

LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

COUNCIL MEETING - 5 JULY 2018

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

At the meeting of the Council held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 5 July 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present:

Bell-Bradford	Graham	Picknell
Burgess	Hamitouche	Poole
Caluori	Heather	Poyser
Champion	Hull	Russell
Chapman	Hyde	Shaikh
Chowdhury	Jeapes	Smith
Clarke	Kay	Spall
Comer-Schwartz	Khondoker	Turan
Convery	Khurana	Ward
Cutler	Lukes	Watts
Debono	Mackmurdie	Webbe
Gallagher	Nathan	Williamson
Gantly	O'Halloran	Woolf
Gill	O'Sullivan	

The Mayor (Councillor David Poyser) in the Chair

1 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting on 24 May 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and the Mayor be authorised to sign them.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

3 MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Clarke-Perry, Fletcher, Ismail, Klute, Ngongo, Wayne and Woodbyrne.

(ii) Order of Business

No changes were proposed to the order of business.

(iii) Declaration of Discussion Items

No items were declared.

(iv) Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor's thoughts were with all of those affected by the stabbing of a 14 year old boy near Archway the previous weekend. The Mayor said that the escalation of knife crime across London is a huge concern, and thanked the emergency services for their work in responding to all of the terrible incidents quickly and professionally.

The Mayor was honoured to attend the minute's silence to commemorate the anniversary of the Finsbury Park terror attack, alongside the family of Makram Ali, Mohammed Mamoud of the Finsbury Park Mosque; Toufik Kacimi of the Muslim Welfare House; representatives of Islington Faith Forum; local MPs, the Mayor of London, councillors and government ministers. The Mayor thanked the emergency services, councillors and council staff who responded to the attack and thanked everyone for attending.

The Mayor was pleased to attend Armed Forces Day, and thanked Islington Veterans Association and Cllr Poole, the Armed Forces Champion, for their ongoing work in supporting the armed forces.

The Mayor had attended the EPIC Awards, which recognise the outstanding contributions made by Council staff. The Mayor congratulated Jade Alexander, a social worker who supports disabled young people, for receiving the Employee of the Year award. The Mayor was proud to celebrate the achievements of council staff and congratulated all of the award winners and all of those nominated.

The Mayor had attended several community events, including the Cally Festival, Andover Soul in the City, Archway Carnival, the Amwell Street Fair, and events held as part of The Great Get Together, held in memory of Jo Cox MP. The Mayor was pleased to see so many councillors at community events, and encouraged everyone to support their local events over the summer.

(v) Length of speeches

The Mayor asked all members to be mindful of the timer and keep within the permitted length for speeches.

4 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Watts thanked everyone who attended the event to mark the first anniversary of the Finsbury Park terrorist attack. Councillor Watts thanked the family of Makram Ali and other survivors for attending, as well as representatives of the Muslim Welfare House and Finsbury Park Mosque. Councillor Watts also reiterated his thanks to all of those who provided support after the attack.

Councillor Watts said he was proud of how the borough came together after the attack; the terrorist, Darren Osbourne, had failed in his attempt to drive Islington's communities apart, as the attack had made Islington's communities stronger and brought them closer together.

Councillor Watts noted this was the first ordinary Council meeting since the local election and said that the administration had hit the ground running. The Council had decided to invest in new housing in EC1, had secured apprenticeships for local young people, had secured the largest fine in the council's history for a rogue private landlord, had launched a 'Housing First' pilot to prevent and address homelessness, and had stood up for local people in campaigns to protect NHS services and improve the accessibility of public transport. Councillor Watts said that, although the election was only a few weeks ago, the Council was already making Islington a fairer place.

Councillor Watts also commented on the recent stabbing near Archway and advised that community safety was a top priority of the administration. Local people were concerned about the safety of their neighbourhoods; the Council was firmly on their side and was working to ensure that Islington is a safe and welcoming borough.

Councillor Watts emphasised that the overwhelming majority of young people in Islington are not involved in criminal activity and praised the work of council services, schools and local organisations in providing opportunities to young people, despite the huge cuts to their funding. However, there are real concerns about youth crime in Islington, and the Council was working with the Police to address these.

Islington worked to prevent young people getting involved in crime through its 'early intervention' approach; the Council supported young people and their families by investing in mentors and caseworkers. The extra £2million the Council had invested to keep young people safe had provided a range of services for young people, as well as extra CCTV and pioneering work to understand the root causes of serious youth crime. However, keeping the community safe was increasingly challenging due to continuous government cuts to the council and the Police. The Government had cut 300 police officers in Islington since 2010 and this undoubtedly had an effect on the safety of the borough.

Councillor Watts was pleased that serious knife crime in Islington had fallen 13.5% compared to a London-wide increase of around 2% and praised the work of the Integrated Gangs Team, which included representation from the council, Police, JobCentre, NHS, and other organisations. The team worked to identify and intensively support young people entrenched in gang activity, helping them to turn their lives around and create a positive future for themselves. However, the council was not complacent, and following the recent stabbing near Archway, it was clear that further work is needed to support young people to keep the borough as safe as it possibly can be.

Councillor Watts said that the council would not shirk from this challenge, would work closely with the Mayor of London and Police, whilst providing challenge where necessary, and would work with local people who want to see an end to the senseless violence.

5 PETITIONS

Councillor Spall presented a petition on behalf of residents objecting to a planning application for a proposed shop, café and homeless night shelter on the Elthorne estate.

Councillor Heather presented a petition on behalf of residents regarding noise pollution and potential fire risks caused by restaurants on Seven Sisters Road.

6 PETITION DEBATE - REDUCE TRAFFIC ON NEW ISLINGTON QUIETWAY

Tabitha Tanqueray introduced the petition 'Reduce traffic on new Islington Quietway' on behalf of the petitioners. The petition was submitted at the 22 February 2018 meeting of the Council and, in accordance with Procedure Rule 19.1(d), was scheduled for debate as it received over 2,000 signatures.

Councillor Webbe moved the motion to debate the petition. Councillor Champion seconded. Councillors Khondoker and Russell contributed to the debate. Councillor Webbe exercised her right of reply.

The following main points were raised during the debate:

- Quietway 10 is a major cycle route through the borough, from Finsbury Park to Clerkenwell. The petitioners' believed that reducing traffic on Quietway 10 would make cycling safer and more enticing for all residents. Cycling has health and wellbeing benefits, and also helps to reduce air pollution.
- The petitioners' considered that the most cost effective way of reducing traffic would be modal filtering to reduce through traffic while still allowing residents to access their homes. This could be achieved through bollards or gates.
- The Council was working to provide healthier and safer streets for all road users, and wanted all residents to lead active and healthy lives and enjoy the benefits that came from cycling, without fear of injury.
- The Council was committed to delivering a successful quietway network across Islington, and was also very concerned by the borough's air quality and its effect on the health of local people. The Council understood the benefits of closing certain routes to through traffic, and was exploring options for improving the quietway route, however it was necessary to carry out comprehensive consultation with the local communities that would be affected by road closures, including local businesses.
- It was suggested that a 'live trial' approach could assist in engagement with local communities. It was also suggested that the health and wellbeing benefits of cycling should be a factor any public engagement on traffic reduction schemes.

