

2004 – 2005  
December 2004 Volume 7



**CABINET  
AND  
COUNCIL  
MINUTES**



**CABINET AND COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

**VOLUME 7: DECEMBER 2004**

**CONTENTS**

**Meeting**

**Date 2004**

**COUNCIL AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES**

Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee  
Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Sub-Committee

6 December  
8 December

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**8 December**

**STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS  
EDUCATION**

**9 December**

**EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL**

**16 December**

**THE CABINET, ADVISORY PANELS AND CONSULTATIVE FORUMS**

**CABINET**

**16 December**

Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel  
Strategic Planning Advisory Panel  
Supporting People Advisory Panel

1 December  
2 December  
7 December

Education Consultative Forum (Special)

7 December



COUNCIL  
AND  
COUNCIL  
COMMITTEES



SCRUTINY  
SUB-COMMITTEES





**HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE****6 DECEMBER 2004**

Chair: \* Councillor Bluston

Councillors: \* Gate (4) \* Vina Mithani  
 \* Lavingia \* Pinkus (2)  
 \* Myra Michael \* Mrs R Shah

Advisor (non-voting): † Jean Bradlow

\* Denotes Member present  
 (2) and (4) Denote category of Reserve Member  
 † Denotes apologies received

[Note: Councillor Marie-Louise Nolan attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Minute 193 below, and Councillor Margaret Davine also attended this meeting in a speaking role].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL****PART II - MINUTES**183. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the appointment of Councillor Bluston as Chair of the Sub-Committee for the remainder of the 2004/05 Municipal Year, as agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 24 November 2004.

184. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Ann Groves	Councillor Gate
Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay	Councillor Pinkus

185. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Myra Michael	Declared a personal interest by virtue of her husband's position at Mount Vernon Hospital.
Councillor Gate	Declared a personal interest by virtue of his wife's employment in a General Practice.

186. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
16. Home Care Review	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members are requested to receive this item in order to consider the review group's report within the set timescale.

(2) item 16 be considered as the first substantive item of business on the agenda, followed by the original running order; and

(3) all items be considered with the press and public present.

187. **Appointment of Vice Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Myra Michael be appointed as Vice Chair of the Sub-Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/2005.

188. **Appointment of Adviser:**

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Ms Jean Bradlow, Director of Public Health, as Adviser to the Sub-Committee.

189. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2004, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

190. **Public Questions:**

Ms Janet Smith submitted the following public question under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8 (Part 4F of the Constitution):

“What is the view of the Sub-Committee on the fact that the Chief Executive of Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT) has stated that he will not fund the Mind Counselling Service, a service which offers medium term help to people with ongoing and serious mental health problems, despite research which demonstrates the great need for and success of this work, and the overwhelming public support for it to continue?”

In response, the Chair invited Mr Andrew Morgan, Chief Executive of Harrow PCT, who was in attendance for agenda item 13 (Minute 196), to provide the PCT's financial reasoning behind the decision not to fully fund Mind Counselling Service. The Sub-Committee further discussed the funding arrangements for the Mind Counselling Service and mental health in general.

**RESOLVED:** That the above public question be received and noted.

191. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 9.

192. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.

193. **Home Care Review - Final Report:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Organisational Performance, which provided Members with the final report of the Home Care Review Group. The Portfolio Holder for Communications, Partnership and Human Resources introduced the report, owing to her former position on the Sub-Committee and consequent involvement in the review. The Sub-Committee expressed thanks to all those involved in the work of the review group, including Louise Stevenson (Age Concern) and a number of other community and voluntary organisations in the Borough. Members were referred to the recommendations in the report and were asked to note that the review group had strongly recommended several points that required more immediate attention. It was expected that the report would be submitted to Cabinet in early 2005, after which the Sub-Committee would monitor the progress of its recommendations.

Particular attention was focused on recommendations 4 and 5, which highlighted the problem of parking provision for health and social care workers. The Interim Head of Community Care noted that Urban Living would have to be made fully aware of the number of workers that this provision would involve. The Portfolio Holder for Social Care and Health informed Members that provision had been made for health and social care workers within the new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme.

The Sub-Committee recognised that the research of the group had helped to clarify service users' definition of 'good service.' Given that a large proportion of care provision was outside direct Council control and the current contracts were due to

expire in 2008, outside agencies would have to be approached in order to ensure that they were fully committed to providing user-defined quality services.

The Sub-Committee discussed the issue of the telelogging system. It was hoped that the process of implementing the system would be driven forward in order to ensure that the benefits would be fully realised. This would be achieved by giving consideration to the cost implications and also ensuring that staff became familiar with the software. It was noted that service users were not fully aware of the benefits that the telelogging system could provide. Having discussed the telelogging system, Members agreed that it was an area in which the procurement division should be actively involved. The Interim Head of Community Care agreed to contact the Group Manager (Procurement and Community Links) with a view to involving the procurement division in the project.

Communication with service users was identified as a key issue arising from the review. A Member reported that many people in the Borough were unaware that the Council provided services such as Freedom Passes and Meals on Wheels. The Sub-Committee were also keen to underline the importance of appropriate translations for service users.

The Portfolio Holder for Social Care and Health welcomed the report and added that its recommendations reflected many of the Council's priorities in this area. The Chair concluded by praising the work and quality of the review group's report and signalled the Sub-Committee's intention to regularly monitor the Action Plan and recommendations.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the report of the review group be endorsed; and

(2) the report be submitted to Cabinet in early 2005 for consideration.

194. **NWL Hospitals NHS Trust Patient and Public Involvement Strategy - Progress Report:**

The Sub-Committee received a report and a presentation from Mr Mike Thompson, Associate Director of Performance, Governance and Service Improvement at the North West London Hospitals (NWLH) NHS Trust. The presentation provided Members with an update on Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) activity from the previous six months.

It was reported that the Patient and Public Involvement and Participation Committee (PPIPICO) had been established and was operating with active participation from patient forum representatives. The NWLH NHS Trust had introduced further measures including the introduction of a Customer Care programme, and had employed a Patient Experience researcher. In July 2004 the Trust had also seen improvements in the findings of the National Patient Survey. It was expected that a closer relationship with Harrow PCT would develop in order to co-ordinate training and public events surrounding PPI issues.

There was discussion on the financial plight of the Trust and the implications for PPI. External grants had been received and it was hoped that similar sources of funding would allow for the continuing development of PPI. One of the main objectives was to imbed patient involvement into service provision rather than relying on retrospective feedback. It was also felt that the NWLH NHS Trust should endeavour to become more engaged with Local Strategic Partnerships. The Director of Organisational Performance welcomed this comment and felt that there would be significant advantages if the Council and local NHS partners began developing a coherent strategy to provide the best possible services.

A Member queried whether there was any evidence to suggest that pressure to reduce waiting times in the Accident and Emergency department had resulted in a reduction in the quality of service. It was explained that this area had been surveyed on two occasions, both of which had produced positive results.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the above be noted; and

(2) a further update on NWLH NHS Trust PPI activity be submitted to the Sub-Committee at a future meeting.

195. **Patient and Public Involvement Forum for the Central and North West London (CNWL) Mental Health NHS Trust:**

The Sub-Committee received a report from Mr Paul Burns, Chair of the Central and North West London (CNWL) Mental Health NHS Trust PPI Forum. The Sub-Committee heard concerns raised over the delayed launch of the GP service for refugees and the potential difficulties for refugees attempting to access mental health services. The Sub-Committee was referred to paragraph 6 of the report, which expressed further concerns over access to the CNWL Mental Health NHS Trust Refugee Support Service. Whilst recognising the importance of making mental health a central issue, Mr Morgan, Chief Executive of Harrow PCT, explained that he had taken measures since arriving in the post in order to secure the PCT's finances. The Sub-Committee was further advised that the initial priority in terms of mental health would be to establish a Crisis Resolution Team.

It was further reported that the CNWL PPI Forum currently had seven Members, none of which were representatives from Harrow.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

196. **Harrow PCT's NHS Performance Rating and Performance Improvement Plan:**

Members received a verbal report from Mr Andrew Morgan, Chief Executive of Harrow PCT, outlining the PCT's performance ratings and improvement plan. The performance ratings were based on a combination of assessment against nine key targets and three Focus Areas. It was explained that the key targets were measured by a penalty points system whereas a cumulative points scoring system measured the Focus Areas. In July 2003 the PCT achieved 0\* in its performance rating. This was followed in 2004 by a score of 1\*, including exceptional performance in the three Focus Areas. Members were given a summary of the PCT's Performance Improvement Plan, which focused on the following areas:

- Financial Management
- Total Time in A&E
- Outpatient Waiting Times at Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH)
- MMR Immunisation
- Human Resources Management
- Staff Opinion Survey – Health and Safety and Incidents

It was anticipated that the PCT was currently heading for 0\* in the 2004/05 rating, primarily owing to problems experienced at the RNOH. If the PCT were to score 0\* a number of consequences would result, including the amount of time and resources directed towards ensuring that the Trust achieved a better performance the following year. Members were advised that the star ratings system would be replaced by a system called Standards for Better Health the following year. The proposals for the new performance framework had been sent out for consultation. The Chair asked that all Members of the Sub-Committee, together with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, receive a copy of the consultation document. The Chair thanked Mr Morgan for his contributions throughout the evening.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

197. **Local Government Ombudsman Finding of Maladministration:**

Members considered a report of the Interim Director of Community Care, which detailed the Ombudsman's finding of maladministration. It was noted that the report had been submitted to Cabinet on 9 September 2004 and the recommendations outlined in the report had been fully accepted. The guidance referred to in paragraph 6.5 of the report had since been published by the Department of Health, although it had not affected the way in which the Council dealt with such matters, given that the appropriate procedures were already in place.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

198. **CSCI Annual Review, Star Rating, and Performance Report:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Children's Services, which provided an overview of the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) Annual Review Letter and the Council's most recent Star Rating performance. It was felt that the judgement and tone of the report was harsh and failed to recognise positive areas of achievement. A Member pointed out that the prospects for improvement in Adult Services were judged to be uncertain. As detailed in the report, officers felt that many indicators gave reasons for optimism.

It was recognised that the Council's current position was not favourable, although it was expected that improvements would be made. A Member referred to page 30 of the agenda to highlight the comments made about the Council's response to the Victoria Climbié Self-Audit. The Portfolio Holder for Social Care and Health reported that the Council had recently produced a document on its Children's Services in relation to the Climbié Inquiry Self-Assessment, which would be sent to Members in the near future.

**RESOLVED:** That the CSCI Annual Review, Star Rating and Performance Report be noted.

199. **Any Other Business:**

The Chair drew attention to the Carers Action Group and their meeting held on 21 October 2004. A copy of the Group's report had been distributed to Members of the Sub-Committee before the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That the Carers Action Group report be noted.

200. **Extensions to and Termination of the Meeting:**

In accordance with the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 6.7 (Part 4F of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm; and

(2) at 10.30 pm to continue until 10.45 pm.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.35 pm, closed at 10.45 am)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR HOWARD BLUSTON  
Chair



**LIFELONG LEARNING SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)****8 DECEMBER 2004**

Chair: \* Councillor Mitzi Green

Councillors:	* Nana Asante	* Janet Mote
	* Gate	John Nickolay
	* Mary John	* Omar
	* Kinsey	* Anjana Patel (2)
	* Vina Mithani (1)	

Voting Co-opted: (Voluntary Aided) (Parent Governors)

† Mrs J Rammelt	† Mr H Epie
* Reverend P Reece	† Mr R Sutcliffe

\* Denotes Member present  
 (1) and (2) Denote category of Reserve Member  
 † Denotes apologies received

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL****PART II - MINUTES**174. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the appointment at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 24 November 2004 of Councillor Mitzi Green as Chair of the Sub-Committee for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

175. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Jean Lammiman	Councillor Anjana Patel
Councillor Osborn	Councillor Vina Mithani

176. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interest made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

177. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
10. Proposed Schools Budget 2005/06	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated owing to the announcement of the provisional settlement being made on 2 December 2004. Members are asked to consider the report in order to make recommendations (if any) to Cabinet on the proposed schools budget.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

178. **Appointment of Vice Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Janet Mote be appointed as Vice Chair of the Sub-Committee for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

179. **Minutes:**  
**RESOLVED:** That the signing of the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2004 be deferred until the next meeting, at which point the Council Bound Minute Volume would be available.
180. **Public Questions:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8.
181. **Petitions:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 9.
182. **Deputations:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.
183. **Proposed Schools Budget 2005/06:**  
The Sub-Committee received a joint report of the Executive Director (Business Connections) and the Executive Director (People First), which provided details of the proposed schools budget for 2005/2006. It was explained that the report would be submitted to Cabinet for decision at its meeting on 16 December 2004. It was added that the Council was required to notify the DfES of its decision by 31 December 2004.
- Members initially discussed the schools formula funding and the adequacy of funding for socially deprived pupils. The Sub-Committee was advised that many Local Authorities had struggled to assemble robust data that could be used for funding social deprivation through the schools formula. The Sub-Committee also questioned the £165,000 contingency under the central items provision. It was explained that this contingency would provide a greater degree of flexibility within the central items budget and could cover an increase in expenditure across all the central item areas for the following year. A query was raised over the £43,000 designated as 'Other.' It was reported that this provision represented a small contingency for schools that faced exceptional circumstances and could be distributed outside of the formula funding. Concern was expressed over whether this figure represented a sufficient amount, particularly given the potential for further school amalgamations.
- The Sub-Committee concurred with the view that the budget represented a good settlement for the Council and agreed to pass its comments onto Cabinet.
- RESOLVED:** That Cabinet be requested to fully passport and spend at the notified Schools Block total.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.34 pm, closed at 7.50 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MITZI GREEN  
Chair



DEVELOPMENT  
CONTROL  
COMMITTEE



---

**REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**


---

**MEETING HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2004**


---

Chair: \* Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: \* Marilyn Ashton \* Choudhury  
 \* Mrs Bath \* Janet Cowan  
 \* Billson \* Idaikkadar  
 \* Bluston \* Miles  
 \* Branch (1) \* Mrs Joyce Nickolay

\* Denotes Member present  
 (1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor Mrs Kinnear also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minutes 813 and 814 below].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**
**PART II - MINUTES**

 794. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Thornton	Councillor Branch

 795. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** (1) To note the following declarations of interest made by Members present relating to the business to be transacted at this meeting:

- (i) Planning Application 2/01 – 15 Holland Walk, Stanmore  
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the above application.

