitment to working with OSC, should hopefully lead to a more constructive relationship with the executive.
- 6.3 Members are also keen that OSC engage residents more and its work is publicised more widely. This could be done through different channels including the media, meetings and events around the borough as well as encouraging more residents to attend OSC meetings at the Town Hall. As part of its work programming process OSC will consider more creative ways of engaging members.

- 6.4 For 2012-13 a variety of issues and topics have already suggested by both members and officers for consideration by OSC and HSP when they agree their work programmes. These include:
- The Partnership's response to welfare reform, focusing on innovative solutions for mitigating its impact and its impact on child poverty
 - Olympics legacy
 - Merger of CSF and AHWB
 - Educational attainment post-16
 - Transition of Public Health to the local authority
 - Availability of funding for community organisations, including allocation of mainstream grants.
 - Prostitution and partnership working to tackle the issue
 - Community asset management and energy efficiency
 - Opportunities presented by the Localism Act
 - The scope and development of the Health and Wellbeing Board
 - Impact of new Police commissioning model
 - Monitoring the ongoing impact of the Barts Health merger

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY AND ALLOCATION OF PLACES ON COMMITTEES AND PANELS OF THE COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD, DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 A change in the political composition of the Council occurred on 25th June 2012 when the Leader of the Labour Group gave notice to the proper officer that for the purposes of the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 ('the 1989 Act') Councillors Kabir Ahmed, Rofique Ahmed, Shahed Ali, Abdul Asad and Shafiqul Haque are no longer members of the Labour Group.
- 1.2 The Councillors named above have not given notice that they have joined any other political group and they will therefore serve on the Council as independent Councillors.
- 1.3 Consequent on this change the Council must review the allocation of places on Committees and other bodies covered by the proportionality requirements in the 1989 Act.
- 1.4 The proposed new allocations are set out overleaf. The effect of the change is to reduce by one the number of Labour Group members on each of the Overview and Scrutiny, Appeals, Audit, Licensing and Pensions Committees; and on the Health Scrutiny Panel; with a consequent increase in the number of unallocated positions. The Conservative and Respect Group allocations are unaffected.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the review of proportionality at paragraph 3 overleaf be noted and the Council agree the allocation of seats on committees and panels established for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2012/13 as set out at paragraph 4.2.
- 2.2 That Members and deputies be appointed to serve on those committees and panels in accordance with nominations from the political groups to be notified to the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services).

2.3 That the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) be authorised to approve the appointment of ungrouped Councillors to any committee places not allocated by the Council to a political group, after consultation with those Councillors and the Speaker of the Council.

3. REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY

3.1 Section 15(i) of the 1989 Act requires the Council as soon as practicable after a change in the political composition to carry out a review to determine the allocation to the political groups of seats on the committees/panels of the Council. The principles which must be adopted are:

- (i) that in relation to each body covered by the Act, all seats are not allocated to the same political group;
- (ii) that the majority of seats on each body must go to the political group with the majority on the Council;
- (iii) that subject to (i) and (ii) the number of seats on the total of all the ordinary committees/panels of the authority allocated to each group bears the same proportion as that group's proportion of the seats on the full Council; and
- (iv) that subject to the above three principles, the number of seats on each ordinary committee/panel of the authority allocated to each political group bears the same proportion as that group's proportion of the seats on the full Council.

3.2 Once the political groups have been allocated their places in accordance with the above rules, the Council may appoint ungrouped members to any remaining positions.

3.3 Neither the Cabinet nor any executive sub-groups are covered by the requirement for proportionality.

3.3 Following the changes described in Paragraph 1 to this report, the political composition of the Council is now as follows:

Group	seats	%
Labour	27	52.94
Conservative	7	13.73
Respect	2	3.92
(Ungrouped*)	15	
Total	51	

* NB: For the purposes of the 1989 Act an individual Councillor cannot constitute a political group. The 'ungrouped' category above therefore includes Councillor Stephanie Eaton (Liberal Democrat) as well as the fourteen 'independent' Councillors.

