

## LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

### COUNCIL MEETING - 29 JUNE 2017

#### MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

At the meeting of the Council held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 29 June 2017 at 7.30 pm.

#### Present:

Andrews	Gill	R Perry
Burgess	Greening	Picknell
Caluori	Hamitouche	Poole
Champion	Heather	Poyser
Chowdhury	Hull	Russell
Comer-Schwartz	Ismail	Shaikh
Convery	Jeapes	Smith
Court	Kay	Spall
Debono	Kaseki	Turan
Diner	Khan	N Ward
Donovan-Hart	Ngongo	D Ward
Erdogan	O'Halloran	Watts
Fletcher	O'Sullivan	Wayne
Gallagher	Parker	Webbe
Gantly	A Perry	Williamson

#### The Mayor (Councillor Una O'Halloran) in the Chair

#### 140 MINUTES

##### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting on 11 May 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and the Mayor be authorised to sign them.

#### 141 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

#### 142 MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

##### (i) Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Doolan, Klute and Nicholls. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Nick Ward and Alice Perry.

The Mayor read a statement from Councillor Klute apologising for his absence, which explained that he was unable to attend due to a work function.

**(ii) Order of Business**

The Mayor agreed to change the order of business so that the Council could consider Motion 4, 'Fire Safety in Islington' alongside Item 9, 'Islington Council's Response to the Grenfell Tower Fire'. It was also agreed that Motion 5, 'Finsbury Park Terrorist Attack – Standing Shoulder to Shoulder as One Community' would be considered as the first motion under Item 13.

**(iii) Declaration of Discussion Items**

No items were declared.

**(iv) Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor passed on the Council's condolences to all of those affected by the recent terror attacks at Finsbury Park, London Bridge, and Manchester Arena, and the all of those affected by the Grenfell Tower Fire. The Mayor thanked the emergency services for their quick response and courage in dealing with the atrocities. The Mayor announced that it was the Council's intention to award Freedom of the Borough to the fire fighters and officers of the Islington and Holloway Fire Station. The Mayor also thanked the Islington Council officers for providing assistance at Grenfell Tower.

In relation to the Finsbury Park terror attack, the Mayor emphasised that Islington has always been a diverse and inclusive borough, and commented on the importance of standing together as a united community. The Mayor highlighted the work of the Finsbury Park Mosque and the Muslim Welfare House to support the local community following the attack.

The Mayor commented that her first month as Mayor had come at a particularly difficult time, however it was a privilege to see how committed the local community was in helping each other in the face of such tragic events.

The Mayor had attended some very special events, including the 500<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Richard Cloudesley Trust, the Armed Forces Day Parade, the Royal Garden Party, and an event at St Luke's Community Centre to raise awareness of Key Changes, the mental health charity. The Mayor had also attended the Cally Festival which had attracted over 8,000 people, and thanked the organisers for their work.

**(v) Length of Speeches**

The Mayor asked colleagues to do their utmost to keep speeches within the permitted length.

**143 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Watts thanked the Mayor and thanked everyone present for observing the two minutes' silence with dignity.

Councillor Watts extended the sympathies of the Council to the family of Makram Ali, who was murdered in the Finsbury Park terror attack, and to all of those injured in the attack, including the husband of Councillor Ismail. Councillor Watts said that it was right to refer to

the attack as an act of terrorism and welcomed that a national minute's silence had been held to remember the victims of the attack.

Councillor Watts said that the council had worked hard to manage the response to the attack and thanked Councillors Hull, Shaikh, Heather, O'Sullivan, Comer-Schwartz, Ismail and the Mayor for helping the community in the days after the attack. The council was coordinating a package of support for the victims of the attack, which included counselling, financial help, benefits advice, housing options and adaptations, travel assistance, and legal advice. Councillor Watts thanked the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Prime Minister for their messages of support and condolences, and paid special thanks to Jeremy Corbyn MP for his response to the attack and support for the community. Councillor Watts said that the aim of the attack was to divide the local community, as was the intention at the London Bridge, Westminster Bridge, and the Manchester Arena attacks. The response to these attacks had demonstrated that the hate-mongers had failed. Councillor Watts was very impressed by the response of the Finsbury Park community, which had come together stronger and more united than ever.

Councillor Watts expressed his sympathies to the family of the person who committed suicide at Archway Bridge earlier the same day, and expressed his anger that effective suicide prevention measures had not yet been installed at the bridge. The council had worked with other boroughs to secure funding for the works and the delays to their installation were disappointing. Councillor Watts hoped that swift action would be taken by Transport for London to install suicide prevention measures following this latest tragedy.

Councillor Watts was pleased that the council had won a legal challenge from the private developer of the territorial army site at Parkhurst Road, who had appealed the Planning Inspectorate after the council had refused planning permission on the grounds that the scheme did not provide a sufficient number of affordable homes. Councillor Watts said that Islington Council put the interests of residents first and it was right to use the council's resources to fight for genuinely affordable housing in the borough. Councillor Watts said that developers were very welcome in Islington, but were not welcome to develop exclusively private housing at the expense of genuinely affordable housing for local people.

#### **144 PETITIONS**

Councillor Greening presented a petition regarding fire safety at the Harvist Estate.

Councillor Russell presented a petition regarding the installation of the trampoline park at the Sobell Leisure Centre.

Councillor Russell presentation a petition regarding redevelopment work and the downsizing of the football pitch at Barnard Park.

#### **145 QUESTIONS FROM THE YOUTH COUNCIL**

Question a) from Youth Councillor Tega to Councillor Watts, Leader of the Council:

How will the election result impact on the lives of young people in the borough and what specific challenges and opportunities does Cllr Watts identify?

Reply:

Thank you very much for your question. The election result was a shock to many, not least of which the Prime Minister, who called for a strong and stable government but spent the entire time looking weak and wobbly. The Prime Minister lost her majority and had to do a deal with the DUP to cling to power, throwing a billion pounds of money which is needed in boroughs like Islington to Northern Irish MPs.

In the short term the election result means political paralysis and chaos. The Conservatives have lost their moral mandate to govern and their parliamentary majority; the public have rejected the austerity politics that they have been pursuing for the last seven years; and they have propped themselves up through the DUP, who's track record on gay rights, women's rights, and other matters shows that they are a long way away from the values of this Council and the vast majority of residents in our borough and beyond. I am very concerned indeed about the DUP having a say on the important matters that affect our country.

On the positive side, this election showed that the Labour Party has enormous momentum, we achieved the biggest increase in the party's share of the vote in any one election, we saw young people assert their place at the centre of British politics and go out to vote in record numbers, 64% of registered votes aged 18 to 24 are thought to have voted, and I think that politicians of all parties will take notice of young people's issues far more than they have ever done.

I think there will be another election before too long. If opinion polls are to be believed that election will result in a Labour government led by Jeremy Corbyn, and a fully costed Labour manifesto promising to bring back EMA and maintenance grants for students, abolish tuition fees, build more genuinely affordable housing for young people, to end the public sector pay cap and to end austerity. This will be paid for by a slightly higher taxes on corporations and people who have the money to pay a bit more tax. I think that will fundamentally change the lives of young people in this borough for the better.

