

COUNCIL, 21 November 2018

MOTIONS

A. LIFTS AT HAROLD WOOD STATION

Motion on behalf of the North Havering Residents' Group

This council calls upon the Mayor of London to investigate and provide an adequate explanation to the ongoing delays to the completion of the ticket hall and lifts at Harold Wood (TFL) station as it is now over 2 years behind schedule.

Amendment in behalf of the Conservative Group

This council calls upon the Mayor of London to investigate and provide an adequate explanation to the ongoing delays to the completion of the ticket hall, lifts and other improvements at Harold Wood, Romford & Gidea Park (TFL) stations, as these are now over 2 years behind schedule.

B. LOWER THAMES CROSSING CONSULTATION

Motion on behalf of the Upminster and Cranham Residents' Associations Group

Following on from the initial consultation regarding the Lower Thames Crossing and the response from this Council (March 2016) which recognised the need for an additional river crossing but preferred the option which would have seen a new crossing alongside the existing Dartford Bridge. The government are now proposing, and consulting upon, a 14.5mile road, including a 2.4 mile tunnel, connecting the M2 near Rochester and the M25 by North Ockendon.

In responding to the current consultation (ends 20th December), this Council calls upon the Leader to reiterate its concerns in respect of:

- Adverse impact on residential amenity for homes in Havering in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration
- Loss of homes in the North Ockendon area
- Impact on conservation areas and heritage assets in the locality

Council, 21 November 2018

- Adverse impact of ongoing works and siting of works compound
- Should the Crossing go ahead as planned, that Havering residents are eligible to a toll discount scheme (on the same basis as received by residents of Thurrock and Dartford for the Dartford Crossing).

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council welcomes the proposed additional investment within transport infrastructure, from the Lower Thames Crossing to the proposed upgrading of the Gallows Corner interchange; and calls upon the Executive to continue to engage within any public consultations to highlight both the specific issues relating to each project but also the commutative affect that all projects will have upon Havering's transport network, and local residents.

C. ADOPTION OF IHRA DEFINITION OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Motion on behalf of the Conservative Group

This council expresses alarm at the rise in antisemitism in recent years across the UK. This includes incidents when criticism of Israel has been expressed using antisemitic tropes. Criticism of Israel can be legitimate, but not if it employs the tropes and imagery of antisemitism.

The Council therefore welcome the UK Government's announcement on December 11th 2016 that it will sign up to the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) guidelines on antisemitism which define antisemitism thus:

“Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

The guidelines highlight manifestations of antisemitism as including:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.

Council, 21 November 2018

- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.”

This Council welcomes cross-party support within the Council for combating antisemitism in all its manifestations. This Council hereby adopts the above definition of antisemitism as set out by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and pledges to combat this pernicious form of racism.

Amendment on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group

There are always 3 sides to an argument! The IHRA definition of “anti-Semitism” is itself “anti-Semitic” and a device along with hateful “Hate Crime” legislation, to protect the powerful by censoring free speech and honest debate on vital issues.

It's also a surprise the Conservatives are promoting this “Left-Wing, thought crime” motion as the previous administration changed the constitution to stop national, let alone international, issues being debated at Council.

Thus Council agrees that debating the motion is premature and reaffirms its support for free speech, tolerance and honest debate as essential British values

D. SIZE OF PLANNING COMMITTEES

Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group

The March 7th Governance meeting and subsequent March 21st Council approved a Governance report proposing changes to the council's planning regime. The report included a recommendation to create two planning committees, a Strategic Planning committee with 7 members and a Planning committee with 11 members, but did say the actual size of the committees (and all committees) would be a matter for Annual Council on May 23rd.

Council, 21 November 2018

At Annual Council it was proposed to create two size 8 planning committees as part of item 9 on the Council agenda. Item 9 was approved without debate following a procedural motion to go vote only. Following the meeting the Monitoring Officer advised the creation of size 8 committees was to “assist with proportionality”, except it doesn’t and neither does the Planning Advisory Service provide specific advice on size of committees.

Due to the quasi-judicial importance of planning committees, the overall creation of two new planning committee positions is welcome, however this motion calls upon Council to agree to change the size of the two planning committees from size 8 to size 7 (strategic) and 11 (planning) as recommended in the approved March 7th Governance Committee report, subsequently approved at March 21st Council.

Council is further asked to agree to increase the total number of seats on committee to 136 (from 134), and to ensure political balance rules are adhered to, agrees to the allocation of seats as set out in the appendix to this motion.

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council notes the decision taken by full council on 23rd May this year to establish the committees of the authority having regard to political balance.

E. PESTICIDE CONTROL

Motion on behalf of the Labour Group

This Council calls upon the Executive to prepare a plan of action to eliminate as a matter of priority the use of pesticides such as glyphosate in its Parks, Gardens, Open Green Space and Highways.

Amendment on behalf of the conservative Group

The Council calls upon the Executive to undertake a review of pesticides used by the authority and to bring a report to Cabinet.

F. LEISURE CENTRES

Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents’ Group

The Councils composite contribution to the new **£28.8m** Romford Leisure Centre was **£26.726m**. This involved **£21.950m** from Morrisons in exchange for the council owned ice rink site and a further **£4.776m** from council reserves. Sports England contributed an additional **£2.074m**.

Council, 21 November 2018

Please note, Council assets and reserves are owned by all the borough. In Havering there are 18 wards and if we count the 3 wards in the south as Rainham, it means Rainham's share of council assets is about **16%**. This means Rainham's contribution to the new Romford Leisure Centre was **16% of £26,726m = £4.277m**. (This figure excludes Rainham's 16% contribution towards whatever the council is spending on the other centres).

On the back of this contribution new centres and facilities have been opened in Romford, Hornchurch, Harold Hill and Noak Hill, with the council responsible for the capital funding and a new 'borough-wide' leisure contract signed with SLM. They are making a payment to council of **£1.1m** to manage the contract, but their own profit is undisclosed and the council has yet to trigger a profit share option.

The Executive claims, as Chafford requires a subsidy it may have to close. Ignoring the fact the Romford Centre was opened after receiving a de facto upfront council subsidy of **£26.726m**. In other words all the centres are receiving subsidy in one form or another and therefore they should all be included in the 'borough-wide' contract and cross subsidised.

In short, Rainham has contributed over **£4.277m** towards the Romford Leisure Centre and 'borough-wide' contract, but its own leisure centre is facing closure, allegedly, due to an unaffordable **£232,000** subsidy, when if Rainham's over **£4.277m** contribution towards the other Centres had been spent in Rainham, it's enough to keep Chafford open for over another **18 years**.

Thus Council agrees this disparity of funding within the new 'borough-wide' leisure contract is evidence of institutional bias against Rainham, contrary to the council's equality, diversity and community cohesion duty within the 2010 Equality Act and calls on the Executive to resume ownership of Chafford Sports Complex and keep it open until a new centre is built in the south of the borough.

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council congratulates the previous administration for delivering the new state of the art Sapphire Ice and Leisure Centre in Romford and welcomes the additional investment being made within sport provision across the Borough.

This Council further notes that due to the financial arrangements of the contract, there is no burden on the council tax payer and there will in fact attribute an on-going surplus for the Council, to reinvest in the Borough.