

Public Document Pack

LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

COUNCIL MEETING - 9 DECEMBER 2021

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

At the meeting of the Council held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 9 December 2021 at 7.30 pm.

Present:

Champion	Hyde	Poole
Chowdhury	Ismail	Poyser
Comer-Schwartz	Jeapes	Russell
Debono	Lukes	Ward
Gallagher	Nathan	Williamson
Gantly	Ngongo	Woolf
Gill	O'Halloran	Jackson
Heather	Picknell	

The Mayor (Councillor Troy Gallagher) in the Chair

163 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting on 23 September 2021 and the Awards Council (Freedom of the Borough) meeting on 18 October 2021 be agreed as a correct record and the Mayor be authorised to sign them.

164 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

165 MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) Apologies

The Mayor explained that not all members were able to attend because the capacity of the Council Chamber had been reduced to accommodate social distancing measures.

(ii) & (iii) Order of business & Declaration of discussion items

The Mayor advised that Motion 6, 'Repeal Islington Council's Low Traffic Neighbourhoods', would be considered after Item 5, Petitions.

Due to the volume of business to be considered, it was also noted that the Council may give priority to motions that had received amendments, to ensure that there could be fair debate on these items before the end of the meeting.

(iv) Mayor's announcements

The Mayor highlighted a number of meetings and events he had attended over recent weeks. The Mayor thanked representatives from his charities James' Place and Forum+, who were in attendance and would speak about their work later in the meeting.

The Mayor was delighted to launch the annual Poppy Appeal and was humbled and honoured to attend a number of remembrance events, culminating in Remembrance Sunday. The Mayor was very pleased that the remembrance events were well attended and thanked all of those involved in the events, including the Islington Veterans Association, local cadets, council officers and councillors. The Mayor also thanked Cllr Poole, as Armed Forces Champion, for his support to the events.

The Mayor was delighted to launch the Reading Adventure, which encourages young people to be engaged in reading, and had also given out awards for the Summer Reading Challenge.

The Mayor had attended the London Political African Conference with Cllr Ismail and the Speaker of Hackney and had discussed how we can best support African communities in London.

The Mayor had attended the Dickens Museum to see the wonderful Oliver Twist exhibition. Local schools had contributed to the mural to raise awareness of food poverty. The Mayor was pleased that Islington's young people had a great understanding of food poverty, environmental issues, and the need to give back to the local community and help the less well-off.

The Mayor had attended a number of events at the Irish Embassy, including an event to celebrate 35 years of the International Fund for Ireland, which promoted modern economic and social advancement while encouraging continued contact and dialogue across communities in Northern Ireland.

The Mayor had attended Islington Carers Hub to speak to young people and share his experiences as a teenager.

The Mayor was also pleased to attend a menorah candle lighting to celebrate Chanukah alongside the Leader and Islington's Jewish communities. The Mayor had also attended the festive light switch on across the borough. The Mayor asked that those present use the festive period to reflect on their own wellbeing, to support those

who needed additional help at this time of year, and wished the very best to everyone for the festive period.

(v) Length of speeches

The Mayor reminded councillors to keep within the permitted length for speeches. The Mayor also noted that the meeting was being webcast on the council's website for those who were unable to attend in person.

166 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader noted that for the third successive meeting not all councillors were able to participate in the Council meeting as the government had not taken action to allow councillors to participate in meetings virtually. The Leader said this was particularly unfair for councillors who may be vulnerable to Covid, and noted concern at the recent rise in cases.

The Leader thanked the Mayor for his service to the borough. The Leader had been pleased to join the Mayor at several events, including the lighting of the Menorah at Islington Green to celebrate the start of Chanukah. The Leader was also pleased to attend the Mayor's Charity Dinner; the work of the Mayor's charities was admirable and the Leader looked forward to hearing more about their work later in the meeting. These charities did brilliant work to support some of the most vulnerable people in the borough and this mirrored the values of the Council.

The Leader spoke about the cost of living crisis and expressed concern for local people experiencing financial hardship. The government had cut universal credit payments at a time when people are still recovering from the financial effects of the pandemic; this had made life even more difficult for families on low incomes, alongside rising energy costs, high levels of inflation and food shortages in supermarkets.

The Leader was pleased that Islington offered one of the most generous resident support schemes in the country, and to further assist those families on lower incomes, the Leader announced that the Council would be distributing £200 supermarket vouchers to nearly 6,000 households in Islington most in need of support. The Council would also fund free school meals vouchers for eligible families through the school holidays.

The Leader wished everyone in Islington a peaceful and joyous festive break.

167 PETITIONS

A petition was received from Jody Graber containing objections to the council's People Friendly Streets scheme.

A petition was received from Rachael Swynnerton relating to promoting biodiversity and objecting to the spraying of glyphosate weed killer.

A petition was received from Martin Franklin objecting to the North London Waste Authority's Head and Power Project, which included plans for a new incinerator facility being developed in Edmonton.

168 NOTICES OF MOTION

The Mayor reminded councillors that this item of business was being brought forward on the agenda.

Motion 6: Repeal Islington Council's Low Traffic Neighbourhoods

Councillor Ismail moved the motion. Councillors Russell and Champion contributed to the debate. Councillor Ismail exercised her right of reply.

The motion was put to the vote and was rejected.

169 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Question (1) from Melissa Hetherington to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport was withdrawn prior to the meeting,

Question (2) from Helena Farstad to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Buildings (commercial and residential) are the largest source of carbon emissions in Islington. Without addressing Islington's leaky properties Islington Council will not meet its 2030 net zero carbon target without major offsetting. When is the Councillor planning for the work to commence retrofitting the buildings and 25,000 homes under direct Council control; and how will he approach the challenge of convincing the remaining 78,000 or so households to do the same?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Islington Council is focused on tackling the housing crisis for local people, as well as the climate crisis, and the housing crisis caused by this government. A key part of that work is ensuring that our housing stock is of the highest possible standard. We are working with University College London to develop a strategic roadmap and options for decarbonising all of our Council housing stock. The project with UCL will also look at the feasibility and approach to minimising carbon footprints within our housing estates. This work built on our extensive ongoing programme of insulation and energy efficiency in our stock, which means that over 20,000 of those homes have achieved an EPC rating of C or above. In parallel to our work with UCL, we will be undertaking large-scale trials of low carbon heating solutions on pilot estates that we are currently in the process of selecting.

As part of our work to decarbonise homes in the borough, we have also successfully secured, and will continue to apply for, new government grant funding to implement energy efficient measures into council-owned street properties, which are amongst the least energy efficient. A large proportion of the grant funding we apply for is also targeted at supporting the implementation of measures into privately owned homes for eligible households. However, we know that the extensive work that would be needed to truly tackle poor energy efficiency of our council homes, as well as those homes not under the control of this council, will take significant funding. After 10 years of cuts from this government, we can't do this alone. If this government is

serious about tackling the climate emergency, they need to urgently provide funds for councils to take the necessary action, including for the retrofitting of homes and buildings. I hope you will support our campaign Helena, thank you so much for your question.

Question (3) from Andrew Willett to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

My impression from the early months of the People Friendly Streets is that they have made a massively positive difference to the numbers of people walking and cycling around Islington, while it also appears that traffic on some of the main roads, for example the Blackstock Road, is starting to 'normalise'. Could the Councillors please confirm if this is in line with what the data is telling them?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I'm delighted that you feel that the People Friendly Streets schemes have made a positive difference. My experience does accord with yours, but I also accept the fact we need objective data, which is why we've carried out the 6 months interim reports, the pre-consultation reports, and we will also do a consultation report.

These do show the changes in traffic volumes and speeds, as well as people cycling, and impacts on boundary roads and internal streets. I would like to emphasise traffic counts and monitoring reports are carried out by independent organisations. A few at the beginning were peer reviewed, but since then they have been carried out by independent companies.

The results are impressive; traffic levels have fallen significantly. For example, in Canonbury East, motorised traffic within the low traffic neighbourhood has reduced by 80 percent; in Highbury we've had increases in people cycling by about 66 percent. I know people remain concerned about what happens on main roads, and so are we, so we are monitoring that as well.

Overall, there hasn't been significant changes on main roads, in some cases they have gone up, in some cases they have gone down. We are monitoring them to make sure that in no road has something which is very significant, because we do need to make sure that we don't have a situation where, for example, traffic just displaces onto one street and causes real problems there.

Monitoring does suggest that traffic patterns settle over time, people change behaviour, and this is demonstrated in the evidence elsewhere. But we are absolutely looking at what we can do to make main roads less hostile. It's also maybe the case that there might be some changes to junctions that we can make to improve the situation.

