

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

AGENDA

DATE: Monday 17 September 2018

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1 & 2, Harrow Civic Centre,
Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XY

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 4)

Chair: Councillor Jeff Anderson

Councillors:

Dan Anderson
Peymana Assad
Honey Jamie
Jerry Miles

Richard Almond (VC)
Jean Lammiman
Chris Mote
Kanti Rabadia

Representatives of Voluntary Aided Sector: Mr N Ransley / Reverend P Reece
Representatives of Parent Governors: 2 Vacancies

(Note: Where there is a matter relating to the Council's education functions, the "church" and parent governor representatives have attendance, speaking and voting rights. They are entitled to speak but not vote on any other matter.)

Representative of Harrow Youth Parliament

Reserve Members:

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Sarah Butterworth | 1. Philip Benjamin |
| 2. Maxine Henson | 2. Stephen Wright |
| 3. Rehka Shah | 3. Norman Stevenson |
| 4. Michael Borio | 4. Ramji Chauhan |
| 5. Dean Gilligan | |

Contact: Frankie Belloli, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1263 E-mail: frankie.belloli@harrow.gov.uk

Useful Information

Meeting details:

This meeting is open to the press and public.

Directions to the Civic Centre can be found at:
<http://www.harrow.gov.uk/site/scripts/location.php>.

Filming / recording of meetings

The Council will audio record Public and Councillor Questions. The audio recording will be placed on the Council's website.

Please note that proceedings at this meeting may be photographed, recorded or filmed. If you choose to attend, you will be deemed to have consented to being photographed, recorded and/or filmed.

When present in the meeting room, silent mode should be enabled for all mobile devices.

Meeting access / special requirements.

The Civic Centre is accessible to people with special needs. There are accessible toilets and lifts to meeting rooms. If you have special requirements, please contact the officer listed on the front page of this agenda.

An induction loop system for people with hearing difficulties is available. Please ask at the Security Desk on the Middlesex Floor.

Agenda publication date: Thursday 6 September 2018

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee;
- (b) all other Members present.

3. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 26)

That the minutes of the meetings held on 5 June and 10 July 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS *

To receive any public questions received in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

Questions will be asked in the order in which they were received. There will be a time limit of 15 minutes for the asking and answering of public questions.

[The deadline for receipt of public questions is 3.00 pm on 12 September 2018. Questions should be sent to publicquestions@harrow.gov.uk

No person may submit more than one question].

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

6. REFERENCE FROM CABINET - REGENERATION FINANCING (Pages 27 - 42)

Scrutiny Challenge Panel on Regeneration Financing - Report back from Cabinet meeting held on 21 June 2018

7. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2018-22 (Pages 43 - 52)

Report of the Divisional Director, Strategy and Commissioning

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Which cannot otherwise be dealt with.

AGENDA - PART II - NIL

*** DATA PROTECTION ACT NOTICE**

The Council will audio record item 4 (Public Questions) and will place the audio recording on the Council's website, which will be accessible to all.

[**Note:** The questions and answers will not be reproduced in the minutes.]

Deadline for questions	3.00 pm on Wednesday 12 September 2018
------------------------	---

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

5 JUNE 2018

Chair:	* Councillor Jeff Anderson	
Councillors:	* Richard Almond * Dan Anderson * Peymana Assad * Honey Jamie	* Jean Lammiman * Jerry Miles * Chris Mote * Kanti Rabadia
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) * Mr N Ransley Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors)
Non-voting Co-opted:	Harrow Youth Parliament Representative	

* Denotes Member present

6. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that no Reserve Members had been nominated to attend the meeting.

7. Declarations of Interest

In connection with Agenda Item 8 (Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy – Annual Refresh), Councillor Chris Mote declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he is a Justice of the Peace as this may relate to some of the criminal justice issues to be discussed. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

8. Minutes

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the amendment of the word “uninformed” in the fifth paragraph of minute item 268 concerning the Community Safety Strategic Assessment 2018 (Page 235) to read “uninformed”;
- (2) the minutes of the special meeting held on 24 May 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

9. Public Questions and Petitions

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions or petitions were received at this meeting.

10. References from Council/Cabinet

There were none.

RESOLVED ITEMS

11. Scrutiny Annual Report 2017-18

RESOLVED: That the Scrutiny Annual Report 2017-18 be noted, agreed and submitted to full Council for endorsement.

12. Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy - Annual Refresh

The Committee received a report on the Annual Refresh of the Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy. The Divisional Director, Strategic Commissioning introduced the report, advising that it built upon the comments from the Committee when it considered the draft strategic assessment in March; further work had been done to address specific points raised then by Members.

Chief Superintendent Simon Rose, Borough Police Commander for Harrow confirmed that the document reflected both the priorities of the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the two additional local priorities selected by the Council.

A Member asked about the definition of motor vehicle crime. Chief Superintendent Rose advised that this data did not include those crimes in which people were robbed while in or on their vehicles. Theft from motor vehicles had declined by 5.8% in the period in question, while theft of motor vehicles had increased by 43%. However, overall, crimes involving motor vehicles in the Borough had reduced substantially. He referred to thieves

targeting high value vehicles which modern electronic locking systems; they were now able to “scan” the vehicles when left unattended, say, in a supermarket car park during the day, and acquire the electronic data to be able to then steal it overnight.

Another Member welcomed the new Portfolio Holder for Community Safety to his first meeting of the Committee in that capacity, and asked him to clarify the scope of his role. The Portfolio Holder clarified his remit, confirming that crime and community in respect of children and young people would be covered. He underlined that he would seek to work in partnership with relevant local organisations, including the Harrow Youth Parliament and Young Harrow Foundation. He would prioritise addressing crimes against and involving young people, and violent crimes such as knife crimes which had increased in London recently.

In response to a Member’s question about the crime levels in Croydon revealed in the data, Chief Superintendent Rose advised that the borough was affected by the number of care homes for young people located there which had the effect of increasing certain types of crime. London Boroughs had their own particular factors such as the gang and drugs issues in Lambeth, the impact of the Notting Hill Carnival in Kensington and Chelsea, and the number of Premiership football teams in Hammersmith and Fulham. So across London, there was a range of different factors affecting crime. He confirmed that, by comparison, Harrow remained a very safe borough. In terms of the trends in certain areas, for example the recent modest reduction in crime in Croydon, Chief Superintendent Rose cautioned that data could sometimes mislead; for example, an increase in crime levels sometimes reflected Police activity to detect crime and arrest those involved. He also explained the different classifications of knife crimes to help Members interpret some of the data. The Police would often shift resources from one area to another to respond to particular situations; for example, Harrow had received more resources recently following a killing and other incidents. These fluctuations in resources made it difficult to rely completely on some trends in crime data.

Replying to a question on the overall reliability of data, the Divisional Director reassured the Committee that the data presented in the report was from MOPAC and was the most relevant available. Chief Superintendent Rose added that interpretation of the data could be challenging as some short-term trends did not necessarily reveal anything of significance.

A Member referred to increasing public concern over violent crime, particularly the use of knives. Chief Superintendent Rose confirmed that there had been increases in violent crime and knife crime in recent months and concerns had arisen from stabbing incidents in Queensbury and Wealdstone. He explained that these had been linked to gangs operating in Brent and Ealing and that a public meeting had been held on the issues in the previous week at the Red Brick Café in the Wealdstone Centre. South Harrow was currently a crime hotspot and Police were addressing this with various strands of work locally.

A Member who had recently been elected for the first time reiterated the concern among local people about violent crime. She asked about the levels

of crime in her ward, the increase in hate crime revealed in the report, and the fact that only a quarter of residents surveyed knew how to contact their local ward Police officers. Chief Superintendent Rose reported that some wards, such as those close to town centres, would always have higher levels of crime, and factors such as new licensed premises and the location of night clubs would also have an effect. With respect to the result of the survey question on contacting ward officers, he suspected that his had been affected by a change in the survey methodology in the last year. He acknowledged that changes in personnel had not helped, but he expected that this awareness would increase over time; he referred to improvements in the Metropolitan Police website which now provided for post code searches for local officers and to a new project with University College London designed to improve access to “Designated Ward Officers”. In respect of hate crime, he advised that this was sensitive to world events and high-profile news stories. To some extent, the data would be affected by the Police and community trying to address under-reporting. Relevant data was available on a ward basis on the Metropolitan Police website. The Divisional Director added that the Council worked with Stop Hate UK as an agent to facilitate and increase third-party reporting and that a conference had been held to discuss issues with key stakeholders in local communities.

(Councillor Chris Mote left the meeting at this point – 8.17 pm).

