

## **Council (Council Tax)**

**Thursday 28 February 2013**

### **INDEX OF TABLED DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION**

<b>Item on Summons</b>	<b>Document/Subject</b>	<b>Document Pages</b>
4.	<b>PROCEDURAL MOTIONS</b> The procedure for the determination of the Council's Budget, Council Tax and Corporate Plan is enclosed.	1 - 2
6.	<b>PUBLIC QUESTIONS</b> Eight public questions which comply with the requirements of Council Procedure Rule 11, have been a received from members of the public.	3 - 10
8.	<b>CORPORATE PLAN 2013-15</b> A recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 26 February 2013 relating to this item is enclosed.	11 - 14
14.	<b>QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE</b> Twenty One questions which comply with the requirements of Council Procedure 12, have been received from Members of Council.	15 - 36
15.	<b>MOTIONS</b> Amendments to Motions 15(1) "Fair Deal", 15(2) "Police Service", 15(3) "Fire Service" and 15(5) "Indian Rape Victim / Violence Against Women" have been notified and will be moved and seconded by the Members indicated. The amendments are attached.	37 - 44

This page is intentionally left blank

**ITEMS 8 - 12 - CORPORATE PLAN**  
**REVENUE BUDGET**  
**HRA**  
**CAPITAL PROGRAMME**  
**TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY/PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS**

**THIS NOTE REFLECTS A CONSENSUS BETWEEN THE LABOUR AND CONSERVATIVE GROUPS ON THE PROCEDURES THAT WILL APPLY FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX AND THE CORPORATE PLAN.**

**OPENING** If there are to be amendments to the Cabinet Recommendations, at the request of the Political Groups, the Leader will move the Cabinet Recommendations and the Mayor will then call for amendments.

**AMENDMENTS** The Political Groups may then move and second any amendments.

**JOINT DEBATE** It is desirable that the Council should hold one comprehensive debate on its budget and Items 8 - 12, so **all** amendments will be considered to have been moved together.

**ADJOURNMENT** Should significant amendments be received the Mayor will propose an adjournment of up to thirty minutes to allow Members to read and assimilate the detail of any amendments.

**EXTENDED SPEECHES** Up to three identified Members of each Group will be allowed a total of **20 minutes** to talk to the recommendation, and to move and second any amendment. The order will be as follows:

- (1) Labour (20 minutes)
- (2) Conservative (20 minutes)

**DEBATING RULES** All other speakers will be restricted to the usual **3 minutes**. To conclude the debate the Groups will be allocated **1 winding-up speech of 5 minutes**, in the following order:

- (1) Conservative
- (2) Labour

**VOTING ON AMENDMENTS** Following the final winding-up speech, the Council will immediately move to voting on the amendments. **NO** further debate will take place between the voting on the amendments.

The amendments will be voted on in the following order:

- (1) Liberal Democrat / Independent
- (2) Conservative
- (3) Labour

One separate vote will be taken on each amendment.  
If any amendment is carried it becomes the substantive proposal.

Following votes on each amendment the Council Meeting will have either:

- if an amendment has been carried, a new substantive Budget / Council Tax proposal / Corporate Plan proposal; or
- if no amendment has been carried the original Recommendations.

**DETERMINATION  
OF ITEMS 8 – 12**

A new substantive Budget/Council Tax proposal (if an amendment has been carried) or the Cabinet Recommendation **if not amended** will be put to a formal vote of the Council to be adopted, without further debate.

**SUSPENSION OF  
COUNCIL RULES**

The procedures set out above vary the rules regarding the moving of a recommendation from the executive, and the rules of debate. Council will be assumed to have endorsed under Rule 25.1 the partial suspension of the relevant rules for the limited purposes of items 8 – 12 on the Summons, taken as a single item.

