

CABINET MINUTES

19 JULY 2012

Chairman:	* Councillor Bill Stephenson	
Councillors:	* Bob Currie	* Thaya Idaikkadar
	* Margaret Davine	* Phillip O'Dell
	* Keith Ferry	* David Perry
	* Brian Gate	* Sachin Shah
	* Graham Henson	
In attendance: (Councillors)	Marilyn Ashton	Minute 454
	Susan Hall	Minute 454
	Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 454
	Amir Moshenson	Minute 454
	John Nickolay	Minute 454
	Paul Osborn	Minute 454
	William Stoodley	Minute 454

* Denotes Member present

449. Agenda Order

The Leader of the Council received Cabinet's approval to vary the order of the agenda and bring items 16, Response of Overview and Scrutiny Committee Report on Redefining Youth Engagement', 17, Harrow Mental Health Day Services Review, and 24, Prince Edward Playing Fields Amendment to Lease Terms to Permit Playing of Professional League Football Matches, forward due to public interest. It was noted that both the public and Councillors questions relating to items 17 and 24 would be answered prior to the consideration of the substantive items. Thereafter, the Leader would revert to the order of business on the agenda.

The Leader confirmed that public questions which did not relate to any substantive items on the agenda would be answered following consideration of item 16.

450. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Items 4 and 5 – Public and Councillor Questions

Councillor Amir Mohenson declared a prejudicial interest in relation to questions relating to Whitchurch Playing Fields. He would leave the room whilst these questions were answered.

Councillor Nana Asante declared a non pecuniary interest in the questions relating to Whitchurch Playing Fields, as her church used the fields. She would remain in the room to listen to the answers given to the questions.

Councillor Camilla Bath declared a personal and prejudicial interest in that she was a chairman of governors at Whitchurch School.

Agenda Item 13 – Print Services Contract

Councillor Bob Currie declared an interest in that his son, who was employed by the Council, would be affected by the proposals. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 15 – Future Organisation of Roxbourne Infant School and Roxbourne Junior School

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a non pecuniary interest in that he was a governor of Roxbourne Junior and Infant School. He would remain the room to listen to the debate on the item.

Agenda Item 16 – Response to Overview and Scrutiny Committee Report Redefining Youth Engagement

Councillor Victoria Silver declared a personal and prejudicial interest in that since starting the research on Redefining Youth Engagement she was now working with one of the organisations referred to in the report. She would leave the room should that particular recommendation be discussed.

Agenda Item 17 – Harrow Mental Health Day Services Review

Councillor Graham Henson declared a non pecuniary interest in that his wife was an employee of Rethink whose service users use facilities in Harrow. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 20 – Harrow Museum Heritage Lottery Fund Round 1 Application

Councillor Husain Akhtar declared a non pecuniary interest due to his photographic interest in Manor House.

Agenda Item 24 – Prince Edward Playing Fields Amendment to Lease Terms to Permit Playing of Professional League Football Matches

Councillors Brian Gate, Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar and Bill Stephenson declared non pecuniary interests in that they had attended a football match

last December at Underhill and at which hospitality was provided. They would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

451. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2012, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

452. Petitions

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were submitted.

453. Public Questions

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

1.

Questioner: Nick DuGard, President, Wealdstone FC Supporters Club

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: “Will the LB Harrow Cabinet members fully take into account the 10 years of planning, construction and £300,000 expenditure that Wealdstone FC invested into the Prince Edward Playing Fields prior to 2004 and ensure that if the lease is amended (as a result of the request by Barnet FC), the provision within the existing lease (concerning the provision of a stadium for Wealdstone FC, in line with granted planning permission and its specific conditions) is both included and strengthened to expressly state that this be provided on an affordable and sustainable basis, thus recognising:

- Wealdstone's considerable contribution, being the instigator of the transformation of the derelict site, making it possible for the Hive facility to have come to fruition in the first place,
- LB Harrow's commitment to see the return of its most notable Football Club to the borough and
- the wishes of the local residents that if anyone should be playing football there, it should be Wealdstone FC?”

Answer: Firstly, I wish to make absolutely clear that the current proposal will not result in any change to the ‘Wealdstone Football Club clause’ contained within the Prince Edward Playing Field lease agreement.

I understand that significant efforts were made during the development of the Prince Edward Playing Field project to engage Wealdstone FC as a partner. Clearly it was not possible to successfully conclude an agreement at that time.

