
REPORT OF CABINET

MEETING HELD ON 14 MAY 2009

Chairman: * Councillor David Ashton

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Barry Macleod-Cullinane
 * Miss Christine Bednell * Chris Mote
 * Tony Ferrari * Paul Osborn
 * Susan Hall * Mrs Anjana Patel

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillors Margaret Davine, Paul Scott and Bill Stephenson also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minutes 618 and 620 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

616. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that no interests were declared in relation to the business to be transacted at the meeting.

617. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2009 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

618. **Petitions:**

Councillor Margaret Davine presented a petition containing 36 signatures of residents of Collier Drive and surrounding roads requesting action to tackle congestion and improve the state of alleyways in the area. She read the terms of the petition to the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and referred to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for consideration.

619. **Public Questions:**

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

1.

Questioner: Brian Stoker

Asked of: Councillor David Ashton, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnership and Finance

Question: "You are reviewing a paper this evening on the future of Cedars Hall in which you are being asked, inter alia, to confirm a Cabinet decision of 21 May 2008 to authorise disposal of Cedars Hall site for residential development. Why is it necessary to confirm this decision, implying that other Cabinet decisions also need to be confirmed?"

Answer: The decision taken by Cabinet in May 2008 agreed the granting of a lease to Weald Tenant's and Resident's Association for community use, subject to certain timescales and conditions and proposed an Option B should this opportunity not be fulfilled, that the land be sold for housing.

The report to be considered by Cabinet tonight proposes the granting of the lease to Kids Can Achieve but Cabinet is also being asked to approve, should the lease to Kids Can Achieve not be completed, the disposal of the site for housing development when, or if, economic conditions permit.

The Officers report being presented sets out all the material considerations clearly and transparently so that they are absolutely clear to all stakeholders.

Supplemental Question: Why is it that the other half of that Cabinet decision, to sell for residential development is not also confirmed? Namely, authorisation to invest up to £100,000 from the sale proceeds to improve local community facilities. The second part of the decision that you have agreed to sell for residential housing, (a) was sell it, and (b) was £100,000 for the community.

Supplemental Answer: Well, the first thing is that we very much hope and expect that the Kids Can Achieve process will work, but we, as a Council, have to have a legal alternative to do something with the property. If contrary to what we expect and hope, the KCA proposal does not work out, then I would expect that whatever commitment we made first time round, in terms of use of part of the funds from selling it if we had to, for residential development, would go the same way as before.

2.

Questioner: Frances Pickersgill

Asked of: Councillor David Ashton, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnership and Finance

Question: "In the paper concerning Cedars Hall that you are being asked to approve later this evening, the "timeline for the submission of the planning application is to be relaxed and KCA is to submit a planning application no later than 6 weeks following completion of the lease".

Since the paper acknowledges that the Council's inability to agree on the lessee being KCA has delayed the application, why is the timeline not the original 4 months as it was in the Cabinet decision of 21st May last year, rather than only 6 weeks?"

Answer: Since the Cabinet Report of May 2008, the Council has been in constant negotiations with the Weald Tenant's and Resident's Association and also Kids Can Achieve to discuss proposals for Cedars Hall. Due to this, it is not seen as necessary to grant Kids Can Achieve a further 4 months from the agreement of the lease to submit the planning application. KCA plans for the property are well advanced and will be part of the consultation to be undertaken for the area along with the plans for the Cedars Youth and Community Centre.

Supplemental Question Why does the Council want first refusal on assigning the lease, if the project should fail, when that would mean repayment of the loan of £500,000 which the Council profess not to have, otherwise they would have refurbished the hall or demolished it in the first place and for much less?

Supplemental Answer: This is a complicated legal question which I am happy to answer in writing but we felt that was necessary to protect our position.

3.

Questioner: Simon Jarrett, Chair - KCA

Asked of: Councillor Tony Ferrari, Portfolio Holder for Major Contracts and Property

Question: "We hope that members can see that this is an excellent project with very positive outcomes both for residents of the Harrow Weald area, the children and young people of the borough and the wider Harrow community. It's an opportunity for community organisations and the Council to work in a partnership to deliver significant benefit for the Harrow people and particularly with Kids Can Achieve bringing in significant external funds to the borough

to enable these improvements to happen. This is going to include specialist services, support for Children and Young People with special needs and their families and it's going to open up opportunities for their integration and engagement.

