

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 26TH NOVEMBER 2014

**MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE HEAD,
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

SUMMARY

1. Eleven motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 13 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 26th November 2014.
2. The motions submitted are listed overleaf. In accordance with the protocol agreed by the Council on 21st May 2008, the motions are listed by turns, one from each group, continuing in rotation until all motions submitted are included. The rotation starts with any group(s) whose motion(s) were 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in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.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 Motion Motion regarding Meals on Wheels

Proposer: Councillor Abjol Miah

Seconder: Councillor Gulam Kibriya

This Council notes

- That a third of UK local authorities have scrapped or reduced the provision of home-delivered meals to elderly and vulnerable people
- That the National Association of Care Catering claim the total number of meals delivered has fallen by over half in the past decade
- That Tower Hamlets Council delivers value for money hot, fresh meals to elderly and vulnerable people in the community
- That Tower Hamlets is also the only London borough to prepare fresh meals on wheels daily, and also prepares Hackney Council's meals on wheels

This Council believes

- That meals on wheels often help prevent social isolation and build community cohesion and solidarity
- That elderly and vulnerable people have a right to accessible and nutritious meals
- That reductions in community meals are likely to result in more hospital admissions, as meals on wheels visitors can often identify concerns that may go unreported until too late
- That this is one more regrettable example of the government's multi-billion pound cuts to local authorities harming those most in need (a view supported by the Local Government Association)

This Council resolves

- To condemn the decision by a third of local authorities to scrap or hollow out meals on wheels
- To reaffirm our commitment to protecting community food services
- To reaffirm our condemnation of a political system that would allow anyone to go hungry.

12.2 Motion regarding homelessness in Tower Hamlets

Proposer: Councillor Marc Francis

Seconder: Councillor Sirajul Islam

This Council notes:

1. Under Labour's Leadership after 1994, the London borough of Tower Hamlets had a strong track record of supporting homeless households, from bringing those placed outside the borough by the Lib Dem administration to back into Tower Hamlets to ending the long-term use of Bed and Breakfast accommodation for families with children ahead of schedule and halving the numbers in temporary accommodation by 2010;
2. From 2002 onwards, LBTH in common with many other London boroughs increasingly offered homeless households a move into a home in the private rented sector on a voluntary basis to prevent their homelessness;
3. Since 2010, the Coalition Government's reduction in the subsidy levels for temporary accommodation and caps on Local Housing Allowance have seriously affected LBTH's ability to source such accommodation from private landlords in Tower Hamlets;
4. As a consequence, dozens of homeless families have been forced to stay in B&B longer than the six week legal limit, which is totally unsuitable for children, and others are now being placed in B&B "annexes", which while legal, are almost as bad;
5. More recently, the Mayor has allowed council officers to discharge the authority's duty to homeless households through the offer of an Assured Shorthold Tenancy in the private rented sector, and that as of 30th June, this had happened to 50 households;
6. The Homelessness Statement 2013-17 agreed by the Mayor and Cabinet notes that the Government had changed the law to allow such a discharge of duty, but does not make clear either that this is a power, not a duty, or that LBTH would be adopting such a policy;
7. LBTH has published no criteria explaining the circumstances in which a homeless household will be made such an offer;
8. LBTH's bid for additional funding of £270,000 from the Government's "Gold Standard" initiative to tackle the growing use of B&Bs was rejected by ministers, while other Conservative-led authorities facing much less housing pressure were awarded funding.

This Council believes:

1. Homeless families are potentially vulnerable and should not be forced to accept the offer of a tenancy in the private rented sector, which lacks security of tenure and which is often at rent levels that can only be afforded with Housing Benefit, creating a "poverty trap";
2. This policy was introduced by the Conservative Secretary of State for Communities &

Local Government and Housing Minister in response to lobbying by Conservative-led Westminster City Council and other Tory boroughs, who have long argued against the legal safety net for homeless people;

3. Statutorily homeless families in Tower Hamlets should not have their rights eroded;
4. The Coalition Government's reasons for denying LBTH funding from the "Gold Standard" scheme to help reduce the use of B&B were spurious.

