

# GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 29 JULY 2010

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Nana Asante

**Councillors:** \* Sue Anderson \* Mrs Vina Mithani  
\* Nizam Ismail \* Chris Mote  
\* Krishna James \* Joyce Nickolay  
\* Manji Kara \* Sasi Suresh

**In attendance:** Bill Stephenson  
**(Councillors)** Chris Noyce (Minute 10)  
Ramji Chauhan

\* Denotes Member present

### 1. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

### 2. Appointment of Reserve Member

**RESOLVED:** That the Panel note the appointment of Councillor Lynda Seymour as a Reserve Member of the Grants Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2010/11.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

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

Agenda Item 10 – Grants Appeals 2010/11

Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest in the following organisations:

## **Organisation**

- Age Concern
- Alan Senitt Memorial Trust
- Association of Senior Muslim Citizens
- Aspire
- Girl Guiding Middlesex
- Harrow Healthy Living Centre
- Harrow Mencap
- Home Group
- Middlesex Association for the Blind

She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in that she worked for Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT) and occasionally visited the Harrow Healthy Living Centre. She declared a further personal interest in Harrow Mencap as her husband was a governor of Kingsley School. She would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Nizam Ismail declared a personal interest in that he was Chairman of the Harrow Muslim Council. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Krishna James declared a personal interest in that she was Ward Councillor for Harrow Healthy Living Centre and had previously used the facilities. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Manji Kara declared a personal interest in that he was a Council representative for Age Concern. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Chris Mote declared a personal interest in that he had known the Senitt family for a number of years. He left the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Deven Pillay declared a prejudicial interest in the following organisations:

## **Organisation**

- Age Concern
- Alan Senitt Memorial Trust
- Association of Senior Muslim Citizens
- Aspire
- Girl Guiding Middlesex
- Harrow Mencap
- Harrow in Business

- Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS) / Harrow Refugees and Minorities Forum (HaRF) / Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) / Relate (Harrow) / Flash Musicals
- Middlesex Association for the Blind/Age Concern/Harrow Mencap

He left the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

#### 4. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2010, be taken and read and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

##### Minute 214 – Grant Funding 2010/11

That the 5<sup>th</sup> line in the second paragraph be amended to read:

“... Upon agreement that the revised proposals be considered, the Labour Group brought forward an amendment. Following a vote this second amendment was lost.”

#### 5. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani as Vice-Chairman of the Grants Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2010/2011.

#### 6. Public Questions

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following public questions were received:

1.

**Questioner:** Dawn Palmer

**Question:** Can you explain why the Assessment Panel made errors which resulted in an inaccurate report to the Grants Advisory Panel on the 3rd March which had a material effect on the decision and why despite receiving apologies about the serious errors, the report prepared for the Panel of 1st July does not seek to correct the impact of the mistakes?

**Answer:** “If you are willing to admit you are wrong when you are wrong, you are all right”

The officer report for 3 March said monitoring information was not submitted by the deadline. Subsequent correspondence showed this not to be the case. The Officers’ Summary Grant Appeal Report presented for the meeting on 1 July 2010 rescheduled to 29 July 2010 states monitoring information for 2008/09 not received by

the deadline.

At the meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> March, Councillors were told that monitoring information had not been received. On the basis of that report, Girl Guiding Middlesex was not considered for a grant. After the meeting, it emerged that Girl Guiding Middlesex had actually sent Monitoring Information. Therefore Councillors were given an erroneous report which had a material effect on their decision.

Apologies were sent to the organisation by Cllr Susan Hall (Deputy Leader at the time) and by Brendon Hills (Corporate Director of Community & Environment) regarding incorrect information on the Harrow Council website relating to CRB checks. The incorrect information was promptly removed from the Harrow Council website.

The Officers' Summary Grant Appeal Report presented for the meeting on 1 July 2010 rescheduled to 29 July 2010 states that complete monitoring information had not been submitted.

## 2.

**Questioner:** Avani Modasia

**Question:** How are appeals to the Grants Panel managed to ensure that it is an objective and equitable process?

**Answer:** The Grants Advisory Panel meeting on 7 March 2007 recommended the following grounds for review:

- If the organisation feels it did meet the grants criteria and demonstrated compliance in its application.
- If the organisation feels that information contained in the officer report submitted to the panel was incorrect or incomplete and had a material affect on the decision.
- Also, in relation to appeals, the Grants Advisory Panel at its meeting on 6 July 2006, agreed that they would not allow a review simply because an organisation felt that the grant recommended was less than what they applied for.