Can Councillor Ferrari assure us that Harrow Council is committed to support Kids Can Achieve and our ambition to secure funds to refurbish the derelict Cedars Hall so that we can provide these services?"

Answer: I am delighted that we have got to where we have got to. There has been a tremendous amount of work on the part of officers, TRA, Kids Can Achieve, local residents and I think it has been a tremendous example of local community working together to get a really good outcome for a building, which will give us a great future for that part of Harrow Weald. So, can I say thank you to everybody who contributed to get to the point that we have got to.

To answer your question, I can confirm that the Council is pleased and committed to be working with and supporting the Kids Can Achieve bid to refurbish Cedars Hall to provide services for children and young people with special needs and their families.

[Note: In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 16.4, questioners 1 and 2 each asked a supplementary question which was additionally answered].

620. **Councillor Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note the following Councillor Questions had been received:

1.

Questioner: Councillor Paul Scott

Asked of: Councillor David Ashton, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnership and Finance

Question: "Would you agree with me that the recommendations regarding Cedars Hall represent a means of bringing the hall back into the community use for which it was intended, are likely to command public support and will be within the Council's financial resources?"

Answer: Very much so. As I said before, and as Councillor Ferrari rightly said, this is a very positive move. We are not quite there yet but it is a very positive move which we completely support.

Supplemental Question: Would you also agree that given the widespread and well known opposition to housing on the site, some of which you have been reminded of this evening, the Council would do well to avoid falling back on the May 2008 decision?

Supplemental Answer: We would hope that is not necessary but as a Council we have a responsibility and we have to have a route forward if we cannot go ahead with our desired option for any property. Therefore legally speaking, we have to have that as an option.

2.

Questioner: Councillor Bill Stephenson

Asked of: Councillor Susan Hall, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Environment Services and Community Safety

Question: "Has the Council joined the Carbon Trading Councils scheme?"

Answer: The Council has not subscribed to this scheme operated by the Local Government Information Unit. Harrow Council has signed the Nottingham Declaration and is taking action to reduce the carbon footprint of the Council's activities. The Climate Change Strategy, which was taken through Cabinet, is at the consultation

stage and will come back to Cabinet in due course.

Supplemental Question: Is Councillor Hall aware that sooner or later we will have to join this scheme? Is it not better to jump before you are pushed?

Supplemental Answer: No, it is actually better to learn to walk before you do anything else and that is what we are doing. We are doing a consultation at the moment. We are moving in a steadfast way but to make sure that we put in sustainable differences as opposed to ticking boxes. We have got our scheme going and we are making sure that everything we do is sustainable.

3.

Questioner: Councillor Bill Stephenson

Asked of: Councillor Susan Hall, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Environment Services and Community Safety

Question: "How many vehicles have been clamped on the Civic Centre site (i) for parking illegally in disabled bays, (ii) for parking illegally in general, for each of the last three financial years?"

Answer: We vigorously encourage good parking behaviour through our security staff and stickers are often put on vehicles asking them to park in a more considerate way.

We do not keep a register of the vehicles that are clamped. At the Civic Centre vehicles are only clamped for the inconvenience factor and there is not a charge for releasing clamps.

On highways the Council policy is not to clamp as well.

Supplemental Question: Is the Councillor aware that some officers claim that clamping notices at the Civic Centre are not legally worded and they cannot clamp vehicles? Would she check whether this is the case, both for the Civic Centre car park and other Council owned properties?

Supplemental Answer: We are aware that we cannot charge. It is a deterrent to put them up. We are looking into this now. Obviously, if you feel that people are parking and they should not be, then please do let us know. If you think that we should start taking out traffic orders in order to do that, then I would be very happy to hear what you have to say.

4.

Questioner: Councillor Bill Stephenson

Asked of: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Housing

Question: "What percentage of responsive maintenance repairs are currently being carried out by staff directly employed by Kier and what percentage are carried out by subcontractors?"