The Member followed up her question by asking about partnership working with other boroughs. Chief Superintendent Rose reported that his Borough Commander role covered Brent and Barnet as well as Harrow so Police officers, senior council staff and other relevant agencies would share information and best practice. He gave an example from another area which involved an arrangement with children’s care homes to deal with disruption and damage by residents without immediate recourse to calling the Police in; incidents could then be addressed with greater sensitivity and more careful direction of resources. The Divisional Director added that a meeting had taken place in Ealing earlier that day concerning the Racecourse Estate in Northolt and the activities of the South Harrow gang. The Council funded an organisation called Ignite to work on gangs and this included opportunities for cross-borough engagement.

A Member referred to the treatment of the issue of modern slavery in the report, expressing concern that there did not seem to be any particular plan to address it. The Divisional Director explained that there had been recent legislation which meant the Council needed to understand the definition of modern slavery and develop ways of identifying the signs of its operation. By its nature, it was a hidden crime and was also strongly linked to organised crime. Chief Superintendent Rose gave the example of some nail bars which used staff who had been trafficked from abroad, were accommodated in often crowded, squalid conditions and were then charged exorbitant amounts for board and lodging, effectively having to work for no pay or being forced into debt. There were similar abuses connected to car washes, cannabis farms, sex workers and the “county lines” drug business. The Divisional Director added that there might be scope for the Council to take enforcement action about the operation of some of the businesses involved; he would raise this with the relevant Council department.

The Member also asked about the scope to share crime data across agencies and the lack support to victims of crime. Chief Superintendent Rose confirmed that while data was shared across agencies, there were clearly limits to this; for example, to protect the identity of informants. There were agreed information sharing arrangements for non-sensitive data. He referred to corporate arrangements for victim support, though he accepted that the switch to an “opt-in” system a year ago may have affected the perception of the availability of services. Victim Support had confirmed that they have capacity to meet the needs of victims. Chief Superintendent Rose explained that, in some cases, the Police could not do as much in terms of community reassurance as they wished because there were reporting restrictions in relation to some crimes and there were cases where an investigation and/or prosecution might be prejudiced by open communications about what had happened. However, the Police did as much as possible within these constraints, to provide information, including to ward councillors, and to reassure the community and support victims.

The Member’s final question concerned the portrayal of Harrow as the safest borough in London and the risk that this could engender complacency in agencies working to tackle crime and possibly attract more crime in future as a result. Chief Superintendent Rose was not aware that criminals were taking advantage in this way. He referred to the difference in the number of calls to Police via the 999 emergency in a recent period – 609 in Harrow while Brent and Barnet had each received over a thousand – as indicating a genuine difference in criminal activity.

Another newly-elected councillor asked whether the information on Pages 63 and 64 of the agenda pack reflected a seasonal link to the level of anti-social behaviour. He also sought an indication of the trend in anti-social behaviour in the first few months of 2018, since many residents had raised the issue in the election campaign. Chief Superintendent Rose reported that spikes in the levels of anti-social behaviour were clearly related to certain seasonal events such as Halloween, school holidays, Bonfire Night and the Notting Hill Carnival; periods of hot weather also correlated. He had figures for anti-social behaviour over the previous 12 months and these revealed a decrease of 13.1% in anti-social behaviour and 11% in repeat anti-social behaviour; there had been a drop across London as well, but by a smaller proportion. Chief Superintendent Rose accepted that residents were nevertheless concerned about the issue.

The Chair asked whether the information on Page 117 of the agenda pack indicated a drop in confidence in policing. Chief Superintendent Rose accepted that the survey results on knowing how to contact local Police officers and the provision of information to local residents were disappointing and improvements should be put in place. Traditionally, local officers had sought to engage residents in local meetings on topical local issues, but it was acknowledged that many, particularly young people, tended not to come to such events. The Police were keen to develop other methods including the “OWL” online neighbourhood watch system, but there were issues of cost to resolve. “Virtual” ward panel meetings would encourage a broader range of people and subjects to be involved.

A Member welcomed the idea of online neighbourhood panels. She underlined the considerable shift recently in the fear of crime, giving the example of artifice burglary as making people afraid even in the relative safety of their own homes; she also referred to a family connection with the only British person killed in the London Bridge terrorist attack in June 2017. She urged all agencies and councillors to encourage residents not to fear crime disproportionately and not to let it affect their daily lives unduly. Chief Superintendent Rose was very conscious of the issue and he reported that he had had discussions with the Harrow Times crime reporter to encourage greater coverage of good news stories rather than simply featuring serious crime when it occurred. This would help in achieving a more balanced picture of community safety in the Borough.

On the subject of artifice burglary, the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety referred to his introduction of a “no cold calling” zone in his ward. Chief Superintendent Rose reported on the “smart water” system which had been introduced in some households; as it involved warning stickers and posters, this would have some deterrent effect on potential burglars, but evidence suggested that the biggest impact was on the occupant of the property as simply applying for and implementing the smart water pack, had the effect of making them more careful and observant. He explained that the scheme was sometimes introduced in particular zones with a target of signing up 80% of households there; this tended to be more effective than individual households paying for their own smart water pack. Chief Superintendent Rose was aware of a small team at Scotland Yard working on levels of burglary across London which could inform implementation of the scheme in a coordinated way in target areas across the capital. In response to a question as to whether the Administration could fund a local project, the Divisional Director advised that there were always choices to be made about the priority and value for money of various schemes; in his instance, there was some evidence that the scheme itself was not as significant driver of change as awareness of the risks among residents. The Member asked that more information be sent to the Committee on the smart water scheme.

The remaining Member of the Committee who was elected recently for the first time, reported that she had been a victim of burglary and aggravated harassment over the previous 12 months; there had also been a stabbing on a nearby estate. She was concerned about the trends in certain crimes, particularly knife crime and hate crime and the decline in the numbers and local visibility of Police officers. She asked about the Police plan to address this and particularly about the rumours that South Harrow Police Station was to be closed. Chief Superintendent Rose confirmed that the Police were retaining the premises with a “front desk” for the public; indeed, the building was being refurbished. He acknowledged the natural public concerns over reports of crime and the genuine recent increase in knife crime in London; however, he wanted to underline that the Police were responding to this and were adopting ways of coping better with the budget reductions they had to implement; for example, Police officers were increasingly using tablet / smartphone devices and applications to file reports without the previous requirement to return physically to a base to type up reports. By comparison with the Metropolitan Police average response time of 15 minutes, Harrow’s

was 7 minutes and 44 seconds. The Divisional Director added that the Council had responded to the consultation exercise about the future of South Harrow Police Station and underlined the value of community representatives reassuring the public about its future.

In response to a Member's query about bids for funding to implement local community safety initiatives, Chief Superintendent Rose reported that a number of partnership bids with Brent had been submitted to MOPAC, including a number since his recent arrival as Borough Commander. The Divisional Director confirmed that the Council tried to submit as many funding bids as staff capacity allowed. There were sometimes judgements to be made about the value of some funding schemes balanced against the resource required to bid, eg. limited and short-term funds. Overall, MOPAC had about £20m of bids in the last round with only £3m funding available. Chief Superintendent Rose advised that Harrow benefited from some schemes which were implemented across a number of boroughs; single borough bids tended to be less successful.

In response to a Member's query about criminals going away from their home areas to commit crimes in other boroughs, Chief Superintendent Rose confirmed this was a feature to some extent; for example, pickpockets from the east of London committing crime in central London and burglars targeting affluent areas such as parts of Kensington and Chelsea. He was not aware of any particular trend of criminals based in inner London boroughs coming to Harrow to commit crimes. By contrast, the "county lines" criminality was essentially about sending young people away from London to places such as Bournemouth and Cardiff to act as drug "mules". Chief Superintendent Rose did not have figures at the meeting of the number of young people from Harrow involved in these crimes.

The Chair thanked Chief Superintendent Rose, the Portfolio Holder for Community safety and the Divisional Director, Strategic Commissioning for attending the meeting and answering questions from members of the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and that the comments made at the meeting be drawn to the attention of the Cabinet when it considers the annual refresh of the Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy.

13. Youth Justice Plan

The Chair confirmed that this item had been withdrawn and it was proposed that it be considered at a special meeting of the Committee on 10 July 2018.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.35 pm, closed at 9.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JEFF ANDERSON
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (SPECIAL) MINUTES

10 JULY 2018

Chair:	* Councillor Jeff Anderson	
Councillors:	* Richard Almond * Dan Anderson * Peymana Assad * Honey Jamie	* Jean Lammiman * Jerry Miles * Chris Mote * Kanti Rabadia
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) † Mr N Ransley Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors)
Non-voting Co-opted:	Harrow Youth Parliament Representative	
In attendance: (Councillors)	Councillor Christine Robson, Portfolio Holder for Young People and Schools	(Minute 16)

- * Denotes Member present
- † Denotes apologies received

14. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that no Reserve Members had been nominated to attend the meeting.