Using the grounds for appeal, the Head of Service undertakes a review of all of the papers and prepares a review report for the Corporate Director to take to the

## Grants Advisory Panel.

Members take note of the report and the evidence before them and come to a view. They then make recommendations to Cabinet which takes the actual decision.

**Supplemental Question** Why were some organisations given the chance to get clarity on some of the things that were not clear and we had not had any contact to give clarification on issues which were unclear to the assessors. i.e. who would be the lead on the project if they thought that was not clear on the bid.

**Answer** A fair Grants Process requires transparency and similar treatment of all applicants. It is unfortunate that in some instances clarification was sought before reports were written and in other instances, this did not happen. I can assure you that Councillors on all sides are anxious that due process should be followed and mistakes rectified; we will be taking the time needed to properly discuss the appeals and come to a considered decision. In terms of the nomination of a lead organisation, since it is usual that one organisation takes the lead as the accountable body.

3.

**Questioner:** Ross Hensman

**Question:** Is Grants funding just for historical uses only, or can it be used for unique innovative services for the most needy?

**Answer:** In theory, grants funding in Harrow is used for “supporting a vibrant, innovative and effective voluntary and community sector and recognises the unique role of voluntary and community groups in enabling local people to identify needs and to develop services to meet those needs”.

Unfortunately, in practice, Grants funding has not lived up to those laudable goals published in the information to applicants. The Scrutiny Review in 2008 addressed the problem. The streamlined grants process has been one outcome. Members will be proposing that a survey of applicants is carried out to assess how they found the grants process of 2010/11 and use the findings to improve the 2011/12 process.

## 7. Petitions

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at this meeting under the provisions of the Executive Procedure Rule 49 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

## 8. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution) that Executive Procedure Rules 50.1 and 50.4 be suspended in order to receive a deputation from the Alan Senitt Memorial Trust in relation to Agenda Item 10 Grant Appeals 2010/11

A representative from the Alan Senitt Memorial Trust contended that:

- the programme was unique and innovative and provided young people with Leadership Skills and valuable work experience so that they became effective citizens;
- the project encouraged young people of different faiths to work together so that they could learn from each other and impact the community around them in a very effective way;
- the Grants Advisory Panel meeting on 3 March 2010 did not treat the organisation fairly and support the development of the service that the Trust provided.

In response to questions from Members of the Panel, the representative clarified that:

- the Trust provided a service to pupils attending Nower Hill High School, as it was the secondary school previously attended by Alan Senitt. The programme was also offered in schools located in Watford, Bushey and Hayes;
- at the time of submitting the application for Grants funding, the organisation was not aware that it would not received funding on the basis that the service was also offered in schools outside the Harrow Borough. As a result, the organisation had modified its application and was now requesting 25% of the original funding requested;
- the programme was aimed at Year 10 pupils who were elected to attend the programme by the school and would complete alongside their GCSEs. Personal safety and Community Leadership was also offered by the programme. Pupils had participated in local community projects that supported vulnerable people, such as, participating in activities at the Milmans Day Centre.

In thanking the representative for the deputation, the Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that the Panel would consider the information contained in the appeal papers submitted by the Trust. He added

that the information received by the application closing date of 30 October 2009 was considered by officers during the allocation process. Any information received after this date was additional. As a result, officers and the Panel were unable to consider subsequent information received after that date or during this meeting.

In concurring with the advice provided by the Corporate Director, the Chairman urged the Panel to distinguish between original information in the application received by the deadline, new information provided today and any information already in the application submitted which was highlighted in the Deputation when making their decision. Whilst the Panel cannot rely on new information, it can take into account information which was in the application but was omitted from the report if the omission had a material effect on the decision made on 3 March 2010.

## **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

### **9. Appointment of Panel Adviser**

The Panel received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services in which they were requested to consider appointing an adviser to the Panel for 2010/11 Municipal Year to assist the work of the Panel on general and specific matters.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)

That Deven Pillay be appointed as the Adviser to the Grants Advisory Panel for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

### **10. Grant Appeals 2010/11**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment that presented the appeals received against the recommendations made by the Grants Advisory Panel on 3 March 2010 and the decision made by Cabinet on 18 March 2010.