Councillors Mrs Bath and Janet Cowan also declared a prejudicial interest.

Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Janet Cowan left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.

At the point of the meeting at which this item was discussed, Councillors Billson and Joyce Nickolay clarified that they had only a personal interest in this item. Accordingly, they remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

- (ii) Planning Application 2/09 – Hamstede, 4 Priory Drive, Stanmore  
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in the above application on the basis that a Member of the Conservative Group lived nearby. Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that she had taken legal advice regarding her interest, and that accordingly, she would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

It was noted that the personal interest also applied to the Members of the Conservative Group on the Committee except for Councillor Mrs Bath who stated that her interest was a prejudicial one.

Councillor Mrs Bath left the room and took no part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

- (iii) Main Agenda Item 12 – Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance  
Councillor Mrs Bath declared an interest in respect of 1 Nelson Road because she knew the person who lived in this property.
- (iv) Main Agenda Item 16 – Prince Edward Playing Fields – Environment Agency Flood Alleviation Works  
Councillors Bluston and Miles declared a non-prejudicial interest in the above item because they were Council appointed Members of Harrow Sports Council.
- Accordingly, they remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (v) Main Agenda Item 20 – Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill  
The Chair, on behalf of the Labour Group, declared an interest in the above item because of a connection through the Labour Party.

At the point of the meeting at which this item was about to be discussed, the Chair further clarified the declaration of interest by stating that the owner of the above-mentioned property had contacted Members of the Labour Group on the Committee and therefore the interest was prejudicial. Accordingly, all Members of the Labour Group on this Committee left the room and did not take part in the discussions and decision-making on this item.

[Note: Councillor Marilyn Ashton, the Vice-Chair, chaired the meeting during the discussion and decision-making on this item].

(2) to note that a discussion took place among the Members of the Committee regarding the requirement or otherwise for particular Members to declare an interest in relation to item 1/01, "19 & 21 & R/O 11-29 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow", by virtue of information circulated in advance of the meeting indicating a prior view taken on the merits of the application: this was debated in the context of practices adopted by Members generally in preparing written reasons for proposed decisions and the legal advice that Members should not make up their minds on an application until they had heard all the evidence put before them at the meeting.

[Note: Following this discussion, no declarations of interest were made in respect of this item].

796. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

- (i) Item 2/02 – Land R/O 123-135 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware (P/2723/04/COU)  
The Development Control Manager requested that the above-mentioned planning application be deferred. He added that it would be re-submitted to the next meeting of the Committee as the 'notice' served on the leaseholders living in the flat adjacent to the proposal had not yet expired.

An objector who was present at the meeting stated that she would speak at the next meeting rather than that evening.

An observer at the meeting pointed out that the plans in respect of the above-mentioned application were wrong and that the boundaries shown were incorrect. He added that he had informed the Planning Section accordingly. The Development Control Manager stated that he would look into this matter.

- (ii) Main Agenda Item 9 – Representations on Planning Applications  
Councillor Marilyn Ashton referred to agenda item 9, details of which had been set out in the Addendum Report.

Members agreed with her that it was not best practice to state the applicant's desire to address the Committee should the Committee allow an objector to speak at the meeting. Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that the applicant would have a right of response in any case.

(iii) Late Items

The Chair reported that the Committee's consent to admit the following late items to the agenda was required:

- Item 13 – Telecommunications Development – Responses set out in the Addendum Report
- Item 19 – Any Other Business – 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (Application No. P/504/04/CFU)
- Item 21 – Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – Enforcement.

(iv) Requests to Backbench

The Chair reported that Councillor Mrs Kinnear wished to backbench in respect of the following items on the agenda:

- Main Agenda Item 20 - Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill  
Main Agenda Item 21 - Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – Enforcement.

She reported that Councillor John Nickolay would not now be backbenching on item 1/01.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following items/information be admitted to the agenda by reason of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Reasons for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contains information relating to various items on the agenda and is based on information received after the agenda's dispatch. It is admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.
13. Telecommunications Development	Reports under this item, as set out in the Addendum Report, are admitted to the agenda as decisions were required in order to comply with the 56 day deadline.
19. Any Other Business – 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (P/504/04/CFU)	In order to allow a Nominated Member to be elected as an appeal had been lodged against the refusal of this planning application. The recommendation of the Interim Chief Planning Officer was for approval of the scheme.
21. Item placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee - Enforcement	In order to allow the Committee to discuss the number of outstanding enforcement matters which are causing great anxiety to members of the public, and to discuss any action that may need to be taken to deal with the backlog of unresolved cases.

and;

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present, with the exception of the following item which be considered with the press and public excluded for the reason indicated:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
20. Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill	The report relating to this item contains exempt information under paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 in that the report contains legal advice.

(3) the application recommended for deferral, as set out in the Addendum Report, be noted.

[Note: The Chair re-ordered the agenda at the meeting in order to allow early consideration of the items that the public were present for. However, business is recorded in the order of the items set out in the agenda for reasons of clarity].

797. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That it be agreed that, having been considered, the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2004 as a correct record once they have been printed in the Council Bound Volume, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Item 2/08 – 75 Athelstone Road, Harrow (P/2172/04/CFU):  
Under 'Notes': To record that the reasons for refusal set out in Note (1) (iii) and (iv) were withdrawn prior to the motion for refusal being put to a vote.
- (ii) Item 2/14 – 44 Dennis Lane, Stanmore (P/2058/04/DFU):  
Under 'Notes': To record that Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached to grant the application for the reasons set out under paragraphs (i) to (iv).
- (iii) Item 2/20 – 15 Gordon Avenue, Stanmore (P/584/04/CFU):  
Under 'Notes': To record that Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to refuse the application.
- (iv) Minute 789(i) – Broomhill, Mount Park Road:  
To record in the preamble to Minute 789(i) that Councillor Mrs Kinnear provided another copy of her letter dated 30 August sent to the then Chief Planning Officer which still remained unanswered.

798. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no public questions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

799. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petition which was referred to the Interim Chief Planning Officer for consideration:-

Petition relating to the development of flats in Manor Road – Planning Application P/2889/04/CFU: A petition signed by 70 residents living in and in the vicinity of Manor Road was presented by Councillor Bluston.

800. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no deputations to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

801. **References from Council and other Committees/Panels:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no references from Council and other Committees/Panels to be received at this meeting.

802. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of item 1/01 on the list of planning applications and Agenda Item 13(D) set out in the Addendum Report.

803. **Planning Applications Received:**

**RESOLVED:** That authority be given to the Chief Planning Officer to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

804. **Planning Appeals Update:**  
The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

805. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**  
The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.

Members raised a number of queries, details of which are set out below:

- (i) 8 Hindes Road, Harrow - Councillor Bluston expressed concern that almost two years had elapsed since this matter had been reported to Committee.
- (ii) 1 Nelson Road, Harrow - Councillor Mrs Bath enquired about the window in the flank wall. The Development Control Manager undertook to report back on this matter.
- (iii) 4 Elm Park, Stanmore - Councillor Mrs Bath enquired if the retrospective planning application had now been received. The Development Control Manager undertook to report on this matter.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

(See also Minute 795(1)(iii)).

806. **Telecommunications Developments:**  
The following applications were reported in the Addendum Report:

- (i) Location: Eastcote Road, opposite junction of Lyncroft Avenue (P/2895/04/CDT)
- Proposal:
- 12m high pole with 1.5m antenna sited at the near edge of the footway
  - 2 ancillary cabinets

**RESOLVED:** That prior approval of siting and appearance be NOT required.

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (ii) Location: Land adjacent to 2 Woodhall Drive, Pinner (B/2915/04/CDT)
- Proposal:
- 10m high simulated telegraph pole with inoyek dual polar omni antenna and equipment cabinet
  - The dimensions of the equipment cabinet would be 1.45m x 0.65m x 1.25m high
  - The facilities would be sited on the 2.2 – 2.5m wide pedestrian pavement to the south east side of Uxbridge Road

**RESOLVED:** That (1) prior approval of details of siting and appearance IS required;

(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and the streetscene in general.
- (ii) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would reduce the footway width to an unacceptable degree which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (iii) Location: Junction of Elms Road and Uxbridge Road (P/2861/04/CDT)

- Proposal:
- Provision of 10.3m lamp post style Microcell telecommunications column sited towards the rear of the footway.
  - Ancillary cabinet located 4.4m south of the column to the rear of the footpath. Cabinet dimensions to include 1.45m (L), 0.65m (W) and 1.25m (H).
  - Column colour to be galvanised steel/grey and cabinet to be midnight green.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) prior approval of siting and appearance IS required; and  
(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reason and informative:

Reason: The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of the visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

Informative: INFORM41\_M (SD1, D4, D24)

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (iv) Location: Outside North Harrow Methodist Church Hall, Pinner Road (P/2888/04/CDT)

- Proposal:
- Provision of 10m lamppost style Microcell telecommunications column sited towards the front edge of the boundary.
  - Ancillary cabinet located 8m north of the column to the rear of the grass verge. Cabinet dimensions to include 1.45m (L), 0.65m (W) and 1.25 (H).
  - Column colour to be galvanised steel – anthracite grey and cabinet to be midnight green.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) prior approval of siting and appearance is required;  
(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and the streetscene in general.
- (ii) The proposed development would give rise, by the neighbouring residents, to a perception and fear of health risk to the detriment of residential amenity.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from objectors which were noted. Following the receipt of representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objectors. One of the objectors also tabled a petition objecting to the application.

There was no indication that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;

(2) during consideration of the above application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of visual amenity and health rather than on visual amenity only.

Following a vote, this was carried and the application was refused on the grounds set out above;

(3) the Chief Planning Officer had recommended the application be granted].

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

807. **Determination of Demolition Applications:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no demolition applications which required consideration.



808. **Tree Preservation Orders:**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer regarding new detailed Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) proposed for a number of sites.

**RESOLVED:** That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to (1) make new TPOs, to be known as follows:

TPO 783 Herga Court (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 785 Penketh Drive (No. 3) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 786 Mount Park Road (No. 8) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 787 Brookshill (No. 8) Harrow Weald  
 TPO 788 Georgian Way (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 789 Water Gardens (No. 1) Stanmore Park  
 TPO 790 September Way (No. 1) Stanmore Park  
 TPO 791 Pine Close (No. 2) Stanmore Park  
 TPO 792 Kynaston Wood (No. 1) Harrow Weald  
 TPO 793 Westfield Park (No. 4) Hatch End  
 TPO 794 Westfield Park (No. 5) Hatch End  
 TPO 795 Julian Hill (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 796 Julian Hill (No. 2) Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 797 Highbanks Road (No. 1) Hatch End

to be made pursuant to sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the maps and schedules attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke the following TPOs on confirmation of the above:

TPO 41 Charnwood & Penketh, Mount Park Road, Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 5 Valleyfield, Mount Park Road, South Harrow  
 TPO 43 Belmont & Thornlea, Mount Park Road, Harrow on the Hill  
 TPO 262 Gordon Avenue (No. 6) Stanmore  
 TPO 79 Old Church Lane (No. 1) Stanmore  
 TPO 98 Stanmore Hill (No. 1) Stanmore  
 TPO 72 Boxtree Road (No. 1) Harrow Weald  
 TPO 80 Westfield Park (No. 1) Hatch End  
 TPO 256 Westfield Park (No. 2) Hatch End  
 TPO 108 Oxhey Lane (No. 1) Hatch End

**Reason:** To accord with current policy.

[Note: Councillor Billson undertook to raise his concerns directly with the Arboricultural Officer regarding the lack of trees on the northern part of Westfield Park, Hatch End, where the Council had recently given approval to a large development].