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

RESOLVED:

To continue to encourage residents to participate in local democracy by carefully considering the concerns raised in the petition and to undertake the debate in a spirit of openness and transparency.

7 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE YOUTH COUNCIL

Question a) from Youth Councillor Bella to Councillor Comer-Schwartz, Executive Member for Community Development:

It was great to attend the celebration event to mark the repeal of Section 28 and to learn about how Islington has always been at the forefront of campaigning for LGBT equality. How are faith institutions encouraged to extend LGBT equality within education settings they are responsible for both inside and outside of the school curriculum?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I attended the celebration too, and it is important that we reflect on our history in Islington. The Council works closely with faith institutions to extend LGBT equality. An example of this is in our work with the Westminster Diocese regarding support for Catholic Schools. These schools access support from the Catholic Education Service alongside Islington Council's School Improvement Service and our Health and Wellbeing Team. Both organisations advocate for schools to be inclusive and sensitive to individual pupils. Governing bodies have responsibilities for schools' approaches in relation to the Equalities Act. The Catholic Education Service model policy for relationship and sex education suggests that schools include the statement, "that our school strives to do the best for all of the pupils, irrespective of disability, educational needs, race, nationality, ethnic or national origin, pregnancy, maternity, sex, gender identity, religion or sexual orientation or whether they are looked after children."

Our resources for Islington schools are accessed and used by faith schools, including the 'out with homophobia' teaching resource for both primary and secondary schools. Islington's relationship and sex education resources strive to be inclusive of all children and young people.

In the light of relationship and sex education becoming a statutory duty, the Health and Wellbeing team has been consulting with a number of schools, including faith schools, and will be issuing further guidance following consultation with a range of stakeholders, including LGBT groups within the borough.

Question b) from Young Mayor Honey to Councillor Watts, Leader of the Council:

At the recent council election, Islington's voters provided you with a mandate to continue with the commitment to make Islington a fairer borough. What positive things can Islington's young people expect during the next 12 months which will improve their lives?

Response:

Thank you very much. Islington Labour received 61% of the vote at the election, that is the highest any party had received in my life time. What people were fundamentally voting for wasn't about personalities, it was about politics, priorities, and making Islington a fairer place. We were the only party that had a serious plan for the future of our borough, and our manifesto included a range of policies to make Islington fairer.

I need to mention the work of the Fair Futures Commission. Islington is a fantastic place to grow up; I know that kids who are fortunate enjoy all of the opportunities possible to enjoy; including world class culture and world class job opportunities. If you have a bit of money, Islington is the best place to grow up in the world. However, people who are struggling do not have access to those opportunities, and it isn't fair. That fundamental unfairness drives our determination to make Islington a better place.

I would like to thank Jermain Jackman, Cllr Woodbyrne and others who took part in the Fair Futures Commission, as their proposals will make a real difference to people's lives. In particular, guaranteeing 100 hours of work-related experience by the time young people are 16, working with schools and employers to develop much better, industry-led careers advice, bringing forward plans to address holiday hunger, making the borough more welcoming by reviewing 'No Ball Games' signs in consultation with communities and young people, continuing to keep critical youth facilities open, and aiming for every young person to have experienced 11 cultural experiences in the borough by the time they reach Year 11. That is

fundamentally about ensuring that young people enjoy those same opportunities that the fortunate are able to enjoy, and that will make our borough a fairer place.

Question c) from Youth Councillor Lydia to Councillor Caluori, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families:

The YMCA in April 2018 conducted research to examine Local Authority expenditure on youth services in England & Wales. In just six years, Local Authorities have cut their expenditure on youth services in England and Wales by more than £750m.

As this research demonstrates, the long-term benefits of youth services are far too often overlooked and young people may miss out on opportunities outside the school setting to engage in activities that support their learning and development. What reassurance can Cllr Caluori provide to Islington's young people that Islington will continue to invest in youth services?

Response:

Thank you very much for your question, Youth Councillor Lydia. I completely agree with you that youth services play an important role in engaging young people and helping with their learning and development, especially in an area as diverse as Islington.

I think it is a scandal that the government is slashing funding for youth services across the country, so I'm really proud that Islington is actually spending more on youth services now than we were in 2010 when we came to office. We have opened a new youth hub near Old Street, we have an amazing summer youth offer available that you are helping us to promote, and the Summerversity and Launch Pad events really show how we are responding to what young people tell us they want: more life skills, and exciting and vibrant cultural and sporting opportunities.

I'm really pleased we are able to offer that, so we are going to continue to invest in youth services, particularly in support services for those who need it, and one of my highlights over the next few years will be working with all of you on how we can reach young people who don't access our services. Maybe they are shy, or scared to travel because of postcode issues, but it's important that all young people are able to benefit from our services.

Question d) from Youth Councillor Jemelia to Councillor Comer-Schwartz, Executive Member for Community Development:

It's been a great year for women as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of women being granted the right to vote following the suffragette movement. We would like to congratulate Cllr Kadeema Woodbyrne on becoming Islington's first ever women and girl's champion and Islington YCllrs have enjoyed working with Cllr Woodbyrne as part of the Fair Futures Commission. What will be the main focus for this role over the next few months, especially for girls and young women in Islington?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I share your excitement in celebrating the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage. Although we have come a long way in the fight for equal rights for women, it is not over yet. Too many women and girls in Islington and across the UK still face harassment, discrimination and violence.

We know that many girls and young women face barriers to opportunity, and the Government's austerity policies have had a serious impact on the younger generation. This is completely unacceptable and this Council wants all women and girls in Islington to feel valued and safe in our community.

So, I am very pleased that the Council has appointed a Women and Girls Champion – the first role of its kind in London. Cllr Woodbyrne will be working to highlight what more can be done to protect the rights of women and girls, as well as championing services designed to support them and end violence against them.

Cllr Woodbyrne and I are currently discussing the details of the role and I am pleased to share with you that her particular areas of interest are tackling period poverty and improving girls' and young women's self-esteem. I know she is looking forward to hearing from and working with women from a wide range of backgrounds. Cllr Woodbyrne will be working with myself, council officers, Voluntary and Community Sector partners and the local community as part of this work. I am sure she will also be meeting with youth councillors soon.

8 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

What conditions are the Council proposing to attach to the planning permission granted to the developers of the Richard Cloudesley site?

Response:

Thank you for your question. On 1 March 2018, the Council's Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission for 66 much needed new council homes and a new two-form entry primary school on this site. This resolution was made subject to the City of London resolving to grant planning permission for a duplicate planning application; this resolution was subsequently made by the City of London Planning and Transportation Committee on 26 March 2018. The resolution was also subject to any direction made by the Mayor of London, and the Mayor confirmed on 18 June 2018 that he did not intend to intervene in this application.

In addition, the resolution to grant planning permission was made subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement, and a number of planning conditions that were set out in Annex 1 to the committee report, which is available on the Council's website.