**ITEM 6**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Mic Sayer**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 1:**

“On behalf of the environmental groups of Harrow can the Council please advise us when the consultations will be for the proposed Budget open space savings e.g. opening and locking park gates and park maintenance.”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING** -

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner:** **Angela Dias**

**Asked of:** **Councillor David Perry (Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)**

**Question 2:**

“There is a substantial body of evidence which proves that the Third sector provides excellent social and economic value on the contracts we deliver, and also makes a firm impact on the council being able to meet its' targets in areas where they receive ratings/ accreditation. Given that our services make a massive difference to well over 25% of Harrow people in key areas such as achieving independence, economic well being etc, can you explain why such a small proportion of council contracts are with the third sector?”



**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Jack Welby**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**Question 4:**

“Can the Portfolio Holder for Finance and magician in finances kindly explain why he does not use the £350,000 profit from the sale of Endeavour House whose value was £1 million according to Councillor Ferry, in keeping front line services running and the balance for restoring cuts to the budget for 2013/14”



**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Steve Porter**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**Question 5:**

“Further to my question and later letter to Sachin Shah concerning the removal of DDR to charity shops, would he now agree that this issue needs looking into again?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Julie Browne**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 6:**

“Subsequent to the decision to cut the VCS Grants budget by 25% Cabinet reinstated 100k to the budget; Can the Leader of the Council please assure us that this reallocation did not impact adversely on the total funding available to the Third Sector to deliver services”.

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Gerry Devine**

**Asked of: Councillor David Perry (Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)**

**Question 7:**

"The reduction in the amount available for grant funding will have a serious impact on the voluntary sector in Harrow, which for some organisations may prove terminal. Whilst the efforts of the Council to restore some funding for 2013-4 are appreciated, the seriousness of the funding situation makes it essential that process of sourcing and allocating funds is as transparent as possible.

Can the Council explain what has happened to the net cut of £70,000, made without notice to the grant allocation, compared to the figures presented during consultation with the voluntary sector last autumn?"

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by members of the public of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Pravin Seedher**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**Question 8:**

In view of the fact that Local government minister Brandon Lewis urged councils to find savings of between 0.5% to 0.9% to achieve a council tax freeze, why has this administration rejected a government hand out in order to increase council tax on residents - whilst in the same breath bemoaning the level of government assistance to Harrow even though other outer London Boroughs which are implementing a freeze receive less assistance?

RECOMMENDATION I

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
 COMMITTEE  
 MINUTES**

**26 FEBRUARY 2013**

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Sue Anderson * Ann Gate * Susan Hall (4) * Zarina Khalid	* Barry Macleod-Cullinane * Paul Osborn * Sasi Suresh (4) * Stephen Wright
<b>Voting Co-opted:</b>	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) † Mrs A Khan
<b>Non-voting Co-opted:</b>	Harrow Youth Parliament Representative	
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Keith Ferry Thaya Idaikkadar Sachin Shah	Minute 359 Minute 356, 360, 361 Minute 362

- \* Denotes Member present
- (4), (4) Denote category of Reserve Members
- † Denotes apologies received

## RECOMMENDED ITEMS

### 356. Corporate Plan

The Committee received a report of the Assistant Chief Executive which formed part of an integrated series of papers, including the budget papers, which had been considered by Cabinet on 14 February and were due to be considered by Council on 28 February 2013.

The Chair welcomed the Leader of the Council and the Divisional Director of Strategic Commissioning to the meeting. The Leader, in introducing the report, stated that the Corporate Plan set out the Council's strategic direction, vision and priorities for the next two years. In addition, for the first time, a balanced budget for next two years was proposed.

Some Members expressed concern that there appeared to be no base lines in terms of performance management. It was unclear what the indicators meant and what the measures were. A Member expressed the view that clearly defined measurable outcomes were required. The Divisional Director, whilst acknowledging the comments, responded that the Plan aimed to set out the core outcomes which aimed to articulate in greater detail the corporate priorities. As the Council moved more towards the measurement of outcomes, the Plan set out what these measures could be, and more work was ongoing to agree these with targets for the Corporate Scorecard. The Plan itself included more specific actions than previous plans as to what was being set out to be achieved, and progress against these would be measured. The Corporate Scorecard could be made available for a future meeting of the Committee, or the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