809. **Prince Edward Playing Fields - Environment Agency Flood Alleviation Works:**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer seeking consent to landscaping proposals submitted pursuant to Condition 4 of the planning permission P/1784/03/CFU. Two Members stated that they were satisfied with the proposals. One of these Members asked that the residents be kept informed.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the landscaping proposals shown on Drawing WNSLKS/D/502 Rev. E pursuant to Condition 4 of planning permission P/1784/03/CFU be agreed;

(2) officers advise local residents adjacent to the site of the decision of the Committee.

**Reasons for Report:** To discuss the provision of landscaping to prevent public access onto the embankment pursuant to Condition 4 of planning permission P/1784/03/CFU.

(See also Minute 795(1)(iv)).

810. **Former Youth Centre, Library and Car Park - Grant Road/George Gange Way Wealdstone Site - Stopping Up of the Highway:**

The Vice-Chair stated that she could not support recommendation 1.3 as set out in the Interim Chief Planning Officer's report because the stopping-up of highways was a major action, and that the results of the consultation ought to come back to this Committee. She referred to the decision taken by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport on this matter, which decision had subsequently been withdrawn following a request to call-in the decision.

She reiterated that the results of the consultation, including the Mayor of London's decision, ought to come back to this Committee.

Members were of the view that only major matters relating to stopping-up actions under Section 247 of the Highways Act 1980 ought to come before the Development Control Committee, following which, it was

**RESOLVED:** (1) That officers be authorised to commence the necessary process to stop up the areas of highway shown on the plan at Appendix 1 in accordance with Sections 247 and 252 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Greater London Authority Act 1999;

(2) that, in the event that objections are made and not withdrawn within the 28 days of publication of the proposed Order, the objections be referred to the Mayor for London for determination as to whether or not a public inquiry should be held in accordance with Section 252 of the Act;

(3) that the results of the consultation be submitted to the Development Control Committee; and

(4) that the Director of Legal Services be authorised to obtain adequate undertakings from the applicant prior to the commencement of the stopping up process stating that the applicant will pay all costs incurred by the Council pertaining to the Stopping Up Order, which it is authorised to recover under the London Local Authorities (Charges for Stopping Up Orders) Regulations 2000.

**Reason:** To enable the development to be carried out in accordance with the planning permission granted.

811. **Rayners Lane Estate, Scott Crescent - Stopping Up of the Highway:**  
Members were of the view that the results of the consultation ought to be submitted to the Development Control Committee and it was

**RESOLVED:** (1) That officers be authorised to commence the necessary process to stop up the areas of highway shown on the plan at Appendix 1 in accordance with Sections 247 and 252 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Greater London Authority Act 1999;

(2) that, in the event that objections are made and not withdrawn within the 28 days of publication of the proposed Order, the objections be referred to the Mayor for London for determination as to whether or not a public inquiry should be held in accordance with Section 252 of the Act;

(3) that the results of the consultation be submitted to the Development Control Committee; and

(4) that the Director of Legal Services be authorised to obtain adequate undertakings from the applicant prior to the commencement of the stopping up process stating that the applicant will pay all costs incurred by the Council pertaining to the Stopping Up Order, which it is authorised to recover under the London Local Authorities (Charges for Stopping Up Orders) Regulations 2000.

**Reason:** To enable the development to be carried out in accordance with the planning permission granted.

812. **Any Other Business:**

- (i) 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (P/504/04/CFU)  
The Development Control Manager reported that an appeal had been lodged against the refusal of the above-mentioned application, details of which were set out in the Addendum Report. He added that a Nominated Member was required, as the recommendation of the then Chief Planning Officer had been to approve the scheme.

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Marilyn Ashton be nominated.

- (ii) Health Aspects of Telecommunications Development  
During discussion of applications for telecommunications development (Minute 806 refers), it was

**RESOLVED:** That officers be requested to report back to a future meeting of the Committee on health aspects of telecommunications developments in relation to appeal cases.

813. **Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill:**  
(Note: The Chair, Councillor Anne Whitehead, having declared an interest in this item and left the room, the Vice-Chair, Councillor Marilyn Ashton took the Chair).

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of Legal Services and the Interim Chief Planning Officer.

The Development Control Manager introduced the report and showed photographs of timber fences and gates in the vicinity of the site.

A Member who was backbenching asked question(s) of the officer(s) and made comments on the breach.

Members discussed whether or not to take enforcement action on the unauthorised fence and gates or to seek modifications to the unauthorised gates only. It was

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to his being satisfied as to the evidence, the Director of Legal Services be authorised to (1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) compliance with Condition 6 of Planning Consent WEST/884/00/CON; and
  - (ii) compliance with Condition 8 of Planning Consent WEST/884/00/CON should be complied with within a period of 28 days from the date on which the notice takes effect;
- (2) issue notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control; and
- (3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:
- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services to the Council through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

**Reason for Report:** To seek the Committee's views on whether enforcement action is considered to be appropriate.

(Note: Following the conclusion of this item, Councillor Anne Whitehead resumed the Chair).

(See also Minute 795(1)(v)).

814. **Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee - Enforcement:**

A Member who was backbenching enquired about the position on enforcement and the lack of enforcement action being taken by officers. She cited examples of where enforcement action was outstanding and, in some cases, had been for up to four years. She provided officers with details of various sites where enforcement action was outstanding. She added that local residents were concerned about the lack of action taken by the Council.

The Vice-Chair described the frustration of residents and Members about the lack of enforcement action being taken and enquired about the reasons why it was taking so long to take any action. She also cited examples where enforcement action had yet to be taken. In addition, she enquired why there was a backlog.

The Chair asked for a report on this matter and an explanation of the rationale behind the lack of enforcement action. She added that Members had fought hard to increase the resources available in this area.

A Member agreed that a report was required and questioned whether the levels of resources available were adequate. Another Member enquired if the matter of the possibility of costs being awarded against the Council was an issue.

**RESOLVED:** That officers be requested to report back on Planning Enforcement to a future meeting of the Committee setting out (i) details of the workload; (ii) the staffing situation; (iii) the backlog of work and (iv) resources in general.

815. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**  
In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4b of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) at 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(3) at 11.00 pm to continue until 11.20 pm;

(4) at 11.20 pm to continue until 11.30 pm;

(5) at 11.30 pm to continue until 11.45 pm;

(6) at 11.45 pm to continue until 12.00 midnight;

(7) at 12.00 midnight to continue until 12.05 am;

(8) at 12.05 am to continue until 12.10 am;

(9) at 12.10 am to continue until 12.15 am.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 12.14 am).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD  
Chair

**SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

<b>LIST NO:</b>	1/01	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2684/04/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	19 & 21 & R/O 11-29 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Gillett Macleod Partnership for Clearview Homes Ltd		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Demolition of Existing Dwellings and Redevelopment to Provide 14 Two Storey Terraced Houses with Access and Parking		
<b>DECISION:</b>	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) The density of the development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the properties in the surrounding area by reason of noise and disturbance generated by the number of units on the site.</p> <p>(ii) The proposal represents backland development to the detriment of the status of similarly situated sites in the locality, which will give rise to an increase in such developments since a precedent would have been set.</p> <p>[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector, which were supported by photographic evidence, and the applicant's architect, which were noted. Following the receipt of the representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objector and the applicant's architect;</p> <p>(2) during the discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;</p> <p>(3) the Committee wished to be recorded as having been unanimous in their decision to refuse permission;</p> <p>(4) it was noted that the final sentence in paragraph (3) under 'Appraisal' in the officer report ought to read: 'It is considered that ..... not be <u>compromised</u> by the .....';</p> <p>(5) the Interim Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted].</p> <p>(See also Minute 795(2)).</p>		

**SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT**

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/01	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2822/04/DFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	15 Holland Walk, Stanmore		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Anthony J Blyth & Co for Mr & Mrs S Freeman		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	First Floor Side, Single and 2 Storey Rear Extension		
<b>DECISION:</b>	<p>GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum report, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.</p> <p>(See also Minute 795(1)(i)).</p>		

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/02	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2723/04/COU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land R/O 123-135 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Gillett Macleod Partnership for London & District Housing Ltd		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Outline: Redevelopment: Two x 2 Storey Blocks to Provide 8 Flats and Chalet Bungalow with Access and Parking		



(6) Councillors Bluston, Choudhury, Idaikkadar, Miles and Anne Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision reached to grant the application;

(7) Councillor Mrs Bath requested that the Director of Legal Services inform her whether the Section 106 money received from Sainsbury's Ltd towards the refurbishment of the multi-storey car park would be lost].

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/04	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2620/04/CLA
<b>LOCATION:</b>	R/O 56/58 Church Road, Stanmore		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Harrow Engineering Services		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Renewal of Temporary Planning Permission EAST/988/02/LA3 for Surface Level Car Park with Access from Elm Park		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (i) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) Condition 1 being amended to read 2 years rather than 3 years.		
	[Note: During discussion on this application, it was moved and seconded that Condition 1 be amended to 2 years for the following reason:		
	The last temporary permission was for two years which was thought to be an acceptable length of time. However, it is unacceptable to use the site for three years because it will give rise to prolonged access difficulties which will occur with the weight of traffic coming out of the Sainsbury's Car Park.		
	Upon being put to a vote this was carried].		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/05	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/1845/04/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	259/261 Northolt Road, South Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Tecon Ltd for Mr K Shah		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Change of Use: Part Ground Floor Retail to Financial/Professional Services (A1 to A2), Use of First Floor as 2 Flats, Single/2-Storey Rear Extension, Shop Front (Resident Permit Restricted).		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/06	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2606/04/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Three Chimneys, 59 The Common, Stanmore		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Rogerson Ltd for Mr & Mrs Zimmerman		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Alterations First Floor and Single Storey Rear Extensions and Alterations, Creation of 2 Balconies, Roof Lights at Rear		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (i) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) the following additional informative:		
	3.	The applicant is advised that any further extensions to this property are unlikely to be favourably considered.	

---

**LIST NO:** 2/07                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/7883/04/DFU  
**LOCATION:** 31 Borrowdale Avenue, Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** M Halai for M L Vishram  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Side to Front and Rear Extension and Two Rear Dormers; Garage and Store in Rear Garden and Construction of Vehicle Crossover  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Note: Councillor Mrs Ashton wished to be recorded that, whilst she was not objecting to the proposal, she was concerned about the proposed size of the store in the rear garden and the use thereof; the owners had advised, however, that the store would be used as ancillary to their property for storage of such items as bicycles and children's furniture].

---

**LIST NO:** 2/08                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2710/04/DFU  
**LOCATION:** 36-38 High Street, Harrow on the Hill  
**APPLICANT:** Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr D O Pelaez  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use of First Floor Restaurant at No.38 in order to Extend Guesthouse at No.36.  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/09                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1824/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Hamstede, 4 Priory Drive, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** Brill & Owen Architects for Mr M & Mr L Reuben  
**PROPOSAL:** First Floor Side and Rear and Single Storey Rear Extension and Three Rear Dormer Windows  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

(See also Minute 795(1)(ii)).

---

**LIST NO:** 2/10                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2379/04/DFU  
**LOCATION:** 37 Nelson Road, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** Mr J Bhasin, JLB Design Associates for Ms U Vohra  
**PROPOSAL:** Conversion of Dwellinghouse to 2 Self-Contained Flats  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Notes: (1) During consideration of this application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons:

(i) The additional activity generated by the conversion of this single dwellinghouse to two units will be detrimental to residential amenities and will give rise to noise and disturbance to the neighbouring properties.



- (ii) The proposal would be out of character in a road where there are no other converted dwellinghouses, which will impact detrimentally on the local area.
- (iii) Parking is typically difficult in the road and so any additional pressure on parking will be detrimental to residential amenities and the free flow of traffic.

Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;

(2) the vote on the substantive motion to grant the above application was carried;

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached to grant the application for the reasons stated in (1) above].

---

**LIST NO:** 2/11                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2547/04/DFU

**LOCATION:** 41 High Street, Harrow on the Hill

**APPLICANT:** Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr Robert Fulker

**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use of First and Second Floors from Office (Class B1) to Two Self-Contained Flats; Alterations to Front and Replacement Windows at Rear.

**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/12                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2548/04/DLB

**LOCATION:** 41 High Street, Harrow on the Hill

**APPLICANT:** Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr Robert Fulker

**PROPOSAL:** Listed Building Consent: Internal Alterations in Connection with Change of Use to 2 Flats, External Repairs and Alterations to Windows.

**DECISION:** GRANTED listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/13                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2660/04/CFU

**LOCATION:** 9 Springfield Close, Stanmore

**APPLICANT:** Concept Windows for Mr D Lack

**PROPOSAL:** Conservatory at Rear

**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Note: The footprint, floorspace and volume calculations for the proposed conservatory are set out in the Addendum Report].

---

---

**LIST NO:** 2/14                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2357/04/DFU  
**LOCATION:** 7 Hillview Close, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** Magan D Solanki for Mr & Mrs Jivraj  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extension  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/15                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2583/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Hill View, Brookshill Drive, Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** Gillett Macleod Partnership for Mr G Orengo  
**PROPOSAL:** Two Storey Rear Extension and Replacement Single Storey Side Extension  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Notes: (1) During discussion on this application, it was moved that the application be refused on the following grounds:

(i) The proposed extensions would result in an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the Green Belt contrary to policies of the HUDP and the provisions of PPG2.

