



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HAVERING Virtual Meeting 15 December 2020 (7.30 - 8.15 pm)

Present: The Mayor (Councillor John Mylod) in the Chair

Councillors Councillors Robert Benham, Ray Best, Carole Beth, Joshua Chapman, John Crowder, Philippa Crowder, Keith Darvill, Osman Dervish, Michael Deon Burton, David Durant, Tony Durdin, Brian Eagling, Gillian Ford, Jason Frost, Martin Goode, Linda Hawthorn, Judith Holt, Tele Lawal, Paul McGeary, Paul Middleton, Sally Miller, Robby Misir, Ray Morgon, Barry Mugglestone, Stephanie Nunn, Denis O'Flynn, Gerry O'Sullivan, Ron Ower, Dilip Patel, Nisha Patel, Bob Perry, Viddy Persaud, Roger Ramsey, Timothy Ryan, Jan Sargent, Carol Smith, Christine Smith, Natasha Summers, Matt Sutton, Maggie Themistocli, Jeffrey Tucker, John Tyler, Linda Van den Hende, Christine Vickery, Melvin Wallace, Ciaran White, Damian White, Michael White, Christopher Wilkins, Graham Williamson and Darren Wise

The Mayor's Official Chaplain - Father John Tuohy, Parish Priest of St Joseph's Catholic Church, Upminster opened the meeting with prayers.

The meeting closed with the singing of the National Anthem.

**44 PROTOCOL ON THE OPERATION ON MEETINGS OF FULL COUNCIL
DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESTRICTIONS (agenda item 2)**

The protocol on the operation of meetings of full Council during the Covid-19 restrictions was noted by Council, without division.

45 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (agenda item 3)

Apologies were received from Councillor Reg Whitney.

46 MINUTES (agenda item 4)

The minutes of the meeting of full Council held on 9 September 2020 were agreed as a correct record, without division.

47 **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (agenda item 5)**

There were no disclosures of interest.

48 **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR, BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL OR BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE (agenda item 6)**

A minute's silence was held in memory of former Councillor Cyril North who had recently passed away. Tributes to Councillor North were paid by Members of several Groups.

The Mayor advised Council that his charities would be St Francis Hospice, Clowns In The Sky and the Rainbow Trust. The Mayor had recently attended Remembrance Sunday events in Hornchurch and Romford as well as a Zoom meeting on the World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims and the on-line lighting up ceremony for the Christmas Tree in Trafalgar Square. The Deputy Mayor had attended a recent live virtual fundraising auction for King George and Queen's Hospitals Charity.

The Leader of the Council thanked staff for their hard work during the pandemic period and added that this been recognised by the granting of an extra day's leave to all staff over the Christmas period.

A total of 30 Covid martials and 7 additional public protection officers had been recruited. The Leader was pleased that the first Covid-19 vaccinations had now taken place at Queen's Hospital but felt that the coming months would continue to be very challenging.

The Chief Executive advised that numbers of Covid-19 cases in Havering continued to rise and that three mobile testing units would therefore be based in the borough. Secondary school pupils had been targeted for testing with 96% of tests given out in the first tranche. Home tests were also available for pupils or teachers.

More lateral flow asymptomatic tests would be rolled out across London and the Council had requested 30,000 of these for Havering. The Covid response work was taking a lot of officer time and the Chief Executive requested that Members work with officers to support the ongoing response work to Covid-19. An all Member briefing would be arranged in due course to give the latest information to Members.

The following procedural motion was proposed by the Conservative Group:

In view of the Chief Executive's announcement and update from the Director of Public Health, and in recognition of the considerable work that officers are currently engaged in and need to continue with; I am putting forward the following motion under Council procedure Rule 12.1 (k):

Under Council Procedure Rule 20, Council agrees to partially suspend the Council Procedure Rules for this evening's meeting. There are petitions under item 7, one report at item 8 as well as members' questions and motions for debate at items 9 and 10.

- i) The petitions are marked as received
- ii) The report in item 8 be received and a vote only procedure is followed on the proposed amendment and if necessary the recommendation in the report.
- iii) That the answers to Members' Question be circulated to all Members by email. Any supplementary questions from Members who put forward the questions be sent to Democratic Services and a written response provided in due course which is copied to all Members.
- iv) That the Council follow the vote only procedure pursuant to Rule 13.4 in relation to motions A and B put forward by the Independent Resident's Group and their proposed amendments.
- v) That the Council agrees the withdrawal of motions C and D pursuant to rule 11.7 and agrees that those items are resubmitted to the next scheduled meeting of Full Council in January 2021.