In considering the Corporate Plan, Members made comments and asked questions including the following:

- The Safety Deposit Scheme did not appear to be included in the Plan and the Member requested that he be provided with details of the work on the scheme to date. The Leader advised that it had not been included as a detailed study to identify potential usage was being progressed.
- A commitment to introduce the Harrow Card was included in the Plan and it was questioned how this could be done without the completion of a feasibility study. The Leader advised that it right that the Plan included the aspirations of the Administration and it was right that this was included.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the Environment department and the Leader was questioned as to how he could reconcile the proposed £3m savings with the corporate priority of keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe. The Member went on to state that not locking parks and cemeteries at night would result in a rise in crime. The Leader responded that a higher grant from Government would have enabled to Council to deal with issues in a different way but that the reality of the situation was that alternatives had to be found. He advised that, for example, on the spot fines for dropping litter may act as a deterrent.

- Referring to the grant the Council had received from Government a Member stated that Merton Council received less than Harrow per head but had, unlike Harrow, frozen its Council Tax. The Leader stated that to his knowledge Merton had significant financial difficulties but that he would look at their budget papers.
- In terms of the priority 'Supporting and Protecting people who are most in need', a Member stated that a representative of Mencap had recently advised that the most vulnerable tended to receive proper care and it was in fact those who were vulnerable, but not so drastically, that required the most support.
- Referring to the aspiration that contractors offer the London Living Wage, a Member questioned how this was costed, the timescale, how this could be measured and what the indicators were to show that this was on track. The Leader responded that whilst all directly employed staff received the London Living Wage, it was an aspiration to extend this to contractors.
- Following a Member's concern that a proposal in his ward would increase the risk of flooding, which appeared to contradict the aspiration in the Corporate Plan, the Divisional Director undertook to look at whether an indicator in relation to flooding could be developed.
- A Member expressed the view that the outcomes listed under each corporate priority heading in the plan did not seem to match the delivery of outcomes. For example, in terms of mental health it was unclear how the outcomes would be delivered from the projects mentioned. Similarly, the stated desired outcome of reducing fear of crime did not appear to be addressed by the projects listed, but instead the reduction of crime. She stated that it would be helpful to include mention of measures such as the dispersal zone and types of street lighting in the Plan to enable Members to see the success or otherwise in terms of delivery.
- Referring to the corporate priority 'Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses', a Member questioned how key projects would be delivered given the proposed savings in the Planning department. The Leader stated that it was expected that £2m development would be attracted to the town centre as a result of the projects/initiatives.

The Chair thanked the Leader of the Council and the Divisional Director of Strategic Commissioning for their attendance and responses.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to Council)

That the Committee's comments be considered.

This page is intentionally left blank



**ITEM 14**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 1:**

“Could you provide a breakdown of the £273,000 cut to the highways maintenance budget?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Stanley Sheinwald**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**To be responded to by: Councillor Graham Henson (Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services)**

**Question 2:**

“I see from the council tax budget papers that you propose to reduce the number of formal council committee meetings so can you tell me which ones are you considering and how much money will this save?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 3:**

“Could you provide breakdowns of the £490,000 and £273,000 procurement savings in Environment and Enterprise over the next two years?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Margaret Davine (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing)**

**Question 4:**

“Could you provide a breakdown of the £350,000 'voluntary sector funding' investment that has been added to the final revenue budget? Additionally, "investment" implies a return; what is the rate of return to that £350k 'investment'?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Margaret Davine (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing)**

**Question 5:**

“At February's Cabinet, you spoke of how Circles of Support (funded by the TPIF) had improved services for users and made savings the council. If all the £2.1m of the s256 money from the Department of Health to support "social care services with health benefits" had actually been invested on social care services with health benefits, like Circles of Support, can you describe the resultant service improvements for users and savings for the Council that would have been achieved?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**Question 6:**

“Can you confirm how the hoped for income from Treasury Management investments essentially doubled to £939,000 between December and February's budgets?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Sachin Shah (Portfolio Holder for Finance)**

**Question 7:**

“In closing the budget gap between December and February, nearly £1.5 million of 'transformation' savings were found. Can you itemise and detail these savings, and explain why they did not feature in the draft budget?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Mitzi Green (Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools and Families)**

**Question 8:**

“Could you provide a breakdown of the £260,000 'Business Support' savings in the Children's Services Budget?”