Question b) from Young Mayor Diana to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

It's really exciting that the council's commitment to youth provision in the borough will see another great summer offer including Summerversity, Launchpad and the opening of Soapbox youth centre. How will councillors promote the fantastic offers across the borough to young people in their wards?

Reply:

Thanks for your question Diana. I think we should all be really proud that Islington is probably the only borough in the country that hasn't cut youth services by even a penny, in fact we are investing more in our youth services.

We will be promoting our youth offer throughout the summer. We will be giving out 16,000 brochures in secondary schools, leisure centres and housing estates. Every young person in Islington will get their own Summerversity brochure, we will also be sending information to young people who don't go to school in Islington but live in the borough, so they know what the offer is too. There will be features in IslingtonLife, the residents' e-bulletin, the schools' circular and all the relevant internal council bulletins. The main online sources of information will be through izzy-info, and the Things to Do section on the website, but we are also launching a social media campaign led by local young influencers with thousands of followers to promote the opportunities on offer as it is very important to ensure we stay connected with young people in ways that are relevant to them and in line with how they communicate. All of the main social networks will be used.

This will be supported by street team style outreach activity led by a team of local young people with a strong and respected local Islington reputation, so there will be promotion happening on the streets as well. We will also be launching a hashtag campaign, #LaunchpadLDN, so that young people can create their own content and upload photos; this is building on the work we've done together which shows that young people are more likely to go to events if they know that their friends are going, so we need to get rid of that fear that some people might have, and make sure that everyone feels comfortable and relaxed, because there are some amazing opportunities available.

Question c) from Youth Councillor Honey to Councillor Watts, Leader of the Council:

Following the horrific terrorist attacks in Westminster, Manchester, London Bridge and Finsbury Park, what more can be done to promote a zero tolerance approach on radicalisation and extremism in the borough, so Islington's young people feel safe?

Reply:

Thank you very much Youth Councillor. We have already marked a minute's silence for those awful attacks which we all condemn. Clearly we have a duty to implement the Prevent Programme and fulfil our legal duties, but we fundamentally believe that the best way we can reduce radicalisation and extremism in our borough is to ensure our borough has as much community cohesion as possible. What happened in Finsbury Park was somebody coming to destroy the cohesion and sense of unity that this borough has; that's why it's so important that the community works together in the face of that. We do a lot of work in our local community, not because of any Home Office programme, but so we can have the strongest, most united, most cohesive community that we can; that is by far the most effective way of ensuring that we keep our community safe.

However, from a safety point of view, I very much welcome the extra police that the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, has committed to patrol outside mosques and other institutions, particularly during the holy month of Ramadan. I think that another way of keeping people safe would be to reduce the cuts to police numbers, which has reduced their ability to respond to some of the threats that we face. I thank the GLA and Mayor of London for trying to allocate funds to make sure there is more physical security on streets to stop vehicle attacks, I think that will make a major contribution to making people feel safe. But in the end I think that people feel most safe by being in a community where people feel valued, people feel included, where people have decent homes and where they feel they have a stake in society. I think that is at the heart of what we need to do, so we can make sure that our borough is safe.

Question d) from Deputy Young Mayor Tega to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

We have over the last few months participated in a variety of activities including the youth crime workshops to help develop the 'Working together for a safer Islington' plan. How can the council encourage schools to make the most of their Safer School Officers to help reduce crime and increase trust between the police and young people?

Reply:

Thank you Tega, and thank you to the Youth Councillors for your work in not only developing the Working Together plan, but delivering it as well; this work has been very interesting, especially the poster competition which you have been involved in. The Safer Schools team in Islington hasn't always been great if I'm honest; but it has got a lot better since the new Sargent has come in to oversee what is happening in our schools. We are now able to talk to the Police about what should be going on, what we think is important, and what they are seeing is going on in our schools.

Since the programme's launch in 2015 over 160 sessions have taken place within Islington Schools with over 7,000 pupils taking part. We are going to keep on promoting this offer so that the programme benefits as many people as possible. We have been talking with the Police about how Safer Schools Officers are promoted, and the Safer Schools Sergeant has given a presentation to the Safeguarding Children's Board. The Council's Health and Wellbeing Team are promoting Safer Schools Officers as they meet with schools to promote their PSHE programme. We have held two head teacher briefings to make sure the heads understand the offer and are using the officers as much as possible; and we have used other initiatives, such as a Safer Schools Officer being interviewed by a young person from the Youth Offending service as part of the launch of Working Together.

We are going to keep talking to the schools and the head teachers and keep making the point that Safer Schools Officers are a really good resource and we need to use them as much as possible.

#### **146 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Question a) from Greg Foxsmith to Councillor Hull, Executive Member for Finance, Performance and Community Safety:

An astonishing 1,021 bicycles were reported stolen between 1/11/14 and 31/10/15. Of these, a mere 36 were recovered and returned to owner, a derisory figure so low that it has only one advantage - it cannot get any worse. What are the figures for reported bicycle theft and recovery in the following year, and notwithstanding the inevitable improvement, do you consider that to be satisfactory?

As Greg Foxsmith was not present at the meeting, the following written response was subsequently provided:

Official bike theft figures for Islington (MPS publication) are 1,133 (FY 2014/15), 1,038 (FY 2015/16) and 988 (FY 2016/17) with 46 bikes being recovered in this last FY. Bike theft levels in Islington have been steadily reducing for the last six years when there were 1,607 in their peak (FY 2010/11), largely due to two factors – better security and a switch in offending type.

The council takes cycle security seriously and introduced two secure bike hangars into the borough last year, as a trial. These hangars provided safe storage for those who cannot store cycles within their dwelling and provides better security.

Following this successful trial, Islington has begun a roll out of bike hangars across the borough, based on known demand. Consultation for the installation of 18 new hangars will begin shortly and the council welcomes further requests. We also installed over 160 on-street Sheffield stands across the borough to provide short term cycle parking.

Many more cycles than is quoted above are recovered by the police each year but it has not been possible to reunite them with the victim as they can't be identified. To support the efforts of ourselves and the police, we urge people to note the frame number, use security marking and leave their bike secure.

Question b) from Ernestas Jegorovas to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

What risk assessment has been done about the influx of cases from West London to Highbury Corner Youth Court following the closure of Hammersmith Court?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. The background to this is the government have closed nearly a fifth of all courts in the country, including ten courts across London. This impacts on people's access to justice, increases the time you have to travel to courts, and puts increased pressure on the workload of courts. The Lord Chancellor decided to close Camberwell Green and Hammersmith Magistrates' Courts and transfer the youth court work from Hammersmith to Highbury Corner.

We don't know whether the Ministry of Justice carried out a full risk assessment on the impact of those closures, or how the decision was reached. However, our Youth Offending Service has carried out its own risk assessment due to the fact that the West London Court day takes place on a Monday, the day before Islington's own court day.

