

2006 – 2007
August/September 2006
Volume 4



**CABINET
AND
COUNCIL
MINUTES**

CABINET AND COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

VOLUME 4: AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2006

CONTENTS

Meeting

Date 2006

THE CABINET, ADVISORY PANELS AND CONSULTATIVE FORUMS

CABINET	3 August
CABINET (SPECIAL)	4 September
CABINET	14 September
Town Centre Project Panel	1 August
Town Centre Project Panel	26 September
Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel	29 August
Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel	13 September
Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel	26 September
Budget Review Working Panel	5 September
Strategic Planning Advisory Panel	12 September
Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel	20 September
Education Consultative Forum	21 September

COUNCIL AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Call-In Sub-Committee	22 August
Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee	13 September
Sustainable Development and Enterprise Scrutiny Sub-Committee	25 September
Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Sub-Committee	28 September
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE * (See Note)	6 and 11 September
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE	19 September
AUDIT COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)	12 September
AUDIT COMMITTEE	25 September
LICENSING AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE	18 September
Social Services Appeals Panel	22 August
Licensing Panel	31 August

Meeting

Date 2006

COUNCIL AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES (continued)

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

19 September

Member Development Panel

13 September

**STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION**

20 September

* **Note:** *A meeting of the Development Control Committee commenced and adjourned on 6 September 2006, and concluded on 11 September 2006.*

THE CABINET,
CABINET ADVISORY PANELS
AND
CONSULTATIVE FORUMS

CABINET

REPORT OF CABINET

MEETING HELD ON 3 AUGUST 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Chris Mote

Councillors: * David Ashton * Janet Mote
* Marilyn Ashton * Paul Osborn
* Miss Christine Bednell * Mrs Anjana Patel
* Mrs Kinnear * Eric Silver

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION I - Financial Regulations, Corporate Procurement Strategy, Contract Procedure Rules, Small Business Friendly Concordat**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which sought approval to a number of documents. The key changes to the documents were set out in paragraphs 2.3 – 2.5 of her report. The Portfolio Holder for Business Development advised that each of the documents were relied upon to ensure probity in the way the Council operated.

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy proposed that a minor amendment to the Contract Procedure Rules in relation to Social Care Block Contracts be made prior to the document's submission to Council for approval.

Having approved the Corporate Procurement Strategy and Small Business Friendly Concordat, it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That the Financial Regulations and Contract Procedure Rules be approved and added to the Constitution in place of the existing Financial Regulations and Contract Procedure Rules dated June 2004.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that the Council had effective governance arrangements in place and that all of the documents reflected the changes to be implemented with the introduction of the new Enterprise Resource Planning System from September 2006 and revisions to legislative requirements.

(See also Minute 57).

PART II - MINUTES35. **Assault on a Member of Staff:**

The Chairman reported that there had recently been an incident where a member of staff carrying out the green bin collection had been assaulted. He advised that such assaults would not be tolerated and that a £1,000 reward was being offered for the apprehension and conviction of the assailant. A press release would set out the details of the reward. The Leader of the Labour group, a representative of the union and the Portfolio Holder for Public Realm – Urban Living, fully endorsed the Chairman's statement.

36. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
26. West House, Pinner Memorial Park	Councillor Paul Osborn	The Member indicated both a personal and prejudicial interest. He would leave the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Chris Mote	The Member indicated a personal interest in that he was a member of the Pinner Association. He would remain in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon. The Member indicated that all Members of Council had an interest in this item in that they were trustees of the Park.
	Councillor Marilyn Ashton	The Member indicated a personal interest in that she was a local authority appointee on West House. She would remain in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Navin Shah	The Member, who was not a Member of Cabinet, declared that his personal interests were detailed on his declaration of interests form.
30. Key Decision - Harrow Consortium for Special Needs	Councillor Anjana Patel	The Member indicated a prejudicial interest in that she was a Board Member of Harrow Mencap. She would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

37. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2006 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

38. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

The Chairman indicated that he would be varying the order of business in that he would group the questions in relation to Wiseworks together and that, after each questioner had submitted their question, Cabinet would consider the officer report in relation to the re-provision of Wiseworks (item 22). Following this, the questioners would be given the opportunity to indicate whether they wished to receive a written answer and submit a supplemental question.

The Chairman indicated that he would be reordering the agenda to take items 24-26, the Urban Living agenda items, immediately after item 12, Appointment of Assistant to Members of Cabinet. During the course of the meeting, he further varied the order of business to take the item on the Financial Position (item 14) after item 12.

In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 33.1, the Chairman indicated that he was prepared to waive the time limit in relation to public question time, set out in Executive Procedure Rule 16.2, to enable all of the questions to be put.

The Leader of the Labour Group, who was not a Member of the Cabinet, requested that the Headteacher of Roxeth School be permitted to submit a public question. The Chairman confirmed that he was prepared to waive the requirements of Executive Procedure Rule 16.3 to allow Mr McDermot to submit a question on the understanding that it might be necessary for the Portfolio Holder to provide a written response.

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

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
28. Key Decision - Financial Position	The report contained exempt information by virtue of paragraph 5 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information of which a claim for legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
29. Key Decision - Reprovision of Wiseworks	The report contained exempt information under paragraph 5 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information of which a claim for legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
30. Key Decision - Harrow Consortium for Special Needs (HCSN)	The report contained exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to the financial business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

39. **Petitions:**

- (i) Alan Brown, Chair, Harrow User Group, presented a petition containing approximately 700 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“Keep Wiseworks open petition, Harrow Mental Health Service has proposed the closure of Wiseworks in September 2006”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

- (ii) Gerry Devine, Harrow Recreation Users Group, presented a petition containing 280 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“We the undersigned strongly urge Harrow Council to continue with the improvements currently under way at Harrow Recreation Ground. To abandon or reduce the scope of the project would seriously affect the availability of amenities which are badly needed for the community.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

- (iii) Annette Scott, an employee of the Council, presented a petition containing 454 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“We the undersigned have been informed that there is a proposal by Council to charge a fee to the staff for the aforementioned service. Further to this, we hereby add our signatures to this petition as a sign of our protest against such an intention by Council as it is too much of an added financial burden and does not encourage us to come to work.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

- (iv) Paul Scott, Harrow Weald Liberal Democrat candidate, presented a petition containing 46 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“As residents of The Avenue, Harrow Weald for 30 years, we, along with the majority of residents have taken great pride in the appearance of our homes and gardens. Unfortunately, however, the Council’s care has been less than acceptable regarding carriage crossings and pavements.

We are all rate payers and yet it appears roads around us are far better services than The Avenue. All we have ever received are patches of tarmac and odd paving. The street looks like a poor relation of Harrow Weald!

The above comments reflect the views of the undersigned and on their behalf, I await a reply regarding this matter.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

- (v) Sanjay Karia, GMB, presented a petition containing 129 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“As you will have gathered by now, Harrow Council are proposing to introduce car parking charges for staff who use the car park. The GMB feels very strongly that these changes are totally unfair and an additional financial burden on all staff who use the car park. The GMB will be protesting in the strongest terms about the possible introduction of the charges.

If you agree that the car parking charges are unfair and wish us to make your views known to the Councillors, we urge you to sign the petition over the page.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

- (vi) Howard Bluston presented a petition containing 19 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“We the residents of Willow Court, College Hill Road, Harrow Weald, deplore the Council’s proposals to provide frozen meals, once a week only instead of daily freshly cooked meals.

This would cause serious, unacceptable problems for us, a lot of us elderly, frail, unable to even stand, are unable to cook any kind of food. Poor quality of frozen food would also cause health issues. We feel we speak for hundreds of residents across Harrow.

We urge the Cabinet to reconsider their policy as a matter of urgency and scrap this cut.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

40. **Public Questions:**

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

1.

Questioner: Alan Brown

Asked of: Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First

Question: ‘The proposed closure of Wiseworks would have a detrimental effect on the well-being and health of mental health service users in Harrow because of the dedicated support provided by that service thus

preventing in some case certain re-admission to hospital. It is essential for service users be involved in full and meaningful consultation regarding future plans for Wiseworks. How and when will this take place?’

2.

Questioner: Ravi Shukle

Asked of: Councillor Chris Mote, Leader of the Council

Question: 'Would the Leader of the Council agree to organise a meeting between Harrow Basketball Club and the Portfolio Holders responsible for Sport and Leisure, for Parks and Open Spaces, and for Young People, to discuss the proposed cut in funding for basketball activities in Harrow Recreation Park and the proposal to withdraw from the Community Coaching Scheme?’

3.

Questioner: Joan Penrose

Asked of: Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First

Question: ‘We fully acknowledge that you cannot be held responsible for the failure of the previous administration to consult about the ‘Wiseworks’ issue before you took up your portfolio, but might it not have been possible for you, subsequently, to have facilitated the consultation we asked for?’

4.

Questioner: Ann Freeman

Asked of: Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First

Question: ‘The Central and North West London Mental Health NHS Trust’s User Employment and Work Experience Scheme, Rethink Phoenix Employment and Work Experience Service in Harrow, and Wiseworks’ Garden and Tool Maintenance, Printing and Computer Employment and Work Experience Services are in existence. Care Coordinators in the Community Mental Health, Assertive Outreach, Intensive Community Support, Drug and Alcohol and Youth Offending Teams work toward best outcomes for their clients and are aware of these Schemes.

How will the re-provided service give new opportunities for those in Harrow with severe mental illness?’

5.

Questioner: Tony Holman

Asked of: Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First

Question: ‘What is planned to replace the centre and what are current and future expenditure plans and do they include financial savings and if so will these be re-invested in Mental Health?’

6.

Questioner: Krishna Lathia–James

Asked of: Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First

Question: ‘Would you agree that one of the first priorities of any decent society is to protect its most vulnerable members, and if so, how can you justify the total abolition of the clothing grant to help the poorest families in Harrow who cannot afford school uniforms for their children?’

7.

Questioner: Maurice Hoffman**Asked of:** Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First**Question:** 'What communication has taken place between CNWL and other stake holders and Harrow Council regarding Wiseworks?'

8.

Questioner: Rasik Popat**Asked of:** Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First**Question:** 'Harrow has the finest meals on wheels service of national repute, serving daily freshly cooked hot meals to most vulnerable elderly people who look forward to receiving these meals on a daily basis. How do you justify cutting this service by introducing frozen meals delivered once a week?'

9.

Questioner: Stan Rooke**Asked of:** Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First**Question:** 'How do you justify increase in hourly rate for homecare currently at £9.50 to £16.00, which is an increase of 68%, more than 25 times the current rate of inflation?'

10.

Questioner: Chris McDermott**Asked of:** Councillor Janet Mote, Portfolio Holder for People First**Question:** 'On behalf of children and teachers, the cuts proposed would suggest £50k from the music service. This is taking away an opportunity for a music education for children. I represent the children of our schools who cannot speak for themselves.'

[Notes: (i) The Chairman indicated that as he had been notified that questioner 8 was unwell he would permit questioner 6 to submit the question on his behalf.

(ii) An oral answer was provided to questions 2, 6, 8 and 9. Under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 16.4, each of these questioners asked a supplementary question which was additionally answered. The Portfolio Holder undertook to provide questioner 10 with a written response.

(iii) Following the consideration of the officer report in relation to the re-provision of Wiseworks, questioners 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7 requested a written response and questioners 3, 4, 5 and 7 each submitted a supplemental question to which it was confirmed that a written response would also be provided].

41. **Key Decision - Re-provision of Wiseworks:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report and Members noted that there was also a Part II report attached for their information only.

The Portfolio Holder for People First advised that there had been a public meeting on 1 August 2006 and that she had listened to the views expressed. It had become apparent that people wanted more time to consider the future of Wiseworks.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Janet Mote and it was

RESOLVED: That, having considered the comments received to date from carers, users, support groups and members of the public, there be a 12 week consultation exercise on the future of Wiseworks and the decision on its future be deferred until the consultation exercise had been completed.

Reason for Decision: To enable a further consultation exercise on the future of Wiseworks to be carried out.

42. **Councillor Question Time:**

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

1.

Questioner: Councillor Navin Shah

Asked of: Councillor Chris Mote, Leader of the Council

Question: 'Would you agree that it is regrettable and entirely undemocratic that when you are considering a £12 million programme of cuts affecting every resident in this Borough, that there is no forum, as previously, for the majority opposition party to express their views and consult local residents on this vitally important matter?'

2.

Questioner: Councillor Phil O'Dell

Asked of: Councillor Mrs Eileen Kinnear, Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm

Question: 'Do you take any responsibility for the botched implementation of the new system of waste collection and will you apologise to local residents for this fiasco and to me personally for totally misrepresenting my views in connection with the budget for Clean and Green?'

3.

Questioner: Councillor Bill Stephenson

Asked of: Councillor Mrs Eileen Kinnear, Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm

Question: 'At this Cabinet we have a very detailed list of cuts all of which are quantified down to the last thousand pounds. At the Cabinet on June 8th you presented a major set of cuts in Urban Living expenditure. The expected savings were not quantified. Could you say precisely what the overall total savings which would be made and could you give a written breakdown of the savings for each item with its original cost.'

[Notes: (i) The Chairman indicated that, on this occasion, as Councillor Phil O'Dell was unwell, he would allow Councillor Brian Gate to submit his question.

(ii) An oral answer was provided to each question].

43. **Forward Plan 1 August - 30 November 2006:**

RESOLVED: To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 August – 30 November 2006.

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

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

45. **Prosperity Action Teams:**

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced the report, which proposed the establishment of 10 prosperity action teams and sought approval for the associated budget.

RESOLVED: That Prosperity Action Teams be established, as set out in the appendix to the report of the Director of Corporate Governance, and the associated budget agreed.

Reason for Decision: To establish funds to support Ward Councillors to make a change to the prosperity of their areas and to ensure that local knowledge and understanding was used to generate real improvements at a local level.

46. **Terms of Reference for the Employees' Consultative Forum:**

The Executive Director (Business Development) introduced the report, which sought approval to amendments recommended by the Employees' Consultative Forum to their terms of reference.

RESOLVED: That the amendments proposed by the Employees' Consultative Forum to their terms of reference be approved.

Reason for Decision: Terms of Reference for the Employees' Consultative Forum required amendment to include membership of GMB following their recognition by the Council. The inclusion of the GMB on the forum fulfilled the Council's responsibility under the terms of the Trade Union Recognition and Procedural Agreement signed in March 2006.

47. **Education Consultative Forum - Amendments to the Terms of Reference:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which sought approval to changes to the terms of reference of the Education Consultative Forum.

RESOLVED: That the additional changes to the terms of reference of the Education Consultative Forum, as set out in Appendix B to the report of the Executive Director (People First), be approved.

Reason for Decision: The changes would make the Forum more representative of its remit and purpose.

48. **Appointment of an Assistant to Members of Cabinet:**

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced the report, which sought to fulfil a vacancy in the number of assistants to Members of the Cabinet following the recent death of Councillor John Anderson.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Tom Weiss be appointed as an assistant to Members of Cabinet.

Reason for Decision: To enable the vacancy in the number of assistants to Cabinet to be filled.

49. **Key Decision - Local Development Scheme (LDS) - Document and Timetable Revisions; Adoption of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI); and Harrow Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals Issues and Options - Consultation:**

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced the report, which detailed the recommendations from the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel meeting held on 18 July 2006.

RESOLVED: That (1) the revised Local Development Scheme and timetable for document presentation contained within it be agreed;

(2) the revised Local Development Scheme be submitted to the Secretary of State;

(3) subject to the Secretary of State not directing any changes to the revised Local Development Scheme, the revisions be brought into effect;

(4) the Statement of Community Involvement be adopted;

(5) the consultation on the Harrow Core Strategy Issues and Options Report and the Site Specific Proposal Issues and Options report commence on 4 September 2006 for a period of 6 weeks.

Reason for Decision: The Council had a statutory duty to prepare a Local Development Framework (LDF) for which the project management plan was the Local Development Scheme, and to keep it up to date. Adoption of the SCI was a statutory requirement and its implementation was a key aspect of the LDF process. Approval to consult on the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report and the Site Specific Proposal Issues and Options report would provide the opportunity for everyone in the community to become involved in the development of these documents early in the process.

50. **Key Decision - Prince Edward Playing Fields - Consideration of Proposal submitted by Football First:**

The Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report, and advised that following an extensive market search, approval of the recommendation would enable Football First to progress development on the site.

RESOLVED: That (1) Barnet Football Club's "Football First" proposal for the development and operational management of Prince Edward Playing Fields as a sports complex, football stadium, with ancillary leisure uses, be approved;

(2) the Executive Director (Urban Living) be authorised, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic), to agree terms for immediate access to the Prince Edward Playing Fields for the purposes of use as a temporary training facility for Barnet Football Club on a basis of a Licence to Occupy/"Contracted out Lease";

(3) the Executive Director (Urban Living) be authorised, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic), to negotiate and agree the most favourable terms for the Council and thereafter to grant 125 year lease (and enter into any associated documentation) in respect thereof;

(4) the Executive Director (Urban Living) be authorised, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic), to agree such terms as are necessary or desirable in order to accommodate another semi professional football club on the site, subject to the approval being obtained to the amendment to the capital programme.

Reason for Decision: To secure authority to enter into negotiations and to conclude arrangements to facilitate the implementation of the Prince Edward Playing Fields Football First Project, in partnership with Barnet FC.

51. **West House, Pinner Memorial Park:**

The Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report and advised that the Council was corporate trustee with responsibility for West House.

RESOLVED: That (1) the offer of a grant of £250,000 to West House and Heath Robinson Museum Trust, as a contribution towards the cost of the first phase of the repairs and renovation at West House, Pinner Memorial Park, be approved;

(2) the release of £250,000 from Harrow Lottery reserve to finance this expenditure be agreed;

(3) the grant of a lease to the West House and Heath Robinson Museum Trust on the principal terms to be agreed by the Executive Director (Urban Living), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic), as being in the best interest of the Council be approved;

(4) the Executive Director (Urban Living) be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic), to consider any objections received following the statutory advertisement and to make such decisions as he considers appropriate in relation to those objections.

Reason for Decision: The approval of the grant, to supplement the funding already raised by the Trust would enable the initial phase of restoration works to commence during the current financial year.

(See also Minute 36).

52. **Key Decision - Financial Position:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which set out a detailed plan for delivering the remaining £9.4m savings that the Council needed to achieve in the current year. Members noted that there was a Part II report attached for their information only appearing elsewhere on the agenda.

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy advised that statutory consultations would be carried out with service users and other stakeholders on the proposals in relation to Home Care subsidies, changes to the Meals on Wheels service and the merger of Anmer and Milmans Day Centres. She drew attention to the comments received from staff and unions in relation to the proposals, which had been tabled for Members' information.

The Portfolio Holder for Business Development commented on the proposals and the level of reserves held by the Council. Following receipt of the petitions from staff and the GMB Union in relation to charges for staff car parking, these views would be considered in the implementation of this proposal. In relation to the change of the payroll date, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that this proposal would be deleted from the proposed list of savings.

RESOLVED: That (1) the proposed action plan, with the exception of the items that were subject to statutory consultation and the change of payroll date for Council staff, to achieve the savings required in 2006-07 be approved;

(2) the statutory consultation on the proposals set out in paragraph 17 to the report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy be approved;

(3) subject to the outcome of consultation, the lowering of the subsidies detailed in Appendix 2 to the report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy be approved;

(4) the changes to Fees and Charges detailed in Appendix 3 to the report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy be approved.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that the savings target of £19m in 2006-07 was achieved.

53. **Strategy for People:**

The Executive Director (Business Development) introduced the report, which proposed the adoption of the draft Human Resources Strategy "Strategy for People" for the Authority.

RESOLVED: That the revised Strategy be implemented within the Council and its contents agreed.

Reason for Decision: The Strategy highlighted the Council's approach to workforce development and clearly set out how it would ensure that the right people with the right skills were in the right jobs at any time. The revised strategy took on board the Local Government Pay and Workforce Strategy 2005, incorporated the Council's visions and plans to deliver the learning and development initiatives and aligned with the new corporate priorities.

54. **Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring to 30 June 2006:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which detailed the first quarter budget monitoring for 2006-2007.

RESOLVED: That (1) the current revenue and capital budget monitoring position at the end of the first quarter for 2006-2007 be noted;

(2) a virement within People First of £171,000 from the Policy to the Strategic budget and a £28,000 Arts Council Budget grant to set up the related expenditure be approved.

Reason for Decision: To effectively monitor the Council's revenue and capital budget. The budget represented the financial resources approved to implement the Council's corporate priorities.

55. **Key Decision - Revised Capital Programme 2006-07:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report and advised that the programme required alignment with the new set of corporate priorities.

RESOLVED: That the revised capital programme for 2006-07 be approved.

Reason for Decision: The Council was in a difficult financial position and it was therefore important that the Capital Programme was affordable and that the revenue budget reflected fully the cost of financing the programme.

56. **Budget and Corporate Planning Process 2007-08 to 2009-10:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which set out the proposed budget and corporate planning process and timetable for 2007-2008 to 2009-2010. She advised that 5 strategic projects, detailed in paragraph 5 of the report had been established to support the Medium Term financial planning process.

The Portfolio Holder for Business Development advised that Open Budget Panel would be meeting again this financial year, with meetings commencing in September 2006.

RESOLVED: That the budget and corporate planning process for 2007-08 to 2009-10 be approved.

Reason for Decision: Members, staff and other stakeholders would be clear about the planned approach for developing the new Medium Term Budget strategy and Corporate Plan.

57. **Key Decision - Financial Regulations, Corporate Procurement Strategy, Contract Procedure Rules, Small Business Friendly Concordat:**
(See also Recommendation I).

Having recommended the Corporate Procurement Strategy and Contract Procedure Rules to Council for approval, it was

RESOLVED: That (1) the Corporate Procurement Strategy be approved;

(2) the Small Business Friendly Concordat be approved (and the Declaration of Support signed).

Reason for Decision: To ensure that the Council had effective governance arrangements in place and that the documents reflected the changes to be implemented with the introduction of the new Enterprise Resource Planning System from September 2006 and revisions to legislative requirements

58. **Section 13A of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which advised that under Section 13A of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 the Council had the power to reduce the liability for Council Tax in relation to particular cases or by determining a class of cases in which the liability was to be reduced.

RESOLVED: That the Council would use Section 13A of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 only in exceptional circumstances and that any use of this power in future would be subject to a Cabinet decision.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that the Council's intentions in relation to Section 13A of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 were explicit.

59. **Risk Management Progress Report:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which provided an update on risk management.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Council's revised strategic risk register be approved;

(2) the revised risk management strategy for the Council be approved;

(3) the progress on key work undertaken by the rest of the risk management team be noted.

Reason for Decision: Cabinet approval was required in line with best practice and corporate performance assessment recommendations and approval would give clarity in relation to the Council's strategic risks and risk management progress across the organisation.

60. **Update on Young People's Participation and Proposals for Future Action:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which sought approval to proposals for future action on young people's participation and strategies. The Portfolio Holder for Issues Facing Young People suggested that it would be helpful if Scrutiny could incorporate this issue into their work programme.

RESOLVED: That (1) the proposals for the future action on young people's participation and strategies set out in the report of the Director of Children's Services be approved;

(2) the proposals be forwarded to the Joint Health and Social Care Integration Board and the Harrow Strategic Partnership for their consideration.

Reason for Decision: To demonstrate the Council's action to value and empower young people in line with the Council's priorities and to celebrate the Council's

commitment and achievements in this area in relation to the Every Child Matters change agenda.

61. **Key Decision - Kenton Learning Centre (Harrow Adult Learning Centre):**
The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which sought approval to move forward with the Kenton Learning Centre Project.

RESOLVED: That the Kenton Learning Centre Project be approved with the demolition of existing Horsa Huts and the rebuild of the new centre.

Reason for Decision: To utilise the Learning and Skills Council major capital project grant of £990,000 to replace the building that is nearing the end of its life and not fully fit for purpose. The Centre would provide a safe, stimulating and effective learning environment, reduce maintenance and connectivity costs, extend the range of learning opportunities with greater teaching space and with progression to Further Education employment opportunities. It would also facilitate extended schools' activities and provide a delivery centre for skills for delivering training to community groups, carers, after school clubs, school support staff and partners.

62. **Financial Position:**
Members considered a confidential report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy which related to a Part I report appearing elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(See also Minutes 38 and 52).

63. **Reprovision of Wiseworks:**
Members considered a confidential report of the Director of Adult Community Care Services which related to a Part I report appearing elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(See also Minutes 38 and 41).

64. **Harrow Consortium for Special Needs (HCSN):**
Members considered a confidential report of the Director of Adult Community Care Services.

RESOLVED: That (1) an approach to the future management of 12 learning disability and 4 mental health units based on Option 1 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report of the Director of Adult Community Care Services be agreed;

(2) officers be instructed to enter into negotiations with Harrow Consortium for Special Needs with a view to achieving a transfer of the registered residential accommodation, supported houses and associated services to Harrow Consortium of Special Needs;

(3) at the conclusion of the negotiations, the sale of property and any TUPE implications be managed through existing policy and practice;

(4) in order to facilitate comprehensive negotiations, an officer project team be formed, led by the Director of Adult Community Care Services;

(5) Cabinet be provided with a further report on the proposed contract arrangements with Harrow Consortium for Special Needs, any additional costs and if appropriate, disposal of land, TUPE arrangements and primary care trust intentions in respect of this proposal.

Reason for Decision: Following a number of reviews of Harrow Consortium for Special Needs over the past 5 years, it was felt that the management and operation of residential care services provided by this arrangement needed to be secured on a more satisfactory basis for the medium to long term.

(See also Minutes 36 and 38).

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.45 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CHRIS MOTE
Chairman

REPORT OF CABINET

SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Chris Mote

Councillors: * David Ashton * Janet Mote
 * Marilyn Ashton * Paul Osborn
 * Miss Christine Bednell * Mrs Anjana Patel
 * Mrs Kinnear * Eric Silver

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

65. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interest was declared: -

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
4. Financial Position – referral by the Call in Sub-Committee – Item 44 – Public Realm Maintenance - Parks Locking	Councillor Bill Stephenson	The Member, who was not a member of Cabinet, indicated a personal and prejudicial interest in that he lived adjacent to a park that would no longer be locked at night. He would leave the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.

66. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2006 be deferred until the next ordinary meeting of Cabinet.

67. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

The Chair indicated that he had been advised that a member of the public, who was present, wished to present a petition to the meeting. Whilst there was no provision on the agenda for petitions as the meeting had been convened to consider a substantive item of business referred by the Call in Sub-Committee, as a concession, he indicated that he was prepared, on this occasion, to ask Cabinet to receive the petition.

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

68. **Petitions:**

Mic Sayer presented a petition containing approximately 200 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“We the undersigned strongly urge Harrow Council not to abandon the locking of parks at night. We believe that the Council’s proposal will encourage crime and anti-social behaviour. The cost of this to the community is likely to exceed any savings claimed by the Council.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Portfolio Holder for consideration.

(See also Minute 67).

69. **Financial Position - Referral by the Call-in Sub-Committee:**

An officer introduced the report, which sought confirmation of the original decision made by Cabinet on 3 August 2006 in relation to five of the items included in the Director of Financial and Business Strategy’s report on the Financial Position. She advised that thirteen items included in that report had been called-in, six of which had been referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

The officer reminded Cabinet of the Council's considerable financial difficulties and the low level of reserves. She advised that the savings target of £19m had to be achieved for 2006/2007 in order to establish a balanced budget. She added that there was a need to balance full consultation with the requirement to achieve the level of savings in a relatively short timescale.

RESOLVED: That (1) the original decision in relation to the following items, considered by Cabinet on 3 August 2006, included in the Director of Financial and Business Strategy's report be confirmed:-

- (i) item 17 – Focus Clothing Grants on Real Need
- (ii) item 35 – Peel House Car Park, Wealdstone – reduce opening hours to 8.30 pm
- (iii) item 47 – Reduce Agency staff in Development Control and reduce contract and permanent staff within conservation and design
- (iv) item 76 - cease Music Teaching subsidy

(2) in respect of item 44 – Public Realm Maintenance – Parks Locking, the decision to cease locking of parks by the Council be confirmed but be implemented on 2 January 2007 instead of 1 October 2006.

Reason for Decision: Cabinet took the original decision as part of the agreed savings plan. The decision would ensure that the savings target of £19m in 2006/2007 was achieved and that key services were protected. A balanced budget for 2006/2007 would be established as another step towards restoring financial stability within the Council.

(See also Minute 65).

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 6.38 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CHRIS MOTE
Chairman

REPORT OF CABINET

MEETING HELD ON 14 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Chris Mote

Councillors: * David Ashton * Janet Mote
 * Marilyn Ashton * Paul Osborn
 * Miss Christine Bednell * Mrs Anjana Patel
 * Mrs Kinnear * Eric Silver

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

70. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
6. Councillor Questions	Councillor Margaret Davine	The Member, who was not a member of Cabinet, indicated a personal interest in that her mother was in receipt of Meals on Wheels. She would remain in the room whilst this matter was considered.

71. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2006 be taken as read and signed as a correct record;

(2) the minutes of the Special Cabinet meeting held on 4 September 2006 be taken as read and signed as a correct record once printed in the Council Minute Volume subject to the correction that the decision on item 77 - Council Involvement in Community Sport Coaching Scheme, had also been reconfirmed.

72. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

73. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received.

74. **Public Questions:**

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

1.

Questioner: Ann Freeman

Asked of: Councillor Chris Mote, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Overview and External Affairs

Question: 'Will you please ensure that the outcomes of the following are taken into consideration before a decision is taken to close Wiseworks Enterprises and lose the Wiseworks site?

1. The needs assessment of those with mental illness starting on 13 Sept. led by Harrow's Director of Public Health as first stage of implementation of Joint Commissioning Strategy Transforming our Adult Mental Health Services agreed by Integration Board.

2. The implementation of the Disability Equality Scheme, that has to be

in place by 5 Dec. (Anne Whitehead is leading on Scheme that must have "Ways of measuring services, make them better, make sure that there is same level of service for disabled and non-disabled people, and take steps to meet disabled peoples needs.") The new legal Equality Duty says that "...if a service is to change, we want to include disabled people to find out if a new service will be more or less difficult for them to use."

3. Work of other Harrow groups dealing with mental health such as MH Promotion Board, MH Partnership Board, Care Plan Implementation Review Comm., Carers Task and Action Groups, and review of statistics from CNWL MH Trust on complaints, suicides, injury and sexual abuse."

2.

Questioner: Gloria Wright

Asked of: Councillor Chris Mote, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Overview and External Affairs

Question: " This consultation document appears to me to treat the closing of Wiseworks as a fait accompli. Will you restart this consultation on a proper basis – ie whether or not Wiseworks should close or remain open."

[Notes: (i) The Chairman indicated that, as he had been notified that questioner 2 was unwell, he would permit Joan Penrose to submit the question on her behalf.

(ii) An oral answer was provided to each question. Under the provision of Executive Procedure Rule 16.4, each of the questioners asked a supplementary question which was additionally answered.

(iii) The Chairman indicated that a response to one aspect of a question submitted by Ann Freeman to Cabinet on 3 August had yet to be addressed but that he would ensure that a response was provided as soon as possible.]

75. **Councillor Question Time:**

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

1.

Questioner: Councillor Margaret Davine

Asked of: Councillor Christine Bednell, Portfolio Holder for Issues Facing Older People

Question: The Information Circular for Cabinet, Item 9 Catering Review, states that the consultation regarding changes to the Meals on Wheels Service will be concluded by November 26. Can the Portfolio Holder please explain how this will be achieved as this matter was not included in the consultation document recently circulated.

2.

Questioner: Councillor Margaret Davine

Asked of: Councillor Christine Bednell, Portfolio Holder for Issues Facing Older People

Question: Can the Portfolio Holder please explain the details of all proposed changes to the Meals on Wheels Service?

[Notes: (i) The Chairman indicated that he was prepared to allow Councillors to ask more than one question at Cabinet as their remit may cover several Portfolio areas. The time limit of 15 minutes would, however, be adhered to.

(ii) The Chairman indicated that he had received late notification of a question from Councillor Paul Scott, which he was, on this occasion, prepared to receive. He advised

that it would, however, be necessary to provide a written, rather than an oral response. In response, Councillor Scott indicated that he would submit a written question.

(iii) Councillor Margaret Davine requested that, in addition to the oral responses received, she receive a written answer to both of her questions. The Chairman indicated that Councillor questions and answers, as well as public questions and answers, would be made available on the Council's website. Copies of the answers would also be forwarded to the opposition Groups].

76. **Strategic Performance Report - Quarter 1 2006/2007:**

The Director of People, Performance and Policy introduced the report to the Performance Board, which had been significantly updated in light of the new Corporate Plan and the new financial year. He advised that the next report would be generated in the new management information system and that he would be discussing the new format of the report with members of Cabinet. He added that it was a pleasing report and that none of the high level indicators were red.

The Chairman indicated that the change in reporting, due to the new management information system, would be discussed with opposition colleagues. Each Portfolio Holder then outlined the key challenges and improvers within their remit.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Performance Report and actions being taken be noted;

(2) the Portfolio Holders work with officers to achieve improvement against key challenges and receive monthly updates.

Reason for Decision: It had previously been agreed that Cabinet would receive a quarterly monitoring information report in its role as Performance Board. The Strategic Performance Report enabled Members to form a coherent strategic view of the Council's performance in achieving corporate priorities and to provide leadership on performance management.

77. **Forward Plan 1 September - 31 December 2006:**

RESOLVED: To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 September – 31 December 2006.

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

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

79. **Appointments to Rayners Lane Estate Committee:**

RESOLVED: That Councillors Bob Currie and Graham Henson be appointed to the Rayners Lane Estate Committee.

80. **Business Transformation Project Partnership Board (BTPPB) - Terms of Reference:**

Cabinet received the report, which had been prepared in response to comments made by the Business Transformation Project Partnership Board at its meeting on 27 July 2006.

RESOLVED: That the revised terms of reference for the BTPPB, attached at Appendix 1 to the report of the Director of Business Transformation, be approved.

Reason for Decision: To enable the Board to operate effectively.

81. **Joint Commissioning Strategies:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which presented revised Joint Commissioning strategies for each of the four main (Adult) community care groups that had been updated and amended with stakeholder involvement in response to comments and concerns in relation to the 2005 versions. The Health and Social Care Integration Board had considered the revised strategies and their comments had been taken into account. She added that the Primary Care Trust (PCT) Board had approved the strategies.

The Portfolio Holder for Issues facing People with Special Needs outlined the content and key aims of each of the strategies. The Portfolio Holders for People First and Issues facing Older People welcomed the report.

Cabinet noted that there appeared to be issues across London in relation to PCTs and their finances and that the Association of London Government would be making representations to Government on this matter.

RESOLVED: That the proposed revised Joint Commissioning Strategies, which had been produced in conjunction with the Primary Care Trust, be approved.

Reason for Decision: The proposed revised Joint Commissioning Strategies provided a joint vision for services for the four main (Adult) client groups and supported delivery of key Government policy requirements and elements of the Community Strategy and Corporate Plan. The strategies would strengthen the basis for further work between the Council and the PCT and with other key stakeholders.

82. **Key Decision - Sport, Recreation and Open Space Plan:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which was the first phase in establishing a clear direction and vision for the provision of sport, recreation and open space in Harrow. She tabled A3 versions of the appendices and advised that there would be a report on Phase 2 submitted to Cabinet in 2007.

RESOLVED: That the actions within Phase 1 of the Sport, Recreation and Open Space Plan detailed in Appendix 1 to the report of the Executive Director (People First) be approved.

Reason for Decision: This was the first phase in establishing a clear direction and vision for the provision of sport, recreation and open space in Harrow.

83. **Key Decision - Hindu School:**

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced the report and advised that officers had been awaiting information from the promoter, some of which had only been received that day. Officers had therefore had insufficient opportunity to assess the new information received and, in the circumstances, he recommended that Cabinet note the report and agree that a further report be submitted to Cabinet in October 2006.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report be noted;

(2) a further report be submitted to Cabinet on 4 October 2006, once officers had had the opportunity to assess the information provided by the promoter of the Hindu School.

Reason for Decision: To enable officers to assess all the information received from the promoter in order to provide Cabinet with all the information required to make a decision in relation to the Hindu School.

84. **Retail Development Potential in Harrow Town Centre:**

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced the report and advised that a retail capacity study had been undertaken in the town centre to identify the qualitative and quantitative gaps. The report detailed the recommendation from the Town Centre Project Panel.

RESOLVED: That officers be authorised to investigate the potential benefits of appointing a Strategic Developer Partner to bring forward retail development opportunities in Harrow Town Centre.

Reason for Decision: A strategic partnership with an experienced retail developer would improve the prospects of securing additional retail development in Harrow Town Centre and reduce the risk that development opportunities identified the Council would not be taken forward.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.25 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CHRIS MOTE
Chairman

CABINET
ADVISORY
PANELS

TOWN CENTRE PROJECT PANEL

1 AUGUST 2006

Chairman:	* Councillor Marilyn Ashton	
Councillors:	* David Ashton	* Navin Shah
	* Mrs Kinnear	* Bill Stephenson (1)
	* Chris Mote	
Advisers (non-voting):	* Mr Abe Hayeem	– Canons Park Residents' Association
	* Mr Baj Mathur	– Harrow Heritage Trust
	* Mr John Palmer	– Harrow Agenda 21

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

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Public Realm Strategy - Appointment of Consultants**

The Panel received reports of the Director of Strategic Planning in both the public and private sessions of the meeting, which sought confirmation of the appointment of a consultant design team to prepare a Public Realm Strategy for Harrow Town Centre. A summary of the fees presented by each of the consultants interviewed was presented to Members in the private session of the meeting.

The Director informed Members that interviews had taken place on 31 July 2006 with a view to recommending the appointment of a multi-disciplinary consultant team to take the Strategy forward, following consideration by the Panel. He briefed the Panel on the interview process, details of which were set out in his report. The Director identified the individuals who had served on the selection panel and, on its behalf, recommended the appointment of Urban Initiatives for the purposes of preparing a Public Realm Strategy for Harrow Town Centre. In recommending the appointment, the Director praised the approach taken by Urban Initiatives on public realm, which had been realistic and imaginative.

Members were informed that, subject to their appointment, Urban Initiatives would be accountable to the Panel, which would receive presentations and reports on a regular basis setting out the work undertaken on behalf of the Council. Resources were available in the Council's Capital Programme to carry out improvements to the public realm with a view to ensuring a uniform approach to urban design.

In response to questions from Members and non-voting advisers, the Director stated that:-

- there would be an interaction between scrutiny and the Panel on public realm and that reports would be presented to both bodies simultaneously;
- sustainability and accessibility issues would be fully addressed in the Public Realm Strategy and he agreed that a holistic approach was essential;
- the Council's Access officer, who would serve on the client steering group set up to oversee the Strategy, would be fully involved;
- work on the Strategy would commence in August 2006 with the intention of it being completed at the beginning of 2007, following appropriate consultations with physical improvement works following in 2007/08;
- the appointment of Urban Initiatives would be subject to a review upon completion of the Strategy with the Council having the right to withdraw prior to proceeding to detailed design, if necessary;
- the Council's public works' partner, Accord MP, would be fully involved in the implementation process.

A Member identified the existing problems of wheelchair access in Harrow Town Centre adjacent to the St. George's Shopping Centre, which required immediate attention.

Following a short discussion, it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic))

That the appointment of Urban Initiatives as a consultant design team to prepare a Public Realm Strategy for Harrow Town Centre be confirmed.

REASON for Recommendation: To confirm the appointment of a consultant design team following selection interviews on 31 July 2006. The development of a distinctive and a high quality public realm would help to transform Harrow Town Centre into a thriving, attractive and safe centre, better able to compete with neighbouring centres.

[Note: Councillors Navin Shah and Bill Stephenson wished to be recorded as having abstained from voting on this recommendation on the grounds that they were not aware of the criteria applied by the selection panel when choosing to recommend the appointment of the company].

(See also Minutes 3 and 7).

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Retail Development Potential in Harrow Town Centre

The Panel received a report of the Director of Strategic Planning, which sought authority to investigate the potential benefits of appointing a strategic developer partner to bring forward retail development opportunities in Harrow Town Centre. It was intended to work with three to four development partners to look at opportunities. Alternatively, the potential of working with a single development partner would be explored. It was important to ensure that Harrow Town Centre operated as a viable Centre and that it attracted retailers who appealed to a 'broader' clientele.

The Director confirmed that there would be no financial costs in undertaking the investigation, other than officer time and consultancy costs, which would be contained within the approved Capital Programme. He informed the Panel that he would report back on the progress made to the next meeting of the Panel. In response to a question from a Member, the Director explained that consultation on the Retail Capacity Study with existing retailers in Harrow Town Centre had been undertaken.

In response to a question from another Member, the Chairman explained the reasons behind the Council's intention to withdraw from the Town Centre Management initiative. She stated that a measured judgement had been taken on this matter.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That officers be authorised to investigate the potential benefits of appointing a strategic developer partner to bring forward retail development opportunities in Harrow Town Centre.

REASON for Recommendation: To advise Members of the options available to bring forward retail development opportunities in Harrow Town Centre. A strategic partnership with an experienced retail developer would improve the prospects of securing additional retail development in Harrow Town Centre and reduce the risk that development opportunities identified by the Council would not be taken forward.

(See also Minute 3).

PART II - MINUTES

1. **Appointment of Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To note the appointment of Councillor Marilyn Ashton at the Cabinet meeting on 8 June 2006 as Chairman of the Town Centre Project Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Bill Stephenson

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
7. Appointment of Advisers	Councillor Janet Mote	The Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, declared a personal interest in that she was a member of Harrow Heritage Trust. She remained in the room whilst this matter was discussed.
12,13 and 15. Public Realm Strategy – Appointment of Consultants/Retail Development Potential in Harrow Town Centre	Councillor Mrs Kinnear	Declared a personal interest in that she lived on the edge of Harrow Town Centre. Accordingly, she remained in the room whilst these matters were considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Navin Shah	Declared a personal interest in that he lived in the area. Accordingly, he remained in the room whilst these matters were considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Narinder Singh Mudhar	The Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, declared a personal interest in that he was the Vice-Chairman of Harrow Town Centre Forum. He remained in the room whilst these matters were discussed.
Urgent Item - Harrow on the Hill Station and Adjoining Land	Councillor Bill Stephenson	Declared a personal interest in that he was a Governor of Harrow College. Accordingly, he remained in the room whilst matters were considered and voted upon.

4. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Town Centre Project Panel (an Executive Panel) meeting held on 4 April 2006, being the predecessor body to this Advisory Panel, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

5. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
7. Appointment of Advisers	The draft report was being consulted on at the item of the dispatch of the agenda and was not available in its final form in time to be included on the agenda. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, to allow the appointments to be made.
Urgent Business – Harrow on the Hill Station and Adjoining Land	The report was not available at the time of the dispatch of the agenda as there had been developments in this area, which Members had to be appraised of. They were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, so that the way forward could be discussed.

(2) 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>
15. Public Realm Strategy – Appointment of Consultants Urgent Business - Harrow on the Hill Station and Adjoining Land	The reports contained exempt information by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

6. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman:**
Nominations were received and seconded for Councillors Mrs Kinnear and Navin Shah. Upon being put to a vote, it was

RESOLVED: That Councillor Mrs Kinnear be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Town Centre Project Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

7. **Appointment of Advisers:**
During discussion on the report, a Member asked if additional advisers could be appointed and questioned whether there was a limit on the number of advisers that could be appointed. The Chairman agreed to discuss these issues separately with the Member.

The Director of Strategic Planning informed the Panel that, in accordance with the provisions set out in Part 5 – Codes and Protocols – Section G (Confidentiality of Part II reports) of the Council's Constitution, it was his opinion that the advisers appointed should not, on this occasion, be permitted to remain in the room during the discussion on the Part II items (Public Realm Strategy – Appointment of Consultants and Urgent Business – Harrow on the Hill Station and Adjoining Land) on the grounds that the release of the information would significantly prejudice the interests of the Council.

RESOLVED: That the following non-voting advisers be appointed to the Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/07:-

Mr John Palmer - Harrow Agenda 21
Mr Abe Hayeem - Canons Park Residents' Association
Mr Baj Mathur - Harrow Heritage Trust.

(See also Recommendation 1 and Minutes 3 and 12).

8. **Terms of Reference:**
RESOLVED: That the terms of reference of the Town Centre Project Panel be noted.

9. **Public Questions/Petitions/Deputations:**
RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15, 13 and 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

10. **Public Realm Strategy - Appointment of Consultants:**
(See Recommendation 1).

11. **Retail Development Potential in Harrow Town Centre:**
(See Recommendation 2)

12. **Urgent Business - Harrow on the Hill Station and Adjoining Land:**

Dandara's Planning Application

The Director of Strategic Planning gave an oral briefing to Members in the private session of the meeting on the recent developments in relation to the planning application submitted by Dandara for the redevelopment of 51 College Road. He added that, following a request from Dandara, the Development Control Committee, at its meeting held on 26 July 2006, had deferred consideration of the planning application for a further dialogue between the Council, the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the applicant. The Panel was informed that these discussions were outstanding.

Harrow College

The Director of Strategic Planning circulated a confidential paper in the private session of the meeting. He sought Members' views on the way forward following the discussion with Harrow College.

Following a short discussion, it was

RESOLVED: That (1) the reports be noted;

(2) it be noted that the Director of Strategic Planning would respond in writing to Harrow College along the terms suggested by Members and circulate the letter to Members of the Panel.

(See also Minutes 3 and 7).

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.31 pm, closed at 9.22 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARILYN ASHTON
Chairman

TOWN CENTRE PROJECT PANEL

26 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman:	* Councillor Marilyn Ashton	
Councillors:	* David Ashton	* Navin Shah
	* Mrs Kinnear	* Bill Stephenson (1)
	* Chris Mote	
Advisers (non-voting):	* Mr Abe Hayeem	– Canons Park Residents' Association
	* Mr Baj Mathur	– Harrow Heritage Trust
	* Mr John Palmer	– Harrow Agenda 21
	* Mr A Wood	– Harrow Public Transport Users' Association

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

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Progress on UDP Proposal Site 6: Harrow on the Hill Station**

The Panel received a report of the Director of Planning Services, which set out the progress made on issues relating to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Proposal Site 6, following discussions with Harrow College, Transport for London (TfL)/Metronet, Quintains and Dandara; all the current land owners surrounding the site under discussion. The report sought approval to a number of recommendations for submission to Cabinet in order to show support for the funding bid made by Harrow College to the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) for a new consolidated college in the Town Centre. This would largely be located on Lowlands Recreation Ground which was owned by the Council and involve a land swap between the Council and Harrow College. It was noted that the LSC would be making a decision on the funding bid on 5 October 2006.

To assist the Panel, a copy of the document titled '*Harrow on the Hill Station – Planning Brief, July 2005*' was circulated to Members and advisers. The Planning Brief had been prepared to help shape redevelopment proposals for land at and around Harrow on the Hill Station and established a set of principles to ensure a comprehensive approach to development in Harrow Town Centre.

The Director of Planning Services (Urban Living) stated that the over-arching primary objective of the Council's policy in relation to this site was to develop and ensure a step change in public transport which would provide the foundation on which the Town Centre could build for the future. This would require significant funding from all involved in the proposals, and this would leave less money to achieve other planning and development objectives, including affordable housing. He added that Harrow College would be under an obligation to make a significant contribution towards the cost of the overall development of the tube and bus stations; the remainder of the cost to be funded by adjoining site owners. The Panel was briefed on the ongoing negotiations with these companies.

The Director stated that the Council's vision was to create a new north/south connection, which might involve the pedestrianisation of College Road. It was intended to create a town centre, which combined development that was sustainable, delivered on housing and retail space, made public transport fully accessible and provided a traffic free environment.

The Panel also received contributions from its advisory members who suggested a number of ways in which the various sites surrounding Harrow on the Hill Station could be reconfigured to help transform Harrow Town Centre into a distinctive and attractive environment that would help change the face of Harrow. It was noted that many of the various suggestions put forward had previously been explored and tested, some of which had already been taken on board. Additionally, the Panel was advised that the Council was exploring options, which could remove traffic from College Road and introduce a town square. Proposals for a new library and a performance/exhibition centre in Harrow Town Centre had not been discounted either.

In response to questions, the Director assured the Panel that other sites had been considered for the redevelopment of Harrow College and that the option set out in his report was considered to be the most suitable. Additionally, the reference to waive the

normal affordable housing requirement applied only to the existing Harrow College site. Issues in relation to the height of new buildings in and around the Harrow Town Centre would be a matter for the Council's Development Control Committee and planning requirements. However, in the interim, a decision was required in relation to the re-siting of Harrow College and its bid to the LSC.

A Member remarked that the Council's Strategic Planning Advisory Panel should also have considered the report; this was noted.

Following further discussion, it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That (1) all developments within the proposal site 6 (PS6) site should contribute to the delivery of the key objective of a new transport hub for the Borough; contributions were likely to be both financial through a S106 Agreement and, where necessary, in the form of land;

(2) the provision of improved public transport infrastructure should be the Council's primary objective and, where necessary, take priority over other policy considerations;

(3) contributions from individual sites would be determined on the basis of the estimated overall cost of public transport improvements together with an economic appraisal of the appropriate level of contribution;

(4) the progress made in discussions with Harrow College, TfL/Metronet, Quintains and Dandara, as set out in the Director's report, be noted;

(5) formal representations be made to TfL/Metronet on the need for comprehensive proposals to make Harrow on the Hill Station fully accessible

Reason for Recommendation: To ensure that the Council's primary objective of securing a step change in public transport was achieved.

[Note: Councillors Navin Shah and Bill Stephenson wished to have their concerns recorded as to the content of paragraphs 3 and 4 of page 3 of the report considered by the Panel in relation to the waiver of affordable housing].

(See also Minute 14).

PART II - MINUTES

13. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Bill Stephenson

14. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
8. Progress on UDP Proposal Site 6: Harrow on the Hill Station	Councillor Mrs Kinnear	Declared a personal interest in that she lived on the edge of Harrow Town Centre, on the opposite side of the site under consideration. Accordingly, she remained in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.
	Councillor Navin Shah	Declared a personal interest in that he lived near the site under consideration. Accordingly, he remained in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Bill Stephenson

Declared a personal interest in that he was Governor of Harrow College. Accordingly, he remained in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.

15. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

Members noted that item 10 which related to the appointment of an adviser to the Panel would be considered after item 7.

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
8. Progress on UDP proposal Site 6: Harrow on the Hill Station	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated, as it could not be finalised until negotiations with the relevant parties had been completed. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, so that a recommendation could be made to the Cabinet in time for the outcome to be reported to the Learning and Skills Council when it considered funding bids in October 2006.
10. Item placed on the agenda at the request of a Member of the Panel - Appointment of an Adviser to the Panel	This item was not included on the agenda at the time of its circulation as the potential adviser had yet to be contacted about the possibility of him serving on the Panel. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, in order to allow the appointment to be made, thereby allowing the appointee to participate at the meeting.

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

16. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That consideration and the signing of the minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2006 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

17. **Public Questions/Petitions/Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 15, 13 and 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

18. **Appointment of an Adviser to the Panel:**

RESOLVED: That Mr Anthony Wood, representing the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association, be appointed as a non-voting adviser to the Panel for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2006/07.

19. **Progress on UDP Proposal Site 6: Harrow on the Hill Station:**
(See Recommendation 1).

20. **Any Other Urgent Business:**

Advisers

In response to a question, the Chairman stated that, in order to ensure continuity, it would not be appropriate for advisers to send a deputy on their behalf to meetings of the Panel.