An apology for absence had been received from Mr Ransley.

15. Declarations of Interest

In connection with Agenda Item 3 (Youth Justice Plan 2018-19), Councillor Jean Lammiman declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she is a Governor of Shaftesbury School. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

In connection with Agenda Item 3 (Youth Justice Plan 2018-19), Councillor Chris Mote declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he had previously served as a magistrate in Hillingdon dealing with offences by young people. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

RESOLVED ITEMS

16. Youth Justice Plan 2018-19

The Committee received a report setting out the draft Youth Justice Plan for 2018-19 and inviting comments before its consideration at Cabinet and full Council. Councillor Christine Robson, the Portfolio Holder for Young People and Schools, introduced the report, explaining that this was an annual requirement as part of a framework established nationally by the Youth Justice Board. The draft report outlined the work of the local Youth Offending Team and its plans for the future; priority objectives included reducing the number of first-time offenders and addressing the increase in serious violent crime affecting young people, particularly knife crime. The plan also sought to address the complex needs of some young people involved in the criminal justice system.

The Interim Corporate Director, People Services underlined that he welcomed the Committee's comments on the draft plan as meaningful consultation with scrutiny councillors was important before the full Council considered the formal adoption of its proposals. He referred to comments and questions received in advance of the meeting which would be addressed in updates to the draft plan along with the comments to be made at the meeting.

The Head of Service, Early Support and Youth Offending Service then gave a detailed explanation of the key aspects of the plan, referring in particular to the executive summary of the plan (Page 15 of the agenda); he highlighted the principal priorities as reduction in the number of first-time offenders, responding to the increase in serious violent crime affecting young people (including knife crime), tackling the involvement of young people in drug-related crime, both the use and supply of drugs, and addressing the longer term needs of young people affected by criminality. He underlined the alignment of the draft plan with the Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy, and the reliance on effective partnership with a range of other organisations; the input of Harrow Youth Parliament and the Young Harrow Foundation was an important element in developing meaningful proposals for action. The Head of Service was pleased to report that there was now a stable staff group in place in the Youth Offending Team; they had the skills and abilities to deliver high quality services to young people. The service was nevertheless keen to seek

improvements and to this end, an independent auditor had been commissioned to review its work and effectiveness. A tool called Asset Plus was also available to help identify and manage risks and vulnerabilities. The Head of Service concluded by underlining the importance of local community action groups in delivering locally-focused services.

A Member raised concerns about the age of data in the plan, some of which dated back to March 2017. He questioned whether, in the light of the changing circumstances of youth crime recently, the plans developed on the basis of that data would be effective. He was also concerned about the apparent contradictions in some of the data. The Head of Business Intelligence explained that the Youth Justice Board template was used and this meant that some of the data referred to offences originally committed in 2016-17; there would always be a lag of some kind given the time associated with court processes. However, he accepted that more could be done to ensure that this was clearer in the presentation of the information in the plan.

The Member referred to information on caseloads at Page 18 of the agenda which indicated these were increasing while a reduction in entrants to the criminal justice system had been reported. The Head of Business Intelligence advised that this related to the complexity of many cases which meant interventions would take longer and therefore impact on caseload figures.

Another Member referred to some arithmetical inaccuracies he had identified which could be checked and, if confirmed, could be corrected outside the meeting. He asked whether the data in the “Intensity” tables at Page 20 of the agenda could be reconciled with the suggestion that cases were becoming more complicated. The Head of Business Intelligence advised that the increase in knife crimes had occurred in 2016 and the level had been maintained since. The risk and vulnerability scores should reflect this trend and he acknowledged that this could be clarified.

A Member asked about the growing problem of the coercion of young people as part of the “county lines” approach of London gangs. The Head of Service, Early Support and Youth Offending Service acknowledged the issue and referred to elements of the Community Safety and Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy which sought to address it. He gave the example of “mental toughness” courses offered to young people to strengthen resistance to being drawn into these practices. Support was also offered to schools and could be provided on a one-to-one basis. The Divisional Director, Strategic Commissioning reported that the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) had top-sliced funding to create a project led by Brent Council to tackle this problem. The emphasis was on improved coordination and information-sharing across authorities and agencies.

A Member referred to a missing graph in the draft plan (Page 36 of the agenda).

The representative of the Harrow Youth Parliament encouraged the Council to use its members as a valuable resource in planning relevant services. She asked whether courses were tailored for the different circumstances and backgrounds of young people. The Head of Service, Early Support and Youth

Offending Service confirmed that he was keen to involve the Harrow Youth Parliament in developing the delivery plan for implementation of the Youth Justice Plan once it was approved. With regard to tailored courses, he suggested that a specialist offer of some courses could be made to schools, for example, if a school reported concerns about any vulnerable students. A pilot programme was running at Canons High School and this was seen as successful.

A Member queried apparent inconsistencies between the caseload data and the reported reduction in cases. The Head of Business Intelligence advised that the reducing number of first-time entrants to the criminal justice system was only part of the picture as staff were increasingly dealing with longer, more complex cases; this in part reflected the continuing high levels of violence affecting young people and repeat offending.

A Member sought information on the ethnicity of young people involved in stop and search cases; the Head of Business Intelligence would check what data was available on this. The Head of Service, Early Support and Youth Offending Service confirmed that these cases involved a disproportionate number of black young men, and this was repeated in other data, such as in the numbers of those given custodial sentences as opposed to other sanctions.

In response to a Member's query about the data on the gender of offenders given in the table at Page 24 of the agenda, it was confirmed that this related to young people in the Borough. The Member also referred to inconsistencies in the report about whether crime levels were increasing or not, and to the fact that one of the bullet points on Page 35 of the agenda contained an incomplete sentence. She also considered that the font used in the report should be standardised to improve the presentation and that the structure could be revised to make it easier to find information. She suggested that a list of stakeholders and partners be added to the plan and that the language, tone and content of the introduction be revisited, as she considered that it did not highlight the Youth Offending Team.

The Member queried the 75% target for those not in education, employment and training (NEET). The Head of Business Intelligence advised that the Borough had one of the lowest rates of NEET young people amongst the general population in the country at less than 2% and aspires to close the gap for young offenders, who have a significantly higher. Efforts were made to ensure that young offenders were in education, training or employment; he would check the position in relation to nearest neighbour authorities.

Referring to the initiatives outlined towards the end of the plan, a Member suggested that there should be clearer evidence, either from local or national experience, of the impact of interventions with young people. While pleased to hear about the stability of the staff team, he wondered whether there was detail of how the service planned to maintain this and manage workforce risks. The Interim Corporate Director, People Services confirmed that the staff team had moved from very challenging circumstances to the present much improved position offering a high quality skill set; he invited members of the Committee to visit the team to observe this at first hand. He underlined the

strengths of the relationships with young people and the use of many innovative programmes; the quality of the service had been reflected in feedback from young people. More information on this could be added to the report.

A Member asked again about the complexity of caseloads, suggesting that it could be that young people were not classed as re-offending if the committed different types of crime. The Head of Business Intelligence confirmed that this was not the case and that, irrespective of the type of crime, new offences by the same person were classed as re-offending. This was part of a national framework of reporting through a type of central clearing house and through which the Council were held to account for their reporting. The performance indicators in this area of work were complicated and detailed analysis of individual young people's records would serve to reconcile the various aggregated data. In response to a related question from another Member about the categorisation of cases where individuals were charged with multiple offences, the Head of Business Intelligence explained the way these were recorded, involving the number of re-offences per offender as opposed to "binary re-offenders". He clarified that it made no difference if the penalties were custodial or not.

The Member also asked about whether the report's comments on Asset Plus suggested that there were difficulties with it. The Head of Business Intelligence confirmed that the nationally-promoted programme was extensive and relatively bureaucratic, and therefore posed challenges in implementation. However, it did offer very thorough assessments.

Referring to the data on the ethnicity of offenders at Page 23 of the agenda, a Member pointed to the differences between White British offenders and Black British offenders, asking for an explanation of these. The Head of Service, Early Support and Youth Offending Service agreed that these differences were significant, but could not offer a ready explanation. The Head of Business Intelligence confirmed that the Council was continuing to analyse the relevant data and to learn from other research such as the Lammy Report. He added that there had been some variability over the years and that, in the context of the youth offending figures for Harrow, the absolute numbers involved were relatively low.