Although we don't have particular issues between gangs in Islington and gangs in West London, young people are very mobile and we need to make sure that the young people accessing the court are safe. We have been liaising more than ever with the police services and court security to make sure that they have a handle on what's going on that day, and to make sure that the entrances and exits are safe. We have also been liaising with the Tri-Borough Youth Offending Team to request that they give us some additional resource when any West London cases are carried over into Islington's designated day on a Tuesday.

Supplementary Question:

A recent report to the Council's Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee identified that there are six gangs in Islington and there have been nine stabbings in the Highbury area over the last year. What steps are being taken to make sure that there will be not be any gang-related issues involving the court?

Reply:

As you can imagine, there are already very tight security arrangements around youth court appearances which are related to gang activity. The issue is, has this risk increased by the transfer of the youth court from Hammersmith to Highbury? From the evidence we have, we have no reason to believe that there are particular issues between gang members from West London and gang members from Islington, but we have to remain vigilant. That's why we have had talks with the Tri-Borough in West London, so that we have the additional resource to manage these risks if needed. However, the generic risks associated with youth crime and running a youth court will be managed as tightly as they have ever been.

Question c) from John Barber to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

Why did the Council bury on page 133 of the Budget Proposal approved at the last full council meeting, GLL's proposal for the trampoline park that will take over half the Sobell

Centre sports hall without giving any details of size, timing or funding and why was this major proposal not brought to the attention of councillors?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. It's clear from the fact that this was such a lengthy document that anything within it was not hidden, but that nothing would stand out particularly, so there is nothing sinister about this proposal being half way through it.

Because of the continuing swingeing reductions in the funding provided by the Government to local authorities, we have made no secret as a council that we need to make further significant budget savings over the next three years. The completed trampoline project will generate additional income for the council and help the council to meet its savings target while delivering an innovative project that will significantly increase usage and physical activity, improving health and wellbeing among some key target groups. As part of its consideration of the budget report, the Council also approved the 2017/18 capital programme which includes financial provision for the project, in the form of a loan.

The decision on whether to approve GLL's request to undertake the trampoline project is a matter delegated to officers in the council's Environment and Regeneration Department. As the Executive Member responsible for Sport and Leisure, I was kept fully informed by those officers of the details of the project and, also briefed the Leader and other members of the Executive, and also other councillors.

Supplementary Question:

Our clear legal advice is that the council should have undertaken a formal consultation prior to this trampoline park being given the go ahead. But aside from the legal obligations, why did the council and GLL simply not deem it necessary to consult the hundreds of loyal users of the Sobell on these massive changes, particularly because GLL and the council representatives present made explicit promises to do so at the Customer Representative meeting beforehand?

Response:

Thank you. The council is not under a statutory duty to consult on the project. The Sobell is not in breach of any statutory duty. With regard to the user group meetings, I do not believe there is anything in those minutes which says that there was going to be a formal consultation, but there has certainly been considerable consultation since then with users of the Sobell, and I know that you are foremost amongst those and you have asked many questions which we have done our best to answer.

Question d) from Benali Hamdache to Councillor Watts, Leader of the Council:

In October 2015 this council passed a motion calling for a revised implementation to the Prevent Strategy. In the motion the council called for a community led, constructive and sensitive approach to tackling extremism in our borough. What progress has been made on these goals?

Reply:

Thank you. Since that motion passed we have agreed a position statement which is on the council's website. This reiterates that we will meet our legal duties under the Prevent programme, including our duty to support the police in identifying terror suspects, however, we agreed that the way in which we would implement Prevent would be evidence-based,

proportionate, and risk-based. We recognise that we also have obligations under the Equalities Act which must be weighed against our obligations under the Prevent programme, to enable us to make sensible judgements on each case.

There are a number of things which would be very helpful to the council in implementing the Prevent programme in a proportionate, risk-based and evidence-based way. The biggest of these would be the government sharing information where there may be genuine issues of concern. Receiving evidence-based information from the government on such matters has proved more challenging than one would assume. The result of this is that local councils struggle to support the implementation of Prevent in any sensible way, and the risk is that whole communities end up being stigmatised, which is something we have been very careful to guard against in Islington. This is counter-productive as people end up being excluded from society and being pushed towards the hate-mongers. Executive members of the Council will know that we have met with officers to ensure that the implementation of the Prevent strategy guards against that.

I also note the comments of organisations such as the Association of Chief Police Officers, who say that the Prevent programme as it stands is now not fit for purpose. I also note that the Mayor of Greater Manchester is carrying out a review of Prevent, and I want to assure you and the members of the Council that we will be following that review very carefully and where it comes up with interesting recommendations we will look to adopt those here.

Supplementary question:

In the application of Prevent specific communities are often singled out, but following the heinous attack at Finsbury Park, how is Islington Council planning to tackle the rise of right-wing extremism, and how can the Prevent duty make sure that all types of extremism are actively prevented?

Reply:

Thank you for your question, you raise an absolutely fair point. While we have had appalling attacks by people who claim that they are motivated by a perverse form of Islamism, we have also had terrorist attacks by the far-right, the murders of Makram Ali and of Jo Cox were both politically motivated. It strikes me that the Prevent duty needs to pay far more regard to the risk of far-right terrorism and extremism, particularly given the rise in far-right extremism in this country over the past few years. We saw a demonstration by the hate-spouting EDL descend into a drunken mob over the weekend.

I think we need to be clear that the Prevent duty should counter extremism of all forms, including the hateful propaganda of the far-right, and we should also be looking at some of the sources of that hateful propaganda. I was pleased to take the opportunity the day after the terrorist attack to address a prime-time audience across the United States on CNN to attack President Trump for the islamophobic way he has conducted his presidency. This was the only part of that day which gave me any sense of satisfaction.

Question e) from James Woolfenden to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

In relation to the proposed Windsor Street development, will the Council please provide drawings and sections to clearly show what is proposed regarding the various structures indicated directly behind and abutting the rear wall of three Packington Street properties with short gardens so that we can consider and comment before any application is made?

This information has been requested since the consultation period started two years ago. It relates to refuse storage, cycle storage and what appears to be a concrete pergola all directly abutting the rear garden walls of the homes and which are only 7.2 metres from our kitchen window.

As James Woolfenden was not present at the meeting, the following written response was subsequently provided:

The Council is currently completing the final design of the scheme. The drawings will be made available together with all the associated planning documents once the application has been submitted. However, the verified views will be provided to residents prior to the planning submission. This is not expected to be before 17th July.