**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor David Perry (Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)**

**Question 9:**

“Could you itemise and break down the £600,000 over two years saving from the Cultural Strategy Review?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 10:**

“Can you confirm what form of service impact assessment was conducted on the PRISM transformation?”

**ITEM 14**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 11:**

“Earlier this month your administration announced £200,000 extra for fixing potholes, and £70,000 for free parking at Christmas. Can you confirm where this funding is coming from, as it appears to be outside the budget framework?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 12:**

“Could you provide a breakdown of the £70,000 free parking figure, and confirm where in the borough this scheme will be implemented?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 13:**

“How much does it cost to change the tariff on all the pay-and-display machines in the borough?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 14:**

“Are all our pay-and-display machines compatible with providing 20 minutes free parking for a set period of time?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall**

**Asked of: Councillor Phillip O'Dell (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)**

**Question 15:**

“Over what time period is this free parking scheme set to run - from when until when - and how much loss of revenue is anticipated to arise from it?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 16:**

“Could you provide the page and paragraph references in the Budget papers presented to Cabinet on February 14th 2013 that set out the role profile and list of responsibilities for the new Portfolio Adviser role, newly created at paragraph 56, page 121, of the documentation?”



**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 17:**

“Could you provide the role profile and list of responsibilities for the Portfolio Adviser role?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 18:**

“Could you clarify why you chose to amend the SRA schedule to allow for Portfolio Holders and Portfolio Advisers to split SRAs upon the appointment of the latter?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 19:**

“Had legal advice been sought on the legality of an arrangement whereby a Portfolio Adviser would be paid personally by their Portfolio Holder, in the absence of suitable bandings on the SRA schedule?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council of a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 20:**

“Was legal advice sought on whether this arrangement would have established a pecuniary interest for the Portfolio Adviser?”

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING -**

**28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**QUESTION WITH NOTICE**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for the asking of written questions by Members of Council or a Member of the Executive or the Chairman of any Committee.

**Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane**

**Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts)**

**Question 21:**

“And, if this proposed arrangement would have established a pecuniary interest, was legal advice taken as to whether and to what extent that pecuniary interest would have hampered the Portfolio Adviser in the carrying-out of their role?”

This page is intentionally left blank

## Fire Service Cuts

### **AMENDED MOTION BY LABOUR GROUP**

This council believes that the safety and security of Londoners, including the residents of Harrow, is being put at risk as a result of cuts to the fire service being pushed through by the London's Mayor.

The council believes that the unprecedented cuts are going too far and too fast and that these cuts to the budget of the London Fire Emergency & Planning Authority (LFEPA) will inevitably endanger families and communities across London and Harrow. This council believes that the cuts are being carried out without consideration of the impact on Londoners' safety.

We oppose the London Mayor's budget requirements resulting in the Draft LSP5 proposal to close 12 fire stations, remove 18 fire appliances and delete 520 firefighter posts. We welcome the potential for an additional fire appliance at Stanmore fire station proposed in the plan but Harrow will still be fully exposed from the downgrading of the fire cover London wide and therefore the real risk of safety and security.

**We deplore the Mayor's legal direction requiring LFEPA to ignore the democratic decisions made by the Fire Authority and majority members of the Assembly Members to enable the Mayor to consult on his closure programme.**

We welcome LFEPA's decision taken on 26 February to consult every Borough in London and look forward to participating in the consultation process. This council calls on the Chief Executive of Harrow Council to respond to the consultation on the draft LSP5 in due course.