In response to a Member's question about the age of those offered courses, the Head of Service, Early Support and Youth Offending Service advised that children as young as 9 could be offered courses if this was recommended in the circumstances. Youth Offending Team courses were offered to those aged 10 and over. It was intended to consider information provided by the Young Harrow Foundation and this might lead to the development of programmes for primary schools.

The Divisional Director, Strategic Commissioning confirmed that further work would be done to address the comments made by members of the Committee to inform consideration of the draft plan at Cabinet and full Council.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet be requested to note the comments made in relation to the draft Youth Justice Plan 2018-19.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.08 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JEFF ANDERSON
Chair

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (SPECIAL) MINUTES

10 JULY 2018

Chair:	* Councillor Jeff Anderson	
Councillors:	* Richard Almond * Dan Anderson * Peymana Assad * Honey Jamie	* Jean Lammiman * Jerry Miles * Chris Mote * Kanti Rabadia
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) † Mr N Ransley Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors)
Non-voting Co-opted:	Harrow Youth Parliament Representative	
In attendance (Councillors)	Councillor Graham Henson, Leader of the Council	(Minute 19)
* Denotes Member present		
† Denotes apologies received		

17. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that no Reserve Members had been nominated to attend the meeting.

An apology for absence had been received from Mr Ransley.

18. **Declarations of Interest**

RESOLVED: To note that no declarations were made by Members of the Committee.

RESOLVED ITEMS

19. **Question and Answer Session with the Leader of the Council and Interim Chief Executive**

The Chair welcomed the Leader of the Council, the Interim Chief Executive and the Director of Finance to the meeting.

The Interim Chief Executive opened the meeting with an overview of the major issues facing the Council and the Borough. He outlined the national picture in relation to the work of local authorities, drawing on some of the themes highlighted in the Local Government Association (LGA) conference the previous week. A major concern had been the issues around funding available to local government, particularly the approach to funding adult and children's social care and the financial demands of children's special educational needs. There has been an announcement of £20bn for the National Health Service, but questions remained as to the implications for adult social care. A Green Paper had already been delayed and was now due in the Autumn. The new Secretary of State had spoken about creating a sustainable footing for social care; this was urgently needed and the issues were now acute in Harrow, with demand increasing, care packages becoming more complex and prices rising.

The outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review setting the national allocation for local government was still awaited. The Fair Funding review would look at the allocation of local government funding between Councils. In London, the pooling of business rates sought to balance out the returns from business growth around London. Harrow had managed to stabilise its business rates levels after long-term decline over 20 years; however, business rate growth in other areas of the capital was stronger.

The Interim Chief Executive reported that housing remained an important national and London theme; the Mayor of London had made funds available for affordable housing and Harrow urgently needed to make the most of this opportunity. The Council was preparing its Strategic Housing Market Assessment and in the new London Plan, the housing targets for Harrow would double. In London, there was now a major focus on gangs, knife crime and the safety of young people. While Harrow was still a relatively safe Borough, it was becoming less safe, with recent incidents in Wealdstone, South Harrow and Rayners Lane. The Interim Chief Executive was conscious that, in this context, the "Harrow is 'safe'" message did not work for residents as it simply did not resonate with their experience, particularly in these areas. Post-Grenfell, a lot of work was taking place on emergency planning arrangements and Harrow was playing its part in these discussions.

The Interim Chief Executive referred to the restructuring of the Police service in London which involved the creation of a new Borough Command Unit

covering Harrow, Brent and Barnet; the new model would go live in November. He was confident that the good partnership relationship with the Police in Harrow developed over many years would help ease this transition. The principal challenges in housing were the high levels of people in temporary accommodation, the HRA's sustainability and the task of increasing social housing while the Council was up against the borrowing cap. The Council's children's services had received a Good Ofsted rating, though the inspection framework had since been strengthened; the next self assessment against this framework would be reported to Cabinet shortly.

The Council was pursuing a re-organisation of adult care services with demand and pressures growing, significantly impacting the Council's budget. External advisors were assisting in exploring options, The Council was retendering its refuse collection fleet to try to avoid the breakdowns which had caused disruption to the service during the winter. Fly tipping, overcrowding, migrant labour, illegal occupation had all created concerns for the Interim Chief Executive. The Council had hosted the Permanent Secretary of Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government a few weeks before to showcase current issues in the private rented housing sector and address community cohesion issues. Customer service standards were holding up and Harrow was now one of the most digital councils nationally with 88% of our customer interactions being self-service via Access Harrow.

To conclude, the Interim Chief Executive confirmed that the Council's overall financial position was very tight, featuring a combination of projected gaps in the budget and low reserves. In February, there was a reported £33m funding gap between 2019 and 2021, with a total of £17m in reserves of which £7m are earmarked and the remaining £10m classed as general fund balances. . The Council was already a low spending authority. Through the budget process, the Council was developing options to address these gaps and the Interim Chief Executive was in discussion with the Local Government Association about support they and the sector could provide to this process; these were early discussions and he would update Members in due course.

The Leader of the Council underlined the significant shortfall in local government funding which the LGA had estimated at £7.8 billion nationally by 2025, simply on the basis of maintaining current service levels. He had concerns over a number of pressures on budgets and services; these included the worrying increase in violent crime affecting young people, particularly in the context of reductions in Police resources; the challenge of securing more affordable housing; the impact of low-paid employment on families; and the levels of support for those with mental health problems, especially young people.

The Chair asked about the development of health facilities in the Harrow town centre area. The Interim Chief Executive reported that he had raised the matter with the NHS Harrow Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG); he wished to be reassured about the capacity and location of primary care practices given the amount of housing development planned in the area.

The Harrow Youth Parliament representative reported that its members had discussed the problem of low pay in employment and sought a response from

the Council on the issue. The Leader of the Council acknowledged that this was a key issue for young people and reported that the Council was trying to address employment issues through support for the Ignite Trust's work and through the promotion of apprenticeship opportunities, both in the Council and in local firms. A representative of the Northwick Park Hospital Trust present at the meeting added that the Trust had held an open day promoting opportunities for young people to work in NHS roles.

A Member queried the level of financial reserves held by the Council and the lack of clarity over the regeneration programme borrowing costs which would arise; it appeared to him from the Cabinet reports on the programme that yields were now estimated at 5% when they had previously been 8%. He asked whether funding was in place and whether it was still intended to use the European Investment Bank as had been suggested at one stage. The constant revision of financial assumptions made it very difficult for councillors to assess the likely risks, and he wondered whether the Council planned to reduce the scale of the programme so as to manage these risks more reliably. The Member also queried the Council's decision to invest in properties outside the Borough when capital funds could have been used directly to increase housing locally.

The Director of Finance advised that the Council had yet to determine the borrowing arrangements and there were a number of options which could be considered, including a bond issue, use of the Public Works Loan Board and other funders such as the European Investment Bank (EIB), though the latter option would only be viable for a proportion of the programme due to EIB investment funding criteria. The Regeneration Programme is an evolving programme and the Council are assessing the capital financing options which meet the needs of the programme and are the most cost efficient to the Council. As the programme is evolving, reports to Cabinet will themselves vary in the financial modelling and options outlined. She confirmed that 5% was being used as the benchmark yield figure for the programme as a whole.

The Interim Chief Executive added that the scale of the regeneration programme was being kept under review and it was possible that borrowing commitments would change compared to previous assessments. The Leader of the Council confirmed that options would be narrowed down and measures put in place to mitigate the risks; he underlined that a significant policy driver was to increase affordable housing to meet the needs of local families. He understood the 8% figure might have related to a particular investment in commercial premises outside the Borough. He concluded by underlining that the Council would obviously not proceed with any elements of the programme which financial modelling indicated as too risky in terms of affordability.

The Harrow Youth Parliament representative sought more information on employment opportunities for young people which she felt had been covered only vaguely in documents such as the Community Safety, Violence Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy. She also referred to a £40,000 reduction in services offering support to young people with mental health issues. The Leader of the Council reported that there was a range of initiatives in terms of employment for young people, including apprenticeships at the Council and opportunities through the Xcite programme; these were not

specifically relevant to the Community Safety, Violence Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy. He advised that the £40,000 funding had been used to re-provide services in a different way, rather than being a cut in resources. He accepted that there were unmet needs in the field of mental health and that the Council wished to do more; however, the 97% reduction in the Government's Revenue Support Grant to Harrow over recent years meant that the Council's only real option was to bid for specialist funds. The Interim Chief Executive added that the Horizons partnership and the work with Thrive London and MIND were examples of the Council's involvement in responding to the needs of young people with mental health issues.

