

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 22nd JULY 2015

**MOTIONS SUBMITTED BY
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

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

SUMMARY

1. Six motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 13 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 22nd July 2015.
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in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.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 regarding the Constitutional Working Group

Proposer: Councillor Craig Aston

Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

This council notes that:

1. Since October 2010 the council has operated under an Executive Mayoral model in which most functions of the council are in the hands of the Executive Mayor.
2. The size of the council was reduced from 51 to 45 in 2014, in part due to arguments about how the work of councillors and the structure of the council could be revised with fewer members.
3. Apart from necessary changes to the constitution to account for the transfer of executive powers, no thorough revision of the structures of the council was carried out, and no such revision has been carried out since.
4. Tower Hamlets is one of only 9 boroughs in London out of 32 with a single Overview and Scrutiny Committee as opposed to a number of scrutiny bodies.

This council notes further:

1. Although a formal scheme of delegation exists, executive powers have never been formally delegated. Responsibility for executive actions therefore rests exclusively with the Executive Mayor.
2. The outgoing Executive Mayor had not answered a single question at Full Council since 2012 and usually his only interaction with Full Council meetings was his 5-minute report, where he generally talked about matters irrelevant to his duties as Executive Mayor.
3. The outgoing Executive Mayor attended just 4 Overview & Scrutiny Committee meetings in a tenure of four and a half years.
4. The council further notes that the newly elected Mayor, attended and responded to a call in at the most recent Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

This council notes further:

1. The intervention of the Department for Communities and Local Government in sending the auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers, to this council.
2. The subsequent report of PricewaterhouseCoopers, which made severe criticisms of the actions and lack of accountability of the outgoing administration.
3. The further intervention of DCLG in sending Commissioners into this borough to exercise certain executive powers.

This council believes that:

1. The structures left in place at the transfer to an Executive Mayoral model in 2010 are, and were, not sufficient to ensure genuine scrutiny and accountability of an Executive Mayoral administration.
2. Those structures have plainly failed, resulting in DCLG intervention.
3. A revision of those structures is both necessary and desirable.

The council resolves that:

1. The Constitutional Working Group be convened to consider revisions to the constitution which would strengthen scrutiny, oversight, and executive accountability.
2. The legal department provide all necessary assistance to the Constitutional Working Group.
3. That proposals for revisions to the constitution should be brought back to Full Council within six months of the date of this meeting.

12.2 Motion regarding TfL and CS2 Cycle Superhighway Upgrade

Proposer: Councillor Amina Ali

Seconder: Councillor Rachael Saunders

This Council notes:

1. That TfL is currently carrying out works along Whitechapel Road/Mile End Road/Bow Road to implement the CS2 Cycle Superhighway upgrade
2. That these works are due to last until Spring 2016
3. The changes to the Mile End Road/Burdett Road/Grove Road crossing and the introduction of a right turn prohibition at Mile End
4. A serious increase in traffic congestion on Grove Road, Roman Road, Old Ford Road and streets around Hamlets Way

This Council believes:

1. TfL has vastly underestimated the impact of the changes
2. This is making all of these roads more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists

This Council resolves:

1. To express its concern to TfL about these poorly designed changes
2. To request council officers to meet urgently with TfL to review traffic flow on other roads as a result of the changes to Mile End Road, in order to address the impact on other roads and agree an action plan for the safety of road users.

12.3 Motion regarding Safeguarding against radicalisation

Proposer: Councillor Rabina Khan

Seconder: Councillor Oliur Rahman

Tower Hamlet Council notes

- The recent tragic, brutal and shocking deaths - on 29th June 2015 - of British citizens who were on holiday in Tunisia
- The earlier tragic disappearance of local schoolgirls who are assumed to have joined ISIS in Syria
- The ongoing threat of ISIS to all – especially the young people
- The potential of radicalisation of youth by misguided and vile ideology of ISIS who do not represent Islam but have hijacked it and are abusing the name.