In putting forward this procedural motion, in particular the vote only procedure for Motions A & B, I acknowledge that the Leader of the Independent Resident's Group has stated that his and his Group's preference would have been to debate these motions before these are put to a vote.

As this is a procedural motion under Council Procedure Rule 12.1(k), this motion should proceed to a vote without discussion.

The procedural motion was **AGREED** by 45 votes to 8 with 0 abstentions (see division 1).

49 **PETITIONS (agenda item 7)**

The following petitions were received:

From Councillor Williamson concerning a request from the residents of Hubert Road, Rainham for a Controlled Parking Zone, from Councillor Summers re a requested relocation of the Covid-19 testing centre on the Cherry Tree Lane car park and from the Leader of the Council re overdevelopment on Romford Seedbed Centre.

50 **EXEMPTIONS TO THE CALL-IN PROCESS (agenda item 8)**

A report of the Chief Executive summarised, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, matters exempt from the call-in process between 30 March and 2 December 2020.

A question on the report submitted by the Residents' Group, together with its response is shown at appendix 1 to these minutes.

Deemed motion on behalf of Administration

That the report be adopted and its recommendations carried into effect.

Amendment by Residents' Group

An additional recommendation be added to the report as follows:

A report be submitted to the next Governance Committee meeting setting out the current process that is followed to request an exemption to "call in" and to allow for this process to be reviewed to ensure that the process is open, transparent and ensures proper accountability of the decision makers.

The amendment on behalf of the Residents' Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 29 votes to 20 with 4 abstentions (see division 2) and the deemed motion on behalf of the Administration was **AGREED** as the substantive motion, without division.

51 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (agenda item 9)**

In accordance with the agreed Procedural Motion, answers to questions would be circulated to all Members by e-mail. Supplementary questions from question setters would be responded to in writing, which would be copied to all Members.

The questions submitted, with initial answers, are attached as appendix 2 to these minutes.

52 **FIRST DO NO HARM (agenda item 10A)**

Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group

This Council calls upon the Executive to contact the Prime Minister to lift restrictions and support the full re-opening of all hospitals, doctors surgeries, mental health units and all other medical centres in order to continue to support all those in need of further treatment, operations, mental health support and other health services, that have been withdrawn due to the Government's Coronavirus Lockdown Restrictions.

Amendment on behalf of the Labour Group

This Council welcomes the lifting of lockdown restrictions and calls upon the Executive to contact the Prime Minister to ensure that the National Health

Service and Public Health Authorities are properly funded to cope with the impact of the pandemic as well as delivering the high level of service it committed to deliver in its 2019 manifesto

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council welcomes the steps taken to safeguard local residents against increased exposure to Covid-19; it notes that Havering has had some of the highest rates of infections across all age categories and that the local hospital trust is running at capacity; and calls upon the Administration to write to the Prime Minister to request additional resources are released to Havering and the wider East London Boroughs, to support the continued suppression of the virus whilst the national vaccine roll out is undertaken.

The amendment by the Labour Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 31 votes to 6 with 16 abstentions (see division 3); the amendment by the Conservative Group was **CARRIED** by 41 votes to 10 with 2 abstentions and **AGREED** as the substantive motion without division.

53 PUBLIC NOTICE OBLIGATION (agenda item 10B)

Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group

Local newspapers act as a valuable part of our democratic system, but just like democracy itself cannot be taken for granted and need support to flourish. Many print editions have gone on-line and the Romford Recorder can only survive with guaranteed income mostly through advertising.

However the Government's "Planning for the Future" consultation (ended 29th Oct) proposed removing the obligation of councils to advertise Public Notices in local papers. If this happened it would harm local papers and undermine the coverage and transparency they provide about planning matters and local affairs.

To avoid this the IRG called on the Executive to respond to the government's "Planning for the Future" consultation in favour of retaining the obligation of local authorities to advertise Public Notices in local papers in the interests of local democracy.

Instead the Administration's submission supported the removal of the Public Notice obligation. and Council strongly disagrees with the Executive decision to support the removal of the Public Notice obligation.

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council welcomes the Administration's submission to the planning for the Future consultation and awaits the response from the Government.

The amendment by the Conservative Group was **CARRIED** by 31 votes to 19 with 3 abstentions (see division 5) and **AGREED** as the substantive motion, without division.

