


Non-Executive Report of the:  <b>COUNCIL</b>  17 <sup>th</sup> March 2021	
<b>Report of: Janet Fasan, Director of Legal and Interim Monitoring Officer</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
<b>Motions submitted by Members of the Council</b>	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Matthew Mannion, Head of Democratic Services
<b>Wards affected</b>	All wards

## SUMMARY

1. Three motions have been submitted by Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 11 for debate at the Council meeting on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2021
2. The motions submitted are listed overleaf. In accordance with the Council Procedure Rules, the motions alternate between the administration and the other Political Groups, with the Opposition Group motions starting with the largest Political Group not to have that meeting's Opposition Motion Debate slot.
3. Motions must be about matters for which the Council has a responsibility or which affect the Borough. A motion may not be moved which is substantially the same as a motion which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the previous six months; or which proposes that a decision of the Council taken in the previous six months be rescinded; unless notice of the motion is given signed by at least twenty Members.
4. There is no specific duration set for this agenda item and consideration of the attached motions may continue until the time limit for the meeting is reached. The guillotine procedure at Council Procedure Rule 9.2 does not apply to motions on notice and any of the attached motions which have not been put to the vote when the time limit for the meeting is reached will be deemed to have fallen. A motion which is not put to the vote at the current meeting may be resubmitted for the next meeting but is not automatically carried forward.

## MOTIONS

Set out overleaf is the motions that have been submitted.

## 12.1 Motion regarding Care Full Pay

Proposer: Councillor Rachel Blake

Seconder: Councillor Val Whitehead

### **This council notes:**

1. The GMB union has launched its Care Full Pay campaign calling for full occupational sick pay for residential social care staff with the aim of persuading care providers and Government that full sick pay is one of the most effective forms of infection prevention in care homes. The main objectives being
  - a. Full occupational sick pay for those working in residential social care.
  - b. Covid-19 full sick pay as a step to full sick pay.
  - c. Promote full sick pay as an infection control measure
2. The UK has one of the lowest levels of Statutory Sick Pay (SSP) in Europe. Over time, the value of the payment has been eroded, and it now equates to around a fifth of median earnings. The April 2020 SSP rate is £95.85 per week.
3. According to the 2020 Vivaldi study, 77 per cent of care home workers received SSP-only (and a further 7 per cent did not receive any sick pay coverage).
4. The Government set up the Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund with the primary purpose of this fund to support adult social care providers to reduce the rate of COVID-19 transmission in and between care and support wider workforce resilience.
5. The Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund was initially set up with £600 million in funding and was paid out in two tranches. The first has been paid to local authorities on 22 May 2020. The second tranche paid in July 2020.
6. The Government have now agreed to extend the Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund for social care until March 2021, with an additional £546 million for infection control in care in September 2020.
7. Dealing with our post Covid-19 future we will need more rigid infection control measures in our care system.
8. That social care workers provide a vital service in Tower Hamlets and across the country, and are greatly valued.

### **This council understands that:**

1. A strong body of emerging evidence links inadequate sickness pay to higher infection rates, and a reluctance to return to work including:
  - a. The initial findings of the Vivaldi study include tentative evidence that 'in care homes where staff receive sick pay, there are lower levels of infection in residents.
  - b. A recent survey of furloughed and non-furloughed workers found that 'workers without employer-provided sick pay have a significantly lower willingness to pay to return to work,' and also that 'workers without additional sick pay are significantly more likely to continue to work even with mild coronavirus symptoms.'
  - c. In Spain, a reduction in the generosity of sick pay arrangements was associated with 'huge increases in both the proportion of relapses and working accidents rates.'
2. A GMB survey of nearly 1000 social care workers found that:
  - a. 77 per cent of care workers said they would be inclined to return to work before they were ready if they were on SSP.
  - b. 80 per cent of respondents said they would be forced to borrow off family or friends to make ends meet if they were put on SSP.

**This council resolves to:**

1. Express its public support for GMB union's Care Full Pay campaign.
2. To call on the government to fund local authorities sufficiently so that they can commission care home providers and domiciliary care agencies to pay full occupational sick pay to the social care workforce
3. To recommend to providers receiving allocated funds from the Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund to pay full occupational sick pay as a priority, noting that guidance does give other uses for the ICF that minimise staff movement and reduce the risk of transmission.
4. To report how the Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund granted to the council in May and July 2020 was spent by care providers, to inform future ICF.
5. To call on the government to ensure guidance for all future Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund strongly stipulate full sick pay as a priority.

