


Non-Executive Report of the: COUNCIL 18 July 2018	
Report of: Asmat Hussain, Corporate Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer	Classification: Unrestricted
Motion for debate submitted by an Opposition Group	

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

SUMMARY

1. Council Procedure Rule 11 allows for time at each Ordinary Council meeting for the discussion of one Motion submitted by an Opposition Group. The debate will follow the rules of debate at Council Procedure Rule 13 and will last no more than 30 minutes.
2. The motion submitted is listed overleaf. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, submission of the Opposition Motion for Debate will alternate in sequence between the opposition groups.
3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council or its partners has a direct responsibility. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.
4. Notice of any proposed amendments to the Motions must be given to the Monitoring Officer by Noon the day before the meeting.

MOTION

Set out overleaf is the motion that has been submitted.

Leisure	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	£4,764	£23,820
Community facilities	£738	£738	£5,411	£5,411	£5,411	£17,709
Total Low	£41,771	£56,868	£68,241	£76,315	£69,649	£312,844
<u>By Priority</u>	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/2021	2021/2022	First five years
<u>of</u>						
<u>Spending</u>						
Critical	£2,450	£17,310	£20,310	£18,185	£20,185	£78,440
Essential	£35,974	£39,141	£47,314	£55,313	£48,147	£225,889
High	£3,347	£417	£417	£917	£417	£5,515
Desirable	£0	£0	£200	£1,900	£900	£3,000
	£41,771	£56,868	£68,241	£76,315	£69,649	£312,844

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

That the DIFS describes the priorities as follows:

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

That these growth numbers and the infrastructure required are unprecedented within London and therefore require an unprecedented response reminiscent of the London Docklands Development Corporation.

The Council therefore calls on the Mayor to:

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

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