This Council resolves:

1. To call on the Mayor to revoke the authorisation for council officers to discharge this authority's duty to homeless households through the offer of a private sector tenancy;
2. To call on the Mayor and our local Members of Parliament to make representations to the Department for Communities & Local Government for an investigation into the process by which local authorities were awarded "Gold Standard" funding;
3. To call on the Mayor to participate actively in London Councils' efforts to persuade this and any future Government to restore full Housing Benefit subsidy for homeless households in temporary accommodation and to agree a protocol for co-operation rather than competition between authorities over the lease of such accommodation;
4. To call on the Mayor to take further steps to comply with the legal requirement that for homeless families are not forced to stay in B&Bs longer than six week and also reduced the use of B&B "annexes", and to report back to Full Council on progress by April 2015.

12.3 Motion regarding the Best Value Inspection undertaken by PwC

Proposer: Councillor Peter Golds
Seconded: Councillor Chris Chapman

This Council notes the delivery of the Best Value Inspection undertaken by PwC and presented to Parliament on November 4th.

The Council also notes that there were two major speeches from both the Government and Opposition front benches and nineteen contributions from backbenchers from all sides of the House. In all of these serious questions were raised as to the organisation and management of this Authority.

As a matter of fact and public interest the Council records the following from the report:

1.11. We note in addition that, as at the date of this report, there are a number of criminal investigations ongoing into allegations of fraud.

2.57. We note that evidence of possible fraudulent payments has been identified and reported by the Authority to the police in connection with nine third sector organisations (not included in our sample) that received monies under the YCS programme. By agreement with the police, we have not examined these matters in detail.

The Council expresses concern that the obvious fact that PwC did not examine matters that are currently being considered by the police is being intentionally misrepresented.

As a further matter of fact and public interest the Council also records the following from the report:

1.46. "Despite its public assertions of support for the Inspection, the Authority has at various stages raised a number of obstacles to our progress which have significantly delayed the provision of information or documentation and which in large part led to our request for an extension to the timetable for the inspection.

The Council notes the following quotations with regard to each area of Inspection.

With regard to grants the report states:

2.7. In relation to the matter of grant making we conclude that the authority is failing to comply with its best value duty.

2.7. A lack of transparency generally over the rationale for decisions as to grant awards. Where application processes exist, the evaluation of these applications has been to a significant extent overridden without any clear rationale.

2.7. Grants were awarded to organisations which were ruled ineligible or which did not meet the required evaluation score.

2.33. Applicants [who had not met the minimum criteria for an award after evaluation] were recommended to receive, in total, awards of £407,700.

2.36. In interview, the Mayor told us (PWC) that he had not been involved in the detail of awards, although he had kept abreast of things generally through occasional high level discussions with one Member in particular. This is somewhat at odds with an email dated 8 August 2012, shortly after the initial circulation of the original officer recommendations, which stated that *“the Mayor has requested a vastly expanded Appendix 1”*. We also note that a press statement dated 1 April 2014 put out by the Mayor’s office in response to the BBC Panorama programme included an assertion to the effect that the Mayor, acting within his powers, had intervened in 32 specific cases.

With regard to the transfer of property by the authority the report states:

2.8: In relation to three of the four property transactions we looked at in detail, namely Poplar Town Hall (“PTH”), Sutton Street Depot and Mellish Street, we conclude that in those instances, **the Authority failed to comply with its best value duty.**

Concerning the disposal of Poplar Town Hall, the report refers to the **six** reports submitted by Mazars to the council. It confirms, 2.9, that the authority accepted a late bid from the winning bidder after other bids had been opened, that the authority did not, in fact, select the highest bidder, and that the winning bidder also asked for and was granted changes to the contract which it had signed. Finally it notes “as a matter of fact”, the winning bidder is connected to a person with other business interests that had an association with the Mayor.

Noting the contract race, as outlined in 2.9., the report publishes, 5.71b, the email exchange with the following statement from a Council solicitor;

“However, (an officer) is only doing what he is told, this has come from the Mayor.”

Summing up, PWC expresses concern at the comments made in 5.104-5.109 that the instruction to Mazars was “a narrow interpretation of the Full Council’s resolution” and as a result, records, 5.105, “It does not appear that Mazars have conducted a further investigation of the potential conflicts of interest.

With regard to the disposal of 111-113 Mellish Street:

PWC identifies the involvement of the Mayor in the leasing of this site in 5.182, whereby the group who were to acquire the site confirm by email that “He (the Mayor) would instruct an officer to support Consortium Member 1 in locating premises for their purpose.”

5.185 discloses the involvement of the Mayor in the ongoing process.