## **12.2 Motion regarding Martyn's Law and the Protection of our residents and visitors**

Proposed by: Councillor Peter Golds

Seconded by: Councillor Andrew Wood

### **This council notes:**

That there have been a number of attacks in London identified as terrorism, these have involved the lethal use of knives and the use of vehicles to knock down, kill and maim vulnerable pedestrians in well visited areas of the city and in a location in the vicinity of a Mosque. Tower Hamlets is a borough with many tourist attractions and places of worship, many located on streets which have large numbers of pedestrians in the past and are likely to have again once travel resumes.

A feature of concern has been crowded places which includes shopping centres, sports stadia, bars, pubs and clubs and residential areas which are easily accessible to the public and attractive to terrorists. Concerns have grown with regard to public security inside venues where people congregate as well as measures to protect our streets. The Shoreditch Triangle which includes, Bishopsgate, Spitalfields and parts of Bethnal Green is already a visitor hotspot with a large night-time economy and is intersected by busy roads. We now also have the prospect of a major Embassy moving to Tower Hamlets.

The government on the 26<sup>th</sup> February 2021 set out its proposals on a new Protect Duty; a legal requirement for public places to ensure preparedness for and protection from terrorist attacks. It would require those in scope to consider terrorist threats, and consider and implement appropriate and proportionate protective security and organisational preparedness measures.

The Protect Duty delivers on a manifesto commitment to improve the safety and security of public venues and spaces, drawing on lessons learned from previous terrorist incidents.

These changes follow a campaign run by the mother of Martyn Hett who was among 22 people killed in the 2017 Manchester Arena bombing. The changes will be to consider airport-style security checks to be mandatory at major sporting and entertainment venues. No such law currently exists so security remains the decision of individual operators.

That the proposed new law would require venue operators to consider the risk of a terrorist attack and take "proportionate and reasonable measures to prepare for and protect the public from such an attack", according to the Home Office. This could include increased physical security, training, incident response plans and exercises for staff on what to do during an attack

That the City of London continues to invest in security measures which include manned checkpoints, rising street bollards, restricted roads and crash-proof barricades. These precautions follow a warning by MI5 that the "eastern cluster" of towers planned around Bishopsgate is "highly sensitive to the threat of a hostile, vehicle-borne" attack and will replace the previous ring of steel installed to ward off IRA attacks.

That in addition the City of London is seeking S106 funds from developers in order to help fund this work.

That within Tower Hamlets only the Canary Wharf estate and the Tower of London has a similar level of physical protection.

That elsewhere in London concrete or other barriers have been erected to protect pedestrians from vehicle attacks.

**The Council further notes;**

That in February 1996 the IRA bombed Marsh Wall which killed two and injured and maimed many more, some who died of their wounds years later. This location was deliberately chosen as a less defended target than Canary Wharf estate to the immediate north but one with the same level of publicity value.

That like the City of London Tower Hamlets has emerging clusters of tall towers in Aldgate, Blackwall, Marsh Wall and the areas to the north of Canary Wharf.

The Chinese Embassy planning application.

That some areas containing high value targets have no public CCTV cameras.

**This Council believes that;**

The borough needs to review our security measures and have appropriate security measures in place to protect and deter potential attacks.

**The Council calls on the Mayor to;**

Initiate a full security and safety review of the Borough which will be submitted to Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny and the full council for consideration and final recommendations, and;

1. Consult with the Security Services on the potential threats to Tower Hamlets given its strategic location and national assets
2. Consider adding to future S106 agreements additional funding for additional security measures over and above those funded through CIL
3. Identify in advance likely targets and consider what steps would be required to mitigate the impact of any future attack using vehicles or other methods as the new Protect Duty requires us to do.
4. Publicise such preparation where appropriate, in order to reassure residents and deter potential attackers
5. Implement security measures in the areas adjoining Canary Wharf and other possible targets such as the Whitechapel Road, Brick Lane, Columbia Road Flower Market and mosques including the East London Mosque.