(ii) The removal of chimneys would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.

(2) Upon clarification from the Development Control Manager that the existing chimneys would be retained, the second reason for refusal in paragraph (1(ii)) above was withdrawn by the mover of the motion;

(3) the ground for refusal as set out in (1)(i) above was seconded and following the advice of the Development Control Manager that the extension had been reduced extensively, the reason for refusal was amended as follows:

(i) The proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions to the building to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Green Belt contrary to Policies of the HUDP and provisions of PPG2.

Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;

(4) the vote on the substantive motion to grant the above application was carried].

---

**LIST NO:** 2/16                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2555/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 7 Stanmore Hall, Wood Lane, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** Eklus (Mauritius) Ltd  
**PROPOSAL:** Lowering of Parapet Wall with the Provision of Railings  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, subject to the condition and informative reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/17                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2556/04/CLB  
**LOCATION:** 7 Stanmore Hall, Wood Lane, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** Eklus (Mauritius) Ltd  
**PROPOSAL:** Listed Building Consent: Lowering of Parapet Wall with the Provision of Railings  
**DECISION:** GRANTED Listed Building Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

**LIST NO:** 2/18                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2724/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Mulberry House, Pinner Hill, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** Orchard Associates for Mr & Mrs R Weerasekera  
**PROPOSAL:** Part Single, Part Two Storey Side Extension with Rear Dormers and Rooflights  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (1) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) the following additional informative:  
4. The applicant is advised that any further extensions to this property are unlikely to be favourably considered.

### **SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL**

**LIST NO:** 3/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2030/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 294 Uxbridge Road, Hatch End  
**APPLICANT:** Michael Burroughs Associates for A Surace  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Retail (Class A1) to Public House (Class A3) as Part of Ground Floor  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.

**LIST NO:** 3/02                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2653/04/DFU  
**LOCATION:** 21 & 23 Woodhall Drive, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** A Davies for Mr & Mrs Fromlich/Mrs R Desai  
**PROPOSAL:** Alterations to Roof and Rear Dormer  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.

**LIST NO:** 3/03                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1941/04/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Former Kings Head Hotel, Harrow on the Hill  
**APPLICANT:** VRDL for Macleod & Fairbriar Ltd  
**PROPOSAL:** Use of Ground Floor & Basement Area Intended for A3 Use in Permission WEST/971/02/FUL, as Residential Unit  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.  
(See also 'Note' under 3/04 below).

---

**LIST NO:** 3/04                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1942/04/CFU

**LOCATION:** Former Kings Head Hotel, Harrow on the Hill

**APPLICANT:** VRDL for Macleod & Fairbriar Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** Use of Ground Floor & Basement Area Intended for A3 Use in Permission WEST/971/02/FUL, as Residential Unit (Duplicate)

**DECISION:** That had an appeal against non-determination not been made, the application for the development described in the application and submitted plans would have been REFUSED permission for the reason and informative reported.

[Note: In respect of both item 3/03 above and item 3/04, the Interim Chief Planning Officer's representative stated, in response to a query from a local resident with regard to the notification undertaken, that the notification should read 164 and not 172 and that this figure would be adjusted].

---

**SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES**

**LIST NO:** 4/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2751/04/CAN

**LOCATION:** 131-135, Kenton Road, Kenton Timber & Builders, Harrow

**APPLICANT:** Brent Council

**PROPOSAL:** Consultation: Part 4/5/6 Storey Building to Provide 16 Flats with Retail Unit on Ground Floor and Parking.

**DECISION:** That Harrow Council OBJECTS to the development set out in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informatives reported.

---

STANDING ADVISORY  
COUNCIL FOR  
RELIGIOUS  
EDUCATION



**STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR  
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION****9 DECEMBER 2004**Representatives of the LEA

Councillors: \* Nana Asante \* Janet Cowan  
\* Choudhury (1)

Representatives of Christian and Other Religious Denominations and Faiths

* Mrs M Besser	Councillor Lavingia
Mr M Bishop	* Councillor Omar
* Mrs N Desai	* Mrs P Perinparaja
* Mrs P Gan-Kotwal	Rabbi D Roselaar
Mrs M Hale	Prof H Singh
* Envoy B Haylock	* Mr P Singh-Kohli
† Mrs Z Jaffer	* Mrs P Wearing
* Dr V Kapashi	

Representatives of the Church of England

* Mrs M Abbott	* Rev'd S Pothen
† Dr K Pinching	

Representatives of Teachers

† Mrs L Bedford	* Mrs A Stowe
Mr R Crocker	* Rev'd Dr S Thompson
* Mrs S Mistry	

Co-opted Members

Mr A Aggarwal	* Ms P Stevens (Humanist Vacancy)
---------------	--------------------------------------

Adviser to the Council, Nominated by the Director of Education

\* Mr P O'Dwyer

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member  
† Denotes apologies received

[Note: Mrs Zainab Kanji and Mrs Tahera Datoos attended the meeting at the invitation of Mrs Z Jaffer as representatives of the Muslim community].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL****PART II - MINUTES**131. **Apologies for Absence:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that apologies for absence had been received from Mrs Bedford, Mrs Jaffer and Dr Pinching.

132. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Ismail	Councillor Choudhury

133. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Nana Asante	Declared a personal interest in that she was a Governor at Stanburn First School.
Councillor Choudhury	Declared a personal interest in that he was a Governor at Elmgrove Middle School.
Councillor Janet Cowan	Declared a personal interest in that she was a Governor at Belmont First and Middle.
Councillor Omar	Declared a personal interest in that he was a Governor at Nower Hill High School.

134. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2004, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

135. **Early Years Resources:**

The Chair reported that packs of Early Years' resources had been purchased and were available for loan by nurseries across the Borough.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

136. **World Citizen Project:**

A Member reported that the competition had been postponed but was likely to be held later in 2005.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

137. **Membership:**

An updated membership list was tabled at the meeting. Mrs Shruti Mistry from Belmont Middle School and Mrs Alison Stowe from Priestmead Middle School were newly appointed teacher representatives. Mrs Wearing pointed out that her name was incorrectly spelt on the list and that her home address should be published.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

138. **Determinations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no determinations to be considered at this meeting.

139. **Black History Month:**

The meeting was informed that the Black History Month included an Inset session led by Punitha Perinparaja on building bridges across religious communities.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

140. **Festival of Lights 20 November 2004:**

It was reported that the Festival of Lights included performances from young people, incorporating music, dance and poetry. A key theme of the event was that people from different faith communities had worked together to ensure that the festival was a success.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

141. **Draft SACRE Annual Report:**

The draft Annual Report was tabled at the meeting. It was noted that one of the appendices would form a report to the Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That Members read the report and notify the Chair of any corrections or suggestions by 18 December 2004.



142. **Key Religious Festivals:**  
Members considered a list of key religious festival dates from September 2004 to July 2005. Members were asked to let the Chair know of any additions or amendments to the list.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

143. **Out of School Clubs:**  
The Adviser to the Council asked Members to inform him of any out of school clubs that were run by the faith communities. Members were also asked to indicate if such clubs were open to children outside of the faith community.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

144. **2005 Focus on Poverty:**  
It was noted that in 2005 there would be special emphasis on working towards the end of worldwide poverty. The British Government, CAFOD and Islamic Relief, together with numerous other organisations, would be involved in the project, which would include vaccinations, aid and related issues. It was added that all RE departments in schools should be aware of this issue.

**RESOLVED:** That relevant information be forwarded to schools when available.

145. **Standing Conference for the Harrow Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education:**  
The Council welcomed Mr Graham Langtree, Religious Education Adviser to the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), who was in attendance at the meeting to speak on the Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education. Mr Langtree, as the author of the Non-Statutory National Framework for RE, described the rationale behind the document. It was explained that the framework used a similar style adopted for other parts of the National Curriculum.

Members noted that the framework was guidance and not statutory. It was anticipated that SACREs across England would modify their respective syllabuses to meet local needs. It was also hoped that the framework would help to promote RE to school management staff. In due course there would also be guidance in the framework specifically for children with Special Education Needs and gifted and talented pupils.

Following the presentation from Mr Langtree, Members were invited to comment and ask questions. It was suggested that Spiritual Education rather than RE should be offered within the curriculum. Mr Langtree felt that there were elements of spiritual development throughout the curriculum and that although RE provided the lead for spiritual development, the two terms were not synonymous.

When asked about the response from University Departments, Mr Langtree confirmed that there had been positive feedback. It was added that the private school sector had been consulted regarding the framework.

One of the key problems in RE was the recruitment of teachers and it was hoped that the framework would lead to more teachers specialising in the subject.

In response to a question about the authority of texts, Mr Langtree commented that 'sacredness' was better reflected in the primary curriculum. He agreed that the notion of holiness should be part of the RE syllabus. Mr Langtree added that schools should be careful to use publications by authentic bodies, when compiling resource material. The Chair thanked Mr Langtree for a helpful introduction to the framework.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

146. **Dates of Future Meetings:**  
Members noted that the next meeting would be held on 10 March 2005.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.40 pm)

(Signed) PAT STEVENS  
Chair



COUNCIL





**MINUTES  
of the  
EXTRAORDINARY MEETING  
of the  
COUNCIL  
of the  
LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW  
held on  
THURSDAY 16 DECEMBER 2004**

**Present:**           **The Worshipful the Mayor (Councillor Lurline Champagne)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Asad Omar)**

**Councillors:**

R. Arnold  
Nana Asante-Twumasi  
David Ashton  
Mrs Marilyn Ashton  
Alan Blann  
H. Bluston  
J. Branch  
K. Burchell  
M. Choudhury  
Bob Currie

Margaret Davine  
Sanjay Dighé  
Ann Groves  
T. Idaikkadar  
M. Kinsey  
D. Lavingia  
Miss Paddy Lyne  
Myra Michael  
Chris Mote  
J.W. Nickolay

Mrs Joyce Nickolay  
Marie-Louise Nolan  
R. Ray  
Navin Shah  
Mrs Rajeshri Shah  
Bill Stephenson  
Keekira Thammaiah  
Keith Toms  
G.G.V. Williams

---

**A**      **PROCEDURAL MATTERS****262.**    **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

It was noted that there were no declarations of interests on behalf of Members with regard to the business to be transacted at this Extraordinary Council Meeting.

**B**      **REPORT FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEE****263.**    **LICENSING POLICY - LICENSING ACT 2003:****LICENSING AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE – RECOMMENDATION I  
(29 NOVEMBER 2004)**

Further to Item 2 on the Summons for this Extraordinary Meeting, the Council received Recommendation I arising from the Licensing and General Purposes Committee meeting of 29 November 2004 in the matter of the Authority's Licensing Policy which required to be considered and adopted by the full Council within the statutory deadline of 7 January 2005.

- (i)      The Chair of the Licensing and General Purposes Committee, Councillor Idaikkadar, formally moved Recommendation I, which was formally seconded by Councillor Ann Groves, the Committee's Vice-Chair.
- (ii)     The Recommendation was the subject of a brief debate.
- (iii)    Upon a vote the Licensing Policy was approved, with only one vote against.

**RESOLVED:**

**THAT THE AUTHORITY'S LICENSING POLICY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT REQUIREMENTS OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003, BE ADOPTED AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX 1 TO THE LICENSING AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION I (29 NOVEMBER 2004).**

[Note: Councillor G.G.V. Williams wished to be recorded as having voted against the adoption of the Licensing Policy on the grounds that the Licensing Act 2003 transferred responsibilities to the Local Authority for which the costs were not yet known and the fees which Local Authorities would be entitled to charge to cover their costs had not yet been determined].

**C**      **MISCELLANEOUS****264.**    **SEASON'S GREETINGS:**

The Mayor took the opportunity of the occasion of this Extraordinary Council Meeting to extend her best wishes to Members and officers for the Christmas and New Year festivities.

**(CLOSE OF MEETING:** The Extraordinary Meeting having commenced at 7.00 pm, and all business having been completed, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 7.09 pm).

THE CABINET,  
CABINET ADVISORY PANELS  
AND  
CONSULTATIVE FORUMS





CABINET



---

**REPORT OF CABINET**

---

**MEETING HELD ON 16 DECEMBER 2004**

---

Chair: \* Councillor N Shah

Councillors: \* D Ashton \* C Mote  
\* Burchell \* Marie-Louise Nolan  
\* Margaret Davine O'Dell  
\* Dighé \* Stephenson  
\* Miss Lyne

\* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillor Mrs Kinnear also attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Minute 667 below].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION I - Key Decision - 2005-06 Budget and Medium Term Budget Strategy 2005-06 to 2007-08**

The Executive Director (Business Connections) outlined the content of his report, which included a summary of the figures and detailed schedules and all the proposals included in the draft budget. The finance settlement outlined in Appendix F to his report was provisional and the budget might therefore need to be refined when the final settlement was known at the end of January 2005.