To address the issues raised specifically regarding the refuse storage, cycle storage and pergola and their respective locations the architect has provided the following statement:

1. The bin stores form part of the single storey element of proposals, and back onto an existing single storey car garage forming the rear boundary of number 8 Packington Street. The garage structure is approximately 3 metres wide and sits at the end of the garden between the rear of number 8 Packington Street and our proposal. The proposed bin store is accommodated within the building envelope and enclosed all sides with doors onto the road for collection. It has been kept to a minimal size with no more than 2 euro bins.
2. The cycle store is located behind the lift and stair core at the eastern end of proposals, and forms the corner of our boundary to Turnbull House, and the boundary wall of gardens at number 15 & 16 on Packington Street. The provision of cycles in this location is a recent design change due to the revised nature of the accommodation - previously the cycles were located adjacent to the bins. The roof level will rise above the existing boundary wall to Packington Street gardens by approximately 500mm for a distance of 4 metres and then falls behind the single storey brick building in the Garden of number 16. Packington Street.
3. The pergola structure in the rear courtyard of proposals will be of timber construction. Vertical elements sit within a low level planter / retaining structure, and away from the boundary wall to gardens on Packington Street. The pergola structure has been provided to allow planting to grow over and enhance privacy to residents living on Packington Street.

Question f) from Brenda Woolfenden to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

Can the Council confirm/guarantee that any proposed development on the Windsor street site car park will be exclusively for residents with a learning disability?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. I can guarantee that the development at the Windsor Street car park site will be for the exclusive use of residents with varying levels of need, but all of whom have a learning disability. The building has been designed with the input of service users, their carers and the commissioners of learning disabilities service specifically for this purpose.

Supplementary Question:

Are you assured of the suitability of the site for the different categories of individuals that will be housed there?

Reply:

I am very confident that the site will be suitable. The site will be subject to a planning application in due course.

Question g) from Barry Hill to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

As one of the group representing all customers and residents when Sobell Sports Centre was threatened with demolition in 2009-2010 and successfully ensuring this architecturally unique facility was saved together with its diverse offer of top class community sports development opportunities for the local community, why has GLL/Better been allowed forego its promises, made at Islington Customer Representative Committee Meetings in 2016, to consult fully with the Islington public and Sobell customers before taking any decision to implement a project involving a major part-change of use of the centre to a recreational theme park?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. As one of the Sobell User representatives on GLL's Customer Representative Committee, you will be aware that GLL kept meetings of that committee fully apprised of the development of the Sobell trampoline park project during 2016/17.

GLL was aware that certain activities at the Sobell Centre would need to be relocated if the project was approved by the council. For this reason, when GLL presented its business case for the project to the council it also submitted a detailed displacement strategy. As a condition of giving its approval to the implementation of the project, the council required GLL to consult with those user groups affected regarding alternative locations for their activities before the works commenced. Such consultation took place during March and April 2017 and most user groups affected have now agreed alternative nearby locations for their activities.

The formal minutes of the Customer Representative Committee do not record any promise on the part of GLL to undertake a full public consultation, there is no statutory duty to consult and the benefits of the trampoline park far outweigh the impact of the displacement programme as most current users will be able to continue to play their sport.

Supplementary Question:

In the past seven days, the petition against the trampoline park has attracted more than 600 signatures from customers and residents across a wide range of sporting activities. What detailed market research and current evidence of need within Islington was provided by GLL Better to the Council's Executive before the project was approved?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. There was a detailed business plan submitted to council officers before the project was approved. Trampoline parks have been extremely popular in other parts of the country, this will be the only trampoline park within inner London, we have no reason to believe that it will be anything other than extremely popular, and we have had a lot of very positive comments from young people who are very excited that this project is coming to the Sobell. I see no reason why it should not be as popular in inner London as it is in other parts of the country.

Question h) from Gill Weston to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

In December 2016 the NHS published guidelines for homes for people with learning disabilities - "Building the right home". These guidelines specify that no more than six people with learning disabilities should live on one site. Will the council confirm that they will adhere to these guidelines in all building projects intended for people with learning disabilities, and that they will be followed in their project at Windsor Street?

Reply:

This document, Building the Right Home, is part of the supporting documentation to assist the national Transforming Care programme. This programme aims to rehouse 2,500 people with learning disabilities and/or autism who currently live in mental health hospitals. It was set up following the Winterbourne View scandal.

You will be pleased to hear that the Windsor Street development is not part of the Transforming Care programme, so the guidance is not directly applicable. It is not prescriptive in any case, but even if the Windsor Street development was specifically aimed at rehousing people from long term institutions, it would be compliant with it.

The guidance says new campus sites should not be built; a campus is a large institution, not a small housing scheme like Windsor Street. It says that housing with occupancy of six or more can become institutionalised: we are of course aware of this risk, and are managing it successfully in our in-house units and at Leigh Road, which is a similar building. It also says commissioners should ensure the support service enables tenants to have control over where they live and who provides the support; we have a strong and improving track record of personalised support in our units.

Indeed, the council's Corporate Director of Housing and Adult Social Services was closely involved in writing Building the Right Home last December and was invited to blog about it for the NHS, so for us not to comply with its recommendations would not reflect well on us. But fortunately it does not apply to this project; Windsor Street is an example of the excellent work we are doing for people with learning disabilities and/or autism that attracts so much national attention and I can assure you again that we are fully compliant with any guidance.

Supplementary:

Thank you Councillor. I have confirmation from the NHS that these guidelines are applicable to Windsor Street, not just the Transforming Care programme. Specifically, they say that it relates to all people with a learning disability and/or autism with challenging behaviour. Some people may currently be in-patients, others will be in the community but at risk of admission. Are you going to reject these NHS guidelines and not safeguard these vulnerable people? When are you going to provide them with sufficient outdoor space, a building that blends in with the community, somewhere with a flexible future use where they can feel happy and safe in their homes and which meets their needs, away from busy and noisy roads and bright lights, with good standards of daylight and where they will not be constantly overlooked? All of these things are in the guidelines, which as I say, the NHS have confirmed does apply to Windsor Street.

Reply:

Thank you. Perhaps you would be kind enough to send us that information from the NHS as that is certainly not our understanding. As I say, our Corporate Director helped to write the document, so I am very surprised to hear that the NHS has a different view.

With regard to whether or not the Windsor Street development will be suitable for people with learning disabilities and other care needs, I very strongly refute the suggestion that it will not be. People with learning disabilities have families in Islington. Their families love their children, brothers or sisters the same as any other person. I think we have a duty to house these people in Islington. Clearly, we do not have lots of spaces away from roads and with beautiful views, but I would suggest that such places in the past have not guaranteed a good standard of accommodation. After all, Winterbourne View would meet the criteria that you have listed, but that was certainly not a good environment for vulnerable people. We will continue to do all that we can for our residents in Islington who happen to have learning disabilities.

Question i) from Chris Conroy to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

Are the council aware that there are several funders available (e.g, the Communities Asset Fund, The Football Foundation, London Marathon Charitable Trust) who would be willing to fund the vast majority of redevelopment of the pitch at Barnard Park in its current size, therefore saving lots of money for Islington tax payers, and creating revenue generating opportunities for the Borough?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Our starting point for the redevelopment of Barnard Park was not funding; it was about recognising the diversity of the community, it was about families, it was about those who live alone, it was about young people and children, it was about older people, it was about those with different abilities, from the sensory impaired to those with mobility difficulties and hearing loss, it was about those who need formal sport and those who need informal sport, it was about those on low income, and those who supported and those who didn't support.