The Planning Committee also resolved to delegate authority to the Corporate Director of Environment & Regeneration, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, to make minor amendments to the Section 106 heads of terms and the conditions.

In accordance with the council's procedures, the committee report, including Annex 1, was published in advance of the meeting of the Planning Committee, and any late representations on the application were reported to the Committee. In addition to this, people who wished to speak for and against the planning application were given the opportunity to do so at the Committee meeting.

Interested parties were therefore provided with an opportunity to view and comment on the draft conditions either verbally or in writing.

Before taking their decision, the Committee properly and fully considered all the written and verbal material that was presented to the meeting, including Annex 1 of the committee report.

The Local Planning Authority is now in a position to issue its decision on the planning application in accordance with the resolution made by the Planning Committee.

Prior to the decision being issued, there will be some changes to the planning conditions set out in Annex 1 of the committee report. These changes will be extremely minor in character and do not materially or substantially change in any way the conditions that were agreed by the Planning Committee. In line with the resolution made by the Planning Committee a decision on these changes will be made by the appropriate officer following consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

Supplementary question:

This afternoon the crowd funder successfully reached its target, which means that the decision will be subject to judicial review. Will you meet me and the objectors to ensure that money is not wasted, and the London Borough of Islington is not again hoodwinked by the Corporation of London.

Response:

I am not going to apologise for 66 new socially rented homes. This Council has a clear mandate for building council housing; I acknowledge your request Sebastian, but given the circumstances will have to defer to our Director of Law and Governance.

Question b) from Benali Hamdache to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

Can the council inform me what the number 08449312211 is for and how many signs it's currently being displayed on in Islington?

Response:

Thank you, this is a really interesting question that has taken me on a journey. As you probably know, when you call this number, as I did, it plays a recorded message telling you to call an 03 number, which I appreciate is a frustrating experience. The 08 number, which is the original Arsenal Hotline number, was set up to provide information to local residents and businesses about Arsenal match days. The signage was created in 2007, under the Liberal Democrat administration.

I thought about this, and wondered what use the number is for the future, because if you have a smartphone you can easily look up Arsenal match day information online for free, whereas a phone call to the 08 number costs 7p or 8p per minute, and a call to the 03 number costs 3p per minute, although may be free depending on your mobile phone tariff.

The signage is a problem, and is clearly of no use to anyone, so I thought about what we could do. Then I discovered that the signage is due to be there until 2094, and would you believe, the number is displayed on approximately 4,000 signs. Unfortunately, as you can imagine, the cost of removal would be prohibitive.

Supplementary question:

Is there an overall plan to reduce street clutter, like redundant signage, and is there a way to check how many other redundant signs there might be around Islington?

Response:

I think that is a sensible question, during times of austerity it is right to consider the signage we put up, to ensure we are not wasteful. What I want to do in future is move towards smart city innovation, if we can install digital signs then we can change them instantly, and we can make streets more inviting at the same time. We are keen to work with those developing these sorts of solutions, I think it is the future, and that is what we will look to in future.

Question c) from Kaily Fox to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

What representations has the Council made to TfL in the last three months regarding the delayed improvements to the Shepherdess Walk/City Road/Bath Street junction?

Response:

Thank you for your question. This is of particular interest to me, and my fellow ward councillors, as well as colleagues in Hackney. We are keen to see this junction improve, and I know you are passionate about it too.

We have engaged with Hackney and Transport for London to push for improvements at this location, we are holding regular meetings and we are allocating resources to this issue. Over the last three months we have met with our counterparts to discuss this and other cycling-related issues, as it is important we see approach cycling as a cross-borough issue.

The progress of this TfL scheme has also been raised at a number of meetings of TfL's 'Islington Working Group', that focuses on the progress of TfL road and cycling improvements. I am increasingly frustrated by the length of time from the decision being made to the improvements being realised, although I understand that these things take time, and need detailed work.

Myself and my fellow ward councillors previously campaigned for two-way cycling on Bath Street. It took a long time, but eventually the changes were made, and it benefitted the local community. We will do the same now. We want to see the improvements happen, and we will be working hard to make sure they happen.

Supplementary question:

What will you do to make sure that the proposals happen?

Response:

It is important that we have engaged residents, who are keen to see things move. I am delighted that residents are pushing for change, because it will help the boroughs to reach an agreement. We will continue to work with TfL, and I hope that works will start mid-August. Thank you for all you do to push this agenda.

Question d) from Sarah Weiner to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

As a parent and local resident, I hope the council shares the commitment of residents and local councillors to supporting the Highbury/Finsbury Park community; preventing pollution increases in schools and standing up to Sainsbury's attempt to bully its way into Highbury (having revived its plans for building a second store on Blackstock Road). How can the

council help us as we try to protect our children, support local businesses, and keep our pavements for pedestrians?

Response:

The Council is committed to working with the local community to protect and support small businesses including local independent shops. As you are aware, the Council refused the previous planning application by Sainsbury's and successfully defended its decision to refuse the application when Sainsbury's appealed to the Planning Inspectorate.

Local ward councillors and Executive Members have been working with the local community to oppose plans for a second Sainsbury's store on Blackstock Road. We are therefore extremely disappointed, and quite frankly angry, that Sainsbury's has come in with a second planning application in the face of intense local opposition to their plans.

The Council refused the previous planning application due to its concerns about the impact that the proposals would have on the vitality and viability of Finsbury Park Town Centre and Highbury Barn; and the failure of the applicants to make adequate and safe provision for the unloading and loading of goods.

Unfortunately, the Planning Inspector did not agree with the Council that the application would harm the vitality and viability of the town centre and Highbury Barn. However, he did however agree that the proposed arrangements for loading and unloading were inadequate and dismissed Sainsbury's appeal. Sainsbury's new application therefore includes revised proposals for the loading and unloading goods at the store.

Public consultation on the planning application is still taking place, and I would encourage anyone who has an interest in the application to respond. I have had various representations on this issue from Councillor Gantly, Councillor Lukes, and Councillor Hull, the ward councillors have been very involved in this, and together with Councillor Shaikh, I have written to the owner of the site to ask for a meeting. I hope they will be willing to work with the Council to find an alternative to a Sainsbury's store on the site.

Supplementary question:

I'd like to thank the councillors for supporting the community on this. There has been a lot of talk tonight about taking the community with you, and I wanted to let you know that since submitting my question we have launched a petition against Sainsbury's, and in 8 days it has been signed by over 1,000 people. The community is furious about the arrogance of Sainsbury's. Work has already started on the building, if you look inside the building now, all it needs is some shelves. We thank you for your support. Given that the last planning application was almost two years ago, and we now have new data on pollution in the borough, can you re-assure us that there will be a new, full environmental and business impact assessment in relation to this application?

Response:

This will be an entirely new planning application, so it will need new assessments. They can't just amend the previous application.

Question e) from Nikki Uppal to Councillor Comer-Schwartz, Executive Member for Community Development:

Islington is one of the most deprived local authorities in the UK where a third of residents live in poverty and almost 70% of secondary school girls are eligible for pupil premium. Given this, what is the Council's short and long term strategy to address period poverty in the borough for both women and girls?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I share your concerns about period poverty, which means some girls are forced to miss school and women cannot afford to buy sanitary products. This Council is firmly committed to championing and protecting women by prioritising services and support that makes a difference to them.