Cabinet, having agreed the draft Revenue Budget for 2005-6 for consultation with stakeholders, the draft Medium Term Budget Strategy, the revised Housing Revenue Account for 2004-5, the draft Housing Revenue Account for 2005-6, the draft three year financial strategy for Housing, and having noted the proposed level of capital programme for 2005-6 and that the detailed programme would be reported to Cabinet in January 2005,

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:**

(1) That the Council maintain a minimum level of unallocated General Fund Reserves of £4,000,000 at the end of each financial year;

(2) that the optimal level of unallocated General Fund Reserves was £7,000,000.

(See also Minute 658).

**PART II - MINUTES**

651. **Paul Osburn:**  
Each of the Group Leaders paid tribute to Paul Osburn, Executive Director (People First), who was retiring from the Authority's employ. Members expressed their thanks for all his work and wished him all the best for the future.

Paul Osburn thanked Members for their good wishes.

652. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
12. Key Decision – Proposed Schools Budget 2005/06	Councillor Burchell	The Member indicated a personal interest in that his spouse was employed in a local authority maintained school. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Dighé	The Member indicated a personal interest in that his wife was employed in a local authority maintained school and his children attended schools in Harrow. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
13. Pinner War Memorial Fund Annual Report 2003-04	Councillor Burchell	The Member indicated a personal interest in that he was a trustee of the West House Trust. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor C Mote	The Member indicated a personal interest in that, as a Councillor, he was a trustee of the Pinner War Memorial Fund. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
14. Arts in Public Places Policy	Councillor D Ashton	The Member declared a personal interest in that he was a Council appointed member of the Middlesex Guildhall Collection and Trust Fund. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Stephenson	The Member declared a personal interest in that he was a Council appointed member of the Executive Committee of Harrow Heritage Trust. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.
15. Hatch End Cluster Proposal for Extended Schools Funding	Councillor Burchell	The Member indicated a personal interest in that he was a governor of Cedars First and Middle Schools. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Miss Lyne            The Member indicated a personal interest in that she was a governor of Cedars First and Middle Schools. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephenson        The Member indicated a personal interest in that he was a governor of Hatch End School. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

653.    **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2004, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

654.    **Arrangement of Agenda:**

The Chair indicated that he was prepared to consider items 12(a), the reference from the Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Sub-Committee, item 12(b), the recommendation from the Education Consultative Forum in relation to the Proposed Schools' Budget 2005/2006, and item 18(a), the recommendation from the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel in relation to the Transport Local Implementation Plan, as urgent so that they could be considered in conjunction with the associated officer reports.

The Chair indicated that he would be varying the order of business to enable consideration of item 8, Star Rating on Social Services, following item 5. Item 11, the 2005/6 Budget and Medium Term Budget Strategy 2005/6 to 2007/8 and item 12, the Proposed Schools' Budget 2005/6, would then be considered. He asked Members to note that item 10, the draft Capital Programme 2005/6, had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**RESOLVED:** That all business be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following item for the reasons set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
20. Clarendon Road Public Realm Proposals – Recommendation from the Town Centre Project Panel – Appendices	The appendices contained exempt information under Paragraphs 7 and 9 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they contained confidential information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person and any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract.

655.    **Petitions:**

- (1) Councillor Miss Lyne submitted a petition, which had also been forwarded to Transport for London, containing 10 signatures, in relation to the Bus Shelter at High Road, Harrow Weald (Northbound). The terms of the petition were as follows:-

“We, the residents of the High Road Harrow Weald, strongly urge you to reconsider the placement of the above-mentioned bus shelter, on the grounds of:-

- Invasion of privacy due to increase in number of users
- safety issue
- detriment to the local environment
- increase in number of buses.”

**RESOLVED:** That the petition be received and noted.

- (2) Councillor Marie-Louise Nolan, as Chair of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel, submitted a petition containing 545 signatures from the Wealdstone Traders' Association in relation to free parking at Peel House. She advised that the petition had the support of the Ward Councillors and read the terms of the petition to the meeting which were as follows:-

"Wealdstone traders and shoppers are concerned by the impending loss of surface car parks in Wealdstone and the effect of loss of trade this will have. We, the undersigned, call upon the Leader of Harrow Council to immediately introduce a period of free parking at Peel House Multi Storey Car Park. We believe this measure would encourage current car park users to relocate to Peel House. We want the same concessions that are already being applied in North Harrow."

**RESOLVED:** That the petition be received and noted.

656. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following public questions had been received:-

1.

**Questioner:** Mr L Choules

**Asked of:** Councillor Navin Shah (The Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet)

**Question:** "The Executive Director Urban Living, in a Written response to the former ALMO Shadow Board's submission to the pre-cabinet meeting of 11th November, stated that: "... it demonstrates the Shadow Board's inability to understand the financial projections produced by the Council Officers". The Cabinet is aware that there were several Councillors on the Shadow Board. Does the Cabinet agree with him that Councillors on the Board and by default ALL Councillors are unable to understand financial projections produced by Council Officers. And if they do not agree, do they then agree that the statement reinforces the culture of Officers believing they are superior and are leading the Council Policies, rather than the elected officials which the people of Harrow voted to represent them?"

2.

**Questioner:** Mr Pravin Seedher

**Asked of:** Councillor Navin Shah (The Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet)

**Question:** "Regarding the glossy colour brochure entitled: New Harrow - rescuing a Borough from its History, please explain the background to its production covering its objective, cost and whether its requirement was driven by Officers or by Councillors."

Cabinet noted that Mr Choules had been unable to attend the meeting and had requested a written response, which Councillor N Shah undertook to provide.

An oral answer was provided to Question 2. Under the provisions of the Executive Procedure Rule 15.4, Mr Seedher asked a supplementary question which was additionally answered.

657. **Star Rating Report on Social Services:**

The Chair welcomed Geoff Corre, the Relationship Manager from the Commission of Social Care Inspection (CSCI), who was in attendance to present the Annual Review of Performance and the star rating letter.

Mr Corre outlined the role of the CSCI and the legislative requirements. He advised that the CSCI would be meeting with Harrow's Director of Social Services and senior managers on a regular basis to manage the change agenda. Mr Corre added that the CSCI would continue to monitor Harrow's progress against the performance assessment framework.

In response to Members' concern that staff within Social Services had not received praise nor recognition for their work from the CSCI, Mr Corre advised that the review had been based on admissible evidence and it had not been possible to make subjective statements. In accepting that evidence was required, the Director of Children's Services, in his role as Director of Social Services, indicated that it was important that the work and commitment of staff was recognised in the change agenda.

Members reiterated their dissatisfaction at the lack of recognition given to staff by the CSCI in their Annual Review.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

**Reason for Decision:** On 11 November 2004, Cabinet had requested that the CSCI be invited to attend their next meeting to enable the Inspector to present his findings.

658. **Key Decision - 2005-06 Budget and Medium Term Budget Strategy 2005-06 to 2007-08:**  
(See also Recommendation I).

The Executive Director (Business Connections) outlined the content of his report and advised that the provisional settlement had been announced on 2 December 2004. The Council's provisional Formula Spending Share for 2005/6 was £248.3m, an increase of £12m or 5.5%. He emphasised that the settlement was provisional and that the budget might need to be refined once the final settlement was known.

The Executive Director (Business Connections) drew Members' attention to Appendix B of his report which set out a summary of the revenue budget for 2005/6 and which would result in a 1.48% increase in Council Tax. When linked to the GLA precept, this would lead to an increase in Council Tax of 2.5%.

The Executive Director (Business Connections) advised Members that the draft Capital Programme 2005/6 would be reported to Cabinet on 13 January 2005.

In response to Members' questions, the Executive Director (Business Connections) undertook to provide a response in relation to the likely Council Tax charge if the Government were to fully fund the cost of the new licensing regime. He also stated that the funding of the social inclusion proposals (detailed elsewhere on the agenda) could be met from reserves as it would be a one-off expense.

Cabinet, having recommended to Council that a level of unallocated General Fund Reserves of £4m at the end of each financial year be maintained and that the optimal level of unallocated General Fund Reserves was £7m,

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the draft Revenue Budget of £254.570m for 2005-06 for consultation with stakeholders be agreed;

(2) that the draft Medium Term Budget Strategy be approved;

(3) that the revised Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2004-05, the Draft Housing Revenue Account for 2005-06 and the draft three year financial strategy for Housing be approved, and that the draft HRA be referred to the Tenants' and Leaseholders' Consultative Forum on 6 January 2005;

(4) to note the proposed level of the capital programme for 2005/06 and that the detailed programme would be reported to Cabinet in January 2005.

**Reason for Decision:** To ensure that the Council was planning the use of resources effectively.

(Note: Councillors D Ashton, Miss Lyne and C Mote wished to be recorded as having abstained from voting on the above resolutions due to the late receipt of the report).

659. **Key Decision - Proposed Schools Budget 2005/06:**  
The Executive Director (Business Connections) introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the reference from the Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Sub-Committee meeting held on 8 December 2004. He advised that the recommendation from the Education Consultative Forum meeting held on 7 December 2004 had been circulated on the third supplemental agenda.

The Executive Director (Business Connections) advised that the draft schools budget would enable the Council to fulfil its statutory obligations and enable schools to

manage their budgets for 2005/6. He indicated that, in response to concerns expressed at the meeting of the Budget Review Working Group on 14 December 2004, he had contacted the external auditors to seek support for Members on the workings of the education budget.

In noting the reference from the Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Sub-Committee and the recommendation from the Education Consultative Forum, including the undertaking that strong representations would be made to the Government to ensure that funds for schools were not reduced in the future, it was

**RESOLVED (unanimously):** That the Secretary of State for Education be notified that the Council would fully passport the Schools Block increase.

**Reason for Decision:** It was a requirement of the Education Act 2002 that the Council notified the Secretary of State for Education of the proposed Schools Budget by 31 December 2004.

(See also Minute 652).

660. **Forward Plan 1 December 2004 - 31 March 2005:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 December 2004 – 31 March 2005.

661. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no reports had been received.

662. **Social Inclusion in Harrow:**

The Director of Strategy (Urban Living) introduced the report and advised that a senior officer steering group led by the Chief Executive had been established and that, subject to Cabinet approval, the Group would produce an outline strategy and project plan to be considered at a future meeting of Cabinet.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Strategy (Urban Living) advised that the pilot areas and methods of consultation had not yet been determined. The Portfolio Holder for Communications, Partnership and Human Resources welcomed the cross-party support for the proposal and indicated her hope that, in future, Harrow might be successful in obtaining external funding.

**RESOLVED:** That social inclusion be placed at the centre of Harrow's strategic priorities for the Borough and its people, working closely with partners to:

- break the cycle of disadvantage affecting many residents and provide equal opportunities for all;
- continue the improvement of coordinated services and delivery at local level to bring equality of service to disadvantaged groups;
- plan for the potential risks and opportunities thrown up by the changing demographic, economic and social trends;
- develop two pilot projects, one geographically based, one community based, in the Borough in 2005;
- extend and enhance the Vitality Profiles to inform policy and ensure effective targeting of resources.

**Reason for Decision:** (1) Social inclusion would lead to a better quality of life for all;

(2) resources, services and social inclusion programmes would be more effectively targeted; and

(3) residents and communities experiencing social exclusion would be more accurately identified and would be supported through coordinated initiatives.

663. **Pinner War Memorial Fund Annual Report 2003-04:**

**RESOLVED:** That the Annual Report of the Pinner War Memorial Fund for the year ending 31 March 2004 be approved.



**Reason for Decision:** The Council, as Trustees of the Pinner War Memorial Fund, was required under the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 1995 to prepare an Annual Report including the Accounts of the Fund.

(See also Minute 652).

664. **Arts in Public Places Policy:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report which proposed that the Council adopt an Art in Public Places policy and set up a 'Percent for Art' fund.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the Council adopt the Art in Public Places policy outlined in the report of the Director of Learning and Community Development and contained within the supporting documentation;

(2) that a 'Percent for Art' fund be set up to handle contributions from developers as part of Section 106 planning obligations;

(3) that officers develop processes and protocols for Section 106 pre-application procedures and for stakeholder participation in the design process;

(4) that officers explore the establishment of an Art In Public Places Development Trust, including holding discussions with appropriate local agencies and stakeholders.

**Reason for Decision:** Approval would further both the Council's commitment in the Cultural Strategy Action Plan 2003-08 to develop and implement an Arts in Public Places policy, for which a date of 2004-05 was set as the milestone, and its commitment to Policy D30 of its Unitary Development plan. Approval would also enable officers to develop the necessary processes to facilitate the implementation of the policy.

(See also Minute 652).

665. **Hatch End Cluster Proposal for Extended Schools Funding:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report and reminded Members that, in July 2004, they had agreed to extend the community schools pilot, subject to plans receiving Cabinet approval.

Members indicated that it was important to get stakeholders on board and that the reports should be submitted to school governing bodies.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposal from the Hatch End Cluster for developing the community schools' approach be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** Approval of this proposal fitted with the Cabinet decision taken in July 2004 to extend the Community Schools' Programme. The proposal from the Hatch End cluster took forward the development of joined-up, inter-agency provision as set out in the rationale for establishing the People First Directorate and fitted within the corporate strategic priorities.

