

# **(Extraordinary) Council SUMMONS AND AGENDA**

**DATE:** Thursday 10 March 2011

**TIME:** 7.30 pm

**VENUE:** Council Chamber, Harrow  
Civic Centre

**All Councillors are hereby summoned to attend the Council Meeting for the transaction of the business set out.**



Hugh Peart  
Director of Legal and Governance Services

**Despatch Date:** Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011

## **PRAYERS**

The Mayor's Chaplain, Imam Hafiz Muhammad Akram, will open the meeting with Prayers.

### **1. EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL:**

This Extraordinary Council Meeting has been convened in accordance with the provisions of Rule 3.1, further to a request from the Monitoring Officer, following the notification by the Greater London Authority of a change in date to its precept setting. It was agreed that all items planned for the previous date of 17 February 2011 should be considered suitable for business at the Extraordinary Council.

### **2. COUNCIL MINUTES: (Pages 1 - 30)**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2010 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from all members of the Council.

### **4. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS / PRESENTATIONS:**

To receive any announcements from the Mayor. Information as to recent Mayoral engagements will be tabled.

### **5. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS:**

To receive and consider any procedural motions by Members of the Council in relation to the conduct of this Meeting.

[Note: Notice of such procedural motions, received after the issuing of this Summons, will be tabled].

### **6. PETITIONS:**

To receive any petitions to be presented:

- (i) by a representative of the petitioners;
- (ii) by a Councillor, on behalf of petitioners; or
- (iii) by the Mayor, on behalf of petitioners.

**7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS:**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for members of the public to ask questions of members of the Executive, Portfolio Holders and Chairmen of Committees, of which notice has been received no later than 5.00 pm two clear working days prior to the day of this Meeting.

[Note: Any such questions received will be tabled].

**8. CORPORATE PLAN - VISION AND CORPORATE PRIORITIES: (Pages 31 - 36)**

Recommendation I: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**9. FINAL REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12 - 2015/16: (Pages 37 - 46)**

Recommendation II: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**10. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET 2011/12 - 2015/16: (Pages 47 - 54)**

Recommendation III: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**11. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011/12 - 2015/16: (Pages 55 - 58)**

Recommendation IV: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**12. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS AND MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION (MRP) POLICY AND STRATEGY 2011/12: (Pages 59 - 62)**

Recommendation V: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**13. SINGLE EQUALITIES SCHEME: (Pages 63 - 68)**

Recommendation I: Cabinet  
(15 December 2010)

Recommendation I: Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
(9 February 2011)

**14. DRAFT WEST LONDON WASTE PLAN - PROPOSED SITES AND POLICIES DOCUMENT:** (Pages 69 - 72)

Recommendation I: Cabinet  
(18 November 2010)

**15. CORE STRATEGY - PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION:** (Pages 73 - 76)

Recommendation VI: Cabinet  
(10 February 2011)

**16. HEALTH SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE:** (Pages 77 - 82)

Recommendation II: Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
(9 February 2011)

**17. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE:**

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

- (i) of which notice has been received at least two clear working days prior to the day of this Meeting; or
- (ii) which relate to urgent matters, and the consent of the Executive Member or Committee Chairman to whom the question is to be put has been obtained and the content has been advised to the Director of Legal and Governance Services by 12 noon on the day of the Council Meeting.

[Any such questions received will be tabled].

**18. MOTIONS:**

The following Motions have been notified in accordance with the requirements of Council Procedure Rule 14, to be moved and seconded by the Members indicated:-

**(1) Freedom of Information**

To be moved by Councillor Paul Osborn and seconded by Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane:

“This Council fully supports the plan put forward by the Director of Legal & Governance Services in ‘The Lawyer’ magazine to automatically publish all information that could be disclosed under an FOI request on the Council’s website.

This plan will:

- further the understanding of and participation in the public debate of issues.
- promote accountability and transparency in decisions made by the Council.
- promote accountability and transparency in the spending of public money.

This Council fully supports the transparency agenda and welcomes public interest in its activities and decisions. Harrow could be an exciting example of a public authority showing what you can do when you think of the FOI Act as an opportunity, not a burden. It is committed to turning the traditional edifice on its head and moving away from the defensive position of keeping everything to itself and towards making information public whenever possible. This Council wants to be one which publishes information because it wants to, not because it has to.

This Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to work with the Director of Legal & Governance Services and other senior officers in bringing this plan to fruition as soon as possible.”

## (2) **Local Government Association**

To be moved by Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane and seconded by Councillor Susan Hall:

“This Council believes that the Local Government Association (LGA) should properly recognise the full reality of the reduction in government funding faced by local authorities, both in terms of the subscription charged to member authorities and in decisions taken about its Chief Executive’s pay and conditions.

This Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to write to the LGA to ask that Harrow’s subscription be reduced proportionate to the reduction in central government funding to free up more money to pay for front line services to the benefit of Harrow residents.

Furthermore, should the LGA not agree to such a reduction and not respond before the close of business (5pm) on 28<sup>th</sup> March, this Council instructs the Chief Executive to immediately write to the LGA, ensuring receipt of this letter by 31<sup>st</sup> March, giving the required 12 month’s notice of Harrow’s intention to withdraw from the LGA, with such withdrawal to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012.”

### (3) **EU Funding**

To be moved by Councillor Susan Hall and seconded by Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane:

“This Council notes that whilst Harrow is facing a reduction in its financial settlement in 2011/12, the UK’s contribution to the European Union (EU) is set to rise by 60% over two years.

This Council notes that, despite the opposition of some Conservative MPs, and Labour and Conservative MEPs, it is likely that the government will agree to a further 2.9% increase in the overall EU budget.

This Council believes the EU should be treated the same as the other tiers of government and in these austere times should share responsibility, along with central and local government, for public spending reductions.

This Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to write to Harrow’s three MPs urging them not to support an increase in the EU budget.”

#### **19. DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURE BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS, LEADER AND DEPUTY LEADER, AND USE OF SPECIAL URGENCY PROCEDURE: (Pages 83 - 88)**

Report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services.

#### **20. DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURE - COUNCIL: (Pages 89 - 92)**

Report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services.

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**MINUTES  
(4 NOVEMBER 2010)**

This page is intentionally left blank



# COUNCIL MINUTES

## 4 NOVEMBER 2010

- Present:**
- \* Councillor Asad Omar (The Worshipful the Mayor)
  - \* Councillor Mrinal Choudhury (The Deputy Mayor)
- Councillors:**
- |                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| * Husain Akhtar             | * Jerry Miles       |
| * Sue Anderson              | * Mrs Vina Mithani  |
| * Nana Asante               | * Chris Mote        |
| * Mrs Camilla Bath          | * Janet Mote        |
| * Christine Bednell         | * John Nickolay     |
| * James Bond                | * Joyce Nickolay    |
| * Mrs Lurline Champagne OBE | * Christopher Noyce |
| * Kam Chana                 | * Phillip O'Dell    |
| * Ramji Chauhan             | * Paul Osborn       |
| * John Cowan                | * Varsha Parmar     |
| * Bob Currie                | * David Perry       |
| * Margaret Davine           | * Bill Phillips     |
| * Mano Dharmarajah          | * Raj Ray           |
| * Tony Ferrari              | * Richard Romain    |
| * Keith Ferry               | * Anthony Seymour   |
| * Ann Gate                  | * Lynda Seymour     |
| * Brian Gate                | * Navin Shah        |
| * David Gawn                | * Mrs Rekha Shah    |
| * Stephen Greek             | * Sachin Shah       |
| * Mitzi Green               | * Stanley Sheinwald |
| * Susan Hall                | * Victoria Silver   |
| * Graham Henson             | * Bill Stephenson   |
| * Thaya Idaikkadar          | * William Stoodley  |
| * Nizam Ismail              | * Krishna Suresh    |
| * Krishna James             | * Sasi Suresh       |
| * Manji Kara                | * Yogesh Teli       |
| * Zarina Khalid             | * Mark Versallion   |
| * Jean Lammiman             | * Ben Wealthy       |
| * Barry Macleod-Cullinane   | * Simon Williams    |
| * Kairul Kareema Marikar    | * Stephen Wright    |
| * Ajay Maru                 |                     |

\* Denotes Member present

## PRAYERS

The meeting opened with Prayers offered by the Imam Hafiz Muhammad Akram.

## 46. COUNCIL MINUTES

### RESOLVED: That

- (i) the minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2010 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to a clarification at page 8 (36 - Motion Council Transparency) to read “wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision and for the Motion to be adopted.”
- (ii) the minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 7 October 2010, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## 47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor invited declarations of interest.

- (i) Item 11(2): Motions: Proposed Cap on Housing Benefit  
Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest as her family was in receipt of housing benefit, but considered that she could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar declared a personal interest as his mother was in receipt of housing benefit, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar declared a personal interest as she was a Council tenant, but considered that she could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest as he was employed by London Councils Ltd, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

- (ii) Item 11(5): Motions: Fare Increases  
Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest as she was a member of the Harrow Public Transport Users Association, but considered that she could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor James Bond declared a personal interest as an employee of Transport for London, based at North Harrow Station, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a personal interest as he was employed by the Greater London Authority, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Manji Kara declared a personal interest as he was employed by Transport for London, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

(iii) Item 11(6): Motions: Harrow International Vision

Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest as she was born in Tel Aviv, her husband's brother was from Tillberg and her parents were from LA. Councillor Asante was also a trustee of Harrow in Europe but considered that she could speak and vote on the Motion.

Councillors Lurline Champagnie, Mrinal Choudhury John Cowan, Brian Gate, David Gawn, Manji Kara Janet Mote, John Nickolay and Joyce Nickolay declared personal interests in that they were trustees of Harrow in Europe, but considered that they could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Jean Lammiman declared a personal interest as her husband was the Chairman of Harrow in Europe and she was also a trustee of the organisation, but considered that she could speak and vote thereon.

Councillor Chris Mote declared a personal interest in that he was involved with the original twinning of the borough with Broken Hill, Zambia in 1966, but considered that he could speak and vote thereon.

#### **48. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor requested that Council note the engagements he had undertaken. The Mayor paid particular attention to the following:

- On 18 October and 31 August 2010, he had attended the 100<sup>th</sup> birthday parties for Mrs Jane Jones and Mrs May Richards respectively;
- On 24 October 2010, he had attended a retirement brunch for Rabbi Grunewald at Pinner Synagogue. On the same day he had also attended a mosque in relation to the Pakistan Flood Relief Event and a Church as part of an event hosted by the Gujarati Christian Fellowship United Kingdom. This had demonstrated and contributed towards the theme of Diversity in his Mayoral year.
- On 3 November 2010, he had attended a celebration for Francis Dowley who had worked for the Council for 40 years. He had also attended the Racial Acoustics Queens Awards. On behalf of the Council, the Mayor had congratulated those presented with awards.