I am personally committed to working with not only Wealdstone FC but also Harrow Borough and Barnet FC to promote and develop football within our borough.

Barnet FC has invested considerable resources to establish the world class, superb facilities which are now available at The Hive and I stand ready to work with Wealdstone FC Directors to facilitate discussions with the Chairman of Barnet FC – all they have to do is contact me. I will point out that I have read your blog and I have seen the history of the problems that Wealdstone FC has had over those ten years and I think you have a very good grasp of what those problems are and I have learnt from them.

Also, we cannot enter into the financial arrangements between Wealdstone FC and Barnet FC but the Chairman of Barnet FC has said to me on several occasions that when Wealdstone FC use the stadium he does not want to make a profit out of you but he does not want to make a loss either, so it will be a cost neutral arrangement. Whatever you need to put into getting that football match run will be the only cost that you will have to provide.

Supplemental Question: Thank you for your response.

I do not believe that we will be able to come to an arrangement because of the costs of actually building a stadium. I hear what you are saying and thank you for that but, if we are homeless again because we have only got a short term lease at the moment at Ruislip, what will the Council commit to do to bring its oldest football club back? We started here in 1899, to bring Wealdstone FC back into the borough of Harrow where it should be.

Supplemental Answer: As you know, I am a Wealdstone Councillor so this matter is close to my heart. I have had several meetings over the last couple of months with Howard Kraiss, your Chairman, and they have lasted well into the evening in some instances and I have told him and this is partly in answer to Councillor Nickolay's answer which I will come to later on, that we are committed to looking at ways to help Wealdstone FC stay alive and in the borough or to come back to the borough. I know your lease runs out in six years' time.

We have looked at opportunities. We have even had a meeting with Harrow Borough when I put my head in the lion's mouth by suggesting that Wealdstone and Harrow Borough might come to a ground share agreement in the presence of Directors from both Harrow Borough and Wealdstone and I am still alive so it probably will have legs on it in the end but when I answer Councillor Nickolay's question, I will come to some of these things but we certainly are committed to working with Wealdstone Directors to help them in whatever way we can to finding somewhere within the Borough where Wealdstone can play.

The bottom line financially is that at lower league level and below it is not sustainable unless you have got the social facilities that you have got with Ruislip Social Club and that is the big stumbling block.

2.

Questioner: Matthew Lloyd

Asked of: Councillor Brian Gate, Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools and Families

Question: "As school and university budgets are slashed, the importance of local support for local education has never been greater. The leadership of the Harrow Conservative Group seem to use the issue for political points in the local press.

However, does the Portfolio Holder agree with me that it is strong leadership on education, during these tough times that will see the young people of Harrow through, that will protect a future fairer for all, whilst preserving society's future potential and that no political leader should use the needs of Harrow's young people as a desperate attempt to cling on to power?"

Answer: I will answer this question the best I can and I am sure that those that you have actually mentioned in your question would like to listen to your opinion as being one of the young people we just talked about and also my answer. So I hope that is the case.

Yes, political leadership is actually essential and this administration is showing strong leadership in an ever changing educational environment. In the past we used to have responsibility for all schools but now, that has now been diminished into a much lesser role of administration.

We are responsible still for the high quality pre-school and school places and we are also championing the cause of vulnerable young people with our Special Educational Needs.

As an administration I think you will find we are being very constructive in what we are trying to do in terms of the new models of schools. We have been very pro-active and supportive of the i-Foundation school that will hopefully be setting up in the Teachers' Centre in September as a Free School. We carried out a piece of work last year to enable those schools that wanted to become academies to go over in one block in the timescale that was actually given to them so that they could actually take advantage of the DfE money that was available.

We also have a strong relationship with our voluntary aided schools and any school that comes forward that wishes to actually provide high quality education for young people will meet a strong and positive approach from this authority.

We also now have a new model of school improvement, the Harrow School Improvement Partnership and that is proving to be very successful with schools not only in this borough but also from other boroughs interested in actually using them to drive up standards which is what we all want to do. This is leading edge innovation.

We have, unfortunately, had to deal with a number of cuts in our budgets through the government's strategy. That may well be an argument for another time but I think it is true to say that we are not able to provide every service that we used to do in education and therefore there is a possibility that some things may not be done. As we know from recent events, that the private sector does not always meet up to their contractual obligations. I would say that the collegiate that we have had in education has always been strong and it has been the case from whichever party runs this borough, there has been a strong support of education and I trust, and I do know, that there are many members of the Conservative Group who actually still support that and I think it is incumbent upon all those that may not feel that way to ensure they actually do subscribe to what we know works in Harrow.