54 LOWER THAMES CROSSING (agenda item 10C)**Motion on behalf of the Upminster and Cranham Residents' Associations Group**

Following on from several consultations regarding the Lower Thames Crossing and the responses from this Council (March 2016 and this year) Highways England submitted a Planning Application for a 14.5mile road, including a 2.4 mile tunnel, connecting the M2 near Rochester and the M25 by North Ockendon.

We have been advised that following feedback from the Planning Inspectorate that the Application has been withdrawn and a new one will be submitted.

Therefore we ask that this Council calls upon the Leader to reiterate its concerns to the Government and our Members of Parliament in respect of the following:

- 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
- Adverse impact of ongoing works and siting of works compounds.
- 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 withdrawal of the Lower Thames Crossing planning application following the objections raised by the Administration as part of the public consultation; notes that the previous scheme failed to adequately address the projected increases in noise and air pollution that would result across Havering from increased traffic movements; notes the unwillingness from Highway England to include sufficient upgrades of the strategic highway network as part of the overall design; notes the unwillingness from Highways England to offer Havering residents a user

discount, and calls upon the Administration to take all necessary steps to engage with Highway England, to ensure that these issues are addressed.

With the agreement of Council and in line with the procedural motion agreed earlier in the meeting, this motion was withdrawn and resubmitted to the next meeting of Council.

55 ORCHARD VILLAGE (agenda item 10D)

Motion on behalf of the Labour Group

This Council call upon the Government to increase funding for the safe removal and replacement of the external building cladding at Orchard Village and other residential blocks irrespective of the height of the buildings in order that shared owners and leaseholders are relieved of the substantial costs involved. Clarion Housing Association is urged to bring forward a programme to make all necessary safety works at Orchard Village.

Amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group

This Council welcomes the £1billion made available by the Government for this financial year to support the remediation of unsafe non-ACM cladding systems on residential buildings 18 metres and above in height, in both the private and social housing sectors. This Council also notes the Government's publication of the draft Building Safety Bill which lays out the framework and enabling powers to implement a new approach to building safety regulation. Clarion Housing Association is therefore urged to bring forward a programme to carry out all necessary safety works at Orchard Village.

With the agreement of Council and in accordance with the procedural motion agreed earlier in the meeting, this motion was withdrawn and resubmitted to the next meeting of Council.

56 VOTING RECORD

The record of voting is attached as appendix 3 to these minutes.

Mayor

COUNCIL, 15 DECEMBER 2020, AGENDA ITEM 8 – EXEMPTIONS TO THE CALL-IN PROCESS

Question by Residents' Group

Would the Leader of the Council explain why so many Executive Decisions on this report have a reason for no “Call in” as Special Urgency due to Gold Command? Furthermore, would the Leader of the Council explain what this means and why they were needed given that the Executive Decisions in question were for non-Covid related decisions?

Answer:

The Key Executive Decisions listed in the report before Members were made exempt from call-in with the agreement of the Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Board. The need for urgency was a direct or indirect consequence of the COVID pandemic, with action taken by the Chief Executive utilising the statutory powers conferred to him under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Gold Command), or through the scheme of delegation by Cabinet, Individual Cabinet Member or Officer.

The Council's previous Monitoring Officer put in place measures to monitor all requests for exemption from call-in and urgency prior to consideration by the Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Board. Our current Monitoring Officer has maintained that practice.

For reasons of openness and transparency, the Chief Executive made a commitment at the outbreak of the pandemic to keep Members updated of decisions made during this period when exercising his powers. He has honoured that commitment both through the publication of decisions listed in the report before Members but also through regular updates at All Member Briefings. I'm sure all Members are grateful for the hard work and commitment demonstrated by the Chief Executive and his staff during these difficult times.

This page is intentionally left blank



Appendix 2

FULL COUNCIL, Tuesday 15 December 2020

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Parking Charges in Hornchurch and Upminster Town Centres

**1) To the Cabinet Member for Environment (Councillor Osman Dervish)
From Councillor Paul Middleton**

Businesses in Hornchurch and Upminster Town Centres are suffering due to the Covid19 pandemic. Hornchurch is losing a major retailer (Peacocks) which is a huge loss to the area and we are likely to see more shops close unless more positive action is taken. An experimental order to introduce 29 on-street parking spaces in Hornchurch Town Centre with a free hour parking has been introduced, but is having little impact and are in the main next to existing car parks that remain mostly empty. During the lockdown period these car parks were made free to use and were 90% full – which shows there is a requirement for off street parking. Would the Cabinet Member introduce one hour free parking in Hornchurch and Upminster Town Centre car parks to encourage the use of the car parks and help save the shops?