On International Women's Day, the Council launched its Tricky Period scheme, in partnership with Streets Kitchen. We are stocking Islington's libraries with free sanitary products, for women and girls in need, and have been widely promoting the scheme.

We are exploring how we can further expand this scheme and work with more Voluntary and Community Sector organisations, and the private sector. This includes talking to Unilever and Boots about bringing the scheme into our schools, and we will be consulting with women and girls about how to do this. We want to ensure that every woman and girl who needs sanitary products has easy access to them in a dignified setting.

Period poverty is a symptom of the inequalities facing women and girls, so it is vital we tackle those inequalities too. This includes our work to fund targeted employment services to help longer-term unemployed women back into work, keeping open all three refuges in the borough, and changing our licensing policy so that more can be done to protect women in licensed premises.

Of course, there is plenty more to do. I am confident that the appointment of our new Women and Girls Champion, Councillor Woodbyrne, along with this Council administration's commitment, will enable us to further tackle period poverty and other inequalities facing women and girls in Islington.

Supplementary question:

Thank you for your response. We are pleased to hear that a champion for women and girls has been appointed. We are also pleased to hear that the Council is working on this issue. However, is it fair that the third sector are taking the lead on this? One of the things we are concerned about is period poverty among school girls, because we know it can affect their attendance and performance. We need to tackle this and make sure that menstrual products are available in schools. Islington has a flagship policy on universal free school meals and spent £1.7 million last year on this. It is a good policy, but it costs £500 per child per year. To provide free sanitary products in school would only cost £40 per girl per year, a fraction of what we spend on universal free school meals. Given that, what possible reason is there for the Council not to put the money forward?

Response:

Thank you. I disagree with your interpretation that the voluntary sector is having to lead on this work. I am really proud of our libraries, as well as the partnerships we have with the voluntary sector, and how we are working together on this issue. It is our ambition to get free sanitary products in as many schools as possible, and we are looking at creative ways of

doing that. We think it would cost around £100,000 a year, which is not a small figure, and because our funding will be cut by 70% by 2020, we know that these decisions need to be taken very carefully. That's why I want to discuss how the private sector can work with us and do the right thing for women and girls.

Question f) from Ernestas Jegorovas to Councillor Hull, Executive Member for Finance, Performance and Community Safety:

How important is it for the council to work closely with the local police to address high crime levels in the borough?

Response:

Thank you for your question. This administration takes tackling crime very seriously and is committed to keeping our communities safe. To this end, it is vitally important that the Council works closely with all our partner organisations, as well as with residents, to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour in Islington. The Police are certainly one of these key partners and we do work closely with them, day-in, day-out.

The government, on the other hand, seems hell-bent on making our borough less safe, cutting 70 per cent of the council's core funding since 2010 and leaving Islington with 300 fewer police officers than it had less than a decade ago. Regressive Government cuts to the Police leave our neighbourhoods less secure. Under a Labour government, the ward I represent, Highbury West, had a dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Team of one Sergeant, two PCs and three PCSOs. We now have a third of a Sergeant, two PCs and one PCSO. That's three and a third officers left policing a population of 16,000 residents.

Nonetheless, despite the government's short-sighted cuts, locally we have had some success of late, particularly when it comes to tackling youth crime in the borough, not least due to the £2m of extra funding we are investing in targeted work with young people on the cusp of criminality. Moped-enabled snatch-theft in Islington is down 60 per cent since Christmas. It is still too high, but concerted partnership action is having an effect.

In our Integrated Gangs Team, the council's youth services are working directly alongside Police and voluntary sector partners to identify and support young people to help them turn their back on gangs, as well as the siblings of gang members. In the last year, the IGT has worked with 133 young people to help give them the best possible start in life. It is, of course, challenging but we are pleased that Ofsted inspectors recently praised the 'strong and robust' support that our Children's Services give to vulnerable adolescents.

Since the launch of the council's youth crime action plan a year ago, knife crime with injury among under-25s has fallen by 13%, bucking the trend in London which saw a 2% increase. Gun crime offences also fell by almost 24.4% in Islington, compared to 3.7% across London.

We cannot be complacent though, and we will continue to work closely with police colleagues to tackle crime and the fear of crime. National government, though, has a role to play too. That is why this Council administration will continue to make representations to the government in the strongest terms to fund our police service properly, in order to keep our residents safe.

Supplementary question:

I have recently spoken to police officers, who told me they are finding it increasingly difficult to find space to hold drop-in sessions. I was surprised to hear that the council charges the Police for hiring their venues. Would you consider working closer with the Police, to ensure that they can hold these sessions with local people?

Response:

I will look into the Police being charged for the use of our facilities for their Safer Neighbourhood meetings, I am surprised to hear that happens, so if you have specific examples please let me know and I will raise it. We have a good working relationship with the Police and I know that they have used council facilities in the past.

The Mayor advised that there was no time remaining for questions from the floor, and encouraged members of the public with outstanding questions to submit them in writing for written response.

9 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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

Islington Council recently secured a High Court victory over a developer who was twice refused planning permission at the former Territorial Army site on Parkhurst Road, because the plans did not include enough genuinely affordable homes. This is a significant legal victory that will support this Council's plans to deliver more genuinely affordable homes for local people, including at the former Holloway Prison site. Can Councillor Ward explain what steps he and the Council are taking to ensure the precedent this judgement sets is recognised by the development industry and by government?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Yes, this really is a landmark legal case, which will help the Council, as well as local authorities across the country, to maximise the delivery of genuinely affordable housing. It will be a powerful tool that will help us dissuade developers from paying too much for land and then using the "dark arts" of viability to reduce the amount of genuinely affordable housing on the site in question. Put simply, you can't overpay for land, and then say "we can't afford to build social housing". They're not going to get away with it anymore. This is a hugely significant victory and we are very proud of it.

Following the High Court decision on 27 April 2018, the Council publicised the judgment very widely. The Parkhurst Road case was then featured in a number of development industry, planning and legal publications, as well as several local papers.

The case continues to attract media interest – only last week City Metric published my article on the Parkhurst Road victory under the title "Developers can no longer over-pay for land to wriggle out of their affordable housing commitments". Over the last couple of months, the case has also featured at a number of legal seminars/events organised by leading law chambers. It truly is a case of national significance.

Council officers distributed the High Court decision to all the specialist officer networks related to planning and development viability in London and have also been invited to give talks on the matter.

You might also be aware that in a highly unusual move, in a postscript to the judgment, Judge Mr Justice Holgate also recommended that the current, widely used, guidance on viability assessments by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors should be revised. That is *"in order to address any misunderstandings about market valuation concepts and techniques, the "circularity" issue and any other problems encountered in practice over the last 6 years, so as to help avoid protracted disputes of the kind we have seen in the present case"*.