(See also Minute 652).

666. **Breakspear Crematorium:**

Members considered the report of the Area Director (Urban Living), which sought endorsement to proposed Service Level Agreement revisions and to proposals arising from consultation.

In response to a Member's question, the representative of the Area Director (Urban Living) advised that he would be looking at the feasibility of providing a 24/7 cemetery/crematoria service.

An amendment in the name of Councillor N Shah was moved, put to the vote and it was

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the proposed Service Level Agreement revisions set out in Appendix A to the report of the Area Director (Urban Living) be endorsed;

(2) that the proposals arising from the consultation be approved and incorporated in the capital investment plan to develop infrastructure and improve the customer experience in the partnership with Hillingdon Council;

(3) that further work/negotiations take place with Hillingdon Council in terms of the viability of a community hall and that a further report be submitted to Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.

**Reason for Decision:** The proposals would contribute to the corporate priority to improve services for local citizens, to enable services to meet community needs in the future and strengthen Harrow's local community by promoting social inclusion amongst its residents.

667. **Planning Services Improvement Plan - Progress Report:**

In accordance with paragraph 18 of the Executive Procedure Rules, the Chair invited, and Cabinet agreed, that Councillor Mrs Kinnear could speak on this item.

The Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report, which updated Members on the achievement against the Service Improvement Plan.

In response to questions from Councillor Mrs Kinnear, the Executive Director (Urban Living) advised that the post of section 106 officer was new and that he would look into why key service objective 6: provide an effective enforcement service, was given a medium priority.

In response to Councillor Mrs Kinnear's comments that the number of complaints made to the Chief Executive and the Ombudsman were related to the delay in response from the enforcement service, the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing indicated that he would discuss this matter with the Chief Executive.

**RESOLVED:** That the update on achievement against the Service Improvement Plan be noted.

**Reason for Decision:** To monitor progress.

668. **Transport Local Implementation Plan:**

A representative of the Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the recommendation from the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting held on 1 December 2004.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the draft policies and programmes to be included in the draft Transport Local Implementation Plan for the purposes of consultation be agreed;

(2) that the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport be authorised to agree updates, changes and the final consultation draft;

(3) that advisers on the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel be invited to the Members' Forum on the Transport Local Implementation Plan.

**Reason for Decision:** The status of the Plan as a statutory document required by the Mayor of London and the statutory requirement for consultation.

669. **Key Decision - Supporting People Review and Inspection:**

The Director of Strategy (Urban Living) introduced the report, which outlined the recommendations of the Supporting People Advisory Panel, and advised that both the Audit Commission and Commission for Social Care Inspection would be carrying out inspections in the week commencing 17 January 2005.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the inspection timetable, process and improvement plan be noted;

(2) that new governance arrangements and the continuing involvement of the Supporting People Advisory Panel Members be noted and agreed;

(3) that the proposed risk management strategy be noted;

(4) that the financial report be noted and that the use of income from charges be retained within the Supporting People budget;

(5) that the continued use of the present system of block gross chargeable contracts be agreed.

**Reason for Decision:** To implement and manage Supporting People in line with guidance from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

670. **Clarendon Road Public Realm proposals - Recommendation from the Town Centre Project Panel:**

The Chief Executive introduced the report, which outlined the recommendations from the Town Centre Project Panel in relation to the Clarendon Road Public Realm proposals. She drew Members' attention to the Part II Appendices, which had been circulated for their information only.

The Chief Executive advised that the report had been submitted to Cabinet on the assumption that the draft Capital Programme would also appear on the agenda for this meeting. However, as the Capital Programme had been withdrawn from the agenda she asked that Members note the recommendation and approve the proposals subject to the Cabinet's consideration of the Capital Programme in January 2005.

**RESOLVED:** That, in principle, the proposals for environmental and public realm improvements in Clarendon Road proceed, subject to the provision in the 2005/6 capital programme.

**Reason for Decision:** Cabinet approval was required to enable the proposed improvements to proceed. The improvements would address the poor environment of a key pedestrian route and set a standard for creating a distinctive town centre environment.

671. **Appointments to Subsidiary Bodies:**

**RESOLVED:** (1) That Councillor Idaikkadar be appointed as Chair of the Best Value Advisory Panel;

(2) that Councillor Bluston be appointed as the 3<sup>rd</sup> Major Minority Group member on the Housing Improvements Options Advisory Panel;

(3) that Councillor Branch and Councillor Thornton be appointed as Reserve Members to Councillor Lyne on the Grants Advisory Panel;

(4) that Councillor Vina Mithani be appointed to the Housing Improvements Options Advisory Panel in place of Councillor Anjana Patel.

672. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 22.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution), it was

**RESOLVED:** At 9.59 pm to continue the meeting until 10.15 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NAVIN SHAH  
Chair



CABINET  
ADVISORY  
PANELS



## TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

1 DECEMBER 2004

Chair: \* Councillor Miles

Councillors: \* Arnold \* Ismail  
\* Branch \* Kara  
\* Burchell \* John Nickolay  
\* Choudhury \* Anne Whitehead  
\* Harriss

\* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillors D Ashton, Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Seymour, Silver and Stephenson also attended this meeting in a participatory role].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Petition Requesting Free Parking Facilities for Shops in Pinner Road, North Harrow**

Your Panel received a petition requesting free parking facilities for shops in Pinner Road, North Harrow. The petition was presented in the following terms: 'All shops in Pinner Road that have controlled parking outside are suffering from a loss in trade, customers do not want to pay to park and go elsewhere to shop, these businesses only want the same concession, as the rest of North Harrow, a period of free parking. We think the Council should implement this as soon as possible'.

In addition, the Panel received and considered advice from the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which detailed the history of and existing arrangements for car parking provision and charges in Pinner Road, North Harrow.

In the debate that followed, the Panel reached a consensus that North Harrow Shopping Centre was in a state of commercial decline, and pending other long-term measures including a report on the health and vitality of the centre, an immediate measure in order to aid regeneration was favoured.

Accordingly, it was proposed that the first hour free parking currently available in the North Harrow shopping parade car parks should be extended to the 28 on-street pay and display parking spaces in Pinner Road.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To the Leader of the Council)

That (1) the first hour of on-street parking be free in Pinner Road, North Harrow, Monday to Friday inclusive, to be implemented as soon as possible; and

(2) all other tariffs remain the same.

[**REASON:** To immediately improve the attractiveness of the local centre, given the problems of the health and vitality of the centre, pending other longer-term measures].

(See also Minute 76).

**RECOMMENDATION 2 - Petts Hill Bridge - Scheme Design and Consultation Results**

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which detailed the improvement scheme design in relation to Petts Hill Bridge and the results of the consultation process with local residents.

Members were informed that following agreement to submit a bid to Transport for London (TfL), work on the improvement scheme had commenced. The Chair commended officers on their ongoing management of enquiries and the extensive consultation with local residents that had taken place.

With regard to the congestion caused by the construction work, it was advised that the Council was liaising with TfL in order to minimise the disruption experienced by motorists, and that officers visited the site daily in order to assess the signal times. In response, Members made several suggestions to limit the impact of the construction work, such as the suspension of a number of bus lanes and the provision of extra warning notices.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport)

That (1) the above comments be noted;

(2) the proposed scheme and junction layout as described in the design report in Appendix A of the officer report be approved for implementation; and

(3) authority be given to officers to take all necessary steps under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce a bus lane at the Northolt Road/Alexandra Avenue junction, subject to the consideration of any formal objections, and that the details of the order-making be delegated to officers.

[REASON: To enable officers to progress to scheme implementation].

### **RECOMMENDATION 3 - Stanmore CPZ - Consultation Results**

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which detailed a review of the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Stanmore and the results of consultation on the proposed extensions to the scheme.

It was advised that the current CPZ had been installed 10 years ago in order to address parking problems in Stanmore and the general consensus was that the system was working well. An officer informed Members that the proposed extensions to the CPZ were very limited and the majority of the roads addressed within petitions objecting to the extension of the scheme would not be included on the basis of lack of support. The exception was Howberry Road where a CPZ would be included in the advertised scheme for part of the road.

In the discussion that followed, several Members referred to the recommendations outlined in the officer report and commented that if a number of businesses chose to purchase a permit in order to make use of the parking bays in The Broadway, this would accentuate the existing parking problems already experienced by shoppers in Stanmore. Consequently, the Panel agreed to omit recommendation 2.1(g) from the officer report and to re-number the remaining recommendations accordingly.

Concerning the consultation process, it was stated that a number of the roads included within the proposed extensions were borderline in agreeing to the scheme. As a result the Panel agreed that they be re-consulted. These included Eaton Close, Snaresbrook Drive and London Road. In relation to Eaton Close, it was advised that residents should be re-consulted in parallel with the statutory consultation. With regard to the latter two roads, it was agreed that residents should not only be re-consulted concerning the implementation of the CPZ but also in relation to its times of operation.

Concerning Howberry Road and Howberry Close, Members agreed the recommendation that a CPZ be implemented, but additionally that residents should be written to in order to explain the benefits of the system. Notwithstanding these amendments to the recommendations, a back-benching Ward Member commended the balance of the report and concluded that the roads included were about right.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport)

That (1) the existing Stanmore Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone B be extended as shown at Appendix M of the officer report;

(2) further consultation be carried out in parallel with statutory consultation in Charlbury Avenue, Craigweil Close and Laburnum Court, and if further consultation shows there is no support for inclusion in the CPZ, these roads be excluded from the scheme;

(3) Eaton Road be re-consulted with regard to inclusion in the CPZ, in parallel with the statutory consultation;

(4) further consultation be carried out in parallel with statutory consultation in the proposed zone H extension to include London Road (to Court Drive) and Snaresbrook Drive as shown at Appendix M of the officer report, to establish if there is support for inclusion in the proposed Monday to Saturday extension, and if further consultation shows there is no support, these roads be excluded from the proposals;



(5) a Controlled Parking Zone be created in Howberry Road between Cloyster Wood and Wychwood Avenue including Howberry Close as shown at Appendix M of the officer report to operate, Monday to Friday, 2pm – 3pm, and the residents of Howberry Road and Howberry Close be written to in parallel to the statutory consultation in order to explain the benefits of the scheme;

(6) the traffic orders be amended to incorporate the on-street business permit facility for both zones;

(7) the free parking space in Merrion Avenue be converted to 18 shared use “pay and display”/residents/business spaces operating from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday as shown at Appendix K of the officer report;

(8) double yellow line waiting restrictions be introduced in Stanmore Hill at its junction with Fallowfield, Park Lane, Hilltop Way and Springfield Close as shown at Appendix O of the officer report;

(9) the existing 8am to 6.30pm yellow line waiting restrictions on the south side in Gordon Avenue at its junction with Old Church Lane be extended to the eastern wall of 7 Gordon Avenue as shown at Appendix P of the officer report;

(10) double yellow line waiting restrictions be introduced in Gordon Avenue at its junction with Water Gardens as shown at Appendix P of the officer report;

(11) the existing double yellow line waiting restrictions in Elm Park on the west side be extended northwards to a point opposite the common boundary of 4 and 6 Elm Park as shown at Appendix P of the officer report;

(12) officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design in accordance with Appendices K, M, N, O and P of the officer report for order-making purposes, and to take all necessary steps under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders, the details of which be delegated to officers, and to implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections, the statement of reasons to be “to control parking”; and

(13) the head petitioners be informed accordingly.

**[REASON:** To gain agreement for the way forward with a view to implementation of parking controls to address the Council’s stated priority of enhancing the environment and encouraging more sustainable transport activity].

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4 - Transport Local Implementation Plan**

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which set out the draft Transport Local Implementation Plan, to be submitted to Cabinet on 16 December 2004.

With regard to the funding for the proposed schemes contained within the plan, it was advised that this would be based on the Council’s Medium Term Budget Strategy and the Forward Capital Programme, which were to be agreed in the New Year, and on information yet to be received from Transport for London on likely future settlements. As a result, Members were informed that there was a need to be realistic concerning the plans/programmes that could be achieved within these limited funds.

In relation to the contents of the plan, an officer referred the Panel to the Parking and Enforcement Plan, which included a thorough review of Controlled Parking Zone policies, and to a new programme which Transport for London had required relating to the analysis of congestion hotspots in the Borough.

In the discussion that followed, Members/Advisers made several suggestions in relation to how the plan could be improved. For example, with regard to road safety, it was stated that age should also be included as a factor in the correlation between ethnicity and the number of road accidents. In relation to cycling facilities in the Borough, a Member informed the Panel that these were currently under-used and, as a result, consultation with cycling organisations and pedestrian groups should take place in order to ascertain how the Council could best meet their needs. Officers undertook to consider all of the points raised and incorporate the suggested improvements in the Plan where appropriate.

In response to a request from an Adviser, the Panel agreed that all Advisers of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel be formally invited to attend the forthcoming Members' Forum on the Transport Local Implementation Plan.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To Cabinet)

That (1) the comments above be noted;

(2) Advisers on the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel be invited to the Members' Forum on the Traffic Local Implementation Plan; and

(3) the proposed programmes and policies be agreed as a basis for consultation on the draft Transport Local Implementation Plan.