Answer: I am advised that approximately 65% of responsive repair works are carried out by Kier and the other 35% by specialist contractors covering such areas as glazing, UPVC windows, electrical locks, CCTV systems and the like.

5.

Questioner: Councillor Margaret Davine

Asked of: Councillor David Ashton, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Partnership and Finance

Question: "Will the Leader please request that the Chair of Overview and

Scrutiny, together with the Scrutiny Leads for Adults and Children monitor closely the Borough's preparedness for a widespread outbreak of Swine influenza?"

Answer: We as a Council have been working closely with the Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT) for over 5 years on the influenza pandemic possibility and planning thereof. The Department of Health is the lead government agency and locally the PCT has been leading on this, but we are very much a support for the PCT.

The Council's Environmental Health, Emergency Planning, Adults and Children's Services have met with their healthcare colleagues on a regular basis to put plans in place and make contingency arrangements, which are in place, and the frequency of these meetings was increased during the past few weeks when the World Health Organisation increased the global warning level from Level 4 to Level 5. As you know, we have almost daily swine flu updates which go out to all Members to keep them informed.

The agenda for scrutiny is up for scrutiny to determine and I am not sure that it would be advisable for them to review this yet but maybe later, maybe the Autumn. But I have no objections to raising it with the Chair of Scrutiny but of course it is up to them to see if they want to look into it. I would not expect or anticipate, as their schedule is quite crowded, that they would give it a huge amount of time but clearly it is an option for them. I would not stop them doing it and do not have the clout to do so.

6.

Questioner: Councillor Margaret Davine

Asked of: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Housing

Question: "Would the Portfolio Holder please ensure that all providers of Harrow services have robust plans in place to ensure continuity of service in the event of an influenza pandemic, and report back to all Councillors on the details of plans in place?"

Answer: The Council has been developing its business continuity arrangements for the past 3 years. This has included prioritisation of critical services using West London Alliance criteria, the identification of IT systems that these services depend upon in terms of delivery, and the development of departmental business continuity plans to ensure that we make sure that our services go out to our most vulnerable residents in the even of an influenza pandemic going up to Category 6.

All of the Council's departmental business continuity plans were completed in July 2008. Our annual review process starts in April each year and the current one will be completed in June. We have shared our planning processes with the Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT).

The Adults and Housing Service has specific plans in place. All contracted providers of services for vulnerable residents, such as Homecare, Residential Care and Nursing Care, as well as Supporting People services, have been reminded of their contractual obligations to have emergency plans in place and to revise these plans in light of the potential pandemic. The Council has asked for these revised plans to be submitted to our Contracts team for review by the end of this May.

Now, it might be said, if they have those plans in place, why are they not ready at the moment. I would just like to reassure you that we are taking the option to update those plans in light of recent PCT guidance and to ensure that those are ready in the case of moving towards a Level 6 categorisation of an influenza pandemic. The current crisis, and our planning around it, has been informed nationally and locally by some of the planning that

went around the avian flu outbreak and so, whilst we are all hoping that this does not progress to Level 6 and falls back quicker, we want to make sure that we are prepared for the worst if the worst should happen. This is only right for us and right for the residents who depend on our services.

Any work that is done around this outbreak is going to be useful in the future against a potential pandemic and most experts in the field expect it is a question of when, not if, it will happen. And so, by getting things ready now, it will inform our work just like the avian flu preparations helped to get ourselves in a better position, with respect of the current swine flu problem.

Supplemental Question: Would the Portfolio Holder agree that should the pandemic of any kind of influenza occur, the external providers of services, especially personal services to our elderly and vulnerable residents could be a weak link in the chain, as they are external. So do we not need to make sure specifically that they have plans that are as robust as the Council's and PCT's own?

Supplemental Answer: This is part of the process that we are undergoing. We are asking them to look at the plans that they have as part of the contractual obligations to us when they entered into those contracts with us. We are asking them to review them in light of the latest guidance from the PCT, in light of the current circumstances and the possible move to a Category 6 influenza pandemic.