4. ALLOCATION OF PLACES ON COMMITTEES

4.1 The committees and panels established by the Council for the municipal year 2012/13 are listed below. There are a total of 91 places on these committees and panels. Seats will now be allocated to the political groups in proportion to their numbers on the full Council as follows:-

Labour: 51 places
 Conservative: 13 places
 Respect: 4 places

4.2 The remaining 23 places are available for ungrouped members. Applying the principles in the Act as closely as is reasonably practicable the proposed allocation of places on the committees and panels covered by the requirement for proportionality for the remainder of the municipal year is as follows:-

	Total	Labour	Conser- vative	Respect	Un- grouped
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (plus 6 co-optees)	9	5	1	1	2
Health Scrutiny Panel	7	4	1		2
Appeals Committee	9	5	1		3
Audit Committee	7	4	1		2
Development Committee	7	4	1	1	1
Strategic Development Committee	9	5	2		2
General Purposes Committee	7	4	1		2
Human Resources Committee	7	4	1		2
Licensing Committee	15	8	2	1	4
Pensions Committee	7	4	1		2
Standards Advisory Committee (plus 7 co-optees)	7	4	1	1	1

4.3 Each political group is invited to submit nominations to the positions allocated to that group and the Constitution provides for the Assistant Chief Executive then to agree appointments to committees/panels in accordance with the nomination of the political group to which a position has been allocated by the Council.

5. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL)

5.1 The legal position is set out in the main body of the report.

6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

6.1 There are no direct financial considerations arising from this report.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1972 SECTION 100D (AS AMENDED)

LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Brief description of background papers:

Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection

- None

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 11th JULY 2012

**MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Fourteen motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 13 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 11th July 2012.
2. In accordance with the protocol agreed by the Council on 21st May 2008, the order in which the motions are listed is by turns, one from each group, continuing in rotation until all motions submitted are included. The rotation starts with any group(s) not reached at the previous meeting.
3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council has a responsibility or which affect the Borough. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.
4. There is no specific duration set for this agenda item and consideration of the attached motions may continue until the time limit for the meeting is reached. The guillotine procedure at Council Procedure Rule 9.2 does not apply to motions on notice and any of the attached motions which have not been put to the vote when the time limit for the meeting is reached will be deemed to have fallen. A motion which is not put to the vote at the current meeting may be resubmitted for the next meeting but is not automatically carried forward.

MOTIONS

Set out overleaf are the motions that have been submitted.

12.1 Electoral concerns in Tower Hamlets

Proposer: Councillor Peter Golds

Seconder: Councillor Tim Archer

This Council notes that:

Following concerns raised by residents, the media, local Members of Parliament and the political parties, the police announced that they would be investigating voting concerns in the borough following the Spitalfields and Banglatown by election on April 19th.

That the election in Spitalfields and Banglatown was decided by 43 votes and that local residents complained of postal votes being collected from their homes by supporters of a particular candidate.

That in one case a householder repeatedly stated that there were just three residents in their property, whilst eight names were registered and all had postal votes.

That in the by election some 14% of postal votes returned to the town hall were rejected because of issues relating to dates of birth and signatures, yet in the May GLA election this figure of rejections fell to 7.66% of postal votes rejected on return.

That the following data concerning the April by election and the May GLA elections from five small areas gives rise to concern:

Brune House, E1

Flats: **92**

Electors: **231**

Registered postal voters: **69**

Postal votes cast April 19th 2012: **55**

Postal Votes Cast May 3rd 2012: **25**

Votes cast in person at polling station on April 19th: **60**

Votes cast in person at polling station on May 3rd 2012: **54**

Herbert House House, E1

Flats: **43**

Electors: **108**

Registered postal voters: **38**

Postal votes cast April 19th 2012: **29**

Postal Votes Cast May 3rd 2012: **19**

Votes cast in person at polling station on April 19th: **27**

Votes cast in person at polling station on May 3rd 2012: **21**

Chicksand House, E1

Flats: **70**

Electors: **194**

Registered postal voters: **46**

Postal votes cast April 19th 2012: **39**

Postal Votes Cast May 3rd 2012: **24**

Votes cast in person at polling station on April 19th: **31**

Votes cast in person at polling station on May 3rd 2012: **32**

8-24 Chicksand Street, E1

Residential properties:**25**

Electors: **67**

Registered postal voters: **38**

Postal votes cast April 19th 2012:**16**

Postal Votes Cast May 3rd 2012: **7**

Votes cast in person at polling station on April 19th: **16**

Votes cast in person at polling station on May 3rd 2012: **11**

14 Brick Lane, E1

Flats: **18**

Electors: **44**

Registered postal voters: **16**

Postal votes cast April 19th 2012: **12**

Postal Votes Cast May 3rd 2012: **4**

Votes cast in person at polling station on April 19th: **0**

Votes cast in person at polling station on May 3rd 2012: **4**

Total votes cast by post from these addresses on April 19th : 151

Total votes cast by post from these addresses on May 3rd: 79

That overall the turnout in Spitalfields and Banglatown in the May 3rd GLA elections increased from that two weeks earlier, yet there is this wide discrepancy in voting as exemplified above and in other areas of the ward.