Supplemental Question:

Do you also agree with me that we need to show a united front against cuts for education and that we hope that, despite it only having one year left that the leadership of the Harrow Conservatives will withdraw their misleading and divisive comments about the Free School in the local paper because Harrow's young people simply will not

have it?

Supplemental Answer: I would actually say that the Leader of the Conservative Group is very capable of answering for herself as to how they actually feel about this particular issue. I do know that they claim that they have been misrepresented. That is a matter of opinion. I think it is incumbent on all of us though to make sure we do not scaremonger regarding issues that may or may not be there and we actually think about the positives of actually setting up schools and work together and indeed actually work cooperatively and collaboratively as a group of elected Members.

I think it is incumbent of us all to make sure we actually do give a strong and positive view for new schools being built and provided for young people because young people are our future and I really could actually reiterate what was said by a previous Prime Minister, "Education, Education, Education".

3.

Questioner: Mrs Joy Nichols, Chair, Little Stanmore Tenants' and Residents' Association

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

Question: "Are you aware of escalating danger around Chandos Recreation Ground, specifically threats, children being beaten up, bicycle taken at knife point, guns being pulled, without the perpetrators facing consequences for their actions?"

Answer: The Council is aware of the anti-social behaviour and criminal issues in the locality around Chandos Crescent and Chandos Recreation Ground that have been going on for a long time. We have been working collaboratively with the Metropolitan Police Service and other public agencies to deal with these issues using the powers and resources available to us and our partners.

Supplemental Question: About 18 months' ago there was a problem at a school in the area. A child was beaten up by a member of another family.

The perpetrator got away with his/her actions and this is the situation we are facing day in and day out in the Little Stanmore community. We are convinced that racism is alive and well and lives in Harrow. What is Harrow doing about the situation?

Supplemental Answer: Where it has been possible to identify individuals who have been responsible for crime or anti-social behaviour and where we have gathered with the police the appropriate evidence relating to these matters, firm action will be taken including criminal proceedings under the Anti Social Behaviour and Housing legislation.

We have also worked to support victims of crime and offer them support in providing evidence against identified perpetrators. I can assure you we will continue to do this until the issues are resolved.

4.

Questioner: A J Pais

Asked of: Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation and Communications
[Answered by Cllr Idaikkadar, Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts]

Question: "Did the Council give a complete Carte Blanche to Whitchurch Consortium in carrying out the so called sham consultation and if so, did the Council choose not to be concerned with the magnitude and impact of this project on noise, traffic, parking, anti-social behaviour given that considerable increase in activity are already planned by the Hive, Whitchurch Junior School expansion, Stanburn School expansion, Stanmore Town Centre remodelling, Stanmore Place development, etc?"

Answer: Firstly I cannot agree with your view that the consultation in respect of this matter has been a sham. No one is given a carte blanche. I find this question to be very offensive and could refuse to answer the question. However, in the interest of public relations, I will give you an answer.

At the last meeting of Cabinet on 20 June we considered a detailed report regarding the extensive consultation and engagement activity that has been undertaken in respect of the important project.

The officer report made clear the concerns that have been expressed by residents in respect of noise, traffic, parking, anti social behaviour and the combined impacts of the other projects which you mentioned in your question.

Council officers are currently negotiating commercial terms with the Whitchurch Consortium. Any agreement will formally be approved at a future meeting of Cabinet, opening the way for the development of a detailed

planning application.

The Planning process requires formal consultation as does the Licensing process, which will also be relevant to this project.

Cabinet in November 2011 asked the Whitchurch Consortium to undertake public consultation. They have done this and the project continues to make good progress.

Supplemental Question: I said that because we know that the Council did not carry out a consultation yet it liberally uses the results of the so called consultation by a party that has a vested interest in the project.

The consultation which the Council promises at the planning stage relates only to planning issues. It is not the same as the initial consultation which the Council should have carried out regarding the impact of development as mentioned in my question.

It seems that the Council is trying to get the project through on a piecemeal basis without a comprehensive planning brief for the whole area. Now should the Council therefore, be giving legitimacy to a consultation which it did not itself carry out?

Supplemental Answer: If you look at all the consultations done by the Council, any project is like that. It is typical for developers to do the consultation at initial stages. That is why the Planning Department do their own consultation once a planning application has been received.