Answer

The Council are supporting local businesses, high streets and residents across the borough and this is why measures introduced from 3rd August for parking included a 20% discount when paying by the cashless app (Ringo) in all Council Car Parks. This was in addition to introducing a number of new on-street parking bays in Hornchurch to increase opportunities for parking and across these we have introduced one hour **free** parking.

This means local residents can visit Hornchurch and Upminster, shop for up to one hour, so putting money into the local economy and not have to pay to do so. In addition, if people want to support local businesses for a longer period for things like a haircut or having a meal, again they can do so by paying a discounted rate in the car parks and again this supports the local economy.

And further to this, we have once again introduced free parking in Council Car Parks over five weekends across the Christmas and new Year period to help people shop locally and support the local economy. The parking offer in Havering is better than our surrounding boroughs. Neighbouring boroughs such as Newham, Redbridge and Thurrock offer no reduced or free parking charges within their Council owned car parks and only a limited 30 minutes at some on-street locations.

Some initial analysis demonstrates that the average uptake of customers using car parks and benefitting from the 20% discount when paying cashless so far this year is, on average 34% of all transactions across the borough. It would

Council, 15 December 2020

therefore appear to be a welcomed much improved offer to the customer with an upward trend over a much shorter period when compared with 2019/20 which was 28%.

Almost half of the total number of on-street transactions since August have been made using the cashless app. With 45% of all on-street parking utilising the 1-hour free parking period compared to 26% in 2019/20 when 30 minutes free was offered.

We will continue to monitor use of car parks and parking bays but I believe our parking offer is popular and being well-used and it is too earlier to consider changes to the system.

Parking Review in Upminster and Cranham

2) To the Leader of the Council (Councillor Damian White) From Councillor Ron Ower

Last year the Council sought views from residents concerning parking restrictions for Maple Avenue, Acacia Avenue and Sycamore Avenue. The scheme was put on hold pending the consultation on a borough-wide parking plan, the details of which have not been revealed to Members. What is the status of the borough-wide review and how much did it cost?

Answer

The CPZ review ended in November 2019 and results have been collected with recommendations pending via an ED to the Director of Neighbourhoods.

The Council's response to the Covid pandemic has delayed the outcomes of the consultation from being published and presented to Cabinet. It is hoped that this will happen before the end of the financial year.

The total costs for the consultation was £27,850+VAT which included face to face consultation in the areas involved, focus group meetings with local businesses and an online consultation.

Lockdown Restrictions

3) To the Leader of the Council (Councillor Damian White) From Councillor Jeffrey Tucker

The Council Leader has suggested there will need to be many lockdown restrictions until a COVID-19 vaccine is available. Surely this is a recipe for mental/health and economic devastation! Is this still his view?

Answer

Faced with an unprecedented pandemic, the Government has chosen to prioritise the health of the nation and particularly that of vulnerable citizens – the elderly and those with pre-existing health problems above other considerations and thereafter mitigate the knock on impact on the social, cultural and economic life of the country. I continue to agree with this approach. Allowing the disease to spread unchecked would result in thousands of both deaths and survivors with persistent and debilitating disability. I note the concern of the councillor for the mental health of residents but wonder how bereavement on this scale would help in this regard? However, we will soon launch a campaign with Mind and other partners to support our residents in addition to the support already available.

What is clear is that there are no easy choices – this Council will continue to do all it can to protect the health of residents and the economic life of the borough while the pandemic persists. With this in mind we need to make sure contrary messages are not promoted to residents which either confuses or encourages people not to stick to the rules.

Moreover, we will encourage every resident who can to take up the offer of vaccination as soon as they are authorised for use as being safe and effective. At that point we can truly begin to put the pandemic behind us.

“Laptops for Schools” Programme

- 4) **To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Families (Councillor Robert Benham)**
From Councillor Paul McGeary

How many laptops have been provided for Havering’s children as part of the ‘Laptops for Schools Programme’? How many have been provided directly by schools and separately by the Council? How many such laptops have been gifted to children and how many are on loan?

Answer

As part of phase one of the Department for Education’s (DfE) digital device rollout, the council have allocated 662 laptops to children and young people with a Havering Social Worker as per the eligibility criteria. We have also set up a dedicated phone line, in partnership with OneSource, operating five days a week to provide after care support for the devices.