Having said all that, yes it is important to have objective evidence, but people's views are also very important to us, which is why we are listening to your views, we are also listening to people who have different views, have mixed views, or in some cases have no views at all. That's why we will take all this into consideration before we

make a decision on whether to make a scheme permanent, to amend it, or to remove it.

Question (4) from Lucy Facer to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

Islington Clean Air Parents would like to acknowledge the council's work and commitment to addressing air pollution in Islington, however children are still exposed to illegal levels of pollution in parts of the borough and air pollution monitoring shows all schools in Islington exceed the new World Health Organisation (WHO) targets. With evidence that there is no safe level of air pollution, will the council revise current air pollution targets in their policies to meet WHO 2021 air quality recommended targets?

Response:

Thank you for your question. I absolutely agree, we need to do all we can to reduce air pollution to the lowest possible level. As you know, we were working to meet the guidelines that were established in 2005. We've always said that no level of pollution is safe. It's an extremely important part of our commitment to make Islington cleaner, greener and healthier. We are working with the Mayor of London and neighbouring boroughs on this issue, with some real success.

Schemes such as ULEZ and People Friendly Streets which enable more people to walk, cycle and wheel have made a difference, and hopefully will continue to make a difference. We've also put in place our extensive School Streets programme, we're embarking on electrification the fleet, where we can't actually remove that vehicle, a highlight of which is our three fully electric refuse collection vehicles, with another due imminently.

Meeting the new World Health Organisation targets and interim guidance levels will be extremely hard. We are very much impacted by pollutants elsewhere, including from northern Europe. Even if we removed all sources of pollutants in Islington, we would still be unlikely to meet the new guidelines. However, the measures that we must take to tackle climate change, such as replacing gas boilers, as well as moving to more sustainable transport, and the roll-out of electric vehicles, will still make a significant difference.

There is a prospect of largely eliminating nitrogen dioxide in the medium to long term, depending of course on what policies are put in place by and support from this government. To answer your point though, there doesn't seem to be a clear path. We are working with researchers to see whether we can reach the required levels, but it will take time to look at that. We will need European countries to phase out coal and other fossil fuels, and solid fuels such as wood, and also fertiliser use in UK. They will also require shifts to active travel, not just in Islington but across London and across the country.

In short, there's a huge amount we can do, and we must do, in partnership with local residents and other organisations, but it will be a real challenge to get us the new WHO levels. The Council will update the air quality strategy and the action plan with

the aim of working towards the new guidelines, and we will certainly continue to work with the community to tackle this together, and I'm sure that Islington Clean Air Parents will be at the forefront of that.

Question (5) from Caroline Royds to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

Does the Council agree with the Committee on Climate Change that “achieving significant emission reductions requires a step change, moving away from landfill and incineration and towards a reduction in waste arisings and reuse and recycling”?

Response:

Reducing waste, encouraging re-use and maximising recycling was a real priority before we declared a climate emergency in 2019, and it's now a very significant part of our net zero carbon strategy. This was discussed at an Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee meeting last week, where officers attended to discuss not just reuse and recycling, but also the new Circular Economy Action Plan.

In Islington, reducing waste in the first place is so important. The 30 percent recycling rates seem very low; a high recycling rate is a really difficult thing to achieve in our densely populated borough with so many flats. So reducing waste in the first place is far easier. The generation of waste also has significant environmental impacts, even if it is recycled. We are working hard with residents, landlords, businesses and other partners, including the North London Waste Authority, to do what we can.

There are many initiatives throughout the year, including using Recycling Champions to share their expertise and reach out local people. I'd also like to mention one of our new initiatives, The Library of Things, which allows people to borrow items, rather than to buy.

We really need our government to step up; they must provide a framework which prevents waste and enables more recycling and reuse. We cannot do this without that support, but their action so far has been disappointing, to put it mildly.

Questions 6, 7 and 8 received a joint response:

Question (6) from Jonathan Ward to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

In relation to the proposals for the redevelopment of Holloway Prison, are you happy with the poor-quality living conditions of the proposed homes?

A significant number of homes, especially social housing, will require air conditioning to keep them comfortable. It is unacceptable that the number of apartments affected is not confirmed, neither are the additional running and maintenance costs for residents, nor the additional carbon emissions. An expert has estimated that hundreds of homes will require this air conditioning. This goes against Islington and GLA policy. The extreme density and height of the buildings site also means that over half of the living rooms will fail to meet the applicable targets for annual and

winter sunlight and that 208 of the rooms will fail to meet minimum daylight requirements. Are you happy with the proposed poor-quality living conditions for Islington residents, and the negative impacts on their lives?

Question (7) from Richard Hope to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

In relation to the proposed Holloway Prison development, why do the flats facing on to Camden Road and Parkhurst Road need mechanical ventilation?

Question (8) from Robin Nicholson to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Given the overheating of so many new homes as a result of being single aspect without through ventilation, is the Council satisfied that the high proportion of flats without through ventilation is acceptable?

- There are no flats on the whole development which are 'through aspect' i.e. providing ventilation from front to back
- 484 flats or nearly half all flats are 'corner' aspect, i.e. with a front and side window and corner aspect flats will overheat if facing south and west
- 60 flats or 6% of all flats are single aspect – i.e. no through ventilation at all and subject to overheating, especially those on Parkhurst Road who will not want to open window because of the noise and pollution
- 441 flats, or nearly half are what they call 'stepped/double aspect' or what amounts to a bay window and to all intents and purposes single aspect and contrary to the London Plan.

The measurements of overheating given are limited and don't consider all flats. The social housing is particularly affected, which means they will need cooling systems, which will only add to tenants' costs.

Response to questions 6, 7 and 8:

Thank you for your questions. The Holloway Prison site development is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to build hundreds of brand new social homes in the heart of Islington. The borough is facing a housing crisis and in particular a dire shortage of genuinely affordable homes. Wherever possible, the Council wants to secure the greatest reasonable number of genuinely affordable homes on development sites that are not owned by the Council, however we also want to deliver the best possible quality and sustainable homes for future residents. This is a requirement of the council's planning policies.

The council is currently in the process of assessing and determining this planning application. I cannot therefore comment on the detail on the merits or otherwise of the application; this is a matter for planning officers and ultimately for the Planning Committee, if the recommendation is recommended for approval. However, I have passed your questions on to planning officers for consideration.

To answer a couple of issues raised in the questions; the new homes will receive fresh-air by mechanical ventilation systems, but it will not be air-conditioned. Planning officers, with the support of colleagues in Sustainability and in Environmental Health, are still completing their initial assessment of the application documents. Based on their early assessment, planning officers have identified areas where they conclude that the planning application documents may not be as clear as they should be in relation to the issue of potential overheating of some of the buildings. They are seeking further information from the applicants on this topic, as well as on wider sustainability issues.

In terms of Daylight and Sunlight in the homes, the application will be assessed against the relevant council and GLA planning policies and the BRE guidance. Thank you again for your questions.

Question (9) from Anita Grant to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Are you happy about the poor quality of the Holloway Prison proposal for children? It lacks a child centred site wide response, with fragmented play areas, some are shaded and windy, some are behind gates in residents' only areas, and 0-4 year olds will be playing next to a 2-way road. It seems a shame when so much work has been done in Islington to put children first and when the need for excellent play is being recognised more and more, that this proposal for the prison site is being considered.

Response:

Thank you for your question. As I said in the previous answer, the Holloway Prison site development is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to build hundreds of brand new social rent homes right in the heart of Islington. The council is in the process of assessing and determining this planning application and I therefore cannot comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval. However, I have passed your query onto planning officers for consideration.

Every child in the Borough deserves to grow up in a safe, secure and decent home. Not all of Islington's children have this advantage. Delivering decent, safe and genuinely affordable homes is the best way of ensuring that many more of Islington's children have the best possible start in life. The council has continued to protect and invest in playground facilities right across Islington to provide the best possible services for young people, but not just that, on every development site in the borough we want to deliver the best quality homes and facilities for future residents, including children and young people. The Holloway site is no different; we will continue to press Peabody to explain and demonstrate how they will deliver a child centred site through their planning application. Thank you again for your question.

Questions 10, 11 and 12 received a joint response:

Question (10) from Nick Clarke to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

The North London Waste Authority will decide on 16 December whether to build the Edmonton Incinerator. To put this project in context the entire county of Chad emits about 900,000 tonnes of CO₂ per annum - not much more than the 700,000 tonnes annual emissions from this proposed incinerator. Lake Chad has shrunk to 1/10th its size due to climate change, affecting 30 million people who rely on its water. In the words of environmentalist Hindou Ibrahim from Chad: "Climate change is real and its not about our future it is about our present... we need solutions, we don't have time. It's now the time for action and immediate action for those people who are getting impacted who didn't create this climate thing."