It wasn't a decision which was arrived at easily. The process took many years and started long before my time in this role. It is easy to jump on the bandwagon of those who oppose, but the council had to listen to all sides of the argument and come to a view. It is not funding that drove this decision, that would be unfair. No aspect of the redevelopment will be funded from taxpayers' money, in fact every aspect of it will be funded by Section 106 monies. As for the issue of generating income, the potential hire of the grass area and the hire of the pitch, these ideas will be subject to further consultation and there will always be time and opportunity for anybody to engage.

Supplementary question:

In light of the objections made to the Department for Communities and Local Government from Sport England, the Football Association, and other organisations, will the council commit to holding a meeting to review an alternative plan for the redevelopment of the sports pitch at Barnard Park?

Reply:

My understanding is that the process has happened. We had a Planning Sub-Committee meeting which came to a decision. The Committee had before it all of the objections received, including those of Sport England, and others. It also had before it representations from those who supported the redevelopment. The Planning Sub-Committee came to a decision, and now that decision is being reviewed by the Department for Communities and

Local Government, as all decisions of this nature are. A decision will be made, and we have no intention of interfering in that process.

Question j) from Jack Scrafton to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

The council's plans to reduce the size of the sports pitch at Barnard Park by 70% will mean that there will be nowhere we can practice on Thursday night after school and on Sunday morning. Can the councillors tell us where we (and our 100 friends) will be able to practice?

Reply:

Jack, I want to thank you for your question, and for standing up for what you believe in, it's really important. You have heard from my fellow councillor, Councillor Caluori, that we absolutely and fundamentally support activities for children and young people, and that's why this redevelopment of Barnard Park will not exclude children and young people in any way. In fact, the facilities will be enhanced to include children and young people, to include you and your friends. The park's not going to get smaller, it's just going to get safer and better and greater, it's a real opportunity because the seven-a-side pitch will provide football for boys and girls, for young and old, and will be in a space which will accommodate all. For those friends, families, and volunteers that give up their time to work with you, please be assured that these activities will continue.

Supplementary Question:

When did you last play football?

Reply:

I haven't played football for a long time. You know the game better than me, your friends know the game better than me, but I absolutely value football as our national sport. We are not taking away football, and I would encourage you and all of your friends to keep engaged in sport. Thank you.

As the 30 minutes allocated for questions from members of the public had elapsed, the Mayor advised that the remaining questions submitted in advance of the meeting would be responded to in writing. The following responses were issued subsequent to the meeting.

Question k) from Ian Fearnley to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

On the 7th June 2016 in a meeting between the council and some residents from Packington Street, the council promised to publish the financial viability report for the Windsor Street development. Now, over a year later, this promise has not been fulfilled. Why has the report not been made available as promised, and when will it be published?

Reply:

The scheme, now in its final design stage, has undergone a number of changes since the last viability report was produced in September 2015. The existing viability report is therefore no longer relevant as it is not reflective of the design or costs incurred on the project since that time. Now that design is being finalised we will begin the process of conducting a further

financial viability to reflect these changes. We anticipate this process will be completed during the summer.

Question l) from David Scrafton to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

In relation to the Barnard Park plans, are the council aware that the SaveOurSportsPitch group at Change.org have already amassed over 650 objections to their plan, a number that is more than 3 times as large as the number of people who ever supported their plans in the consultation?

Reply:

- We are aware of the petition and appreciate the large number of people who have an interest in the future of Barnard Park.
- The Council's final consultation on the proposed design and both of the planning applications did have a greater number of submissions in support of the scheme than against. Nearly 80% of the responses we received when consulting on the most recent proposals supported the scheme –those in support were people from a wide range of backgrounds, from different social class and including residents on our Council estates
- The decision in relation to Barnard Park sought to recognise the diversity of the community creating a space for families, young people and children, the under 5s as well as older people, those on low incomes and those without gardens and space to play and be active, engaging both boys and girls as well as those with differing abilities from the sensory impaired to those with mobility difficulties and hearing loss.
- The Council's decision was about taking a scarce resource and striking a balance in terms of design based on those who play sports and those who use the park for other activities.
- So, the decision had to be reached following extensive local community consultation and embraced those who supported the scheme as well as those who opposed. The Council had to listen to all sides and come to a view. It was not a decision that was arrived at without due and proper consideration of all sides of the argument.
- We understand the needs and desires of everyone cannot be accommodated in this small space, but we believe this design meets a broad range of needs of the different groups of users within the community from formal and informal sport to formal and informal recreation and events.
- A petition is an important indicator of an opinion but it is never the sole determining factor when making a decision. A petition in support of the scheme might produce a similar number of signatories. As the Executive Member for Environment and Transport, I am happy to continue the conversation and meet with a delegation of the petitioners.

Question m) from Stephen Griffith to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

Why were the layman councillors at the 9th May planning for Barnard Park asked to weigh up, on the one hand, an absolute requirement to retain sports pitches with, on the other, environmental considerations when there was no question under the Borough's own Development Plan rules that retention of the Sports Pitch at Barnard Park was not something to be compromised?

Reply:

The correct process for determining planning applications is set out within s38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Section 38 of the Act refers to the 'Development Plan'. The Development Plan for Islington includes the London Plan (2016) Spatial Strategy and also the suite of development plan documents adopted by Islington taken as a whole. Section 6 states that "the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

In this regard, the recommendation that was presented to the 9th May 2017 Planning Committee (and the 18 July 2016 Committee previous to that) considered the proposal against the adherence to the Development Plan policies but also gave weight to material considerations which included environmental considerations but also, the fact that Islington has some of the lowest amount of greenspace per person within London and the need to maximise the flexible functionality of its green spaces for the benefit of diverse population needs and demands, particularly in light of the significant number of residents who have very limited or no access to private open spaces themselves.

It should be noted that policy DM6.4 'Sport and Recreation' part C does specifically (by footnote) protect against the loss of public sport and recreation facilities stating that developments that would result in their loss will be refused planning permission unless:

- (i) The same type(s) of facility are reprovided;
- (ii) New facilities meet identified need;
- (iii) Replacement facilities are appropriately and accessibly located;
- (iv) The quality of provision is enhanced; and
- (v) The quantity of provision is maintained, with local population increase provided for.

A footnote to the above policy states "Public sport and recreation facilities, such as leisure centres, are those with unrestricted public access on a pay and play basis without membership being required."

The existing sport pitch due to its current poor standard does not meet the stated definition of a sport's pitch to which this policy is said to apply.

Policy 6.3 'Protecting Open Space' sets out at part F) that existing play spaces across the borough will be protected by resisting their loss, unless i) a replacement play space of equivalent size and functionality is provided to meet the needs of the local population. Where this is not possible development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are over-riding planning merits to the proposal.

In this regard, it is the view of officers that exceptional circumstances were demonstrated and that there are over-riding planning merits to the proposal, in the context of the borough having the second lowest amount of green space per person in England (Core Strategy 2011 supporting text 3.6.5). Due to the nature of housing development in this part of the borough, many of which being flatted and without access to private public open space and given that Barnard Park is close to the ward boundary with Caledonian ward, which is a priority area for increasing the quantity of public open space (due to a current deficiency).