A Member referred to a question which he had notified to the Leader of the Council in advance, namely why there had been underspends in 2017-18 of £3.2m and £107m on the revenue and capital budgets respectively, and how the Council could have improved its performance had these resources been used. The Leader of the Council reported that budget planning was based on estimated demand for services which, because so many were demand-led services, could not always be predicted accurately; equally, there would be one-off circumstances which could affect demand for revenue resources. In the case of the capital budget, the Leader of the Council did not have a complete understanding of all the factors affecting it, but the circumstances and priority of certain schemes could change during the year as plans developed, and also there were sometimes instances where the tenders received would be at lower prices than anticipated. The Interim Chief Executive added that he could not recall a financial year when the Council had not underspent; in practice, this and the reserves provision allowed the Council flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances, such as the temporary relocation of Pinner Wood School in the previous year, and to cover costs arising from reorganisations such as redundancy payments, which could not be projected with complete accuracy in budget-setting.

A Member asked about the progress of the new Civic Centre project and the likely timing of the move there. The Interim Chief Executive advised that UK Power Networks was assessing the implications for the demolition of the sub-station on site. An audit of the requirements for the new building was being carried out to feed into design options; this would include proposed layouts, electrical works required and desk/staff ratios. Architects and engineers were working on this and it was expected this would take some six months; the Council would then go to the market to secure a contractor. It was therefore expected that the building completion would be in the first quarter of 2021 with occupation in the summer of that year. All relevant contracts were being reviewed and arrangements for pool cars were being developed. A planning application was anticipated in the late summer. The Leader of the Council added that while these were the Council's current plans, they would be subject to decisions informed by the financial modelling and assessments.

Another Member queried the significant reduction in staff car parking at the new site and whether staff such as social workers would be able to deliver services effectively as a result. The Interim Chief Executive advised that the current "pod" working arrangements for social workers would be replicated in the new building and pool cars would be available, including at the depot. Based on analysis of existing occupancy levels, a 6/10 desk-to-staff ratio was

currently planned for the new building; this compared to 5/10 used at the new Hounslow Civic Centre. Further work would be done on flexible working arrangements. The Interim Chief Executive agreed with the Member's statement that plans should be based on staff views and experiences, not those of directors. The representative of the Northwick Park Hospital Trust added that his experience was that effective working networks could be successfully established without co-location of staff.

The Member suggested that the Council adopt a clear critical path analysis for the Civic Centre project and she also underlined the importance of planning to secure the continued provision of services as part of the transition.

A Member asked about the recent community safety engagement forum meetings in South Harrow and Wealdstone and another Member reported that residents were increasingly feeling that the Borough was becoming less safe. The Leader of the Council confirmed that incidents in these areas and in Rayners Lane in recent months were being addressed by the Council and the Police seeking to consult and reassure local communities. It was hoped that capacity and resources for this work could be supported with funding from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. The Leader of the Council acknowledged the concerns about the fear of crime in many areas, even though this was often inversely related to actual crimes levels; crime rates were in fact rising faster in other areas of London. The Interim Chief Executive agreed that it was unhelpful to talk about Harrow as a "safe" borough in areas such as Wealdstone. He reported that the meeting with the community there had been useful, though there were constraints in the sense that the Police could not be completely open about the situation given that there were live investigations into incidents. Nevertheless, it was still important to continue to engage with the public at such meetings; a meeting had been held with the relevant ward councillors in the previous week.

A Member asked about whether the Council could formally become a London Living Wage employer. The Leader of the Council advised that while the Council had adopted the London Living Wage for its staff in 2012, the problem with formal accreditation was that some of the Council's contractors for care services were not in a financial position to pay the required rates. Ironically, some care providers in inner London boroughs could meet these standards as otherwise they would struggle to secure sufficient staff for their services. The Council would keep the matter under review.

The Member also asked about the Interim Chief Executive's view of the working relationship between Members and officers and whether a Member's view would always override that of an officer. The Interim Chief Executive underlined that officers at all levels worked for all councillors irrespective of political groups; the success of any council depended on positive and respectful relationships between officers and Members, and he was sure that this had been the case at Harrow for some time. At the same time, there was no room for complacency and efforts should continue to maintain these good working relationships into the future; some of the best work of the authority involved, to his mind, joint problem-solving by officers and Members. The Interim Chief Executive did not agree that Members' views always took precedence over those of officers; for example, it would not be acceptable for

a Member to intervene in, say, a legal case involving child protection. There were clear rules and protocols about respective roles and responsibilities in decision-making and it was important that these were respected by all parties.

A Member asked about the national local government funding arrangements and the likely impact on Harrow of the Government's Fair Funding review and possible shifts in resources between rural and metropolitan authorities. In common with most involved, the Interim Chief Executive was uncertain as to how the financial settlement would pan out. He was concerned that the county councils were a strong voice in the discussions about resource distribution across the country and London tended to suffer from an impression that it was a wealth creator and that therefore, its councils were in a financially advantageous position. London Councils was engaged in a campaign to address these misconceptions, with input from him and the Director of Finance. Even within London, there were decisions to be made about the balance of resources between inner and outer London boroughs; while outer London boroughs were in similar positions, Harrow was slightly worse off in terms of funding prospects. The Council would continue to lobby about its budget pressures. The Leader of the Council added that comments made at the LGA Conference had indicated that councils were having to fight over a smaller and smaller funding "cake" and that the real challenge was to persuade the Government to acknowledge, for example, the significant pressures on the care system trying to cope with an ageing population with increasingly complex needs; this same argument had been used to explain additional funding for the NHS.

A Member referred to the decision not to implement the £58,000 saving on Members' Allowances and the Labour Group's manifesto commitment to review the number of councillors with a view to achieving a financial saving; he contrasted this with that group's submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England arguing for retention of the current number of councillors. The Member asked about the officer resources used in the preparation of the submission. He also referred to the reduction in the number of scrutiny leads and the fact that the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee would only meet three times a year, weakening the role of scrutiny.

The Leader of the Council advised that, following the local elections, it had been agreed to reduce the size of the Cabinet. His political group had reviewed the demands on councillors and the views of residents on the doorstep, and had taken the view that councillors' workloads supporting an increasing population with diminishing resources, underlined the case for retaining the current number of councillors. He also felt that a reduction would simply narrow the opportunities to get more people involved in serving their local communities in this way. Both political groups had made their submissions to the Commission who would now decide on a future number of councillors. He confirmed that officer resources and support had been equivalent for both submissions. With respect to scrutiny, the Leader referred to the review undertaken by the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the various measures taken to strengthen it; he reminded the Committee that the Council had significantly reduced the dedicated resources for scrutiny work in view of the severe budget pressures on services.

The Chair thanked the Leader of the Council, the Interim Chief Executive and the Director of Finance for attending the meeting and answering the Committee's questions.

20. Termination of the Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution), it was

RESOLVED: At 9.59 pm to continue to 10.05pm

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 8.14 pm, closed at 10.02 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JEFF ANDERSON
Chair

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17 SEPTEMBER 2018

REFERENCE FROM CABINET – 21 JUNE 2018

11. Response to the Scrutiny Review Panel Report on Regeneration Finance

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee/Scrutiny Review Group be noted, including the actions undertaken in response to those recommendations, as set out in the report.

Reason for Decision: To respond to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review Group.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected: As set out in the report.

Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member/Dispensation Granted: None.

FOR INFORMATION

Background Documents:

Agenda of Cabinet – 21 June 2018: Report on Regeneration Finance

Contact Officer:

Daksha Ghelani, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1881

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date of Meeting:	21 June 2018
Subject:	Response to the Scrutiny Review Panel Report on Regeneration Finance
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Paul Nichols, Divisional Director of Regeneration and Planning
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Keith Ferry, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning and Employment Councillor Adam Swersky, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	No, as the recommendations are for noting only
Wards affected:	All Wards
Enclosures:	None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides responses to the recommendations from the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel Report on Regeneration Finance from March 2018.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to:

- Note the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Note the actions undertaken in response to the recommendations as set out in this report.

Reason: (For recommendations)

The recommendations and responses are based on the outcome of the Regeneration Scrutiny Review process.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

The scope of the Regeneration Scrutiny Review was to consider the Council's regeneration and development programme on general fund land, HRA land, other public sector land and private land in the borough over the period 2017-21.