On 9 July 2020 the Council passed a motion regarding Atonement and Reparations for the United Kingdom's Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Africans acknowledging: "a great deal of the wealth of the United Kingdom was founded on this vile crime against humanity, and the legacies of chattel, colonial and neocolonial forms of enslavement are still prevalent in our society today".

Does the Council not recognise that postponing our move to a circular economy by 25 years because we do not have the will and imagination to see beyond our waste fuelled culture and economy is a perpetuation of this crime against humanity?

Question (11) from Kate Pothalingam to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

The Labour Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, is on the record saying "London is facing a climate emergency and I will continue to oppose new incineration capacity in London, which is not needed to manage the city's non-recyclable waste." Why does Islington Labour not agree?

Question (12) from Ben Griffith to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

On 16 December, Councillors Champion and Gill, as the Council's representatives to the North London Waste Authority, will be voting on whether to award a contract as part of the plan to incur £1.2bn of council tax payer debt to build a new bigger waste incinerator and other facilities at Edmonton. They will be encouraged to vote in favour of the Edmonton Incinerator because it is claimed there is no better alternative; and yet we know this decade is crucial to reduce our CO₂ emissions - the council has set 2030 as a deadline for net zero.

Instead of the incinerator, we can sort our waste into its constituent parts. We can educate, support and incentivise the general public to do this. We can pressure companies to reduce waste. We can invest in mixed waste sorting technology. In this view I find myself supported by the Chief Scientific Advisor to DEFRA who states 'incineration is not a good direction to go in'

The NLWA commissioned Ramboll to compare the carbon impact of incineration to landfill. But would Councillors Gill and Champion please describe what circular economy alternatives to incineration have been considered by the NLWA? Please detail any specific feasibility studies that have been commissioned by the NLWA describing circular economy alternatives to incineration?

Response to questions 10, 11 and 12:

Thank you for your questions. I understand that this is a difficult topic, and I do understand the position of the people who don't believe that this is the right solution, but I'm also asking them to perhaps reflect on the reasons why we think it is.

We do know that climate change impacts on poorer countries and on poorer communities; there is absolutely a need for richer countries to tackle emissions, but also to support developing countries with both money and technology. We also know it's an existential threat to all of us, and COP26 frankly was not particularly encouraging in that regard. Local authorities like Islington are doing a lot, but unfortunately much of this is outside of our control. It's not a lack of will, it's not a lack of imagination.

I agree with Ben, we must do what we can, and we will do what we can, we are doing a lot, but his language is illustrative. He talked about the need to educate, support and incentivise, and frankly that is our problem. We can't make people generate less waste. We can't make people recycle more. We can persuade, we can try, but it's incredibly difficult, and as I said earlier, it's particularly difficult in a borough like Islington, with such densely populated properties and flats.

Our power has actually been reduced by the government. What we need is for them to provide the framework to prevent waste, enable reuse, and recycle. If the government don't do that then frankly we don't get very far. We also need this government to fund local authorities, so we can go out and talk to people. We can put facilities in place that will encourage people to do to change their behaviour, and we can work with businesses and residents, but this is a government that didn't even mention climate change once in their budget, so frankly I'm not that optimistic.

The Mayor's London Environment Strategy states in London will have sufficient residual waste capacity once Edmonton is developed. No one wants to incinerate waste. But this is our choice unfortunately: do we dispose of our waste through a publicly controlled facility, run by a wholly-owned company of North London Waste Authority, which comprises elected representatives who have specified the highest environmental standards and have the determination to adopt new technology, including carbon capture, as soon as it becomes available; or do we effectively wash our hands responsibility for the waste disposal by sending it to privately run companies, motivated by profit? Their duty is not to the residents, and we would have no control over their standards or the costs.

We are held to a higher standard because we're here to serve the public. We know we will listen, and will do the very best we can. What is important is we hold ourselves to a higher standard. That is why I trust North London Waste Authority, and my

council colleagues, to deal with our waste not now, but in coming years as well, over companies who make a business of it.

Question (13) from Bridget Fox to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Islington Council claims to support recycling, yet communal recycling bins and waste areas on our estates are regularly left overflowing. What measures is the Council taking to clean up its act?

Response:

Thank you very much for your question. Islington Council is determined to tackle the climate crisis. An important part of that is effective and sustainable waste and recycling. Our recycling process covers the widest range of materials in the country. Many residents have the maximum opportunity to recycle. We also provide public reuse and recycling centres for items that cannot be recycled in household collection.

We are focused on increasing the number of recycling facilities across our borough to make it easier and better for local people to recycle, as well as to prevent fly-tipping. Estate staff work closely with enforcement teams to tackle fly-tipping, identifying hotspots, sharing intelligence, using CCTV to assist in, and identifying those who dispose of refuse incorrectly. Areas are regularly inspected by our estates staff and we will continue to review both bin capacity and collection frequencies to prevent overflowing bins on our estates. If residents have concerns with any specific areas on their estates please contact our Estate Services team and please feel free to contact me as well. Thank you very much for your question.

Question (14) from Filip Rambousek to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

With so many families in overcrowded or unsafe council accommodation, what is the average void time to turn around council homes between tenancies, and why is it taking so long to make these much-needed homes available?

Response:

Thank you very much for your question. The council is focused on providing safe and decent genuinely affordable homes for local people. There is a housing crisis in our borough caused by this government, with too many people living in unsuitable homes. A key part of tackling the housing crisis is to make the most of our current housing stock, and we've got to do that as efficiently as possible.

The average void turnaround time for a routine void is 26.5 days for 2021-22 so far. The council remains focused on reducing the time it takes for a property to be refurbished and made ready for new tenants, balancing speed of turnaround time with the need to make homes fit and welcoming for new tenants, so we'll continue to try and get better at this. There is nothing better in my job than going to see residents and families whose life has been transformed because they've moved into a council

home. I hope that I can visit many more residents in that situation, so we will continue to work on reducing our void times, and indeed on building as many council homes as possible. Thank you again for your question.

Question (15) from Melissa Herman to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

In relation to the proposals for the redevelopment of Holloway Prison, the SPD is referenced in the emerging plan site allocations document as a document that 'will be given significant weight in terms of future determinations' and states the following:

5.44 In reflection of the council's commitment to community cohesion and the value and vitality associated with diverse communities, the residential elements of a future scheme should be based on a layout which maximises tenure integration, with affordable and private housing built to the same standards and indistinguishable from one another in terms of design quality, appearance and location on site. There should be no separation of amenity or facilities according to tenure.

In Peabody's plans for Holloway, many of the homes for social rent will be on the main road in the tallest block planned for the site and there is no pepper potting or tenure mixing with the blocks. How will the council ensure tenure integration and equality of standards (e.g. space, aspect, materials used) between tenures on the Holloway development?

Response:

Thank you for your question. As you will have heard already this evening, I am passionate about making sure the Holloway Prison site delivers on its potential to be a generational opportunity to properly tackle the housing crisis in our borough. Let's make no mistake, this government thinks of our borough as a cash cow; that's why they sold Holloway Prison for the maximum possible receipt, so they could use that money to build super prisons away from away from our borough, and take those proceeds out of our borough. The government thinks of this borough as a cash cow, and we won't take that.

As I've said earlier this evening, the council is in the process of assessing and determining this planning application, and I cannot therefore comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval. However, I have passed on your query to planning officers for consideration.

The Council's planning policies in respect of residential amenity apply equally to all housing tenures and all housing tenures are expected to meet the same standards. We are very strict about that. We also want to make sure that all new developments, including this one, are tenure blind. That is why we work so hard on our planning policies. This principle is set out very clearly and very strongly in the Council's planning policies. These policies require that private and genuinely affordable homes

are built to the same standard and offer the same visual appearance and quality of living accommodation and amenity to their occupants.

I was proud this morning to visit Charles Simmons House in Clerkenwell ward, which has just been completed. This was going to be a half-private development, but as a result of funding from the Mayor of London, it is now 100% council housing scheme, and this is something to be proud of. Thank you again for your question.

Question (16) from David Lincoln to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

Advancing the health and wellbeing of residents is an important role of Islington council. There is strong scientific evidence that incorporating physical activity into their daily routine helps people live healthier and happier lives.

Does the Council agree that extending the roll out of People Friendly Streets will enable more people to choose to walk or cycle more often which will have a significant positive impact toward improving public health, perhaps greater than any other intervention available to the council?

Response:

Thank you. I absolutely agree with you that increasing physical activity greatly helps improve people's health and wellbeing. Increasing walking and cycling is one of the key aims of Islington's Transport Strategy. This is aligned with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, and sets a goal for all Londoners to have 20 minutes of physical activity each day by 2041.

We know that building opportunities for people to do this activity as part of their daily routine, such as walking to work or cycling to school, is the most effective way of making sure it happens; and we know this has a real benefit to both mental and physical wellbeing of residents.