RESOLVED: That the position be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.14 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARILYN ASHTON
Chairman

**EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS
ADVISORY PANEL**
29 AUGUST 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Janet Cowan

Councillors: * Mrinal Choudhury * Joyce Nickolay

Advisers: Mr D A Jones
(Vacancy)

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS
RECOMMENDATION 1 - Admissions to County Schools

On 29 August 2006, there were seventeen children for whom admissions staff could make no reasonable offer of a school place. The Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel was requested to authorise the admission of these pupils to a school, where no place existed in the relevant year group.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That an offer of admission to a school be made as follows:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Year Group</u>	<u>Admitting School</u>
H9	10	Harrow
H10	10	Harrow
H11	10	Hatch End
H12	10	Rooks Heath
H13	10	Rooks Heath
H14	10	Hatch End
H15	10	Canons
H16	10	Park
H18	10	Bentley Wood
H19	11	Park
H20	11	Harrow
H21	11	Canons
H22	11	Rooks Heath
H23	9	Bentley Wood
H24	10	Bentley Wood
H25	10	Canons
H26	10	Canons

[Note: Case no. H17 was withdrawn from the agenda as an offer of a place had already been made].

PART II - MINUTES
29. Attendance by Reserve Members:

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

30. 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.

31. Arrangement of Agenda:

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
9. Admissions to County Schools	The applications detailed in these reports had been received after the main agenda was

9. (a) Admissions to County Schools printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider these reports, in order to allocate appropriate places to the applicants.

(2) the items appearing in Part II of the agenda be considered with the Press and Public excluded on the grounds indicated below:

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
9. Admissions to County Schools	These items were considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they contained information relating to individuals.
9. (a) Admissions to County Schools	

32. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2006 be taken as read and signed as a correct record; and

(2) the minutes of the meetings held on 4 July and 18 July 2006 be deferred until printed in the Council Minute Volume.

33. **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).

34. **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).

35. **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).

36. **Dates of Future Meetings:**

RESOLVED: That future meetings of the Panel be held on the following dates:

Tuesday 6 September 2006 at 5.00 pm	Tuesday 21 November 2006 at 5.00 pm
Tuesday 10 October 2006 at 5.00 pm	Tuesday 5 December 2006 at 5.00 pm
Tuesday 24 October 2006 at 5.00 pm	Tuesday 19 December 2006 at 5.00 pm
Tuesday 7 November 2006 at 5.00 pm	

37. **Admissions to County Schools:**
(See Recommendation 1 above).

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 5.00 pm, closed at 5.25 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JANET COWAN
Chairman

**EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS
ADVISORY PANEL**
13 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Janet Cowan

Councillors: * Mrinal Choudhury * Joyce Nickolay

Advisers: Mr D A Jones
(Vacancy)

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS
RECOMMENDATION 1 - Admissions to County Schools

On 13 September 2006, there were twenty-two children for whom admissions staff could make no reasonable offer of a school place. The Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel was requested to authorise the admission of these pupils to a school, where no place existed in the relevant year group.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That an offer of admission to a school be made as follows:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Year Group</u>	<u>Admitting School</u>
H27	9	Hatch End
H29	9	Nower Hill
H30	10	Park High
H31	11	Hatch End
H32	11	Rooks Heath
H33	11	Park High
H34	8	Bentley Wood
H35	9	Bentley Wood
H36	9	Nower Hill
H37	11	Harrow High
H38	11	Harrow High
H40	9	Canons
H41	10	Park
H42	10	Hatch End
H43	10	Nower Hill
H44	10	Nower Hill
H46	10	Harrow
H47	11	Rooks Heath
H48	11	Rooks Heath
H49	11	Whitmore
H50	11	Harrow
H51	9	Hatch End

[Note: Cases nos. H28, H39 and H45 were withdrawn from the agenda as an offer of a place had already been made].

PART II - MINUTES
38. Attendance by Reserve Members:

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

39. 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.

40. Arrangement of Agenda:

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
8. Admissions to County Schools	The applications detailed in these reports had been received after the main agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider these reports, in order to allocate appropriate places to the applicants.
8. (a) Admissions to County Schools	

(2) the items appearing in Part II of the agenda be considered with the Press and Public excluded on the grounds indicated below:

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
8. Admissions to County Schools	These items were considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they contained information relating to individuals.
8. (a) Admissions to County Schools	

41. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 4 July, 18 July and 29 August 2006 be deferred until printed in the Council Minute Volume.

42. **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).

43. **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).

44. **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).

45. **Admissions to County Schools:**
(See Recommendation 1 above).

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 5.00 pm, closed at 5.22 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JANET COWAN
Chairman

**EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS
ADVISORY PANEL****26 SEPTEMBER 2006**

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Janet Cowan
 Councillors: Joyce Nickolay * Asad Omar (1)
 Advisers: Mr D A Jones
 (Vacancy)

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

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Admissions to County Schools**

On 26 September 2006, there were 15 children for whom admissions staff could make no reasonable offer of a school place. The Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel was requested to authorise the admission of these pupils to a school, where no place existed in the relevant year group.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That an offer of admission to a school be made as follows:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Year Group</u>	<u>Admitting School</u>
H52	11	Canons
H54	9	Canons
H55	11	Rooks Heath
H56	10	Rooks Heath
H57	10	Bentley Wood
H59	11	Bentley Wood
H60	9	Nower Hill
H61	9	Nower Hill
H62	9	Bentley Wood
H63	9	Bentley Wood
H64	10	Bentley Wood
H65	11	Canons
H66	11	Bentley Wood
H67	11	Park
H68	11	Whitmore

[Note: Cases numbers H53 and H58 were withdrawn from the agenda as an offer of a place had already been made].

PART II - MINUTES**46. 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 Mrinal Choudhury	Councillor Asad Omar

47. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of personal or prejudicial interests made by Members of the Panel arising from the business transacted at this meeting.

48. Arrangement of Agenda:

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
8. Admissions to County Schools	The applications detailed in these reports had been received after the main agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider these reports, in order to allocate appropriate places to the applicants.
8. (a) Admissions to County Schools	

(2) the items appearing in Part II of the agenda be considered with the Press and Public excluded on the grounds indicated below:

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
8. Admissions to County Schools	These items were considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they contained information relating to individuals.
8. (a) Admissions to County Schools	

49. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 4 July, 18 July, 29 August and 13 September 2006 be deferred until printed in the Council Bound Minute Volume.

50. **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).

51. **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).

52. **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).

53. **Admissions to County Schools:**
(See Recommendation 1).

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 5.00 pm, closed at 5.15 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JANET COWAN
Chairman

BUDGET REVIEW WORKING PANEL

5 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor David Ashton

Councillors: * John Cowan * Narinder Singh Mudhar
 * Tony Ferrari * Bill Stephenson
 * Archie Foulds

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**1. **Appointment of Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To note the appointment of Councillor David Ashton at the Cabinet meeting on 8 June 2006 as Chairman of the Budget Review Working Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of personal or prejudicial interests made by Members of the Panel arising from the business transacted at this meeting.

4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following items 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. Financial Position	Members were asked to consider the tabled document titled 'Summary of Current Financial Position', which had not been available at the time the main agenda was printed and circulated. The purpose of the document was to ensure that up to date information was provided. Members were asked to consider this document to avail themselves of the Council's current financial position.
Urgent Business - Operation of the Budget Review Working Panel	Members were asked to consider this matter, which had not been included on the agenda. The future operation of this Panel was considered as urgent so that any changes proposed, if necessary, could be reported to the Cabinet for implementation with immediate effect.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following item for the reasons set out below:-

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
17. Notes of the Budget Review Working Group Meeting held on 6 February 2006	The notes of the informal Budget Review Working Group, being the predecessor body to this Advisory Panel, were private.
18. Financial Position	The report contained exempt information by virtue of paragraph 5 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information of which a claim for legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

19. Treasury Management – Borrowing and Lending Activities 2005-06
- The report contained exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to the financial and business affairs of a particular person.

5. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor John Cowan as Vice-Chairman of the Budget Review Working Panel for the 2006/2007 Municipal Year.

6. **Terms of Reference:**

The Chairman reported that the terms of reference of the Budget Review Working Panel were comparable to those of its predecessor body, the Budget Review Working Group, which used to meet in private. He added that they were intended to ensure that an overview of the Council's financial position was provided to the Panel without duplicating the work of the scrutiny committees.

RESOLVED: To note the terms of reference of the Budget Review Working Panel.

7. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at the meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 15, 13 and 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

8. **Financial Position:**

The Panel received reports on the Financial Position considered by the Cabinet at its meetings held on 29 June 2006 and 3 August 2006. Members noted that there was a confidential report attached elsewhere on the agenda which had been considered by the Cabinet on 3 August 2006.

The reports provided:-

- (i) background for managing the current year's budget and developing the new Medium Term Strategy for 2007-08 to 2009-10;
- (ii) the detailed plan for delivering the remaining £9.45m savings that the Council needed to achieve in the current year.

In addition, a paper detailing the summary of the current financial position was tabled at the meeting.

The Panel was informed that:-

- the reports set out the Council's serious adverse financial position, the critical financial implications arising and how the savings were going to be achieved;
- the reserves held by the Council as at 31 March 2006 were £2.5m and that discussions with the Council's external auditors on their adequacy would take place shortly;
- the Council needed to achieve savings of £19.1m in the current year, of which a sum of £9.7m had already been allocated. The remaining sum of £9.4m was planned to be covered by the savings programme adopted at the Cabinet on 3 August 2006;
- some of the proposed savings were subject to consultation;
- the special Cabinet meeting on 4 September 2006 had considered six of the thirteen items referred back to Cabinet by the Call-In Sub-Committee. The original decisions in relation to five items had been re-affirmed by the Cabinet and that the decision to cease locking of parks would now be implemented on 2 January 2007 instead of 1 October 2006;
- the Council would have to find further savings of £4.5m in order to ensure a nil increase in Council Tax for 2007/08 - over and above current unallocated savings and pressures of £9.3m;

- the latest estimates suggested that some of the figures set out in the paper tabled at the meeting might need revision upwards and that a clearer picture would be available at the Cabinet meeting on 4 October 2006.

In response to questions and comments from Members, the Chairman and officers responded as follows:-

- the position on redundancies and its impact on the reserves held by the Council was subject to further discussion with the Council's external auditors;
- the Council was still working on the basis that the property market was depressed; however, given the magnitude of savings to be attained, the Council would ensure that, where appropriate, realistic appraisals were carried out – such as in income received by the Council from land charges – which might reduce the overall levels of savings required, albeit the effect would be small;
- a review of concessionary travel was intended with a view to improving the current arrangements;
- capitalising budgets on wholesale basis was not productive, especially in the longer term;
- some limited element of growth had been built into the Medium Term Budget Strategy (MTBS);
- the decision to establish Prosperity Action Teams would not be reconsidered because they would bring real improvements at a local level and they were funded out of capital;
- the figures for residential placements would be looked at on a regular basis to ensure their reliability.

In response to a question from a Member on how reductions in the People First Directorate would be achieved, the Chairman stated that he would discuss this with the Member concerned separately. The officer offered to provide the same Member with information on projects that would be capitalised.

RESOLVED: That the comments set out in the preamble above be noted.

9. **Revenue & Capital Outturn 2005-2006:**

An officer introduced the report on the Revenue and Capital Outturn, which had been considered by the Cabinet on 29 June 2006.

It was noted that:-

- Harrow's collection rate (cumulative) was set at 99% and that the Chairman was of the view that, for budgeting purposes, it ought to be revised to 98.5%;
- the Council's collection rate was good in comparison with other boroughs, but that maintaining the rate at this level would be difficult;
- Court action would continue for non-payment.

RESOLVED: That the comments set out in the preamble above be noted.

10. **Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring to 30 June 2006:**

An officer introduced the report, which detailed the first quarter budget monitoring for 2006/07. She added that the structure of the report had been amended and that it contained additional information than that had appeared in previous reports.

In response to questions from Members, the officer stated that the People First Directorate was unlikely to achieve the required savings in relation to the spend on asylum seekers and that it might have to identify compensatory savings from other service areas within the Directorate. The Chairman indicated that he expected a more holistic approach to the savings exercise.

RESOLVED: That the comments set out in the preamble above be noted.

11. **Revised Capital Programme 2006-07:**

An officer introduced the report on the revised capital programme, which had been considered by Cabinet on 3 August 2006.

The Chairman stated, as a general overriding comment, that it was intended to ensure that all projects were supported by budgets that were feasible in order to ensure that the objective was achievable and the budget realistic. He added that budgets would be transparent.

RESOLVED: That the comments set out in the preamble above be noted.

12. **Budget and Corporate Planning Process 2007-08 to 2009-10:**

An officer introduced the report, which set out the proposed budget and corporate planning process and timetable for 2007/08 to 2008/10. She advised that five strategic projects, detailed in paragraph 5 of the report, had been established to support the medium term financial planning process and that the timetable for these projects was set out in paragraph 7 of the officer report.

The officer informed Members that consultation mechanisms had been reviewed and that consultation on the budget would be in the form of:-

- the Open Budget Panel would meet on a monthly basis commencing 7 September 2006;
- a series of open Cabinet meetings ("Question Time" format) around the Borough commencing 27 September 2006 at the Kodak Centre;
- a series of briefings for stakeholder groups on the budget proposals which would commence in January 2007.

Members felt that whilst the Assembly, set up by the Power Inquiry, had worked well, the process had been costly and it would be prudent not to repeat this exercise in 2006/07.

A Member, whilst agreeing that the Assembly had been costly, questioned how the Open Budget Panel would feed into the budget process, whether it could be considered to be representative of Harrow's communities and whether it would have any influence on the make-up of the budget. In response, the Chairman stated that the Panel would evolve.

In response to additional questions from Members, the Chairman and the officer responded as follows:-

- the strategic savings projects reports had been completed, the administration had not had the opportunity to review these. The report would be released in due course and would be considered by Cabinet;
- benchmarking with "nearest boroughs" consisted of Brent and Hillingdon Councils. In addition, comprehensive benchmarking was carried out with the whole of London.

RESOLVED: That the comments in the preamble above be noted.

13. **Date of Next Meeting:**

RESOLVED: That the date for the next meeting be agreed separately.

14. **Notes of the Budget Review Working Group Meeting held on 6 February 2006:**

RESOLVED: That the notes of the 6 February 2006 meeting of the Budget Review Working Group (being the predecessor body to this Advisory Panel) be agreed.

15. **Treasury Management - Borrowing and Lending Activities 2005-06:**

An officer introduced the report, which provided a summary of Treasury Management activities in the financial year 2005-06, performance against the Prudential Code Indicators and the performance of the external cash manager in the private session of the meeting. It was noted that the report was for information only.

In response to a question from a Member, the officer stated that, whilst there was confidence that the central return target would be achieved, the situation would become clearer following a meeting with the cash manager in October 2006.

RESOLVED: That the comments set out in the preamble above be noted.

16. **Urgent Business - Operation of the Panel:**
The Chairman raised this matter during the private session of the meeting. He was of the view that the Panel might want to meet as it had done under the previous administration. He explained the reasons behind this suggestion and sought Members' views.

RESOLVED: That Members report back to the Chairman on their views on the future operation of the Panel.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.40 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR DAVID ASHTON
Chairman

STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL

12 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Councillors: * Mrs Camilla Bath * Thaya Idaikkadar
* Robert Benson * Mrs Kinnear
* Keith Ferry * Navin Shah

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Vaughan Centre**

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced the report which sought the Panel's views on the status of the former Vaughan School as a locally listed building.

During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- Some Panel members stated that the costs given for refurbishment of the building seemed excessive.
- A Panel member expressed the view that the building was of architectural and historical importance and that de-listing it would give a signal to developers that Harrow did not wish to preserve such buildings. In response, another Panel member stated that de-listing the building would not automatically lead to its demolition.
- A number of Panel members agreed that the issue was complex but that, in the particular circumstances of the Vaughan Centre, de-listing seemed the most appropriate course of action.

It having been moved and seconded that the building be de-listed, a Panel member proposed that the wording of the Recommendation be amended to capture the Panel's concerns that the de-listing of the former Vaughan School should not set a precedent for further de-listing of locally listed buildings.

Having been put to a vote it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic)

That (1) the former Vaughan School building be de-listed in view of the specific circumstances outlined in the report of the Director of Strategic Planning, and

(2) the de-listing of the building should not set a precedent and any future application for de-listing should be judged on its merits.

[REASON: To provide clarity and certainty in developing proposals for the future of the site and building].

[Notes: (i) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Camilla Bath, Robert Benson and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted for the above decision;

(ii) Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar and Navin Shah wished to be recorded as having voted against the above decision;

(iii) during the discussion on the above item it was moved and seconded that the Recommendation be made to Cabinet rather than the Portfolio Holder. Having been put to a vote, this was not carried;

(iv) Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar and Navin Shah wished to be recorded as having voted for the motion set out under (iii) above;

(v) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Camilla Bath, Robert Benson and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the motion set out under (iii) above].

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Greater London Authority: Government Proposals for Additional Planning Powers

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced a report which outlined a draft response to the Government's proposals to extend the Mayor of London's powers in relation to planning.

All Panel members were in agreement that strong representation should be made against the Government's proposals. During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- The determination of planning applications by the Mayor should be held in public session, with democratic representations received where appropriate, to ensure a transparent decision-making process.
- In cases where the Mayor took over determination of planning applications from the London Borough of Harrow, assurances should be given that any monies resulting from a Section 106 legal agreement would be allocated to the Borough for locally identified needs.
- In the event that the Mayor was minded to direct approval of a planning application that the Borough wished to refuse, there should be a process in place for the Borough to be notified of the draft decision and given an opportunity to respond before the final determination of the application.
- There should be a process in place by which the Borough could appeal against decisions made by the Mayor.
- The proposals did not appear to be in keeping with the spirit of the Local Development Framework process and the London Plan.
- The proposals had the potential to have additional resource implications.
- There may be an equalities impact as the proposals would take away the right of representation.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That the comments as set out in the report of the Director of Strategic Planning, amended in accordance with the views expressed by Panel members, be forwarded to the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Association of London Government.

[REASON: To make the Government aware of the Council's views].

[Note: The Panel wished it to be recorded that this decision had unified cross-party support].

(See also Recommendation 3).

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Greater London Authority: Government Proposals for Additional Planning Powers

Having made a recommendation to Cabinet in this regard, the Panel:

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Property, Housing Planning (Development) and Planning (Strategic))

That the Portfolio Holder write to the Association of London Government (ALG) setting out the concerns raised by the Panel and requesting that the Panel's comments be formally taken into consideration by the ALG Leaders' Committee.

[REASON: To make the ALG aware of the Council's views].

(See also Recommendation 2).

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Housing and Planning Delivery Grant: Government Consultation

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced the report which outlined a draft response to the Government's proposals to replace the Planning Delivery Grant with a Housing and Planning Delivery Grant from 2008/9 onwards.

During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- A Panel member stated that, in her view, the Borough would lose out under the proposed scheme.
- A Panel member expressed concern that the new grant framework could potentially take resources away from more deprived areas that were not areas for housing growth.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That the comments as set out in the report of the Director of Strategic Planning, amended in accordance with the views expressed by Panel members, be forwarded to the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Association of London Government.

[**REASON:** To make the Government aware of the Council's views].

PART II - MINUTES

20. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

21. **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.

22. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
8. Vaughan Centre	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider this item as a matter of urgency.
9. Greater London Authority: Government Proposals for Additional Planning Powers	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider this item as a matter of urgency.
10. Housing and Planning Delivery Grant: Government Consultation	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider this item as a matter of urgency.

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

23. **Minutes:**

It having been noted that the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2006 had been circulated with the agenda in error, it was

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2006 be deferred until the next meeting of the Panel.

24. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 15, 13 and 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

25. **Vaughan Centre:**

(See Recommendation 1).

26. **Greater London Authority: Government Proposals for Additional Planning Powers:**

(See Recommendations 2 and 3).

27. **Housing and Planning Delivery Grant: Government Consultation:**

(See Recommendation 4).

28. **Special Meeting of the Panel:**

RESOLVED: That a Special Meeting of the Panel be held on Tuesday 31 October 2006 at 7.30 pm to discuss the responses to the current LDF consultation.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.20 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARILYN ASHTON
Chairman

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

20 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman:	* Councillor John Nickolay	
Councillors:	* Marilyn Ashton	* Manji Kara
	* Mrs Camilla Bath	* Jerry Miles
	* Robert Benson (1)	* David Perry
	* Mrinal Choudhury	* Jeremy Zeid
	* Nizam Ismail	
Advisers:	† Mr A Blann	† Mr L Gray
	† Mr E Diamond	* Mr A Wood

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

[Note: Councillor Paul Scott also attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Recommendation 4 below. Councillor Mrs Kinnear attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Recommendation 4 and Minute 29.]

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Green Lane - Traffic Conditions**

The Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure, which set out an investigation into the traffic conditions in Green Lane. It was reported that a petition had been received from the St John's Church of England School in Green Lane raising concern about safety. Also, complaints had been received about parking problems. Measures to alleviate the prevailing conditions had been identified, as shown in Appendix C. Members discussed Appendix C and a Member suggested that a speed control of 20mph could be introduced.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm):

That (1) officers be authorised to consult the residents/businesses of Green Lane and associated roads on Option 2 shown at Appendix C;

(2) subject to the development of a school travel plan, enforceable school yellow zigzag keep clear road markings be introduced at both Stanmore Hill and Green Lane entrances to the school;

(3) the petitioners' request for pedestrian crossings be considered as part of a Safe Routes to Schools scheme subject to funding from Transport for London;

(4) the head petitioners be advised of the above.

[REASON: To gain approval to consult the local community on the recommended option.]

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Cycling Update

The Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure which informed Members of the progress made in improving cycling facilities in Harrow and to review plans for delivering further cycle routes within the Borough. An officer explained that three quarters of the London Cycle Plus (a London-wide network of cycle routes) had been completed and one quarter of the Local Cycle Network had been completed. Transport for London had set a London-wide target to achieve at least 80% increase in cycling levels by 2010. Officers outlined difficulties in joining up the routes particularly at junctions. Members considered the following issues:-

- the possibility that cyclists could use service roads to avoid congestion on roads;
- that cycle parking offered no protection from the elements and vandals;
- changing roundabouts to traffic lights would create problems for all road users;
- the uptake of cycling training courses, particularly by schools.

A motion was moved and seconded and upon a vote it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm):

That (1) the report be noted and that it be accepted that there was an obligation to continue with the objectives set out in the London Cycle Network and Local Implementation Plan, however, there was a reluctance to sacrifice further valuable road space to accommodate cycle lanes and the shared use of pedestrian footways should be avoided wherever possible;

(2) it be noted that the Panel's preferred option was for quiet roads to be used by cyclists and that officers take this into account when drafting further schemes and that ways be found of taking into account the views of ordinary cyclists with regard to routes and facilities;

(3) the Panel considers that the Government and Transport for London should take action to oblige cyclists to comply with the law and treat pedestrians with consideration by avoiding riding at high speed along footways.

[REASON: To improve cycle facilities in Harrow, deliver further cycle routes within the Borough, reduce congestion, and improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.]

RECOMMENDATION 3 - The Highlands - Consultation Results

The Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure, which informed Members that following complaints received from local residents about speeding and parking congestion, officers had been instructed to investigate. The investigation had shown the highest weekday 85 percentile speed (the speed not exceeded by 85% of vehicles and the nationally recognised speed used for design purposes) was less than 30mph but that parking was a problem. A Member requested that the Controlled Parking Zone be given priority in the March 2007 review.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm):

That (1) the results of the consultation be noted and the priority of the Burnt Oak Broadway area be reviewed in March 2007 when the Controlled Parking Zones and Residents' Parking Schemes Programme was reviewed;

(2) the residents be informed of the above, including the outcome of the investigation and consultation.

[REASON: To seek a review of the priority of the area for parking controls.]

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Wealdstone Controlled Parking Zone - Review and Possible Extension to Zone CA and Associated Restrictions

The Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure, which asked Members to consider the consultation results and to agree a way forward.

An officer reported that there had been a stakeholder meeting in November 2005 where areas of concern had been identified. The main issues identified were 1) parking difficulties experienced by residents living just outside the current controlled parking zone; 2) requests for more visitor/shopper parking close to the High Street; 3) congestion problems especially on High Road and High Street north of George Gange Way and 4) access and safety concerns where parking occurs too close to junctions.

There had been a public meeting in February 2006 where traders had highlighted serious difficulties associated with the permitted hours of access for loading in the pedestrianised area of the High Street. It had been agreed that an urgent review would be conducted and this had now taken place, culminating in a series of recommendations for the Panel's consideration and approval.

An officer advised the Panel that the necessary revisions to traffic orders, to relax loading times in the designated bays in the pedestrian zone to allow loading at all times had already been advertised. This was being taken forward on a fast track basis in line with the recommendation from the Panel at the meeting on 28 February 2006.

Some Members raised concerns about the proposed scheme and an additional recommendation was moved and seconded, but, having been put to a vote, the motion was lost.

Members raised a number of questions and the officer responded as follows:-

- loading would be permitted in bays between George Gange Way and Locket Road for a shorter period than at present, between the peak hours (10.00 am to 3.00 pm), and would be restricted to defined bays;
- that there were difficulties associated with using service roads for deliveries and that relocating service vehicles had been a Transport for London (TfL) funded initiative but this initiative had now been stalled. It was accepted that the proposals, including further dedicated loading facilities and disabled bays just off the main road, probably offered the best balance between traffic movement and access, at least in the short to medium term;
- at two junctions on Kenmore Avenue, double yellow lines would be considered to address parking problems;
- yellow school 'keep clear' markings outside many schools were not enforceable, however consultation was proposed to achieve this for the markings outside Elmgrove School in Kenmore Avenue. A Member who was also the Chair of Governors at Elmgrove School stated that the school would want these enforced;
- operational hours would be put on all the permit bay signs;
- footway parking proposals would not be taken forward in Whitefriars Avenue, due to little support. In Byron Road, where consultation opinion was divided, the scheme proposed to address the current unregulated parking on the footway.