Additionally, Greenspace, having carried out a significant degree of public consultation with local residents in developing their plans, put forward a proposal for a variety of play spaces including a reduced size sports pitch of significantly improved quality, supplemented by an area of 'Village Green' that can also be booked formally, or alternatively used for more information play and recreation. The proposals provide enhanced amounts of green space to support biodiversity, open up more routes through the park improving the connectivity and the usability of the park and these were considered to be valid material considerations, particularly in the context of the need for public open space in the borough to be as flexible as

possible so as to maximise the park's usability as a result of the significant number of competing demands due to the considerations set out above.

The original 18 July 2016 Sub-Committee A report sets out the fuller details as to what material considerations were weighed against the non-compliance with this policy.

Question n) Michael Coffey to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

Are the council aware that the Department of Local Communities and Government have extended the time for the review of their planning application for the reduction in pitch size at Barnard Park by 70%, and that Sports England have objected to the Council's planning application?

Reply:

- We are aware of the objection from Sport England to the planning application. It was reported to the 18 July 2016 Planning Sub-Committee A meeting whereby the Committee resolved to defer making a decision to allow for further discussion.
- There are differing views on this project, but following extensive discussions with the community and park users, we agreed a plan, with majority support, that sought to strike a reasonable balance so that Barnard Park could be enjoyed by all including parents, older people, footballers, children and young people and other park users. We want the park to meet diverse local needs.
- The final decision was based on extensive consultation over many years and strong support from the local community.
- The Council is also aware that the decision has been referred to the Secretary of State. This is normal procedure that is required under law for applications that involve the loss or replacement of a playing field, or otherwise.
- The Council cannot grant planning permission on the application until after 21 days of the Secretary of State receiving the consultation. That time elapsed on 15 June but the Secretary of State wrote to us requesting an extension as they were unlikely to be in a position to respond in time – understandably it has been a very busy time for his Department and there was also a General Election.
- On 24th August 2017 we received notification that the Secretary of State had called in our planning application for Barnard Park. We are of course disappointed. Islington is a densely populated and geographically small borough, and its parks are rightly very highly valued.
- We are now carefully considering the detail of the call-in and our response.

Question o) from James Dunnett to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

The Sobell Centre is recognized as work of architectural importance, nominated for listing at national level by the Twentieth Century Society when threatened with demolition eight years ago.

In view of this, why have Greenwich Leisure Ltd been permitted to start implementing works that will radically alter the internal architectural qualities of the Centre without consulting the planning department or the users of the Centre or making proper drawings available to them - to the extent that even the official User Representative was unaware of the works until they started?

Reply:

Although the Sobell Centre is not currently listed at either national or local level, we recognise the centre's architectural magnificence, and wish to celebrate it, by enabling more people to use it and to experience the scale of the space available

The works to the main sports hall arena are built and designed to be retractable if required to reinstate the space to its original form. We have gone to great lengths to ensure that there is minimal intervention to the existing space, including the introduction of a floating floor to protect the Sprung floor. The works do not require planning permission and are therefore only a matter for building control. The business plan has been structured to allow for the project to reinstate the sports hall to its original state or to future leisure need.

Details of the proposed works were made known to the Sobell User's Group and to the Customer Representative Committee.

I know that you have met one of the council Officers involved with the scheme, and indeed have had considerable email correspondence about it with detailed responses to the points you raised. If you have any outstanding queries with regard to detail, please do contact Mark Christodoulou again, and copy me in.

#### **147 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

Question a) from Councillor Poyser to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

The Council quite rightly has taken all the actions it can to improve and maintain conditions, despite swingeing government cuts, to help social housing in Islington.

Islington Council recently took a private landlord who owned a multi-occupancy property in Hillrise ward to court after we found a series of hazards – including a lack of fire alarm, insecure handrails and banisters, and rotten window frames in a multiple occupancy property. The inspection, in the autumn, also found a window in disrepair, a hole in the wall, and dirty kitchen extractor fans. The landlord, from Enfield, paid fines of £12,000 along with costs of £1,124 and a victim surcharge of £100.

Many of the tenants in Islington's private rented sector live in appalling conditions, and some are paying a huge percentage of their incomes to live here. What can we do as a council to help these tenants?

Reply:

Thank you very much for your question. There's lots of things the council can do to help tenants in the private rented sector. Environmental Health carry out a programme of activities to identify and improve the worst living conditions in the sector, for example we investigate and identify hazards that could be a risk to the tenant's safety, we work with landlords to ensure they provide safe accommodation, and we carry out enforcement action if we have to.

We have a licensing system for Houses of Multiple Occupation, we carry out inspections, and we also use our own data to identify unlicensed HMOs and potentially unsafe private rented accommodation. We work with internal and external partners to share information on this, and we also work with Trading Standards to enforce letting agent requirements.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for your work on this. Given the scale of government cuts, in the future will the council still be able to carry out this work in the private rented sector?

Reply:

This council will never stop working hard for the private rented sector, that is our job, regardless of what cuts are imposed on us by the government. I would encourage all councillors to contact the council about any concerns they have regarding private rented sector properties in their ward, or with any concerns about landlords.

Question b) from Councillor Ismail to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

According to the council's Principal Risks Report 2017/18, serious youth crime has increased by 30% in Islington, and there has been a 9% rise in knife crime victims under 25 years old. What is the council doing about this, and how is it engaging with young people and the local community?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Serious youth crime is a priority for the council. I think it's important to say that involvement in serious youth crime harms both the victim and the perpetrator; everyone loses. Information on what we are doing to address youth violence is detailed in our new Youth Violence Strategy, Working Together for a Safer Islington. That plan sets out very detailed account of what we are going to do, focusing on prevention and early intervention. What we really want to do is make sure that young people are not being drawn into violent crime and offending.

Our new strategy builds on the original 2015 Youth Crime Strategy. We have protected youth funding and have invested an additional £500,000 a year into services for those at risk of offending and who are offending. In addition to this our Integrated Gangs Team is going to be working with more young people, including those on the cusp of gang involvement. We are pushing for stronger sentences for the adults who are exploiting and coercing children into carrying out criminal activities, such as county lines drug dealing. The Assertive Outreach Team includes St Giles Trust workers who are ex-gang members; they have been really effective since we brought them into the borough, and they will be working until very late on Fridays and Saturdays, advising and supporting vulnerable young people over the weekend.

We also have to work with the community on this. I think the original Youth Crime Strategy was right in indicating that we cannot succeed in all of our plans without support from the community. We have to make sure that everyone is on the same page with this, that the reporting is done right, that people are reporting when there are strange people in vehicles on estates talking to young people, and reporting when things seem wrong. It's really important that these things are reported and that we have a community response that is united.

We have seen some early results. The number of first time entrants into the youth offending system has reduced ahead of target for a first time in a long time, but we still have that entrenched cohort of serious offenders who we need to deal with.

Supplementary question:

Given that young people are in structured education from early years until sixth form or college, is it surprising that young people are turning to such serious crime?