If the Whitchurch Consortium is refused planning permission there is no development or if it is modified it may not go ahead. The same applies to the Licensing process.

I am satisfied the consultation done was very widespread.

You are asking questions whether I have done it correctly, the same way you have got to look at all the petitions submitted by the people opposing the Consortium's plans. They also had petitions and one particular paper, consultation, for me, an untrained eye, it looked like all the things were done by people so I cannot go into details because that has legal implications but what I am trying to tell you in so many words, we do it in good faith. When people sign it, they sign it with their full knowledge.

5.

Questioner: Neil Smith

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

Question: “In the recently published Day Service review proposal it is suggested that Marlborough Hill Day Centre will be closed, what will happen to the service users who are attending Marlborough Hill?”

Answer: Service users who currently attend Marlborough Hill will be supported in transferring to the Hub which will, if the proposals this evening go through, be at the Bridge and, through the review, we intend to provide an improved Mental Health Day Service. It is our intention to ensure that everyone who currently accesses services has the opportunity to use them also in the new service model so there will not be anyone that just has their service cut. We appreciate that we will have to give a lot of support to some of those people because I do understand the anxiety around changes to their daily lives and the service they get but that is what we are going to put in place.

Supplemental Question: How many people currently attend the Bridge Day Centre compared to Marlborough Hill?

Supplemental Answer: I will have to give you a written answer on that because I am not sure exactly. However, there is a good deal of unused space and it also depends on how you use that space in the services you deliver. We are confident that everything will fit if that is the reason behind your question.

Written answer: The numbers using services varies over time as people enter and leave the services. However at the time of the report being written, there were 191 people registered with The Bridge and 126 registered with Marlborough Hill. Of those, 11 were registered with both services.

6.

Questioner: Adam Salem

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

Question: “How much money is being utilised in preventative day support for mental health service users in the mental health day service review recommendations, so that those currently excluded can access vital support?”

Answer: Our recommendation is that the Bridge service would become a 'Hub' which has a drop-in service which is open to all and very similar to the service that currently is at Marlborough Hill.

The expectation is that the Hub element of the service would receive about £260,000 in funding and give support in a preventative way so that people experiencing different mental health needs, rather than just those with a statutory need and that is at the moment a bit of the difference between Marlborough Hill and the Hub, will still receive a service. This is because we have listened to the feedback that we got through the consultation that was saying that people needed more preventative services.

Supplemental Question: If the Council is not allocating any preventative day support for mental health service users, why has the Council invested so much time and money on preventative support for other care groups, for example, through re-enablement and circles of support but not mental health which is an inequality in approach?

Supplemental Answer: I explained before that we are investing in prevention. I think you would be right to say that over a long period there has not been as much invested in mental health services and I have been trying to put that right for a good while.

I do think that re-ablement, the examples you gave, those services are for all service users. They are not excluding mental health users at all so they do get those services as well but I think in this case we are going to have a focus on the preventative side for mental health users for the lower end of the spectrum and that will be the drop-in service at the Bridge.

7.

Questioner: Raksha Pandya – Mind in Harrow

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

Question: "Have you forecast what the financial repercussions of mental service users relapsing compared to maintaining the existing day services?"

Answer: I do not believe we are going to less Day Services. We are going to have two buildings instead of three buildings if this review goes through but I think we will be investing more in making sure that everybody has a service. I would

like to know if you feel any of the people that were getting a service are excluded because that is not our intention and it is not the way we want to organise this.

It is very different to what some other boroughs have done where they have just cut services or cut Mental Health Day Centres without doing anything else about it. As you know, we have spent two years over this to make sure we get it right and we think we will have a better service for everyone that needs Mental Health Day Services.

Supplemental Question: We have previously asked for a comparative analysis of the old treatment at Day Centres that people are receiving compared to the new revamped treatment and the comparative costs and savings. Would you provide us with this information?

Cllr Davine: Well, I think if I understand your question, all the information is in the paper tonight. What we will be saving overall will be around the £250k. We are going to give a better service with that.

8.

Questioner: Jon Donelan

Asked of: Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation and Communications
[Answered by Cllr Sachin Shah, Portfolio Holder for Finance]

Question: "I rang up Harrow Council with questions about the eligibility criteria for the national disabled freedom pass, which I currently hold. Access Harrow had no knowledge of the criteria, why is this?"

Answer: I am really sorry that you did not get the service you deserve from our main switchboard.