When those revised plans come in, we will be looking to make sure that they are robust and that our team, both within the Council and with our PCT partner, are assured that they are robust, and that our care providers do not become a weak link.

The last thing we would want is people who are going into our care homes and residential circumstances to be the cause of further problems. We want to make sure that we make them a strong rather than a weak link.

[Note: In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 17.4, each Councillor asked a supplementary question, with the exception of question 4, and this was additionally answered].

621. **Forward Plan 1 May - 31 August 2009:**

The Chairman reported that two items on the Forward Plan, "Future Partnership Governance Arrangements for Adult Health and Social Care in Harrow", and "IT Strategy and Delivery Model", had been deferred to June. The item "Procurement of Sports and Leisure Facilities Contract Management Partner" had been deferred to September.

RESOLVED: To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 May – 31 August 2009.

622. **Progress on Scrutiny Projects:**

RESOLVED: To receive and note the current progress of the scrutiny reports.

623. **Establishment of Cabinet Committees, Advisory Panels and Consultative Forums and appointment of Chairmen:**

The Chairman reported that the nominations for Chairman and membership of Cabinet's Committees, Advisory Panels and Consultative Forums were before Members for consideration and approval. The appointment of Cabinet Assistants was also subject to approval.

RESOLVED: That the appointments for the Municipal Year 2009/10 as detailed in Appendix 1 to these minutes be approved.

Reason for Decision: To enable Cabinet bodies to be convened and Cabinet Assistants to be appointed.

624. **Timetable for the Preparation and Consideration of Statutory Plans and Strategies 2009/10:**

The Leader of the Council introduced a report, which set out the requirements of the Council's Constitution in terms of the development of its policy framework and sought approval to the timetable for consideration of four statutory plans and strategies. He advised that the timetable for the Local Implementation Plan was subject to the Mayor of London publishing the transport plan and then Transport for London publishing guidance. Dates for this plan were therefore not included in Appendix A to the report.

RESOLVED: That the timetable for the preparation and consideration of the statutory plans and strategies as set out at Appendix 2 to these minutes be approved.

Reason for Decision: To comply with the requirements of paragraph 3 of the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules set out in Section 4C of the Council's Constitution.

625. **Comprehensive Area Assessment and Audit Fee Letters 2009/10:**

The Corporate Director of Finance introduced a report, which provided Cabinet with an opportunity to comment on the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) and Audit programme and fees for 2009-10. She advised that this year, two separate fee letters had been received, one from the Audit Commission and the other from the External Auditor. She added that the fees were indicative and would be kept under review by both the Audit Commission and External Auditor.

The Corporate Director of Finance advised that the fees would be considered by the Governance, Audit and Risk Management Committee in June. She invited Portfolio Holders to send her comments on the fees which she would then forward on as appropriate.

The Chairman commented that it was pleasing to see that the fees were reducing.

RESOLVED: That the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) and Audit programme and fees for 2009-10 be noted.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that Cabinet was aware of the planned assessment and audit activity for 2009-10.

626. **Temporary to Permanent Housing Initiative:**

The Portfolio Holder for Adults and Housing introduced a report, which confirmed that the proposed West London Temporary to Permanent Housing initiative was no longer proceeding. He advised that paragraph 2.1.5 of the report set out the reasons for not continuing with the scheme.

RESOLVED: To note that the scheme was not proceeding for the reasons set out in the report of the Corporate Director of Adults and Housing.

Reason for Decision: The scheme was no longer proceeding.

627. **Key Decision - Future Organisation of Priestmead First School and Priestmead Middle School:**

The Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development introduced a report, which set out the outcome of the statutory consultation about the future organisation of Priestmead First School and Priestmead Middle School, and the recommendations of the federated governing body that the two schools amalgamate in January 2010.

The Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development reported that 77% of the responses from parents and staff of both schools were in support of the proposals whilst 6% were opposed. The Director of Schools and Children's Development advised that the governing body had commended the work of the headteachers and the support they had given to the whole process.

RESOLVED: That, having considered the outcome of the statutory consultation and the recommendation from the federated governing body, the publication of statutory notices to combine Priestmead First School and Priestmead Middle School be approved.