Reply:

Young people do have a very structured and regimented education, but the problem is that once they reach adolescence all of the support seems to end. As a society we suddenly stop caring for young people, they go from being people who we love and cherish, to people who we cross the road to avoid. Young people sense this and internalise it, this is something I have spoken about with the Fair Futures Commission earlier this week. What we want is for an understanding in the community that we have to cherish and look after adolescent young people, rather than making them feel unwanted or a hostile presence.

Given that so many young people are living in overcrowded conditions, is it any wonder that they congregate in outside spaces. They are treated like criminals before anything has even happened, and that is something we need to look at closely.

Question c) from Councillor Ismail to Councillor Hull, Executive Member for Finance, Performance and Community Safety:

The recent terrorist attack at Finsbury Park Mosque has shocked us all, and more and more parents are worried for young Muslim girls going about their daily life.

Are you aware of these concerns, and what will Islington Council do about this?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Yes, we are very much aware of these concerns. Locally these issues are being tackled in a number of ways, including work on counter-terrorism and work on crimes against young girls. The Prevent Co-ordinator has been working very closely with a number of women in the area. Even before the terrorist incident, local women reported feeling afraid after leaving the mosque after evening prayers. This was relayed to local police and extra patrol cars were put on to have a visible presence in the area.

As a result of parental concerns we have delivered a Web Guardian programme, which is aimed at parents who do not understand computers well, and those who are concerned because they are unable to monitor what their children are doing online. This has become an increasing worry after the three girls from Bethnal Green were radicalised online and travelled to Syria. As a result of the course local mothers are able to use the computer, monitor the browsing history and set up parental controls.

A number of briefings have also been delivered raising awareness of the threats around extremism and keeping people safe. We are planning to run an advice session with a local Somali speaking police officer for local young women and girls. Young women have been one of the main priority groups in delivering a number of other courses.

Today I met representatives of the Home Office and the Police to receive an update on security and counter-terrorism, and what is being done to tackle the global extreme right-wing threat. Two recent referrals have been made to our Prevent Programme about extreme right-wing individuals, so it is very important that we take this threat seriously.

The council has also just reviewed and updated its Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy. It includes a partnership approach to work with all communities to ensure the message of zero tolerance around unacceptable practices and violence against women and girls is strengthened across the borough. We want to do more to support young people to address trauma they may have witnessed in their lives and address harmful attitudes and

behaviours early on. We also want to do more to support lower-risk cases to avoid escalation and limit the harm. These two areas will be a focus of delivery for the 'prevention' and 'provision' priorities in the strategy.

Finally, our Hate Crime Strategy was signed off in September last year, and one of the important commitments is to make sure victims of hate crime are supported and that there is a joined up response to ensure that the right support and safeguarding is provided. We have been working with the police and partners to deliver awareness-raising sessions with different community groups who are most likely to be affected by hate crime in order to provide reassurance, improve community confidence, encourage reporting and identify issues of concern that require a response.

Supplementary question:

Is the council working with young Muslim girls who are vulnerable, and who may be targeted due to their dress code?

Reply:

Thank you. Some of those projects I mentioned are working with young Muslim girls, and if you want more information on a specific programme I can get that for you. I will say that our Hate Crime Forum is led by representatives of the local community, and they are very keen to ensure that hate crime is reported to the police, and want to make sure that hate crime is being dealt with effectively. There have been three hate crime reports in Finsbury Park over the last week, including one today, and I have been liaising with the Police to ensure that they are being taken very seriously and hopefully they will result in prosecution and conviction. It is important that those who report hate crimes see that action is being taken. We will continue this work, and please do let me know if you have any suggestions for how we can best support young Muslim women in Finsbury Park and elsewhere.

Question d) from Councillor Smith to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

What steps will the Council be taking to ensure the important outreach services to women provided by the Paradise Park Cafe will be restored to a five day a week service?

Reply:

Thank you. We met with the parents at Paradise Park, and we know that they really value the café that has been operated by Islington Play Association for many years alongside the nursery. The problem is that Islington Play Association felt that they were not in a position to fund the café anymore, because they wouldn't be running outreach services from the building. This is because Islington Council's new early years' service will be running all of the outreach work, so the money they would have used to run the café isn't there anymore.

This is a really difficult issue. We don't run cafés and we don't fund them. Given the tough financial position we are in we have to do some very difficult thinking about this. To be fair, I can understand why the parents really value the café, and that the nuance of why the service is moving back in-house isn't important to them.

What we really need to do is find a situation that everyone can be happy with. The café has re-opened for two days a week. What we are trying to do is look whether we can use the café facility as a resource for parents in the wider area, and see if some of the area budget for the early years' service can go towards that, but that will mean trade-offs, because there is a

fixed budget for each of the different areas, which needs to cover all of the different services provided. We will keep on talking to the providers, parents and ward councillors, and hopefully we will find a solution. The parents have already come up with some really interesting fundraising and volunteering solutions, so hopefully we can come up with something that everyone is happy with.

Under the new early years model every area will have its own consultative body which involves parents, that will have a much more robust and direct way of intervening in how services are delivered, and there will be a budget for them to spend in line with their priorities, so there will be more opportunity for parents to decide how money is spent in future.

Question e) from Councillor Russell to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

Does Islington have a "Sports Pitch Strategy", as recommended by Sports England, and if not, does it intend to commission one?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. The council does not currently have a Sports Pitch Strategy. Islington's last sports and recreation assessment was undertaken some years ago, firstly through the Leisure Needs Analysis in 2006, and then as part of the wider Open Space Sports and Recreation Assessment in 2009. Clearly these documents are out of date, but earlier this year the council commissioned a Sports Facilities Update. The results of this will feed in the Local Plan review which will be framed within the wider policy context of the London Plan and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework which requires local authorities to plan for sport and recreation needs.

As you know, we have tremendous pressure on our sports facilities, not only the pitches, indeed we have the pressure of success rather than the other way around, which is positive but it does create problems. Nonetheless, Islington is the most active borough in London, Islington Tennis Centre is the most used indoor tennis centre in the country, and Highbury Leisure Centre is the busiest per square metre of any in London. I am pleased that we provide an amazing array of sport in the borough.

Supplementary question:

As there is no Sports Pitch Strategy, which is recommended by Sport England, do you not think that it might be a good idea to at least wait for the Sports Facilities Update before actually making the final decision on Barnard Park? Given you don't have the overall strategic view of sports facilities in the borough, would it not be pertinent to make any decision in light of that strategic review?

Reply:

The Barnard Park decision has been a long time coming. I think it was first discussed with the local community in 2008. It has been through all the processes of the council, and I think to delay it any more would be of great disappointment to people who live in the area.

Question f) from Councillor Russell to Councillor Burgess, Executive Member for Health and Social Care:

Is the Council in breach of its statutory duty to consult on the proposed changes to the Sobell Centre?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. The Council is not under a statutory duty to consult on the trampoline park project at the Sobell Centre and therefore no question arises of the Council being breach of any statutory duty.