This is something that the Council has been calling for over the last couple of years, due to serious concerns about how the RICS Financial Viability in Planning guidance note was being applied in practice. We are now looking to join forces with the Mayor of London to seek engagement with the Ministry of Housing Community and Local Government, the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors to take forward the recommendations set out in the High Court decision.

This is not our only significant achievement in this area. For the Holloway Prison site we prepared and published our own development scenarios and viability advice. This indicated that 50% genuinely affordable housing could be provided on the site. Our aim was to discourage future purchasers of the site from overpaying and then claiming that they could not afford to meet our affordable housing target. We were the first local authority to take this approach.

Supplementary question:

We were told by the Ministry of Justice that the Holloway Prison site would be sold in the spring; we are now being told that the site will be sold by the end of the year. Does Councillor Ward agree that the Council's demand for at least 50% genuinely affordable housing has put off those seeking to make a quick financial gain from the sale of public land at the expense of the local community, and does that bring hope that we can keep this land in public ownership, until we get a Labour Government in future, and we can then have full control over the site?

Response:

I heard Rory Stewart MP's statement last week, and all I can say is that there is no justice without housing justice. If the Ministry of Justice do not understand this, they are not worthy of the name. I hope Rory Stewart has done his homework, I hope Rory Stewart has read the high court judgement, I hope Rory Stewart has read Islington's Council Planning Guidance on the Holloway Prison Site. If he has not, I can summarise it for him: 50 per cent genuinely affordable housing, at least.

Question b) from Councillor Heather to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

The former George Robey site in Finsbury Park Ward is the subject of negotiations between Islington Council's Planning Department and a private developer for a chain hotel to be built there. I have asked council officers if genuinely affordable homes could be built on the site, in accordance with Council policy, but I have been informed this is not possible due to the location and size of the site. As there is enormous need for genuinely affordable homes in Finsbury Park Ward I am requesting your second opinion in this matter.

Response:

No one is in any doubt that Islington is facing an unprecedented housing crisis and there is a dire need for genuinely affordable homes across the borough and in Finsbury Park. I know you have personally been involved in much of the consultation on building new genuinely affordable homes in your ward. This Council administration is delivering Islington's largest

council house building programme in 30 years, and will have delivered 1,900 new genuinely affordable homes by 2022.

However, it is also important that we learn the lessons from the past, and that we ensure that any new homes, particularly council homes, offer their occupants a good standard of living and access to outdoor space. I am especially proud of the new council homes that we are building. I believe that they offer better living standards than many of the new private homes that are being built in the borough. This is in stark contrast to the 'poor doors' approach that is pursued and tolerated elsewhere. In addition, local residents are only likely to support increased housing densities, if any new homes are built to high standards.

As you are aware, the Sir George Robey site is currently in private ownership. The site faces directly on to Seven Sisters Road, which is a very busy road, and whilst it is not unusual for Islington residents to live on busy roads, the site also backs directly onto the railway. The site is also very small.

Due to its relatively narrow character and its location sandwiched between the elevated railway tracks and a very busy road, the site is exposed to high levels of noise and vibration and poor air quality. Unfortunately, planning officers have concluded that it is highly improbable that the site could deliver new homes that could achieve environmental health standards and meet the council's planning policies in relation to the quality of accommodation within new homes and the provision of outdoor space. It is likely a high proportion of any new homes would have to be single aspect, and they may not be able to have windows that open. The highly constrained nature of the site means that it would also be very difficult to provide outdoor amenity space for future occupants, and the site was not therefore allocated for a residential use in the council's Site Allocations Document.

As you have stated in your question, a planning application has been submitted for the construction of an eight-storey hotel on this site and planning officers are currently negotiating with the applicants. Planning officers are seeking to secure the inclusion of either affordable workspace or a music venue within the scheme.

I understand your disappointment, I am disappointed too, but we have looked very hard at this site, and our commitment to deliver good quality affordable homes for local people means that not every site is suitable. I would be happy to meet with you to discuss this further.

Supplementary question:

Obviously you will be aware that there is student accommodation next door, there is already a hotel fifty yards away, and you will be aware of the City North development, where there is no problem in building luxury homes. The noise and pollution doesn't seem to be a problem for the hotel.

You mention quality, but we hear about people living in private-rented hovels all over Islington, so it's all relative. What scares me is that development sites are not found easily, we need lots more genuinely affordable homes, especially in Finsbury Park ward, and do we really need another hotel fifty yards away from the other one? I don't think we do. I think we need genuinely affordable homes. I accept your point, but I don't feel as a local ward councillor that it is acceptable for this to go through without being questioned. So my question is, will you please go back and look into this again, just to check that it cannot be done? I want to be sure, and it is only fair to the electorate that we go through this with a fine tooth comb.

Response:

One thing that we agree on is that we are totally committed to building as many new genuinely affordable council homes as possible, so I would be very happy to go back and look at this one more time, just to make sure there is no way that we could develop genuinely affordable homes on this site. I will discuss this with senior officers and come back to you.

Question c) from Councillor Lukes to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

I know Councillor Ward will agree with me that it is unacceptable that anyone is forced to sleep rough on the streets, so I was concerned to find out that a couple of people had been seen sleeping on Highbury Fields. I know they are no longer there, and I know we are short of resources due to central government cuts, but could Councillor Ward provide an update on how this Council is supporting vulnerable rough sleepers, including those who may have no access to housing or benefits because of their migration status or rights to reside?

Response:

Thank you for your question Councillor; I completely agree that no one should be forced to sleep rough on our streets, and that's why the council invests a significant resource into preventing homelessness and getting people into appropriate accommodation as soon as possible. The Council commissions St Mungo's outreach team who make contact with those who are rough sleeping in Islington. This team offers support to all rough sleepers, including those who have no access to benefits and will signpost people to specialist services where needed. In recognising the increase in rough sleeping in the borough from 2016 to 2017, the Council has given additional funds to the outreach team for an outreach coordinator's post, to increase the capacity of the team, including outreach and case work.

Not just that, we are also developing new innovative approaches to helping those who face homelessness, and that's why I am very proud to say that we are piloting a Housing First model, which focuses on providing stable housing as a first step, to support people in leaving homelessness behind. But, ultimately we need a government that allows us to build the genuinely affordable council homes, and reverses all the damaging cuts to social security. We need a government that gives private renters more protections than rogue landlords, considering the most common reason for homelessness is the end of an assured short-hold tenancy.

We have been successful in bidding for funds from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government which will create additional roles, one of which is a part time No Recourse to Public Funds worker whose specific remit will be to work with rough sleepers who have no access to benefits. This is very welcome, but I would also like the Ministry to commit to more genuinely affordable homes and reversing austerity so that this Council can work together with them to prevent homelessness in the first place.

Supplementary question:

I agree with everything you said, but I am a bit concerned by the Homeless Reduction Act, which means that councils need to change the way that they are working with all of those who approach the local authority, and ensure that they actually do get help, advice, information and assistance to prevent their homelessness. I am concerned that we are not necessarily investing enough time and resources in training, supervising and encouraging our staff to take a collaborative approach with people who approach them when they are homeless. I would like to know what we are doing about training and changing the way our staff work with homeless people.