An officer outlined the recommendations of the report and advised that organisations had a right to appeal if they felt that the information presented to the Panel on 3 March 2010 was incorrect or if information was omitted and that this had a material effect on the Panel's decision.

#### **Grounds for Appeal**

He added that in assessing whether an organisation had grounds for appeal:

- any additional information provided by the applicant after the application closing date (30 October 2009) or submitted as part of an appeal; or

- if an organisation felt that the grant recommended was less than what they had applied for

could not be considered as a basis for an appeal.

### **The assessment process**

The officer outlined the three-stage assessment process that applied to all grant applications received by the closing date:

#### Stage 1

Applicants were required to fulfil the grants criteria to be eligible for funding and qualify for the second stage. The Home Group were eliminated at this stage as they were not a registered charity and had an annual turnover in excess of £230 million.

#### Stage 2

Applications that had been assessed and scored using the assessment tool were positioned below or above the threshold applicable to the amount of funding they were requesting. Applications, such as, the Association of Senior Muslim Citizens, that did not score above the threshold were eliminated at this stage.

#### Stage 3

- a) All remaining applications were required to demonstrate whether their services were delivered outside of the borough and if Harrow residents would benefit from them. Any applications that could not demonstrate this were eliminated;
- b) applications that did not provide a breakdown of how the budget for a particular activity would be funded by the funding applied for were also eliminated;
- c) other applications that had received funding in 2008/09 and had not provided monitoring information or evidence by the application deadline were also eliminated from the process.

A number of applications, including the Alan Senitt Trust and Girlguiding Middlesex North West had been eliminated at this stage.

- d) other organisations, such as, Aspire, Harrow Healthy Living Centre, Harrow Mencap/Middlesex Association for the Blind and Age Concern partnership Consortium were eliminated at this final stage as the proposed projects in their application duplicated another service being delivered or being considered for funding by the Council for 2010/11.

### **Lessons to be learnt**

The Panel were advised of the issues that had been highlighted by the recent grants round which included, the eligibility criteria that organisations must fulfil and the duplication of services that different organisations would provide. An



officer added that organisation would be advised that the duplication of services would be considered as part of the assessment criteria.

### **Funding Position**

The remaining balance from the total grants allocation in 2010/11 was £10,648.

The grant award to the National Autistic Society Harrow Branch for 2009/10 for the School Link Project had been returned as they were unable to access these funds from their Head Office. Additionally, the Whittlesea Life Skills Association had declined the grant awarded to them as maintenance costs for premises leased by the association would be met by Shaftesbury High School.

As a result the total funds available for distribution through the appeals process was £18,608. Officers recommended that any unallocated funds would be placed in a reserve fund.

### **Options available to the Panel**

As there were insufficient funds to meet the cost of the appeals process, the Panel were requested to consider and recommend one of the options below to the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services:

- (1) funding be allocated to organisations that had achieved the highest score during the assessment process. Those with lower scores would be placed on a reserve list;
- (2) each successful applicant would receive half of their grant and the remainder would be distributed when the funds became available;
- (3) the funding would be placed in a reserve fund and the organisations would be placed on a reserve list. Funding would be allocated when sufficient funds became available.

Following the presentation, the Chairman invited Members to discuss how they wished to proceed. She explained that not having funds for appeals could be taken as having predetermined that no appeal would be successful, an untenable position which could be challenged in Law. A Member expressed his concern regarding the Panel's consideration of the appeals as any decisions made could lead to legal and/or COMPACT challenges. He added that, as the Panel could not change the rules set for 2010/11, the Panel could discuss what changes could be made for 2011/12. In response, the Chairman commented that Members were expected to discuss the appeals and come to a view; there was no proposal to change the rules set for 2010/11. The criteria for appeals were narrow: the information in the reports had to have been incorrect and that mistake must have had a material effect on the decision. Members needed to consider information contained in the officers report as well as the information provided by appellants. In answer to questions, she had promised that Members would discuss the appeals and come to a decision. She added that the Panel could not consider issues

raised by information submitted by organisations after the closing date or new information submitted as part of their appeal. In terms of the funding available, she noted that insufficient funds were available in the grants budget to meet the cost of appeals but the Panel should note that where there were grounds for appeal, organisations should be in the same position they would have been in, if their original application had been handled properly on 3 March 2010.