There are further details as to the short period of marketing the site, the low valuation and controversies as to its use following acquisition by the successful consortium.

The disposal of Sutton Street depot indicates further concerns as to best value in its disposal and is covered in detail in sections 5.120-5.180.

The Council further notes that East End Life was excluded from the investigation but with regard to publicity:

2.13-2.14 PWC, in examining whether “media advisers to the Mayor were genuinely for the benefit of the authority or of a party political nature pertaining to the Mayor.”, conclude that “we found a lack of control around the monitoring of the demarcation of activities , based on a lack of documentation based on these activities.” Their final conclusion is a failure to comply with best value duty.

2.17 concerns the Ofcom findings as to political advertisements placed on TV channels and concludes, “This itself constitutes a failure to comply with best value duty.”

The report is critical with regard to contracting:

2.108: “Both we in our limited sampling and the Authority’s Internal Audit function in their work have found instances of procurement policies and procedures have not been adhered to. Examples include:

- a. An absence in a significant number of cases of signed contracts;
- b. A prevalent lack of audit trail in procurement documentation;
- c. Some instances during the early part of the Period where the correct number of quotations had not been received. On the evidence we have examined, we do not see this recurring to the same extent later in the Period;
- d. Lack of evidence of tollgate reviews in a significant minority of procurement files;
- e. Some examples of a failure to provide bidders as required with information concerning the criteria for evaluation of bids;
- f. Lack of maintenance of complete contracts registers by directorates; and
- g. Lack of monitoring by Central Procurement of the adherence of directorates to procurement procedures in their areas.”

2.109: In addition, there is some evidence – albeit disputed – of the involvement of the Mayor and/or other Cabinet Members in the selection of suppliers in one case at the PQQ stage.

The Council notes the following conclusions regarding the governance and overall management of the Council:

2.23: “in our view the current governance arrangements do not appear to be capable of preventing or responding appropriately to failures of the best value duty of the kind we have identified. This calls into question the adequacy of these governance arrangements”.

2.22: “Furthermore, in our view the Authority’s response to the identification of issues in the above areas [i.e. the areas considered in the report] suggests a tendency towards denial or obfuscation rather than an inclination to investigate concerns raised”.

2.22 (d): “in its communications with advisers and others in relation to the BBC Panorama programme, the Authority tended to pronounce allegations to be

baseless and/or politically motivated without having conducted what we would consider to be an adequate investigation into the issues raised”.

2.20: “At the core of the Authority’s system of governance are the statutory officers, specifically the Head of Paid Service, the section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer. All of these positions have been held by a variety of individuals through the course of the Period. Currently, all of these positions are held on an interim basis.”

2.113: “Since July 2012, the Authority has had no Chief Executive. One of the Authority’s Corporate Directors has since that time (with a short hiatus) fulfilled the role of Head of Paid Service, as required by statute, however the Head of Paid Service has not had the full powers of a Chief Executive delegated to him under clause 3.5.5 of the Authority’s constitution. These powers have remained with the Mayor. This means that, for most purposes, the Head of Paid Service, other statutory officers (being the Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer), as well as other Corporate Directors are all directly accountable to the Mayor.”

This Council, noting this ongoing failure of governance and best value:

- Welcomes the appointment of Commissioners to oversee Best Value in the future and pledges to work with them to this end.
- Seeks to ensure the speedy appointments of; 1. A Chief Executive; 2. Monitoring Officer and 3. Section 151 Officer, to work with the Commissioners, Administration and Council.
- The Council refers the PWC Report to the overview and Scrutiny to consider comments relating to the disposal of Poplar Town Hall in their deliberations, drawing attention to the comments in 5.104-5.109 regarding the narrow interpretation of the original resolution of January 2014 and inviting Mazars, in view of this to further examine “conflicts of interest.”
- The Council with regard to the disposal of both 111-113 Mellish Street and the Sutton Street Depot resolves:
- To instruct the Head of Paid Service to call in the District Auditor to undertake an immediate investigation into the marketing and disposal of both sites.
- That this investigation should include details of all meetings held between officers of the council, bidders and those responsible for publicising the sale.
- That the investigator should identify and publish details of all meetings and correspondence between the Mayor, Cabinet and Mayor’s Office relating to the disposal of both sites.
- That there should be an independent property valuer to establish the estimated values of both sites at the time of disposal and that this should not be the consultants used in the marketing at the time.