**[REASON:** To agree the basis for statutory consultation on the draft Plan].

**RECOMMENDATION 5 - Petition Objecting to the Parking Restriction in Pinner After 6.30pm**

Your Panel received a reference from the Council meeting held on 21 October 2004 asking the Panel to consider a petition from the residents of Harrow which objected to the parking restrictions in Pinner after 6.30pm.

A Member advised the Panel that the current parking restrictions were causing shops and restaurants in Pinner loss of trade, and a general consensus had been reached that the restrictions after 6.30pm should be lifted by May 2005.

In the discussion that followed, an Adviser commented that to abolish the restriction was a piecemeal measure that would not solve the overall traffic problems in Pinner. In order to illustrate this point a number of examples were cited such as the junction of Marsh Road and School Lane. Members were informed that double yellow lines were required at this junction in order to prevent parked cars from blocking the road when vehicles were waiting to turn right into West End Avenue. It was further advised that a full review of the Pinner Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was the only method suitable for solving all of the parking-related problems in Pinner.

The Chair concluded by advising that although a total consensus had not been achieved on this matter, the recommendation to change the hours of operation should be implemented within the next 6 months and in advance of the programmed CPZ review, to which the Panel agreed. It was further advised that the suggestion to install double yellow lines at the junction of Marsh Road and School Lane be given consideration.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport)

That (1) the 8am – 8pm restrictions in Pinner CPZ be changed to 8am - 6.30pm in advance of the programmed CPZ review and within the next 6 months; and

(2) the suggestion to install double yellow lines at the junction of Marsh Road and School Lane be given consideration.

**[REASON:** To bring the restriction times in Pinner into line with other CPZs in the Borough].

**PART II - MINUTES**

66. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the appointment at the Cabinet meeting held on 11 November 2004, under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 5.1, of Councillor Miles as Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

67. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

68. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

69. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

Both Councillor Anne Whitehead and Councillor John Nickolay each having been duly nominated and seconded to the office of Vice-Chair, and upon a vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Anne Whitehead be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

70. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) all items be considered with the press and public present;

(2) item 10a on the Main Agenda be considered before item 10b and item 11b on the Main Agenda be considered after item 10a; and

(3) two items now identified by the Chair be added to the business for this meeting. (See Minutes 86 and 87 below).

71. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2004, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record subject to Recommendation 1, Paragraph (1) being amended to read as follows:-

“That (1) officers continue to investigate with Brent Council and TfL as a matter of urgency the feasibility of widening Kenton Road and reinstating the (currently banned) right-turn into Kenton Lane whilst retaining two straight ahead lanes (option 3), seeking the assistance as necessary of the GLA Member for Brent and Harrow who is also a Brent Councillor.”

72. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

73. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt at the meeting of the following petition, which was referred to officers for consideration:

- Petition Requesting a Yellow Line on Both Sides of Village Way and Parking Controls for Part of the Day  
The petition was presented by Councillor Arnold and had been signed by approximately 62 residents.

74. **Petition from the residents of Albury Drive, Pinner in relation to parking and traffic congestion:**

The Panel received a petition from the residents of Albury Drive, Pinner in relation to issues of parking and traffic congestion.

A petitioner informed the Panel that congestion in the road was a particular problem at the beginning and end of the school day and accordingly requested that Albury Drive be monitored at these times.

**RESOLVED:** That officers investigate parking and traffic congestion in Albury Close, taking into consideration the times of the day suggested above, and report as appropriate.

75. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no deputations to be made to this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

76. **Petition Requesting Free Parking Facilities for Shops in Pinner Road, North Harrow:**  
Further to Recommendation 1 above and the discussions on the impact of parking restrictions on the vitality of North Harrow, the Chair proposed additionally that a report on outstanding traffic issues in the shopping centre be submitted to the next meeting of the Panel.
- RESOLVED:** That a report on outstanding traffic issues in the shopping centre, North Harrow, be submitted to the meeting of the Panel scheduled to take place on 2 March 2005.
77. **Petts Hill Bridge - Scheme Design and Consultation Results:**  
(See Recommendation 2).
78. **Petitions Objecting to the Extension of the Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ):**  
(See Recommendation 3).
79. **Stanmore CPZ - Consultation Results:**  
(See Recommendation 3).
80. **Transport Local Implementation Plan:**  
(See Recommendation 4).
81. **Petition Requesting an End to the 8pm Parking Restriction in Place at the Upper End of Marsh Road:**  
(See Recommendation 5).
82. **Petition Objecting to the Parking Restriction in Pinner After 6.30pm:**  
(See Recommendation 5).
83. **Reference from the Call-In Sub-Committee Meeting held on 3 November 2004 - Call-in of the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder Decision: Proposed Pelican Crossing in Station Road, South of its Junction with Gayton Road, Harrow:**  
The Panel received a reference from the Call-In Sub-Committee meeting held on 3 November 2004, which detailed the call-in of the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder's decision to install a pelican crossing in Station Road, south of its junction with Gayton Road, Harrow.
- The meeting was informed that the call-in had been rejected, but that the Panel had been requested to consider proposed changes to the consultation process, as outlined in the reference.
- RESOLVED:** That officers consider the changes to the consultation process recommended in the reference for proposals subject to traffic orders in the town centre.
84. **Extension of Meeting:**  
Further to Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 12.1 (Part 4E of the Constitution) and Committee Procedure Rule 14.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) requiring the termination of a meeting at 10.00pm, and during the course of the debates then in progress, the Chair proposed at 10.00pm that it be agreed to extend the "guillotine" until 10.15pm. (The Panel subsequently approved further extensions until 10.35pm).
- RESOLVED:** That the Panel's meeting be continued beyond the procedural closure time to enable the items on the agenda and the agreed additional business to be completed.

85. **Portfolio Holder Decisions:**

**RESOLVED:** That the decisions taken by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder upon Recommendations submitted to him from the Panel meeting of 22 September 2004, as now reported, be noted.

86. **Parking Provision in the Service Road off Honeypot Lane:**

Further to Minute 70(3), a Member raised concerns over commuters who had been displaced by the Canon Park Station parking restrictions and as a result were parking in the service road at the north end of Honeypot Lane. As a solution to the problem, the Member suggested banning parking on one side of the service road.

In response, an officer advised that displaced vehicles were likely to have a detrimental effect on parking in neighbouring roads such as Bromefield, which were also subject to a request for residents' parking, and therefore this issue should be considered as part of the CPZ Review in March 2005, as previously agreed with Ward Members.

**RESOLVED:** That parking restrictions in the service road at the north end of Honeypot Lane be considered as part of the annual CPZ Review in March 2005.

87. **Elmgrove School - Yellow Zig-Zag Lines:**

Further to Minute 70(3), a Member raised concerns over yellow zig-zag lines which had failed to deter parents from parking outside Elmgrove School.

The Member suggested that the school should have the power to write to parents who persistently parked outside the school and inform them that if they continued to park in this area they would be issued with a parking ticket.

In response, it was confirmed that the particular zig-zag road markings at Elmgrove School were not of a category which was enforceable. It was proposed that a Road Safety Officer visit the site in order to assess the parking problems and advise on possible solutions.

**RESOLVED:** That a Road Safety Officer visit Elmgrove School in order to assess the parking problems.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.35 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES  
Chair



## STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL

2 DECEMBER 2004

Chair:	* Councillor Burchell	
Councillors:	* Marilyn Ashton	* Mrs Kinnear
	* Mrs Bath	* N Shah
	* Idaikkadar	* Anne Whitehead
Non-voting Co-opted Member:	* Councillor Branch (See Minute 11)	

\* Denotes Member present

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Revised Terms of Reference**

Cabinet, at its meeting held on 29 July 2004, had re-titled the UDP Advisory Panel as the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel in order to reflect the recent changes to the Planning System.

In order to reflect its new duties, the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel, at its meeting held on 2 December 2004, agreed its revised terms of reference and

**Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Cabinet)**

That the revised terms of reference set out below be agreed:

1. To give detailed consideration to and make recommendations in respect of:
  - (a) the Local Development Framework and its Development Plan Documents and matters incidental thereto;
  - (b) representations received to Development Plan Documents and any amendments proposed;
  - (c) monitoring the implementation of the Framework, its review and modification as necessary.
2. To make recommendations in respect of the development of such individual sites as may be referred to the Panel by the Cabinet.
3. To give detailed consideration and to make recommendations in respect of all other planning policy matters such as the designation of Conservation Areas and amendments to their boundaries and the designation of locally listed buildings.

[REASON: To ensure that the Panel's Terms of Reference reflect its new remit].

**RECOMMENDATION 2 - Developing the Local Development Framework in Harrow - Draft Local Development Scheme**

The Director of Strategy (Urban Living) briefed Members on her report and thanked her staff for producing the draft Local Development Scheme (LDS) within a short timescale. She reported that the deadline for submission of the LDS to the Government Office for London (GOL) had changed and that it had been extended from December 2004 to 31 March 2005.

The Director of Strategy (Urban Living) identified the Council's priorities in the LDS and how these would be achieved, details of which were set out in her report. She added that there was no statutory requirement to involve the community in the production of the LDS and that officers hoped to provide information on the Local Development Framework (LDF) via the website and other mediums.

In response to a number of questions from Members, the Director of Strategy (Urban Living) explained how:

- the community would be engaged with a view to identifying their needs for inclusion in the LDS. As the timescales to ensure total engagement with the community were tight, the Plan would be developed incrementally. The King's Cross model - mentioned by a Member - was noted as an excellent example

of engaging with the community to accept change rather than imposing change; however, community involvement at King's Cross had been developed over a number of years.

- Members would be involved. It was proposed to hold a workshop on 1 March 2005 to allow Members to discuss the LDF proposals prior to finalising and issuing the document to GOL.

A Member stated that she was concerned about the process and the requirement to conform generally to the London Plan, which, in her opinion, was not suitable for Harrow.

The Panel was informed that:

- all policies in the saved HUDP would eventually be replaced by the LDF and that it was important to ensure that there were no delays in meeting the deadline;
- the expertise of the Community Engagement Team which was based in the Organisational Development Directorate would be utilised, together with expertise in other Council service areas, to assist the LDF team.

A Member suggested more frequent meetings of this Panel to ensure that Members had an opportunity to address all issues.

Following further discussion on community engagement, the Panel agreed that a briefing paper rather than the detailed LDS should be available for comment through the Council's website and that articles - inviting comments - should be posted in the local newspapers. The full LDS would be available to anyone who wanted to receive a copy and it would also be accessible on the website.

The Panel also agreed that Members of the Development Control Committee be invited to participate in the Workshop scheduled to be held on 1 March 2005 at 6.30 pm. The Panel agreed the following programme:

<u>1 March 2005</u>	
6.30 pm	– Refreshments
6.30 – 7.00 pm	– Workshop 'The Local Development Scheme'
7.30 pm onwards	– Meeting of the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Portfolio Holder)**

(1) That the priorities and programme identified in the draft LDS, attached to the officer report, be endorsed;

(2) that a briefing paper on the LDF and the timetable for production be made available for public comment, in addition to the LDS document being posted on the Council's website;

(3) that the briefing paper be circulated to Members for comments;

(4) that the comments received, referred to in resolutions (2) and (3) above, be considered by a meeting of the Panel to be held on 1 March 2005 in order to allow the Panel to submit the LDS for approval by Cabinet prior to its submission to the Government Office for London (GOL) by 31 March 2005;

(5) that a workshop be held on 1 March 2005 on the new LDF system to include Members of Development Control, prior to the formal meeting of the Panel.

**[REASON:** The Local Development Scheme is required to be approved by Cabinet prior to submission to the Government Office for London by 31 March 2005. Submission of the LDS by the set deadline, the priorities included and the delivery of the programme set out in the LDS are important elements of Planning Delivery Grant. Public involvement on the draft is seen as a positive start to the LDF process].



**PART II - MINUTES**1. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the appointment of Councillor Burchell as Chair of the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year, as agreed at the Cabinet meeting of 11 November 2004.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

4. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

Councillor Anne Whitehead was nominated and seconded. Councillor Marilyn Ashton was nominated and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Anne Whitehead be appointed Vice-Chair of the Panel for the remainder of the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

5. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present.

6. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Unitary Development Plan Advisory Panel (being the predecessor body to the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel) held on 8 July 2004, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

7. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no public questions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

8. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no petitions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 13 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

9. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no deputations to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

10. **Revised Terms of Reference:**  
See Recommendation 1 above.11. **Appointment of Co-opted Member:**

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Branch be appointed as a non-voting co-optee on the Panel.

12. **Land at Honeypot Lane - Development Brief:**

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced his report and advised Members that he could no longer recommend approval of the Development Brief for land at Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, for the following reasons:

- the stance taken by the Environment Agency on flood risk and the possibility that a significant part of this site might not be available for development;
- to allow officers to assess the impact on traffic of the planning application received for the site, to ascertain the access arrangements and to allow the

negotiations between the developer and the Environment Agency, which were at an advanced stage, to be concluded;

- the recently available information that the owners of a major part of the site, subject to the current planning application, had an option to purchase the area to be vacated in the New Year by the Office of Government Commerce.