A backbench Member raised concern about cars and buses double parked at the entrance to the bus garage on High Road, Harrow Weald. An adviser explained that this issue had been discussed at the Bus and Rail Liaison meetings and Metroline was currently in discussion with the Council's planning department to try to identify land available for expansion of the bus garage to relieve their highway difficulties. The double yellow lines proposed on High Road by the bus station were to enable evening enforcement if buses were left unattended.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living – Public Realm)

That (1) officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design in accordance with Appendices J, L, N, P and Q and take all necessary steps under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders the details of which be delegated to officers and implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections. The statement of reasons to be "to control parking and facilitate loading" to enable the extension and modification to the controlled parking zone and associated parking restrictions as detailed in (2) to (14) below. The changes mainly comprising:-

(2) double yellow line restrictions be introduced at the junctions shown at Appendix L, but their extent be modified with reference to consultation feedback and site geometry;

(3) the existing Wealdstone CA CPZ be extended to include Lorne Road, Stirling Road, Ladysmith Road, Whitefriars Avenue, remaining parts of Aberdeen Road, High Street, Graham Road and Spencer Road and further part of Locket Road as shown at Appendix N;

(4) shared use bays be introduced into Grant Road, Thomson Road, Spencer Road (southern end), Ladysmith Road, Graham Road and Wolseley Road, as shown on the consultation plan so they can additionally be used by people who pay and display as shown at Appendix Q;

(5) the waiting and loading restrictions be modified in High Street (north of Gordon Road), western ends of Grant Road and Locket Road as shown on the consultation plan at Appendix J;

(6) a part-time pay and display bay be introduced opposite the police station in High Street as shown at Appendix Q;

(7) part-time and full time loading bays be introduced in High Street, Grant Road and Spencer Road, (the latter by the conversion of a permit bay) as shown at Appendix Q;

(8) additional disabled bays be introduced in High Street, Grant Road and Spencer Road, and be subject to a maximum stay of 3 hours as shown at Appendix Q;

(9) modification be made so that business permit holders can additionally use permit bays and that zone specific business permits be available for operational purposes as agreed within the Local Implementation Plan;

(10) the waiting and loading restrictions be modified in High Road and its junctions with The Meadow Way, Weald Lane, College Avenue, Long Elmes, College Road, Weighton Road, Alma Road, Boxtree Road and Elms Road, as shown in the consultation proposals at Appendix J;

(11) the waiting restrictions throughout Forward Drive be changed to no waiting at any time, double yellow lines;

(12) the single yellow line 8am to 6.30pm Mon – Sat, in Christchurch Avenue, be taken forward as part of the scheme as shown on the consultation plans at Appendix J;

(13) a waiting restriction, applying Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm, be introduced in the remaining section of Cardinal Way as shown in the consultation proposals, layout 6 at Appendix J;

(14) an exemption be made under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974 to allow two wheel footway parking in Byron Road south of Locket Road both within and outside the CPZ as shown at Appendix P;

(15) further consultation be carried out in parallel with consultation for the zone C review in roads or sections of roads, as shown in Appendix O, to see if there is support for extension of the permit parking and CPZ to these roads;

(16) the layout of the eastern end of Gordon Road be re-examined as part of the review to open the High Street to traffic, to assess the practicality of P&D here.

[REASON: To gain agreement for the way forward with a view to implementation of parking controls.]

PART II - MINUTES

21. **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 Yogesh Teli	Councillor Robert Benson

22. **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. Wealdstone CPZ Consultation Results	Councillor Marilyn Ashton	Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in that she was the Chair of Governors at Elmgrove School. Accordingly, she remained in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.

23. **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>
12. Wealdstone CPZ Consultation Results – Appendices J to T	Due to the complexity of the scheme and the range of consultations involved, Appendices J to T of the Wealdstone CPZ Review report (item 12 on the main agenda) were not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were requested to consider this item in order to be fully informed of the outcome of the consultation exercise and make timely recommendations on the further development of the scheme.

13. Any Other Business – Replacement of Metropolitan Line Trains
- In order to inform Members of the progress made since the resolution passed by Council at its meeting on 13 July 2006: “That the Council instructs the Executive to seek a high level meeting with London Underground to seek the fullest possible consultation in relation to the proposals for the Metropolitan Line with all users and residents across the Borough”, Members were asked to consider this item as there was a limited consultation period and the next meeting of Council was not until 19 October 2006.

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

24. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2006 be signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment to Recommendation 3, “Urgent Review of Loading Restrictions in High Street, Wealdstone”:

“After “the undertaking of the urgent review” insert “An advisor to the Panel proposed that there be a temporary suspension of all loading and unloading restrictions in the Wealdstone area, for which there was some support from Members. Upon advice from officers, however, it was agreed not to proceed with this.””

(2) the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2006 be signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

Recommendation 1, third line of second paragraph to read, “some people. However, a majority...”; and the fifth line of the second paragraph of Minute 13 to read, “...would cause congestion, plus concerns that the right-turn ban would result in increased rat-running.”

25. **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).

26. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petitions which were referred to the relevant officer for consideration:

- (i) Petition requesting Harrow Council to implement a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in College Road, Harrow Weald, to deal with the problem of long-term parking and traffic flow
Presented by Councillor John Nickolay and signed by 15 people.
- (ii) Petition requesting improvements to pavements, pavement drives and the road in Uppingham Avenue, Stanmore
Presented by Councillor Manji Kara and signed by 321 people.

27. **Deputations:**

Having been advised that a late request for a deputation had been received, the Panel waived the requirement set out in paragraph 14.3 of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules and

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution), a deputation be received from residents of Athol Gardens, Pinner, in relation to agenda item 8(a) ‘Repaving of Athol Gardens Pinner – Reference from the meeting of Council held on 13 July 2006’.

(See also Minute 28).

28. **Repaving of Athol Gardens, Pinner:**

The Panel received the above reference from the Council meeting held on 13 July 2006, and a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure (Urban Living), which responded to the concerns raised by residents.

An officer advised the Panel of the process undertaken to prioritise works and informed Members that officers had met with the Head Petitioner and agreed to undertake some minor repairs to the road. The Panel was advised that the next bi-annual survey would take place in 2007 when roads below a certain standard would be identified and resources would be allocated on a worst first basis. The time elapsed since a road was last repaved would not affect when the road would next be repaired as prioritisation was based on the condition of the road.

A Member queried the effectiveness of the herbicides currently being used to clear weeds.

RESOLVED: That (1) the petition and response be noted;

(2) Athol Gardens be looked at critically in the next survey;

(3) officers inform the responsible officers of a Member's concern regarding the use of herbicides.

(See also Minute 27).

29. **Reference from the Meeting of Council held on 13 July 2006: Double Yellow Lines at Mount Park Avenue between London Road and Georgian Way, Harrow on the Hill:**

The Panel received the above reference from the Council meeting held on 13 July 2006, and a report of the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure (Urban Living), which responded to the concerns raised by residents. An officer explained that providing double yellow lines on both sides of the road would cause displacement of parked cars and that it might be necessary to accommodate parking on one side of the road.

Members discussed the Green Travel Plan and were advised by the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living, Public Realm, that the Vice-Principal of Harrow College was producing the College's Green Travel Plan but this had not yet been received by Harrow Council. An adviser suggested that the College be reminded that students under 18 could travel for free on London buses.

Members requested information on which schools had provided their Green Travel Plans.

RESOLVED: That (1) it be noted that the Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure would investigate the possibility of providing double yellow lines, consult with ward councillors and the local community as appropriate and report the findings and recommendations to the Panel and/or the Portfolio Holder;

(2) officers contact the Vice-Principal of Harrow College for its Green Travel Plan and remind the College that students under 18 could travel for free on London buses;

(3) officers provide Members with details of which schools had been asked to provide a Green Travel Plan, which schools had done so and which ones had not.

30. **Green Lane Traffic Conditions:**
(See Recommendation 1).

31. **Cycling Update:**
(See Recommendation 2).

32. **The Highlands - Consultation Results:**
(See Recommendation 3).

33. **Wealdstone CPZ Consultation Results:**
(See Recommendation 4).

34. **Any Other Urgent Business:**

a) **Replacement of Metropolitan Line Trains**

The Panel received information from officers on this matter. An adviser explained that the new trains on the Metropolitan, Circle and Hammersmith and City Line would be standardised and subsequently there would be a net reduction of 30% of the seats on Metropolitan Line Trains. The size of seats would be increased. As there was a need for disabled passengers to be evacuated from the train through the back or front of the train, the gangway had to be widened. As trains would run more frequently, there would be a net

reduction in capacity of 5%. The adviser informed the Panel that it had been suggested that a train start from Harrow on the Hill station every 15 minutes during rush hour to enable users of this and the following stations to be able to sit on the train. The adviser explained that the Rail Liaison Group would be consulted about the shortlisted colour schemes and interiors and the needs of the partially sighted would be considered.

The adviser informed the Panel that he had made representations to get Northwick Park Station included in the accessibility programme for 2009 as it was currently in the post 2013 programme. He reported that a London Underground Limited (LUL) accessibility officer would be meeting with him on 4 October and that Members were welcome to attend.

A motion was moved and seconded and upon being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED: That (1) the outcome of talks held with senior officials of London Underground Limited (LUL) regarding seating in the new Metropolitan Line rolling stock be noted and that Mr Wood be thanked for the role he had played in making the arrangements;

(2) it be noted that the increased frequency of trains should to some extent serve to offset the effect of reduced seating in individual trains, but that the Panel very much regretted suggestions to diminish this reduction have been rejected by LUL;

(3) it be noted that, whilst the new rolling stock would be accessible for those in wheelchairs, the number of stations on the Metropolitan Line that would be totally accessible when these trains come into service was likely to be pitifully small;

(4) that LUL be recommended to take action to rectify this situation as soon as possible.

b) Goodwill To All Junction

The Chairman advised Members that officers were available to discuss the plans for the Goodwill To All Junction after the meeting.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Advisory and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 12 (Part 4E of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.10 pm.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.04 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JOHN NICKOLAY
Chairman

CONSULTATIVE
FORUMS

EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

21 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman:	* Councillor Miss Christine Bednell	
Councillors:	* Mrs Camilla Bath * B E Gate * Manji Kara	* Julia Merison (1) * Raj Ray † Bill Stephenson
Teachers' Constituency:	Mr R Borman † Ms C Gembala * Ms J Lang	* Ms L Money * 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

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

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - School Term Dates 2007/08**

The Forum received an update concerning the finalisation of school term dates for 2007/08, following the deferral of this decision from the Forum's previous meeting on 3 July 2006, and in order to obtain information regarding neighbouring boroughs' proposals.

An officer reported that this information was still unavailable, as both Brent and Ealing had not yet completed their consultations. However, a document was tabled suggesting proposed revisions to the dates agreed by the Forum at its meeting on 31 January 2006, taking into account guidance by the Local Government Association (LGA).

A teacher's representative commented that the Primary sector was in favour of the model proposed by the LGA. By contrast, a representative from the secondary sector commented that his experience indicated that the sector was broadly in favour of retaining Harrow's own model, as this would reduce the administration involved in the opening and closing of schools over Easter. However, in light of other views expressed at the Forum and the importance of synchronicity between boroughs on this issue, the representative said he would support the proposed revisions tabled at the meeting.

Members commented that they would support the views expressed by the education sector representatives.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder, People First):

That the following 2007/08 school term dates be approved:

Autumn 2007	Monday 3 September – Friday 19 October Half Term 22 – 26 October (5 days) Monday 29 October – Wednesday 19 December
Spring 2008	Thursday 3 January – Friday 15 February Half Term – 18 – 22 February (5 Days) Monday 25 February – Friday 4 April
Summer 2008	Monday 21 April – Friday 23 May Half Term 26 – 30 May (BH + 4 days) Monday 2 June – Wednesday 23 July

[Reason: To enable school term dates for 2007/08 to be published, and so aid future planning for schools, governors, parents and other partners.]

PART II - MINUTES17. **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 Janet Mote	Councillor Julia Merison

18. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that (1) the following personal interests were declared;

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath	Governor of Whitchurch first school, and Harrow High School
Councillor Miss Christine Bednell	Governor of Vaughan First and Middle School, Stanmore College and Whitmore High School
Councillor B E Gate	Governor of Whitmore High School
Councilor Manji Kara	Governor of Glebe School and Stanburn School
Councillor Julia Merison	Governor of Newton Farm/Grange School
Councillor Raj Ray	Governor Kingsley High School

(2) prejudicial interests were declared in relation to item 6: Matters Arising – Voluntary Aided Hindu School.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath	Chairman of the Development Control Committee
Councillor Manji Kara	Member of the Development Control Committee
Councillor Julia Merison	Member of the Development Control Committee

19. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

20. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the signing of the minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2006 be deferred until printed in the Council Bound Volume.

21. **Matters Arising:****Recommendation 1 - Terms of Reference**

An officer informed the Forum that there were currently two Governor positions vacant on the Forum's membership, and that these should be filled, under the terms of reference, by a Primary sector headteacher, and a Secondary sector headteacher.

The Chairman asked Governor representatives their views on potential nominations, and responded that they would return to the Forum with advice.

Minute 4 - Arrangement of Agenda

An officer expressed the view that it would be appropriate if more suggestions for agenda items would be volunteered from constituent groups, and asked that these be forwarded to her.

Minute 13 – Harrow Sixth Form Collegiate

Members of the Forum were informed that the Council remained in negotiations regarding the above, and had met with the Learning and Skills Council (LSC). In addition, it was reported that officers were to meet with MPs and the Secretary of State to discuss the matter further.

The Chairman and Members of the Forum offered their congratulations to the work conducted so far on the project, and noted the expansion of numbers in the collegiate as a sign of success.

Minute 14 – Financial Position

A Member of the Forum expressed disappointment that consultation over recent Council reforms which had affected the education sector had been conducted over the summer, when staff were not readily available to comment.

Members also drew attention to a recent report which had publicised the benefits of music tuition in schools, an area affected by recent reforms, and also to the reductions in clothing subsidies.

A teacher representative commented that there was also concern over the reduction of legal assistance to schools.

A Member commented that the decisions had undergone due process, but agreed that the consultation and conditions under which the proposals were initially brought to the Executive were unsatisfactory, particularly in that the Forum did not have an opportunity to comment.

The Chairman stated that she would make the views of the Forum known to other Members, and said that she expected the Forum to be consulted on such matters in future.

Minute 15 – Voluntary Aided Hindu School

The Forum heard that a site for the school had been identified, and that the planning process for this had begun. An officer stated that consultation results would be published shortly.

Members expressed concern about the validity of the consultation period, particularly regarding the notification that schools received. Officers agreed to relay this feedback to I-Foundation representatives.

Responding to a query regarding the school's status, the Forum heard that the school would be a Trust school, with a two-form infrastructure, although initial plans were only to admit one form. In addition, the school had proposed a gradual expansion of intake in order to minimise impact on surrounding schools.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

22. **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).

23. **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).

24. **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).

25. **School Term Dates for 2007-08:**
(See Recommendation 1)

26. **Rapid Intervention Team / Reduction in Exclusion:**

The Forum received a report of the Director of Lifelong Learning and Cultural Services, outlining developments concerning the Rapid Intervention Team (RIT) and reductions in exclusion.

It was reported that there had been 63 referrals to the RIT since February 2006, and that this was having a positive impact in reducing the number of exclusions. The Forum heard that schools had welcomed the support of the team accordingly.

An officer stated that in terms of the Team's future development, a system was required, to enable the progress of certain children to be tracked.

Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that the RIT was properly resourced, and suggested the alternative sources of funding, such as the local police, be explored. The importance of contact with parents was also stressed, and the need to publicise support services to help reduce exclusions further.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

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

RESOLVED: To note that the next meeting of the Forum would be held on 30 January 2007.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.35 pm, closed at 9.10 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CHRISTINE BEDNELL
Chairman

COUNCIL
AND
COUNCIL
COMMITTEES

SCRUTINY
SUB-COMMITTEES

CALL-IN SUB COMMITTEE

22 AUGUST 2006

Chairman:	* Councillor Anthony Seymour	
Councillors:	* B E Gate * Mitzi Green	* Dinesh Solanki (4) * Jeremy Zeid (1)
Voting Co-opted: (See Note (1) below)	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt † Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) * Mr H Epie † Mr R Sutcliffe

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

[Notes: (1) Under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 5.4, where there is a matter relating to the Council's education functions at Call-in Sub-Committee meetings, the "church" and parent governor representatives have attendance, speaking and voting rights. The items indicated at Minutes 7(i), (ii), (iv), (v) and (vi) below relate to education functions;

(2) Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Navin Shah and Bill Stephenson also attended this meeting in a participatory capacity].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**1. **Appointment of Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To note the appointment, at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 18 July 2006, of Councillor Anthony Seymour as Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Jean Lammiman
Councillor Mark Versallion

Reserve Member

Councillor Jeremy Zeid
Councillor Dinesh Solanki

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
7(c). Call-in of the Decision of the Cabinet Meeting on 3 August 2006: Key Decision – Financial Position – Item 17 – Focus Clothing Grants on Real Need	Councillor Mrinal Choudhury	Personal interest arising from his involvement with Elmgrove School. Accordingly, the Member would remain in the room and take part in the discussion on this item.
	Councillor B E Gate	Personal interest arising from his membership of the Education Consultative Forum. Accordingly, the Member would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
7(f). Call-in of the Decision of the Cabinet Meeting on 3 August 2006: Key Decision – Financial Position – Item 44 – Public Realm Maintenance – Parks Locking	Councillor Bill Stephenson	Prejudicial interest arising from the fact that the Member lived adjacent to a park that would no longer be locked at night. Accordingly, the Member would leave the room and take no part in the discussion on this item.
	Councillor Jeremy Zeid	Personal interest arising from the fact that the Member lived adjacent to a recreation ground that would not be affected by the decision not to lock parks. Accordingly, the Member would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
7(i). Call-in of the Decision of the Cabinet Meeting on 3 August 2006: Key Decision – Financial Position – Item 47 – Reduce Agency Staff in Development Control and Reduce Contract and Permanent Staff within Conservation and Design	Councillor Mrinal Choudhury	Personal interest arising from his membership of Development Control Committee. Accordingly, the Member would remain in the room and take part in the discussion on this item.

4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

It was agreed that the order of items 7(a) to 7(l) be varied, and that items relating to education functions, or for which members of the public were present, be taken first.

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the meeting be called with less than 5 clear working days' notice by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated below:-

Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency: Under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22, a meeting of the Call-in Sub-Committee must be held within 7 clear working days of the receipt of a request for call-in. This meeting therefore had to be arranged at short notice and it was not possible for the agenda to be published 5 clear working days prior to the meeting.

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

5. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Mitzi Green as Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

6. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2006, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

7. **Call-in of the Decision of the Cabinet Meeting on 3 August 2006: Key Decision - Financial Position:**

At its meeting on 3 August 2006, the Cabinet had received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy, advising of the need for the Council to achieve a further £9.4m of savings in 2006/07. The report set out an action plan which outlined some 80 measures to achieve these savings and, with the exception of a few items, all the measures had been approved. 12 call-in notices had subsequently been received, calling in the decisions relating to 13 items, and these decisions had therefore been referred to the Call-in Sub-Committee for consideration under the call-in procedure.

The Sub-Committee received the report to Cabinet, documents setting out comments from staff and from GMB which had been tabled at the Cabinet meeting, the relevant extract from the Cabinet minutes, and the 12 call-in notices.

At the meeting, the Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced her report, and stated that each proposal had been evaluated for impact prior to the decision. Some consultation on the proposals had been carried out - for example, views of staff

and Unions had been reported to Cabinet and partner organisations had been informed – and consultation was also being undertaken on those proposals for which it was a statutory requirement. In addition, the papers for the Cabinet meeting had been available in advance of the meeting, and the issue had been well publicised in the press; as a result Cabinet had received a number of petitions and public questions relating to the proposed savings. The urgency of the decision was stressed, however, and it was noted that, in light of this, the proposals had been considered only at Cabinet, not at any other Committees or Consultative Forums. A Member representing the signatories to the call-in notices also made a statement about the budget proposals generally, expressing concern that they had not been subject to the same level of consultation and scrutiny as the annual civic budget, and that their impact had not therefore been properly considered.

The Members of the Sub-Committee considered each of the call-in notices in turn. For each item, an officer was invited to explain the reasons for the decision and to respond to the grounds for call-in, and a Member representing the signatories to the call-in notice was invited to explain the key reasons for the call-in. All the items with the exception of three had been called in the following grounds:

- (a) inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision
- (b) the absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision;
- (c) the decision is contrary to the policy framework of the Council; and
- (d) the action is not proportionate to the desired outcome.

Agenda items 7(a), “Item 5 – Civic Centre Car Parking Subsidies”, and 7(k), “Item 76 – Cease Music Teaching Subsidy” had been called in on grounds (a) to (c) only, and agenda item 7(j), “Item 67 – Close Harrow Teachers’ Centre Library” had been called in on grounds (a) and (b) only.

(i) Item 17 - Focus Clothing Grants on Real Need:

The Interim Director (Business Services) explained the background to this decision, and a Member representing the signatories to the call-in notice summarised the grounds for the call-in.

In response to Members’ detailed questions, further information was provided on a number of issues. It was noted that it was within the Council’s discretionary powers to decide whether or not to provide this grant, and that, prior to this decision, Harrow had been the most generous authority in London. In addition, schools had balances of £10m, in comparison with the Council’s balances of £2.5m, and schools had received a 6% increase in funding this year, in comparison with a 2% increase in the Council’s funding. A Member suggested that schools could provide this grant in future.

The Sub-Committee was concerned, however, that there had been no consultation prior to this decision, particularly with schools, and it was also noted that parents had not been informed of the date on which this decision would come into effect.

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

(ii) Item 76 - Cease Music Teaching Subsidy:

An officer reported that there would be consultation on the removal of this subsidy, as the contract still had some time to run; consultation had not been carried out prior to the Cabinet meeting as it was known that there was still time to consult, and a commitment to do this had been made.

A Member representing the signatories to the call-in argued, however, that there should have been consultation with schools and service users prior to the decision, as there was a risk that schools may choose not to buy back the service. It was noted that Harrow’s was among the higher-costing music services in London due to the high quality of the teachers, and some schools had already opted out of the Council’s service as they could buy it cheaper elsewhere.

Members of the Sub-Committee were also concerned that there had been no consultation with schools, service users and Harrow Young Musicians, and it was

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

(iii) Item 44 - Public Realm Maintenance - Parks Locking:

The Executive Director (Urban Living) explained the reasons for this decision. He also reported that Harrow Police had been apprised of the proposal to stop locking parks through the Harrow Strategic Partnership, and there was still an opportunity to engage with the community on this, as it was a task that residents could possibly take on; the Council would be seeking to do that in relation to specific sites. It had not been possible to consult residents beforehand, however, due to the urgency of the decision.

A Member representing the signatories to the call-in felt that the Harrow Strategic Partnership had not been properly consulted and argued that there should have been consultation prior to the decision with park user groups, residents living in the vicinity of parks, residents' associations, Ward Members, the police, staff and Trade Unions. He doubted whether residents would be able to take on the task of locking and unlocking parks, and it was suggested that there may be issues relating to liability.

The Sub-Committee

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

(See also Minute 3).

(iv) Item 27 - Reduce Subsidised Legal Support to Schools:

The Director of Legal Services responded to the issues outlined in the call-in notice. He stated that consultation with schools on the reduction of subsidised legal support had been on-going for several months via the Primary and Secondary Schools Group, which was the headteachers' preferred forum. Schools valued the legal service and were willing to pay for it. He added that there was nothing to stop schools from taking ill-advised decisions currently as lawyers did not attend all Governing Body panel meetings; the policy framework did not state that the Council should provide a subsidised legal service to schools; and schools recognised that they currently paid only a nominal fee for a good service.

A Member representing the signatories to the call-in felt that consultation with headteachers did not constitute consultation with schools, as Governors sat on the panels for which legal advice was required. He considered that there should have been consultation with Governing Bodies and the Education Consultative Forum. In addition, he questioned whether the £10,000 saving arising from the decision was worth the risk of schools opting out of the service and acting without legal advice, with possible disastrous effects and significant costs to the Council. It was confirmed that this was a risk, but it had been flagged up.

Upon a vote, and with the Chair using his second and casting vote, it was

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

(v) Item 67 - Close Harrow Teachers' Centre Library:

Members were informed of the background to the decision to close the library at the Teachers' Centre. Following a Best Value Review in 2004, the library at the Teachers' Centre had changed from a buy-back service to a pay-as-you-go service, as part of a package of measures to make the Teachers' Centre self-financing. During that time, there had been consultation of all users and major-funding stakeholders. A Member representing the signatories to the call-in felt that this was inadequate, however, and that there should have been consultation on the library's closure with schools.

It was noted that resources currently available in the Teachers' Centre Library would be re-located elsewhere; some of them would be put onto the electronic library catalogue located in the Civic Centre Library, and would be more accessible as a result.

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

- (vi) Item 77 - Cancel involvement in Community Sports Coaching Scheme:
It was confirmed that there had been no consultation on the proposal to cancel involvement in the community sports coaching scheme, and that the Council would lose access to coaches as a result. There may be funding available for the scheme from other sources, but this was not guaranteed.

A Member representing the signatories to the call-in stated that this decision would involve withdrawing from a partnership with other Boroughs, and argued that, given that the saving arising from this decision was only £13K, the action was disproportionate to the outcome.

The Sub-Committee

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

- (vii) Item 5 - Civic Centre Car Parking Subsidies:
It was reported that consultation on this decision had been carried out with staff and unions, and that further consultation would be carried out by the Project Team who were developing the details of the scheme. In addition, the proposal was not contrary to the Council's statutory policy framework, as the Council's Strategy for People was not a statutory policy. The proposal was in line, however, with the Council's Green Travel Plan.