The purpose of the review was to:

- Review the planned capital and revenue financing for the regeneration programme and to assess whether the Council's proposals for the financing of its regeneration programme are realistic, affordable, robust and deliverable. This includes aspects of the commercialisation strategy (e.g. the proposal to build private homes for rent) that directly impact upon the regeneration and development programme;
- Review selected financial assessments for individual regeneration projects, including investigating the regeneration programme finance model, in particular the underlying assumptions, cash flow projections and projected costs and benefits over the near and longer term;
- Ensure that financial risks are properly considered and that proposed mitigations are appropriate and balanced;

- Appraise the projected financial benefits of the Council’s regeneration programme and ensure a balanced risk management process and proposed mitigation measures are in place;
- Greater understanding and clarity of the financing of the regeneration and development programme by members; and
- Carry out a review of projected benefits of the regeneration programme, including direct and indirect benefits to the Council, business and to the local community.

Options considered

The table below sets out the recommendations relating to options considered by the Panel and the Council’s response.

Background

This Scrutiny Review has involved desk research, two Challenge Panels and two field visits as detailed below:

- Policy Officers undertook desk research into the financing of regeneration programmes in a select number of Councils that have a similar make-up to that of Harrow. The aim was to investigate what other comparable local authorities were doing as part of a regeneration and commercialisation agenda. The Panel also had the opportunity to scrutinise the latest update on Regeneration, which was published on 14 September 2017.
- Members and officers visited two London Boroughs (Barnet and Waltham Forest) to gain a detailed understanding of the challenges that were being faced. These field visits explored best practice by other councils in how they finance and manage their regeneration and development programmes.
- Two Challenge Panels were held, with questions being put to the Chief Executive, the Director of Finance, the Divisional Director of Regeneration and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council.

Recommendations and responses

The table below sets out responses to the recommendations arising from the Regeneration Programme Scrutiny Review.

No.	Recommendation	Response
1	That the Regeneration Programme Risk Register include the capitalisation of wages in the Regeneration Programme, and the revenue risk involved if this cannot happen in certain cases	Currently this does not get reported into the risk register but going forward this will be the case. This should only be relevant to schemes that are within feasibility or where there has been a change in scope and are not taken ahead. Previous practice was to treat feasibility schemes in the first instance

		as capital, this practise has stopped and all feasibility schemes are now treated as revenue with staff time only being capitalised when the decision has been taken to take the scheme forward. A thorough review is being undertaken to ensure that the capitalisation policy is being correctly administered.
2	<p>That officers produce one report that includes all risks and mitigations in relation to the Regeneration Programme.</p> <p>This report will include the impact the expected increase in population will potentially have on the council, its partners and the borough.</p> <p>The report will analyse and discuss, but not be limited to, the impact on (1) the NHS and care services, (2) education, (3) transport services (including both infrastructure and capacity improvements to rail and bus services, better London orbital routes, and other local transport issues that will be experienced throughout the developments, i.e. parking and road issues), (4) refuse collection, (5) increased demand for enforcement and regulation against the potential social and economic gains including increase in Council Tax receipts and business rates (including any business profiling that has been undertaken and a strategy to encourage businesses to move and stay in Harrow), (6) the New Homes Bonus, (7) increased employment (and whether this will be long or short term), and (9) apprenticeships that may be created in the area, and if so,</p>	<p>The need to prepare a report which demonstrates the anticipated impacts of population increase in the borough associated with the Regeneration Programme is acknowledged.</p> <p>Officers will prepare a report that utilises the existing evidence base that: supported the Area Action Plan and Regeneration Strategy; draws on advice from internal and external partners and stakeholders; and articulates existing work that has been done on the positive socio-economic impacts of the Programme.</p> <p>The report will address the anticipated impacts of the Regeneration Programme on health services, education, transport, refuse collection, Council Tax and Business Rates, the New Homes Bonus, employment and apprenticeships.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the report will be completed by late Autumn 2018.</p>

	in which sectors and in what numbers.	
3	That a comprehensive lobbying strategy be agreed to promote improved transport links to central London and out of London be developed and integrated within the Regeneration Programme.	<p>Work has commenced on developing a Transport Improvement Lobbying Strategy that will include enhanced dialogue with TfL, GLA, Network rail and MPs. The Strategy will target objectives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for transport improvement funding from TfL capital projects • The inclusion of local transport improvements in the 2018 Mayor's Transport Strategy • Transport improvements associated with Heathrow expansion • Step-free access at Sudbury Hill station • Step-free access at South Harrow station • Establish capacity issues at Harrow and Wealdstone and Harrow on the Hill stations, as evidence for service improvement lobbying.
4	That, as part of the lobbying strategy, for a letter to be drafted from the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition to the Mayor and TfL (London Underground Lines and London Overground), relevant Government Ministers, the Department of Transport, Network Rail, and rail operating companies (London Northwestern Railways, Southern, and Chiltern Railways) calling for improvements in capacity and facilities at Harrow and Wealdstone Station and Harrow-on-the-Hill station along with greater frequency, more capacity and improved reliability of all services operated by London Underground Lines, London Overground, London Northwestern Railways,	As at 3, work will be undertaken to establish capacity issues at Harrow and Wealdstone and Harrow on the Hill stations. Once complete, that evidence will be used to support engagement between key transport infrastructure providers and stakeholders from relevant Members aimed at improving services that require it.

	Chiltern Railways and Southern.	
5	That the Council produce a Harrow specific, all-encompassing infrastructure plan/ strategy, which will incorporate the Atkins study on Wealdstone and clearly set out how the impacts of the Regeneration Programme will be managed both short and long term.	As at 2, it is agreed that a report that analyses the potential impacts of the Regeneration Programme on infrastructure should be produced. That report will reference the Atkins Study and it is anticipated that it will be completed by late Autumn 2018. It will consider how potential impacts could be managed in the short and the long term.
6	That all relevant strategies produced by the Council reference the Regeneration Programme and how they contribute to or are impacted by it.	All council departments will work towards ensuring strategies are considered in light of the council's current regeneration strategy, with a view to aligning priorities and linking with potential opportunities that may arise. The council's Corporate Strategic Board will routinely look forward to strategies that are due to be presented at Cabinet or Council looking specifically for links. Additionally, officers will work to update the CSB report template to ensure that all strategy leads give consideration to regeneration when developing policies. It will be for strategy owners to look for the alignments, links and opportunities at both a strategic and operational / tactical level.
7	That the Programme should investigate and learn from the 2008 financial crash and specifically what happened to rental prices in Harrow and further consider what a 20% - 30% downwards price correction would do to the For Sale strategy to make sure we better protect the financial viability of the programme.	The Regeneration Programme financial model is dynamic and updated regularly, including updates on rental and sales values from the industry. The financial model is currently subject to a review to ensure current programme thinking is accurately reflected in financial terms. Once this is complete, sensitivity analysis can be undertaken to model a number of scenarios on rental and sale values to ensure plans are in place in case the scenarios come to fruition.
8	The panel recommends that the break-even point for all planned regeneration projects is constantly reviewed, and that appropriate steps are taken to address any adverse change	At present, the financial model looks at project performance against a target yield of 5% for the Build to Rent schemes. Overall the Regeneration Programme must achieve a cost neutral position to prevent any pressure on the general fund. The financial model is currently subject to a review to ensure the model is fully populated and is

		flexible to meet the needs of the evolving Regeneration Programme. The issue of break-even point at project level is being discussed with the financial modellers.
9	<p>To understand the implications of the 2020 business rates recalculation on the Civic Centre and Kodak sites; to ensure a reduction in notional business rates for the borough; and to establish a proactive lobbying strategy (particularly with Ministry of Homes, Communities, and Local Government (MHCLG), and Treasury) to ensure an exemption in business rates for both sites.</p>	<p>All commercial property was revalued recently as part of the national 2017 revaluation. The Civic Centre and Kodak were also revalued as part of this.</p> <p>Currently, under the 100% London Pool Pilot, Harrow is a gainer as it benefits from business rates growth around London regardless of whether business rates in Harrow are either static or declining.</p> <p>The coming Fair Funding Review, to be implemented for 2020, will re-establish the baseline need of every local authority, and, at the same time, the business rates baselines will be reset for the first time. The government also intends to redesign the business rates retention system, moving to a 75% local retention, while restructuring the system of risk and rewards.</p> <p>At the moment there is uncertainty that if a London Pool was to continue, whether it would continue under the current 100% local retention or whether it would move to the proposed 75% scheme. Both the changes regarding percentage changes and whether a London Pool continues could impact adversely on Harrow business rates income.</p> <p>Officers have already responded to the Fair Funding review consultation and other consultations on business rates devolution and have advocated support of a London Pool. Should a London Pool continue this will ensure Harrow is not just dependent on its own business rates. Large fluctuations would be offset by sharing growth across London. Key large sites which may be lost in the future, for example the existing Civic Centre and the Kodak site, in isolation will only marginally impact on future rating income. The Civic Centre would also be partly replaced by a new although smaller building but additional commercial properties would come out of the regeneration plan. As such any business</p>