The criteria is set by government, not by the Council. The team that answers the phone calls should know the criteria. I will log this as a complaint but I am really sorry you did not get the service you deserve.

Supplemental Question: I contacted Dependability about my National Disabled Freedom Pass and was given vague information about the criteria along with inappropriate personal comments from the gentleman on the phone. What training have staff had in understanding and empathising with mental health service users?

Supplemental Answer: I cannot answer on your personal point because I do not know the circumstances. All staff will have been trained on disability equality but if you want to, outside of the public meeting, tell me exactly when that happened I can look into it further. I am really sorry that you did not get the service you deserve but I am happy to look into it.

(Cllr Stephenson – if you could send us the details in an email or a letter to Cllr Sachin Shah, we will take this up because the service you received is not acceptable. Calls are logged so we should be able to find the details if you can provide the date and time.

9.

Questioner: Mark Gillham, Mind in Harrow

Asked of: Councillor Bill Stephenson, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation and Communications
[Answered by Cllr Sachin Shah, Portfolio Holder for Finance]

Question: “When will the Leader require CNWL NHS Foundation Trust, as promised at Cabinet months ago, to fulfil their responsibilities under the Section 75 Agreement to support Harrow residents in accessing their legal or discretionary entitlements to the Freedom Pass, by ensuring that CNWL staff are properly trained in the Freedom Pass eligibility criteria and the evidence required by the Council’s own reviews?”

Answer: We have offered training to CNWL and they have confirmed they are happy to take it up. The Council officers are now working with them to ensure this is delivered as soon as possible. We are as an administration fully committed to supporting vulnerable customers and I hope that training will be taken up as soon as possible.

Supplemental Question: It appears to Mind that between Council Directorates, and I know there has been a restructure recently, there appears a lack of clarity within the Council about who is responsible for the Freedom Pass, which is one of the top priorities for mental health service users.

So my question is, who is responsible and how will the Council address the fact which has emerged from the recent Freedom Pass review that CNWL has apparently failed to support around 400-500 Harrow residents who are substantial or critical under FACS (Fair Access to Care) and currently under their care to apply and benefit

from a Freedom Pass?

Supplemental Answer: I am in charge of Freedom Pass policy and I want to make sure that everyone that is entitled to a Freedom Pass, a national or discretionary, has it. We as a Council cannot be seen to be stopping people with their entitlement.

I want to make sure that those that are entitled to it, both the discretionary or the national one, receive the Freedom Pass and I hope CNWL are starting to get the training done quickly which is the start of the process. I am sure if it does not happen you will continue to ask me questions at this meeting.

10.

Questioner: Christopher Nash

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "Please take this as a question on item 24 (Prince Edward Playing Fields) on the agenda of the Cabinet meeting, this Thursday 19th July: "Barnet FC and its supporters are ambitious for success and promotion in the Football League. In the event that these ambitions are achieved will Harrow Council give support to Barnet FC for the further development of the stadium to allow for attendances up to capacities of 10,000 spectators in compliance with Football League conditions?"

Mr Nash was not present at the meeting. A written answer was provided.

Written Answer: I have personally checked the Football League membership criteria relating to stadium capacity.

League 2, the league in which Barnet Football club play and also League 1, have a capacity requirement for 5000 spectators, 2000 of which must be seated.

The Planning Permission approved in April 2008 enables this requirement to be met.

The Championship has a minimum stadium requirement of 5000 spectators, 5000 of which must be seated.

At this stage therefore I am confident that the stadium which the Council has already approved will be sufficient to meet Barnet Football Club's requirement for the future.

However, I fully appreciate the positive sentiment of your

question, but I can not reasonably be expected to preempt a future decision of the Council and in particular the Planning Committee.

The Council is involved in along term, 125 year partnership with Barnet Football Club, and we are committed to working with the club and in particular local residents to help secure a positive future

11.

Questioner: Mrs. Joan West

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

Question: “When the Council investigates a replacement building for The Bridge will they consider re-building the Marlborough Hill building, currently run by Family Action, as this building is ideally situated sharing the site with Wiseworks, and explore working jointly with an independent organisation to raise funding for this project as well as consulting users and carers affected by mental illness?”

Answer: If the recommendations in the report go through, we will then be looking and you are on the Steering Group that will be helping us with that, to review the options for alternative use of Marlborough Hill. It will not be within the mental health day services but there are other possibilities of other use within the voluntary sector or not. That will be a Council decision but it will be considered by the Steering Group.