The Adviser reported that organisations could receive funding from their appeal even though their original application had been rejected. He advised that the Panel should seek to make equitable decisions on the appeals they would be considering. In response, the Chairman thanked the Adviser for his comment and added that the appeals process gave Members the opportunity to consider appeals with the correct information available to them. The appeals process gave organisations the opportunity to have their applications reconsidered by the Panel where wrong information had been presented which had a material effect on the decision..

The Panel considered the officers report and made a decision on the appeals received as follows:

### **Home Group**

Officers had recommended for the appeal application for funding to be upheld as one of the grounds it had originally been rejected for was that having completing a search of the Charity Commission records, it had not been listed as a registered charity. The Home Group had appealed as it was a registered charity under the Industrial and Provident Services Act 1965 and appeared on the FSA Mutual Register.

In response to a question raised by a Member of the Panel, the Chairman reported that officers had been told during briefings before the Grants Advisory Panel meeting of 3 March that it was not a Grant Condition that organisations should be registered charities and in any case an Industrial and Provident Society was charitable in aims. It is unfortunate that a Grant Condition was being imposed which did not form part of the criteria. Members pointed out that they had not seen a report on Home Group and that it was important that one should be provided in order to be equitable in the decision making process.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment added that the officers' assessment of the Home Group had been included in the report. He added that the officers' summary grant appeal report was not prepared for consideration for the Panel.

Members pointed out that summary reports formed part of the information Members use for their decision of 3 March. In light of this, it was agreed that officers would prepare a report on the appeal for funding by Home Group for the Panel to consider at a future meeting.

## **Harrow Healthy Living Centre**

This organisation had not been recommended for funding as officers had concluded that it duplicated the services of another organisation in the same area and had a similar target group.

In response to a Members comment on the activities that the organisation provided, the Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that the Panel should consider information contained in the application. An officer added that the organisation had not submitted an application in previous years. The Corporate Director advised that following investigations, officers had clarified that there was no duplication and had accordingly updated the advice provided to the Panel.

In light of the information contained in the officer report, the Panel agreed by majority that the appeal be upheld and that the amount awarded be reserved.

## **Harrow Mencap/Middlesex Association for the Blind/ Age Concern Consortium**

Following his declaration of a prejudicial interest on this item and the organisations concerned, the Adviser to the Panel left the room and did not take part in the discussion and decision-making for this organisation.

The application had been rejected on the grounds that the project would duplicate the work of another service and that the partnership did not have a track record of delivering the project. The application did not stipulate which of the three organisations would be accountable.

In the discussion, Members comments included that:

- officers had concluded that the partnership did not have a track record. However, the individual organisations forming the partnership had an established reputation for delivering services;
- each individual organisation had a history and track record of delivering a service in their specialist area to Harrow residents and a track record of partnership working;
- some of the organisations had received funding as part of their individual grant applications. It seemed perverse that funding could not be provided to these organisations as a partnership;
- with the current grant criteria, applicants could apply for funding more than once if they were providing different services. The Panel were tasked with considering whether the project could be delivered;
- there was no duplication as the partnership would be providing a service, that included, Human Resources and Financing for smaller organisations within the borough, which at present was not being provided by any other organisation.

An officer advised that the proposed service to be provided by the consortium would not be duplicating an existing service. She added that the application failed to nominate a lead organisation in the consortium. Members pointed out that it was usual practice in the VCS that where there was a partnership or consortium a lead organisation was nominated.

In light of Members comments and the advice provided by officers, the Panel agreed by majority that the appeal for funding should be upheld.

### **Alan Senitt Memorial Trust**

Councillor Chris Mote left the room before the appeal was discussed as he had declared an interest in that he had known the Senitt family for a number of years. He left the room and did not take part in the discussion or the decision-making for this organisation.

As Ward Councillor for where the organisation was based, Councillor Noyce took part in the discussion on this item. He advised that the project took place in four schools, one of which was in the borough. As a result, the organisation had amended their original funding application to 25% of the original amount requested. He added that the organisation was a worthwhile cause that benefited Harrow and its young residents. If the appeal was unsuccessful, he requested for the Panel to consider the application when assessing the 2011/12 grant allocation process.