		<p>rates losses would only be temporary as, overall, the new buildings would offset any losses due to the 2 aforementioned buildings being demolished.</p> <p>We must also consider that as we currently retain 64% of all business rates income under 100% localisation, losing large buildings on which we ourselves pay business rates is not actually a loss; we may lose 64% of the rate retention but in the case of the Civic Centre we reduce our liability for business rates significantly.</p> <p>Exempting or removing properties from the Valuation list unfortunately is the jurisdiction of the Valuation Office which is part of HMRC. As such it is not appropriate to lobby Government, but officers will look to see if there is anything strategically that can be done to influence the rateable value so it positively supports Harrow's long term taxation objectives.</p> <p>It is also important to note that any impact on business rates needs to be understood alongside the substantial positive impact on the Council Tax base from the Regeneration Programme.</p>
10	The panel recommend that modelling of the new Civic Centre should reflect the efficiency of the new Civic Centre for staff and maintenance costs, so that we get the true opportunity costs of any delay, including a reduction in business rates.	The project model / business case for the Civic Centre includes both capital requirements and revenue implications, including capital financing, fit out and IT. The efficiency of the new Civic Centre for staff and maintenance is integral to the Civic Centre Transition Plan which is running alongside the Regeneration Programme. The impact on business rates and the Council Tax base is managed as part of the project model and MTFs.
11	To formalise governance arrangements for cross-party engagement on the regeneration programme post-election, and establish a public forum, either through the Major Developments Panel as it currently exists, or by expanding the remit of this Panel, or establishing a new, specific Regeneration Panel.	The need to further develop cross-party governance of the Council's regeneration programme, as it moves into implementation, is fully accepted. The Major Developments Panel (MDP) provides cross-party oversight of Planning and Development issues in Harrow, within a formally constituted and public forum. With appropriate development, this could form an appropriate basis for cross-party governance. All major regeneration projects (whether private sector or Council) have

		been brought to the MDP for review and comment at the pre-application stage. As the Council's regeneration programme gathers pace, it is proposed to broaden the remit of the MDP to consider programme wide progress reviews. The Panel can also review and comment on the ongoing implementation of major development schemes forming part of the Council's regeneration programme.
12	For the Corporate Risk Register to reflect an overall risk and level of risk of the regeneration programme, and to include a risk on the Corporate Risk Register of each high value project (such as the Civic Centre) at the GARMS committee.	The Corporate Risk Register includes two risks for the Regeneration Programme: 32 – New Civic Centre is not built within cost and on time 33 - The Harrow Regeneration Strategy / programme fails to deliver its core objectives and is unaffordable. The Risk Register is refreshed quarterly and reported to the GARMS Committee after each update.
13	To develop cross-party understanding of the critical pathways of the regeneration programme, and the timing of the "stop-go points".	As set out in (11) above, reports and project dashboards relating to the Council's regeneration projects can be brought to the MDP on a regular basis. These will indicate outstanding risks, delivery progress, upcoming decisions, inter-dependencies and items on the critical path at programme level.
14	To ensure that other related bodies, such as the Health and Well-being Board, Harrow's Clinical Commissioning Group, Safer Harrow, Harrow Youth Parliament, and all relevant and significant partners have an integrated approach to the Council's regeneration strategy.	An integrated approach will be vital to ensure that the Council's regeneration programme delivers the full range of potential social, economic and placemaking benefits in Harrow. The Building a Better Harrow Board has a remit to ensure that all relevant and significant partners are engaged in the development and implementation of the programme. For example, detailed discussions are in train with Harrow's CCG to look at the potential for closer integration with Council services and the development of primary care hubs within the regeneration programme.
15	To continue to monitor and assess risks in relation to the likelihood of further interest rate rises.	The most appropriate debt management strategy for the Regeneration Programme is under constant review with the Council's Treasury Management Advisors to ensure that the most appropriate borrowing opportunities are pursued and the borrowing is timely to minimise the cost of carry. The monitoring of interest rates is integral to

		the Treasury Management function and interest rates are tracked regularly to gauge the optimum time to borrow to support the Regeneration Programme and minimise the cost of carry.
16	The panel recommends that borrowing is not delayed by pursuing unrealistic borrowing opportunities.	The most appropriate debt management strategy for the Regeneration Programme is under constant review with the Council's Treasury Management Advisors to ensure that the most appropriate borrowing opportunities are pursued and the borrowing is timely to minimise the cost of carry.
17	To ensure a proactive transport lobbying strategy is in place in order to ensure issues around reliability, capacity, and frequency are addressed in relation to Harrow and Wealdstone station.	As at 3 and 4, work has commenced on a comprehensive Transport Lobbying Strategy which will seek to establish capacity issues and engage with key stakeholders in an attempt to resolve them.

Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? Yes

Separate risk register in place? Yes

This report requires a check of regeneration programme risk registers to ensure that risks associated with the potential future decapitalisation of projects are fully reflected.

Procurement Implications

The recommendations and responses contained in this report do not give rise to any specific procurement implications at this time.

Legal Implications

The recommendations and responses contained in this report do not give rise to any specific legal implications at this time.

Financial Implications

The recommendations and responses contained in this report do not have any financial implications at this time.

Equalities implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

It is considered that there are no specific implications arising from the recommendations in this report on equalities, or as a result of the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Council Priorities

The content of this report relate to the Council's Priorities as in the following ways:

Building a Better Harrow

The Council's regeneration programme for the delivery of new homes, creation of new jobs, commercial workspaces and high quality town centres will create the places and opportunities that residents deserve and make a difference to the borough and to residents' health and quality of life.

Being more Business-like and Business Friendly

The Council aims to support local businesses and enable them to benefit from local economic growth, develop its own commercial ventures and help residents gain new skills to improve employment opportunities.

Through regeneration we will deliver the Council's aim to make a difference for:

- Communities, by providing new homes and jobs, vibrant town centres and an enhanced transport infrastructure and energy network;
- Business, by providing new commercial workspace, support to access markets, advice and finance;
- Vulnerable residents, by providing access to opportunities, reducing fuel poverty and designing out crime; and
- Families, by providing new family homes, expanded schools and renewing Harrow's estates.

Protecting the Most Vulnerable and Supporting Families

The Council's aim is to make sure that those least able to look after themselves are properly cared for, safeguarded from abuse and neglect and given access to opportunities to improve their quality of life, health and well-being.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Dawn Calvert

Chief Financial Officer

Date: 11 June 2018

Name: Stephen Dorrian

on behalf of the
Monitoring Officer

Date: 11 June 2018

Section 3 - Procurement Officer Clearance

Name: Nimesh Mehta

Head of Procurement

Date: 8 June 2018

Ward Councillors notified:

**NO, as it impacts on all
Wards**

EqIA carried out:

NO

An EqIA is not required because this report is responding to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review Panel and is not proposing any programme changes at this time.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Paul Nichols, Divisional Director Regeneration Enterprise and Planning, 020 8736 6149, paul.nichols@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Agenda Item 7b of Cabinet Report dated 15th March 2018.

<http://www.harrow.gov.uk/www2/documents/s150198/Regeneration%20Programme%20-%20Reference%20from%20OS%20to%20Cabinet.pdf>

**Call-In Waived by the
Chair of Overview and
Scrutiny Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

*[Call-in does not apply as the
Recommendations are for noting
only]*

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date of Meeting: 17 September 2018

Subject: Scrutiny Work Programme 2018-2022

Responsible Officer: Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director,
Strategic Commissioning

**Scrutiny Lead
Member area:** All

Exempt: No

Wards affected: All

Enclosures: Scrutiny Work Programme 2018-22

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report accompanies the scrutiny work programme 2018-2022.

Recommendations:

Councillors are recommended to approve the scrutiny work programme 2018 - 2022

Section 2 – Report

The Council's Constitution provides that, in years when whole-borough elections take place, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should consider its work programme at the first suitable meeting. As time has been required for discussions with the newly-appointed Scrutiny lead Members following the election, the report on the work programme is being reported to the September Overview and Scrutiny Committee with full Council consideration in November.