The Council joined the Mayor in congratulating Laura Turner, a resident of Harrow, on winning a gold medal at the recent Commonwealth Games in Delhi for the 100 metres sprint relay.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the Worshipful the Mayor, as tabled, be noted and received.**

#### 49. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

In accordance with Rule 14.6, the Leader of the Council agreed that the referral of the Harrow International Vision Motion to Cabinet be disappplied. This allowed Council to debate the Motion and make recommendations to Cabinet.

#### 50. PETITIONS

In accordance with Rule 10, a petition was submitted by Councillor Lurline Champagnie, containing 22 signatures of residents, requesting that the Council consider action to address a traffic hazard at Pinner Green lights.

[The petition stood referred to the next meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel].

#### 51. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

In accordance with Rule 11, the questions submitted by members of the public and responded to by Portfolio Holders, were contained at appendix I.

#### 52. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council introduced his report highlighting achievements and proposals since the last ordinary meeting.

At the conclusion of his report, the Leader responded to questions from Members of the Council.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the Leader of the Council be received and noted.**

#### 53. PETITION DEBATE - Parking Issues in Pinner

- (i) In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, Council considered a petition which had inititally been received at its meeting on 8 July 2010.
- (ii) The petition contained 2487 signatures and its terms were read by Councillor Stephen Wright as follows:

*We the undersigned request that Harrow Council urgently address the parking issues in Pinner. Local businesses are suffering as a result of the high car parking charges in comparison with other local High Streets in the area.*

*We urge Harrow Council to introduce a free ½ hour care parking scheme in Pinner car parks and meter parking areas and to reduce hourly rates to fall in line with Northwood, Ruislip and Eastcote.*

- (iii) A debate was held on the content of the petition.

**RESOLVED: That the petition be referred to Cabinet for consideration.**

**54. RECOMMENDED CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES**

Further to Item 9 on the Summons, the Council received a Recommendation from the Constitution Review Working Group.

The Recommendation was formally moved by Councillor Bill Stephenson (Chairman of the Working Group).

**RESOLVED: That the proposed Constitutional changes be approved, as set out in Appendix II to these minutes.**

**55. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE**

In accordance with Rule 12, the questions submitted by Councillors and responded to by Portfolio Holders, were contained at Appendix III.

**56. MOTION - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION**

(i) At item 11(1) the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors James Bond and Chris Noyce in the following terms:

“This Council notes that the following two statutory instruments came into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010:

1. The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2010 (2010 No. 2134) will make changes of use from Class C3 (dwellinghouses) to Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation) permitted development.
2. The Town and Country Planning (Compensation) (No. 3) (England) Regulations 2010 (2010 No 2135)

This Council notes therefore that the Government has amended the planning rules for houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and as a result from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010 changes of use from family houses to small HMOs will be able to happen freely without the need for planning applications.

This Council is concerned that appropriate time was not given to consultation with Local Authority Planning Services.

This Council also views with concern the possible detrimental effects such permitted development could have on the character and environmental aspects of residential roads including the increase in motor vehicles, refuse and possible nuisance to surrounding neighbours.

This Council regrets that the new legislation does not allow residents to be alerted to such proposals for houses in multiple occupation.

This Council recognises the extra burden placed on Local Authority Planning Services in order to facilitate Article 4 Directions.

This Council resolves to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Planner at the Department of Communities and Local Government to express our grave concern that such developments can occur without recourse to Local Authority approval.

This Council further instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Members of Parliament for Harrow West, Harrow East and Ruislip, Pinner and Northwood to note our concerns.”

- (ii) There was an amendment proposed in the names of Councillors Keith Ferry and Bill Stephenson, which sought to amend the Motion to read as follows:

“This Council notes that the following two statutory instruments came into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010:

1. The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2010 (2010 No. 2134) will make changes of use from Class C3 (dwellinghouses) to Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation) permitted development.
2. The Town and Country Planning (Compensation) (No. 3) (England) Regulations 2010 (2010 No 2135).

This Council notes therefore that the Government has amended the planning rules for houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and as a result from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010 changes of use from family houses to small HMOs will be able to happen freely without the need for planning applications.

This Council is concerned that appropriate time was not given to consultation with Local Authority Planning Services.

This Council also views with concern the possible detrimental effects such permitted development could have on the character and environmental aspects of residential roads including the increase in motor vehicles, refuse and possible nuisance to surrounding neighbours.

This Council regrets that the new legislation does not allow residents to be alerted to such proposals for houses in multiple occupation.

This Council recognises the extra burden placed on Local Authority Planning Services in order to facilitate Article 4 Directions.

This Council resolves to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Planner at the Department of Communities and Local Government to express our grave concern that such developments can occur without recourse to Local Authority approval.

This Council further instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Members of Parliament for Harrow West, Harrow East and Ruislip, Pinner and Northwood to note our concerns.

This Council further requests that the Local Development Framework Panel, as a matter of urgency, to examine the scope for the introduction of an Article Four Direction covering the whole of the Borough to control the number of HMOs.”

- (iii) Upon a vote the amendment was carried;
- (iv) Upon a vote, the substantive Motion, as amended, was agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the substantive Motion as amended and set out at (ii) above, be adopted.**

## **57. MOTION - PROPOSED CAP ON HOUSING BENEFIT**

- (i) At item 11(2) on the Summons, the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors Kairul Kareema Marikar and Ben Wealthy in the following terms:

“This Council deplores the unreasonable cap on Housing Benefit which will export poverty to Outer London Boroughs like Harrow. London suffers severe housing shortages which have not been helped by the Conservative Right to Buy Policy as it depleted housing stock. To make matters worse, the Tory policy of offering private housing as an option for homeless families will mean that Councils in inner London will be setting up a revolving door for families in temporary private housing who will have to be moved to outer London or beyond.

This Council notes that 59% of families in private housing are living in poverty. The cap on Housing Benefit is neither fair nor reasonable as it affects the poor and impacts on children who are more likely to be moved several times resulting in unstable education with its consequent impact on education attainment.

This Council draws the attention of Government to the fact that high rents in London are not a new phenomenon but are driven by the housing shortage. When the Local Housing Allowance was introduced the average rent in Central London for a 3 bedroom house was £700, twice the cap. This Council draws the Government's attention to the fact that it is Landlords who profit from Housing Benefit not tenants.

As a Council committed to listening and leading, this Council urges Government to look at the root causes of high rents in London and bring out policies which deal with problem instead of ideological cuts which play well in Tory heartlands but penalise the poor and those unfortunate enough to lose their jobs.

This Council urges the Government to reconsider the cap and reduce the housing benefit bill by funding Councils to build enough social housing thereby stimulating the building industry, creating jobs and giving the country the much needed optimism which will take us out of recession and avoid a depression.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister expressing our concern about this retrograde step which penalises families;
  - (2) write to Harrow's MPs and GLA Member to ask them to raise these concerns in Parliament and the London Assembly;
  - (3) work with the other London Boroughs through London Councils to lobby against the Housing Benefit cap;
  - (4) support the voluntary and community sector to campaign for fairness for families."
- (ii) During the debate on this item, Councillor Brian Gate moved a Motion that the question now be put. Upon a vote this Motion was carried.

**RESOLVED: That the Motion, as set out above, be adopted.**

**58. MOTION - GOVERNMENT SPENDING REVIEW IMPLICATIONS FOR WOMEN**

- (i) At item 11(3) on the Summons, the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors Sue Anderson and Victoria Silver in the following terms:

"This Council notes with deep concern the huge cuts announced during the spending review contain measures that will hit women twice as hard as men in our communities in Harrow.

The Council believes urgent action is needed by the government to tackle the effect these cuts will have on households and female workers in Harrow - and across the country - because the clear effects will be damaging throughout our communities if the consequences of cutbacks on females and families are not significantly addressed.

The Council is resolutely committed to helping those in greatest need but the targeting of local government for cuts is tantamount to singling out women for the greatest hit as 75 per cent of local government workers nationally are women and the rolling back of public services hits women particularly hard because they tend to use services more frequently and more intensively, because of their sizable caring responsibilities.

The Council hopes the government will reconsider its plans because making women bear the brunt of cuts makes a mockery of its claimed commitment to fairness. We also hope the Council will commit to closely monitoring the impact of changes on women and families in the borough through proper impact assessments and evaluation."



- (ii) There was an amendment proposed in the names of Councillors Paul Osborn and Susan Hall, which sought to amend the Motion to read as follows:

“This Council notes with deep concern the huge cuts announced during the spending review contain measures that will hit women twice as hard as men in our communities in Harrow.

The Council believes urgent action is needed by the government to tackle the effect these cuts will have on households and female workers in Harrow - and across the country - because the clear effects will be damaging throughout our communities if the consequences of cutbacks on females and families are not significantly addressed.

The Council is resolutely committed to helping those in greatest need but the targeting of local government for cuts is tantamount to singling out women for the greatest hit as 75 per cent of local government workers nationally are women and the rolling back of public services hits women particularly hard because they tend to use services more frequently and more intensively, because of their sizable caring responsibilities.

The Council hopes the government will reconsider its plans because making women bear the brunt of cuts makes a mockery of its claimed commitment to fairness. We also hope the Council will commit to closely monitoring the impact of changes on women and families in the borough through proper impact assessments and evaluation

This Council should lead by example, therefore a full Equalities Impact Assessment should be completed and available for inspection before any decision can be made by Cabinet or by a portfolio holder.”

- (iii) During the debate on this item, Councillor Brian Gate moved a Motion that the question now be put. Upon a vote this Motion was carried;
- (iv) Upon a vote, the amendment at (ii) was lost;
- (v) Upon a further vote the substantive Motion, was agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the substantive Motion, as set out at (i) above, be adopted.**

[Note: Councillors Husain Akhtar, Mrs Camilla Bath, Christine Bednell, Mrs Lurline Champagnie OBE, Kam Chana, Ramji Chauhan, John Cowan, Tony Ferrari, Stephen Greek, Susan Hall, Manji Kara, Jean Lammiman, Barry Macleod-Cullinane, Mrs Vina Mithani, Chris Mote, Janet Mote, John Nickolay, Joyce Nickolay, Paul Osborn, Richard Romain, Anthony Seymour, Lynda Seymour, Stanley Sheinwald, Yogesh Teli, Mark Versallion, Simon Williams and Stephen Wright wished to be recorded as having voted for the amendment to the Motion and against the adoption of the substantive Motion].