In response to Councillor Noyce's submission, the Chairman noted that the organisation was prepared to amend the funding being requested because only one of the schools was in Harrow, however the grant conditions do not require that the schools be in Harrow but that Harrow residents benefit. She added that the deputation had highlighted why funding was required and that information was in the original application. She added that the organisation only needed to demonstrate that projects supported by Harrow grant funding would benefit Harrow residents and the appellant had done so in their Deputation. A Member added that children living in Harrow may attend one of the schools located outside of the borough. The Adviser to the Panel commented that organisations services should not be confined to Harrow if the organisation can demonstrate that its services benefit children living in Harrow.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that the revised figure of 25% included in the appeal application had not been included in the original application. He added that this was new information submitted by the organisation after the application closing date. He requested that the Panel be consistent in their decision, as other organisations could have appealed for funding on the same grounds.

Members were of the view that Alan Sennitt did not need to confine itself to 25% of the original application but needed to assure Harrow that the funding would benefit Harrow children. Since it is not a Grant Condition that the schools must be in Harrow and since it is a matter of record that Harrow children attend out of borough schools, based on information which was

provided in the original application which had been highlighted to Members in the Deputation, Members were of the view that the appeal had merit on the narrow grounds of appeal outlined above.

Following the discussion, the Panel agreed by majority to uphold the appeal, subject to the condition that the organisation can provide an audit trail that Harrow children are benefiting from their service.

### **Girlguiding Middlesex North West**

Officers had not recommended that this organisation receive funding as the budget breakdown did not relate to the leadership programme described in their application. The organisation had also failed to provide comprehensive monitoring information for 2008/09 by the agreed deadline as requested.

The Chairman reported that the information in the report was incorrect and misled the Panel who considered the original application at its meeting in March 2010. The Panel was told that the organisation had not submitted Monitoring Information. After the meeting, this information was found to be incorrect. Secondly, the organisation was not applying for funding for the leadership programme so it is not surprising that the budget did not relate to it. The comment about the leadership programme was unhelpful as the organisation was applying for a contribution to the Willow Tree Centre.

A Member responded and stated that at the meeting in March 2010, the Panel made a decision based on the information available. He added that the decision to uphold the appeal could be challenged.

The Chairman pointed out that the grounds of appeal were whether information was incorrect and whether this had a material effect on the decision. The Panel of 3 March was told that monitoring Information had not been submitted, this was found to be incorrect.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment added that the monitoring information provided by the organisations was an important role of the grant function and was material for officers to assess whether an organisation was fit for purpose. He added that organisations had not been eligible for funding as they had not fully provided monitoring information and had not provided a breakdown of how the funding would be used.

The Chairman pointed out that the information provided on 3 March was that the organisation had failed to provide monitoring information. This was modified after a series of exchanges after the meeting to mean that the information was incomplete. Members should have been given the correct information at the meeting. The grounds of appeal include whether information was incorrect **and** had a material effect on the decision. In this case, the information was incorrect and had an effect on the decision.

In light of the discussion, Members agreed by majority that the appeal for funding be upheld.

## **Aspire**

Funding for this organisation was not recommended as it had not provided costings for one year as required by the eligibility criteria.

The Chairman reported that it was practice in Harrow that applications for more than £10 000 of funding were awarded for 3 years. This is best practice and was also a recommendation of the recent Scrutiny Report. These types of awards gave stability to the Voluntary and Community Sector and were valued. It would therefore be perverse to penalise an organisation for assuming that the Grants Advisory Panel was following best practice.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that the total cost of the project was £180,000 over three years. The application had requested funding of £30,000 over three years.

The Adviser to the Panel stated that the Panel should consider sustainability of the project as funding may be agreed for part of the project and may not be sustained for its entirety.

The Corporate Director advised that the organisation had provided an explanation of how the service would be maintained if future funding applications were rejected.

For this particular application, the Panel agreed by majority to uphold the appeal for 2010/11 on the condition that the organisation was advised that funding may not be awarded for future years.

## **Association of Senior Muslim Citizens**

The organisation had not been recommended for funding as it had scored below the funding threshold. Officers had not recommended that the appeal be upheld as they had not fulfilled the appeal criteria.