A Member representing the signatories to the call-in stated that there should have been consultation with Members and other stakeholders. It was advised that there had been Member briefings on the budget report, but that there would be further consultation with Members and other tenants on the Civic Centre site.

Some Members of the Sub-Committee were concerned that stakeholders were being consulted after the event, but it was noted that the largest stakeholder group, ie staff, had been consulted prior to the decision.

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

- (viii) Item 14 - Harrow Saves:
A Member representing the signatories to the call-in stated that their concerns related particularly to the decision to stop expenditure on conferences and seminars, and on journals and subscriptions.

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy explained the reasons for this decision. It was also clarified that where a training course or journal subscription was essential to a role, for example due to Continuing Professional Development requirements, this would continue. Many staff development activities were done in-house so these would also continue. It had not been considered appropriate to carry out formal consultation with staff on these measures, as Directors had agreed them and had informed their teams.

The Sub-Committee unanimously rejected the call-in, but suggested that the exceptions to the decision, as clarified above, be communicated to staff.

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

- (ix) Item 35 - Peel House Car Park, Wealdstone-reduce opening hours to 8.30pm:
Members were informed that the opening hours of Peel House Car Park had been extended in 2004 in line with the opening hours of the Wealdstone Centre library, but that the latter had subsequently been reduced. It had not been possible to consult with users, as there were very few users of the facility after 8.30 pm, and consultation on the reduction of the car park's opening hours had therefore been limited to the Library Service. A Member representing the signatories to the call-in stated, however, that the original extension of the opening hours had also been in response to requests from traders, and that they and Ward Members should have been consulted. In addition, a Member

of the Sub-Committee highlighted that there was a temple in Wealdstone, and that when the temple held events, other car parks were often full.

Members of the Sub-Committee agreed to uphold the call-in on the grounds of inadequate consultation, and suggested that there should have been consultation prior to the decision with traders operating in the evening, Ward Members and the local temple.

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

(x) Item 46 - Withdraw from Town Centre Management Initiative:

The Executive Director (Urban Living) outlined the background to this decision. He highlighted that the Town Centre Management Initiative was a wholly discretionary service, and that the Council's focus was shifting from the management to the development of the town centre. There had been consultation on the decision with the Chair of the Harrow Town Centre Forum (HTCF). A Member representing the signatories to the call-in felt, however, that there should also have been consultation with traders, Harrow in Business and Harrow Chamber of Commerce.

It was noted that more than half the funding for the initiative came from the Council, with the rest provided by retailers, but that the HTCF had built up balances; it may therefore be able to continue without Council funding.

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

(xi) Item 47 - Stop Indemnity Insurance cover Provided for Building Control Surveyors:

The Member representing the signatories to the call-in expressed concern that the Audit Committee had not been consulted on this decision, contrary to advice from officers, and that there had been no consultation with staff. The Sub-Committee was informed, however, that the Service Manager in Building Control had provided a response to the proposal, and this was read out at the meeting. In addition, it was noted that the insurance cover had been introduced in 2002 when the Council was doing work for the Brent and Harrow Health Authority, but that that arrangement had now ceased, and since then a personal indemnity scheme had been introduced which meant that the Council indemnified staff.

It was unanimously

RESOLVED: That the grounds for the call-in be rejected and the decision be implemented.

(xii) Item 47 - Reduce Agency Staff in Development Control and Reduce Contract and Permanent Staff within Conservation and Design:

The Executive Director (Urban Living) explained the implications of the decision, and clarified the position with regard to the Planning Delivery Grant. He added that it had not been considered necessary to consult the Development Control Committee but only to advise them of the decision, since their role was to determine applications. A Member representing the signatories to the call-in argued, however, that the Committee should have been consulted in light of the possible impact on the Planning Service.

The Sub-Committee agreed that the call-in be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation, and suggested that the Development Control Committee should be consulted on the decision. The other grounds for call-in were rejected.

RESOLVED: That the call-in of this decision be upheld on the grounds of inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision, and that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration.

8. **Extensions of the Meeting:**
In accordance with the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 6.6(ii)(b), it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 9.58 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) at 10.29 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(3) at 10.57 pm to continue until 11.15 pm;

(4) at 11.11 pm to continue until 11.30 pm;

(5) at 11.28 pm to continue until 11.45 pm;

(6) at 11.44 pm to continue until 11.50 pm;

(7) at 11.50 pm to continue until 11.55 pm.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.33 pm, closed at 11.54 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANTHONY SEYMOUR
Chairman

**ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY
SUB-COMMITTEE****13 SEPTEMBER 2006**

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Myra Michael

Councillors: * Mrs Lurline Champagnie * Julia Merison
* Mrs Margaret Davine * Joyce Nickolay
* David Gawn * Mrs Rekha Shah

Adviser (non-voting): Jean Bradlow

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillor Eric Silver also attended to speak on the item indicated at Minute 30 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**23. **Attendance by Reserve Members:****RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.24. **Declarations of Interest:****RESOLVED:** To note that the following interest was declared:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Mrs Rekha Shah	Declared a personal interest in that she was an employee of Brent Council Social Services.

25. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present.26. **Minutes:****RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2006 be deferred to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.27. **Public Questions:****RESOLVED:** That the following questions be received under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8:

1.

Questioner: Ann Freeman**Asked of:** Councillor Myra Michael (Chair of Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee)**Question:** "Will you please ensure that the outcomes of the following be taken into consideration before a decision is taken to close Wiseworks Enterprises and lose the Wiseworks site?"

1. Director of Public Health in conjunction with MH Partnership Board is starting a needs assessment of those with mental illness on 13 September as first stage of implementing the new Joint Commissioning Strategy "Transforming our Adult Mental Health Services" agreed by integration board;
2. Anne Whitehead, Harrow PCT, has started consulting widely on implementing a Disability Equality scheme that has to be in place by December 5th. The scheme must have "Ways of measuring...services and making them better; make sure there is the same level of service for disabled

and non disabled people; take steps to meet disabled people's needs." The new legal Equality Duty says that "...if a service is to change, we want to include disabled people to find out if a new service will be more or less difficult to use."

3. Work of other Harrow groups such as MH Promotion Board, CPA Implementation Review Comm and Statistics for CNWL MH Trust on complaints, suicides, injury and sexual abuse should ideally be looked at, too?"

2.

Questioner: Joan West

Asked of: Councillor Myra Michael (Chair of Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee)

Question: "Could you produce a full and complete list of all services provided by Wiseworks' staff to clients, ensuring this information is sent to everyone receiving the consultation document?"

3.

Questioner: Alan Brown

Asked of: Councillor Myra Michael (Chair of Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee)

Question: "The current consultation pack only addresses the 'Proposed re-provision of services currently at Wiseworks' and assumes that the Wiseworks building will be closed. Why has Harrow Council still failed to consult users, carers and the public about the closure of the Wiseworks building?"

4.

Questioner: Joan Penrose

Asked of: Councillor Myra Michael (Chair of Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee)

Question: "It is not possible to have a meaningful consultation when the staff who provide the service under discussion are banned from talking to stakeholders. Will you ensure that Wiseworks front line staff are permitted to join in this consultation with other care providers, clients and carers – with immediate effect?"

[Note: Oral responses were given to all questions. Each questioner then asked a supplemental question which the Chairman referred to the Portfolio Holder - People First for a direct response].

28. **Petitions:**

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

29. **Deputations:**

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

30. **Department of Health White Paper - 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say':**

The Director of Adult Social Services presented a report to the Sub-Committee outlining the provisions of the Government White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say'. The Director explained that the White Paper would have significant implications for the delivery of health and social care services, including:

- further expansion in the numbers of people using direct payments as an alternative to direct provision or Council Commissioned services;

- development of 'individualised budgets';
- emphasis on preventative health care with improved access to services;
- improved access to community services;
- improved care for those with long-term conditions;
- relocating care closer to where people live.

It was explained that there was to be an emphasis on joint working between NHS bodies and Local Authorities in order to attain these goals, and that changes in this regard would be the primary means by which the White Paper's provisions would be funded. To this end, the Council and PCT had established the Health and Social Care Integration Board, through which the development of integrated services could be considered and overseen.

Members queried plans to expand the direct payments scheme, and the existing number of those on the scheme. It was explained that the number of people receiving direct payments had increased considerably since the scheme's introduction, and that there were now 70 people in the Borough receiving direct payments. Training and guidance was also being provided through the voluntary sector to increase this number.

In response to questions regarding the financial position of the bodies involved and how this might impact upon the proposals, the Sub-Committee heard that efficiencies would have to be found by both the Council and the PCT, and that dialogue was important in this.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

31. **Central and North West London NHS Mental Health Trust - Application to Become a NHS Foundation Trust:**

The Sub-Committee received a report from Dr Peter Carter, Chief Executive of Central and North West London NHS Mental Health Trust, detailing the Trust's application to become an NHS Foundation Trust.

In presenting the report, the following points were raised:

- there would be three phases in becoming a Foundation Trust, including public consultation in the first phase, culminating between January and April 2007;
- becoming a Foundation Trust would increase accountability to local people and staff who could become members and governors, whilst the Trust would remain part of the NHS and subject to its standards;
- becoming a Foundation Trust would increase financial stability through legally binding contracts;
- future plans included improved premises for drug and alcohol detoxification in-patient services, as well as development of adolescent in-patient services, amongst others.

During the discussion that followed, it was emphasised that the Trust, if successful in its application, would remain funded by Harrow PCT and obligated to provide key services, although the PCT could elect to purchase some services from other providers. It was therefore important that the Trust be able to compete in a market setting, and this would help ensure that the Trust was attuned to local needs.

It was added that the Trust's finances would be in part overseen by 'Monitor', but also that there would be accountability to board members.

The Chief Executive also added that the feedback received so far as part of the consultation exercise had generally been positive.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

32. **Harrow Primary Care Trust - Update on Financial Position, including Recovery Plan:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Executive, Harrow Primary Care Trust, detailing the Trust's current financial position. The Sub-Committee heard that

the Trust was obliged to break-even this year and to repay £2.5 million of historical or 'legacy' debt, out of a total of £11 million.

The Chief Executive explained that the Trust was achieving its targets for the current period, with £3.9 million of planned savings delivered. However, pressures such as an increase in activity had meant that the budget was so far £2.6 million overspent. In addition to this, an extra £400,000 'topslice' was required by the London Strategic Health Authority (SHA), and the Trust had heard that the anticipated budget allocated from the Department of Health would be smaller than first thought. This meant that a further £2.1 million of savings was required.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

33. **North West London Hospitals Trust - Update on Financial Position including Recovery Plan:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Finance, North West London Hospitals' Trust, setting out the Trust's financial position.

It was explained that the Trust had first experienced difficulty in 2002/2003, and that revisions to the way Trusts were required to account meant that past deficits, as well as in year deficits, had to be reported. As a result, the overspend figure of £32 million took into account these previous deficits; the 2006 portion of this was £6.3 million. However, the Trust's recovery plan had set out a target deficit of £11.1 million for this point, and so this had been met.

In isolating specific areas of savings, the Director of Finance stated that whilst the Trust had fallen behind in intended savings, unplanned underspend had compensated. However, Accident and Emergency incidents had increased significantly, and this had meant the Trust had needed additional funding from the PCT.

The Sub-Committee head that the Trust aimed to improve processes of care, and in turn, efficiency in all disciplines. However, the Director gave the Sub-Committee his assurance that patient care would not be compromised. Procurement was being improved, and outpatient capacity would be reduced in line with demand with local conditions.

It was explained that the Trust currently needed a cash injection from the Department of Health, which had been agreed, but that the Trusts' objective was to break even every month from November 2007.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Finance stated that the Trust had a policy of minimising redundancies in seeking these efficiencies, and that staff were being redeployed where possible. Where redundancies would be made, emphasis would be on back-office positions, with the impact on front-lined staff minimised.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

34. **Northwick Park Hospital - Update:**

The Chief Executive of Northwick Park Hospital updated the Sub-Committee on developments at the maternity unit, following publication in August 2006 of the Health Care Commission's (HCC) Part 2 investigation into ten maternal deaths there.

The Chief Executive emphasised that the HCC had commented on the Trust's progress in implementing reforms laid out in special measures, but that primarily the report focused on the women who had died.

The Sub-Committee heard that whilst special measures were still in place, the HCC had reviewed the Trust's progress and would report in due course. It was added that it had not been envisaged that special measures would be lifted before this point.

In response to Members' questions, the Sub-Committee heard that provisions for whistleblowing had been reviewed and updated, and that the culture of the maternity unit had changed; there was now the right number of supervisors, and a different management team in place. In addition to this, reviews of clinical incidents and 'near-misses' had been improved and appropriate systems had been put in place to deal with clinical risk.

The Chief Executive stated that the number of women to be treated annually had been capped at 4,700, and that there would be no reductions in staff in 2006.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

35. **Harrow PCT Community Facilities Consultation: Update and Outcomes:**

The Director of Corporate Performance, Harrow PCT, presented a report updating the Sub-Committee on the Community Facilities Consultation and its outcomes. It was reported that services had been transferred from both the Cecil Park and Northolt Road Clinics, excepting neonatal classes which would be run from Pinner Village Hall.

The Sub-Committee heard that the Trust had contacted London Buses in order to swap the routes of the 398 and H12 buses and so improve access to the site, but had been informed that this would not be possible. The Director stated that the Trust would work with community groups to challenge the analysis on which this position was based and re-approach London Buses, but that in the meantime, 'Dial A Ride' would be used to support patients who required transport.

During the discussion that followed, the Sub-Committee heard that GPs had expressed interest in relocating to the site, and that some minor surgery had also been scheduled to take place there. In addition, it was explained that the Cecil Park and Northolt Road sites were both currently on an internal NHS estates register where they would remain for a fixed period before being sold on the open market, if no interest was forthcoming.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

36. **Outcomes from the PCT Review of Sexual Health:**

The Sub-Committee received a report from the Director of Public Health for Harrow PCT and Adviser to the Sub-Committee, outlining the PCT review of sexual health. The Sub-Committee heard that sexual health was a key public health issue, and that the report in turn set out the state of sexual health nationally as well as in Harrow, and the PCT's strategy for improvement, which had been developed through consultation with a wide range of stakeholders.

The Sub-Committee was informed that the provision of prevention services in the Borough had been re-tendered after working with the Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS). In addition, the Director of Public Health stated that the Department of Health was to produce a report focusing on the national level, which could be presented to the Sub-Committee if it desired.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

37. **Community Plan for Harrow 2006-2020:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy regarding the Community Plan for Harrow. An officer stated that the plan had first been produced in 2004 with the aim of identifying and achieving a positive future direction for Harrow, and had been formulated with short to medium-term goals in order to foster a partnership style of working with local communities.

The document presented to the Sub-Committee was therefore a draft version of the refreshed plan, formulated on the back of a summit held in July 2006. It was explained that the final phase would be a three-year action plan, updated yearly.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

38. **Extension of the Guillotine:**

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 6.6 it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.15 pm;

(2) at 10.15 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

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

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.45 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MYRA MICHAEL
Chairman

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND
ENTERPRISE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE****25 SEPTEMBER 2006**

Chairman: * Councillor Richard Romain

Councillors: * Ms Nana Asante * Jerry Miles
* Graham Henson Narinder Singh Mudhar
* Ashok Kulkarni

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**16. **Attendance by Reserve Members:****RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.17. **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.18. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present.19. **Minutes:****RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2006 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.20. **Public Questions:****RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rule 8.21. **Petitions:****RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rule 9.22. **Deputations:****RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.23. **References from Council and Other Committees/Panels:****RESOLVED:** To note that no references were received from Council or other Committees/Panels.24. **Challenge Panel - Water Management and Drought Final Report:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which introduced the final report of the Water Management and Drought Challenge Panel.

The Chairman of the Challenge Panel highlighted some of the key findings of the Panel, which included the need for improved consultation between the water companies and the Council, and the need to introduce compulsory metering to help save water.

The Sub-Committee thanked the scrutiny officer for his research and organisation, and noted that a press release had been issued on the report. The Sub-Committee also expressed its dissatisfaction with Three Valleys Water's definition of 'permitted' or 'acceptable' loss, which amounted to 140 million litres of water per day.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report be noted;

(2) the Challenge Panel's findings and recommendations be endorsed;

(3) the report be submitted to the Cabinet at the next available opportunity.

25. **Light Touch Review - Residents' Information Pack Final Report:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which introduced the final report of the Light Touch Review of the Residents' Information Pack.

The Chairman of the Review presented the report and thanked the scrutiny officer for his research and organisation. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee thanked the Review Chairman for his work and proposed that the recommendations of the report be divided into a "to do list" and a "wish list" before being presented to Cabinet.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report be noted;

(2) the Review report's findings and recommendations be endorsed;

(3) the Review report be submitted to Cabinet at the next available opportunity.

26. **Work Programme:**

The Chairman of the Sub-Committee stated that since there was uncertainty as to how Cabinet envisioned the role of Scrutiny, he proposed to leave the Work Programme for Years 2, 3 and 4 to be confirmed at a later meeting of the Sub-Committee.

The officer agreed to circulate an update on the Community Strategy to Members, and it was agreed that this item be removed from the Work Programme for the 8 March 2007 meeting. It was further agreed that the update on Waste Management be added to the 8 March 2007 meeting, and that the Decent Homes Capital Programme and Planning Effectiveness items be removed from the same meeting.

RESOLVED: That (1) the nature of the reviews to be undertaken for 2006-07 be approved;

(2) the review schedule for 2006-07 be approved;

(3) the review schedule for 2006-10 be approved in principle;

(4) the Work Programme for Sub-Committee meetings until March 2007 be approved, subject to the above amendments.

27. **Challenge Panel - Tourism Review - Scope:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy in relation to the scope of the Challenge Panel for the Tourism Review. It was noted that the purpose of the Panel would be to identify matters outstanding following the Tourism Review, and in the process to 'wrap up' the final outcome of the Review.

RESOLVED: That (1) Councillor Jerry Miles be appointed Chairman of the Challenge Panel;

(2) the plan for the Challenge Panel be agreed as outlined in the report; and

(3) a report be presented to the Sub-Committee in November 2006 on the Panel's findings.

28. **Challenge Panel - Borough-Wide Economic Development - Scope:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which provided a background to the development of the Council's Economic Development Strategy, and called on Members to make a number of decisions in relation to the scope of a Challenge Panel on Borough-wide Economic Development.

It was noted that economic development had recently been brought under the control of the Forward Planning team, which had itself moved to Urban Living from the Chief Executive's Directorate. Members were informed that this gave the Sub-Committee an excellent opportunity to review the work being undertaken by the Council in partnership with GHK (an external consultant) on this matter. The culmination of this work would form the basis of an economic development strategy to be drafted early in 2007. The remit of the Challenge Panel would be to examine this work, but also to investigate the issue of economic development in the Borough more broadly.

Members were informed that the first meeting of the Challenge Panel would likely be scheduled around 17/18 October 2006, with the intention of producing a report the following week. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee informed Members that he was keen for the Panel to include representatives of all three political groups.

RESOLVED: That (1) Councillor Richard Romain be appointed Chairman of the Panel unless another Member put him/herself forward for the position; and

(2) the plan for the Challenge Panel, as previously approved by the Chairman, be agreed.

29. **Review of Demography and Demographic Change - Preliminary Planning Information:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which gave preliminary planning information on the Review of Demography and Demographic Change. The scrutiny officer informed Members that he planned to present a scoping document to the Sub-Committee at its November 2006 meeting.

The Chairman expressed his concern that the Review should involve a range of people in the Borough to ensure the issue was carefully examined. The scrutiny officer confirmed that even though the first year of the Review would be a mapping exercise, this would involve going out of the Council to meet residents. It was also noted that although the Council held some statistical information on the demographic composition of the Borough, from the Census for example, there was less information on what people wanted from the Council. It was also important to listen to the needs of individual residents, rather than only engage with residents' and amenity groups.

The Chairman stated that he wished for all Members of the Sub-Committee to participate in the Review in whatever way they felt able.

RESOLVED: That (1) all Members participate in the four-year review programme;

(2) the project be fully planned and scoped; and

(3) the Review Group report back with a final scope in November 2006 prior to the commencement of the gathering of evidence.

30. **Any Other Business:**

Reports to Cabinet

Members agreed that when the Sub-Committee submitted review reports to Cabinet, the Chairman of the review should present them. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee offered to assist the Review Chairman if necessary.

Information Circular

The Chairman noted that, in its current format, the Strategic Performance Report presented in the Information Circular was not helpful to Members. Councillor Nana Asante agreed to liaise with the Scrutiny officer to discuss how the format and content of the Information Circular could be improved.

Agenda Timings

Members confirmed that they were happy with the way this meeting had been conducted in terms of the timed agenda.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.25 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR RICHARD DAVID ROMAIN
Chairman

**SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES
SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**
28 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Anthony Seymour

 Councillors: * Robert Benson * Stanley Sheinwald
 * G Chowdhury * Mrs Sasi Suresh
 * Dhirajlal Lavingia (1) * Keeki Thammaiah

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

[Note: Councillors Mrs Kinnear and Susan Hall attended to speak on the item indicated at Minute 23].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES

 16. **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 Mano Dharmarajah	Councillor Dhirajlal Lavingia

 17. **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.

 18. **Arrangement of Agenda:**
RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act	The report was received late as a result of the need for further consultation with Members on the report of the challenge panel. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, to enable Members to agree the report and to make a timely contribution to the Council's preparations for Corporate Assessment.
14. Terms of Reference	Proposed amendments to the Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference had not been finalised at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency, in order to avail themselves of the revised Terms of Reference agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

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

 19. **Minutes:**
RESOLVED: That the consideration and signing of the minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2006, be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

 20. **Public Questions:**
RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8.

21. **Petitions:**

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

22. **Deputations:**

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

23. **Questions and Answers with Portfolio Holder for Urban Living (Public Realm):**

The Chairman welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Urban Living (Public Realm) to the meeting. The Chairman invited Members to put their questions to the Portfolio Holder and stated that they could also ask supplemental questions.

Recycling and waste

Question 1: *What progress has been made on increasing the level of recycling?*

The Portfolio Holder responded that the level of recycling had increased from 26.7% to 30% this year, green box recycling had increased by 23% and the amount of plastic bottles and cans being recycled had trebled. There had also been an increase in organic recycling but the level of contamination was high, and brown bin tonnage had increased by 17% on last year. It was reported that the government had set a recycling target for Harrow of 40% by 2009/10 and that Harrow's level of recycling was the ninth highest London Borough.

In response to a supplementary question the Portfolio Holder informed the Sub-Committee that anyone who had placed an order for an additional green box would have it supplied. A Member responded that not all residents were aware they had to place an order and the Portfolio Holder requested that she be given the details of these individuals.

Question 2: *What lessons have been learned from recent changes to recycling that will be implemented when collections are changed in October?*

The Portfolio Holder responded that in July 2006, there had been a change in the frequency of collections and compulsory recycling had started (except for flats) across the whole of the Borough. The lesson that had been learned from this was that the implementation of changes should be phased in. In response to a supplementary question about improvements, the Portfolio Holder requested that if any incidents were reported to Members, she should be informed so that they could be investigated.

Question 3: *What plans are there for extending recycling to items that are currently going to landfill?*

The Portfolio Holder explained that the materials recycled would depend on the markets available but that drink cartons and all cardboard would probably be included. However, Harrow was close to reaching the maximum that could be diverted from landfill. She reported that Cabinet would be considering changes, including all recycled material being collected and sorted later to save time at the kerbside, and also the possible introduction of a blue box with the capacity of five green boxes.

In response to a supplementary question about where collected rubbish was taken, the Portfolio Holder explained that organic material was taken to Harefield and the rest was taken to the Civic Amenity Site.

Question 4: *How is the Council going to implement compulsory recycling in blocks of flats as anybody can put their rubbish into the flats' bins?*

The Portfolio Holder responded that there were no plans to extend compulsory recycling to flats as this would pose significant challenges as there was a lower level of personal responsibility. However 1,500 out of 19,000 flats had on-site recycling facilities and this figure would be improved.

A Member informed the Portfolio Holder that some flats had bins at the end of their drives and this was noted by the Portfolio Holder.

Question 5: *What support is in place to support elderly or disabled residents who find it difficult to leave bins near the edge of their property?*

The Portfolio Holder explained that an assisted collection scheme operated for those unable to manage bins and that demand for this service had been increasing. Some residents were being advised to use waste bins instead of their regular bins and that these would be collected by operatives.

Community safety

Question 6: *How is the Council assessing the impact of the introduction of third party reporting? Has it increased reporting so far?*

It was explained that there were 47 reports currently within the system including a significant number which had been carried over from previous systems or reported again through the system. Only 3 of these had been passed to the police for further investigation as potential offences and this figure was not above average for the period of time. The system was currently very new and it would not be possible to accurately predict reporting levels with confidence until it had been operating for at least 6 months. However it was critical in terms of the fact that some of the cases may not have been reported before the introduction of third party reporting and complainants were able to access reporting in their own communities and be referred to the agency of their choice. A multi-language initiative had also been started to enable all people to access the service.

Officers reported that third party reporting was started as it was recognised that Harrow had low reporting levels compared with high ethnic diversity in the resident population and that many people would not report to formal organisations without the system in place. This is why the reporting sites were in 11 community sites across Harrow and delivered by members of local communities for their own communities.

Cycling

Question 7: *What can the Council do to prevent parking on cycle lanes?*

The Portfolio Holder explained that there were two types of cycle lanes: advisory and mandatory, and that only mandatory ones could be enforced through Traffic Orders. The Council had decided to have advisory cycle lanes and prioritise joining up a network of cycle lanes. This would lead to more usage of cycle lanes and subsequently to a greater need for making the cycle lanes mandatory.

Street Lighting

Question 8: *What progress has been made regarding the PFI? How will the Council progress improvements if the bid is unsuccessful?*

The Portfolio Holder responded that the Council had submitted an expression of interest to the Department of Transport, which had awarded the Council PFI credits and asked them to submit a business case. It was acknowledged that the associated costs would be high. In response to a supplementary question about the fear of insufficient lighting, the Portfolio Holder reported that this matter would be considered during discussions.