## 59. MOTION - STANDING UP FOR HARROW

- (i) At item 11(4) on the Summons, the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors Bill Stephenson and Ben Wealthy in the following terms:

“This Council notes that the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review threatens Harrow’s economic recovery.

Many senior economists believe that the scale and speed of cuts in public spending will damage business and lead to job losses.

Experts have also warned that the Coalition Government’s spending plans are regressive, not progressive, and will hit the poorest hardest.

This Council notes:

- Following the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s budget, the Office for Budget Responsibility downgraded its growth forecast for next year from 2.6% to 2.3% in response to the increased pace of public spending reductions.
- In their independent assessment of the Comprehensive Spending Review, the Institute for Fiscal Studies said that the measures were ‘more regressive, than progressive’ and made clear that children were the biggest losers, not bankers.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review, outlines big cuts in Local Government spending of almost 30%. The Local Government Group has been clear that such reductions ‘will lead to cuts at the front line.’
- Local Government has had some of the biggest cuts in the public sector, and most authorities’ cuts are significantly front-loaded to 2011/12.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government have admitted that at least 1 million jobs will be lost - half in the public sector and half in the private sector.
- Other cuts to funding for new social housing, child tax credits, university teaching budgets and school modernisation programmes will curb aspirations and opportunities for many people in Harrow.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s decision to raise VAT to 20% in 2011 will damage Harrow businesses and is unfair, hitting those on low and fixed incomes hardest.

This Council believes that the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review will hinder, not help Harrow’s economic recovery. Furthermore, their wider economic policies

are deeply unfair and will hit the poorest and most vulnerable in Harrow hardest.”

- (ii) There was an amendment proposed in the names of Councillors Barry Macleod-Cullinane and Paul Osborn, which sought to amend the Motion to read as follows:

“This Council notes that the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review threatens Harrow’s economic recovery.

Many senior economists believe that the scale and speed of cuts in public spending will damage business and lead to job losses.

Experts have also warned that the Coalition Government’s spending plans are regressive, not progressive, and will hit the poorest hardest.

This Council notes:

- Following the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s budget, the Office for Budget Responsibility downgraded its growth forecast for next year from 2.6% to 2.3% in response to the increased pace of public spending reductions.
- In their independent assessment of the Comprehensive Spending Review, the Institute for Fiscal Studies said that the measures were ‘more regressive, than progressive’ and made clear that children were the biggest losers, not bankers.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review, outlines big cuts in Local Government spending of almost 30%. The Local Government Group has been clear that such reductions ‘will lead to cuts at the front line.’
- Local Government has had some of the biggest cuts in the public sector, and most authorities’ cuts are significantly front-loaded to 2011/12.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government have admitted that at least 1 million jobs will be lost - half in the public sector and half in the private sector.
- Other cuts to funding for new social housing, child tax credits, university teaching budgets and school modernisation programmes will curb aspirations and opportunities for many people in Harrow.
- The Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s decision to raise VAT to 20% in 2011 will damage Harrow businesses and is unfair, hitting those on low and fixed incomes hardest.

This Council believes that the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review will hinder, not help

Harrow's economic recovery. Furthermore, their wider economic policies are deeply unfair and will hit the poorest and most vulnerable in Harrow hardest.

This Council agrees that Councils have a duty to ensure their plans for working through economically challenging times are robust, and in terms of the Council Vision and Priorities report passed by Cabinet on 7 October 2010, considers whether this is the case for Harrow."

- (iii) Upon a vote, the amendment at (ii) was lost;
- (iv) Upon a further vote the substantive Motion, was agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the substantive Motion, as set out at (i) above, be adopted.**

## **60. MOTION - FARE INCREASES**

- (i) At item 11(5) on the Summons, the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors Navin Shah and Phillip O'Dell in the following terms:

"Harrow Council deplores London Mayor Boris Johnson's proposals for a devastating rise in bus and tube fares with an average increase of 7% going up to an actual increase of 74%.

This Council notes that:

- Tube and bus fares went up by 6% in the first year of his Boris Johnson's Mayoralty and last year single bus journeys went up by 20 %;
- the coalition government is already hitting Harrow residents with a likely cut of at least 30% in its grant to Harrow Council in addition to the above inflation rises in tube and bus fares;
- the only legacy of Boris Johnson has left so far as the people of Harrow are concerned is that of closing ticket offices like North Harrow Station, endless weekend closures of the Jubilee and Metropolitan line services and the scrapping of funding for disabled access to Harrow on the Hill and Stanmore tube stations.

This Council instructs the Chief Executive to communicate this motion to the three Harrow MPs and the London Assembly Member for Brent and Harrow asking them to oppose these fare increases and further instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Mayor of London demanding that the fare increases be scrapped."

- (ii) There was an amendment proposed in the names of Councillors Barry Macleod-Cullinane and Susan Hall, which sought to amend the Motion to read as follows:

“Harrow Council deplores London Mayor Boris Johnson’s proposals for a devastating rise in bus and tube fares with an average increase of 7% going up to an actual increase of 74 %.

This Council notes that:

- Tube and bus fares went up by 6% in the first year of his Boris Johnson’s Mayoralty and last year single bus journeys went up by 20 %;
- the coalition government is already hitting Harrow residents with a likely cut of at least 30% in its grant to Harrow Council in addition to the above inflation rises in tube and bus fares;
- the only legacy of Boris Johnson has left so far as the people of Harrow are concerned is that of closing ticket offices like North Harrow Station, endless weekend closures of the Jubilee and Metropolitan line services and the scrapping of funding for disabled access to Harrow on the Hill and Stanmore tube stations.

This Council agrees that, in order to protect and assist some of Harrow’s most vulnerable people from the uncertainty and vagaries of fare prices charges, this Council guarantees that no resident who currently receives a discretionary disabled Freedom Pass will cease to do so as a result of any action taken or decision made by this Council.

Council instructs the Chief Executive to communicate this motion to the three Harrow MPs and the London Assembly Member for Brent and Harrow asking them to oppose these fare increases and further instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Mayor of London demanding that the fare increases be scrapped.”

(iii) Upon a vote, the amendment at (ii) was lost;

(iv) Upon a further vote the substantive Motion, was agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the substantive Motion, as set out at (i) above, be adopted.**

## **61. MOTION - HARROW INTERNATIONAL VISION**

At item 11(6) on the Summons, the Council received a Motion in the names of Councillors Nana Asante and Graham Henson in the following terms:

“This Council notes with some concern the pessimism of the governments’ spending plans and the short-sighted cuts which threaten the economic recovery. The Council notes with great concern the in-year cut of the Migrants Impact Fund which has cost London authorities an estimated £2.4 million. This Council also puts on record its concern at the cut in LAA Reward Grant,

an act which undermines the credibility of future agreements with Government. This assault on Local Government funding makes the silence on the important area of community and social cohesion even more worrying.

The Council believes that the Government should take some lessons from a Council that listens and leads, and tap into the optimism and potential of residents and enable them to work towards a brighter future. This Council is resolutely committed to furthering Community Cohesion and celebrating the fact that Harrow is the most religiously diverse borough of England and Wales.

This Council commits to renewing its international vision by:

- working towards recognition of Harrow as a Fair Trade borough in March 2011;
- following the example of its twin town Douai and exploring the possibility of twinning with more towns and cities such as Balakot, Bhuj, Broken Hill, Hargeisa, Pattan, Port au Prince, Kingston, La, Tilburg and Tel Aviv, underlining the tremendous advantage such links can bring, both to the harmony of the Borough and its future development.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) explore the feasibility of Harrow twinning with further towns and cities;
- (2) involve residents in creating opportunities for experiencing and exploring other cultures thereby building an atmosphere for economic development and trade opportunities, a positive climate to counterbalance the doom and gloom coming from the current Government;
- (3) work with London Councils to mitigate the impact of the short-sighted cuts on our residents.”

**RESOLVED: That the substantive Motion, as set out above, be recommended to the Executive.**

## **62. DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURE BY CABINET AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

Further to item 12 on the Summons, Council received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services providing a summary of the urgent decisions taken by Cabinet, and the use of the special urgency procedure since the last ordinary meeting of Council on 8 July 2010.

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

### **63. URGENT DECISIONS ON MATTERS RESERVED TO COUNCIL**

The Director of Legal and Governance Services advised of three urgent decisions taken in respect of matters reserved to Council, following consultation with the Leaders of each of the Political Groups, since the last meeting.

**RESOLVED: That the decisions taken under delegation by the Director of Legal and Governance Services, on behalf of Council, be noted.**

### **64. PROCEDURE FOR TERMINATION OF MEETING**

- (i) At 10.28 pm, during the debate on the Item 11(4) (Motion: Standing Up for Harrow), the Mayor put to the vote a procedural motion under Rule 9.2 that the closure of time for the Council meeting be extended until the completion of all remaining business on the Summons. Upon a formal vote, this proposal was not agreed;
- (ii) At 10.30 pm, in the course of the consideration of Item 11(4) (Motion: Standing Up for Harrow), the Mayor advised that the 'guillotine' procedure had come into operation for the determination of the remaining business on the summons and was applied to Items 11(4) (Motion: Standing Up for Harrow), 11(5) (Motion: Fare Increases), 11(6) (Motion: Harrow International Vision), 12 (Decisions Taken Under the Urgency Procedure by Cabinet and Portfolio Holders), and 13 (Urgent Decisions on Matters Reserved to Council).

**RESOLVED: That the provisions of Rules 9.2 and 9.3 be applied as set out at (i) and (ii) above.**

### **Appendix I - Public Questions**

### **Appendix II - Constitutional Changes**

### **Appendix III - Questions with Notice**

**(CLOSE OF MEETING:** All business having been completed, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 10.33 pm).

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING**

**4 NOVEMBER 2010**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS (ITEM 6)**

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.

- 1. Questioner:** Cassie Marie McDonagh

**Asked of:** Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise

**Question:** “What are the plans to build more sites for the Gypsy and Traveller communities in Harrow?”

**Answer:** Written answer to be provided as the questioner was not present.
  
- 2. Questioner:** Jeremy Zeid

**Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation

**Question:** “In the light of the public consultation on the Equalities Act and its implications, could the Leader of the Council affirm that he and his administration are committed absolutely to the principles of equality, freedom and justice for all?”