Any remaining devices will continue to be allocated to children and young people with a Havering social worker as part of business as usual. Collection from the Town Hall on a fortnightly basis is carried out by the child’s social worker.

Council, 15 December 2020

As per DfE guidance, the devices allocated as part of this rollout are a DfE asset until March 2021. After this point, they will become an asset of the council.

Phase two of the DfE's digital device scheme for vulnerable children without a social worker is managed directly by the schools with allocations set by the DfE. The council is currently awaiting details as to how many laptops have been allocated directly by schools as this data is held directly by the schools.

Public Protection

**5) To the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Safety (Councillor Viddy Persaud)
From Councillor Brian Eagling**

What powers do the Council's Enforcement officers have when dealing with issues regarding Covid-19 and related matters.

Answer

The Council has a number of enforcement options available, which in general, focus around the obligations placed on businesses. These are outlined in the Public Protection Outbreak Control Enforcement Policy. In addition to the informal enforcement options such as guidance and signposting and verbal/written advice, officers have powers to provide both written and verbal warnings. These would be appropriate where contraventions are due to a lack of understanding and no significant health risks are present or likely to be present.

Formal enforcement options include:

- Prohibition notices under the Coronavirus Regulations to deal with business that should not be open
- Closure Notices, where authorised, necessary and appropriate, in consultation with the Director of Public Health in cases of serious and imminent threat to Public Health.
- Fixed Penalty Notices may be used as an alternative or precursor to prosecution.
- Revocation, refusal or review of licence (where relevant)
- Prohibition notices under the Health and Safety at Work Act may be appropriate in certain situations
- Formal cautions, may be offered as an alternative to a financial penalty or prosecution
- Prosecution, in the most serious of cases

Throughout the COVID pandemic – we have ensured our enforcement and compliance teams get the balance right between encouragement and enforcement. We continue to engage with businesses to offer advice support – as well as using

our enforcement powers where necessary to ensure the safety of our residents and communities.

Mayor's Charities 2019/20

**6) To the Leader of the Council (Councillor Damian White)
From Councillor Ray Morgon**

Would the Leader of the Council confirm how much Councillor Michael Deon Burton raised as Mayor for his chosen charities?

Answer

When funds are donated in response to a mayoral appeal, payment may in some cases be made directly to the nominated charities rather than through the Council. Payments made to the Council are processed through the "The Mayor of Havering General Appeal Fund". In accordance with the relevant regulations, records are kept for each financial year as opposed to each mayoral year and passed to the Charity Commission. However, the efforts of current and past Mayors in promoting worthy local causes deserve the support of all members.

School Streets

**7) To the Cabinet Member for Environment (Councillor Osman Dervish)
From Councillor Christopher Wilkins**

The Council has introduced the School Streets' Scheme in Cedar Avenue, where Branfil School is situated. Local Members were provided with very short notice regarding the scheme. During the consultation period, Local Members did raise concerns regarding increased congestion and pollution for those living in adjoining streets, prior to the scheme being introduced. There appears to have been no, or little, consultation with residents in adjoining roads. Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

What steps will be taken to alleviate the pollution and congestion in the adjoining roads, where the School Streets' Scheme was introduced?

Answers

We monitored roads surrounding all of the School Street schemes during November. This involved looking at the volume and type of traffic using the school streets scheme. We used video cameras to record and analyse the behaviour of motorists, such as double parking, drop kerb obstruction and dangerous manoeuvring. This monitoring took place for one week during the morning and afternoon school runs.

Pollution cannot be measured in any meaningful way for a period of less than six months to a year. Diffusion tubes passively monitor nitrogen dioxide and are highly unlikely to demonstrate any effect on minor roads with low traffic volumes.

Air Quality mesh monitoring provides hourly monitoring and is more effective, but unfortunately is too expensive and not covered by TfL funding.

The results from the monitoring will provide the basis for a lesson learned report – including any suggested actions - for the consideration of senior management and Members.

The school's streets scheme was consulted on with those residents where the restrictions would be put in place. This is our normal practice with any traffic and parking consultation, in that the consultation is with those affected by the restrictions being proposed and not the surrounding areas. Other boroughs in London have forged ahead with changes to their streets in response to the Covid pandemic with no consultation with local people and as a result have received considerable backlash and, in some cases have had to reverse the work they'd implemented. Taking the approach we have, ensure local residents are on board with our proposals before we undertake any costly work.