Parks and Open Spaces

Question 9: *Did the Portfolio Holder liaise with the police and community groups before the decision was made to keep parks open at night, and what consultation plans does the Portfolio Holder have in the future for this?*

The Portfolio Holder responded that Members would be provided with a written response as this question had been submitted late and not all the required information was available. However she commented that there were plans to consult park users.

The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder for her responses.

The Sub-Committee considered the information provided in the appendices circulated with the agenda, in particular, the Strategic Performance Report – Quarter 1, 2006/07 and noted that many of the performance indicators were 'green'. Members requested further information from officers on the reasons some of the 'improve community safety' performance indicators were 'red'. An officer explained that robberies were now recorded differently, increasing the metrics of recording, and that identified prolific offenders who were responsible for the increased numbers, were being targeted. However, Harrow had the second lowest robbery rate in London and, overall, it had the lowest crime in London. The officer explained that, in Harrow, the fear of crime was disproportionate to actual crime.

Members asked questions about domestic violence rates and an officer reported that Harrow had the highest conviction rate in Harrow. The officer explained that the third party reporting sites used to report race crimes could also be used to report domestic violence.

RESOLVED: That the Portfolio Holder's responses and the Strategic Performance Report be noted.

24. **Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which updated Members on the work undertaken by the Sub-Committee since the last meeting.

Members discussed the content of the report of the Scrutiny Challenge Panel and commented that the report should be circulated to all Members of the Council, who should be offered training on Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report of the Challenge Panel be agreed;

(2) the comments received from the co-opted member be incorporated into the report;

(3) the Portfolio Holder for Business Development, subject to funding being made available, consider making available provision for suitable training to Members;

(4) the report be referred to Cabinet and the Safer Management Group;

(5) the report be circulated to all members of Council;

(6) the report be drawn to the attention of the Chairmen of the Licensing and General Purposes Committee and Development Control Committee.

25. **Consultation Draft of the Refreshed Community Plan:**

The Panel received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy which asked Members to consider and make comments on the consultation draft of the refreshed Community Plan. An officer explained that the Community Plan would replace the Community Strategy and set out the way in which Harrow would develop over the next 15 years. Consultation was taking place with over 70 community groups and Members. Members of the Sub-Committee were invited to provide comments individually or as a Sub-Committee before 27 October 2006.

In response to a question from a Member, the officer explained that 9 or 10 comments had been received from individuals and community groups and some had focused on there being too little about older people and disabled people in the report. He reported that in November 2006, the Harrow Strategic Partnership Board would consider the comments that had been received on the Community Plan.

A Member commented that Northwick Park Hospital did not have a stroke unit and that every hospital should have one as it was imperative to treat patients immediately after they had had a stroke. The officer informed the Member that this comment would be included as a formal comment of the report.

RESOLVED: That the report and comments be noted.

26. **Scrutiny Work Programme:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which asked Members to consider and agree the major topics to be included in the work programme for 2006/07 and to consider the scheduling of longer-term topics for the period 2006-2010.

Members considered whether the police could be invited to attend the January 2007 meeting for the items relating to alcohol misuse and performance reporting.

Members discussed the work programme for 2006/07 and the possibility of combining the proposed financial inclusion project with the fuel poverty as the next topic for review as they both related to anti-poverty initiatives and working with the voluntary sector. It was estimated that this review would take up a substantial part of the year.

Members thanked the scrutiny officer for her work.

RESOLVED: That (1) Anti-poverty/voluntary sector – financial inclusion and Anti-poverty – fuel poverty be combined as the next topic for review;

(2) the Borough Commander be invited to attend the January 2007 meeting;

(3) a representative of the police and a Council licensing officer be invited to attend the January 2007 meeting of the Sub-Committee for the item on alcohol misuse, alongside the Director of Public Health, Harrow PCT.

27. **Terms of Reference of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Sub Committee:**

RESOLVED: That the amended terms of reference be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.15 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANTHONY SEYMOUR
Chairman

DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 6 SEPTEMBER & 11 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath

Councillors:	* Robert Benson	* David Gawn
	* Don Billson (present on 6 September only)	* Thaya Idaikkadar
	* Mrinal Choudhury	* Manji Kara
	* G Chowdhury	* Narinder Singh Mudhar
	* Keith Ferry	* Joyce Nickolay
	* David Gawn	* Dinesh Solanki (1) (present on 11 September only)

* Denotes Member present

(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillors B E Gate, Mrs Kinnear, Ashok Kulkarni, Jean Lammiman, Chris Noyce and Mrs Anjana Patel also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 71 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

70. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that (1) no Reserve Members were in attendance at the meeting held on 6 September 2006;

(2) in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 3.4 (Part 4B of the Constitution) the following duly appointed Reserve Member was in attendance at the reconvened meeting held on 11 September 2006:

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Don Billson

Councillor Dinesh Solanki

71. **Right of Members to Speak:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillors, who were not Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda items indicated:

Councillors B E Gate, Ashok Kulkarni, Chris Noyce and Mrs Anjana Patel	Planning Application 1/03
--	---------------------------

Councillor Mrs Kinnear	Planning Application 2/13 and agenda item 18
------------------------	--

Councillor Jean Lammiman	Planning Application 1/05
--------------------------	---------------------------

72. **Declarations of Interest:**

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

(i) Planning Application 1/03 – Strongbridge Close, Harrow
Councillor B E Gate, who was not a member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in the above item arising from the fact that he had been a Member of the Management Board as a Local Authority representative until 2003. He wished it to be noted that the Management Board was now defunct.

(ii) Planning Applications 1/11 and 1/12 – Land at R/O Pinner United Reform Church, Paines Lane
Councillor Jean Lammiman, who was not a member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in the above items arising from the fact that she was a patient at the Pinn Medical Centre.

- (iii) Planning Applications 3/01 and 3/02 and Agenda Item 15 – Golds Gym, 1 Sheepcote Road
Councillor Narinder Singh Mudhar declared a personal interest in the above items arising from the fact that he was a member of the gym. Accordingly, he would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (iv) Agenda item 17 – Former Cloisters Wood Fitness Club
Councillors Mrinal Choudhury and Manji Kara declared a personal interest in the above item arising from the fact that they had occasionally visited the temple. Accordingly, they would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (v) Planning Application 2/13 – 45 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
Councillor Joyce Nickolay declared a prejudicial interest in the above item arising from the fact that she knew the son of the applicant. Accordingly, she would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.

73. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: (1) That, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's dispatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.
5. Minutes	The minutes had not been finalised when the main agenda had been printed and circulated.
15. 1 Sheepcote Road	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were requested to consider this item as a matter of urgency.

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

74. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the Chairman be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2006 as a correct record, once printed in the Council Bound Minute Volume.

75. **Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Last Meeting:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

76. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 19.

77. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note receipt of the following petitions which were referred to the Head of Planning for consideration:

- (i) Petition supporting the proposals for the development of Strongbridge Close
Ms Esther Lathan presented the above petition, which had been signed by 86 people.

- (ii) Petition opposing the scale of the proposed redevelopment of Strongbridge Close
Ms Jo Boyle presented the above petition, which had been signed by 742 residents of Fairview Crescent.

78. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17.

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

RESOLVED: To note that no references were received.

80. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

Having been advised of a late request by an objector to make representation in relation to planning application 2/06, the Committee

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 27.1 (Part 4B of the Constitution), Committee Procedure Rule 18.2 be suspended in order to receive a representation in respect of planning application 2/06;

(2) in addition, and in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/01, 1/03, 1/09, 1/14 and 2/12.

81. **Planning Applications Received:**

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

82. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

RESOLVED: To note the report.

83. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.

RESOLVED: To note the report.

84. **1 Sheepcote Road:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue a Listed Building Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 38 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, no sooner than 42 days after 6 September 2006, requiring:

- (i) the permanent removal of all plant, ducting, air-conditioning units, associated frames, supports and bolts on the east elevation wall;
- (ii) the painting in a black matt finish of all plant, ducting, air-conditioning units, associated frames, supports and bolts on the south elevation wall;
- (iii) the permanent removal of the constituent elements of the plant, ducting, air-conditioning units, associated frames, supports and bolts outlined in section (i) above.

(i), (ii) and (iii) should be complied with within a period of three (3) months 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;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

(See also Minute 73 and items 3/01 and 3/02 on the attached Schedule).

85. **Confirming a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) with an Objection:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning which sought the Committee's approval of TPO 853 in light of an objection received.

RESOLVED: That TPO 853 be confirmed.

86. **Former Cloisters Wood Fitness Club:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning which provided an update on planning permission ref: P/1306/05/CFU, which had been granted by the Committee on 7 June 2006.

RESOLVED: That (1) the update be noted;

(2) officers be requested to carry out an inspection of the premises and submit a report to the 5 October meeting of the Committee.

(See also Minute 72).

87. **102, 104, 106 High Street, Harrow on the Hill:**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning and the Director of Legal Services in this regard.

Having noted the officer's recommendation that no enforcement action be taken in this case, Members of the Committee expressed the view that they would like a second opinion on the matter and

RESOLVED: That officers be requested to (1) seek a second opinion from a suitably qualified and experienced non-Council conservation officer;

(2) invite all persons having an interest in the development/buildings to enter a Section 106 legal agreement with the Council regulating the use of the buildings for telecommunications equipment;

(3) make and serve appropriate requisitions on title/ownership of the buildings involved (104, 106 and 106A High Street).

(See also Minute 71).

88. **Member Site Visits:**

A Member of the Committee requested that a further Member site visit be arranged to 454 Alexandra Avenue, which the Committee had visited on 2 September 2006.

RESOLVED: That (1) Member visits to the following sites take place on Saturday 30 September 2006 from 9.00am:

1/05 - Pinner Park Farm
1/07 - The Flying Eagle public house
2/10 - South Winds, 1 South View Road
2/12 - 11 Temple Mead Close
454 Alexandra Avenue

(2) the Democratic Services Officer be requested to write to Members of the Committee to confirm the order and timing of the visits.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 10.00 pm on 6 September 2006 to continue until midnight;

(2) at 12 midnight to continue until 12.30 am;

(3) at 12.30 am to continue until 1.00 am;

(4) at 12.45 am that the meeting be adjourned, and that the meeting be reconvened at 7.30 pm on 11 September 2006;

(5) at 9.35 pm at the reconvened meeting on 11 September 2006 that the meeting would continue in the normal manner until all business remaining on the agenda had been completed.

[Notes: (i) At 12 midnight on 6 September 2006, it was proposed by the Chairman that the meeting continue until all applications for which there were members of the public present had been dealt with, at which time the meeting would adjourn, and that the meeting would reconvene at 7.30 pm on 11 September 2006. This was agreed by the general assent of the Committee, and it was therefore agreed to extend the meeting to 12.30 am in the first instance (as per Resolution 89(2) above), in order that all applications for which members of the public were present might be dealt with;

(ii) at 12.30 am the Chairman proposed that the meeting be extended to 1.00 am, which extension was not opposed by any member of the Committee;

(iii) at 12.35 am a member of the Committee queried whether it had been agreed formally that the meeting be extended beyond 12.30 am;

(iv) further to (iii) above, at 12.40 am it was moved and seconded that the meeting should then be extended to 1.00 am. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(v) Councillors Mrs Camilla Bath, Robert Benson, Don Billson, G Chowdhury, Narinder Singh Mudhar and Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the motion at (iv) above;

(vi) at 12.42 am Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, David Gawn and Thaya Idaikkadar left the meeting;

(vii) at 12.45 am, the meeting having considered main agenda items 1 to 11, main agenda item 17, and a number of planning applications under item 12 (1/01, 1/03, 1/04, 1/08, 1/09, 1/11, 1/12, 1/14 and 2/12) it was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned to 11 September 2006. Upon a vote, this was carried].

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm on 6 September 2006, adjourned at 12.45 am, reconvened at 7.30pm on 11 September 2006 and closed at 11.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CAMILLA BATH
Chairman

SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

LIST NO:	1/01	APPLICATION NO:	P/803/06/CFU
LOCATION:	31 Warren Lane, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Crest Nicholson (Chiltern) Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Construction of Conservatory Extensions to 17 'A' houses approved under Reserved Matters Ref: P/1650/05/CDP for 90 x 2/2.5 storey houses, 108 flats in 3 x 4 storey blocks, underground parking, roads and open space (amendment to P/1650/05/CDP)		
DECISION:	<p>DEFERRED to enable renotification to take place and for officers to investigate whether the proposed development exceeds the footprint of the previous development on the site.</p> <p>[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representation from an objector, which was noted;</p> <p>(2) there was no indication that the applicant or their representative was present and wished to respond;</p> <p>(3) during the discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for the reasons given above; upon being put to a vote, this was carried;</p> <p>(4) Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to defer the application].</p> <p>(See also Minute 80).</p>		

LIST NO:	1/02	APPLICATION NO:	P/1690/06/CFU
LOCATION:	Star House, 6 Garland Road, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Dovetail Architects for Devonshire (Stanmore) Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Second floor extension and re-cladding of elevations		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		

LIST NO:	1/03	APPLICATION NO:	P/2006/05/CFU
LOCATION:	Strongbridge Close, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	PRP Architects for Metropolitan Housing Trust		
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment to provide 260 units: 3 x 4/5 and 6 storey blocks of flats (Blocks A, B and F) 1 x block of 6 storey flats (Block G), 1 x block of 5 and 7 storey blocks of flats (Block H), 2 x blocks of 2 and 3 storey houses (Blocks C and D) and one block of 2 storey houses (Block E), roads, parking, and open space (revised proposal)		
DECISION:	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) The proposed development by reason of excessive height, scale and bulk of the 5, 6 and 7 storey blocks of flats would be an obtrusive and incongruous feature of this development and its relationship with existing properties on the respective boundaries of the site.</p> <p>(ii) The proposed development by reason of excessive height and siting would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy to residents in the surrounding roads.</p> <p>(iii) The lack of adequate car parking would give rise to overspill parking on the surrounding roads to the detriment of the amenity of the local residents.</p>		

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from two objectors and the applicant's representative, which were noted;

(2) during discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be granted subject to the submission of a travel plan for consideration by the Committee. Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;

(3) Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, David Gawn and Thaya Idaikkadar wished to be recorded as having voted for the motion referred to at Note (2) above;

(4) subsequently, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the reasons given above. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(5) Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, David Gawn and Thaya Idaikkadar wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision to refuse the application;

(6) the Head of Planning had recommended that the above application be granted].

(See also Minutes 71, 72, 77 and 80).

LIST NO:	1/04	APPLICATION NO:	P/2065/05/CFU
LOCATION:	Raebarn House, 86-100 Northolt Road, South Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Bennett Urban Planning for St James Group Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment to provide part 4/8/10 storey building to comprise 150 flats and offices, car parking and access (duplicate)		
DECISION:	DEFERRED at officers' request to be considered alongside the new revised planning application (P/2471/06) to be reported to the Committee on 5 October 2006.		
LIST NO:	1/05	APPLICATION NO:	P/2136/05/CFU
LOCATION:	Pinner Park Farm, George V Avenue, Pinner		
APPLICANT:	Michael Burroughs Associates for Hall & Sons		
PROPOSAL:	Use of part of site and a building for storage, office, parking and workshop in association with operation		
DECISION:	DEFERRED for Member site visit.		
	(See also Minutes 71 and 88).		
LIST NO:	1/06	APPLICATION NO:	P/1594/06/DFU
LOCATION:	Wealdstone Service Station, Station Road, Wealdstone		
APPLICANT:	Twigg Brown Architects for Stephen Howard Homes and Lupo Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment: Four storey building to provide Class A1 shop (249m ² in floor space) and 4 x 2 bed flats with 14 car parking spaces and demolition of existing petrol filling station		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, as amended on the Addendum.		
	[Note: The Committee noted that the description of the application that appeared on the agenda contained an error. The correct description is shown above].		

LIST NO: 1/07 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1225/06/CFU
LOCATION: The Flying Eagle Public House, Mollison Way, Edgware
APPLICANT: DWA Architects Limited for Lukka Care Homes Limited
PROPOSAL: Outline: Redevelopment to provide part 2 / part 3 storey residential care home with 53 bed spaces and 7 car parking spaces
DECISION: DEFERRED for Member site visit.
(See also Minute 88).

LIST NO: 1/08 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1615/06/CFU
LOCATION: The Gables, 92 & 94 Welldon Crescent, Harrow
APPLICANT: Gable Estates Limited for Gable Investments Limited
PROPOSAL: Change of use from multi-occupation to ten flats and first/second floor extension; garaging and parking
DECISION: WITHDRAWN by the applicant.

LIST NO: 1/09 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1532/06/COU
LOCATION: Edgware Town FC, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware
APPLICANT: Cornerstone Architects Ltd for Edgware Developments Ltd
PROPOSAL: Siting & access for redevelopment to provide 164 flats and 11 houses in nine blocks of three and five storey buildings
DECISION: INFORM the applicant that:

(1) the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within three months (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:

(i) approval by the Local Planning Authority prior to the start of development and implementation by the developer, and successors in title, of a Car Club within three calendar months of the first taxable occupation of any part of the development;

(ii) prior approval by the Local Planning Authority of the contents of a 'welcome pack' explaining all modes of transport other than privately owned cars and the issue of the same to all occupiers within seven days of occupation. Such packs to be issued by the developer, and successors in title, for a period of not less than five years from the first taxable occupation of the development;

(iii) the developer or successor in title shall fund all costs of public consultation, analysis, reporting and implementation of local on street parking restrictions, at any time within five years of the first taxable occupation if in the Council's opinion a monitoring period shows unacceptable local on street parking, up to a maximum of £15,000 index linked;

(iv) the applicant to pay Harrow Council the sum of £750,000 within 14 days of the date of the agreement. This sum will be used to carry out works for the promotion of football development within the Borough, eg. the completion of a stadium pitch at Prince Edward Playing Fields to Ryman League standard or an artificial turf pitch of similar quality;

(v) the provision of at least 30% affordable housing being 52 units in total. Such housing to be split into 70% social (38 rented) and 30% intermediate (14 for sale) housing;

(vi) the improvement of the existing or provision of a further pelican crossing to Burnt Oak Broadway and associated pedestrian routes up to a maximum of £85,000;

(vii) within 14 days of the execution of the agreement the applicant shall pay Harrow Council the sum of £25,000 for planning administration costs.

(2) a formal decision notice granting permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, as amended on the Addendum, will be issued only upon the completion by the applicant of the aforementioned legal agreement and the advertisement/referral of the application to the Government Office for London in accord with the Development Plans and Consultation Departure Direction 1999.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and the applicant's representative, which were noted;

(2) during discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred pending a decision on Prince Edward Playing Fields. Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;

(3) three members of the Committee having demanded a recorded vote by roll call, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 21.4, it was noted that Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, David Gawn and Thaya Idaikkadar had voted for the motion referred to at Note (2) above; Councillors Mrs Camilla Bath, Don Billson, G Chowdhury, Narinder Singh Mudhar and Joyce Nickolay had voted against the motion; and Councillors Robert Benson and Manji Kara had abstained;

(4) following advice from the legal officer, the Committee noted that the last sentence of Reason 1 on page 71 of the officer report should read "Members will note that the capital sum is payable within 14 days of the completion of the legal agreement.". The applicant, who was in attendance, confirmed that this was correct;

(5) subsequently, it was moved and seconded that the application be granted subject to paragraph 1(iii) of the legal agreement being changed to "...at any time within 5 years...". Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(6) three members of the Committee having demanded a recorded vote by roll call, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 21.4, it was noted that Councillors Mrs Camilla Bath, Robert Benson, Don Billson, G Chowdhury, Manji Kara, Narinder Singh Mudhar and Joyce Nickolay had voted for the motion; and Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, David Gawn and Thaya Idaikkadar had voted against the motion referred to at Note (5) above].

(See also Minute 80).

LIST NO:	1/10	APPLICATION NO:	P/1782/06/CFU
LOCATION:	Whitefriars First & Middle School. Whitefriars Avenue, Wealdstone		
APPLICANT:	Mr Allen Gibbons for Harrow Council		
PROPOSAL:	Alteration & extension of school buildings & formation of Children's Centre		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		

LIST NO:	1/11	APPLICATION NO:	P/1734/06/CFU
LOCATION:	Land at r/o Pinner United Reform Church, Paines Lane		
APPLICANT:	Gibberd Ltd for Carecapital Ltd		

PROPOSAL: Erection of Health Centre, attached pharmacy, bridge and car park
DECISION: DEFERRED at officers' request for further negotiations and amendments to overcome objections.
 (See also Minute 72).

LIST NO: 1/12 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1733/06/DCA
LOCATION: Land at r/o Pinner United Reform Church, Paines Lane
APPLICANT: Gibberd Ltd for Carecapital Ltd
PROPOSAL: Demolition of Scout Huts
DECISION: DEFERRED at officers' request for further negotiations and amendments to overcome objections.
 (See also Minute 72).

LIST NO: 1/13 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1386/06/CFU
LOCATION: Stonegrove Filling Station, High Street, Edgware
APPLICANT: Rolfe Judd Planning for Greendev LLP
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment: Part four part five storey building to provide 26 flats (16 x 1 bed and 10 x 2 bed) with 22 basement car parking spaces and demolition of existing petrol filling station
DECISION: INFORM the applicant that:
 (1) the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:
 (i) submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme which:
 (a) provides a minimum of 9 units of affordable housing for shared ownership occupation in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (for future management by an RSL).
 (b) ensures that the affordable housing units are available for occupation in accordance with a building and occupation programme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work on the site. All affordable housing units shall be provided in accordance with the definition of affordable housing set out in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.
 (2) a formal decision notice granting permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon the completion by the applicant of the aforementioned legal agreement.

LIST NO: 1/14 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1764/06/CAD
LOCATION: Bentley Grove (The Grove), Warren Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Crest Nicholson Chiltern Ltd
PROPOSAL: Retention of hoarding & display of advertisement
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informative reported, as amended on the Addendum.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representation from an objector, which was noted;

(2) there was no indication that the applicant or their representative was present and wished to respond;

(3) during voting on the substantive motion to grant the application as per the officer's recommendation, the legal officer advised that Councillors Keith Ferry and Thaya Idaikkadar were not eligible to vote as they had not been present in the meeting room for the entire debate in relation to the item;

(4) having been put to a vote, the application was granted].

(See also Minute 80).

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO: 2/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2512/05/CFU
LOCATION: Rosehill, 135 Wood Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Geoff Beardsley & Partners Ltd for A Townswadey & M Chapell
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment: Detached two storey house and double garage
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2513/05/CCA
LOCATION: Rosehill, 135 Wood Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Geoff Beardsley & Partners Ltd for A Townswadey & M Chapell
PROPOSAL: Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of existing house and outbuildings
DECISION: GRANTED Conservation Area Consent for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1669/06/CVA
LOCATION: 168-172 Honeypot Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Indigo Planning for UK & European Investments Ltd
PROPOSAL: Variation of Condition 9 of Planning Permission P/2972/05/CFU to allow hours of use from 06.30 to 20.00 on Monday to Friday, 07.00 to 16.00 on Saturday, 09.00 to 16.00 Sunday
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application, subject to the condition and informative reported, as amended on the Addendum.

LIST NO: 2/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1608/06/CFU
LOCATION: 6 Fauna Close, Brockley Park, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Dr Colin Elton
PROPOSAL: Outbuilding in rear garden
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/821/06/DVA
LOCATION: Alexandra Avenue Clinic, 245 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow
APPLICANT: Drivers Jonas Surveyors
PROPOSAL: Removal of Condition 13 (requiring the provision of 4 wheelchair accessible homes) and variation of Condition 16 (relating to the provision of 10 key worker homes) of Planning Permission P/1776/03/CFU
DECISION: (1) GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions reported, as amended on the Addendum.
(2) RESOLVED That officers be requested to invite the Council's Access Officer to attend site, with Councillor David Gawn, to investigate DDA issues.

LIST NO: 2/06 **APPLICATION NO:** P/74/06/DFU
LOCATION: Ebberston, 39 South Hill Avenue, Harrow
APPLICANT: Kenneth W Reed & Assocs for Mr & Mrs J Snowdon
PROPOSAL: First floor rear extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.
(See also Minute 80).

LIST NO: 2/07 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1692/06/DFU
LOCATION: Pinner Bowling Club, Pinner Memorial Park, Pinner
APPLICANT: Dennis Granston for Pinner Bowling Club
PROPOSAL: Single storey side extensions to bowling pavilion (revised)
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/08 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2415/05/COU
LOCATION: West Lodge, The Grove, Warren Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Reynard Designs for Mr & Mrs J Briggs
PROPOSAL: Outline: Replacement detached house
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informative reported.

LIST NO: 2/09 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2302/05/CFU
LOCATION: Priory Lodge, Priory Drive, Stanmore
APPLICANT: N Kotak Associates for Mr M Shah
PROPOSAL: Retention of two garden buildings
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the informative reported.

LIST NO: 2/10 **APPLICATION NO:** P/935/05/CFU
LOCATION: South Winds, 1 South View Road, Pinner
APPLICANT: Mr Anil Patel
PROPOSAL: Fencing to front and rear boundaries
DECISION: DEFERRED for Member site visit.
(See also Minute 88).

LIST NO: 2/11 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1510/06/CFU
LOCATION: Land adjacent to 74 Uxbridge Road, Harrow Weald
APPLICANT: AAP Consulting for Hutchison 3G (UK) Ltd
PROPOSAL: Replacement of existing 15m high telecoms mast with new 16.7m high telecoms mast
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/12 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1622/06/DFU
LOCATION: 11 Temple Mead Close, Stanmore
APPLICANT: David R Yeaman & Associates for Mr D Balaria
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment to provide 2 x single/detached houses with parking (revised)
DECISION: DEFERRED for a Member site visit, to include the neighbouring property.

[Note: Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector, and the applicant's representative, which were noted].
(See also Minutes 80 and 88).