Response:

Thank you Councillor. The Homelessness Reduction Act is fine on paper; the elephant in the room is resources. This government seeks to place additional burdens onto local authorities, but without allocating additional funding. We are prepared for the Homelessness Reduction Act, and we have been busy training staff, and we have been looking over the past year at how our staff speak to homeless residents who need our help. I have shadowed our Outreach Team on an evening, and would be keen to get you involved in this process. I invite you to come out with me and the Outreach Team to see our process in action. Let's work together to make the process as good as it can possibly be.

Question d) from Councillor Khurana to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

Crouch Hill station in Tollington currently has no step-free access to its platform, which makes it inaccessible to residents with disabilities and mobility issues. The Equality and Human Rights Commission identified access to public transport as a key barrier for disabled people in the UK. Do you agree that Transport for London and the Department for Transport should listen to the calls of local people, and those of my colleagues and I as local community champions, and bring forward plans to make Crouch Hill station accessible for all?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I share local residents' and councillors' concerns about accessibility at Crouch Hill station. The lack of step-free access at the station makes it inaccessible to people with disabilities or mobility issues, and anyone travelling with heavy luggage or young children.

We are committed to making Islington a fairer borough for everyone. We are a borough that seeks to be exemplary on the issue of equality. This includes ensuring our community and facilities are inclusive and accessible for all. Frankly, it is unacceptable that people with disabilities and mobility issues cannot access public transport, and therefore find it harder to access education and work, and socialise. There should be no public facility which is a no-go area for people with disabilities or mobility issues.

This Council administration has been urging TfL to develop plans for all its stations in the borough to be made fully accessible through step-free access. I fully agree that TfL should bring forward plans to make Crouch Hill station accessible for all. There is a real opportunity, because the Gospel Oak to Barking line, which serves the station, is becoming an increasingly important transport connection. Why not make it good practice all the way through, ensuring that people with disabilities are able to access the station.

I am pleased that, in response to a letter sent from local councillors, TfL confirmed last week that it will consider the case for step-free access at Crouch Hill station when the Department for Transport and Network Rail next invite recommendations for Access for All funding. We expect this will happen next year. Until then, I am happy to support Tollington residents and councillors in making the case for Crouch Hill station to be one of the first stations to receive this funding.

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

Please outline how much money is being spent by the Council in Caledonian Ward on (a) general youth services; and (b) targeted youth services and other preventative measures aimed at reducing the high incidence of gang related crime and ASB.

Response:

Thank you for your question. I have a detailed breakdown on the spend on youth services in Caledonian ward, which I won't talk through now but I will share with you. The top line is that we spend £77,903.60 on general youth services in Caledonian ward. In terms of Targeted Youth Services, they aren't so easily divisible by ward, but the Targeted Youth Service holds one session per week in Caledonian ward, and that will soon be increasing to two. We also have the Y-Truck mobile youth centre which will be in the area. We're also looking to provide summer programmes.

I'd like to thank Councillor Convery and his ward colleagues for the amazing work they've done locally to respond to the very understandable concerns about crime and disorder; I was really pleased to come along to a local meeting, and it's really encouraging that people at the meeting wanted to support young people in the area, rather than demonising them. It's really important that young people are taking part in positive activities, so we will continue to invest in youth services.

Supplementary question:

Thank you very much, I look forward to seeing the detail. I congratulate the administration on how they have safeguarded the level of spending on youth services over the past eight years, at a time when we have faced significant financial constraints.

The reason I ask this question is that Cally faces really considerable obstacles. At times it feels that we have an almost unbreakable culture of youth crime and anti-social behaviour, a culture of violence, that has a pervasive influence throughout the neighbourhood and is making youth work delivery very challenging. We tend to face an institutional response, which is a bit youth-averse, risk-averse at times, that is not very geared to decisive action, and as a result we cannot say that all our young people are safe all of the time. It is worrying that there are hundreds of families that do not feel safe letting their kids outside. Do you agree that we could all work more effectively to make Cally safer for children?

Response:

I certainly agree that the funding we spend could have a bigger impact on the area, and I think we should look again at how that money is targeted at different groups. One issue we face in Cally has been providing activities for younger people, without them having the older young people around influencing what is going on, so I think we need to look at the details to make sure our services are effective.

I think this demonstrates a wider point, that things are not always interchangeable across the borough; some areas are very different, Cally is facing particular problems, other wards are facing other problems, and they are influenced by history, geographic location, and a range of other factors. I think we could do more to target our youth spending to reflect the needs of each area.

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

Supporting local people to lead healthier lives is a key priority of this Council. Obesity costs the NHS alone £5.1 billion every year and obese individuals lose on average 12 years of their lives. In Islington, more than a fifth of children start primary school overweight and more than a third leave secondary school overweight. It is clear that the vast quantities of sugar in our modern diets is unhealthy and is contributing to this health crisis. Could Councillor Burgess provide an update on what the Council is doing to tackle obesity and what more can be done to tackle the high levels of sugar in people's diets?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Last October Islington signed the Local Government Declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food. To sign the declaration, a local authority must make pledges across six different areas, details of this have been circulated in the handout laid round the Chamber. The aim of the declaration is not to ban sugar altogether, but to make a range of changes to make healthier choices easier and more convenient and affordable.

As part our commitment to raising public awareness, Islington has agreed to take forward the Sugar Smart campaign which is a vehicle for engaging our local communities and businesses to take their own action on sugar reduction. The official launch for Sugar Smart is now planned for later in the Summer, and some key local organisations have already given their commitment to signing up and to taking action. These include GLL, Arsenal and The Whittington Hospital.

One key aspect is giving local people access to free drinking water, so that people buy less sugary drinks. "Refill Islington" is a scheme that promotes local cafes, bars and other places that allow the public to come in and fill up their water bottles. 40 business have signed up already, and bids have also been submitted to the GLA to support the installation of water fountains in public places. In Islington we also offer advice and support to parents and their children around weight management which include cooking and eating sessions and 1-1 support. There is a range of work underway, and we will be doing more in this area.

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

The Roman Way Medical Centre, which serves 4,400 local patients, is due to close as one of the current GPs is retiring, the other GP proposes to move. As the GPs own the practice building, it will not be possible to continue providing NHS GP services from the current premises. Roman Way is a much-needed local GP surgery and the closure could particularly affect older and more vulnerable people, of whom there are many in the immediate vicinity. There is vociferous opposition to losing provision in this area from the residents. Working with Councillor Burgess and local people, the Caledonian ward councillors submitted a petition with 550 signatures calling for NHS England to provide a new NHS GP surgery for local people, or to ensure robust plans are in place to expand existing local NHS surgeries to ensure local people maintained good access to NHS services.

Now the NHS has delayed a decision on what to do next, will Councillor Burgess confirm that she will continue to work with us as local councillors to get the best outcome for local people, and can she confirm that this Council will always fight to protect the NHS and local people's ability to access NHS services?

Response:

Thank you for your question, and thank you for your fantastic campaigning on this issue.