If the Bridge ceases to be available in future, then we will be looking everywhere to find the best possible available site for a new Hub for the Mental Health Day Services.

Supplemental Question: Well, it is a great pity you are not considering Marlborough Hill because of its closeness with Wiseworks and it sharing the site. When will it be let and will it be let to? You have suggested various organisations? In the meantime, what security measures will be taken bearing in mind that it shares the site with Wiseworks? May I suggest that Wiseworks could expand their activities and use this building as well.

Supplemental Answer: I do not know about that last suggestion.

The Council has to review the options and I am saying you will be involved but, there were, as you know, many reasons why if we were reducing the number of buildings

from three to two, Marlborough Hill was not suitable for a lot of the people that we provide Day Services to, particularly the elderly people, the disabled people, people who are not able to climb stairs and the amount of work that would have to be done on Marlborough Hill to make it suitable for that function as a Hub of the service just was not a possibility with the Council. So that is why, because it just is not suitable for the whole service whereas the Bridge is.

12.

Questioner: Elizabeth Hugo, Chairperson of Trustees for Aspergers Syndrome Access to Provision

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

Question: “My question concerns the building at 74 Marlborough Hill which it is proposed in the MH services re-organisation to be closed and the MH service to be removed to another site. I represent a voluntary group – a charity in Harrow which supports adults with Autism and their parents and carers and we use that building to provide support sessions such as a monthly carers meeting, and activities 3 times a week currently for the adults themselves such as social skills groups, personal support, jobskills workshops, advocacy, counselling, relationships workshops, healthy cooking and eating, creative writing etc.

My question is to ask the Portfolio Holder whether the building will still be available to continue in use by voluntary groups such as ours (another parent/carer support group for parents of people with MH problems called Re-think also uses the building as well as an Asian ladies group and a Widows group – there may be more) as we do not think that we could continue the wide scope of our services at any other venue, such as a single room in a church hall?”

Answer: The future of Marlborough Hill will be looked at by the Council if these recommendations go through tonight.

We recognise the importance of the building to a number of voluntary organisations and will work with any affected groups to try and find them alternative location. A number of them will be able to use some of the accommodation at the Bridge because there will be longer hours and it will be used in a more enterprising way. I think we probably came to the conclusion that that would not be suitable for ASAP when we had our discussion before and so we will

support groups to find somewhere else and it just cannot be right that they have to be in Marlborough Hill or nowhere else. We will work with you and try and find you somewhere else and that is what we are going to do with the voluntary groups that are using Marlborough Hill and have been doing for some time.

Supplemental Question: Marlborough Hill is absolutely ideal for what we do. It has got small rooms, it has got big rooms, it has got upstairs, it has got downstairs, it has got use of kitchen facilities which you will not find anywhere else. We have researched quite widely in the Harrow area and if you know of anywhere that is as good as Marlborough Hill, I would be very interested to hear of it.

Secondly, I want to reiterate, is Marlborough Hill being totally removed from the voluntary sector?

Supplemental Answer: The Council and the voluntary groups that are using it at the moment will have to decide what the possibilities going forward are. What I am doing is removing the Mental Health Day Services from there so that I can have a more effective Day Service. We will work with you and we will involve you in that work. I am not saying it cannot be, the Council could decide to let it to other voluntary organisations or an umbrella organisation, all sorts of things it could decide but that is not within what we are considering this evening but we will work with you and we will not just exclude you and close the door and say that is it.

13.

Questioner: Gerry Bates, Director of Barnet Football Club Supporters Trust

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "Barnet FC Supporters have a major role to play in ensuring that Professional League Football at PEPF has as a positive impact on the local community. We therefore request that Barnet FC Supporters Trust is represented on the proposed advisory group. Would this be taken into consideration?"

Answer: It is intended that the proposed advisory group mentioned in the report will be comprised of representatives drawn from the local community, Barnet Football Club and the Council and this will mainly be to identify and mitigate any problems that occur during the first year or so of operation.

I think your request would helpfully be directed to the Chairman of Barnet Football Club, as it is a matter for each of the stakeholder groups how their representation is selected. I think it is crucial that Barnet Football supporters, whether they are members of the Trust or not, are involved in this process because they are the people that will make this work or not work and irrespective of the Advisory Group, I would hope to work with you and members of the Supporters Trust to make sure that as far as possible, Barnet supporters use public transport to travel to the Hive and if they drive, then they park on site and also, they take up the offer from the Chairman of buses to take people from Underhill to the Hive and back again.