LIST NO: 2/13 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2032/06/DFU
LOCATION: 45 High Street, Harrow
APPLICANT: DPG Development Consultants for Mr T Harris
PROPOSAL: Change of use of basement and ground floors from residential (Class C3) to office (Class A2)
DECISION: DEFERRED to enable officers to investigate the history of the usage of the building since 1992.
(See also Minutes 71 and 72).

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/7/03/CCO
LOCATION: Golds Gym, 1 Sheepecote Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Draper Neal Associates for Golds Gym
PROPOSAL: Retention of plant and ducting on side and rear elevations
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason reported.
(See also Minutes 72 and 84).

LIST NO: 3/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/38/03/CLB
LOCATION: Golds Gym, 1 Sheepcote Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Draper Neal Associates for Golds Gym
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: Retention of plant and ducting to rear side of elevations
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason reported.

(See also Minutes 72 and 84).

REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath

Councillors:	* Robert Benson	* Thaya Idaikkadar
	* Don Billson	* Manji Kara
	* Mrinal Choudhury	* Narinder Singh Mudhar
	* G Chowdhury	* Joyce Nickolay
	* Keith Ferry	* David Perry (1)

* Denotes Member present

(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillors Jerry Miles and Paul Scott also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 91 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES
90. 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 David Gawn	Councillor David Perry

91. Right of Members to Speak:

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillors, who were not Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda items indicated:

Councillor Jerry Miles	Planning Applications 2/02 and 2/03
Councillor Paul Scott	Planning Application 2/08

92. Declarations of Interest:

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

- (i) Planning Applications 2/14 and 2/15 – 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
Councillor Joyce Nickolay declared a personal interest in the above related items arising from the fact that she knew the son of the applicant. Accordingly, she would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item. Councillor Joyce Nickolay wished it to be noted that, on previous occasions, she had declared a prejudicial interest in items associated with this person because the applicant's son had formerly been a Harrow Councillor.
- (ii) Planning Application 3/01 – 274-278 Northolt Road, South Harrow
Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar declared a prejudicial interest in the above application arising from the fact that he had been a member of the Licensing Panel that had determined the licensing application. Accordingly, he would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.

93. 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>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's dispatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

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

94. **Minutes:**
RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2006 be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.
95. **Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Last Meeting:**
RESOLVED: To note that there were no matters arising.
96. **Public Questions:**
RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 19.
97. **Petitions:**
RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16.
98. **Deputations:**
RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17.
99. **References from Council and other Committees/Panels:**
RESOLVED: To note that there were no references from Council or other Committees or Panels received at this meeting.
100. **Representations on Planning Applications:**
RESOLVED: In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 18 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 2/01, 2/02, 2/03 and 2/10.
 [Note: Subsequently, item 2/01 was deferred and the objector did not make representation at this meeting].
101. **Planning Applications Received:**
RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Head of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.
102. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**
 The Committee received a report of the Head of Planning which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.
RESOLVED: To note the report.
103. **Member Site Visits:**
RESOLVED: (1) That Member visits to the following sites take place on Saturday 7 October 2006 from 9.00 am:
 2/06 – Heriots, The Common, Stanmore
 2/07 – Weald Cottage, Brookshill Drive, Harrow
 2/10 – John Lyon School Playing Fields, Sudbury Hill
 (2) the Democratic Services Officer be requested to write to Members of the Committee to confirm the order and timing of the visits;

(3) to note that a Member site visit to 454 Alexandra Avenue (item 2/01 on the list of planning applications) had been agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 6 September 2006 (which had adjourned to 11 September 2006).

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

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.15 pm;

(2) at 10.15 pm to continue until all business remaining on the agenda had been completed.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR CAMILLA BATH
Chairman

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO: 2/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/764/06/DFU
LOCATION: 454 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow
APPLICANT: Jeremy Peters Associates for Stampdile Ltd
PROPOSAL: Change of Use: Ground floor and basement from retail (class A1) to restaurant and hot food takeaway (class A3 and A5); extract flue at rear
DECISION: DFERRED for Member site visit.
(See also Minutes 100 and 103).

LIST NO: 2/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/417/06/DFU
LOCATION: 26 Kenilworth Avenue, Harrow
APPLICANT: Saxton Design for Mr S Daheley
PROPOSAL: Single and two storey side and rear extensions; front porch; conversion to two self-contained flats (revised)
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and the applicant's representative, which were noted;

(2) during the discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposed two-storey side to rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk, prominent siting and unsatisfactory design, would be unduly obtrusive with inadequate space about the buildings and would detract from the established pattern of development in the street scene and the character of the locality.
- (ii) The proposed parking area, by reason of inadequate landscaping, would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the street scene.
- (iii) The combined impact of 26 and 28 in that space will be excessive and overbearing on this site to the detriment of the amenity of the locality.

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

(3) the substantive motion to grant the application was carried.

(See also Minutes 91 and 100).

LIST NO: 2/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/262/06/DFU
LOCATION: 40 Tregenna Avenue, Harrow
APPLICANT: Mr J I Kim for Mr S Dule
PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension and conversion to two houses (revised)
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representation from an objector, which was noted;

(2) there was no indication that the applicant or their representative was present and wished to respond].

(See also Minute 91 and 100).

LIST NO:	2/04	APPLICATION NO:	P/1776/06/CFU
LOCATION:	5 Julius Caesar Way, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Countrywide Surveyors for Mr & Mrs M Walker		
PROPOSAL:	Outbuilding in rear garden		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the condition and informatives reported.		

LIST NO:	2/05	APPLICATION NO:	P/1460/06/DFU
LOCATION:	Pizza Express, 33-36 High Street, Pinner		
APPLICANT:	JWPC Ltd for Pizza Express Restaurants Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Variation of Condition 5 of Planning Permission WEST/758/94/FUL (controlling hours of use) to permit opening from 10:00 hours Mondays to Saturdays until 00:30 hours of the following day, and 10:00 hours until 00:00 hours on Sundays		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the condition and informative reported.		

LIST NO:	2/06	APPLICATION NO:	P/1621/06/CFU
LOCATION:	Heriots, The Common, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Jane Duncan Architects Ltd for Mr & Mrs L Portnoi		
PROPOSAL:	Single and two storey front, side and rear extensions, alterations to roof and external alterations		
DECISION:	DEFERRED for a Member site visit. (See also Minute 103).		

LIST NO:	2/07	APPLICATION NO:	P/1797/06/CFU
LOCATION:	Weald Cottage, Brookshill Drive, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs C Bennett		
PROPOSAL:	Conversion of car port to habitable room		
DECISION:	DEFERRED for a Member site visit and to enable an accurate history of the site to be investigated and reported. (See also Minute 103).		

LIST NO:	2/08	APPLICATION NO:	P/1513/06/DFU
LOCATION:	73 Belsize Road, Harrow Weald		
APPLICANT:	K Sisodia for Ms S Cook		
PROPOSAL:	Conversion of dwellinghouse into 3 self contained flats; single storey front, part single/part two storey rear, two storey side extensions (revised)		

DECISION:	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) This proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the attached neighbour's property, and is out of character with the surrounding properties. (ii) The provision of parking is inadequate in this particular location and would lead to overspill parking in the road which would be to the detriment of the residents in the road. <p>[Notes: (1) During discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a Member site visit. Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;</p> <p>(2) Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar and David Perry wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of deferring the application;</p> <p>(3) subsequently, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the reasons given above. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;</p> <p>(4) Councillors Mrs Camilla Bath, Robert Benson, Don Billson, Maji Kara, Narinder Singh Mudhar and Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to refuse the application;</p> <p>(5) Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar and David Perry wished to be recorded as having abstained from the vote to refuse the application, and, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 21.3(b), wished it to be recorded that the reason for their abstention was that the Committee had voted against deferring the application for a Member site visit;</p> <p>(6) the Head of Planning had recommended that the above application be granted].</p> <p>(See also Minute 91).</p>
------------------	--

LIST NO:	2/09	APPLICATION NO:	P/1443/06/DFU
LOCATION:	37 Sandringham Crescent, South Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Mr J Benaim for Mrs E Beccles		
PROPOSAL:	Single and two storey rear extension; single storey front extension, alterations at side; change of use from dwellinghouse (C3) to care home (C2)		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, as amended on the Addendum.		

LIST NO:	2/10	APPLICATION NO:	P/1423/06/DFU
LOCATION:	The John Lyon School Playing Fields, Sudbury Hill		
APPLICANT:	Kenneth W Reed & Associates for The John Lyon School		
PROPOSAL:	2 metre high fencing to South Vale and Sudbury Hill boundaries; 2 metre high metal gates across site accesses from South Vale and Sudbury Hill and alterations to hardsurfaced area from Sudbury Hill; 2 metre high fencing to west side of playing field and concrete demarcation posts to Green Lane boundary and Sudbury Hill access		
DECISION:	DEFERRED for a Member site visit.		

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representation from an objector, which was noted;

(2) there was no indication that the applicant or their representative was present and wished to respond;

(3) during the discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for the reasons given above; upon being put to a vote, this was carried].

(See also Minutes 100 and 103).

LIST NO: 2/11 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1697/06/DFU
LOCATION: Highcroft, The Common, Stanmore Hill
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs R Eker
PROPOSAL: Rear dormers
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/12 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1784/06/CFU
LOCATION: 19 Stanmore Hall, Wood Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Mr S C Mistry for Mr S Geller
PROPOSAL: Extension and alteration of first floor stair landing
DECISION: DEFERRED to enable the application to be considered by the Committee alongside the application for Listed Building Consent.

LIST NO: 2/13 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1923/06/CFU
LOCATION: 89 Bridge Street, Pinner
APPLICANT: Waldon Telecom Ltd for Orange
PROPOSAL: Telecommunications development: antenna on chimney at front and equipment cabinet at rear
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/14 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1584/06/DFU
LOCATION: 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
APPLICANT: DPG Development Consultants for Mr T Harriss
PROPOSAL: New shopfront
DECISION: DEFERRED at officer's request for further consideration of access.
(See also Minute 92).

LIST NO: 2/15 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1806/06/DLB
LOCATION: 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
APPLICANT: D P Gamblin for Mr T Harriss
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: Installation of new shopfront and entrance to above premises

DECISION: DEFERRED at officer's request for further consideration of access.
(See also Minute 92).

LIST NO: 2/16 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1707/06/CFU
LOCATION: The Hollies, 36 Oxhey Lane
APPLICANT: Jonathan Fiszpan AGI Arts for Mr & Mrs D Gold
PROPOSAL: Conservatory at rear and demolition of existing garden shed
DECISION: DEFERRED at officer's request for consultation with neighbouring borough.

LIST NO: 2/17 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1794/06/DVA
LOCATION: 430 Alexandra Avenue, Harrow
APPLICANT: Eastern Fire
PROPOSAL: Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission WEST/256/02/FUL to permit opening to customers from 10:00 hours to 00:30 hours of the following day
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, subject to the condition and informative reported.

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1335/06/DVA
LOCATION: 274-278 Northolt Road, South Harrow
APPLICANT: PDS Licensing for Mr Aziz Damania
PROPOSAL: Variation of Condition 2 of Appeal Permission APP/M5450/A/04/1157717 to permit opening to customers from 09:00 hrs Sunday to Thursday until 01:00 hrs the following day and from 09:00 hrs Friday and Saturday until 02:00 hrs the following day
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the variation described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, for the reason reported.

[Notes: (1) During discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred so that further information regarding the Licensing Panel decision, details of any conditions imposed by the Licensing Panel and details of neighbouring properties' opening hours, could be reported to the Committee. Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried;

(2) the substantive motion to refuse the application was carried].

(See also Minute 92).

AUDIT
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF AUDIT COMMITTEE

(SPECIAL) MEETING HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor John Cowan

Councillors: * Archie Foulds * Richard Romain
 Thaya Idaikkadar * Stanley Sheinwald

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

17. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

18. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: That it be noted that there had been no declarations of interest by Members in relation to the business on the agenda for this Panel meeting.

19. **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>
6. Statement of Accounts 2005-2006	The report, including Appendix 4 to the report which was tabled at the meeting, was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated as additional information from, and discussions with, the External Auditor had required changes to the accounts. Members were asked to consider this item as the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 required approval to the Statement of Accounts by 30 September 2006.

(2) all items 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>
6. Statement of Accounts 2005-2006 – Appendix 4 to the report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy	This Appendix was considered to contain confidential information under Paragraph 3 and Paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, and information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

20. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2006 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

21. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16.

22. **Statement of Accounts 2005-2006:**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy which asked the Committee to receive and agree the changes to the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts considered by the Committee in June 2006, to receive and consider the audit report and conclusions of the External Auditor and approve the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts.

The External Auditors presented their report and entered into detailed discussion with Members on the contents of the report. During the course of the discussion, the following issues were raised/considered by Members:-

- how bad debt provision was funded;
- how the Council's actuaries estimated pension liabilities;
- the criteria that had been applied to reach the Value For Money Conclusion;
- the criteria used for capital expenditure, including feasibility studies;
- the level of insurance provisions;
- planning consents;
- Local Public Service Agreement grant funding.

Members asked many questions and were advised that further questions and comments could be directed to officers who would liaise with the External Auditors.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Pension Fund Investments Panel ascertain how the Council's actuaries, Hymans Robertson, estimated pension liabilities, as their figures appeared to be higher than those of other actuaries and report back to the Audit Committee, detailing this information;

(2) the changes, as presented at this meeting, to the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts considered by the Committee in June 2006 be agreed and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman be authorised to consider any further changes to the Statement of Accounts prior to the Audit Committee meeting on 26 September 2006;

(3) the audit report and conclusions of the External Auditor be received and noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.45 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JOHN COWAN
Chairman

REPORT OF AUDIT COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor John Cowan

Councillors: * Keith Ferry (1) * Stanley Sheinwald
* Archie Foulds * Jeremy Zeid (3)

* Denotes Member present
(1) and (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

23. **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 Richard Romain Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar	Councillor Jeremy Zeid Councillor Keith Ferry

24. **Declarations of Interest:**

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

25. **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>
9. Statement of Accounts 2005-2006	The report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated as additional information from, and discussion with, the External Auditor required changes to the accounts. Members were asked to consider this item as the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 required approval of the Statement of Accounts by 30 September 2006

(2) 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>
9. Statement of Accounts 2005-2006 – oral explanation in relation to line (12) of Appendix 1 to the report	The oral explanation in relation to the additional Insurance Provision included at line (12) of the tabled Appendix 1 contained exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information in relation to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

26. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2007 be taken as read and signed as a correct record;

(2) the minutes of the Special meeting held on 12 September 2006 be deferred until the next meeting and once printed in the bound Council Minute Volume.

27. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 19 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

28. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

29. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

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

RESOLVED: To note that no references were received from Council or other committees at this meeting.

31. **Statement of Accounts 2005-2006:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report, which set out the proposed changes to the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts. She drew Members' attention to the revised Appendix 1 to the report, which had been tabled, and advised that, subject to the agreement of the Committee, the Accounts would be signed by the Chairman, the External Auditor and herself. The External Auditors, Nigel Johnson and Angus Fish, Deloitte and Touche, were in attendance at the meeting.

An officer detailed the adjustments made to Appendix 1, advising that training costs had been marginally reduced. In relation to increase/decrease in accruals, he advised:-

- (6) Housing benefit claim had reduced;
- (11) Professional fees was a new item;
- (12) Additional insurance provision was a new item and the main addition to the Appendix.

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy advised that, following further discussions, it was proposed to increase the additional insurance provision to £450,000, resulting in a figure of £1,839,000 for the balance carry forward post audit amendments. This additional provision related to a planning appeal and a Member requested that this be discussed in detail in private session.

The External Auditor detailed the updating to the report that had been carried out since the Committee's special meeting on 12 September 2006. The Committee were advised that:-

- issues in relation to bad debt provision had broadly been resolved or accommodated within an acceptable level of tolerance;
- considerable time had been spent on premia arising on redemption of debt;
- in relation to capitalisation of expenditure, more information had become available on the feasibility of projects but more was still required. The Auditor advised that he needed to confirm that the authority was correct in its view and that he would be speaking to Price Waterhouse Coopers on this issue;
- in relation to the additional insurance provision, the Auditor confirmed that the figure was within tolerance levels and that he was aware of the specific issue in relation to the planning appeal;
- the Auditor was fairly content with the assumption in relation to pension liabilities but were requested to note that there was a presentational update;
- there was little change to the statement on internal control;
- in relation to group accounts, further information on Breakspear Crematorium had just been received but the impact was likely to be minimal;

- the amounts capitalised in respect of the Business Transformation Partnership, the recoupment balances and the council tax system reconciliation had been referred to in the status of audit as these were substantive areas of concern;
- the Auditor felt that it was important to make reference to the value for money conclusion and that, having received further information, had been able to remove one area of qualification since the Committee's special meeting;
- there was correction to the anticipated value for money conclusion on page 34 of the report in that the report would be qualified in respect of two matters and should refer to Appendix 2, not 4;
- the Auditor would not be confirming that the audit was complete until the Accounts had been signed by the Chairman of the Committee, the Director of Financial and Business Strategy and the External Auditor.

A Member expressed concern in relation to the value for money judgement and questioned who should be making such judgements and whether it was a function of Audit. In response, the Director of Financial and Business Strategy advised that this was the first time such a judgement had been included in the Statement of Accounts and that the Auditors had a choice of statements, from a clearly defined framework, for inclusion.

Members thanked the External Auditors and the officers for all their work on the Statement Accounts.

RESOLVED: That (1) the changes to the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts, including the revised Appendix 1 and additional insurance provision, be approved;

(2) the revised audit report and conclusions of the External Auditor be noted;

(3) the 2005-2006 Statement of Accounts, subject to any consultation with members of the Committee if there were any material changes, be approved.

(See also Minute 34).

32. **Internal Audit Full Year Report 2005-06:**

Members received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy, which set out the progress against the 2005-2006 Internal Audit plan and key issues arising from the work undertaken.

An officer reminded Members that they had received an interim final year report at their meeting in June 2006 and that this report added to that information. The report before Members included progress against the Internal Audit work plan and information in relation to financial irregularities.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

33. **Internal Audit Escalation Report - Web Publishing Protocols:**

Members received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy, which related to the systems behind the web publishing protocols. An officer advised that the Web refresh project should be concluded by December 2006.

In response to a Member's comments that the Council's website was difficult to use and navigate, that fonts tended to be small and that the use of pdf documents was not helpful to the user, the Director of Financial and Business Strategy advised that these concerns had been raised by other Members and that the project would look at the whole site and that there would be significant consultation as part of the project. She added that disaster recovery was being considered as part of the Business Transformation Project.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

34. **Statement of Accounts 2005-2006:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy gave an oral report in relation to the additional insurance provision included in the Statement of Accounts for a specific planning appeal.

RESOLVED: That the position be noted.

(See also Minutes 25 and 31).

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JOHN COWAN
Chairman

LICENSING
AND GENERAL
PURPOSES
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF LICENSING AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Lurline Champagnie

Councillors: Robert Benson * Ashok Kulkarni
 * Don Billson * Mrs Vina Mithani
 * Mrinal Choudhury * John Nickolay
 * G Chowdhury Phillip O'Dell
 * Mano Dharmarajah * Raj Ray
 * Thaya Idaikkadar * Tom Weiss
 * Nizam Ismail Jeremy Zeid

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES
17. Declarations of Interest:

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

18. Arrangement of Agenda:

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
7. Gambling Policy and Casino Resolution Consultation - Information	New Gambling Act Explained for Councillors – this leaflet was provided by the Department for Culture, Media and Sports' (DCMS) to help Members gain a better understanding of their role under the Gambling Act 2005. Officers felt this was an opportune time to distribute it.
9. Order on Controlled Drinking Zone	Government revision to the Gambling Act 2005 timescale - the revised timescale was issued after the agenda had been produced and would have a knock on effect of the Authority's deadlines. This was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all the relevant information before making a decision.
	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated, due to the delays in finalising the installation dates of the street signs. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency.

(2) it be noted that Item 10 – Delegated Authority Housing Act 2004 Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation, had been withdrawn from the agenda; and

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

19. Minutes:

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the Special meeting held on 5 June 2006, which had not been detailed on the agenda for the meeting, be taken as read and signed as a correct record;

(2) the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 15 June 2006, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

20. **Public Questions, Petitions or Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 19, 16 and 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

21. **Gambling Policy and Casino Resolution Consultation - Information:**

The Committee received a report which updated Members on the forthcoming legislative changes arising from the impending Gambling Act 2005.

Members noted that the Government had announced a 3 month delay for Local Authorities to accept licence applications under the new legislation. This meant that Local Authorities would now receive and process applications with effect from April 2007. The delay was to enable sufficient time for the training of staff and Members under the new legislation, and in order to prepare for the influx of gambling licence applications.

The officer confirmed that the Gambling policy consultation and the online survey regarding a casino in the Borough would end on 16 October 2006. The results of the consultation would be reported back to the Committee in November, together with the Authority's Gambling policy for approval.

RESOLVED: That (1) a hard copy of the Gambling Act Policy be circulated to the Committee;

(2) the report be noted.

22. **Response to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation document 'Options for a New Look Local Government Pension Scheme in England & Wales:**

A report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy was presented to the Committee, which sought views on the way forward following proposals from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on the "Options for a New Look Local Government Pension Scheme in England and Wales." Responses were due back to the DCLG by no later than 29 November 2006.

RESOLVED: That the response provided at Appendix 1 to these minutes be submitted to the DCLG.

23. **Order on Controlled Drinking Zone:**

The Committee received a report which sought approval of the final order of the Alcohol Exclusion Zone.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Designated Public Place Order No. 1 appended to the report, pursuant to section 13(2) of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, be approved;

(2) the Director of Legal Services or delegate, on behalf of the Head of Community Safety Services, affix the seal of the London Borough of Harrow to Designated Public Place Order No. 1;

(3) publication of a Designated Public Place Order No. 1, erection of signs and sending of a copy of the Order to the Secretary of State in accordance with regulations 7 to 9 of the Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places) Regulations 2001, be authorised.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.10 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.05 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MRS LURLINE CHAMPAGNIE
Chairman

APPENDIX 1**RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS RAISED IN DCLG CONSULTATION PAPER**

Based on the views presented in the report please indicate your agreement or otherwise with the following questions raised in respect of the DCLG consultation Paper 'Options for a new look Local Government pension Scheme in England & Wales'		
Question	Answer	
	Yes	No
1. Which new scheme option do you support?		
A: Updated current final salary scheme (1/80 th accrual plus 3/80ths lump sum) with RPI revaluation after leaving		
B: New 1/60 th final salary scheme (and lump sum available by commutation) with RPI revaluation after leaving.		
C: CARE scheme with 1.85% accrual and RPI revaluation both during employment and after leaving (with lump sum available by commutation)		
D: CARE scheme with 1.65% accrual and RPI + 1.5% revaluation during employment and RPI revaluation after leaving (with lump sum available by commutation)		
E: a new hybrid CARE / final salary arrangement	✓	
Other - please specify:		
2. Do you agree that cohabitants' pensions should be introduced into the new-look LGPS?	✓	
If so, should this be from		
a. the beginning of the new-look scheme?		
b. the date the "law of the land" is changed to recognise cohabitants?	✓	
3. Do you agree that spouse's pensions should increase		✓
4. Which of the extensions to the flexible retirement provisions would you support?		
I. Allow scheme members to make extra contributions to offset any reduction in their pension in the case that they wish to retire early. These extra contributions could be calculated according to cost neutral buy-back factors;	✓	
II. Remove the requirement for employees to obtain employer consent for flexible retirement;	✓	
III. Remove the requirement for employees to take a reduction in hours or grade in order to take flexible retirement;	✓	
IV. Benefits accrued <i>after</i> age 65 also to be <i>increased</i> by cost-neutral uplift factors when a member elects to take payment of them after age 65.	✓	
5. Do you agree that in the initial design of the new-look LGPS the average employees' contribution rate should be targeted at 7%?	✓	
If not, what percentage rate would you wish to target? Please specify:		
6. Do you support a tiered employee contribution rate?		✓
If so, do you think the tier should be set at £7185 (the basic rate tax figure)		
Or at some other rate (please specify):		

7.	Do you agree that in the initial design of the new-look LGPS the employers' contribution rate for future service should be no more than 13%?	✓	
	If not, what percentage rate would you wish to target? Please specify:		
8.	Do you agree that there should be a cost sharing mechanism built into the LGPS?	✓	
	If not:		
	by some other mechanism (please specify):		
9.	Do you agree that this should be assessed by the Government Actuary following every second valuation and based on all Funds experience?	✓	
10.	Should any resulting change in cost be met by:		
a.	a change in the accrual rate for future scheme membership (but not accrued membership)?		✓
b.	a change in the normal retirement date for future scheme membership (but not accrued membership)?		✓
c.	a change in the employees' contribution rate?	✓	
11.	Do you support a move to a two-tier ill health arrangement?	✓	
	If yes:		
	Should ill health enhancement at the top tier be based on 50% of prospective membership between leaving and age 65?	✓	
	If not, what should it be based on (please specify)		
12.	Do you agree there should be no enhancement at the second tier?	✓	
13.	Do you support a review mechanism for the top tier?		✓
14.	Do you support a review mechanism for the second tier?		✓
15.	Do you think there should be more than two tiers?		✓
	If so, how many (please specify)		
	Question	Yes	No
16.	Do you agree that to fall within the top tier an employee's earnings capacity should be reduced by more than a specified percentage?	✓	
	If so, should that percentage be a 75% reduction?	✓	
	Or some other percentage (please specify):		
	If not, how do you think the assessment of whether or not an employee falls into the top-tier should be assessed (please specify):		
17.	If Option A (retention of the existing Scheme) is not the scheme taken forward by the DCLG, do you agree that existing scheme members should be compulsorily moved into the new look scheme for future service?	✓	
	If yes, which of the options set out in 1,2 and 3 of (2.78) would you support in relation to existing members accrued service		
1.	give all existing members at 31 March 2008 an actuarially equivalent period of service in the new-look Scheme, according to a formula to be set by the Government Actuary?	✓	
2.	give existing scheme members at 31 March 2008 more credit in the new-look scheme than they would receive under (a)?		