**Answer:** Thank you for your question. Can I remind you of the motto of this fine Council? “Salus Populi Suprema Lex” – “the well-being of the people is the highest law”.

I can confirm that I and my administration are fully committed to the principles of equality, freedom and justice for all and will, of course, abide by the laws of this country such as the Equalities Act, as best we can. We mean it and will act upon it.



**Supplemental Question:** Could the Leader therefore explain how it can be right that we consider twinning with regimes that proscribe and legislate against and generally persecute gays, lesbians and the transgendered?

**Supplemental Answer:** This Council does not work with regimes, the Government does. Therefore you should take it up at a higher level.

3. **Questioner:** Christine Jones

**Asked of:** Councillor Phillip O'Dell, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety

**Question:** "There seems to be some confusion in the way the Neighbourhood Champion system is working.

I am concerned because the original remit that I signed up to appears to have been widened from a fairly passive role of 'reporting issues seen locally as you go about your normal business' to a much more proactive one where we are asked to look out for 'wanted individuals' and more.

Would the Portfolio Holder say when this was agreed and by whom as I have not been consulted on it nor asked to sign any new agreement?"

**Answer:** Thank you for your question. First of all I would like to thank all Neighbourhood Champions throughout the borough for the voluntary contribution that they are making.

It was the intention from the start of the scheme to provide Neighbourhood Champions with information updates and feedback to be able to support their neighbours in keeping their locality clean and safe and to report issues to the Council and Police.

**Supplemental Question:** In a number of cases I have received an incomplete response or even no response to issues I have reported, which makes me wonder how well this scheme is working overall. Would the Portfolio Holder accept, as with any new project, it is time to take stock and have a comprehensive review to report what the level of satisfaction is amongst the Neighbourhood Champions, whether or not they are all active and what the fallout rate is and of course, how this is measured?

**Supplemental Answer:** I agree with your comments, there should be. We are in the process of reviewing the Neighbourhood Champions scheme. Neighbourhood Champions will be asked to give feedback to the system, so we can take and evolve your views of taking part in

order to roll the scheme forward across Harrow. Thank you.

**4. Questioner:** Eileen Kinnear

**Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation

**Question:** For those of my then colleagues who were present on the course for Resonance at the end of last year, my name is Eileen Kinnear and I am here to ask a question of the Leader of the Council.

“At its meeting on 14th June this year the Standards Committee adopted a Statement of Intent which indicated that it would strive to be a model among local authorities in promoting high standards of conduct ... and stated

"The committee will seek transparency in the Council's decision-making so that anyone interested - internal and external - can find out how the Council ensures high standards of conduct and governance. The ethical governance regime at Harrow will be open to scrutiny from the Council as a whole and the wider community".

It then set out 4 main categories for the future work of the Committee to do this, which included working with the public so that they can make their views known. I cannot trace that there has yet been any consultation on this.

Will the Leader please indicate when this consultation should commence and what form it will take?"

**Answer:** Thank you. The Standards Committee is a Committee appointed by Council with 6 Councillors and 4 Independent Members. It is, as such, answerable to Council and is totally independent of the Executive. I therefore have no direct say or control on the matter you raise.

I have, however, asked that your question be referred to the Chairman of the Standards Committee for him to reply to you. As you will be aware, we have 2 Independent Members of the Committee here, as well as all the Council Members of the Standards Committee.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to the Standards Committee on its relaunch. Much has already been achieved, such as the adoption of a Statement of Intent and General Objectives as indicated by the question; new webpages which provide greater detail to members of the public about its role

and purpose with a list of frequently asked questions with answers. These are innovative actions among local authorities nationally.

I am confident that the Committee will continue to lead the way in ensuring transparency and accountability in this important area.

**Supplemental Question:** I thank the Leader for his statement just made. Residents see ethical governance as a concept whereby the whole Council is firmly committed to adherence to the procedures for good conduct of business. Harrow Council recently told the Information Commissioner that they did not investigate how certain Councillors, who last year obtained copies of restricted papers from a closed Standards Sub-Committee, came to be aware that those papers contained their personal data.

As this question still concerns a number of residents, would the Leader kindly agree to meet us to discuss how this occurred?

**Supplemental Answer:** Thank you for your question which does not seem to be a supplementary to the one before.

I would need to take some legal advice on whether it would be appropriate for me to meet you. In principle, I would not have any objection to having a discussion but it is obviously something which I do not know about and which has been dealt with by the Standards Committee.

5. **Questioner:** Pravin Seedher

**Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation

**Question:** "Given that the Council needs to save £50 million over the next 3 years, how does spending several million pounds extra on new IT equipment help meet this objective, and wouldn't it be best practice to put a contract of this scale out to public tender?"

**Answer:** Thank you for your question. I think you were present when the Council had a wide, full ranging debate on this matter when all the questions you have asked were answered comprehensively and in full by my colleague, Councillor Graham Henson, who has the overall responsibility as Portfolio Holder for IT.

However, as a reminder, when we came to power we found that the previous administration had neglected the Council's IT, which is currently in a disjointed, dysfunctional state with 95% of the

hardware beyond its useful life, totally out of date email systems and software which is extremely hard to maintain and no disaster recovery system. I could go on.

The Council was spending 0.6% of its budget on IT as compared to an average CIPFA benchmark of 2.9%. We could not afford to let this situation continue and had to ensure we had an IT system fit for purpose. We also need an upgraded IT system so we can extend Access Harrow, introduce mobile and flexible working which will lead to considerable savings to the Council and underpins many of our other savings proposals. In short, the Council cannot afford not to invest in better IT.

The procurement process we followed was the one put in place by the previous administration and we believe that this is absolutely the right way forward in these circumstances.

**Supplemental Question:** You will have heard the old adage “a bad workman blames his tools”. In your case, your administration is blaming your IT.

Would you not agree that your administration would look pretty poor when after spending millions on new tools, it delivers budget overspends and tax rises?

**Supplemental Answer:** Mr Mayor, I am not blaming any tools, I am blaming the previous administration.

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**COUNCIL MEETING**

**4 NOVEMBER 2010**

**QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE (ITEM 10)**

Fifteen minutes will be allowed for Members of the Council to ask a Portfolio Holder a question on any matter in relation to which the Executive has powers or duties.

**1. Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question:** "Will you guarantee that no Harrow resident who currently receives a discretionary disabled Freedom Pass will cease to do so as the result of any decision taken by your administration?"

**Answer:** We are currently consulting Adults Services users on a range of issues including concessionary travel. No decision is to be made until the outcomes of the two consultations which are being conducted are known.  
**(Cllr Stephenson)**

We conducted a thorough review of concessionary travel, Freedom Passes, blue badges and taxicards and have identified some issues concerning eligibility criteria, the way in which the system is administered and how assessments are carried out. We are now looking at the possibility of centralising all concessionary travel, administration and assessment works to ensure the service is more integrated and efficient and in particular, avoiding duplication and ensuring consistency of decision making.

As I said, this is out for two consultations. One is going out now, there will be one in the new year. Until we have had the outcome of those consultations, we cannot give you any assurances either way.

**Supplemental Question:** Can you please give us some indication because clearly we are being lobbied for a decision? Can you give us some idea when you may have an answer to the posed question?

**Supplemental Answer:** At the moment we are discussing the consultation and people will remember for Social Care, that we have to go through an elaborate form of consultation, both consulting about what we can consult about and then going out for the consultation. We will not have outcomes until February / March 2011. We will then be able to have some indication as to what we may be proposing.

I have given an indication of the areas under consideration in the consultation paper. If anybody has any concerns please do make your views known. That is what the consultation is all about. It is one of the biggest consultations that has ever been carried out in this Borough on Social Care.

**2. Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

**Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation)

**Question** “As part of fulfilling your pledge to listen to residents, have you considered implementing something along the lines of Redbridge Council’s online ‘YouChoose’ scheme, which allows residents to prepare dummy budgets – seeing the financial and service impacts of their decisions – and to submit suggestions on how the Council should make spending choices?”

**Answer:** Thank you for the question. As I have indicated on several occasions, we are always ready to learn from what other councils are doing and indeed, many councils are contacting us to learn about our innovative Transformation Programme.

As you will be aware, I have also suggested to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, that it might be interested in undertaking some work in this area. They could perhaps look at what happens in Redbridge and elsewhere. However we are already exploring the possibility of developing a ‘YouChoose’ scheme on the website and we have contacted Redbridge to understand how they have taken this forward, as well as speaking with the Local Government Improvement and Development, formerly IDeA, who actually developed the tool.

**Supplemental Question:** The Leader of Redbridge Council wrote to you on 11 October 2010, telling you about the Redbridge scheme, which has now clocked up over 3,700 submissions to it. Instead of taking this forward, which is a free piece of software and making sure that it is online and operative before we start really getting the budget sorted out, we seem to have instead an administration which

seems to be committed to more gimmicks that does not seem to know what it is doing.

Do you regret having wasted almost a month before actually getting on with actually implementing a Redbridge type scheme?

**Supplemental Answer:** Councillor Macleod-Cullinane seems to know all about my correspondence.

I have not received a letter from the Leader of Redbridge Council as far as I am aware. As I have just indicated to him, we are on the case. We are looking at it and we are considering it.

**3. Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

**Asked of:** Councillor Rekha Shah (Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services)

**Question** “What progress have you made in developing libraries as “community hubs”, as stated in your manifesto?”

**Answer:** Thank you. This is work in progress and we will put forward proposals when they are ready.

**Supplemental Question:** Whatever you are doing, do you not then think that it is going to be extremely difficult to do, given that you will have a third less staff?

**Supplemental Answer:** I will provide you with a written response to your question.

**4. Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question** “Can you update the Council on any responses received as a result of the Motion passed on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2010, regarding the Kenton Road right turning?”

**Answer:** In response to the Motion, the Chief Executive wrote to Boris Johnson, Mayor for London. He responded to the matter and said that it was one for Brent Council as the relevant Highway Authority to deal with.

**Supplemental Question:** We are aware of that because we said this was the case in the first place. Do you regret therefore, the rash statement made by our GLA member, Councillor Navin Shah, saying we were not to worry because he would sort this out by Christmas?

**Supplemental Answer:** At the time that comment was made, Councillor Shah was making a factual statement. As we all know, this government has made cuts on the Department of Transport funding (which funds Transport for London and other London boroughs). Therefore I presume the proposed scheme has not been deemed to go ahead because obviously the costs would be considered to be disproportionate to the benefits.