This council challenges the Mayor's position that the scale of the cuts is necessary and acceptable. This council calls on the Chief Executive of Harrow Council to write to the Mayor of London and the Commissioner of the LFEPA expressing the concerns of Harrow about the closure plans. The Council also calls upon Harrow's MPs and Harrow's Assembly Member to oppose the Draft LSP5 proposals promoting closure plans and reckless cuts in the fire service which will put at risk the safety and security of Harrow's residents and community

Proposed by: Cllr Navin Shah  
Seconded by: Cllr Ajay Maru

This page is intentionally left blank



**AMENDED MOTION:**  
**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

The recent rape case leading to the death of a young girl in New Delhi was a deeply distressing event which has brought into focus the heinous violence perpetrated towards women and lack of values and respect accorded to women across the world in many a societies.

In particular, female infanticide continues to happen in many parts of the world. The fundamental problem is that women are not valued enough in all societies.

In Harrow, this is reflected by a worrying increase in Domestic Violence which is affecting many families.

Mother earth is crying and it is time we took notice.

This Council thanks the former Borough Commander of Police for implementing a Zero Tolerance policy to tackle violence against women and girls and the abuse they are subjected to. But, much needs to be done.

This Council pays a tribute to and reaffirms its support to the voluntary and statutory organisations in Harrow who actively engage in supporting women and girls.

Approaching International Women's Month in March, this Council believes that International Communities must work together in a spirit of partnership to exchange and implement good practices to eradicate the evil of violence, abuse and discrimination of women and girls worldwide.

The Council instructs the Chief Executive to

- Write to the former Borough Commander, placing on record our thanks for his commitment to women's rights
- Write to the borough's Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations thanking them for the work they do for and with the borough's women
- Write to the Indian High Commissioner regarding the gender imbalance that has been identified in society and offering Harrow's experience in creating a cohesive society by meeting its Public Sector Equality Duty as published in Our Harrow, Our Story where the Council articulates the services and projects being delivered and advances Equality and fosters good relations.
- Write to the new Borough Commander asking him to work with the Council in partnership to raise awareness of the evil of Domestic Violence

Proposed: Cllr Krishna James

Seconded: Cllr Zarina Khalid

This page is intentionally left blank

## Amendment for Motion (1) – Fair Deal Motion

To amend as below:

“This Council believes that there is room for a sensible debate on the amount of grant funding Harrow receives. It notes that Harrow receives around £450 less per-resident than the outer London average.

This Council does not believe, however, that talking Harrow down and comparing it with boroughs which suffer far more deprivation is the best strategy in arguing for more funding. When other outer London boroughs such as Merton have similar levels of deprivation to Harrow – while also receiving nearly £50 grant per-resident less – it is disingenuous to compare Harrow with Brent, which is the 24<sup>th</sup> most deprived local government area nationally.

Additionally, this Council notes that it is much harder to make the case to the Government that Harrow needs more funding after the Council’s administration turned down nearly £1 million to assist in freezing council tax, and over £300,000 to assist with the localisation of council tax benefit.

This Council therefore believes that representations made to the Government regarding Harrow’s grant funding should be logical and reasonable in both ambition and approach.

This Council resolves the following:

1. That representations be made to relevant government Ministers and officials to bring this matter to the attention of those in positions of decision making.
2. That Officers are instructed to examine the formula that is used for the funding calculation and to identify parameters that could be considered to unfairly weigh against the interests of the Borough.
3. That Officers are instructed to consult the results of the 2011 census and to establish, where possible, a basis for appeal to the government on grounds of the population characteristics and diversity of the Borough having regard to the characteristics of other comparable Boroughs.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition

## Amendment for Motion (2) – Police Service Motion

To amend as below:

“This Council believes that the safety and security of Londoners, including the residents of Harrow, is being put at risk as a result of cuts to police service being pushed through by the London’s Mayor and the Coalition Government and therefore calls upon the Mayor of London to publicise more vigorously that closing rarely-visited police stations and counters, the disposal of surplus police properties and reducing high-paid managers will not only release more officers to patrol our streets but also will enable the Met Police to recruit extra officers over and above the increases secured so far.