- That, in view of the seriousness of this situation, produces a report to be considered by first the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then reported to the full council.
- Furthermore, in view of the concerns raised by PWC as to the terms of reference given to Mazars with regard to Poplar Town Hall, the terms of reference should be agreed with the Proposer of this motion and the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

12.4 Motion regarding the NUT Manifesto for Education

Proposer: Councillor Mahbub Alam

Seconder: Councillor Mohammed Mufti Miah

The Council notes:

- The publication of the NUT Manifesto for Education, which is aimed at promoting a discussion about education in the period before the general election.
- The Manifesto covers a wide range of issues, which the NUT believes should be at the heart of a successful education system, and presents a set of positive recommendations, which the Union would like to see adopted by whichever government is elected in 2015.
- This Council congratulates the staff in our schools for their contribution to the success of education in Tower Hamlets and notes that in many respects this success is built on many of the principles contained in the NUT Manifesto.

This Council believes:

- That there is a pressing need to build trust in teachers and schools and to repair the relationship between the government and teachers, which has been so damaged in recent years. We believe that the recommendations in the Manifesto could help to do that.
- We believe that the recommendations in the Manifesto are based on research and evidence and draw on best practice from other countries.

The Council resolves:

- A new approach to school evaluation involving teachers, parents and local communities
- All students should benefit from a broad, balanced and enriching curriculum
- All those teaching should be qualified teacher or on a training route to qualification
- All teachers to receive regular training throughout their career with ring-fenced funding for this
- Local Authorities should be given back the power to plan and provide enough school places
- Restore the role of the Local Authority as the democratic local organisation responsible for education
- Each local council should have a Director for Education to ensure consistency and equality and a good local school for every child
- Restore financial support for post-16 students to stay in education

- Give a high priority to reducing youth unemployment
- Nurturing a climate of professional respect and responsibility as was the case with the London Challenge, which made London schools among the best in the world
- Reversing the downward spiral of education funding, restoring it to 2010 levels in real terms
- An end to the marketisation of education and policies that inhibit cooperation between schools

Since it was published the Manifesto has won widespread support from the world of education.

Professor Tim Brighouse, leader of the London Challenge, which is widely credited with transforming schools across London has commented, "At last a set of statements which if acted upon could transform our children's future. It will command the support of all engaged on a daily basis in education - parents, school staff students and governors. Their voices need to be heard by all those seeking our votes in 2015."

This Council resolves to do the following:

- i) Endorse the NUT Manifesto and issue a public statement to this effect;
- ii) Work with the NUT to promote the values contained in the Manifesto to parents in the borough;
- iii) Invite a speaker from the NUT to a future council meeting to talk about the Manifesto.

12.5 Motion regarding the Docklands Sailing Centre

Proposer: Councillor Dave Chesteron

Seconder: Councillor Andrew Wood

This Council notes:

1. The developers of the Westferry Printers site are currently going through pre-application public consultations.
2. The Sailing Centre is concerned about the potential effect development alongside the Millwall Dock may have on the wind and the detrimental impact this may have on sailing and other watersports.
3. The Sailing Centre has made a number of representations to the developers; so far the Sailing Centre's concerns have been largely ignored.
4. The Sailing Centre is the borough's premier watersports centre and among the largest public open space in Tower Hamlets. Pressures on public infrastructure as a result of population increases arising from new developments are well understood. The Council must protect its public open spaces for use by current and future generations.

This Council believes:

1. Pressures on public infrastructure as a result of population increases arising from new developments are well understood.
2. The Council must protect its public open spaces for use by current and future generations.
3. Council should continue to recognise the importance of the Docklands Sailing Centre in enabling use of one of the largest areas of open space in Tower Hamlets by the whole community for sport and recreation, with unique opportunities for education and employment.

This Council resolves:

1. To protect the Docklands Sailing Centre from the consequences of property development which may prevent the continued use of the Millwall Docks for those uses and the charitable purposes of the Docklands Sailing Centre Trust.
2. To exercise its powers as local planning authority, to ensure any development on the West Ferry Printers site does not cause any detriment to sailing and use of the Millwall Docks from Docklands Sailing Centre.