5. **Questioner:** Councillor Anthony Seymour

**Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation)

**Question** "What steps is the Council taking to embrace and implement the government's proposals for the 'Big Society'?"

**Answer:** You are making a big assumption that we embrace the 'Big Society', I do not. I fully accept the general aims and objectives of getting more people directly involved in their local communities, something which is hardly new in Harrow or elsewhere in the country. It is certainly not such a big idea, as it is so often made out to be.

However, the research we have done with Harrow residents under our 'Better together' project shows that people are very willing to get involved and want to have a greater say. There is however a great reluctance among many of them to take over full responsibility for running services. You heard a Neighbourhood Champion articulating that sentiment.

The 'Big Society' is predicated on the principle that councils are part of the problem and that other people should take over from them. I do not accept that at all. Councils are actually part of the solution. We are the key to achieving these aims and objectives of the 'Big Society'.

In Harrow we have so many community projects exemplifying the ideas of the 'Big Society'. Volunteers running 'Under One Sky' and the Harrow Museum; Neighbourhood Champions; all our carers in



Harrow; volunteer escorts on Special Educational Needs transport; Civic Centre staff acting as special constables and more generally the One-4-One scheme; our wonderful school governors, all rated good or excellent by Ofsted; numerous sports coaches out there every weekend coaching our young people; all the work done by faith groups and churches, temples, synagogues and mosques. I could go on. These few examples exemplify what I believe should be the aim of the 'Big Society'.

In Harrow we are fortunate that we do have a fantastic community spirit, which we hope to build on. The Council has a co-ordinating and facilitating role in getting local residents involved in various parts of the Council work and supporting the work of the voluntary community sector. We want to build on this.

**The Mayor ruled the supplementary question invalid.**

- 6. Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane
- Asked of:** Councillor Graham Henson (Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services)
- Question** "Now that your administration has finally launched its proposals for listening and engagement with residents, do you regret referring to Harrow residents who might be interested in how the Council is run as "armchair auditors" at July's Council meeting?"
- Answer:** This Council in Harrow believes thoroughness and transparency is about real engagement and ongoing conversation with residents, not just publishing online statistics. We believe in taking influence beyond the town hall.

We fully support the transparency agenda and welcome public interest in the activities of the Council. We also support the proposal that the Council should publish details of their expenditure over £500.

The term 'armchair auditor' has been widely used in this context. Indeed Eric Pickles himself said "the simple task of putting spending online will open the doors to an army of armchair auditors, who will be able to see at a glance exactly where millions of pounds was spent last year". He also stated that he wants to see an army of armchair auditors pore over the information.

I do, however, have concerns about the rules the Government has proposed for this. Harrow Council makes around 24,000 payments

each year. The draft guidance requires 15 different pieces of information to be published for every transaction.

My concerns are, and I think all our concerns are, there will be significant effort required to set up new reports on our systems that include all 15 elements. Some of the data may have to be inputted manually, if it cannot be extracted from the system. The plethora of data that will be generated, most of which will not interest the public, will make it harder for the public to find what they want to know.

The requirements seem to be more about comparing councils than allowing residents to see what their council spends its money on. There is a significant fraud risk posed by the publication of so much detail. A significant amount of work would be required to produce the reports each month, review them, redact any sensitive information and deal with questions arising and detailed Government guidelines on what should be published goes against the Localism agenda.

Officers have set up a working group to ensure that we comply with the requirements and we have about 6 months to get this all up and running. The estimate is that costs will be around £20,000. I am sure you will agree with me that this added burden is difficult to manage in a time of such severe funding reductions.

**Supplemental Question:** Thank you. We are being told that we are going to have pop-up living rooms with armchairs across the Borough. When those armchair auditors turn up into those pop-up living rooms, would it not make sense for them to be more equipped with the facts about what Harrow Council is doing, be able to actually have some of that information needed to make real, meaningful engagement and discussion with the Council? Could you tell us tonight where in each ward these pop-up living rooms will actually be?

**Supplemental Answer:** I refer to the answer I have given to the earlier question, except for the part where the pop-ups will be. The Leader has said that he will e-mail that information out tomorrow.

- 7. Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane
- Asked of:** Councillor Bill Stephenson (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Business Transformation)
- Question** “Since you last updated us at October's Cabinet, how many more members of the Labour Group have begun "acting within identified roles" but have yet to receive formal appointment and backdated payments?”
- Answer:** Briefly in response to the previous questioner, the packs informing the locations of all the pop-ups and roadshows, will be delivered to Councillors on Friday. The Councillors representing South Harrow have already been advised.
- With regard to your question the answer is a very simple one - none.

## **(A) Council Procedure Rules (Rule 14.6)**

### **14.6 Motions Relating to a Matter Delegated to the Executive or a Committee**

14.6.1 If the Mayor, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, considers that any motion made under this Rule refers to matters within the powers of the Executive or a Committee of the Council, then it shall be indicated on the Council summons, supported by reasons, that the motion shall stand referred to the next meeting of the Executive or to a Committee. Any Member may move that any such referral should not apply to a motion, and if seconded, that motion shall be put to the vote without any discussion, provided that after disposal of any motions relating to business reserved to the Council the Leader of the Opposition may move one motion at a meeting of Council (excluding the Annual Meeting) relating to a matter within the powers of the Executive which shall not stand automatically referred to the next meeting of the Executive but shall be dealt with as if paragraph 14.7.1 below applied, ***such motion having been identified to the Director of Legal and Governance Services at the time of the deadline for submission of motions.***

(continues as per Constitution thence on)

## **(B) Committee Procedure Rules (Rule 46)**

### **46. Call-in**

46.1 Call-in is the process whereby a decision of the Executive, Portfolio Holder or Officer (where the latter is taking a Key Decision) taken but not implemented, may be examined by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to implementation. They may recommend that the Executive reconsider the decision. For the avoidance of doubt a decision may only be subject to the call-in procedure once.

### **46.2 The process for call-in**

46.2.1 Six Members of the Council ~~comprising Members from at least two political groups~~ can call in a decision of the Executive, which has been taken but not implemented. In relation to Executive decisions on education matters only the number of Members required to call in a decision which has been made but not implemented shall be six ~~Councillors being representatives from either two political groups~~ or, in the alternative, **six persons comprising** representatives of the voting co-opted members and at least one political group on Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Only decisions relating to Executive functions, whether delegated or not, may be called in.

(continues as per Constitution thence on)

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 FEBRUARY 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION I:           Corporate Plan –  
  Vision and Corporate Priorities**

This page is intentionally left blank

# CABINET MINUTES

## 10 FEBRUARY 2011

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
* Mitzi Green	

**In attendance:  
(Councillors)**

James Bond	Minute 146
Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

\* Denotes Member present

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 150. Key Decision - Corporate Plan - Vision and Corporate Priorities

Cabinet received a report of the Assistant Chief Executive that set out a key aspect of the Council's medium term planning process, the Corporate Plan. The Corporate Plan identified the Council's new Vision and Priorities, including information on key initiatives and projects for 2011/12.

The Divisional Director Partnership Development and Performance introduced the report, a draft of which had previously been considered agreed by Cabinet in October 2010. Since then, a consultation exercise had been carried out and the report included the results of the "Let's Talk" public consultation on the Council's draft Vision and Priorities and presented the Corporate Plan, setting out the direction for the Council over the coming years. He advised that an original Priority 'A Town Centre to be proud of: Changing Harrow for the Better' had changed to 'Supporting Our Town Centre, local shopping

centres and businesses' as a direct result of conversations with residents through "Let's Talk". This showed a recognition of a greater affinity with all shopping centres, not just a focus on the Town Centre. The Divisional Director also spoke on the responses received through Let's Talk, a campaign through which a number of innovative and engaging events had been held. He informed Cabinet that under each Priority, a number of priority actions had been set.

The Leader of the Council explained the thinking behind the proposed new Vision for the Council, "Working Together: Our Harrow, Our Community", which had received overwhelming public support, together with the Priorities, all of which would help shape Harrow during the challenging financial years ahead. He added that the Vision would reach out to residents and find new ways of involving residents, as well as enabling users of services and partners to keep improving the services delivered. Thus "Our Harrow Our Community" aspect of the Vision emphasised a unified Harrow and celebrated the diversity of its residents. Working Together meant joint working within the Council, with Partners, statutory bodies, central government, local MPs, the GLA Member for Brent & Harrow and residents thereby harnessing the existing community spirit. Silo cultures would be eradicated and the Council would facilitate local groups to work together. The key drivers behind this Vision would be to listen and involve the community in everything the Council did.

Council Priorities proposed were:

- Keeping Neighbourhoods Clean, Green and Safe.
- United and Involved Communities: A Council that Listens and Leads.
- Supporting and Protecting People who are Most in Need.
- Supporting our Town Centre, Our Local Shopping Centres and Businesses.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing requested that a priority action included in the Corporate Plan be amended to read 'Tenants' Charter' rather than 'Tenant Consultation Charter'. He explained that whilst consultation was important, it was only one part of the wider Charter which the Council wanted to develop over the next year.

The Corporate Director Children's Service made a minor amendment to a measure which related to another priority action 'Improving Outcomes for those Children and Families in greatest need of help'. It was agreed that the measure should read 'Reduce the number of Children with Child Protection Plans for over two years by March 2012'.

Cabinet noted the tabled reference received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 February 2011.



The Leader of the Council commended the Council's new Vision and Priorities and supporting Corporate Plan to Council.

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

That the Vision and Priorities together with the Corporate Plan prepared to reflect the Vision and Priorities be adopted, subject to the minor amendments to the priority actions advised.

**Reason for Decision:** To provide the Council with a Vision and Priorities to guide its work in the coming years.

This page is intentionally left blank

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 FEBRUARY 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION II:           Final Revenue Budget  
2011/12 – 2015/16**

This page is intentionally left blank

# CABINET MINUTES

## 10 FEBRUARY 2011

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
* Mitzi Green	

**In attendance:  
(Councillors)**

James Bond	Minute 146
Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

\* Denotes Member present

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 151. Key Decision - Final Revenue Budget 2011/12 to 2015/16

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director Finance, which set out the final Revenue Budget for 2011/12 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2011/12 to 2015/16. The Revenue Budget set out the Council Tax Strategy and spending plans, including new investment and savings proposals. The report set out the impact of the proposals and included information on the local government settlement, reserves policy and consultation on the budget. It covered all of the Council's main activities, including schools.