**12.3 Motion regarding the proposed new Chinese Embassy in Tower Hamlets and a proposal to investigate naming of roads or new buildings – Tiananmen Square, Uyghur Court, Hong Kong Road and Tibet Hill and establish that any collaboration between the Chinese Embassy and local schools reflects the borough’s heritage of standing up for each other.**

Proposer: Councillor Rabina Khan

**This Council notes:**

1. The purchase of the Royal Mint site in Tower Hamlets for the new People’s Republic of China London embassy building.
2. The number of residents living in Tower Hamlets from the People’s Republic of China including Hong Kong residents. In addition, the number of businesses from there that are active and investing in Tower Hamlets. There is also a Tibetan community in the borough and Tibet has also been subjected to human rights’ violations by the CCP.
3. The long history dating back to before the 1880’s of the Chinese community in Tower Hamlets and that many people from the region are now citizens of the United Kingdom.
4. The historic ties between China, Hong Kong and Tower Hamlets due to the trade between these two countries, whether tea shipped into the docks or from the trading desks of the Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corporation (now HSBC) whose global headquarters are in Tower Hamlets.
5. Discussions on the potential to raise the Tibetan Flag and rename roads near the Royal Mint site as Tiananmen Square, Uyghur Court and Hong Kong Road.’
6. We are very proud of the fact that Tower Hamlets is such an open and tolerant borough where we truly value our diversity and understand the strength that it brings, and where we also understand and appreciate the need to be good partners and to foster good relationships.
6. We remain deeply concerned about China’s human rights’ record on a number of issues, in particular the appalling treatment of the largely Muslim Uyghurs, and the situations in Hong Kong and Tibet.
7. The BBC coverage of the allegations of systematic rape of Uyghur women in China.
8. That the Chinese Embassy in the UK has written to a [number of local schools](#) as part of its consultation to explore opportunities for future collaboration.

**This Council further notes:**

1. Cllr Peter Golds has written to English Heritage regarding the heritage of the Royal Mint Street site; the plague pits at the Royal Mint Street site (New Chinese Embassy plans plagued by Black Death burial pits (<https://bit.ly/3r9nB3h>)).
2. That the Tibetan Community in Tower Hamlets wrote to the Mayor, Cllrs Khan, Wood and Golds requesting to raise the Tibetan Flag on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021.
3. 10<sup>th</sup> March is Tibet’s National Uprising Day, and the Tibetan flag is currently raised annually by Waltham Forest, Northampton, Woolwich and others.
4. Cllrs Khan, Wood and Golds responded that they welcomed raising the Tibetan Flag on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021.
5. Mayor Biggs passed the request to raise the Tibetan flag to the Council’s Chief Executive who has responsibility for such matters.

6. The Council's Chief Executive rejected the call for the Tibetan flag to be raised, citing protocols, even though other councils are raising the flag, as mentioned above.

**This Council Resolves:**

1. That Tower Hamlets Council investigates whether roads or possibly new buildings near the location of the proposed Chinese Embassy could be renamed appropriately as acts of solidarity with historic symbols or place names of Chinese significance; for example: Tiananmen Square, Uyghur Court, Hong Kong Road and/or "Xiaobo Road" (in memory of Xiaobo Liu), and to investigate what other actions the council could take to show solidarity.
2. That there is no financial cost associated with naming roads and buildings to residents, businesses and schools or any other stakeholder.
3. Welcomes the relocation of the Chinese Embassy and its staff moving to Tower Hamlets. But that as new neighbours and friends we must continue to make clear where our own standards and principles apply.
4. That we in Tower Hamlets welcome residents of Hong Kong who wish to take advantage of their now increased ability to move to the United Kingdom (even if more could be done). The Borough has a long and proud history of being the first home in the UK for many people fleeing persecution in their original countries. And that those earlier arrivals are now British citizens.
5. To establish what kind of collaboration the Chinese Embassy in the UK is seeking with local schools and whether it will reflect the Borough's Strategic Plan, which states clearly: "We have a proud history of standing up for each other as one community and celebrating our differences."  
<https://democracy.towerhamlets.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=130890>