Reason for Decision: To exercise the local authority's statutory responsibility in relation to school organisation and to publish statutory notices to effect the change.

628. **Key Decision - Cedars Hall, Uxbridge Road, Harrow:**

The Portfolio Holder for Major Projects and Property introduced a report, which updated Cabinet on the current position with Cedars Hall and sought approval of a number of recommendations. The Leader of the Council stated that Members were keen to see the proposal progress and indicated that residents should contact him if any issues arose.

RESOLVED: That the Corporate Director of Place Shaping, in conjunction with Portfolio Holder for Major Projects and Property, be authorised to:

- a) permit a letting of Cedars Hall to Kids Can Achieve (KCA), subject to KCA receiving a quote for the refurbishment in line with their funding from Futurebuilders and KCA granting a sub lease to Weald Tenants and Residents Association (WTRA) at a peppercorn rent for the duration of their lease and other terms to be approved by the Corporate Director of Place Shaping;
- b) relax the timeline for the submission of the planning application and KCA submit a planning application no later than 6 weeks following the completion of the lease;
- c) agree alienation terms which permitted Futurebuilders (the proposed funders) only to assign, having first given the Council the option to take the property back on agreed terms, noting that assignment was to be with landlord's consent which would be statutorily qualified not to be unreasonably withheld;
- d) in the event of the Cedars Hall letting not proceeding, confirm the decision of Cabinet 21 May on 2008 and conclude the disposal of Cedars Hall site for residential development at best consideration, noting that the necessary marketing exercise would commence if and when suitable economic conditions prevailed.

Reason for Decision: If the letting of Cedars Hall proceeded, the recommendation would allow KCA access to funding from Futurebuilders to bring the property back into community use, providing a base for WTRA. If the option to accommodate WTRA in the new Cedars Youth Centre, to be redeveloped with the £4.1m grant, and KCA within the Council's existing school property was deemed suitable, then the leasing of Cedars Hall would not need to proceed. This would permit Cedars Hall to be disposed of for residential development generating a capital receipt in accordance with Option 2 in the May 2008 Cabinet Report.

629. **Key Decision - Sustainable Building Design Supplemental Planning Document - Adoption:**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise introduced a report, which stated that the objective of the Sustainable Building Design Supplemental Planning Document (SPD) was to ensure that new development within Harrow was designed to be more efficient, cost less to run (heat and maintain) and more sustainable. She drew attention to section 1 of the report which stated that the SPD also sought to encourage all residents to consider the actions they could take to reduce their own impacts on the environment. Through improving the sustainability of homes and buildings, it was anticipated that this SPD would contribute towards the Council meeting its commitment to tackle climate change as well as generally improving the quality of life of its residents. The Portfolio Holder drew attention to the recommendation from the Local Development Framework Panel.

The Corporate Director of Place Shaping stated that his department intended to provide sufficient and appropriate information to applicants to enable them to comply with the SPD requirements.

RESOLVED: That the Sustainable Building Design SPD, attached at Appendix A to the report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping, be adopted.

Reason for Decision: The SPD would, upon adoption, become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.05 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR DAVID ASHTON
Chairman

APPENDIX 1CABINET ADVISORY PANELS 2009/2010

(Membership in order of political group nominations)

ConservativeLabourLiberal Democrat**(1) BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION PARTNERSHIP PANEL (5)****(3)****(2)****I.**
Members**David Ashton
Narinder Singh Mudhar
Paul Osborn****Keith Ferry
Bill Stephenson *****II.**
Reserve
Members1. Tony Ferrari
2. Yogesh Teli
3. Tom Weiss1. Navin Shah
2. Thaya Idaikkadar
3. -

[Note: The Councillor representatives on the Partnership Board should be the same as the full-voting Members of the Business Transformation Partnership Panel.]