Our People Friendly Streets programme aims to allow people to walk and cycle; but also, just to be. I think that is our next challenge: how we change our streets, in the face of the climate emergency, to make resilient inter-community spaces which are nicer to be in, not just nicer to travel through. Children can then play, people could sit and chat, or people can choose to go for walks or cycle through them.

Reducing traffic on neighbouring streets is really important, and we know it's really important to the more vulnerable residents as well. If you want to get people to cycle, if you want to get children to cycle, if you want to get mothers to take children to school by bike, or to take their children to play dates by scooting, you have to reduce traffic to a really low level. I know that some people think cycling among traffic is fine; but for many of us, including myself, high traffic levels are a barrier to cycling. I agree we have to continue to do what we can, but also to recognise the work of other boroughs, so together across London we can build a network of connected, safe and attractive spaces. Thank you for your question.

The Mayor announced that the 30 minutes permitted for questions from members of the public had expired and all remaining questions would receive a written response.

Question (17) from Rebekah Kelly to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

People are eager to know about the final decision for St. Peter's People Friendly Streets scheme as the ETO expires and the council must now decide whether the scheme becomes permanent, is removed or adjusted, and what adjustments may take place.

As it is not on the agenda for this council meeting, how and when will that decision be announced? Please provide a specific date.

Response:

The consultation for St Peter's closed on 11 October 2021. Since that date, the council has been carefully analysing all the feedback provided during the public consultation and other engagement activities. This is an important aspect of our people-friendly streets programme as it allows local people to best chance to have their say and tell us what they think about the people-friendly streets neighbourhoods.

As the 18-month experimental traffic order for the St Peter's LTN expires on 3 January 2022, the council will be making an announcement before that date, regarding the future of the St Peter's scheme. The decision will be announced via press release, website changes, leaflets to local residents and on social media. The consultation report and decision report will be published online.

Question (18) from Pierre Delarue to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

What is the average time taken to repair a streetlight once reported, and what percentage of street lights were fixed within one week?

Response:

Streetlights are a key part of keeping people in our borough safe and we are determined to ensure that once a fault is reported, it is dealt with as soon as possible. The average time taken to repair a streetlight once reported last year was 3.5 days and the percentage of street lights fixed within one week is 99.5%.

Question (19) from Ernestas Jegorovas-Armstrong to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

How many residents engaged in Let's talk about a greener future two week festival? What is the council going to do to make sure more residents get involved in Islington Together festival in 2022?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Our recent climate festival, Islington Together: Let's Talk about a Greener future, was a wonderful opportunity to listen to local people and discuss how we can all work together to tackle the climate crisis, following the publication of Vision 2030, our roadmap to becoming a net zero carbon borough by 2030.

We are now in the process of looking at what we heard and learned from local people and the organisers of over 100 festival events to support our work in implementing the Vision 2030 strategy. We were pleased with the overall level of engagement across many of the festival events, with momentum behind the events increased as the fortnight progressed. We will use what we have learned from the festival to decide we can tackle these issues alongside local people in future, including continuing to look at innovative ways we can achieve the greatest reduction in Islington carbon emissions.

Question (20) from Devon Osborne to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Does the council know how many estate intercoms are currently in need of repair and how many residents this effects? Does the council have a timetable for repair of intercoms on estates and a procedure with timings and deadlines that is followed after the first complaint? Does the council acknowledge the necessity of working intercoms for residents safety? And what is the council's plan to address anti-social behaviour in stairwells and supposedly secure common areas?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Everyone has the right to feel safe and secure in their home without having to worry about intruders or anti-social behaviour in communal areas and stairwells.

Recognising the importance of this, the council is carrying out a comprehensive upgrade to the IT of its intercom and linked fob systems on the 642 sites across the borough that operate with this system. The council has commissioned a programme of upgrade works to the intercom equipment at the affected sites to connect each of them to a more modern and robust door entry access control IT system. This work programme began in November 2021 and we expect this upgrade work to take six months to complete.

Our council is determined to tackle ASB wherever it takes place, including in communal areas. We encourage anyone experiencing anti-social behaviour to report it to the council so that we can take action. When these problems arise, we use a number of forms of action against those taking part in anti-social behaviour to deter perpetrators.

We also look at the physical environment to see where we can make improvements that can make anti-social behaviour in blocks less likely. This can include would

ensuring broken intercoms are fixed, as well as considering if temporary CCTV is needed, improving lines of sight around e.g. hedges and planted areas, ensuring bin areas are safe and secure and making sure that doors are not being propped open, to make our borough and local people's homes as safe as possible.

Question (21) from Chuck Y to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

On Chadwell Street there is an island between the bike and car lane. This island has become a regular dumping ground for both household, commercial and building waste. This includes furniture and huge cardboard boxes among the other waste.

Given this happens on a daily basis, it was quite surprised when I was told by the Islington Waste Team that they would not be able to take any real actions to stop the fly tipping; I was told all they could do is send someone to clear the trash, which is unlikely to even be done given the number of items of litter regularly there.

My question to the council is what active steps are the council taking to prevent fly tipping? It seems at the moment that the lack of surveillance, the lack of a note or sign, and the response of the team when I called Islington Council, indicate that the Council are taking no steps to prevent fly tipping and simply addressing the after effects by cleaning up after these criminals.

Given the frequency and scale of fly tipping, is this not arguably easier to tackle than a one off occurrence of fly-tipping? If the council won't even bother with an easier case of trying to stop fly-tipping, is the council simply not trying to address fly-tipping at all?

Response:

We are determined to make Islington cleaner, greener and healthier and that is why the Council takes fly-tipping very seriously. Our dedicated officers proactively clear fly-tips with a 93% clearance rate, within 24 hours of fly tip being reported. The Council's Cleansing Operational team regularly pass on fly-tipping intelligence to our Council Compliance team who use this information along with other intelligence received such as your enquiry relating to Chadwell Street to undertake enforcement action to prevent and reduce fly-tipping within the borough.

Our Council Compliance team put up no dumping enforcement signage and are undertaking regular monitoring patrols in Chadwell Street to catch and enforce upon the small minority of people that refuse to do the right thing and dispose of their waste correctly. I will contact you after this meeting to pass on the details of the Council Officer who would be best placed to manage your query.

Question (22) from Guilene Marco to Cllr Ngongo, Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families:

Most of the equipment in the playground in Arundel Square has been removed following a safety inspection in May. Residents, parents and children have been waiting for 6 months now for a reopening of their favourite playground. Will you be

able to let us know when the Council will secure a supplier and a budget to fix the equipment in Arundel Square? Do you have a timeline for the works, and can you guarantee a reopening before May 2022?

Response:

Thank you for your question Guilene. Ensuring the health and safety of local people is a top priority for the Council, in particular ensuring facilities for our young people are in the best possible condition. Due to immediate safety concerns around some of the equipment in Arundel Square playground, we took the difficult decision to secure the whole playground to ensure the safety of the children that use it. Unfortunately the timber supports for the main bridge structure and swings was found to be rotten. We then carried out remedial work to allow some items to remain accessible.

We know that the playground is a much loved resource, and we understand the disappointment that this closure will have caused to children and families. The council has been working hard to source a supplier for these works but, unfortunately, a huge surge in demand and major supply issues, including Brexit and Covid related problems, within the play industry have meant this hasn't yet been possible. We cannot unfortunately therefore provide a timeline or any guarantees of when the work will be completed by. The council will continue to work hard to find a supplier for these works, despite the current difficulties. Once a supplier has been found, we will ensure the playground is repaired and restored for local people to enjoy as quickly as possible.

Question (23) from Dominic Martin to Cllr Lukes, Executive Member for Community Safety:

What are the 2021 figures for bicycle theft in Islington, and how do they compare with other London boroughs? What percentage of reported bicycle thefts result in successful prosecution; and what is the Council doing to reduce levels of bicycle theft in Islington?

Response:

Encouraging cycling is a key part of the Council's strategy to make our borough a cleaner, greener, healthier place for all. Part of that work is ensuring local people who cycle can rely on the safety of their bike.

During the past 12 months, 1,148 bikes were stolen in Islington, which is a 16% reduction from the previous 12 months. In comparison, across London, there has been a 6% reduction. Despite this, we know every bike theft is difficult for those concerned and we are working with the Police, partners and the local community to further tackle the problem.

This work has included, organising 12 Bike Safety events across the borough, marking and registering over 400 bikes using Bike Register etching kits and crime preventative stickers and 'Hot Spot' analysis shared with police, to inform where and when they patrol to tackle this crime type. Unfortunately we do not hold data around prosecutions.