The Business plan and financial settlement was agreed with GLL on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017 but was subject still to an agreement on how GLL would consult on the displacement programme with the users affected. The displacement strategy will enable 96% of users to continue their sporting activity; over 80% of those will remain at the Sobell. Volleyball, netball, badminton and gymnastics will all be getting access to court time equivalent to current use. The Council has increased the amount of dedicated football provision at the Sobell Leisure Centre by providing two new floodlit artificial surface pitches, enabling competitive FA standard provision and competition to be available and the rest moved to other FA approved nearby facilities.

We are continuing to review the operational implications with GLL. Islington has actually increased the amount of dedicated Football Association approved football provision at the Sobell. The new floodlit artificial surface pitches are solely for football, whereas the indoor sports hall is multi-purpose and not dedicated, so there is a net gain in football provision.

Supplementary question:

My question was about the statutory duty to consult. I have some case law you may want to have a look at, which suggests that by removing footballers from the Sobell, it is possible that the council has failed to meet its public sector equality duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in which case that would be discriminatory against the footballers on grounds of age. There was also a legitimate expectation of consultation, so the duty to consult had arisen due to GLL's prior promise to consult. Will Councillor Burgess consider these points?

Reply:

Please send me details of this case law, I would be very surprised if we were in breach of our statutory duties. We are continuing to invest in football, there are alternative facilities less than a mile down the road, and they can still play football.

**148** **ISLINGTON COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE GRENFELL TOWER FIRE (ITEM 9) AND MOTION 4: FIRE SAFETY IN ISLINGTON (ITEM 13)**

Councillor Ward moved the recommendations in the report set out in the additional despatch of papers. Councillor Watts seconded.

Councillor Russell moved the motion. Councillors O'Sullivan, Convery, Heather, Greening, Parker and Webbe contributed to the debate.

The recommendations were put to the vote and **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That Council's thanks be passed to the firefighters of Islington and across London for their heroism and prompt response to the Grenfell Tower fire on 14 June;

- (ii) That Council notes the urgent actions being taken by Islington Council in response to the fire at Grenfell Tower and the support provided to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the Grenfell Fire Response Team;
- (iii) That following on from urgently addressing the fire safety issues currently in hand, a thorough examination will be undertaken by Islington Council into how the sides of Braithwaite House came to be partially clad in a combustible form of cladding;
- (iv) That the council make public all existing fire safety risk assessments of high rise towers in Islington;
- (v) That the council reassure residents in Islington about fire safety and work with local residents to hear and address any concerns;
- (vi) That the council assist London level efforts to support the victims of the Grenfell Tower.

#### **149 ISLINGTON ARMED FORCES COMMUNITY COVENANT: ANNUAL UPDATE**

Councillor Watts moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Poole seconded.

The recommendations were put to the vote and **CARRIED**.

##### **RESOLVED:**

- (i) That activity over the past year to celebrate and support Armed Forces personnel, veterans and their families be noted;
- (ii) It be noted that, from April 2017, the Council has agreed an additional measure to support veterans: payments under the War Pension Scheme are now fully disregarded in the financial assessment for social care charging (with the exception of payments of Constant Attendance Allowance);
- (iii) It be noted that, in December 2016, the Council passed a motion to support the Royal British Legion's campaign for the 2021 Census to include questions concerning military services and members of the Armed Forces community, to provide more robust data to help target our support.

#### **150 CONSTITUTION UPDATE**

Councillor Gill moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Picknell seconded.

The recommendations were put to the vote and **CARRIED**.

##### **RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the amendments to the Constitution as set out in the Appendix to the report submitted be approved;
- (ii) That the council's right of referral to the Secretary of State in responding to formal consultations involving all of the Councils in the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee pursuant to Regulation 23(9) of The Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013 be delegated to the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- (iii) To adopt the Members Allowance Scheme for 2017/18;
- (iv) That authority be delegated to the Service Directors of Public Protection, Public Realm and Housing Operations to authorise the appropriate officers in their department with the relevant functions under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014;
- (v) That the Director of Law and Governance be authorised to make any consequential amendments to the Constitution considered necessary.

**151 CHIEF WHIP'S REPORT**

Councillor Gill moved the recommendations in the revised report set out in the additional despatch of papers. Councillor Picknell seconded.

The recommendations were put to the vote and **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

**1. APPOINTMENT TO THE HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

That Dean Donaghey be appointed as a resident observer to the Housing Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2017/18 or until a successor is appointed be agreed

**2. APPOINTMENT TO THE DAME ALICE OWEN FOUNDATION**

That Andrea Stark, Director of Employment, Skills and Culture, be appointed to the Dame Alice Owen Foundation until the end of the municipal year 2018/19 or until a successor is appointed be agreed.

**3. APPOINTMENT TO THE CAMDEN AND ISLINGTON NHS FOUNDATION TRUST**

That Councillor Turan be appointed to the Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust until the end of the municipal year 2017/18 or until a successor is appointed be agreed.

**152 NOTICES OF MOTION**

**MOTION 5 – FINSBURY PARK TERRORIST ATTACK – STANDING SHOULDER TO SHOULDER AS ONE COMMUNITY**

Councillor Shaikh moved the motion. Councillor Hull seconded. Councillor Ismail, O'Sullivan, Russell and Heather contributed to the debate.

The motion was put to the vote and was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

- To continue to support those affected by this terrorist atrocity in any way that we can;
- To work with the local community, faith leaders and the police to combat terrorism and hate crime in all its forms;
- To continue to work closely with local mosques, other faith groups, and the police, to assess security issues in the borough and to provide assistance and support where necessary;
- To condemn anyone who seeks to sow hatred in our community and our country either through their words or by their actions.

**MOTION 1 – PROTECTING ISLINGTON SCHOOLS FUNDING**

Councillor Caluori moved the motion. Councillor Debono seconded.

The motion was put to the vote and was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

- To continue to make representations to ensure Islington schools get a fair deal from the National Funding Formula;
- To work with its two MPs, head teachers, parent representatives and trade unions to make the case that Islington schools should receive adequate funding;
- That the Leader of the Council and the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families to write to the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Education, calling for Islington schools to receive sufficient funding and a fairer deal from the proposed National Funding Formula.

**MOTION 2 – PROTECTING EU NATIONALS IN ISLINGTON**

Councillor Gallagher moved the motion. Councillor Comer-Schwartz seconded.

The motion was put to the vote and was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

- To continue to make representations to urge Government to stop playing politics with the lives of EU citizens currently living in the UK by immediately guaranteeing their right to continue residing here;
- To continue to work with partners and the voluntary and community sectors to coordinate practical support for EU nationals who want to remain in Islington.

**MOTION 3 – CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM**

Councillor Comer-Schwartz moved the motion. Councillor Alice Perry seconded.

The motion was put to the vote and was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED:**

- To adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of anti-Semitism and to continue to work to make Islington a welcoming and tolerant place to all communities;
- To thoroughly apply this working definition to the Council's operations.

The meeting closed at 10.15 pm

**MAYOR**