(2) CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL (6)**(4)****(2)****I**
Members**Husain Akhtar
Miss Christine Bednell
Janet Mote
Myra Michael****Mrs Margaret Davine *
Mitzi Green****II.**
Reserve
Members1. Mrs Vina Mithani
2. Julia Merison
3. John Nickolay
4. Mark Versallion1. B E Gate
2. Raj Ray**(3) EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS PANEL (3)****(2)****(1)****I**
Members**Husain Akhtar
Anjana Patel****Asad Omar *****II.**
Reserve
Members1. G Chowdhury
2. Julia Merison
3. Narinder Singh Mudhar1. Krishna James
2. -
3. -

(4) GRANTS PANEL (10)**(6)****(4)****I.**
Members

Don Billson
G Chowdhury
Ashok Kulkarni
Mrs Myra Michael
Chris Mote (from 31 Aug –
Jean Lammiman)
Joyce Nickolay

Ms Nana Asante
Asad Omar
Mrs Rekha Shah *
Mrs Sasi Suresh

II.
Reserve
Members

1. Manji Kara
 2. Yogesh Teli
 3. Narinder Singh Mudhar
 4. Jeremy Zeid
 5. Susan Hall
 6. Julia Merison

1. Nizam Ismail
 2. David Gawn
 3. Thaya Idaikkadar
 4. Krishna James

(5) HARROW BUSINESS CONSULTATIVE PANEL (4)**(2)****(2)****I.**
Members

Susan Hall
Manji Kara

Mrinal Choudhury *
Keith Ferry

II.
Reserve
Members

1. Yogesh Teli
 2. Mrs Vina Mithani
 3. Mrs Myra Michael

1. Thaya Idaikkadar
 2. Mrs Sasi Suresh
 3. -

(6) LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PANEL (7)**(4)****(3)****I**
Members

Husain Akhtar
Marilyn Ashton
Manji Kara
Joyce Nickolay

Keith Ferry *
Thaya Idaikkadar
Navin Shah

II.
Reserve
Members

1. G Chowdhury
 2. Don Billson
 3. Dinesh Solanki
 4. Julia Merison

1. Mano Dharmarajah
 2. Jerry Miles
 3. Raj Ray

(7) SUPPORTING PEOPLE PANEL (5)**(3)****(2)****I.
Members**

Jean Lammiman (from 31 Aug –
Dinesh Solanki) Mrs Margaret Davine *
David Gawn
Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Yogesh Teli

**II.
Reserve
Members**

1. Mrs Myra Michael
2. Jeremy Zeid
3. Mrs Vina Mithani

1. Krishna James
2. Nizam Ismail
3. -

(8) TRAFFIC PANEL (10)**(6)****(4)****I.
Members**

Manji Kara
Ashok Kulkarni
Julia Merison
John Nickolay
Yogesh Teli
Jeremy Zeid

Mrinal Choudhury
Nizam Ismail
Jerry Miles *
David Perry

**II.
Reserve
Members**

1. G Chowdhury
2. Paul Osborn
3. Mrs Vina Mithani
4. Husain Akhtar
5. Susan Hall

1. Bob Currie
2. Graham Henson
3. Raj Ray
4. Keith Ferry

(CH)
(VC)

= Chair

= Vice-Chair

* Denotes Group Members on Panels for consultation on administrative matters.

To note the membership of the following informal body.

BUDGET REVIEW WORKING GROUP (6)**(4)****(2)****I.
Members**

David Ashton
John Cowan
Richard Romain
Tom Weiss

Archie Foulds *
Bill Stephenson

**II.
Reserve
Members**

1. Salim Miah
2. Ashok Kulkarni
3. Yogesh Teli
4. Jeremy Zeid

1. Thaya Idaikkadar
2. Mrinal Choudhury
3. -

CONSULTATIVE FORUMS**“ADVISORY” COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED UNDER SECTION 102(4) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972, APPOINTED BY CABINET**

(Membership in order of political group nominations)

Conservative**Labour****(1) EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM (7)****(4)****(3)****I.**
Members

Mrs Camilla Bath
Miss Christine Bednell
Janet Mote
Anjana Patel

B E Gate
Raj Ray
Bill Stephenson *

II.
Reserve
Members

1. Husain Akhtar
2. Julia Merison
3. Mrs Vina Mithani
4. Jean Lammiman

1. Keeki Thammaiah
2. Nizam Ismail
3. David Perry

(Representatives of the Teachers', Governors', Elected Parent Governor Representatives', Denominational Representatives' and Arts Culture Representatives' Constituencies)
(Mrs C Millard (Governor Representative) (VC))