12.6 Motion regarding allocation of community grants

Proposer: Councillor Julia Dockerill

Seconded: Councillor Andrew Wood

This Council notes:

- That residents' confidence in the robustness of the processes and decision-making behind the allocation of community grants in our borough is at an all-time low after PwC concluded that taxpayers' money on occasions has been handed out with no apparent rationale, with over £400,000 of public money given to bodies which failed the minimum criteria.
- The Mayor's view that the PwC report identifies process and governance issues that need to be improved.
- That, regrettably, trust in the grants process has diminished to the extent that it has become a source of community division rather than a mechanism for building unity and cohesion between every resident in Tower Hamlets.
- That the neighbouring London Borough of Newham, an area of East London with similar challenges to our own, takes a very different approach to the allocation of grants with money awarded not to groups that emphasise their ethnic, religious or cultural difference but to those which offer services and support to the whole community.
- That Newham's approach not only promotes social harmony within their borough but fosters greater trust and confidence in the system, something that is desperately needed in Tower Hamlets at the present time.

This Council resolves:

- To advise and recommend to the commissioners when appointed, that the criteria by which grants are allocated place an explicit emphasis on unity and cohesion and are judged positively if they bring people together, negatively if they divide the community according to race, creed or ethnicity.
- The council implements a fully transparent and accountable new grants system that is open to all in order to rebuild trust among the entire community in Tower Hamlets.

12.7 Motion regarding Pay Day Loan Caps

Proposer: Councillor Alibor Choudhury

Seconder: Councillor Maium Miah

This Council Notes:

- The Tower Hamlets Fairness Commission, whose report “Time to Change” was published in September 2013, condemned the impact of pay day loan companies on vulnerable residents, and recommended:
 - That Government gives local authorities greater power to limit unhealthy businesses, including fast food, payday loan and gambling outlets, particularly in terms of the Use Classification Order system.
- That there is a local and national campaign to raise awareness of the impact of high cost credit, promoting alternatives.
- In November Cabinet the Fairness Commission presented a One Year On report which highlighted the positive impact of the “Time to Change Report”, including highlighting the possibility of an FCA imposed cap on Pay Day Lenders.
- On the 11th of November the Financial Conduct Authority announced a series of curbs on the charges Pay Day Loan companies can make, including:
 - An initial cap of 0.8% a day in interest charges.
 - A cap of £15 on the one-off default fee.
 - A total cost cap of 100%.

This Council Believes:

- That the cap should be welcomed, however campaigns should continue to reduce the level of the cap.
- There are still too many Pay Day lending companies on our streets and residents need to be made aware of the danger of Pay Day loan companies.
- Alternative providers of affordable credit should be supported, including the credit union.

This Council Resolves:

- To thank the Fairness Commissioners for their commitment and the impact they have made locally and towards national campaigns.
- To continue to campaign against Pay Day Loan Companies
- To use East End Life to provide residents with information about the dangers of Pay Day Loan Companies and provide information on alternatives, including the London Community Credit Union.

12.8 Motion regarding public access to information

Proposer: Councillor Joshua Peck

Seconder: Councillor Rachel Blake

This Council notes:

1. That unlike planning applications, licensing applications are not put on the council's website and that residents have to go into a council office to see applications
2. That even when councillors ask to see licensing applications it can be several days before they sent, reducing the time available for objections

This Council believes:

1. That all licensing applications should be fully available on the council website as soon as they are advertised

This Council further notes:

1. That when a resident reports a potential planning breach they will receive a letter confirming that a planning enforcement case has been opened but that they won't then receive any other communication from the Council until the case is closed, which may be many months later, leaving the resident with no information about the progress of their case until then.

This Council further believes:

1. That residents have a justifiable expectation of being kept better informed by the Council about planning enforcement cases they have raised.
2. That a letter at key points in the enforcement process (ie after the initial visit of planning officers, after the expiry of any date given to allow resolution of the breach, after any deadline for enforcement action etc) would enable residents to know what was happening.

This Council resolves:

1. To call on the Mayor to ensure that, within three months of this motion being passed, all licensing applications are published on the Council website at the same time they are put out to consultation
2. To call on the Mayor to ensure that, within three months of this motion being passed, planning enforcement start to update residents at key points in planning enforcement cases
3. That the relevant Corporate Directors bring reports on these issues to the next Council meeting.

12.9 Motion regarding the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)

Proposer: Councillor Oliur Rahman

Seconder: Councillor Harun Miah

This Council notes:

- The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a proposed free trade agreement between the United States and the European Union.
- That the TUC and Lancashire Council, have voiced concerns that the TTIP will increase corporate power and make it more difficult for governments to regulate markets in the public interest.