Tower Hamlets Council resolves

- To extend all our sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of those who so tragically lost their lives in Tunisia during this extremely difficult period
- To reaffirm our commitment to resisting the politics of hatred and division in all its forms, and in this specific case, the vile ideology of ISIS who have hijacked the name of Islam and are manipulating young minds. In particular, for ISIS to use the holy month of Ramadan - when Muslims are supposed to be extra conscious of the duties of charity, forgiveness, kindness and looking after all living beings – let alone human beings - for such activity demonstrate their clear and evil misrepresentation of Islam
- To deliver the following programme of work:
 - Working with schools to safeguard young people from radicalisation;
 - Continue to engage local mosques and madrassahs to strengthen their capacity to safeguard residents and pupils from radicalisation
 - To work with families through such projects as the Parenting Programme in order to highlight risks and how parents can protect their children from radicalisation
 - Develop community resilience against online radicalisation
- To continue to work together and get to know one another at personal and human level – from all religions and none – to dismantle any misguided perceptions, propaganda and misrepresentation of each other in our society
- To observe a minute's silence for the Tunisian and 7/7 victims at the full Council meeting (can be taken at the beginning of the meeting if felt appropriate)
- To work with all stakeholders to deliver the following:-
 - Undermining extremist Ideology
 - Supporting vulnerable individual

- Strengthening Institutions

- To develop programmes of work to develop Young Leaders to challenge extremist opinions through increasing awareness and understanding of extremism among young people and their families to develop analytical thinking to challenge extremist material
- Write to local schools to launch a competition to hear from young people about their views and potential solutions and suggestions to the radicalisation issue – the winner should be invited to meet all Members/representatives of all three Groups in the Council and be given an opportunity to present the winning proposal in the Chamber at an appropriate Council meeting

12.4 Motion regarding the South Quay Masterplan

Proposer: Councillor Andrew Wood

Seconder: Councillor Chris Chapman

Residents of the Isle of Dogs welcome the decision that the Mayor has taken to put the South Quay Masterplan (SQMP) on hold for a review. He has said that this will have to be done quickly. We fully agree, the pace of development along South Quay has accelerated in recent months with six major developments currently in the planning pipeline in this area alone: 3 Millharbour, South Quay Plaza 3, Jemstock, 225 Marsh Wall, Ballymore Cuba Street & Alpha Square. There is a very real risk that by the time any plan is approved it will have no practical purpose.

Since the South Quay Masterplan was first raised in the Forward Plan back in October 2013 the following developments have been approved or started construction: Dollar Bay, City Pride, Arrowhead Quay, South Quay Plaza, the Novotel on Marsh Wall, Meridian Gate & 2 Millharbour. This is not a full list of all of the planning applications or schemes in the area.

In total we expect the population of the South Quay area to go from 2,932 people in 2011 to some 25,000+ people (or the equivalent of a 4 member ward) in 11,000 new units. This does not include the 24,000 other units in nearby developments like those at Wood Wharf, ASDA, Westferry print works or Newfoundland.

This compares to the 3,500 proposed units in the Whitechapel Vision area whose diversion of Officers time has so badly delayed the completion of the SQMP.

The primary concern though of local Councillors and residents has been what is missing from the Plan not with the contents of the plan itself which we think are generally good especially the supporting LUC report which is excellent.

This Council therefore recommends that the following issues are dealt with as part of any refresh of the SQMP in order to ensure it is an effective policy to help guide development in the fastest growing area in London;

1. That the Council make a clear decision through the Masterplan process between two choices;

a. Whether the future of the Isle of Dogs will be like Hong Kong Island or Pudong in Shanghai. In which case it needs to plan and invest on that basis and make clear to residents that this is the choice it has made;

or

b. To use the London Plan recommended density limits as introduced by Ken Livingstone when he was Mayor of London and the principles of Sustainable Development from the National Planning Policy Framework to actively guide sustainable development in the area.

2. That the Council learn the lesson of the current masterplan for a part of the area, the Millennium Quarter Masterplan written in the year 2000. The objectives of that plan were never delivered and residents today still feel the Council mis-led them.