The Chair stated that approval of the development brief ought to be deferred to allow officers to take account of the issues above and the following additional matter:

- provision of health and education in the area.

In response to questions from Members, the Director of Strategic Planning stated that:

- the planning brief referred to above could not be agreed until the Council had reviewed the access arrangements;
- the planning brief ought to be agreed prior to a decision being taken on the planning application received;
- the revised brief would be submitted to the March 2005 meeting of the Panel;
- the owners of the site were in negotiations with the Environment Agency and that they were looking at ways of dealing with the flood risk which would not prejudice the development potential of the site;
- more sophisticated models were now being used by the Environment Agency to determine/forecast flood requirements more accurately than had previously been the case; and this had resulted in the Agency taking a more precautionary approach on this particular site in response to the submitted application;
- the public would be re-consulted on the brief should there be significant changes in either the mix of uses or the quantum of development arising from the outcome of the further work outlined.

Members made the following observations:

- that the approval of the brief before the Panel that evening could lead to development on a piecemeal basis of the site which was undesirable;
- that the views of the Environment Agency needed to be resolved prior to approval of the brief;
- that in any development of the site, the existing trees and gardens ought to be retained and that the planting of additional trees – in particular willow trees – ought to be a prime consideration in the brief;
- that the sophisticated modelling exercises used by the Environment Agency may well impact on the number of properties built;
- that with global warming, the approach being taken by the Environment Agency should be seen positively.

Members asked to be kept informed at all times of the progress in the negotiations between the developer and the Environment Agency which were underway, and

**RESOLVED:** To defer approval of the Development Brief for land at Honeypot Lane, Stanmore.

13. **Developing the Local Development Framework in Harrow - Draft Local Development Scheme:**

See Recommendation 2 above.

14. **Any Other Business:**

(i) **Training for Members of the Development Control Committee**

The Director of Strategic Planning reported that Members of the Development Control Committee would be trained on the Local Development Framework (LDF) between now and 1 March 2005 and the session would be made available to other interested Members.

A Member commented on the large number of training sessions being held for Members and the need for officers to avoid clashes where possible.

**RESOLVED:** To note that Members of the Development Control Committee would be trained on the LDF.

(ii) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 – A Brief Guide

**RESOLVED:** To note that 'Planning Notes' in relation to the above-mentioned Act were circulated to Members for information.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.47 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL  
Chair



**SUPPORTING PEOPLE ADVISORY PANEL****7 DECEMBER 2004**

Chair: \* Councillor Margaret Davine

Councillors: \* Ann Groves \* Myra Michael  
\* Lavingia \* Silver

\* Denotes Member present

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Supporting People Review and Inspection**

A report of the Director Of Strategy (Urban Living) was presented to the Panel, which summarised the development of Supporting People (SP) programme since its launch nationally 18 months ago.

Harrow Council, as an Administering Local Authority, was responsible for implementing and managing SP according to guidance from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), for securing best value, and for delivering the programme in line with strategic objectives set by the Commissioning Body.

The report highlighted key issues currently facing the SP programme in Harrow, and sought approval to progress to the next phase of implementation.

Since its inception in April 2003, SP had been implemented steadily and effectively in line with the ODPM's guidance. However, a review of governance had now been carried out which had identified some weaknesses in the current arrangements in Harrow and recommended a new governance framework. In particular, it was recognised that the Commissioning Body should comprise senior officers from the Local Authority, Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the Harrow and Hillingdon Probation Services.

A review of the financial and risk management arrangements had also been undertaken, in line with corporate policies and frameworks, to ensure that the programme was managed effectively. An updated table detailing the medium-term financial position of the SP programme was presented to the Panel for consideration. An officer explained that a grant allocation formula had been introduced nationally which indicated that Harrow's SP provider payments grant would be reduced by 3.5% on average for 2005-2006, in comparison with a reduction of 5% throughout England. In addition, Harrow's SP administration grant had been reduced by 20% in 2005-2006, compared to an average reduction of 13% throughout England.

The estimated charging income was £92,000 p.a., which the Commissioning Body had requested be recycled back into the SP pot to fund new services. The outcome was that a number of key issues were picked up as potential risks, such as:

- the impact of future grant or budget reductions. This could be either the size of the national pot, or Harrow's particular share of the distribution. Changes over the next few years put sound medium term financial planning at a premium;
- ensuring appropriate services e.g. health and safety, the protection of vulnerable adults;
- issues arising from funding and paying for contracted services – occupancy levels, litigation, ineligibility for grant, decommissioning, managing the market (local and regional) sustaining providers.

All SP Administering Authorities were required to contract for services and decide which services should be deemed chargeable. In Harrow, Cabinet had decided to follow a block gross chargeable type of contract, following a recommendation of the Panel. In agreeing this arrangement, Cabinet had agreed with the recommendation that this position be reviewed after eighteen months of operation. The review had considered whether the block gross chargeable contract was fulfilling its original objectives.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Cabinet)**

That (1) the inspection timetable, process and improvement plan be noted;

(2) the new governance arrangements, and the continuing involvement of the Supporting People Advisory Panel Members be noted and agreed;

(3) the proposed risk management strategy be noted;

(4) the financial report be noted and that the income from charges be retained within the SP budget;

(5) the continued use of the present system of block gross chargeable contracts be agreed;

(6) the novations required for the Council to sign the Supporting People Interim Contracts be noted and agreed.

**REASON:** To implement and manage SP in line with guidance from the ODPM.

## **PART II - MINUTES**

51. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That the appointment of Councillor Margaret Davine as Chair of the Panel for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/2005, as agreed at the Cabinet meeting on 11 November 2004 under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 5.1, be noted.

52. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

53. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Silver as Vice-Chair of the Panel for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/2005.

54. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

55. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present.

56. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

57. **Public Questions, Petition and Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions, petitions or deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 15, 13 and 14 respectively.

58. **Supporting People Review and Inspection:**

(See Recommendation 1).

59. **Any Other Business:**

(i) **Providers Forum Meeting – 18 November 2004**

It was noted that this meeting had been used as an open discussion forum to consult on Supporting People policy issues. Twenty-five service providers had attended together with the consultants Barttle-Linney Associates, Miles Partridge & Mark Goldup. The service providers had been encouraged to give feedback on unmet needs, the draft steady state contracts and the 2005-10 Draft Supporting People Strategy.

(ii) Inclusive Forum

The Supporting People team had also held two annual Inclusive Forum events for SP service users and stakeholders. The last meeting had had a good turnout with consultants Barttle-Linney Associates in attendance. The consultants had been there to obtain the views and feedback of the service users on the SP Strategy. Service users and stakeholders had discussed and reviewed options for the 2005–10 Supporting People 'Vision Statement', and also reviewed and commented upon other elements of the strategy such as supply and needs mapping and the commissioning process.

**RESOLVED:** That Members of the Panel be kept informed of and invited to future meetings of both the Forums.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 10.00 am, closed at 11.50 am)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARGARET DAVINE  
Chair





CONSULTATIVE  
FORUMS



## EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM (SPECIAL)

7 DECEMBER 2004

Chair:	* Councillor Stephenson	
Councillors:	* Mrs Bath * Miss Bednell * Gate	* Ismail Janet Mote * Ray
Teachers' Constituency:	† Mr R Borman * Ms C Gembala	* Ms J Lang * Ms L Snowdon
Governors' Constituency:	* Ms H Henshaw * Mrs C Millard	† Mr N Rands Ms H Solanki
Elected Parent Governor Representatives:	* Mr H Epie	* Mr R Sutcliffe
Denominational Representatives:	Mrs J Rammelt	* Reverend P Reece
Arts Culture Harrow Representatives:	(Vacancy)	(Vacancy)

\* Denotes Member present  
† Denotes apologies received

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1: Proposed Schools Budget 2005/2006**

The Forum received a joint report of the Executive Director (Business Connections) and Executive Director (People First), which outlined the proposed schools budget for 2005/2006.

It was reported that on 2 December, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) had made the announcement on the minimum amount which the Local Education Authority (LEA) should pass on to schools, and that Harrow had received a larger increase in the schools formula spending share (SFSS) than the national average. Officers explained that the report outlined Harrow's proposed budget based on the amount specified by the DfES. There was a statutory duty to notify the proposal by the end of December which was known as 'fully passporting'.

The SFSS was divided into two parts, the Individual Schools Budget (ISB) which was given directly to schools and the Central Items, which were retained by the LEA to be spent on Special Education Needs (SEN), nursery provision and other services.

It was advised that the ISB funding would be increased by 7.1% if it were agreed to reduce schools' contingency provision. The proposed budgets for the Central Items were discussed; it was noted that the budget for SEN provision was anticipated to increase by over £500k and that this could be funded from an anticipated reduction in the Early Years budget.

It was reported that the entire schools budget for 2006/2007 would be set and funded by the Government, which was planning to increase the funding to those LEAs that currently funded below SFSS. There was therefore a risk that this would be resourced from those Authorities who currently spent above the SFSS.

The Chair informed the Forum that the December Cabinet meeting needed to decide whether to agree to recommend fully passporting or not. The specific budget allocations to education would be discussed at the next meeting.

In response to a query from a representative of Elected Parent Governors regarding the high number of SEN placements outside the Borough, officers replied that most of the SEN budget was spent on Harrow pupils attending schools outside the Borough as there was not sufficient specialised provision within the Borough to cover all SEN pupils. However, Harrow collaborated with Boroughs in West London and Pan-London to cut costs and to ensure good service to all SEN pupils.

In response to a question from a member of the Governors' Constituency regarding whether sufficient trend analysis had been carried out in order to safely reduce the contingency for schools, officers advised that the decision to accept the total allocated sum upfront or at a later stage was currently the subject of consultation with individual schools. There was a certain risk in the decision, but officers explained that the allocations to schools would be based on last year's trends and therefore the risks should be minimal.

In response to another question regarding possible cutbacks in the schools budget after 2006, officers replied that it was uncertain whether a possible reduction in the budget would affect both the ISB and the Central Items.

The Chair stated that strong representations would be made to the Government to ensure that funds for schools were not reduced in the future.

In response to a query regarding the deprivation indicators used to target schools with high levels of deprivation, officers confirmed that both the provision of free school meals and the postcode to determine pupils' place of residence were being used as measures of deprivation.

A member of the Teachers' Constituency commented that more support to schools with a large number of refugees was needed to cater for additional needs such as counselling and the provision of English as a second language.

In response to this comment, the Chair stated that the Extended Schools initiative, which was partly funded by the Government, had initially been rolled out in deprived areas but would eventually be rolled out to all schools.

The Chair recognised the considerable financial pressure placed on schools last year by having to deal with issues such as workforce re-modelling, single status, recruitment and retention and other extra costs. The Council had therefore decided last year to grant an extra £1.2 million to the schools budget, which was intended to fund initiatives in coming years.

A member of the Governors' Constituency voiced concern regarding the proposed schools budget as the settlement received from the Government last year had been too low, and hoped that schools would not be under-funded this year.

The Chair indicated that he anticipated that the Authority's administration would be asking the Council to support full passporting of the proposed schools budget. Another Council Member advised that she believed that this would also be the position adopted by her political Group on this issue.

The Forum thanked officers for the presentation.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (for decision by Cabinet)

That the comments made by Forum members on the proposed schools budget for 2005/2006 be considered by Cabinet.

**REASON:** To meet the Education Act 2002 requirement to notify the proposed schools budget to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2004.

## **PART II - MINUTES**

141. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That the appointment at the meeting of the Cabinet on 11 November 2004 of Councillor Stephenson as Chair of this Forum for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/05 be noted.

142. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

143. **Declarations of Interest:**

In relation to this item, Council Members re-stated the governorships, which they each held, as set out in the minutes of the meeting of the Education Consultative Forum on 15 July 2004 (Minute 110).

Councillor Ray declared a personal interest as a member of his family was a teacher at Rooks Heath High School, but remained and took part in the discussion on agenda item 10, "Proposed Schools Budget 2005/2006".

**RESOLVED:** That the Declarations of Interest now made by Council Members be noted.

144. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
10. Proposed Schools Budget 2005/2006	The report was not available at the time the main agenda was printed and circulated owing to the announcement of the provisional settlement being made on 2 December 2004. Members were asked to consider the report in order to make recommendations (if any) to Cabinet on the proposed schools budget.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

145. **Appointment of Vice Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That Ms Jo Lang, from the Teachers' Constituency, be appointed Vice Chair of the Forum for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/05.

146. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the signing of the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2004 be deferred until the next ordinary meeting of the Forum.

147. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

148. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 13 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

149. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

150. **Proposed Schools Budget for 2005/2006:**

Further to Recommendation 1 it was

**RESOLVED:** That a report on contingency provision in Harrow schools be made to the next meeting.

151. **Date of the Next Meeting:**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Forum was due to be held on Tuesday 1 February 2005.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.37 pm, closed at 8.35 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON  
Chair