The Council responded to the NHS England consultation on the future of Roman Way Medical Centre strongly supported re-procurement of this practice. This was based on evidence of existing and future populations in the immediate area and around nearby practices, and also taking into account sheltered housing and also new housing planned for the area.

The Primary Care Commissioning Committee, which is considering options for the future of this practice, listened to councillors' representations and the petition signed by residents, and took this into account at their meeting on 21st June. Recognising the impact on patients registered at the practice, and on other practices and their patients, the committee delayed making a decision on this practice's future. NHS commissioners have committed to meeting the partners at Roman Way Medical Centre with an aim of extending their notice period, allowing more time to find an acceptable solution.

We will continue to work closely with the Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure accessible and high quality primary care provision across the borough. The Council's Public Health and Planning departments have previously analysed the impact of new housing across the borough and practices that are likely to experience the greatest impact from this, and the CCG and the Council's planning department work together to identify how to ensure adequate GP provision for residents in those areas.

In answer to your question, and on the 70th anniversary of the NHS, and I'm pleased to say that this Council will always support the NHS, and support our residents in accessing NHS services.

Supplementary question:

Thank you. In addition to your response, please can you provide us with detailed reassurance that the impending risk of us losing further GP provision in our ward will be considered in discussions with the CCG and other stakeholders. As you will appreciate, Cally has one of the highest levels of deprivation in the borough, and our residents desperately need NHS provision across the ward.

Response:

Thank you. I will certainly raise this with the CCG. We are committed to working with the CCG to make sure that provision is continued there, and I think that the CCG and NHS England need to take these issues into account when making decisions. I know there are some concerns about the future of the Bingfield Street practice, however we are aware that the premises are owned by the NHS, so there is no reason why that would not remain as a GP practice.

The Mayor advised that there was no time remaining for questions from members of the Council, and that outstanding questions would be responded to in writing. The following responses were issued following the meeting:

Question h) from Councillor Jeapes to Councillor Shaikh, Executive Member for Economic Development:

It has been just over one year since the unreasonably high increase in business rates on Islington's businesses, for instance, Canonbury (the N1 area) has suffered a 39% increase. This will have the greatest impact on residents on the lowest incomes and/or those in receipt of benefits, the very people that the Prime Minister, Theresa May, has said she wanted to help – the "JAM's" – "just about managing". For example, a small business like a laundrette burdened with a 39% tax increase will put up their prices to compensate, so putting more pressure on Islington's residents already struggling with this Conservative Government's austerity agenda.

I would like to know if the Council has an idea of how many businesses have been so affected by this tax increase that they have left Islington to find cheaper, more affordable premises or have just gone out of business? What are we doing to get the message across that Councils do not set the rate, but that this is yet another example of a Conservative Government that actually does not care about the majority of residents, and in particular, has really no idea about JAM?

Response:

The Government's decision to revalue business rates has had a significant impact on local businesses in Islington. Many who face huge rates rises may feel they have no choice but to increase prices, which in turn impacts on residents. I therefore share your scepticism that the Prime Minister is particularly concerned about people who are 'just about managing' after years of austerity.

Although the Council does not set business rates, we have been working tirelessly with our local business community to galvanise opposition to the rates increases following the Government's revaluation last year. After a hard-fought campaign and delivery of a 14,000-strong petition to the Government, Islington received one of the largest shares of Government funding to help lessen the impact of the rates rise. Although this funding is by no means enough, this small amount of relief would likely not have materialised without this campaign.

At the time of the business rates revaluation, business rates bills rose by an average of 44 per cent. We do not have precise figures for how many local businesses have left Islington or gone out of business since the revaluation, but it is raised as a significant challenge in almost every conversation I and officers have with local small businesses.

As soon as the new business rates were set, the Council wrote to all local business owners to inform them that the Government had decided that their business rates would rise. In this letter, we made it clear the Council did not set the rates and urged all local business to check that their rateable value was correct. The letter also included details of how local businesses could find out if they were eligible for a discount, funding for which was secured following our aforementioned campaign with the local business community.

We have further spread the message that the Council does not set business rates through meetings and workshops on business rates, along with conversations with local businesses and Town Centre Management Groups. These conversations have resulted in a perceptible shift in understanding of traders, as illustrated by a notable fall in complaints about business rates. The Council is now seen more as a reluctant administrator of business rates rather than the rates setter.

We know that business rates is a key issue for businesses and we are in the process of developing another campaign to put pressure on central government to urge them to rethink the current system which is failing many of our businesses. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this campaign with you further.

This Council administration is firmly on the side of local businesses and residents. I urge you and your ward colleagues to contact me with any concerns you have about particular businesses who have been hit particularly hard by the Government's hike in business rates in Canonbury.

Question i) from Councillor Russell to Councillor Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development:

Given the smoke damage and difficulty in exiting the building experienced by residents in 6-10 Aberdeen Park in the recent fire, how many front doors are non-compliant with fire regulations in council properties, tenanted and leasehold, in each ward?

Response:

Fire safety is this Council administration's top priority. Our £38 million fire safety programme is supported by the London Fire Brigade, and we will act to comply with all the recommendations that emerge from the national public inquiry into the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower.

In the Council's directly-managed tenanted stock, we have 16,360 fire compliant doors. We are currently upgrading a further 3,539 doors and plan to replace a further 635. Where we have replaced doors to tenanted properties, we have also offered to replace leaseholders' doors, as leaseholders are responsible for their own front doors. Take-up of this scheme has been low but we are working to increase it through engagement with leaseholders.

Attached as an appendix to this letter is a chart breaking down the number of fire compliant doors in tenanted and non-tenanted properties in each ward, and doors that are included in fire compliance packages. We are working to ensure that necessary works are completed on all doors so they are fire compliant. *[The chart is appended to these minutes]*

In homes managed by Partners for Islington, we plan to survey all tenanted flat front doors as part of a recently-let contract to install interlinked heat and smoke detection and alarms. This work is due to begin in autumn this year and is likely to take several years to complete.

I would like to reiterate my thanks to the council staff and fire services who responded to the recent fire at Aberdeen Park on 29th May, and to the residents for their co-operation while repairs are being carried out.

If you have any questions or concerns about fire safety in particular properties in your ward, please contact me.

Question j) Councillor Russell to Councillor Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport:

The City of London has a pedestrian friendly Electric Vehicle (EV) charging policy that avoids any charging points or boxes being located on the pavement. Why has Islington Council allowed Source London to install EV charging equipment on the footway rather than on pavement build outs in the carriageway as has been done previously e.g. in Sherringham Rd?

Response:

Thank you for your question to me at Full Council on Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points.

I am pleased that Islington is leading the way in rolling out EV charging points. By 2022, we hope to have installed an extra 400 charging points across the borough, enabling local people who require a car to switch to more sustainable and environmentally-friendly options.

There are a wide variety of EV charging points, which vary in size and technical specifications. All of the Source London charging points are free-standing pillars and are significantly smaller than the rapid charger on Sherringham Road, which is approximately the size of a petrol pump.