3. That the main maps are updated to show approved schemes and those in the planning pipeline – existing maps imply that this is virgin territory which is no longer the case. The map should also reflect the actual proposed heights of units.
4. That the page on infrastructure requirements is completely re-written to reflect actual approved densities. The Council has approved developments at densities far in excess of the London Plan recommended density limits and that planning infrastructure as if London Plan density limits apply will result in an under provision of infrastructure.
5. The plan should detail which TH departments are responsible for delivery of each piece of infrastructure.
6. That the Council do not place three of the six proposed principal public open spaces on road junctions or roads.
7. That the Council include in the main report the key findings and recommendations of the report written by their consultants, LUC especially as regards the impact of higher density developments.
8. That the Council do not refer to the ground underneath the elevated DLR track as a Tower Hamlets version of New Yorks highline. Although it can be made more attractive it is far too noisy to be used as a recreational area.
9. That with so many new apartments located right next to the elevated DLR track that consideration is given to soundproofing the track especially where it rounds corners.
10. That without a new Thames Water strategy for the area many of these units cannot be built as the water and sewage pipes will need to be expanded before construction can start. This needs to be reflected in the Masterplan.
11. That the Council recognise that the main content of the Plan, the recommendation that developers follow a podium and plinth model with towers above has been followed on only two of the sites, the preferred style of development in the area is for tall, thin towers.
12. That we actively look at changing the mix of housing types across the wider area of the Isle of Dogs as 3 bedroom affordable units in the SQMP area are not technically affordable i.e. developments further away should have a higher proportion of family sized affordable units to compensate.
13. That the Council reflect on the fact that approximately 25% of the new residents in the SQMP area will be social housing tenants and that designs & service charges that might work well for Asian investors to be occupied by 20 something flat sharing professionals might not work for all. Consideration should be given to off-site housing for social tenants if that delivers more units with more affordable service charges.
14. That the SQMP coordinates the delivery of community centres. With developers offering small community spaces we will end up with a large number of small un-sustainable centres. We need to factor in the requirements for children, older people, halls, prayer spaces and physical activity and co-ordinate these spaces across the island.

15. That Tower Hamlets CCG are actively involved in the planning of new surgeries in the wider area. The Isle of Dogs & Blackwall will need 28 GP surgery places over and above the 9 already planned at Wood Wharf.

16. That the Council quickly respond to the ever-worsening gap between approved developments and approved schools in the wider area. Currently the shortfall between residential developments in the pipeline and schools in planning is 6.5 primary schools and 1.5 secondary schools. The National Planning Policy Framework requires where there are large developments that schools be built within 10 minutes walking distance.

17. That the Council publicly responds to the comments made by residents, local Councillors and the Isle of Dogs neighbourhood Planning Forum during the public consultation in February 2015. They have had no reply to their comments and suggestions.

18. That Transport for London provides an input into the Masterplan especially as regards DLR capacity issues at South Quay station.

19. That the Council help to find a solution to the largest piece of socially useful infrastructure in the area, the Lanterns dance studio

20. That the Council provide an accurate database for all schemes in the area listing the following information (where available). Without this data the Council, Councillors and residents won't be able to understand what is happening or plan for the infrastructure required;

- a. Number of units by type and mix (social rented, affordable, private)
- b. Estimated population of those units
- c. Number of children estimated to be on site using GLA calculation
- d. Density measured by habitable rooms per hectare (hectares based on residential component only)
- e. Where in planning process each development is (or if approved likely construction dates)
- f. Size in hectares (for the residential sections)
- g. Additional facilities to be provided on site i.e. retail, D1 etc.
- h. Children's play area on site – split internal / external – in square meters
- i. Size of green spaces (in addition to child play space) in square meters (split between ground and elevated sections)
- j. Car parking spaces (with disabled spaces shown separately)
- k. Bicycle parking spaces
- l. Number of units designed for disabled and / or elderly use
- m. S106 by category of spend or TH CIL contribution (total £ value)
- n. Height in meters AOD of each unit
- o. PTAL rating of each development

12.5 Motion regarding Tax Dodging

Proposer: Councillor Clare Harrisson

Seconder: 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.

12.6 Motion regarding Sports Facilities in the Borough

Proposer: Councillor Julia Dockerill

Seconder: Councillor Peter Golds

That this council recalls with pride the role this borough played in the success of the London 2012 Olympics, and the appetite residents demonstrated for wider community and sporting participation.

Notes with concern that the quality and upkeep of a number of sports facilities in the borough are not a fitting sporting legacy of the Olympics.

Further notes that a number of council sports premises are under-utilised and regrets the lost opportunity this represents in providing first class leisure and community facilities to borough residents.

Further notes that the Greenwich Leisure Ltd. contract to provide borough leisure services is shortly due for renewal.

Calls for a candid assessment of GLL's performance in running that contract and further debate on how our borough leisure facilities are run and what opportunities are available to raise substantially the quality of provision.