Supplemental Question: Well basically it is on that basis I suppose, as far as transport and things like that are concerned. We do really have to get back to our members and the people that we represent with all these kind of details. I do feel it would be more to advantage if you could put it over to the Chairman as well because you have a direct dealing with him and that we could be part of this Advisory Group.

Would you do that then?

Supplemental Answer: I do agree with you and I will pass it on to the Chairman because we will be having negotiations about interventions but irrespective of what the Chairman says, I would still like to work with the Trust.

14.

Questioner: Jennifer Zeffman (*asked by Ann Freeman*)

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

Question: "Will the Council proactively involve users and carers affected by mental illness in the selection and monitoring of these services?"

Answer: Yes, we will proactively involve. Granted it will start with the Steering Group. When we go towards implementation, we will continue working with the Steering Group as we were weeks' ago before we got to this point.

Supplemental Question: This really is a muddle because in fact it should have related to Section 75 Agreement monitoring but anyway I think my supplementary will make it clear.

Remembering how the needs of young and older people

with severe mental illness who are resident at 6 Welldon Crescent were too long overlooked, would it not be a good idea to take the opportunity to explore and test the competitive marketplace for the very best quality provision of social care and support services needed for people suffering with severe mental illness as the Section 75 with CNWL NHS Foundation Trust expires, I believe in March 2013?

Supplemental Answer: As far as Welldon Crescent is concerned, we did go out to competitive tender and that is how Richmond Fellowship came in and I have heard from you that things have gone well with it. I am very concerned to do a thorough review of the Section 75 until it gets refreshed? We are tightening our monitoring all the time. There are two weekly meetings with them looking at that. It is one of the subjects highest on my Improvement Board agenda and that is work that I am trying hard to carry forward.

15.

Questioner: Richard Worrall (*asked by Councillor Bill Stephenson*)

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "If Barnet FC have not complied with the Green Travel Plan requirements, can permission be legally given by LB Harrow, at this stage, to Barnet FC for this development proposal?"

Answer: The issue that Cabinet will consider this evening is an amendment to a commercial lease agreement.

The officer report is clear that if the Cabinet approve Barnet Football Club's request to the amendment of the lease, this will only be completed when any outstanding planning matters have been resolved. The Green Travel Plan was drawn up as part of the planning application and it really addresses the fact that 5,176 spectators would travel into the ground and out of the ground. The reason why the Green Travel Plan has not been implemented insofar as annual reports are concerned is that the stadium is not there so we have not had this movement of spectators.

However, I will make sure that the Director of Planning reviews this Green Travel Plan to make sure that we have got 100% compliance with it.

16.

Questioner: Joan Penrose

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

Question: “How will Harrow Council ensure efficient case management of every mental health patient's care so that all needs involving social support, dual-diagnosis issues, practical help, medication compliance, physical health and communication pathways are met by an efficient, coordinated and accountable service?”

Answer: As everyone will know, this is not about Mental Health Day Services, this is about mental health. I know that you have a particular case, that we are both aware of, in mind.

The Council cannot make commitments about the health care of patients in the borough because, as you know, that is in the hands of NHS Harrow and Brent. They are responsible for meeting these, however, those that are in the community side of mental health services in Harrow all have a CPA Care Coordinator and a Care Plan and I know there is a lot of dissatisfaction with how that has been handled in the past.

I agree with you that these services must provide for every patient and if they are missing a patient or they are not providing properly for any patient that just is not acceptable.

But the requirements under CPA are regularly monitored and audited. Staff are trained in dual diagnosis and in using the Bromley Screening tool to identify drug and alcohol concerns as well.

All patient details are entered on Jade, the electronic patient record, information on service users is available to all professionals involved in their care and additionally patients are reviewed in line with the CPA policy and may also have their needs discussed weekly at multi-disciplinary assessment feedback meetings.

The Service is monitored by the Council and the delivery of performance targets within Section 75. As I have already said, we are in the process of reviewing and refreshing Section 75 which will be completed in March 2013 when the contract ends. I do agree with you, of course it has to be right for every single patient and I have listened to circumstances where it is not right and every time that happens I will do the best I can to carry that

forward. I know the case that you have in mind here has been taken up by one of our officers and is being pursued.

Supplemental Question: There are many cases.

I find your answer a bit depressing because it implies that of course there is a schism between the health side and the social care side.