“DoingMyBit” Campaign

8) To the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Safety (Councillor Viddy Persaud)

From Councillor David Durant

The Council's “DoingMyBit” campaign was launched without undertaking a Medical Risk Assessment into the pros and cons of mask wearing and without a report being approved by Cabinet. This failure matters as the morally coercive campaign could undermine human and employment rights and result in an increase in Disability Hate Crime, and make the council potentially financially liable for any medical harm caused to people from heeding the campaign.

In view of this does the Cabinet Member for Public Protection agree the “DoingMyBit” campaign should be halted until an MRA is undertaken and a full report on the matter is prepared and approved by Cabinet?

Answer

No, I do not agree.

It is a lawful requirement to wear face coverings in public settings. The hugely successful Public Services Communications award winning Doing My Bit campaign sets out to raise awareness of this along with a range of other measures to prevent transmission of Covid-19 and save lives. And because it is lawful requirement, people could be fined if they are not exempt.

Exemptions based on age, health or disability exist so that people who cannot wear one do not have to. We have promoted initiatives supporting awareness of this.

Council, 15 December 2020

Nobody who is exempt from wearing a face mask should experience discrimination or aggression because of it and because of that risk it is vital that only those with a legitimate reason use that exemption.

For those who are not exempt, there are no 'cons' of wearing a mask. It is part of being a decent and compassionate member of society.

The spread of this virus is enabled by the spread of hoaxes and lies. I hope Cllr Durant will see fit to retract his statement that, and I quote, "if you wear a face mask for a long period of time this could actually reduce your oxygen levels in your blood and cause you more harm". This is not true and has been comprehensively debunked by doctors. It is damaging and dangerous to spread this sort of fake news.

SEND Pupils in Havering

**9) To the Cabinet Member for education, Children and Families (Councillor Robert Benham)
From Councillor Keith Darvill**

How many SEND pupils are there in Havering and what is the current cost of sending some of those pupils out of Borough for their education needs separated between private and public sector providers?

Answer

- Currently there are 1870 children and young people with Education Health and Care Plans in Havering.
- Of these children/young people 205 (10.9%) attend educational placements out of the borough (further details below).
- The breakdown between maintained (public sector) and independent/voluntary sector (private) is as follows:

	Maintained Setting Placements		Independent/Voluntary Sector Placements	
	Current Numbers	Cost 2020-21 £000	Current Numbers	Cost 2020-21 £000
Pre-16	74	985	44	2,412
Post-16	76 (47 in B&D college)	690	11	941
Total	150	1,675	55	3,353

- Children are generally placed out of borough because there is no local provision, due to the speciality of the provision, or capacity that can offer a place at the necessary time, or because the child is placed out of the borough in a foster placement or residential care due to social care reasons. They tend to be the children with the most complex needs, and if they were to remain in Havering the placements would be in the higher cost brackets.
- The total cost of these placements is £5m. This represents 20% of the total spend of High Needs Budget of £25m.
- It is of note that Havering were in the top 10 authorities for achieving good outcomes for the amount of money invested from the high needs funding in the Impower Best performing Councils of 2020 report. It remains a priority to place children in education that represents good value and achieves positive outcomes.
- Havering's High Needs Review and action plan has identified the need to develop more local specialist provision with plans underway to increase Primary and Secondary Additional Resourced Provision (Specialist units in mainstream settings), by a further 50 places before 2022. This is in addition to the 60 place special free school due to open in 2022.

Public Firework Displays

**10) To the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Safety (Councillor Viddy Persaud)
From Councillor Martin Goode**

Further to our agreed Motion at January's Full Council meeting, what progress has the Council made to encourage all public firework displays within the Local Authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event? A public awareness campaign about the impact fireworks have on animal welfare and vulnerable people will allow residents to take appropriate precautions and encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock 'quieter' fireworks for public display

Answer

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic no applications for firework events were received this year. However all public firework displays organised by school or community groups which charge a nominal fee (e.g. up to £10.00) would normally be publicised in advance via our event webpage. Firework displays which are organised by Commercial operators will have their own independent advertising policy. Although the council would not fund the advertising of commercial events they would be able to advertise in Living in Havering magazine and the Heart magazine

All firework retailers were written to this year and reminded that the council had adopted the motion and that they should consider stocking quieter fireworks. The matter was also added to the authority's inspection sheets to remind officers to discuss the stocking of quieter fireworks during proactive visits.