Of course the best way to prevent bike theft is secure storage, and we are working hard on that. We have 181 units on our estates with capacity for 1889 bikes. We have 240 street bike hangars with 1440 spaces. And there will be more! This year we plan 160 more hangars with 960 spaces, and next year 100 more with 600 spaces. If you want one near you, please do get in touch.

Question (24) to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

Does the Council feel confident it will meet the Net Zero 2030 plan and how much does it anticipate having to offset to be net zero by 2030?

Response:

I am proud that Islington's Labour-run Council is at the forefront of tackling the climate emergency. We were one of the first councils in the country to declare an emergency, in July 2019 and since then, we have been focused on achieving our ambitious goal of a net zero carbon borough since 2030.

Carbon emissions in the borough fell by 45% between 2005 and 2019 (the most recent reporting year), well ahead of the borough's target of 40% by 2020, and during a period in which our population increased almost a third. Per capita carbon emissions in Islington fell by 58% in the same time period – the 11th largest reduction in the country.

The Vision 2030 strategy is ambitious and far-reaching, and will involve testing or trialling interventions or ways of working that are innovative and radical. However, Islington Council is only directly responsible for around 4% of the borough's emissions, with around another 5% coming from boilers in homes of council tenants. That is why it is so important for us to tackle this issue together, as a borough.

Becoming a net zero borough will need each and every one of us to take action – residents, businesses, public bodies and the third sector. We are committed to leading the way in supporting local people, businesses and other partners to reduce their impact. However, reaching these goals is made much harder by Tory austerity and the Central Government cuts which have forced the Council to make £250 million in budget savings since 2010.

We do not currently have a figure for the level of carbon offsetting that will be required to be net zero in 2030, as this will be dependent on a range of factors, including how quickly the electricity grid decarbonises and the level of support provided by central government to deliver net zero action. We will be monitoring our progress against the strategy on an ongoing basis, reporting annually this will inform our work to develop an offsetting strategy to help us address any residual emissions.

Question (25) from John Hartley to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

Following COP26, everyone must now agree that we are in a climate emergency, and we all must reduce our emissions urgently. Islington has also committed to Vision Zero for London - to eliminate all deaths and serious injuries from our roads. Air pollution in London is killing 4,000 people every year. Tackling global heating, road deaths, toxic air - three essential, unarguable, goals. Discouraging the use of private vehicles by rolling out People Friendly Streets across the Borough will go a long way to achieving all three aims.

Is the Council aware of any alternative which is likely to be as effective in meeting these three critical goals?

Response:

I agree the three goals you set out are incredibly important, and I am proud that Islington's Labour-run Council is addressing all three through our successful people-friendly streets programme. There is a growing evidence base for the effectiveness and positive impacts of low-traffic and liveable neighbourhoods, which aligns with the evidence from the monitoring of our own schemes (which can be found on the Council's website).

Our people-friendly streets programme is being rolled out across the borough to make Islington cleaner, greener and healthier, as well as making our roads safer for people walking, cycling and wheeling.

Our reports show that traffic levels within the people-friendly streets neighbourhoods has fallen significantly as well as decreases in the number of vehicles speeding and vast increases in the number of people cycling. However, it is important we get local people's feedback. We are keen to hear views on all of the people-friendly streets neighbourhoods in the formal consultation period and would encourage everyone who lives near or uses the schemes to have your say.

Question (26) to Cllr Turan, Executive Member for Health & Care:

NDP (Neuro Development Pathway) wait times are on the Whittington Trust's risk register. As the parent of a severely distressed child, whose 15 month wait for a Neurodevelopmental Pathway Assessment had already exceeded the 52 week wait time given, I was recently told that the wait time has now been extended to 32 months. Can you satisfy me there is a robust recovery plan in place rather than one that is creating systematic churn?

Response:

I would like to start by apologising for the situation you have experienced looking to get support for your child. The current position of waiting times for ASD assessment in Islington, and indeed across the whole of North Central London, is a high priority for the Council and all our partners in the sector. I'm all too aware that the current

position is unacceptable and we are committed to working in partnership to address the challenges and develop a model for children and young people that reduces delay.

Senior leaders in Whittington Health and within North Central London (NCL) Clinical Commissioning Group, are actively engaged in working to ensure a clear plan, delivered within agreed timescales, to reduce the waiting times to 18 weeks and clear current backlogs across North Central London by March 2023. The plan includes the provision of additional funding for the Islington Neuro Developmental Pathway, with an additional funded programme in place to reduce backlogs.

Islington Council has also worked with Whittington Health to put in place a programme of therapeutic and family support for young people which can be accessed while they are on the waiting list. Parents are advised to visit the Islington CAMHS pages on the Whittington Health website to find out more about services available. Thank you again for your question and I will keep in contact with NHS colleagues and partners to ensure the measures I have mentioned take place.

Question (27) from Roderik Gonggrijp to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

The proposed Holloway Prison development is for 985 housing units to accommodate 3,450 new residents. Based on data from the Mayor's Office, this will give St George's ward the 12th highest population density of all 624 wards in London. Yet, no new amenities or even a community centre are planned, nor does the 300 document planning application appear to contain any tested impact assessment for the existing amenities in the area that the new residents are expected to use.

What assessment has been made to ensure that there are adequate health, education and sport facilities, along with green space to support the residents moving in to the new homes?

Response:

Thank you for your question. The council is currently in the process of assessing and determining this planning application, and I cannot therefore comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval. However, I have passed your query onto planning officers for consideration.

Councillors have always made it very clear to Peabody that they are not just building a new neighbourhood, they are building a new community. The provision of a new public park and a Women's Building within the proposed scheme is therefore welcome.

However, our planning policies require that the built form of the development support community cohesion and integration. We also expect the development to be welcoming to the wider community and for the residents of this new neighbourhood to

feel part of the wider Islington community. These considerations will all be part of the final recommendation of planning officers and then the decision of the Planning Committee.

Question (28) from Linda Clarke to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

The proposed environmental design for the redevelopment of Holloway prison, intended as a net zero energy building development, falls far short of the London Borough of Islington Net Zero Carbon targets:

- The heating demand is 72-162% more than the Islington target;
- The building airtightness mean the buildings will be 5 times more leaky than the Islington target;
- The upfront embodied carbon emissions are 650kg/CO₂/m², more than double the 300kg/CO₂/m² target for 2030;
- Not a single item from the site is proposed to be reclaimed for re-use;
- The renewable energy generation is only 62% of the Islington Council target;

In the light of the Climate Emergency, the Council's 2030 Net Zero carbon targets and recognising that the project will be completed close to 2030, surely the proposals for the site cannot be accepted by the Council given that they are at odds with its own environmental policies?

Response:

Thank you for your question Linda. The council is currently in the process of assessing and determining this planning application, and I cannot therefore comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval. However, I have passed your query onto planning officers for consideration.

On this and every other development site we want to deliver sustainable development in line with the council's Net Zero Carbon commitment and the council and GLA planning policies. The council's planning policies require all major developments in the borough to be net zero carbon but allow for carbon offsetting payments if the development cannot meet the net zero carbon requirements on site.

Peabody's planning application includes an Energy Strategy and the initial plans include proposals for air or ground source heat pumps to provide energy for the site. Planning officers are still in their initial stages of their assessment of the application and are taking advice from internal and external technical experts, to continue to push for improvements to the Energy Strategy in line with the relevant planning policies and the council's Net Zero Carbon commitment.

Question (29) from Jill Ellenby to Cllr Champion, Executive Member for Environment & Transport:

What would be the financial implications for Islington Council if the new north London incinerator operates at respectively 80 per cent, 60 per cent and 40 per cent of capacity, given the impact on its cost-effectiveness as well as the income from burning waste and from supplying heat and electricity?

Response:

The Energy for Waste facility at Edmonton Eco Park is an important part of the work done by Islington and our surrounding boroughs to manage waste and recycling in North London.

The Council doesn't hold the detailed financial analysis for Islington referred to in the question. North London Waste Authority have, on the request of the constituent boroughs, estimated that the construction of a facility with a 30% smaller capacity would reduce the cost of the project by 8% initially. However, NLWA have advised that this would need have to be re-tendered and with the current inflation of the parts needed running at 12%, this would eventually lead to the facility costing more for a lower capacity plant.

The overall cost of the project will be paid for through the waste disposal levy and by each of the constituent boroughs once the facility has been built. This is one of several elements that make up Islington's and the other borough's waste levy including the tonnage of residual waste and recycle collected, day to day operating costs (e.g. the cost of running North London's reuse and recycling centres, haulage cost disposal fees, waste prevention and reuse work etc), any third party income e.g. from commercial waste.

Questions 30 and 31 received a joint response:

Question (30) from Claire Zammit to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

The Holloway Prison Site is a generational opportunity to tackle the housing crisis in our borough and build hundreds of new good quality social homes on the border of Holloway ward.