This Council believes:

That this research coupled with other information, indicates the need for a thorough investigation by the police.

This Council resolves:

To call upon the police to investigate all evidence regarding electoral malpractice in the borough and interview residents, councillors, political activists and journalists to ascertain evidence.

To call upon the Police and the CPS to pursue malpractice through the courts to ensure that everybody has confidence in the electoral process in Tower Hamlets and that it is not bought into further disrepute in this borough.

12.2 New Family Migration Rules

Proposer: Councillor Fozol Miah
Seconded: Councillor Harun Miah

This Council notes:

- a) that the Government is introducing new family migrant rules on 9th July
- b) these rules will require someone wishing to marry and bring to this country their spouse an individual annual income of at least £18,500 and that even higher income is required if children are involved
- c) these rules impose punitive language knowledge conditions
- d) that the probationary period of entry will be extended from two years to five years
- e) that these changes to the rules come on top of what are already very severe restrictions on family migration to this country

This Council believes these new rules:

- a) will have a dramatic and adverse impact on thousands of people in Tower Hamlets, both from the ethnic minority communities and more broadly
- b) are being introduced as a blatant pandering to ignorance and racial prejudice
- c) constitute an unacceptable attack on the human rights of British citizens to marry whom they wish and to enjoy family life with their spouses and children

This Council resolves to:

- a) make urgent representations to the Government urging them to withdraw these proposals
- b) inform residents in Tower Hamlets of the changes to the rules relating to family migration
- c) assist residents to preserve their basic human rights in relation to family life

12.3 Increases in serious violent and acquisitive crime

Proposer: Councillor Abdal Ullah
Seconder: Councillor Joshua Peck

This Council notes:

- The increase in incidents of serious violent crime and serious acquisitive crime over the past year.
- That there were 19 more incidents of serious violent crimes this year than there were last year; that this is 47 more than the Mayor's target; and that this is a 4.4% increase year on year.
- That there were 353 more incidents of serious acquisitive crime this year than there were last year; that this is 423 more incidents than the Mayor's target; and that this is a 6.6% increase year on year.
- There has been a 4% increase in public concern over vandalism, graffiti and criminal damage in the past year.
- There continues to be serious public concern about the rising levels of crime in Tower Hamlets.

This Council Further Notes:

- Labour's decision to introduce Safer Neighbourhood Teams in every ward led to year on year falls which followed this initiative.
- Labour's introduction of Safer Neighbourhood Teams not only reduced crime in Tower Hamlets but also increased public confidence in the police.
- The decrease in the levels of police community engagement and the loss of many local ward panels.
- The lack of a designated member with responsibility for crime and community safety.

This Council believes:

- The rise in serious violent and serious acquisitive crime over the last year is of significant public importance and should be regarded a priority issue by the executive.
- With serious acquisitive and violent crime increasing the Mayor must do everything he can to protect local communities and reduce rates of criminality.
- That the Conservative-led Government's 20% cuts to policing budgets nationally are putting local communities at risk by cutting the numbers of front line police officers.
- That the Conservative Mayor of London has failed to protect London from these destabilising cuts to the police even in the face of last year's riots and the upcoming

Olympic Games.

- The Mayor's administration has been ineffective at protecting community policing from government and GLA police cuts
- The plans for police counter closures and sharing of Safer Neighbourhood Team sergeants should be reversed to ensure a reassuring police presence in our communities.
- There is a clear need for better community based policing including local engagement through ward panels.
- That not having an executive member dedicated solely to crime and community safety sends the wrong message.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Call on the Mayor to adopt a strong policy of community based policing; advocating the retention of local ward panels.
- Request the Council produce an assessment of the impact of sharing SNT sergeants between wards.
- To request the Mayor makes a biannual statement to Council on steps taken to combat crime and reduce anti-social behaviour.

12.4 History Teaching And The English Baccalaureate

Proposer: Councillor David Snowdon

Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

This Council notes:

Only 11.7% of Tower Hamlets school children passes GCSE History at grades A*-C. This is the fifth lowest number in England, ahead of only Knowsley, Newham, Kingston-Upon-Hull and Manchester.