Council communications have included advice on protecting vulnerable people, how to keep pets safe and encourage residents to buy quieter fireworks. Social media has also been used to promote this messaging throughout the firework period. We also linked up with the RSPCA campaign to increase awareness of how animals and pets are affected by fireworks and what steps can be taken to help keep pets secure during this time.

Educational Attainment Information

**11) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Families
(Councillor Robert Benham)
From Councillor Ray Morgon**

Would the Cabinet Member confirm what steps he will take to ensure that all schools provide clear and transparent information on their results performance and place the collective information on the Council's website?

Answer

Maintained schools, academies, free schools and colleges must publish specific data online, including a range of exam, assessment results and information for key stages 2, 4 and 5 where appropriate.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/what-maintained-schools-must-publish-online>

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/what-academies-free-schools-and-colleges-should-publish-online>

The Local Authority checks that this information is made available through its existing quality assurance processes.

For academies, free schools and colleges, this is also done by the Department for Education Regional Schools Commissioner.

Ofsted also check this information is available as part of their inspection process.

In addition, a comprehensive set of statistics and performance tables is regularly published by the Department for Education;

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-performance-tables>

Council, 15 December 2020

This allows parents to review the performance of primary, secondary and post-16 providers across a wide range of measures, including progress, standards, absence, workforce and finance.

Schools must also include a link to the DfE school and college performance tables (above) and their school's performance tables page.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department for Education has cancelled the 2019/20 national curriculum assessments and associated data collections. The Primary and Secondary school performance tables: 2020 publication has been cancelled due to coronavirus (COVID-19).

However, other non-standards related data will still be available, including progress, Not in Education Employment and Training (NEET), absence, finance, workforce, finance.

Havering Local Register

**12) To the Cabinet Member for Housing (Councillor Joshua Chapman)
From Councillor Linda Hawthorn**

There are many buildings in Havering, which although of local interest, are not eligible for national listing. We used to have a local list of such buildings, which gave them some protection. This has been shelved for many years now. Can the Cabinet Member please advise when this list will be returned, and Councillors are able to apply for buildings in their wards to be added to it?

Answer

A review of the existing entries on the Local List and the ability to propose additions to it will be considered further as part of the future planning policy work programme, following the adoption of the Local Plan.

The Local List highlights heritage assets which are of local heritage value, ensuring that their importance is taken into account through the planning process. Any impact upon these assets is always reviewed and carefully considered as part of the decision making process on planning applications.

Havering's Local List has not been 'shelved' - it continues to exist and is available to view on the Council's website.

This Council is extremely proud of our borough's rich history and heritage and we will always do our utmost to protect it.

Testing Centre in Cherry Tree Car Park

- 13) **To Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Safety (Councillor Viddy Persaud)**
From Councillor Natasha Summers

Despite claiming to support the High Street the Executive harmed the High Street by closing the Cherry Tree car park, for 6 months, and opening a 'coronavirus testing centre'. No shopkeepers, residents or local councillors were consulted and the centre was operational before the decision to close the car park was made. Will the Cabinet Member for the High Street admit a terrible mistake has been made and relocate the testing centre to a more appropriate location?

Answer

No.

This decision was taken as a matter of urgency against a backdrop of rapidly increasing Covid-19 cases in the borough. It has been of huge benefit in the fight against this pandemic that we have had increased testing capacity located close to where people need it.

The Cherry Tree car park site is the one which we believe best meets both ours and Department of Health and Social Care criteria.

Not taking that decision or taking months over it would have the effect of drawing residents in Rainham and South Hornchurch in to making long journeys to Dagenham or Romford to obtain a test. The impacts on infections if that was the case do not bear thinking about.

Council and PSL Tenants

- 14) **To the Cabinet Member for Housing (Councillor Joshua Chapman)**
From Councillor Keith Darvill

How many Council and PSL Tenants are currently living in overcrowded accommodation (as defined in housing legislation) and have applied to the Housing Department to move into a property that meet their housing needs?

Answer

Housing legislation defines a property as being overcrowded only in very severe circumstances and therefore it includes few households. As a result the council uses the more reasonable bedroom standards that includes more households. We have applications on the Housing Register from 24 households in PSL properties, and 227 in council properties, who have requested a move because they require an additional bedroom for the size of their household.