(2) EMPLOYEES' CONSULTATIVE FORUM (7)**Council Representatives****(4)****(3)****I.**
Members

David Ashton
Mrs Camilla Bath
Susan Hall
Paul Osborn

Bob Currie
Graham Henson *
Phillip O'Dell

II.
Reserve
Members

1. Joyce Nickolay
2. Don Billson
3. Julia Merison
4. Tony Ferrari

1. B E Gate
2. Keith Ferry
3. Navin Shah

[Note: In accordance with the Forum's Terms of Reference, the Council membership should include the Leader and/or Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder with responsibility for human resources].

Employee Representatives

Six UNISON Representatives

Lynne Ahmad, Mary Cawley, Anna Jackson, Gary Martin, Robert Thomas, (Vacancy)

One GMB Representative:

John Dunbar

Three HTCC Representatives

Lynne Snowdon, (2 vacancies)

(Note: The Chairman of the Employees' Committee shall be a Council side representative in 2009/2010, and the Vice-Chairman is to be appointed by the Employees' side. These appointments shall thereafter alternate in succeeding years) (TBC (Employees' Side Representative) appointed VC 2009/10).

(3) TENANTS' AND LEASEHOLDERS' CONSULTATIVE FORUM (4)

I.	(2)	(2)
<u>Members</u>	Barry Macleod-Cullinane Yogesh Teli	Bob Currie * David Gawn
II.	1. G Chowdhury	1. Phillip O'Dell
<u>Reserve</u>	2. Ashok Kulkarni	2. B E Gate
<u>Members</u>	3. Mrs Myra Michael	3. -

"ADVISORY" COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED UNDER SECTION 85A OF THE SCHOOLS STANDARDS FRAMEWORK ACT 1998**HARROW ADMISSIONS FORUM (3)**

The appointment of Council Members is subject to the agreement of the Forum at its next meeting.

<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Labour</u>
(2)	(1)
Anjana Patel Dinesh Solanki	Bill Stephenson *

Other Representatives

Community Schools (Governor)	-	Vacancy
Community Schools (Primary)	-	Sue Jones
Community Schools (Secondary)	-	Allan Jones
Jewish School	-	Mrs D Palman
Roman Catholic School	-	Mike Murphy
Church of England School	-	Mrs S Hinton
Church of England Diocese	-	Rev Paul Reece
Catholic Schools Diocese	-	Mr Billiet
Primary Elected Parent Governor Representative	-	Mrs D Speel
Secondary Elected Parent Governor Representative	-	Mr R Chauhan
Harrow Council for Racial Equality	-	Julia Smith (temporary)
Early Years Development Partnership	-	Helena Tucker
Children's Services Representative	-	(Vacancy)

NB: Each school in the Borough is also entitled to appoint their own representative on this Forum.

(CH)
(VC)
*

= Chair
= Vice-Chair
Denotes Group Members on Panels for consultation on administrative matters.

**APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRS TO ADVISORY PANELS AND CONSULTATIVE FORUMS
FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009-10**

Advisory Panel

Budget Review Working Group
Business Transformation Partnership Panel
Corporate Parenting Panel
Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel
Grants Advisory Panel

Harrow Business Consultative Panel
Local Development Framework Advisory Panel
Supporting People Advisory Panel
Traffic Advisory Panel

Consultative Forum

Education Consultative
Employees' Consultative *
Tenants' and Leaseholders' Consultative

Other Forum

Harrow Admissions (appointed by the Forum)

Appointment

Councillor David Ashton
Councillor Paul Osborn
Councillor Janet Mote
Councillor Anjana Patel
Councillor Chris Mote
(from 31 Aug – Councillor Jean Lammiman)
Councillor Manji Kara
Councillor Marilyn Ashton
Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Councillor John Nickolay

Councillor Anjana Patel
Councillor Paul Osborn
Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

To be decided by the Forum

[* Note: The appointment of the Vice-Chair for 2009-10 will be appointed by the Employee's side].