The Council believes that the unprecedented cuts are going too far and too fast and that these cuts to the budget of the Metropolitan Police Service will inevitably endanger families and communities across London and Harrow and that, to counter this false belief, the Mayor must do more to explain the positive impact on police numbers and crime levels that these changes will bring about. This council believes that the cuts are being carried out without consideration of the impact on Londoners’ safety and that the Mayor could do more to explain how public safety will be improved by more police patrolling than sitting behind desks.

Most inadequate and sham of a consultation undertaken in Harrow by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) has raised more questions than answered, not least why the MP for Harrow West left halfway through the MOPAC consultation held in Harrow. We have serious concerns about the Mayor’s proposed ‘New Policing Model’ for London and its impact on Harrow and raise the following issues:

1. Reduction of Police: There will be loss of 17 police officers as compared to police officers in the year 2010 (Reduction from 402 to 385).
2. Scrapping of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs): Replacing the current dedicated SNT of six in each and every ward of Harrow with only one Police Constable will see the end of the current successful ward-wide policing and leave the local areas exposed to more crime and increase the fear of crime – something not helped by this council’s decision to reduce funding of the town centre policing team.
3. Base Stations for SNTs: We are concerned that no assurance is given that these will not be closed.
4. Closure of Police Stations and Front Counters: We oppose the plans to close the police stations at Pinner and Wealdstone and oppose the loss of police facilities at the Harrow Civic Centre. The Mayor has promised new and better front counters before closing the police stations but we have not seen any evidence of this for any of our areas in Harrow.
5. Closure of Custody Suites: We are concerned that MOPAC has not yet finally confirmed the future of Harrow’s custody suites which are planned for closure. We are opposed to any such closure as we do not believe that the alternative of Kilburn is a viable one.

[This Council is additionally appalled by the decision of the Council’s administration to cut the size of the Council-funded police team, while refusing to take up an offer from the MPA/MOPAC which would have allowed it to be increased in size while still saving money.](#)

[This Council also notes the various public comments from the new councillor for West Harrow regarding police numbers, and therefore encourages and invites her to add her voice to the campaign against the police cuts made by the Council’s administration.](#)

This Council challenges the Mayor’s position that the scale of the cuts are necessary and acceptable. This council calls on the Chief Executive of Harrow Council to respond to MOPAC’s consultation and oppose the Mayor’s planned changes for policing of Harrow, as well as to note how this council has already cut its local funding for policing in Harrow, whilst, under the Mayor of London’s plans, police numbers would rise. The Council also calls upon Harrow’s MPs and Harrow’s Assembly Member to oppose the Mayor’s plans and draconian cuts in policing, except in so far as they will reduce crime and the fear of crime in Harrow.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition

## **Amendment for Motion (5) – Indian Rape Victim / Violence Against Women Motion**

To amend the motion as below:

“The recent rape case leading to the murder of Jyoti in New Delhi was a deeply distressing event.

This incident brought into focus the amount of violence perpetuated towards women and lack of value and respect accorded to numerous women around the world, for example:

- Malala was shot in Pakistan for trying to promote education amongst girls.
- In England, a woman giving evidence against a rapist taking her own life during the trial.

These incidents are all linked together with the number of female foetuses aborted in India and perhaps in this country too. According to some estimates 50 million females are missing in India causing gender imbalance.

This Council also believes that, as community leaders and local representatives, councillors have a responsibility to speak out against and tackle the issue of violence against women closer to home. This includes, but is not limited to, the issue of domestic violence, which affects the whole of society – with over a million women in the UK each year suffering abuse, and with the highest repeat victimisation rate of any crime.

The Council resolves to:

Do more than simply pass Council motions in response to national and international instances of violence against women, and to adopt a formal commitment to promote prevention events and to raise awareness of the issue. This Council can do more than simply express distress; it can take action, and stand alongside those women who have been and are continuing to be victims of violence.

Take this opportunity to write to the outgoing Borough Commander Chief Superintendent Dal Babu thanking him for implementing a Zero Tolerance policy towards Violence Against Women & Girls during his term of office.

The Council further reiterates its support to all Women’s Organisations in the borough especially as we approach International Women’s Day/Month in March.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition

This page is intentionally left blank