We know the site has a strong legacy as it was the largest women's prison in Europe before it was closed, providing extensive services to and for the wider community. Can you tell me what the Council is doing to ensure that, if the plans are approved, the legacy of supporting women will continue and what type of services you believe the Women's Building will provide for the greater community? Also will the Women's Building be women-only and how will you ensure it will be financially sustainable?

Question (31) from Niki Gibbs to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

HMP Holloway is a site of huge historical national importance to the struggle for women's rights, and part of Islington's built heritage.

When the planning department was preparing its Design Brief for the Women's Building, 24 of 28 expert individuals and organisations said they did not support the draft plans for the HWB. The useable room space offered is approximately 920sqm within the 1500sqm floor plan; the remainder is corridors and WC facilities. Yet even the draft brief recommends approx.. 1,200sqm.

Peabody's plan is effectively disrespecting half the population with a tokenistic offer of a Women's Building on a unique legacy site for women. Is the Council willing for this important history to be erased, and its legacy reduced to a single floor under a tower block, when no feasibility study or needs assessment has been done to quantify the space, services, service delivery, viability or governance, meeting the needs of women as laid out in the SPD?

Response to questions 30 and 31:

The council is currently in the process of assessing and determining this planning application, and I cannot therefore comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval.

However, I have passed your query onto planning officers for consideration. We are clear that the Holloway Prison Site has a significant legacy for women in Islington and beyond as the former largest women's prison in Europe. Since the publication of the Supplementary Planning Document in January 2018, the council has been clear about its priorities for this site. The council expects the site to deliver the maximum reasonable amount of genuinely affordable homes, a new public park and of course a Women's Building.

Over time, the planned building has increased in size from 800sqm to the current 1489sqm. This will be the largest community facility in the borough and the building is larger than the other women's centres that planning officers consulted and considered during the development of the brief. This increase in space was in direct response to the consultation feedback and the ongoing research undertaken by planning officers. The need to accommodate, within one building, two functions – the less public and more safe women's centre facilities and the more open and public facing women's building activities and functions, was agreed early in the consultation process.

At this point in time, I cannot provide a detailed response to your questions about the commissioning and funding of services within the building or even who can access the building. Indeed it would not be appropriate for me to do so because further work is needed to investigate these important matters.

The council is working with Peabody to commission a study from an organisation that is an expert on these matters. This will identify the arrangements for commissioning an organisation to run the Women's Building and the potential arrangements for delivering and funding services within the building.

Through the study, we will continue to engage openly and positively with grass roots women's organisations, potential service users and providers, and organisations that deliver similar services to women including those organisations that currently run and manage similar buildings. This will allow us to further identify best practice in these areas and identify the most effective arrangements for commissioning, funding and delivering services within the building.

A draft brief for this study has been sent to Community Plan for Holloway, and I do hope that it will commit to joining us in commissioning this study, to ensure the site, and women's building, serves the community, and Islington women in particular, in the best possible way.

Question (32) from Debbie Humphry to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

Are you happy that there are no London Living Rent homes (suitable for low income households such as key workers who will not be able to access social rent housing) but that all 18% of Intermediate housing is shared ownership with minimum required household incomes of over £65K for a 25% share of a 2-bed Peabody property in Islington?

Response:

Thank you for your question Debbie.

The council is currently in the process of assessing and determining this planning application, and I cannot therefore comment in detail on the merits or otherwise of the application. Consideration of this matter will be a matter for planning officers and ultimately the Planning Committee if the application is recommended for approval. However, I have passed your query onto planning officers for consideration. I am of course pleased that if the current application is approved, it will deliver 60% affordable housing including 42% for social rent. Securing homes for social rent is the council's main priority.

I do however share your concerns about the affordability of the shared ownership tenure. Peabody has told us that the charges for this tenure will be compliant with the GLA's policies on shared ownership and I have pressed for further details of how this will work in practice on this site. I have also constantly pressed Peabody to consider the inclusion of London Living Rent homes on this site if it can be demonstrated that it is financially viable to do so and this will not impact the delivery of homes for social rent. This is something which planning officers will be working with Peabody on, while considering the application as a whole.

170 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Question (1) from Cllr Poyser to Cllr Gill, Executive Member for Finance & Performance:

The Boxing Club in Elthorne Park was temporary many years ago and is now dilapidated. As I have said many times before in full Council, organised boxing has been shown to be a proactive solution to all sorts of youth issues where the Council has been active. The Club is particularly supportive of women boxers.

The Boxing Club are doing excellent work trying to renew their premises – following the ‘Queensberry Rules’. It would be knock-out if Council help kick-start Round One of this project

Could you outline the support the Council has given the rebuilding?

Response:

Thank you for your question. The Council is focused on improving facilities for local people to take part in exercise and sport, as well as supporting local community organisations. The Boxing Club has plans to replace its current building with a new extended club building. This will enable the Boxing Club to provide better facilities for its members. So far the Council has contributed £34,500 to support the club in developing these plans; this funding has mainly come from the Hillrise ward councillors, but St Mary's and Junction ward councillors have also contributed from their local funds. Senior Planning officers have also met with the Boxing Club on a couple of occasions and provided the club with some extensive pre-application advice. We understand the planning application for the new building will be submitted shortly and I wish them all the best in their future fundraising efforts.

Question (2) from Cllr Poole to Cllr Ngongo, Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families:

As Her Majesty The Queen prepares to pass an historic milestone and celebrate her Platinum Jubilee next year, will the Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families tell the Council what plans are being formulated for Islington Schools to celebrate this great event?

Response:

Thank you for your question. The Platinum Jubilee next year is a wonderful landmark for our borough and the country. This Council is planning to work with our schools to make sure our children get fully involved, because it is a good opportunity for them to learn about the history of our country and the reign of our Queen. The government has announced that all schoolchildren are going to receive a free book, which will allow them to learn more about the monarchy and to understand in details the meaning of the jubilee. That is why we are putting resources in place for our young people to get involved. We know this is going to be a good and remarkable Jubilee

next year; and we are going to make sure our children and young people learn about and celebrate the jubilee. Thank you.

Supplementary:

Thank you for that very encouraging answer. One thing that could be done is to secure and save the Royal Northern War Memorial as a fitting tribute to our Majesty.

Response:

Thank you. We will be celebrating our achievements.

Question (3) from Cllr Ismail to Cllr Turan, Executive Member for Health & Social Care:

Before coronavirus disease, black women over 50 suffered loneliness, isolation, depression, and language barriers. Now, with the current Omicron looming, what support is in place to combat further loneliness and isolation for Black women?

As Cllr Turan was not able to attend the meeting the question was answered by Cllr Comer-Schwartz, Leader of the Council:

Thank you for your question. We are very much aware that of the health inequalities that affect this Borough and our society, especially the inequalities in mental health and how that this has widened during the pandemic.

Women, especially those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities, are one of the groups that have been most deeply affected by this.

We know that loneliness increased due to the pandemic and the changes brought about because of it. This has led to increased isolation, depression and anxiety. The Council is working with our partners and our local community to tackle these issues head on.

The health and wellbeing services within the Borough quickly moved to a remote approach to ensure that they were able to continue to support local people while keeping within the Covid regulations. This has meant that services were able to continue both within buildings, but also through a range of remote options, including telephone.

We have offered digital training and equipment to support residents with accessing these services. Community services continue to operate on a flexible basis, both face to face and virtually, to support residents in a way they prefer.

There are a number of organisations in Islington that engage with local people on health concerns. Where the Council and the NHS cannot reach them and we recognise the value of the voluntary sector in this regard. Working collaboratively with these organisations is vital to ensure that we support as many people as possible. This is why we work with Manor Gardens, an organisation that helps people whose

first language isn't English, providing access for social workers and other professionals, as well as finding support through other residents and improving access to community groups.

Islington Mind is also a large mental health provider within the Borough and a reputable voluntary community sector organisation. It provides a range of practical and emotional support to over 850 residents in 2020/21, We know that in 2019, 18% those people attending Mind services described themselves as either Black African, Black Caribbean or Black British. In Quarter 1 of 2021, this has increased to 21%. However, while the Council and the NHS continue to seek to offer support to as many people as possible, this becomes much harder while continuing to be held back by government austerity. Mental health services continue to be under-funded, which has been an issue for the last decade. This Council continues to try and fill the gaps, although we have had to make £250million in budget savings since 2010. We can only tackle these deep-rooted issues by working together and by central government properly funding mental health services.

Supplementary question:

Thank you. Neighbouring boroughs such as Camden, Hackney and Tower Hamlets run culturally sensitive luncheon clubs. How many luncheon clubs that are sensitive to culture and faith are run by the Council? I think it would be good to know, as these would help to address loneliness and support mental health. When I talk to relatives and friends in neighbouring boroughs, they have culturally sensitive luncheon clubs that are run by the council, or by the local community with council funding. How many of those do we have in Islington?