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER SOCIAL SERVICES EXECUTIVE BODIES FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009/10

BODY

Appointment

Adoption Panel

Councillor Miss Christine Bednell

Fostering Panel

Councillor Miss Christine Bednell

[Note: In relation to the Adoption Panel, the statutory guidance states that 'where possible, the Local Authority should appoint an elected member from the corporate parenting group or a member with responsibility for children's services.']

REPRESENTATION ON HOMES LIMITED (FORMERLY WARDEN HOUSING COMMITTEE AND RAYNERS LANE ESTATE COMMITTEE) FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009/10

BODY

Appointment

Homes Limited
(formerly Warden Housing Committee and
Rayners Lane Estate Committee)

Councillor Bob Currie
Councillor Graham Henson

[Note: The appointed Members are local Roxbourne Ward Councillors]

REPRESENTATION RE – PRIMARY CARE TRUST JOINT WORKING BODIES FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009/10

BODY

Appointment

Health and Social Integration Board

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Councillor Mrs Margaret Davine

Adult Health and Social Care Partnership

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Councillor Mrs Margaret Davine

Children and Young People's Partnership

Councillor Miss Christine Bednell
Councillor Bill Stephenson

[Note: There are two appointments for each body]

APPOINTMENT OF CABINET SUPPORT MEMBERS 2009/10

Cabinet Member	Assistant (Support Member)
<u>Cllr David Ashton</u> Leader (Strategy, Partnership and Finance)	(1) Cllr John Cowan (2) Cllr Tom Weiss
<u>Cllr Susan Hall</u> Deputy Leader, Environment Services & Community Safety	(1) Cllr Julia Merison (2) Cllr John Nickolay
<u>Cllr Marilyn Ashton</u> Planning, Development & Enterprise	Cllr Joyce Nickolay
<u>Cllr Christine Bednell</u> Children's Services	Cllr Husain Akhtar
<u>Councillor Tony Ferrari</u> Major Contracts & Property	(1) Cllr Richard Romain (2) Cllr Jeremy Zeid
<u>Cllr Barry McLeod-Cullinane</u> Adults & Housing	(1) Cllr Jean Lammiman (from 31 Aug Cllr Dinesh Solanki) (2) Cllr Yogesh Teli
<u>Cllr Chris Mote</u> Community & Cultural Services	(1) Cllr Manji Kara (2) Cllr Golam Chodhury
<u>Cllr Paul Osborn</u> Performance, Communication & Corporate Services	Cllr Narinder Mudhar Singh
<u>Cllr Anjana Patel</u> Schools & Children's Development	Cllr Husain Akhtar

APPOINTMENTS TO THE BTP PARTNERSHIP BOARD 2009/10**I.**
Members

1. Councillor David Ashton
2. Councillor Narinder Singh
Mudhar
3. Councillor Paul Osborn

1. Councillor Keith Ferry
2. Councillor Bill Stephenson*

II.
Reserve
Members

1. Councillor Tony Ferrari
2. Councillor Yogesh Teli
3. Councillor Tom Weiss

1. Councillor Navin Shah
2. Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX A

STATUTORY PLAN/ STRATEGY 2008/9 (AND DEADLINE DATE)	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CABINET MEETING	COUNCIL MEETING
1. DEVELOPMENT PLAN	Core Strategy – Preferred Options 24 September 2009 TBA	Core Strategy – Preferred Options 22 October 2009 TBA	Core Strategy – Preferred Options 29 October 2009 TBA
2. LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	TBA	TBA	TBA
3. CORPORATE PLAN	10 February 2010	11 February 2010	18 February 2010
4. COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN	Approved in March 2008 for a 3 year period →		
5. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY	Approved in April 2009 for at least two and probably three years →		
6. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN	Not required in 2009		
7. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE STRATEGIC PLAN	Approved in May 2009 for a 2 year period →		
8. GAMBLING POLICY	24 September 2009	22 October 2009	29 October 2009
9. LICENSING POLICY	Approved in 2007 for a 3 year period – Review 2010 →		