Members noted that the organisation had received funding under an exceptional top-up in the previous year.

As the organisation did not meet the grounds for an appeal, the Panel unanimously agreed that the appeal should be refused.

## **Harrow MENCAP**

The organisation had failed to meet the appeals criteria. An officer requested that the Panel to make a judgement based on information in the original application.

Having considered the information available to them the Panel unanimously agreed that the officers recommendation be upheld and refused the appeal.

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

Comment re predetermination that the failure to provide sufficient funds in the grants budget for appeals could be seen as predetermining that no appeal should be successful. Therefore, as there are insufficient funds available in the grants budget to meet the cost of the appeals upheld, that Cabinet consider how the grants to the organisations whose appeals were upheld will be funded. In order to avoid a reoccurrence of this, in future the grants funding and appeals time-table to be modified in such a way that no grant is agreed until all appeals have been heard.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder of Community and Cultural Services)

- (1) That the appeals of:
- Harrow Healthy Living Group
  - Harrow Mencap/MAB/Age Concern Consortium
  - Alan Senitt Memorial Trust
  - Girlguiding Middlesex North West
  - Aspire

be UPHELD.

- (2) the appeals of:
- Harrow Mencap
  - Association of Senior Muslim Citizens

be DECLINED.

- (3) officers would prepare a summary report on the appeal application submitted by the Home Group for the Panel to consider at a future meeting;
- (4) that a report be prepared on how the grants time-table can be modified to accommodate a meaningful appeals process which would avoid the charge of predetermination.

## **11. Grants Review**

In view of the late hour, the Panel was unable to receive a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment that proposed that consideration be given to revising the Council's voluntary sector funding arrangements and that members of the sector be consulted on this.

Members agreed unanimously that discussion should be deferred until the next Panel meeting in September.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that under the COMPACT agreement, officers would need twelve weeks to consult with the voluntary sector about the proposed revisions. If the Panel were to discuss the report in September, a delay to the 2011/12 grants round would

occur and officers would not be able to implement any decisions taken until December 2010.

In response to a question by the Chairman, the Adviser clarified that Cabinet could not make a decision until the consultation process had been completed. The Corporate Director confirmed that if the Panel agreed with the officers' recommendations in the report, the Portfolio Holder could take the decision for the voluntary sector to be consulted. This would enable officers to continue with the timetable for assessing grant applications before the end of this financial year. If the decision to go out to consultation was made at the Cabinet meeting in September, this would lead to considerable delay and decisions for funding may be taken in the 2011/12 financial year. This could have budgetary implications. Members however pointed out that it was more important to get the process right than to rush it.

In light of the advice received, the Chairman sought clarification on whether the Adviser could engage with the voluntary sector and ask whether they would be willing to agree to a reduced consultation period. In response, he advised that he could not speak for the sector before consulting with them but engaging with the voluntary sector to discuss any revisions to the funding arrangements was vital. He added that the process would need to be well organised and a contingency plan would need to be agreed.

The Corporate Director of Community and Environment advised that in order to continue with the timetable, a special meeting of the Panel could be arranged to discuss the report. This would enable officers to start the consultation process and complete the assessment process in time for the Panel meeting in March 2011. In response, some Members stated that the issue should be fully debated in order for a clear, correct and proper process to be implemented.

**RESOLVED:** That discussion on the report be deferred until the meeting of the Panel on 7 September 2010.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio holder of Community and Cultural Services) That

- (1) the Portfolio Holder delegate authority to officers to write to all voluntary organisations advising them that the grants time-table would change this year because of the necessary consultation
- (2) officers would circulate this information to a wider area and advise the voluntary sector accordingly.

## **12. Extension and Termination of the Meeting**

In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** At 9.55 pm to continue until 10.10 pm.



### 13. Any Other Urgent Business

#### Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman advised Members that she had received letters from the Willow Tree Centre and Harrow Muslim Council (HMC). The letter from Harrow Muslim Council referred to the issue of public liability insurance and the current restriction of hours and premises used by the HMC.

The Panel were advised that the letters would be forwarded to the Corporate Director of Community and Environment and the information and a response would be brought to the attention of the Panel at the next meeting.

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.07 pm).

COUNCILLOR NANA ASANTE  
Chairman