3. treat all accrued service of existing scheme members at 31 March 2008 as a benefit to be payable on retirement, under terms of the current scheme, based on the final salary at retirement?		
Other – please specify:		
18. Do you support the idea that there should be a facility for individual employers to opt to provide specific additional benefits (above the national core benefits)?		✓

LICENSING AND
GENERAL PURPOSES
PANELS

SOCIAL SERVICES APPEALS PANEL**22 AUGUST 2006**

Chairman: * Ms D Cooper (Independent Person)

Councillors: * Mrs Lurline Champagnie * Eric Silver

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**1. **Appointment of Chairman:****RESOLVED:** That Ms Dawne Cooper be appointed Chairman of the Panel for the purposes of this meeting.2. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That the item listed in Part II of the agenda be considered with the press and public excluded for the reason indicated below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
6. The Keeping of a Child in Secure Accommodation	This item was considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I to Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contains information relating to an individual.

3. **Terms of Reference:****RESOLVED:** That the terms of reference of the Panel be noted.4. **Guidance Notes:****RESOLVED:** That the guidance notes setting out the nature of the Panel be noted.5. **The Keeping of a Child in Secure Accommodation:**

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Children's Services which set out the background to the current situation and outlined the reasons why a secure placement was still considered necessary. The Panel also considered a report from the Independent Investigator setting out the views of the child, and a report from the Secure Unit.

The Panel carefully reviewed the case, taking into account the verbal updates from the Social Services Officer and the Independent Investigator. The Panel also considered additional reports from the Secure Unit which were tabled at the meeting.

Having considered all the views expressed at the meeting including the wishes of the child who was present at the meeting, the Panel

RESOLVED: That the child remain in the Secure Unit for a period of 6 weeks from 28 July 2006.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 12.20 pm, closed at 1.50 pm)

(Signed) MS DAWNE COOPER
Chairman

[Note: Social Services Appeals Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chairman for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next Panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Social Services Appeals Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chairman and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

LICENSING PANEL

31 AUGUST 2006

Chairman: * Councillor Robert Benson

Councillors: * Mrs Lurline Champagnie * Mrinal Choudhury

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**35. **Appointment of Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To note the appointment of Councillor Robert Benson as Chairman for the purposes of this meeting.

36. **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.

37. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

38. **Minutes:**

(See Note at conclusion of these minutes).

39. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 19, 16 and 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

40. **Licensing Procedures:**

The Chairman introduced the Panel and the officers present and outlined the procedure for the conduct of an oral hearing, which was set out in the agenda.

41. **Application for a New Premises Licence - Treetops, 406 Kenton Lane, Harrow:**

An officer introduced a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer, outlining an application made for a new premises licence for Treetops, 406 Kenton Lane, Harrow. The application had been made by Mr Premji Prindoriya and sought to change the nature of the licence from a Proprietary Club to a Premises Licence.

The application had been referred to the Panel as representations had been received from The Planning Authority, Health and Safety, the Environmental Health Authority (Pollution and Environmental Enforcement) and the Metropolitan Police. Ms Louise Roberts attended on behalf of the Environmental Health Authority, Mr Nicholas Ray on behalf of the Planning Authority, and Mr Philip Hicks on behalf of the Metropolitan Police. Mr Premji Pindoriya and Mrs Premila Pindoriya attended to present the application.

The applicant stated that the main reason he was seeking a new licence was in order to extend current opening hours for events such as private functions, when desired.

It was explained to the applicant that granting a Premises Licence would significantly alter the public entry conditions and opening hours of the premises, meaning that members of the public could not be denied access in the manner of a proprietary club. This would also mean that additional conditions would be necessary on the licence to account for the possibility of increased activity, such as the imposing of restrictions on noise, even if the applicant did not intend to hold activities in line with the full terms of the licence.

As a result, and in light of the aims behind the application, it was suggested by licensing officers that the applicant consider withdrawing the application before the Panel and re-applying for a variation on the current licence. It was reiterated that this would entail repeating the process, and would necessitate paying the same fees again.

In light of the above, it was:

RESOLVED: To note that the applicant withdrew his application for a premises licence for Treetops.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 1.35 pm, closed at 2.25 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ROBERT BENSON
Chairman

[Note: Licensing Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chair for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Licensing Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chair and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

STANDARDS
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2006

Chairman: * The Right Revd Peter Broadbent

Councillors: * Mrs Lurline Champagnie (1) * Mitzi Green (1)
* Mrs Janet Cowan * Mrs Kinnear
* B E Gate * Tom Weiss (2)

Independent Persons: * Ms Sheila Darr † Mr Mohammad Rizvi
* Dr J Kirkland

* Denotes Member present
(1) and (2) Denote category of Reserve Members

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION I - Protocol for Co-optees and Advisers**

Your Committee received the draft of a proposed Protocol for co-optees and advisers, which covered the Constitutional provisions governing their appointment, rights and obligations, with particular reference to the provisions concerning the Code of Conduct (for Councillors), confidentiality and access to information.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Council)

That the Protocol on Co-optees and Advisers, now attached, be adopted.

PART II - MINUTES16. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Jean Lammiman
Councillor Joyce Nickolay
Councillor Philip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Tom Weiss
Councillor Mrs Lurline Champagne
Councillor Mitzi Green

17. **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.

18. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) it be noted that item 15 – Reference from Member Development Panel, incorrectly marked as enclosed, had been withdrawn from the agenda; and

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

19. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2006 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

20. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 19, 16 and 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

21. **Protocol for Co-optees and Advisers:**

(See Recommendation I).

22. **Members' Register of Interests:**

The Director of Corporate Governance reported on the extent of Members' compliance with the Code of Conduct, in relation to completing their Register of Interests form within the statutory 28 day deadline.

It was noted that a significant number of Members had failed to return their forms in line with the 28 day requirement and that systems were being put in place to address this for the future. To date only one Member had not returned a complete Register of Interests form. The Committee sought confirmation as to which Councillor this was. Arrangements were also under consideration to place the Members' Register of Interests electronically onto either the intranet or the internet in order to enhance public accessibility.

RESOLVED: That (1) it be noted that Councillor Anjana Patel had not completed and returned her Register of Interests form;

(2) in future, Members who fail to comply with the requirement to complete their Register of Interests forms within the 28 day statutory requirement, be publicly recorded;

(3) officers investigate how other boroughs make their Members' Register of Interests available, and report back to the Standards Committee before any decisions were made in relation to the electronic publication of the Register of Interests.

23. **Confidentiality of Documentation:**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Corporate Governance, which briefed Members on the various rights of access to information in relation to complaints of breach of the Members' Code of Conduct. The issue of "whistleblowing" was raised in debate.

The Director of Corporate Governance advised that officers acting in a statutory role who were advised on a confidential basis of a breach of the Code had a duty to follow

up the allegation and therefore to advise the informant that there would be circumstances when confidentiality could not be maintained.

A Member expressed concern regarding the working practices of the Standards Board for England (SBE) and the maintaining of confidentiality in respect of cases under investigation. It was agreed that the circumstances would be investigated and reported back to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That (1) a report from the Interim Director of Human Resources on "whistleblowing" be submitted to the next meeting of the Standards Committee;

(2) it be noted that the statutory officers were obliged to pursue allegations brought to their attention and this overrode confidentiality of the source;

(3) it be established whether it was standard practice for SBE to divulge confidential information on complaints in correspondence and over the telephone, and this be reported back to the Committee;

(4) the report be noted.

24. **Member and Officer Indemnity:**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Corporate Governance, which advised of recent legislative changes to indemnify Members against legal costs incurred in defending themselves against an allegation of breach of the Code of Conduct.

It was advised that a caveat to the indemnity claim was that there was a limit of £50,000 maximum per claim and that, in addition, all monies would be required to be reimbursed by the Member should they be found to be in breach of the Code.

RESOLVED: That (1) a letter be sent to all Council and Independent Members advising them of the indemnity insurance; and

(2) the report be noted.

25. **High Ethical Standards - Roles of Leader of Council and of Chief Executive:**

Members considered a report of the Director of Corporate Governance which proposed the addition, in the Constitution, of specific references to the responsibilities of the Leader and the Chief Executive for maintaining the high ethical standards of the Authority.

Members noted that the revisions were to be considered by the Constitution Review Working Group and, if then agreed, would be reported to Council on 19 October 2006.

RESOLVED: That the proposed revisions to the Constitution, relating to the responsibilities of the Leader and the Chief Executive for the high ethical standards of the Authority, be noted.

26. **Review of Complaints to the Standards Board about Members:**

The Director of Corporate Governance informed Members of decisions of the Standards Board for England (SBE) following receipt of complaints against Members of this Council.

It was noted that there had only been two complaints against Harrow Councillors in the period August 2005 – July 2006, neither which had warranted investigation.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Director of Corporate Governance, upon receipt of notification from the SBE regarding a complaint against a Councillor, notify the Standards Committee and also provide an annual summary of this information for the Committee; and

(2) the report be noted.

27. **Member Officer Protocol:**

The Director of Corporate Governance's report advised that the Member/Officer Protocol had been circulated to all Members for comment on whether they found it to be a useful document. It was noted that of 63 Councillors, 13 responses had been received and were summarised in the report. Proposals for a more detailed review of the Protocol, having regard to the comments received, were endorsed, subject to the exclusion of some of the issues raised.

RESOLVED: That (1) officers report back on potential revisions to the existing Protocol; and

(2) the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.35 pm).

(Signed) THE RIGHT REVD PETER BROADBENT
Chairman

APPENDIX 1**PROTOCOL ON CO-OPTees AND ADVISERS****CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION****1. Appointment**

- 1.1 The Council may appoint non-voting co-opted members to its Committees;
- 1.2 The Council is required to appoint some voting co-opted members to its Standards Committee;
- 1.3 Committees may appoint non-voting co-opted members to their sub committees or panels;
- 1.4 The Overview and scrutiny Committee is required to appoint voting co-opted members to the Children and young People Scrutiny Sub Committee;
- 1.5 Any Committee, sub committee or panel may appoint advisers to assist in their work.

2. Co-optees and Advisers

- 2.1 Co-opted members are appointed by the parent body to a subsidiary body. Any conditions on the exercise of any rights are determined by the parent body. Any changes to an appointment can only be made by the parent body.
- 2.2 Advisers are appointed by the body concerned. Advisers can be made subject to any restrictions that the body concerned think reasonable.

3. Rights of Co-opted Members and Advisers**3.1 Co-optees**

The basic rule is that co-opted members have such rights as agreed by the parent body making the appointment.

BUT: In the case of certain appointments required by statute (e.g. co-opted members of the Standards Committee) they must be afforded all the rights required by statute.

3.2 Advisers

Have such rights as agreed when the body concerned makes the appointment.

3.3 Rights

Unless otherwise determined by the parent body or subsidiary body (subject to statute) all co-opted members and advisers will be afforded the right to

- receive all agenda papers including "Part II" of confidential papers
- be notified of all meetings
- attend all meetings
- contribute to the consideration of all items

3.4 Exception

The position set out in (iii) above is subject to a restriction where, if a Chief officer, believes information is so confidential that it could significantly prejudice the interests of the council, then that information may not be distributed to a co-opted member or adviser (again subject the statutory rights of certain co-optees).

4. Obligations of Co-optees and Advisers

All co-optees and advisers will have the following obligations:-

- not to disclose confidential or exempt information as defined in the Access to Information Procedure Rules;
- not to commit a breach of trust by imparting information yet to be made public to others (see Note *);
- to declare all personal and prejudicial interests as defined in the Members' Code of Conduct and to exclude themselves from the room whenever a matter in which they have a prejudicial interest is being considered.

Additionally:-

- Co-optees are required to complete an entry into the Register of Interests.

5. Acceptance of this Protocol and the Members' Code

All co-optees and advisers will be required to sign as having understood and accepted both this Protocol and the Members' Code of Conduct.

6. Breaches of the Protocol

The Monitoring Officer may, if appropriate:-

- (i) refer Co-optees alleged to be in breach of the Protocol to the Standards Board for England;
- (ii) consider referring advisers alleged to be in breach of the Protocol to a Standards Committee meeting.

7. Record of Appointments

A record shall be kept by the Monitoring Officer of the co-optees and advisers appointed each Municipal Year together with information denoting any particular associated rights or obligations.

*(Note: The duty of trust is equivalent to the elected Member observance of confidentiality set out in paragraphs 4 and 5 respectively in the Code of Confidentiality of Part II Reports (Section 5G of the Constitution), which in summary are:-

- (a) Members must observe the confidentiality of information which has not been made public: imparting such information is a breach of trust:
- (b) Members shall not impart to any person (other than another member or an officer) in writing or verbally any information of a confidential nature, unless and until that information has become public in the course of the Council's business.)

MEMBER
DEVELOPMENT
PANEL

MEMBER DEVELOPMENT PANEL**13 SEPTEMBER 2006**

Chairman: * Councillor Jean Lammiman

Councillors: B E Gate * Keeki Thammaiah (1)
* Paul Osborn* Denotes Member present
(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Annual Development Programme**

Your Panel considered a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which sought Members' comments on the draft proposals for the Member Development Programme for 2006 to 2010.

It was noted that the proposals had been drawn up in response to feedback from Members on the 2006 induction programme and a Member survey on training needs. The Panel felt that overall the induction programme had been good. The need for regular training needs analyses to be carried out was emphasised.

Members proposed some minor amendments to the Member Development Strategy set out at Appendix 1 to the officer report, and made a number of comments on the proposals for the Member Development Programme. A Member suggested that there should be more training for Executive Members, and that it should be mandatory. The importance of training on chairing and serving on certain Committees was highlighted. Members felt that, rather than a quarterly briefing, the event entitled "Representing the Council on Outside Bodies" should be recommended training for all Members. It was also suggested that, later in the programme, events be held for members of the public who were interested in becoming Councillors.

Further to a query from a Member, the Director of People, Performance and Policy undertook to check whether there was a need for the further training sessions on scrutiny scheduled for November 2006, and what the objectives of those sessions were. The Panel also emphasised the need to ensure that Member training sessions, particularly for mandatory training, did not clash with other Council meetings and events or faith events and requested that there be better communication between Departments.

The Panel having approved the Member Development Programme for 2006 to 2010, as amended to reflect the comments outlined above,

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Standards Committee)

That (1) the draft Member Development Strategy for 2006 to 2010, as now amended, be approved; and

(2) the draft Member Development Programme for 2006 to 2010, as amended to reflect the comments outlined above, be noted.

(See also Minute 11).

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

RESOLVED: To note the appointment, at the Standards Committee meeting held on 22 June 2006, of Councillor Jean Lammiman as Chairman of the Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/2007.

(See also Note under Minute 6).

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Councillor Keeki Thammaiah

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. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

5. **Terms of Reference:**

RESOLVED: That the Terms of Reference of the Panel be noted.

(See also Note under Minute 6).

6. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman:**

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor B E Gate as Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the Municipal Year 2006/2007.

[Note: Minutes 1, 5 and 6 arose from standard business to be undertaken at this first meeting of the Municipal Year which had been omitted inadvertently from the agenda].

7. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 4 April 2006, and of the Special meeting held on 28 April 2006, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as correct records.

8. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18.

9. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15.

10. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16.

11. **Annual Development Programme:**

Further to Recommendation 1 above, it was

RESOLVED: That the draft Member Development Programme for 2006 to 2010, as now amended, be approved.

12. **Date of Next Meeting:**

RESOLVED: To note that the next meeting of the Panel was scheduled for 16 November 2006.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 6.06 pm, closed at 7.34 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JEAN LAMMIMAN
Chairman

STANDING ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR
RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION

**STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION****20 SEPTEMBER 2006**Representatives of the LEA

Councillors: * Ms Nana Asante † Mrs Anjana Patel
 * Councillor Mrs Lurline
 Champagne (Chairman)

Representatives of Christian and Other Religious Denominations and Faiths

* Zia Baig	Mrs S Lynn
* Mrs M Besser	* Councillor Asad Omar
† Mr M Bishop	Mrs S Panjwani
* Mrs N Desai	Rabbi D Roselaar
* Mrs P Gan-Kotwal	Prof H Singh
* Mrs M Hale	* Mr P Singh-Kohli
* Dr V Kapashi	* P Wearing
Brother L Lindsay	

Representatives of the Church of England

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

Representatives of Teachers

† Mr R Crocker	* Mrs R Shakar
† Mrs S Mistry	† Mrs A Stowe
† Ms B Pandya-Arepalli	† Rev'd Dr S Thompson

Co-opted Members

Mr A Aggarwal	* Mr M Shah
Mr D Liversedge	* Ms P Stevens

Adviser to the Council, Nominated by the Director of Education

* Mr P O'Dwyer

* Denotes Member present
 † Denotes apologies received

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**23. **Apologies for Absence:**

RESOLVED: To note that (1) apologies for absence had been received from Mr M Bishop, Mr R Crocker, Mrs S Mistry, Ms B Pandya-Arepalli, Councillor Mrs Anjana Patel, Rev'd S Pothen, Mrs Stowe and Rev'd Dr S Thompson;

(2) if a member had neither attended nor offered apologies for three consecutive meetings, the Chairman would write to the faith group to establish if the individual still wished to be a member of SACRE.

24. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no reserve members present at the meeting.

25. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note (1) the following interests declared by Council Members:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Ms Nana Asante	Declared a personal interest in that she was a Governor at Stanburn First School

Councillor Mrs Lurline Champagnie Declared a personal interest in that she was a Governor at Hatch End High School

Councillor Asad Omar Declared a personal interest in that he was a Governor at Nower Hill High School

(2) the following interests declared by non-Council members:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Mrs M Abbot	Declared a personal interest in that she was a Governor at Pinner Park First School
Ms P Stevens	Declared a personal interest in that she was the secretary of the Harrow Interfaith Council

26. **Minutes of the Meeting on 13 June 2006:**

Mrs Desai reported that the reason she had not attended the 13 June 2006 meeting was that her agenda had been lost in transit. Apologies were offered to Mrs Desai, who was disappointed that she had missed the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings of SACRE and of the Standing Conference for the Harrow Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education, both held on 13 June 2006, be taken as read and signed as correct records subject to the following amendments to the SACRE minutes:

Minute 8 – Declaration of Interests

Amend the spelling of Mrs Abbott's name.

Minute 15 – Education for Councillors

Amend the spelling of Mrs Gan-Kotwal's name.

Minutes 17, 19, 21, 22

Refer to 'Pat Stevens' without a title.

27. **Matters Arising**

(i) NASACRE Conference Material:

RESOLVED: To note that Pat Stevens had agreed to forward material from the National Conference to Councillor Paul Osborn, Portfolio Holder for Issues Facing Young People, and all other Councillors.

(ii) Contacts with London SACREs:

RESOLVED: That Councillors Ms Nana Asante and Mrs Lurline Champagnie, and Pat Stevens, meet to discuss ways of working with other London SACREs.

(iii) SACRE Showcase for Councillors:

RESOLVED: To note that (1) Paddy O'Dwyer and Pat Stevens would act as leads for the working party to set up a showcase; and

(2) Councillor Paul Osborn would be invited to be involved in the project.

(iv) Report on the Multi-Racial Forum on Racial Harassment:

Pat Stevens, member of the Harrow Multi-Agency Forum on Racial Harassment steering group, tabled and presented a brief report on the Multi-Racial Forum on Racial Harassment. She noted that the overall picture was that Harrow was one of the safest boroughs in London, but that there had been 44 recorded faith hate crimes in the period 2004-2006. A pilot project for reporting racial and faith harassment in schools had been initiated. Pat Stevens was to meet with the Harrow Council Race Hate Coordinator to devise strategies for schools to deal with this and to prevent further incidents. A full report on the forum was available from Pat Stevens on request. It was noted that contact details for race hate crimes had been published in the latest Harrow People magazine.

RESOLVED: That Pat Stevens continue to report to SACRE on the Forum's work.

28. **SACRE Constitution:**
The SACRE constitution, as updated on 28 September 2004, was tabled at the meeting. It was noted that this document formed part of the current SACRE handbook, and that although it still carried the term 'Draft', the constitution had been agreed by SACRE. Pat Stevens had asked John Robinson, Director of Corporate Governance, for comments.
- RESOLVED:** That (1) members look at the constitution before the next SACRE meeting and forward any comments by email to susan.bole@harrow.gov.uk or by post to Susan Bole, SACRE Clerk, People First Strategic Services, Civic Centre, Harrow HA1 2UW;
- (2) the constitution be discussed at the next SACRE meeting in the light of any comments received.
29. **Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education and Scheme of Work:**
It was noted that although the syllabus was still in draft form and without photographs, it was already being used by some schools. Permission had been sought for the publication of some pictures of festivals, and the Communications Unit would be finishing the syllabus by adding pictures including those of buildings. It was noted that no photographs of children in Harrow's schools would be used.
- The draft introduction to the syllabus was tabled. This included a letter from Mike Bishop as Chairman of the Agreed Syllabus Conference and introductions to the following faiths and philosophies: Baha'i, Humanism, Islam and Zoroastrianism. Jain and Bhuddism introductions had been received since the draft was printed.
- RESOLVED:** To note that (1) Rev'd S Pothen had agreed to write the Christianity introduction;
- (2) Mrs Desai had agreed to submit the Hindu introduction.
30. **Baha'i Materials:**
Dr Stephen Vickers had brought a collection of materials about the Baha'i faith. It was noted that there was very little material currently available about the Baha'i faith outside the community itself.
- Dr Vickers explained that the packs, one for primary children and one for secondary students, were prototypes. As yet there were no pictures and he was happy to receive comments and recommendations which could be incorporated into the final products. Mr Vickers was happy for members of SACRE, other teachers and interested professionals to look at the packs in order for feedback to be gathered. He would then price up the packs.
- RESOLVED:** To note that the Chair would establish if there were funds available, and if so, SACRE members would consider if it would be appropriate to purchase the packs for Harrow's schools after they had been seen by interested parties.
31. **Collective Worship:**
It was noted that Mrs Stowe had given her apologies but hoped to present her paper at the next SACRE meeting.
- RESOLVED:** That the item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
32. **Determinations:**
RESOLVED: To note that there were no determinations to report.
33. **Guidelines on Meeting the Religious Needs of Pupils:**
Festivals September 2006 - July 2007
Each member present was given a copy of the comprehensive SHAP calendar of Religious Festivals and a list of religious festivals on which pupils would be permitted authorised absence from Harrow's schools. The authorised absence list would be reprinted and distributed to SACRE members and headteachers in the light of comments from Members. It was noted that the list did not include festivals that fell on non school days, or minor festivals.
- RESOLVED:** To note that Pat Stevens would republish and circulate the list of religious festivals on which pupils would be permitted authorised absence from Harrow schools with the minutes of this meeting.

Swaminaryan Beads

Pat Stevens had been asked for guidance from SACRE regarding the wearing of swaminaryan beads. These blessed beads were worn by some Hindus to symbolise a vow. It was felt that the decision about the beads could only be made by the school. However, members agreed that children should be allowed to wear the beads in school as long as they were not visible and they were removed during lessons such as PE and Design and Technology where there might be a health and safety risk.

Mixed Swimming

It was noted that two mosques arranged single sex swimming for children on Saturdays, covering the national curriculum. A Brahmin family had asked that their child swim in a single sex environment.

RESOLVED: To note that (1) Mrs Desai had offered to speak to the Brahmin family to establish if it might be appropriate for the mosque to be approached to enable the child to swim at the Saturday sessions;

(2) Pat Stevens would liaise between the family and Mrs Desai.

Staff Leave for Festivals

The headteacher of Park High had reported that eleven of the Hindu staff at his school had asked for time off for Diwali, which in 2006 fell on a Saturday. He had requested advice from SACRE.

RESOLVED: To note that Pat Stevens would inform the headteacher of Park High that SACRE considered that the issue should be referred to the Local Authority (Councillor Janet Mote and Governing Bodies) rather than to SACRE.

34. **News from the Faith Communities:**

The Chairman requested that members submit news items in writing before the next meeting.

Mrs Hale reported that there was to be an event on the following Sunday at Kingsbury Bhuddist Temple to raise funds for an orphanage in Sri Lanka. Further details were available direct from her.

Patrick O'Dwyer tabled an extract from the 'Harrow Governors' Newsletter'. It was noted that Harrow was keen to recruit new governors. Governing body meetings normally took place 6 times a year, although there could be more. Paddy O'Dwyer was happy to distribute literature on the role of governors and also visit interested parties. Mr Baig explained that he had expressed an interest to be a governor but had not been invited to do so. Mr O'Dwyer explained that, although names of volunteers were forwarded to schools, the onus was on schools to make contact as appropriate vacancies occurred.

A booklet about Black History Month (Autumn 2006) and 'We Served', the untold story of the West Indian contribution to World War Two were both tabled.

RESOLVED: To note that (1) members should submit news items to Susan Bole;

(2) SACRE members would speak to their community groups to make known the need for governors.

35. **Dates and Venues for the Next Meetings:**

It was noted that members had enjoyed a guided tour of St Lawrence's historic church and that Reverend Paul Reece had welcomed members to a short evening service before the formal meeting on 20 September.

7 December 2006 - time to be confirmed – Pat Stevens was in the process of arranging for the meeting to take place at the Zoroastrian Centre, Rayners Lane.

8 March 2007 - time to be confirmed at the Brent Seikh Centre – Mr Singh-Kholi would liaise with the Chairman regarding the details.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

36. **Any Other Urgent Business:****Membership**

It was noted that Mr Haylock had tendered his resignation from SACRE since the last meeting. The Chairman had written in appreciation of his service. Mr Crocker had also expressed a wish to resign, and confirmed he would put this in writing in due course.

RESOLVED: That Pat Stevens invite a representative of the Free Churches and a teacher, preferably a primary headteacher, to join SACRE.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 8.10 pm, closed at 9.30 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MRS LURLINE CHAMPAGNIE
Chairman