In 2017, a Centre for Public Scrutiny review of how we could improve scrutiny in Harrow recommended that: *'Steps should be taken now to begin to set the framework for a new scrutiny work programme whose priorities derive directly from scrutiny's agreed role, engages with the council's ambitions and benefits from a range of inputs so it is less council-centric and has a greater outward focus. It would provide a framework with rigorous principles of topic selection to enable members to be able to populate an annual forward plan'*.

In response to the recommendation, Members agreed the role of scrutiny is defined as:

'Cross-party investigation of issues and decisions that are important to local residents'

Based on this, Council officers and the Scrutiny Leadership Group have researched and developed the attached work programme for 2018-2022. This work programme aims to strike a more equal balance between looking at decisions the Cabinet are taking and holding them to account and looking at some of the bigger, longer-term issues facing the borough or that concern residents, where scrutiny can play a more influential role in highlighting issues and shaping the response.

Research input sources

The background research conducted for this work programme drew upon on a range of quantitative and qualitative information and data sources to form a list of key strategic areas for the Scrutiny Leadership Group to consider and which the Leader, Leader of the Opposition and Chief Executive have also endorsed. The research sources were:

- Harrow Resident Survey 2017 (telephone survey of 501 residents, July 2017)
- Local media monitoring data, including press articles and social media posts
- Complaints data over the last two years
- Issues/ themes arising from the Harrow Ambition Plan 2017 refresh
- Common issues raised with local councillors (via Group offices) over the last two years
- Common issues raised with London Assembly Member (Brent & Harrow) and local MPs
- Review of manifestos for local elections
- Issues / themes arising from discussion at the council's Corporate Strategic Board (CSB) in the last year, and areas where the Board wish to focus on in future
- Review of think tanks and local government publications
- Review of government plans and announcements
- Insight from council officers
- Harrow Contracts Register

Principles for topic selection

The principles used for selecting topics for the work programme were:

- Is it an area of significant concern to local people or of public interest?
- Is it an area where significant change or budget cuts are being proposed?
- Is it a topic that would span electoral cycles and therefore benefit from cross-party collaboration?
- Is it an area of poor performance?
- Is it a source of a high level of complaints?
- Is it an area in which the council or partners wish to develop or significantly change policy?
- Is it an area where Government legislation is being developed?
- Could scrutiny's investigation help identify solutions and lead to real impact?

Work Programme 2018 - 2022

The attached document sets out the themes and issues Scrutiny wishes to consider over the next four years through scrutiny leads, reports to committee and scrutiny reviews. The Scrutiny Leadership Group comprising the chairs and Vice-Chairs of the scrutiny committees and scrutiny leads are the guardians of the work programme and will meet quarterly to review and prioritise the items on it, taking into account any new, emerging or topical issues that may arise during the course of the year and warrant Scrutiny's attention.

The items in the work programme for the various scrutiny committees will be turned into a forward plan that also takes into account the routine and statutory items that also come to committee such as petitions, scrutiny reviews and progress reports, policies that are part of the Council's statutory policy framework, items from health etc.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Performance Issues

There are no performance issues associated with this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are no risk management implications associated with this report.

Equalities implications

An Equalities Impact Assessment has not been undertaken for this report as it summarises the activities of Scrutiny and does not propose any changes to service delivery.

Corporate Priorities

All

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Rachel Gapp, Head of Policy, 0208 416 8774
rachel.gapp@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

Draft Scrutiny Work Programme 2018 – 2022

This paper sets out the scrutiny work programme for 2018-2022. Year one of the work programme is more defined than years 2, 3 and 4 at this stage, which are more outline to allow the work programme to be flexible and respond to developing and emerging need. Work that scrutiny launches in year one may carry on into subsequent years. The Scrutiny Leadership Group are the custodians of the Scrutiny Work Programme and meet quarterly to ensure the work programme remains current, is delivering and to agree the escalation of any issues from Scrutiny Leads or committees.

Routine and standing items such as statutory reports, follow up to scrutiny reviews, health consultations and Q&A sessions will be added in to the forward plans for each of the scrutiny committees and Performance Indicators from the P&F 'watchlist' will be added to the Leads' remits.

Scrutiny Method	Item	Objective	Cabinet Member/Partner
Year 1 2018/19			
Overview & Scrutiny	ASB & Youth Crime	Contribute to the development of the Community Safety Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy and Youth Offending Plan.	Cllr Krishna Suresh
	Waste, Recycling and Fly-tipping	How might we ensure the councils waste strategy and enforcement activity have a positive impact on increasing recycling levels and reducing flytipping. How might we ensure the depot redevelopment plans have a positive impact on increasing recycling levels and reducing flytipping. How might we use technology so that we can improve the bin collection system	Cllr Varsha Parmar
	Adult Social Care	How is the council responding to the Government consultation on care and support for older people	Cllr Simon Brown
Performance and Finance	Children's services demand pressures & budget	Focus on understanding the children's services budget pressures, forecasts and savings proposals and the impact these are having on performance.	Cllr Christine Robson

	Adult Social care demand pressures & budget	Focus on understanding the adult social care budget pressures, forecasts and savings proposals and the impact the these and the new 'resilient communities' vision are having on performance.	Cllr Simon Brown
Health Sub	Mental Health	How might we work together to improve young people's mental health in the borough Follow up on progress to date on the scrutiny review into maternity services at Northwick Park Hospital. Part of CQC inspection report and action plan.	CNWL, Barnardo's Young Harrow Foundation NWLHT
Scrutiny Reviews	ASB and youth crime (Children's Leads)	How might we use all the council's policies (especially planning, licensing and regeneration) to contribute to reducing ASB and youth crime.	Cllr Krishna Suresh, Cllr Keith Ferry
	Road Maintenance (Communities Leads)	How might we better inform, engage and consult with residents so that the agreed work schedule addresses the concerns of residents as raised in the 2017 residents' survey.	Cllr Keith Ferry
Scrutiny Leads	People's	Children's demand pressures and budget Adult demand pressures and budget	Paul Hewitt, Visva Sathasivam
	Communities	Waste, Recycling & Flytipping In-work Poverty	Paul Walker
	Resources	Capital programme Customer services and access to services/digital exclusion Strategic Community Safety	Alex Dewsnap
	Health	Life expectancy Health and Social Care Integration (STP, Accountable Care, Better Care Fund)	Paul Hewitt, Carole Furlong

Scrutiny Method	Item	Objective	Cabinet Member/Partner
Year 2 – 2019/2020			
Overview & Scrutiny	Adult Social Care	How is the new 'Resilient Communities' vision contributing to reducing spend and demand pressures and supporting the growing aging population in the borough. How is Harrow performing on Delayed Transfer of Care.	
	Shared Services	How might we learn from six years of shared services initiatives so that any future shared service ventures benefit Harrow residents.	
	ASB and Youth Crime	Explore our understanding of the drivers of Youth crime to that the Community Safety Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation Strategy and Youth Offending Plan are responding effectively. Review the impact of the tri-borough command unit merger.	
Performance and Finance	Budget	Spending Review 2019? TBC	
	Performance – TBC	Continue focus on the impact of spending pressures on children's and Adults performance? TBC	
Health Sub	Life Expectancy	How might we best direct our public health, housing and regen resources so that we can narrow the life expectancy gap in the borough.	
Scrutiny Reviews	Adult Social Care	How might we use technology in adult social care to support a growing elderly population in the borough.	
	Digital technology - TBC	What impact is the move to digital and online services/customer contact having on residents' ability to access services.	

Scrutiny Method	Item	Objective	Cabinet Member/Partner
Year 3 2020/2021			
Overview & Scrutiny	In-work poverty	How might the regeneration programme help alleviate in-work poverty	
	Affordable Housing	How might the council build the quantity of affordable homes so that we meet the London Plan targets.	
Performance and Finance	Budget – TBC		
	Performance – TBC		
Health Sub	Diabetes	Review the delivery of the Harrow Diabetes strategy to see if local services are doing enough to collectively manage the issue and reduce levels in Harrow.	
Scrutiny Reviews	Life Expectancy	How might we best direct our public health, housing and regen resources so that we can narrow the life expectancy gap in the borough.	
	TBC		
	TBC		
Scrutiny Method	Item	Objective	Cabinet Member/Partner
Year 4 2021/2022			
Overview & Scrutiny	Transport Infrastructure	Review the process for CPZ's. Follow up on recommendation from regen scrutiny review for an infrastructure strategy to deal with the transport implications from the regeneration programme.	
	TBC		
Performance and Finance	Budget – TBC		
	Performance – TBC		
Health Sub	TBC		

Scrutiny Reviews	In-work Poverty	How might we understand what impact ethnicity has on in-work poverty so that we can take appropriate action to alleviate it.	
	TBC		

This page is intentionally left blank