Over three times more school children achieve A*-C GCSE History in the top performing council in the country, Hammersmith and Fulham.

That the new gold standard of English secondary education, the English Baccalaureate, requires school children to have A*-C passes in Maths, English, two sciences, a modern language and history or geography. Only 5.9% of children achieved this, in part due to the low number of history GCSEs entered.

Tower Hamlets has the ninth lowest number of children passing A-Level History in England.

This Council believes:

That the study of history allows our school children to develop high level analytical skills, and helps them to more fully appreciate the world around them. This in turn promotes civic and community engagement.

That in order to increase the number of Tower Hamlets school children achieving the English-Baccalaureate we need to increase the provision of History teaching in our schools. Not achieving this standard threatens to limit the educational opportunities available to our school children.

This Council resolves:

To instruct officers to write to all head teachers of schools within the Borough to make them aware of the Council's support for a higher provision of History teaching.

To instruct officers to contact schools to see what barriers exist to a higher level of provision of history teaching, and report back to full council within six months.

To ask the Mayor to champion the case of history teaching in Tower Hamlets, and investigate what he can do to promote this objective

12.5 Defending the Welfare State

Proposer: Councillor Harun Miah

Seconder: Councillor Fozol Miah

This Council notes:

a) the Condem government is planning an extra £18 billion welfare cuts, on top the £18 billion already in train

b) this will condemn more families to poverty and undermine progress made in reducing child poverty in Tower Hamlets and nationally.

c) Government attempts to depict these cuts as largely affecting the long term unemployed or disabled are misleading

d) most of those drawing benefits are the working poor like cleaners, carers and caterers who are working hard yet need benefits to survive because of their very low pay.

e) Britain's low wage economy and lack of jobs are driving up our benefits bill, as is our failing housing market

f) 95% of the recent £1 billion rise in housing benefit is paid to those in work.

This Council agrees:

a) the defence of the welfare state from Tory driven attempts to dismantle it is a political priority for the people of Tower Hamlets

b) that Government austerity is self-defeating

c) instead of creating growth and jobs these policies are shrinking the economy, strangling growth, increasing unemployment, and driving the country deeper into recession.

d) that we urgently need a programme of job creation, housing building, and measures to ensure people are paid a real living wage and have access to decent, affordable and secure housing.

12.6 Urgent summit to avert a severe housing crisis

Proposer: Councillor John Pierce

Seconder: Councillor Sirajul Islam

This Council notes:

- London is suffering from a housing crisis. High housing costs are blighting lives in London.
- Social housing is under attack from David Cameron, Nick Clegg and the Tory-led Coalition government.
- The average house price in London is now double that for the country as a whole and prices in London continue to rise, despite falls elsewhere. Moreover, since 2008 private sector rents have risen 30%.
- Far too many workers cannot afford to buy or rent a decent home on the open market, and the social rented sector is struggling to cope with the severe demands placed on it.
- Overcrowding, homelessness and social housing waiting lists are all increasing – sure signs of the strain on people’s finances and lives.
- The average house price in London in 2010 was £408,384, 15.1 times the median London income of £27,128, and easily the highest ratio of prices to incomes in the country.
- In 2010, there were 22,707 household on the council’s housing waiting list.
- The gross income needed for a mortgage, based on 75% at 3.5 times, was £74,111.

This Council further notes:

- The Mayor of Tower Hamlets recently blogged that “We are committed to building over a thousand new homes each year – which is far more than any other local authority”.
- Based on HCA figures, from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012, a derisory 200 affordable homes were started, with only 31 social rented, 124 affordable rent, 14 intermediate and 31 affordable home ownership.

This Council resolves:

- The Mayor has broken his pledge to build 1,000 homes a year. In the first full year of the mayoralty, he has only achieved 1/5 of what he had promised during April 2011 to March 2012.
- This failure to build affordable housing will exacerbate the severe housing crisis in the borough.
- That the Mayor should urgently call a summit of social landlords and housing developers working in our borough to devise a strategy to avert this severe housing crisis caused by his administration’s lack of leadership on house building.
- To call upon the Mayor to be honest with the electorate about house building and his ability to deliver new homes for the borough.

12.7 Social Landlords

Proposer: Councillor Gloria Thienel

Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

This Council Notes:

- That the Minister for Housing and Local Government has praised social landlords such as Viridian and Home Group for their plans to publish expenditure over £500.
- That the Housing Minister calls on social landlords to follow Viridian and Home Group's example and become more transparent.
- That the government is committed to a consultation with social landlords on whether to expand the scope of the Freedom of Information Act to apply to them.