The Council does not currently prohibit EV chargers on pavements. Instead, existing policy guidance is followed, which seeks to ensure that any new street furniture is appropriately designed and positioned to avoid obstruction on pedestrian routes. If all new EV charging points were prohibited from being located on the pavement, it would significantly hamper the Council's ability to provide the infrastructure necessary to support the transition from petrol and diesel vehicles to electric vehicles.

However, we want to ensure our footways remain accessible and navigable for all pedestrians. I have therefore instructed council officers to work with Source London to ensure that all new EV charging points provide a wider clear footway width of 1.5 meters. Council officers are also ensuring that all new rapid chargers are installed on build outs in the carriageway, such as the one on Sherringham Road, unless there are special site circumstances.

I am sure you will share my excitement that the Council is currently trialling Ubitricity lamp column charges in Balfe Street, and intends to roll out more of these charging points in the future. Although lamp column chargers avoid the creation of street clutter, they can only charge vehicles at a slow speed. It is important that Islington's EV charging network contains a mixture of slow, fast and rapid chargers, which all have different design and space requirements, to meet demand and need.

10 CORPORATE PLAN

Councillor Watts moved that the Council adopt the Corporate Plan 2018-22. Councillor Burgess seconded.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Corporate Plan 2018-22 be adopted.

11 CONSTITUTION UPDATE

Councillor Gill moved the recommendations. Councillor Hamitouche seconded.

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

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the amendments to the Constitution as set out at Appendix 1 to the report submitted be agreed;
- (ii) That the Members Allowance Scheme for 2018/19 be adopted;
- (iii) That the Director of Law and Governance be authorised to make any consequential amendments to the Constitution considered necessary.

12 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT

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

RESOLVED:

To note the decision taken on 13 April 2018 to award a contract to Insight Direct (UK) Ltd for the purchase of Microsoft licences.

13 CHIEF WHIP'S REPORT

Councillor Gill moved the recommendations. Councillor Hamitouche seconded.

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

RESOLVED:

Committee Appointments

- (i) That Katy Porter, Chief Executive of the Manor Gardens Welfare Trust, be appointed as the voluntary sector representative on the Health and Wellbeing Board and Haringey and Islington Health and Wellbeing Boards Joint Sub-Committee with immediate effect for a two-year term or until a successor is appointed.
- (ii) That Osama Al Jayousi be appointed as Primary Parent Governor representative on the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee with immediate effect for a four-year term or until a successor is appointed.

Outside Body Appointments

- (iii) That Councillor Nathan be appointed as a Council representative on the Sadler's Wells Foundation with immediate effect until February 2019 or until a successor is appointed.
- (iv) That Councillor Spall be appointed as a Council representative on Islington United Charities with immediate effect for a four-year term or until a successor is appointed.

Other Appointments

- (v) That Councillor Lukes be appointed as Migrants Champion with immediate effect for a one-year term or until a successor is appointed.
- (vi) That the appointment of Councillor Turan as a Deputy Whip of the Labour Group be noted.
- (vii) That the appointment of Alan Layton, Director of Financial Management, as the Acting Section 151 Officer be noted.

14 NOTICES OF MOTION

MOTION 1: FAIRNESS FOR ALL

As Councillor Ngongo had submitted apologies for absence, the motion was moved by Councillor Comer-Schwartz. Councillor Lukes seconded. Councillor Webbe contributed to the debate.

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

RESOLVED:

- (i) To explore establishing a programme of briefing sessions for Voluntary and Community Sector organisations, to enable them to provide advice to residents affected by the Windrush scandal;
- (ii) To explore how to direct local residents affected by the Windrush scandal towards independent immigration advice, including by providing training to Frontline council staff;
- (iii) To make representations to the Government to urge them to implement the recommendations of the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Detention, including to end the practice of indefinite detention and introduce a time-limit of 28 days on the length of time anyone can be detained for immigration purposes; prosecute staff if there is evidence of abuse in detention; only use detention as a last resort; and directly involve experts-by-experience in future inquiries into detention;
- (iv) To continue to support calls for the rights of local residents originally from other European Union countries to be immediately guaranteed.

MOTION 2: PARITY OF ESTEEM BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Councillor Gantly moved the motion. Councillor Burgess seconded. Councillors Clarke and Russell contributed to the debate.

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

RESOLVED:

- (i) To write to the Secretary of State for Health to urge him to ensure a genuine parity of esteem is achieved between physical and mental health services, and to provide adequate funding to ensure the NHS can deliver mental health services for all;
- (ii) To work with NHS partners, and the voluntary and community sector, to ensure residents can access the mental health services they need; including by providing community based preventative services and commissioning specific services for residents from BAME communities;
- (iii) To support Thrive LDN's campaign to empower individuals and communities in Islington to improve their mental health;
- (iv) To reaffirm this Council's commitment to ensuring the NHS remains free at the point of use, and remains publicly owned and publicly accountable.

MOTION 3: MAKE VOTES MATTER

Councillor Russell moved the motion. Councillor Watts moved the amendment circulated in the additional despatch of papers. Councillor Burgess seconded the amendment.

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

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

RESOLVED:

- (i) To write to the Prime Minister to ask her to guarantee the full rights of EU Citizens, including their right to vote and stand in local elections;
- (ii) To write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to make clear this Council's opposition to requiring voters to present photo identification before being able to vote, and to ask what plans the Government has to increase participation at local elections.

The meeting closed at 9:50pm

MAYOR

APPENDIX: CHART REFERENCED IN MINUTE 9, THE RESPONSE TO QUESTION I FROM COUNCILLOR RUSSELL TO COUNCILLOR WARD, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT:

Total Properties Per Ward	Total Tenanted Properties Per Ward	Ward	Number of Compliant Doors Per Ward	Number of Compliant Doors in tenanted properties	Number of Compliant Doors in Non-Tenanted Properties	Number of non-compliant fire doors in tenanted properties	Number of Tenanted Properties included in Packages	Number of tenanted properties not yet included in packages	Number of non-compliant fire doors in Non-Tenanted properties
489	270	BARNSBURY	108	105	3	165	157	8	216
2,935	2,083	BUNHILL	1,263	1,240	23	843	425	418	829
2,099	1,434	CALEDONIAN	959	947	12	487	481	6	653
1,900	1,492	CANON BURY	893	878	15	614	497	117	393
2,033	1,442	CLERKENWELL	487	478	9	964	946	18	582
1,776	1,358	FINSBURY PARK	891	879	12	479	479	0	406
1,365	871	HIGHBURY EAST	526	521	5	350	277	73	489
1,354	999	HIGHBURY WEST	476	459	17	540	511	29	338
2,339	1,620	HILLRISE	1,057	1,029	28	591	543	48	691
1,620	1,112	HOLLOWAY	541	531	10	581	542	39	498
1,557	1,069	JUNCTION	737	726	11	343	334	9	477
2,038	1,558	MILDMAY	1,165	1,149	16	409	396	13	464
1,523	1,091	ST GEORGE'S	436	433	3	666	659	7	421
1,150	841	ST MARY	333	328	5	513	444	69	304
1,630	1,153	ST PETER	759	754	5	399	341	58	472
1,447	1,064	TOLLINGTON	755	739	16	325	254	71	367