Response:

I would have to get you a specific number and I'm very happy to do that for you.

I'm very aware, as you are, that there are many culturally appropriate organisations up and down this borough. I can think of many, especially that support women, including at Nafsiyat and the Westbourne Community Centre. Only this week, at the launch of our Let's Talk Islington open mass diagloue, I met a wonderful woman who has set up a charity within Cally to support more Black Women facing isolation. There are many fabulous women of all ethnicities in this borough supporting each other through really difficult mental health challenges. Thank you again for your question.

Question (4) from Cllr Ismail to Cllr Lukes, Executive Member for Community Safety:

Since the stabbing of Sir David Amess MP, the Somali community has suffered badly from islamophobia, as reported on BBC London, Sunday Politics and the Guardian Newspaper. Have you engaged with the Somali community with any support and reassurances; and how and when?

Response:

Thank you for your question. Our Council is determined to make our borough the safest it can be and root out all types of hate crime. In the aftermath of the tragic death of Sir David Amess, the Leader and I both contacted a range of community leaders across the borough to send a clear message that the Council stands together with our communities and against hate crime.

Since then, the Council has used Islamophobia Awareness Month to send a clear message that Islamophobia of any kind will not be tolerated in our borough. As you know, we have a thriving and diverse Muslim community in here in Islington, who contribute a great deal to our borough. Those activities during Islamophobia Awareness Month enabled us to showcase the work that our mosques and Muslim communities have done in providing a great deal of support to residents throughout the pandemic; feeding those on lower incomes, helping the homeless, and helping people get vaccinated.

We were involved in delivering an event called Islington Against Islamophobia at Finsbury Park Mosque on 26th November which was attended by over 70 people. I was delighted to be one of the speakers there to reinforce that message. The event was also an opportunity to listen to our local communities and hear their thoughts on how we can make Islington even more welcoming and diverse. We looked at the experiences of different groups, including the experiences of Black and Somali Muslims, young Muslims and Muslim women. Councillor Ibrahim spoke about his experiences of being a Black Muslim from a Somali background, and how events in the news can trigger phobias towards certain communities.

We discussed how we can make our borough a safe place. The Council supports the independent Islington Hate Crime Forum, which is committed to working with the Police and community organisations, including Somali organisations, to tackle hate crime, reduce the risk of it taking place, support victims, and improve reporting.

I was inspired at that event by the young Muslim women I met who spoke movingly of the impact of Islamophobic hate crime and their determination to oppose it. I wonder what they think of the Prime Minister, a man who says they look like letter boxes and bank robbers, a comment that Tell Mama linked to a 375% increase in Islamophobic incidents. Luckily for those young women, they live in Islington, and we take hate crime seriously and we oppose Islamophobia.

Supplementary question:

Islamophobia and hate crime is a crime to all humanity. The stabbing of Sir David Amess has triggered Islamophobia and hate crime, particularly with the Somali community, and particularly against those who look like me, wearing a hijab. Have you been in touch with our local Somali mosque? I recently attended and there were 400 women all complaining about Islamophobia. Have you contacted them, and have you made any arrangements, because that was a very serious moment, particularly for the Somali community.

Response:

Both the Leader and I contacted a whole range of faith and community organisations immediately after the stabbing. We also maintain contact with the Police in order to check on whether there was any increase in reporting of any kind of Islamophobic hate crime in the wake of that event. I'm very glad to report that Police data indicates that there had been no increase in numbers. Islamophobic hate crime is an absolute stain on our borough and we're working very hard to try and tackle it, including through education. We work with a whole range of Somali and other Muslim communities, and we rely on those communities to report hate crime, so we can identify and bring to account the perpetrators, and also to learn from that.

The Hate Crime Forum is a very active organisation and was also involved in some of the reaching out in the immediate wake of that of that murder, as with any other incident which might increase any type of hate crime in the borough. We have been very active we continue to be. I'm very glad to meet with anybody who wants to talk to me about how we can improve that practice because it is a priority of mine.

Question (5) from Cllr Russell to Cllr Gill, Executive Member for Finance & Performance:

How many residents are eligible for the council tax reduction scheme this year and how many of these are in arrears with their council tax this year?

Response:

Thank you for your question. As you know, we're discussing this topic very soon. Islington Council continues to provide the maximum amount of support possible for those on low-income. Our Resident Support Scheme is one of the most generous in the country. I'm proud tonight that we are proposing to increase the Council Tax Support Scheme to 95%; an investment in the most vulnerable people in the borough. The total number of Islington residents receiving support through the Council Tax Reduction Scheme is currently 26,150, but this total does vary during the year. The number of households in arrears for Council Tax, who receive support through the scheme this year, is 1,354 as of last week. This would equate to about 5% of those accessing the scheme. We continue to support those people in arrears, so that they can clear their arrears and return to a stable financial footing.

Supplementary question:

Thank you. I wonder how many of those 1,354 in arrears, have arrears that have accrued from previous years?

Response:

Thank you. I don't have that information to hand, but I will look at it and share it with you.

Question (6) from Cllr Russell to Cllr Ward, Executive Member for Housing & Development:

How many repairs have been requested in Islington to fix mould in residents' homes each year across the last five years? Please supply aggregated annual Islington figures at the meeting for the last five years and supply a table in writing separately broken down by ward and housing type (estate or street property and building construction type if you hold that data).

Response:

Islington Council is determined to provide safe secure and genuinely affordable homes for local people. A vital part of that is ensuring that our current housing stock is kept the highest possible standard. We've taken a comprehensive approach to damp and condensation works on our estates. We will fix leaks, but where there's mould due to condensation, we carry out mould washes and we work with residents to maintain a mould free home. We know that damp and condensation occurs more in homes that are not well heated, and our programme of energy efficiency works will also very importantly help to address problems of damp and condensation in some properties. I will supply the full information to you following the meeting, but the number of homes in which we have undertaken mould treatment works has remained broadly stable over recent years, aside from 2020 when there were fewer reports and people did not want others to work in their homes. There have been 2,687 homes visited for mould since 2017. We don't hold ward level information, but I will write to you with further information.

Supplementary question:

I completely agree with you about the importance of tackling mould. I think ventilation as well as good insulation is a really important element of this. Of those 2,687 cases of mould, how many of them were repeat requests?

Response:

I'm afraid that I don't have that information to hand, but I'm very happy to speak to senior officers about this.

Question (7) from Cllr Williamson to Cllr Turan, Executive Member for Health & Social Care:

There was already a crisis in young people's mental health and support services before Covid-19, but the pandemic has made the situation worse.

Before the pandemic waiting times were long for CAMHS. But with an even bigger growth in demand for mental health and support services, and the escalating NHS recruitment crisis caused by a Tory government asleep at the wheel, we are witnessing a perfect storm – with disastrous effects for our young people. One of my own young constituents has already spent over a year of his childhood waiting to be assessed by CAMHS, and is expected to still wait another year before getting assessed. Waiting times are now at roughly 30 months. While we know the Tory

government rhetoric of parity of esteem for mental health services needs to be matched with reality – with real funding and serious work to bring down waiting times, what is the CCG doing locally to reduce waiting times for CAMHS?

Response:

Thank you highlighting this very important topic. The current situation with waiting times for autistic spectrum disorder assessments in Islington and the indeed across the whole of North Central London is a high priority for this Council and all our partners in the sector. I'm all too aware that the current position is unacceptable and we are committed to working in partnership to address the challenges and develop a model for children and young people that reduces delay.

Senior leaders in Whittington Health and the North Central London Clinical Commissioning Group are working to ensure a clear plan to reduce waiting times to 18 weeks and clear the current backlogs across North Central London by 2023. The plan includes provision for additional funding for Islington's neurodevelopment pathway with an additional funded programme in place to reduce the backlog. Islington Council has also been working with Whittington Health to put in place a programme of therapeutic and family support that young people can access while they are on the waiting list. Parents are advised to visit Islington's CAMHS page on the Whittington Health website.

On the wider issue of children and young people's mental health, we have a range of services on offer to support young people's mental health, including CAMHS mental health support teams in schools and online counselling services. However, as we come out of this pandemic, it is vital that the government finally acts on its promises and properly funds mental health support services.

Supplementary question:

A lot of the issues with CAMHS services is to do with a massive lack of funding and a recruitment crisis caused by the government. First, can the council campaign on this issue, and second, can we work with the CCG to ensure that any child is seen within a certain time frame, for example before 30 months? My constituents are telling me that waiting lists are getting longer and longer, which is causing despair for families. Can we work with CCG to make sure no one's going beyond 30 months and that clear waiting times are given at the point of initial referrals?