This Council believes:

- The TTIP, in its current form, gives unprecedented power and influence to transnational corporations.
- This will become the benchmark for all future trade agreements, currently being negotiated between the EU and the USA.
- The TTIP would allow companies to challenge decisions by national Governments, or local authorities, that they think may damage their business interests.
- Disputes would be heard in private by unelected experts, rather than
- Public courts, which would make it impossible to reverse decisions, such as the privatisation of the NHS, without being sued by foreign investors.
- The deal opens up access to government contracts to major US multinationals and would make it difficult for Tower Hamlets, or any other local authority, to ensure give local suppliers are supported.

This meeting agrees:

- To oppose TTIP in its current form
- To write to the Prime Minister calling for the exclusion of all public services, including education and health, public procurement, public utilities and public transport from the negotiations;
- To demand no levelling down in relation to consumer, worker or environmental protection;
- To insist on genuine consultation with civil society organisations, including trade unions;
- To work with like-minded organisations, both here and in Europe, in opposing all detrimental aspects of TTIP and in campaigning for alternative EU trade and investment policies.

12.10 Motion regarding new schools

Proposer: Councillor Danny Hassell

Seconder: Councillor Any Whitelock Gibbs

This Council notes:

1. The increasing number of school providers in the borough, with increasing number of free schools and academies.
2. A recent survey by London Councils which showed 68% of parents believe local authorities should have powers to intervene in Free Schools and that 81% support council influence over school places.
3. The urgent need for additional primary and secondary schools places within the borough, especially in the East of the borough.
4. A number of site allocations have been identified across the borough for additional primary and secondary school provision.

This Council believes:

1. The decision of the Conservative-led Government to restrict the opening of new community schools by local authorities is an example of wider attacks on the role of local councils, who are often best place to make decisions about services for their local communities.
2. That this policy has made it more difficult to address issues such as a shortage of school places both nationally and locally.
3. Academies and Free Schools often lack local accountability, particularly in comparison to community schools and that parents support a role for councils in relation to performance of Free Schools and Academies.
4. Schools should reflect the communities that they serve and that schools with diverse and representative student populations will offer greater opportunities for young people.
5. Collaboration rather than competition should be at the heart of a local education system. All new schools in the borough should be part of the wider family of schools, committed to improving education in the borough as well as the wider well being of the local community.
6. Any free schools must therefore demonstrate that they benefit all local children, regardless of income, background or ability, and have a positive impact on the wider local community.

This Council resolves:

1. To work with parents, teachers and other non-profit groups to ensure any Government approved free schools in Tower Hamlets are part of the family of schools, promote

inclusive, non selective, comprehensive and high quality education for all children, and abide by the local authority admissions code.

2. To call on officers to work with developers bringing forward schemes which include education floor space at an early stage to ensure that the provision is for a local authority school where possible (for example through the use of satellite schools where appropriate).
3. To request officers investigate the admissions policies and processes of all schools in the borough and report on the profiles of the student populations at different schools.
4. To establish a standing scrutiny committee for education and schools standards, similar to the health scrutiny panel.

12.11 Motion regarding tax dodging

Proposer: Councillor Clare Harrisson

Secunder: Councillor John Pierce

The Council notes:

1. It has been estimated that the UK Treasury loses as much as £12 billion to tax dodging by multinational companies every year. Developing countries lose three times more to tax dodging than they receive in aid each year – enough to give a basic education to the 57 million children currently missing out.
2. The UK has a particular responsibility to end tax dodging, as it is responsible for 1 in 5 of the world's tax havens in the British Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.
3. The use of tax havens by UK companies is rife, with 98 of the FTSE 100 companies routinely using tax havens.
4. Large multinational companies pay as little as 5% in corporate taxes globally while smaller businesses pay up to 30%.

This Council believes:

1. As a local authority we have a duty to provide the best possible public services
2. Our ability to provide quality local services would be significantly enhanced by the increased revenues from the government tackling tax dodging.
3. All who benefit from public spending should contribute their fair share.
4. The UK must take a lead role in creating a fairer tax system and combating tax dodging.

This Council resolves:

1. To support the campaign for tax justice alongside organisations like Action Aid
2. To ask our MPs, Jim Fitzpatrick and Rushanara Ali to put pressure on the national government and the treasury to take steps to end tax avoidance loopholes.