The Leader of the Council stated that this was the first budget of the new administration and that it had been a challenging process as a result of the cuts imposed in the region of 28% over a four year period. The severity of the cuts in local government and other public sector bodies, such as the Primary

Care Trusts (PCTs), had led to many requests to the government to change its mind. A £5.6m in-year funding gap had been filled and the budget proposed by the administration was responsible and robust.

The Leader acknowledged that it had been difficult to deliver a balanced budget without affecting front line services but he was proud that Harrow would be retaining all its libraries and children centres which would remain open. This had been possible as a result of planning ahead and that during the last eight months 12 major projects were being delivered and front line services had been defended. Some of these projects would be considered at the next Cabinet meeting.

The Leader alluded to various proposals which were underway and those that had contributed towards a robust budget, such as a major procurement exercise which would include working with Hammersmith & Fulham Council, a re-shaping of the senior management structure, a successful voluntary severance scheme and joint working through the West London Alliance. He also referred to funding gaps in future years, that could increase if further cuts were imposed by government.

The Leader commended the budget stating that it could not be considered as having been produced by applying a 'salami slicing' approach. He thanked officers for their work in ensuring a balanced budget.

The Corporate Director Finance highlighted key aspects of the report and explained how the funding gap had been closed, which had been achieved due to technical changes, levies on other public bodies and the positive position on the collection fund. She added that the impact of investments and savings proposed had been carefully considered, a new policy on contingencies was being proposed, and the reserves policy and the rules on virements needed amending. The budget contained a £1m contingency fund. A detailed risk assessment of the budget would be referred to the Governance, Audit and Risk Management Committee (GARM), and the schools' budget was ring-fenced. The Greater London Authority (GLA) budget precept was expected to be set at zero but had yet to be agreed as a result of which the Council meeting date had been changed to 10 March 2011.

The Corporate Director highlighted the challenges that lay ahead as a result of the settlements which would be reduced by £7m in 2012/13 and £5m in 2013/14. However, a 0% Council Tax increase for 2011/12 was proposed. She was recommending a budget to Cabinet and Council that was robust and had adequate reserves.

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Well-Being updated paragraph 39 of the report under the Adults and Housing section and it was agreed that it should read: 'There are a number of areas which were currently subject to consultation which were shown in the budget. No decision had been made on those areas. However, the pre-consultation phase had now been concluded. The Steering Group met this morning and agreed that it go forward to a full consultation. The full consultation has to be over 12 weeks. It is anticipated that it will conclude in the early summer. The results will be

report to Cabinet later in the year. There were no alternative plans to achieve these savings if proposals were not implemented post consultation. Covering these savings was therefore the first call on the contingency fund established as part of the 2011/12 budget.'

Cabinet noted the tabled reference from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in this regard and the feedback received from the stakeholders.

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

That, subject to the update on paragraph 39 above,

- (1) the budget be approved to enable the Council Tax for 2011/12 to be set;
- (2) the policy on the use of contingency at appendix 7 to the report be approved;
- (3) the schools budget at appendix 8 to the report be approved;
- (4) the reserves policy at appendix 10 to the report be approved;
- (5) the virement rules at appendix 11 to the report be added to the financial regulations;
- (6) Members' Allowances be frozen and the current Members' Allowances Scheme be adopted for 2011/12;
- (7) the model Council Tax resolution at appendix 1 to the minutes be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To ensure that the Council sets a balanced budget for 2011/12.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Model Council Tax Resolution**

# **Harrow Council**

**Council Tax Resolution 2011-2012**

Cabinet to approve as part of the Summons for Council, the model budget and Council Tax resolutions reflecting the recommendations of Cabinet and the GLA precept.

Council is requested to determine the level of the Council Tax for 2011-2012 in the light of the information on the precept and make the calculations set out in the resolution shown below.

- (1) To note that at its meeting on 15 December 2010 the Council calculated the amount of 87,148 as its Council Tax Base for the year 2011-2012 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33 (5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
  
- (2) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2011-2012, in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
  - (i) Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (2) (a) to (e) of the Act. (**Gross expenditure**)
 

£559,815,183
  
  - (ii) Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3)(a) to (c) of the Act. (**Gross income including use of reserves**)
 

£384,306,299
  
  - (iii) Being the amount by which the aggregate at (i) above exceeds the aggregate at (ii) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, **as its budget requirement for the year.**

£175,508,884
  
  - (iv) Being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant, increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund its Collection Fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Collection Fund Surplus)
 

£72,103,425

(v) Being **the amount to be raised from Council Taxes**

Calculated as the amount at 2 (iii) above less the amount at 2 (iv.) above.

£103,405,459

(vi) Being the amount at (v) divided by the Council Tax Base, calculated by the Council at its meeting on 15 December 2010 in accordance with Section 33 (1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. (**The average Band D Council Tax**)

£1,186.55

(vii) Valuation Bands

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	791.03	922.87	1,054.71	1,186.55	1,450.23	1,713.90	1,977.58	2,373.10

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (vi.) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

(3) That it be noted that for 2011-2012 the Greater London Authority stated the following amount in precept issued to the Council, in accordance with section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below

Valuation Bands

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	206.55	240.97	275.40	309.82	378.67	447.52	516.37	619.64

(4) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (2)(vii) and (3) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2011-2012 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below

Valuation Bands

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	997.58	1,163.84	1,330.11	1,496.37	1,828.90	2,161.42	2,493.95	2,992.74

**HARROW COUNCIL**  
**REVENUE BUDGET SUMMARY 2011-2012**

	2010-2011 Original Budget  £000	2011-2012 Original Budget  £000
<b>Local Demand - Borough Services</b>		
Adults and Housing	70,029	67,208
Children's	40,437	40,832
Community and Environment	46,496	43,797
Place Shaping	4,332	4,439
Legal and Governance	1,174	3,566
Assistant Chief Executive	5,076	2,422
Corporate Finance	21,691	18,083
Transformation Programme	0	-389
<b>Total Directorate Budgets</b>	<b>189,235</b>	<b>179,958</b>
Inflation and Corporate items	2,075	2,269
Provisions for debt/litigation	225	325
Capital Financing adjustments	-6148	-3,989
Interest on Balances	-690	-474
Council Tax Support Grant	0	-2580
Area Based Grant	-12922	0
<b>Total – Baseline</b>	<b>171,775</b>	<b>175,509</b>
Capitalisation	-90	0
Contribution to Balances	0	0
<b>Total Net Expenditure</b>	<b>171,685</b>	<b>175,509</b>
Collection Fund Surplus b/f	-1448	-1978
Formula Grant	-67,764	-70,126
<b>Local Demand on Collection Fund</b>	<b>102,473</b>	<b>103,405</b>
<b>Funds / Balances</b>		
Balances Brought Forward	5,716	6,294
Adjustment to Balances	0	0
Balances Carried Forward	<b>5,716</b>	<b>6,294</b>
<b>Council Tax for Band D Equivalent</b>		
Harrow (£)	<b>1,186.55</b>	<b>1,186.55</b>
<u>Increase</u>		
Harrow (%)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>Taxbase</b>	<b>86,362</b>	<b>87,148</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 FEBRUARY 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION III:      Housing Revenue Account  
   Budget 2011/12 – 2015/16**

This page is intentionally left blank

# **CABINET MINUTES**

## **10 FEBRUARY 2011**

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
* Mitzi Green	

**In attendance:  
(Councillors)**

James Bond	Minute 146
Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

\* Denotes Member present

### **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

#### **152. Key Decision - Housing Revenue Account Budget 2011/12 to 2015/16**

Cabinet received a joint report of the Corporate Director Finance and the Interim Divisional Director Housing, which set out the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget for 2011/12 to 2015/16.

The Corporate Director Finance stated that the Council had a statutory obligation to agree and publish the HRA Budget for 2011/12. The Medium Term Financial Strategy set out the planned income and expenditure for the HRA over the coming five years and how income collected would be spent in the management and the maintenance of the Council's housing stock and in meeting its obligations as a landlord. The HRA showed how much money the Council intended to raise from rents and service charges and how much was intended to be spent on the management and maintenance of the housing stock.

The Corporate Director added that the HRA balances would increase from 2012/13 and would become sustainable. She referred to the proposed increase in rents, and the improvements made to the quality of housing stock in moving towards the Decent Homes standards.

The Corporate Director Adults and Housing added that together with the Housing Ambition Plan, a drastic change in the finances and performance of the housing service had been achieved and the levels of satisfaction had increased, all of which had been reflected into a 'healthier' HRA.

The Leader of the Council stated that the HRA budget had been dysfunctional over a number of years with deficits being funded from reserves. This budget would put matters right and there would be a surplus in the following year.

Members noted the feedback received from the Tenants' and Leaseholders' Consultative Forum and the Harrow Federation of Tenants' and Residents' Association (HFTRA).

The Leader of the Council congratulated staff for their hard work. He added that the HRA was due to be abolished in April 2012 and he hoped that any new regime which replaced the HRA would bring benefits to local authorities.

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

That the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2011/12 and the HRA Capital Programme at Appendices 2 and 3 to the minutes be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To publish the final HRA proposals and set Council rents and other charges for 2011/12.