This Council Believes:

- That the example shown by Viridian and Home Group is a step in the right direction and all social landlords should consider following their lead.
- That the government should extend the Freedom of Information Act to apply to social landlords and all Housing Associations; so they will publish spending over £500.

This Council Resolves:

- To support the Government in its consultation.
- To encourage and support Housing Associations/Social landlords in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to publish all spending over £500.

12.8 Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations

Proposer: Councillor Alibor Choudhury

Seconder: Councillor Rabina Khan

This Council notes:

- That Tower Hamlets Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations (TRAs) has produced a Residents Charter
- That the Residents Charter sets out some basic standards which residents believe that social landlords in the borough should adopt

This Council welcomes:

- The fact that TRAs are working together to give residents a voice in the important task of securing improvements in service standards of social landlords.

This Council believes:

- That all social landlords should sign up to the Residents Charter

This Council resolves:

- To endorse the Residents Charter which the Federation has produced
- To request the Mayor to ask social landlords in the borough to commit to meeting the standards set out in the Charter.

12.9 High Earners and Council Housing

Proposer: Councillor Tim Archer

Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

This Council Notes:

- There are some 6,000 Council houses across the UK that have tenants earning more than £100,000 a year living in them.
- That it has been reported that there are 15,000 tenants in social housing earning more than £80,000 a year.
- That there are a number of such tenants resident in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, including key supporters of the Mayor and his administration, who fall into this category.
- The wish by the Spitafields Housing Association for the introduction of new measures which will enable them to re-let a Town House in Wapping to tenants more serving then the current resident.
- That the Minister for Housing and Local Government, Grant Shapps MP has brought forward plans that would give social landlords new powers to increase rents for high-income tenants.

This Council Believes:

- That these new powers social landlords will be granted in the proposals by the Department for Communities and Local Government will help solve this problem, and return much needed social housing to those in need.

This Council Resolves:

- To support the Department for Communities and Local Government in putting in place these new powers.
- To encourage all social landlords in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to not subsidise rents for those high earners earning over £80,000 a year.

12.10 Threats of violence

Proposer: Councillor Rabina Khan

Secunder: Councillor Kabir Ahmed

This Council notes:

- That reports in media about the behaviour of Cllr Kosru Uddin after the full council meeting on 16th May, 'in which it is alleged that he 'threatened to kill' Cllr Rania Khan' and 'that screams were heard coming from the Town Hall as a "violent fracas" erupted'.

This Council believes:

- That it is completely unacceptable that any member of this council engage in violent behaviour against other members.

This Council resolves:

- That in view of the serious nature of these allegations, violence and threats of violence against fellow members of the council and public will not be tolerated;
- That any member found to be guilty of such actions will be expelled immediately by their group;
- That the individual(s) in question will be barred from all council activities and premises;
- That the council will seek the maximum penalty permitted under the law.

12.11 Housing Benefit Reform

Proposer: Councillor Oliur Rahman

Seconder: Councillor Rabina Khan

This Council notes that:

- Some London councils are seeking to 'export' council tenants saying they can no longer afford to house residents owing to rising rents in the capital and the impact of housing benefit reforms.
- In Tower Hamlets, the changes to Local Housing Allowance (LHA) means that 77% of LHA recipients will see a reduction in income.
- Despite Grant Shapp's comments that there is a National Discretionary Housing Payments Fund of £91m, Tower Hamlets has received only £490,000.
- Residents in the borough are now receiving collectively £3.2m less than before April 2011 in benefits.
- On 28th February 2012, the Mayor and key partners in Tower Hamlets signed a Welfare Reform Pledge, which committed the Council and its partners to limiting the impact of Central Government's reforms on Tower Hamlets' Residents.

This Council believes that:

- Grant Shapps MP's defence of Housing Benefit Reforms was disingenuous and ignored the unique circumstances faced by inner London boroughs.
- These Central Government reforms will have a disproportionate impact on Tower Hamlet's residents, as it limits the level of housing benefits to large families and in areas of high rents.
- This is a deliberate attempt by the coalition government at social engineering.
- Inner London should remain somewhere people on all incomes can live.

This Council resolves:

- To continue to work with all partners to develop solutions which will help residents to stay in the borough.
- To support the lobby for a larger Discretionary Housing Payments Fund for London Boroughs.
- To support the lobby for a living rent.
- To offer support and guidance to any families who find themselves in financial difficulties due to these changes.