Response:

I would be incredibly proud to join you on that campaign, and I am sure that fellow councillors would be too. This is clearly an important issue to our residents. I meet with the CCG regularly and will continue to push this issue, particularly around giving families realistic waiting times.

171 PRESENTATION FROM MAYORAL CHARITIES - ICAP & FORUM+

The Council received presentations from two of the Mayor's charities.

Catherine Hennessy, CEO of icap, spoke of their work in supporting the Irish community in London with issues such as anxiety, depression and stress. The organisation offered therapy and counselling services to the community.

Tessa Havers-Strong, Director of forum+, spoke of their work to support the LGBT+ community in Islington and Camden, including services for victims of hate crime.

The Council thanked icap and forum+ for their work and for attending the meeting.

172 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2022/23

Councillor Gill moved the motion. Councillor Debono seconded. Councillor Russell contributed to the debate.

The recommendations in the report were put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- (i) To change the way the Council Tax Support is calculated so that:
- The cap for working age households reduces from 8.5% to 5%. This will increase from 91.5% to 95% the level of support they would have been entitled to under the old council tax benefit rules.
 - Payment of Council Tax Support on two homes is allowed in specific circumstances.
 - The age for a Class 2 reduction is aligned with the increase in state pension age.
- (ii) To agree to adopt the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2022/23 as contained in Appendix A to the report submitted.
- (iii) To retain the amendments to council tax agreed at full Council on 10 December 2020, with 1) to 3) below continuing to apply, whilst updating 4) below to charge a premium at the maximum that is now allowed. This will mean increasing from 100% on the council tax of all properties that have remained empty for over 2 years to the amounts set out in 4) below.

This continues the Council's practice to discourage properties remaining empty that impacts on the economic and social well-being of the borough. There will be support for any vulnerable residents impacted.

1) council tax exemption classes A (unoccupied and unfurnished property that requires or is undergoing major repairs) and C (unoccupied and unfurnished property) will have a discount of 0% for all cases;

2) council tax discount for second homes will be 0% in all cases;

3) council tax discount for empty furnished lets will be 0% in all cases; and

4) a premium will be charged at the maximum percentage allowed of 100% on the council tax of all properties that have remained empty for over 2 years but less than 5 years in all cases.

a premium will be charged at the maximum percentage allowed of 200% on the council tax of all properties that have remained empty for over 5 years but less than 10 years in all cases.

a premium will be charged at the maximum percentage allowed of 300% on the council tax of all properties that have remained empty for over 10 years in all cases.

173 CHIEF WHIP'S REPORT

The Mayor noted that the report has been circulated in the second despatch of papers.

Councillor Hyde moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Woolf seconded.

The recommendations in the report were put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. That Councillor Gilgunn be appointed to the Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed.
- ii. That John Everson, Director of Adult Social Care, be appointed to the Health and Wellbeing Board for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed.
- iii. That Councillors Khurana, Khondoker and Graham be appointed as substitute members of the Audit Committee for the remainder of the municipal year or until successors are appointed;
- iv. That Councillor Khondoker be appointed as a substitute member of the Licensing Committee for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed;
- v. That Councillor Khondoker be appointed as a substitute member of the Health & Care Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed.
- vi. That Councillor Poyser be appointed to the Grievance Appeal Committee for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed
- vii. That Councillor Weekes be appointed to the Schools Forum for the remainder of the municipal year or until a successor is appointed.

- viii. That Miss Maxine Telfer be appointed to serve on Independent Admission Appeals Panels

174 CONSTITUTION REPORT

The Mayor noted that the report has been circulated in the second despatch of papers.

Councillor Hyde moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Woolf seconded.

The recommendations in the report were put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. To approve the amendments to the Constitution set out in the appendices to the report;
- ii. To note that the amendments will take effect from 10th December 2021, with the exception of the revisions to the procurement rules (paragraph 4.2), that will come into effect from 1st January 2022.

175 NOTICES OF MOTION

The order of motions was amended to take those with proposed amendments first.

Motion 3: Rename the Ring Cross Estate after Yvonne Conolly, the first Black female Headteacher in Britain

(title amended to *'Celebrating Yvonne Conolly, the first Black woman Headteacher in Britain'*)

The Mayor advised that a proposed amendment to this motion has been circulated in the second despatch of papers.

Councillor Ismail moved the motion. Councillor Jackson moved the amendment. Councillor Russell contributed to the debate.

Councillor Ismail exercised her right of reply on the motion. Councillor Jackson exercised his right of reply on 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 Rename Ring Cross Community Centre after Yvonne Connolly to mark her achievement, the first Black woman Headteacher in Britain, as a sign to encourage black youth to learn and understand their proud history.
- ii. To install a plaque to commemorate Yvonne Connolly's contribution to Holloway Ward and Islington.

- iii. To Collaborate with Caribbean Teachers Association annually exhibition and workshop of her work and achievement in Islington History Museum so it encourages Black Youth in Islington/UK and families too.
- iv. To support the innovative work which has been carried out by the Runnymede Trust, the Black Curriculum and others to engage young people and teachers with more expansive, representative and inclusive histories of Britain, to overhaul the curriculum to better educate about the United Kingdom's role in slavery, and to support calls from the National Education Union to 'review the curriculum to ensure it embraces the fact that Britain is rooted in Black and global history, achievement and culture and includes the achievements of Black Britons; as recommended by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry.

Motion 7: Pause and Review the Edmonton Incinerator Project
(title amended to '*A green solution for Islington's waste*')

The Mayor advised that a proposed amendment to this motion has been circulated in the second despatch of papers.

Councillor Russell moved the motion. Councillor Champion moved the amendment. Councillor Heather contributed to the debate.

Councillor Russell exercised her right of reply on the motion. Councillor Champion exercised her right of reply on 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 continue to work with the NLWA and Labour Mayor of London to produce an EfW facility which maintains the highest possible environmental standards, produce as much renewable energy as possible and contribute to higher rates of recycling.
- ii. To continue to work with residents, businesses and organisations in Islington to reduce waste, increase recycling and move towards a circular economy in line with the Council's commitments to net zero and waste reduction.
- iii. To work with the NLWA in a transparent and accountable way to include the regular updating of the Council Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee by NLWA officers.

Motion 1: Good, well paid jobs for local people

The motion was moved by Councillor Heather in the absence of Councillor Shaikh.

The motion was put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. To continue supporting local people into good, well-paid work through innovative measures such as targeting in-need sectors such as health and social care
- ii. To work with local schools and colleges to reduce the number of young people who are not in education, training or employment
- iii. To keep working with local businesses to encourage them to pay the real Living Wage to their workers, making Islington a fairer and more equal place for all
- iv. Work with trade unions to develop community campaigns to challenge insecurities in the labour market, improve union membership and tackle the exploitative nature of the gig economy

Motion 2: Stop the Government making local people pay for the pandemic

Councillor Picknell moved the motion. Councillor Chowdhury seconded.

The motion was put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. To call on Central Government to provide sustained, adequate and fairly distributed funding to public services, including councils, and not impose further austerity.
- ii. To work with LGA Labour on the 'Stop the Squeeze' campaign, seeking to stop Central Government increasing Council Tax and putting the burden on local people.
- iii. To continue supporting local people with the cost of living crisis through targeted support to those most in-need.

Motion 5: A cleaner, greener, healthier Islington

Councillor Champion moved the motion. Councillor Gantly seconded.

The motion was put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. To continue to work locally, and in partnership with London councils and City Hall to tackle the climate emergency, reaching net zero carbon by 2030.
- ii. To write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, calling for the Government to match Islington's ambition with real funding for

climate resilience, conversion to heat pumps, decarbonisation of the transport network, and subsidies to support further local energy generation and storage.

- iii. To build on the success of our climate festival, launching a new climate hub service to provide residents and businesses with the advice and information they need to make low-carbon decisions, alongside a climate pledge tool, allowing everyone to set their own decarbonisation target on our journey to net zero together.
- iv. To campaign for investment in green jobs, a just transition, climate resilience measures and a decarbonised public transport network to support our recovery.

Motion 4: Affirmation of membership of Stonewall's Diversity Champion scheme

Councillor Russell moved the motion. Councillor O'Halloran contributed to the debate.

The motion was put to the vote and CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- i. To continue demonstrating leadership on LGBTQ+ equality and inclusion in the workplace to residents, businesses and other organisations in the borough.
- ii. To maintain its membership of Stonewall as a Diversity Champion and continue participating in Stonewall's UK Workplace Equality Index to measure and compare the Council's performance on workplace LGBTQ+ inclusion on a national level.

The meeting closed at 10.30 pm

MAYOR