## APPENDIX 2

### HRA Budget 2011-12 to 2015-16

	Budget 2011-12 £	Budget 2012-13 £	Budget 2013-14 £	Budget 2014-15 £	Budget 2015-16 £
<b>Operating Expenditure:</b>					
Employee Costs	1,564,300	1,466,670	1,544,030	1,557,760	1,571,560
Supplies & Services	639,260	639,260	539,260	539,260	539,260
Utility cost (Water, Gas, Elec)	679,000	679,000	679,000	679,000	679,000
Estate & Sheltered Services	2,680,040	2,774,510	2,798,680	2,817,790	2,837,070
Central Recharges	3,028,200	3,088,770	3,150,540	3,213,550	3,277,820
<b>Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>8,590,800</b>	<b>8,648,210</b>	<b>8,711,510</b>	<b>8,807,360</b>	<b>8,904,710</b>
<b>Repairs Expenditure:</b>					
Repairs - Voids	619,100	636,410	654,500	673,400	693,160
Repairs - Responsive	2,652,850	2,744,430	2,840,120	2,940,120	3,044,630
Repairs – Other	2,048,640	2,091,140	2,135,290	2,181,150	2,228,750
<b>Total Repairs Expenditure</b>	<b>5,320,590</b>	<b>5,471,980</b>	<b>5,629,910</b>	<b>5,794,670</b>	<b>5,966,540</b>
<b>Other Expenditure:</b>					
Contingency - General	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Charges for Capital	6,943,390	6,918,420	6,950,980	6,962,440	6,995,430
Bad or Doubtful Debts	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
HRA Subsidy	6,988,350	6,988,350	6,988,350	6,988,350	6,988,350
<b>Total Other Expenditure</b>	<b>14,331,740</b>	<b>14,306,770</b>	<b>14,339,330</b>	<b>14,350,790</b>	<b>14,383,780</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>28,243,130</b>	<b>28,426,960</b>	<b>28,680,750</b>	<b>28,952,820</b>	<b>29,255,030</b>

	<b>Budget 2011-12 £</b>	<b>Budget 2012-13 £</b>	<b>Budget 2013-14 £</b>	<b>Budget 2014-15 £</b>	<b>Budget 2015-16 £</b>
<b>Income</b>					
Rent Income – Dwellings	-24,501,410	-25,397,420	-26,325,020	-27,285,280	-28,284,000
Rent Income – Non Dwellings	-754,090	-761,970	-770,000	-778,200	-786,560
Service Charges - Tenants	-649,380	-665,540	-682,100	-699,080	-716,600
Service Charges – Leaseholders	-657,140	-760,410	-763,750	-767,150	-770,620
Facility Charges (Water & Gas)	-507,170	-517,320	-527,660	-538,200	-548,980
Interest	-6,120	-6,120	-6,120	-6,120	-6,120
Other Income	-183,010	-183,010	-83,010	-83,010	-83,010
Transfer from General Fund	-163,000	-163,000	-163,000	-163,000	-163,000
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>-27,421,320</b>	<b>-28,454,790</b>	<b>-29,320,660</b>	<b>-30,320,040</b>	<b>-31,358,890</b>
<b>In Year Deficit / (Surplus)</b>	<b>821,810</b>	<b>-27,830</b>	<b>-639,910</b>	<b>-1,367,220</b>	<b>-2,103,860</b>
<b>BALANCE brought forward</b>	<b>-3,503,540*</b>	<b>-2,681,730</b>	<b>-2,709,560</b>	<b>-3,349,470</b>	<b>-4,716,690</b>
<b>BALANCE carried forward</b>	<b>-2,681,730</b>	<b>-2,709,560</b>	<b>-3,349,470</b>	<b>-4,716,690</b>	<b>-6,820,550</b>
<b>BALANCE Business Plan</b>	<b>-5,319,000</b>	<b>-5,460,000</b>	<b>-4,539,000</b>	<b>-3,572,000</b>	<b>-2,899,000</b>

\* Note: Balances brought forward 01 April 2010 £4,783,836 less forecast outturn Qtr 03 £1,280,296 yields estimated balances at 31 March 2011 £3,503,540

**HRA Capital Programme**

	<b>2011-12 No. of properties</b>	<b>2011-12 £'000</b>	<b>2012-13 £'000</b>	<b>2013-14 £'000</b>	<b>2014-15 £'000</b>	<b>2015-16 £'000</b>
Decent Homes :						
Capitalised salaries	-	310	310	310	310	310
Contingency	-	50	50	50	50	50
Major voids	25	50	50	50	50	50
Kitchens including rewiring	105	625	650	1,000	1,000	1,000
Bathroom including rewiring	109	500	700	1,000	1,000	1,000
Health & Safety programme	1,250	625	500	500	500	500
Gas heating programme	156	500	450	500	500	500
Enveloping programme	75	900	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Door entry upgrade/renewal	40	480	500	500	500	500
Lifts	120	300	300	200	200	200
Digital TV aerials	2,000	700	-	-	-	-
Electric night storage heating	166	500	250	-	-	-
Water tank replacement	5	25	-	-	-	-
Sheltered warden call	-	-	50	-	-	-
Structural issues / drainage	3	250	500	200	200	200
Boiler replacement programme	100	250	250	250	250	250
Partial heating upgrade	50	100	-	-	-	-
Garages	60	30	-	-	-	-
Aids & Adaptations	100	600	600	600	600	600
<b>HRA Capital Programme – Council Funded (including over programming)</b>	<b>4,364</b>	<b>6,795</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>
Less over programming	-	(635)	-	-	-	-
<b>HRA Capital Programme – Council Funded</b>	<b>4,364</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>
Grant funded Extensions	-	200	200	-	-	-
<b>Total HRA Capital Programme</b>	<b>4,364</b>	<b>6,360</b>	<b>6,360</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 FEBRUARY 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION IV:      Capital Programme  
2011/12 – 2015/16**

This page is intentionally left blank

# **CABINET**

## **MINUTES**

### **10 FEBRUARY 2011**

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
* Mitzi Green	

**In attendance:**

James Bond	Minute 146
Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

**(Councillors)**

\* Denotes Member present

### **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

#### **153. Key Decision - Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16**

Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director Finance, which proposed the Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 that formed part of the annual budget review process.

The Corporate Director introduced the report and informed the meeting that the Capital Programme set out the Council's investment plans for 2011/12 to 2015/16 and included a list of projects. She identified the key aspects of the Programme relevant to each of the Council's Directorates, including where more work was required to identify the nature of the works necessary.

The Corporate Director explained how the Capital Programme aligned with the Council's new Corporate Priorities, and that the investments would be funded by external grants, capital receipts, housing allowances and

borrowing. She assured Cabinet that Full Business Cases (FBC) would be carried out prior to any major projects commencing.

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

That the allocations within the Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To ensure an approved Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16.



**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 FEBRUARY 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION V: Treasury Management  
Strategy, Prudential Indicators  
and Minimum Revenue  
Provision (MRP) Policy and  
Strategy 2011/12**

This page is intentionally left blank

# CABINET MINUTES

## 10 FEBRUARY 2011

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
* Mitzi Green	

<b>In attendance:</b>	James Bond	Minute 146
<b>(Councillors)</b>	Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
	Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
	Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

\* Denotes Member present

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

**154. Key Decision - Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Prudential Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy and Strategy 2011/12**

The Corporate Director Finance introduced a report, which set out the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Prudential Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy and Strategy for 2011/12. She explained that Treasury Management was the management of the Council's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and debt transactions together with the effective control of risks associated with those activities.

The Corporate Director highlighted the importance of risk minimisation, as the Council was funded by public money. It was important for an authority to strike a balance between risk and return in order to allow for a contribution to

the budget. The borrowing element was also a key aspect with duration and timing as essential ingredients. She explained that as base rates were currently low, it was better to borrow internally but that this would be kept under review.

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

- (1) the Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators be approved;
- (2) the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy and Strategy for 2011/12 be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To promote effective financial management and comply with the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) Regulations 2003 and other relevant guidance.

# **(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL 10 MARCH 2011**

## **SINGLE EQUALITIES SCHEME**

**RECOMMENDATION I: Cabinet – 15 December 2010**

**RECOMMENDATION I: Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
9 February 2011**

This page is intentionally left blank

# CABINET MINUTES

## 15 DECEMBER 2010

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Bill Stephenson	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
	* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
	* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
	* Brian Gate	† Mrs Rekha Shah
	* Mitzi Green	
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Susan Hall Paul Osborn Anthony Seymour	Minute 101

- \* Denotes Member present
- † Denotes apologies received

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 104. Key Decision - Single Equalities Scheme

Cabinet received a joint report from the Corporate Director Adults and Housing and Assistant Chief Executive, providing an update on the draft Single Equalities Scheme (SES) and the public consultation which had informed the Scheme.

Cabinet noted that the SES covered the Council's approach to taking forward the protected characteristics, such as age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, and sex and sexual orientation under the Equality Act 2010. It was intended to work towards the excellent level of the new Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG) with a view of achieving the excellent accreditation by March 2012. The Council's approach to equalities was to

ensure that equality considerations were embedded in all aspects of service development and decision-making so as to improve services and the overall customer experience.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services identified the key changes to the SES, the responses received including those suggestions that had been taken on board, and the benefits of achieving excellence in this area. He referred to the action plan set out in the report, which would help embed the SES.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services welcomed Shelly Choudhury from the Harrow Equality Centre, to the meeting. Ms Choudhury welcomed the SES and commended the partnership working on the SES to ensure that the needs of the communities in Harrow were met. She added that following endorsement by Council in 2011, work in implementing the SES and meeting expectations would need to be progressed.

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

That the Single Equalities Scheme (SES) be approved.

**Reason for Recommendation:** To ensure that equalities were key to service development and decision-making and those services were fair and equitable. To improve services, increase customer satisfaction and comply with the Council's obligations under the Equalities legislation and Public Equality Duties.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.49 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON  
Chairman



# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

## 9 FEBRUARY 2011

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Sue Anderson * Kam Chana * Ann Gate * Susan Hall (4)	* Barry Macleod-Cullinane * Sachin Shah * Krishna Suresh (3) * Stephen Wright
<b>Voting Co-opted:</b>	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) (Vacancy) (Vacancy)
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Bill Stephenson	Minute 88

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

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 87. Single Equalities Scheme

The Committee received a report of the Corporate Director of Adults and Housing and the Assistant Chief Executive which set out the final draft Single Equalities Scheme. The scheme covered the Council's approach to taking forward the protected characteristics (Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or

Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation) under the Equality Act 2010 and working towards the excellent level of the new Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG) with a view to achieving the excellent accreditation by March 2012.

An officer advised that the scheme set out the actions the Council intended to take and also the actions it was hoped would achieve excellence. The officer added that Cabinet had recommended the scheme to Council for approval as it was a change to the policy framework.

A Member stated that the scheme did not appear to address double and triple discrimination. The officer advised that the Equality Act specifically provided for the recognition of dual discrimination but due to the timing of the production of the scheme, this would be addressed when it was revisited.

In response to a Member's question in relation to the reduction of inequalities through corporate commitment and partnership working, the officer advised that there had been a significant increase in equalities and diversity training. In addition, there was an e-learning package and an improved version of the induction training for both new staff and managers. Officers were ensuring that Equality Impact Assessments were completed for changes to policies. He added that there was a quality assurance process in place to ensure that these were done correctly, with a selection being sent to the Equality Centre for checking.

A Member questioned whether there was an indicator in place in terms of the data held by the Council on its residents. The officer advised that there was a link to categories of information and by 31 July 2011, the Council was due to publish how its functions supported the general equality duty against each of the protective characteristics.

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

That the comments of the Committee be considered.