12.12 Recorded Votes

Proposer: Councillor Ohid Ahmed

Seconder: Councillor Shafique Hoque

This Council notes:

1. That Council's constitution includes a provision for 'Recorded Votes'.
2. That this provision is designed to allow for maximum accountability.
3. That until 25 January 2012 the threshold of members required to trigger a Recorded Vote in Full Council was 10.
4. That on 25 January 2012 a motion was carried by a majority in Full Council increasing the threshold from 10 members to 20.
5. That this threshold is unreasonably high without precedent in Tower Hamlets and elsewhere.
6. That in Camden, the threshold is 7 members, in Barnet it is 10 members, in Newham it is 6 members, in Westminster it is 10 members, and in Greenwich it is 5 members.

This Council believes:

1. That the 'Recorded Vote' thresholds are generally low so that a minority can make their views known when votes go against them, to communicate to the public that whilst something they did not support may be Council policy, it is not unanimous and the minority opposed it.
2. That having a threshold of 20 members defeats the object of this provision, since (assuming whipping) recorded votes can only go ahead if the majority group is in favour.
3. That raising the threshold from 10 to 20 members was a backward step as regards the health of local democracy, and a grave mistake.
4. That having the highest threshold in the land, particularly when compared to the other aforementioned London boroughs, is deeply embarrassing for this authority.

This Council resolves:

1. To lower the threshold of support required to trigger a recorded vote from 20 members to 7 members.

12.13 Dignity Code for nurses and care workers for the elderly

Proposer: Councillor Gulam Robbani

Seconder: Councillor Abdul Asad

This Council notes that:

1. Recent exposes of shocking abuse of elderly and vulnerable patients in Care Homes for the elderly.
2. The calls from public figures, politicians and charities that Nurses and care workers should sign a Dignity Code guaranteeing that elderly patients are treated with respect.
3. The comments of Jeremy Hughes, chief executive of the Alzheimer's Society, that the care system in the UK is at further risk due to underfunding.

This Council believes that:

1. The care of elderly and vulnerable residents is one of the most important responsibilities of local government.
2. All residents of care homes have the right to the highest quality of care, as well as the right to live in dignity and be treated with respect.

This Council resolves:

1. To condemn all forms of abuse in care homes.
2. To call on the Government to improve the national inspection of Care Homes and protect funding for care homes.
3. To improve our own systems of reporting and investigating abuse to ensure that all vulnerable people in our care receive the highest standards of care.
4. To support the national call for Nurses and care workers to sign up to a Dignity Code.

12.14 Recession

Proposer: Councillor Rania Khan
Seconder: Councillor Shafiqul Haque

This Council notes:

1. Tory driven austerity measures are not working; unlike the United States, UK economic output has yet to return to the levels before the recession began four years ago.
2. This economic picture is set to worsen; national debt is expected to continue rising, from 67.3% of GDP this year, to peak at 76.3% of GDP in 2014/15, contrary to George Osborne's claims that his cuts would reduce the debt.

This Council agrees:

1. To support calls for a Plan B for the economy, outlined by over one hundred leading economists last year (Guardian Saturday 29 October 2011) which would include 'reversing cuts to protect jobs in the public sector, directing quantitative easing to a green new deal to create thousands of new jobs, increasing benefits to put money into the pockets of those on lower and middle incomes and thus increase aggregate demand. This could in part be paid for by the introduction of a financial transactions tax.'
2. To support the call for 'Robin Hood' taxes on the financial sector. A tiny tax on short-term, casino-style trading, which employs a small number of highly paid bankers in London, not the tens of thousands employed in high street financial services, would raise an estimated £20 billion. Research by the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) shows that the sector can comfortably afford paying another £20 billion in tax.
3. That the priority for this council will be to follow policies that seek to protect residents, and their quality of life, from the impact recession by maintaining frontline services, protecting lower waged staff, reducing housing waiting lists and overcrowding by meeting the Mayor's affordable homes pledge, reducing energy bills via the setting up of new borough-wide energy co-op, and campaigning for a programme of public investment to create jobs and improve infrastructure.
4. That in light of the fact that the financial sector is responsible for the current economic crisis, and that they have received huge handouts from the public purse, the bankers have a moral responsibility to get their industry in order and repay their debt to the British people.

This page is intentionally left blank