Council, 15 December 2020

The Council is committed to reducing the levels of overcrowding in all tenures and we have taken action to increase the supply of larger homes in the borough:

- Purchasing of 38 three and four bedroom homes at Crow Lane.
- Increasing the support provided to under-occupiers in council housing to enable them to down-size thereby releasing their home for another family to move to.
- Amending the Housing Allocation Scheme to give greater priority to under-occupying tenants and overcrowded households.
- Increasing the supply of family sized homes in our housing regeneration schemes.
- Buying back former family sized council homes for overcrowded tenants to move to.
- Implementing a programme of loft conversions and extensions where it is feasible to give families more space and create more large family homes.
- Increasing the supply of family homes in the private rented sector through the Capital Letters Scheme.

Charging Points for Electric Vehicles

**15) To the Cabinet Member for Environment (Councillor Osman Dervish)
From Councillor Reg Whitney**

Given the increasing demand and need for electric vehicles, would the Cabinet Member confirm the Administration's Strategy on charging points?

Answer

The Government wants the UK new car market to offer no petrol or diesel vehicles by 2030.

The Department for Transport (DfT) has restated its vision that all drivers of Electric Vehicles in the UK should be able to access public charging infrastructure that is affordable, efficient, and reliable.

The current London Plan requires all new developments with parking provision to include 20% of the spaces with Electric Vehicle Charging Points ready to use and 20% of the spaces ready prepared for the addition of charging infrastructure when demand increases in the future.

Havering's emerging Local Plan states that developments will need to include the minimum required electric vehicle charging points in line with the London Plan requirements.

Council, 15 December 2020

It is recognised that electric vehicle (and hybrid vehicle) numbers will increase significantly over the coming years and that presents both opportunities and challenges.

Last year the Council commissioned a study on Electric Vehicle Charging Points and the potential demand for such infrastructure in the borough.

Further work is taking place exploring options for how EVCP infrastructure can be introduced in the borough and the funding opportunities that are available.

This page is intentionally left blank

DIVISION NUMBER:	1	2	3	4	5
The Mayor [Cllr. Cllr John Mylod]	0	0	0	0	0
The Deputy Mayor [Cllr Christine Vickery]	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
CONSERVATIVE GROUP					
Cllr Robert Benham	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Ray Best	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Joshua Chapman	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr John Crowder	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Philippa Crowder	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Michael Deon Burton	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Osman Dervish	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Jason Frost	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Judith Holt	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Sally Miller	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Robby Misir	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Dilip Patel	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Nisha Patel	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Viddy Persaud	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Roger Ramsey	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Timothy Ryan	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Carol Smith	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Christine Smith	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Matt Sutton	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Maggie Themistocli	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Ciaran White	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Damian White	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Michael White	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
RESIDENTS' GROUP					
Cllr Nic Dodin	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Paul Middleton	0	0	0	✓	✗
Cllr Raymond Morgon	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Barry Mugglestone	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Stephanie Nunn	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Gerry O'Sullivan	✓	✓	0	✗	0
Cllr Reg Whitney	A	A	A	A	A
UPMINSTER & CRANHAM RESIDENTS' GROUP					
Cllr Gillian Ford	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Linda Hawthorn	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Ron Ower	✓	✓	0	✓	0
Cllr John Tyler	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Linda Van den Hende	✓	✓	0	✓	✗
Cllr Christopher Wilkins	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
INDEPENDENT RESIDENTS' GROUP					
Cllr David Durant	0	✓	✗	✗	✗
Cllr Tony Durdin	0	✓	0	✗	✗
Cllr Natasha Summers	0	✓	0	✗	✗
Cllr Jeffrey Tucker	0	0	0	0	✗
Cllr Graham Williamson	0	✓	✓	✗	✗
LABOUR GROUP					
Cllr Carole Beth	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Cllr Keith Darvill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Cllr Tele Lawal	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Paul McGeary	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Cllr Denis O'Flynn	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓
NORTH HAVERING RESIDENTS' GROUP					
Cllr Brian Eagling	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Martin Goode	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cllr Darren Wise	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
INDEPENDENT					
Cllr Bob Perry	0	✓	0	✗	✗
Cllr Jan Sargent	✓	0	✗	✓	✗
Cllr Melvin Wallace	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
TOTALS					
✓ = YES	45	20	6	41	31
✗ = NO	0	29	31	10	19
0 = ABSTAIN/NO VOTE	8	4	16	2	3
ID = INTEREST DISCLOSED/NO VOTE	0	0	0	0	0
A = ABSENT FROM MEETING	1	1	1	1	1
	54	54	54	54	54

This page is intentionally left blank