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(18 November 2010)**

**RECOMMENDATION I:      Draft West London Waste Plan  
– Proposed Sites and Policies**

This page is intentionally left blank

# CABINET

## 18 NOVEMBER 2010

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

<b>Councillors:</b>	†	Bob Currie	*	Graham Henson
	*	Margaret Davine	*	Thaya Idaikkadar
	*	Keith Ferry	*	Phillip O'Dell
	*	Brian Gate	*	Mrs Rekha Shah
	*	Mitzi Green		

**In attendance:** Susan Hall Minute 86

**(Councillors)** Barry Macleod-Cullinane Minute 86

\* Denotes Member present

† Denotes apologies received

### 89. Key Decision - Draft West London Waste Plan - Proposed Sites and Policies Document

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise introduced the report on the Draft West London Waste Plan Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document for approval for the purposes of public consultation.

Members were informed that the Plan was one of the policy documents, which would comprise the overall Local Development Framework (LDF) for the borough and would eventually replace the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The Plan had been prepared jointly by the six west London boroughs of Harrow, Brent, Ealing, Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames.

The Portfolio Holder added that this matter had been the subject of discussions at recent meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Local Development Framework Panel, held on 2 and 9 November respectively, both bodies having submitted their observations to Cabinet.

**RESOLVED to Recommend:** (to Council)

That the Draft West London Waste Plan: Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document, and the associated Sustainability Appraisal for the purposes of public Consultation, be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To enable meaningful progress on the West London Waste Plan (WLWP) in order to meet targets set out in the current London Plan (consolidated with Alterations 2008), draft Replacement London Plan 2009, and Planning Policy Statements 10 and 12.



**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATION  
(10 February 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION VI:      Core Strategy – Proposed  
Submission Version**

This page is intentionally left blank



# CABINET MINUTES

## 10 FEBRUARY 2011

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Bill Stephenson	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
	* Margaret Davine	* Thaya Idaikkadar
	* Keith Ferry	* Phillip O'Dell
	* Brian Gate	* Mrs Rekha Shah
	* Mitzi Green	
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	James Bond	Minute 146
	Susan Hall	Minute 141 and 146
	Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 146
	Ben Wealthy	Minute 146

\* Denotes Member present

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 155. Key Decision - Core Strategy - Proposed Submission Version

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise introduced the report on the Harrow Core Strategy, which, subject to all necessary approvals, would be published in March for a period of public consultation prior to its submission to the Secretary of State by June 2011.

The Core Strategy set out the long term spatial vision of how Harrow should develop and set out the strategic objectives for the borough. It made reference to the development intended, and when, where and how it would be delivered.

Cabinet noted the recommendation from the Local Development Framework Panel and a tabled reference from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 November.

The Portfolio Holder moved minor drafting amendments to the recommendations which were agreed.

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

- (1) the submission version of the Core Strategy be placed on a six week statutory pre-submission consultation subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise, to agree amendments to the proposed submission version of the Core Strategy to reflect any changes deemed appropriate prior to the pre-submission publication;
- (2) the Core Strategy be approved for submission to the Secretary of State following the pre-submission consultation, subject to the following:
  - (a) authority being delegated to the Divisional Director Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise, to agree a schedule of any minor amendments to the Core Strategy resulting from the six week pre-submission consultation and to submit the schedule of minor amendments to the Secretary of State along with the Core Strategy;
  - (b) any substantial amendments to the Core Strategy being reported back to Cabinet.

**Reason for Decision:** To progress the Core Strategy to the next statutory stage of submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with the agreed revised programme.

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION  
(9 February 2011)**

**RECOMMENDATION II:      Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee  
- Terms of Reference**

This page is intentionally left blank

# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

## 9 FEBRUARY 2011

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Sue Anderson * Kam Chana * Ann Gate * Susan Hall (4)	* Barry Macleod-Cullinane * Sachin Shah * Krishna Suresh (3) * Stephen Wright
<b>Voting Co-opted:</b>	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) (Vacancy) (Vacancy)
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Bill Stephenson	Minute 88

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

### RECOMMENDED ITEMS

#### 86. Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee - Terms of Reference

The Committee received a report from the Health Sub-Committee which outlined proposals for the revision of their terms of reference, areas for future consideration in respect of their remit and a proposed protocol for the appointment of co-optees.

A Member questioned whether there were sufficient staffing resources given the current situation in relation to the Primary Care Trust (PCT). An officer advised that there was one full time member of staff and that a paper would be submitted to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Leadership Group on the proposal to increase the number of meetings from four to six.

The Committee, having agreed the proposed changes

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

That Council ratify the changes to the name of the Sub-Committee and its terms of reference.

### **PROPOSED NEW HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee is responsible for scrutinising matters in relation to health, public health and social care. The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee also has responsibility for considering matters related to other general policy proposals and issues beyond the remit of health and social care but with implications on health outcomes.

The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee has the following powers and duties:

1. To be the key driver of the scrutiny function's health and social care scrutiny programme and maintain relationships with health and social care colleagues and partners in relation to shared stated priorities, in consultation with the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
2. To be responsible for the discharge of the functions conferred by Section 21(f) of the Local Government Act 2000 of reviewing and scrutinising, in accordance with regulations under Section 7 of the Health and Social Care Act 2001, matters relating to the planning, provision and operation of health and social care services in Harrow.
3. To have specific responsibility for policy development and scrutiny of the following functions:
  - Health and social care infrastructure and service
  - GP Consortia and the Health and Wellbeing Board
  - Public Health
  - Other policy proposals which may have an impact on health, public health, social care and wellbeing
  - Collaborative working with health agencies
  - Commissioning and contracting health services
4. To conduct research, community and other consultation in the analysis of policy issues and possible options;
5. To consider and make recommendations for response to NHS consultations on proposed substantial developments/variations in health services that would affect the people of LB Harrow.
6. To consider and make recommendations for response to consultations from local health trusts, Department of Health, Care Quality Commission and any organisation which provides health services outside the local authority's area to inhabitants within it.

7. Continue to seek the development of relationship with GP consortia, Health and Wellbeing Boards, Care Quality Commission, LINK/ HealthWatch and the LMC.

Any health matter requiring an urgent decision/comment before the next meeting of the Health Committee will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee if that is sooner.



**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY  
PROCEDURE BY PORTFOLIO  
HOLDERS, LEADER AND DEPUTY  
LEADER, AND USE OF SPECIAL  
URGENCY PROCEDURE**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **REPORT FOR: COUNCIL**

---

**Date of Meeting:** 10 March 2011

**Subject:** **Decisions taken under Urgency Procedure by Portfolio Holders, Leader and Deputy Leader, and Use of Special Urgency Procedure**

**Responsible Officer:** Hugh Peart – Director of Legal and Governance Services

**Exempt:** No

**Enclosures:** Appendix A

### **Section 1 – Summary**

This report sets out decisions taken under urgency procedure rules by Cabinet, and use of the special urgency procedure since the meeting of the Council on 4 November 2010.

**FOR INFORMATION**

## **Section 2 – Report**

In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 47.6 set out in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, any Executive decisions taken as a matter of urgency are reported to the next available meeting of the Council.

Appendix A sets out those decisions taken as a matter of urgency since the Council meeting held on 4 November 2010.

In accordance with the Access to Information Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, the use of the Special Urgency procedure in relation to Executive decisions is to be reported quarterly to Council. The Special Urgency procedure has not been used since the Council meeting on 4 November 2010.

## **Section 3 – Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications.

## **Section 4 – Corporate Priorities**

Corporate priorities are included in the individual reports to Cabinet and the Deputy Leader.

Name: Steve Tingle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 1 March 2011		

## **Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

### **Contact:**

Pauline Ferris, Democratic & Electoral Services Manager

Tel: 020 8424 1269

E-mail: pauline.ferris@harrow.gov.uk

### **Background Papers:**

Council's Constitution/Portfolio Holder Decision report/Cabinet agenda

APPENDIX A

**Urgent Decisions**

The following urgent decisions have been taken since Council on 4 November 2010:-

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision Maker (Portfolio Holder/Leader/Cabinet)</b>	<b>Reason for Urgency</b>
Draft Admission Arrangements and Consultation process for the 2012/13 Academic Year	Cabinet – 18 November 2010	There was a statutory requirement to consult and the consultation period was to last for a minimum of eight weeks between 1 November and 1 March. To meet this requirement, the Harrow Admissions Forum had recommended the consultation period as 29 November 2010 to 28 January 2011. If call in was to proceed these timescales could not be met.
Grant Appeals 2010 – 11 25 November 2010	Leader of the Council	Due to the fact that grant appeals had remained outstanding since July 2010 and required a resolution. Approval to appoint an independent adviser would enable the Executive to move forward and resolve appeals within the Council's grant application and financial guidelines.
Grant Appeals 2010-11 – 8 February 2011	Leader of the Council	The report recommended the upholding of two appeals which had been outstanding since July 2010. These monies needed to be transferred

		to the relevant organisations within the current financial year. Before this could happen, officers would need to evidence that the relevant activities for which the grant appeal was awarded, had been carried out. In addition, the appeals needed to be finalised before the next grant round recommendations were made. This process would begin in the second week of February.
Future Organisation of Grange Nursery and Infant School and Grange Junior School – 16 February 2011	Portfolio Holder for Schools and Colleges	To allow recruitment processes to be completed before the end of April 2011 and to recruit a headteacher for the combined school to be in post for September 2011

**(EXTRAORDINARY) COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2011**

**DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY  
PROCEDURE - COUNCIL**

This page is intentionally left blank



## **REPORT FOR: COUNCIL**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	10 March 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>URGENT DECISION ON A MATTER RESERVED TO COUNCIL</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Hugh Peart – Director of Legal and Governance Services
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Enclosures:</b>	None

In accordance with the delegations to Chief Officers, the Leaders of each of the Political Groups on the Council were consulted on the following urgent decision, which was approved on behalf of the Council, as it required action prior to this meeting:

### **Appointment to the Section 151 Officer Role**

Julie Alderson, Interim Corporate Director Finance was appointed as the Council Section 151 Officer with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011, as she has the required qualifications and experience to carry out this role effectively. It was further agreed to also transfer all Delegations associated with the role effective the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

The issue was agreed as a matter of urgency to ensure the Council met its obligations under Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 to make arrangements for the proper administration of its financial affairs and to secure that one of its officers has responsibility for the administration of these matters.

### **FOR INFORMATION**

**Contact:**

Pauline Ferris, Democratic & Electoral Services Manager

Tel: 020 8424 1269

E-mail: [pauline.ferris@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:pauline.ferris@harrow.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:** Urgent Decision Forms

This page is intentionally left blank