So could you please take the spirit of this question and at least with us organise a meeting including the existing Primary Care Trust, the Council, yourselves, CNWL, Compass, the GP Commissioners, psychiatrists and users and carers so we can start comparing notes and finding out how we can, in a coordinated way, meet the needs of patients because at the moment, many needs are just being completely neglected. Patients not taking any medication when they are not being looked after by hospital and there are many cases of this. It is a scandal and could we have some sort of meeting organised to try to coordinate these, all these issues?

Supplemental Answer: Yes, I can certainly arrange such a meeting. I think we have to get to look very closely at the way our Section 75 is worded and make it much more accountable and that is the work I am embarking on at the moment.

17.

Questioner: Abe Hayeem, CAPRA Development Representative
(asked by Shirley Sackwild)

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "In view of the abysmal lack and method of public consultation, with no decent presentation material on view, the poor record of resolution of planning issues by Barnet Football Club's proprietors, the Borough's recommendations to minimise 'as far as is reasonably practical, adverse impacts on the locality' seems too wide open to interpretation to inspire local residents' confidence. The local residents of Whitchurch Lane and Camrose Avenue will also bear the brunt of the Council's poor record of implementing planning conditions. Is it not thus premature for any decision for League Games to be played at the Hive to be taken, and should not this decision be deferred until all the above mentioned issues have been resolved?"

Answer: I do not accept that there has been an abysmal lack of public consultation and that the information provided to

residents regarding the matter to be decided was insufficient. As you will see in the report we have spent a lot of time pointing out all of the concerns that we have received at both the Ward Councillor meetings, the Residents' Associations meetings and the twelve hours of drop-in sessions that I personally was at with the Corporate Director of Place Shaping. I am sorry that Mr Hayeem feels that way.

I was personally involved in designing and delivering the consultation which I think resulted in a really helpful response from residents, both in terms of attendance at the drop-in sessions and written comments to our email address.

I was also involved in meetings, as I said, with the residents; Associations and with Ward Councillors.

All of the key points which were raised by residents have been incorporated within the officer report.

The report to be considered by Cabinet this evening is quite clear about the interventions required to minimise any adverse impacts on the local community, if Professional League Football is to be played at The Hive.

The report is also clear that formal approval, through completion of an amended lease agreement, will only be taken forward when any outstanding planning matters are resolved.

Assuming Cabinet agree to Barnet Football Club's request, we have a year to design in detail, in consultation with the local community, the interventions required. I am confident that this is more than sufficient time.

I would like to make clear once again that the 5,176 capacity stadium has planning permission. Barnet Football Club's request provides us with a good opportunity to ensure that the stadium is able to work really well within the locality into which it is located.

So put simply, I do not agree that this decision should be deferred.

Supplemental Question:

Why should a key planning decision of approval of league games being played be given before all the planning and environmental issues have been properly assessed and consulted as the impact on the local area will be significant? Is this not an absurd perversion of proper planning procedures where decisions seem to have been taken behind closed doors and then imposed on

bewildered residents who feel helpless to resist or influence the result?

Supplemental Answer: I think this is probably going on to your next question but I would like to make quite clear, this is not a planning matter at all, this is a lease change matter and we certainly are not, as you see here this evening, making any decision behind closed doors.

18.

Questioner: Shirley Sackwild, Hon Sec CAPRA

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "In view of the failure of Barnet Football Club to fulfil its planning conditions associated with the last planning consent (esp. landscaping) given to this organisation concerning development on the sports ground Prince Edward Playing Fields now known as The Hive, can the Council assure and guarantee to residents that promises and conditions appertaining to this new application be fulfilled."

Answer: The officer report to be considered by the Cabinet this evening is quite clear on this matter. The second bullet point on page 456 of the agenda papers clearly states that completion of any amendment to the lease, if approved at Cabinet this evening, can only be implemented subsequent to 'discharge of all outstanding planning conditions'.

I do have concern with your reference to landscaping which you have expressed through your question and it is a source of some significant personal disappointment, as you know we have spoken about this many times, that this matter still remains outstanding.

However, we need to consider the Prince Edward Playing Field project in the round. Barnet Football Club have delivered superb facilities for our community. Only last week the new bar, restaurant and gym were completed. These, I think you will agree, are really fabulous facilities as I found out during a tour last Sunday afternoon during The Hive's very successful Community Day.

Hopefully we will see the new stadium in the near future.

I will be making it clear to the Chairman of Barnet Football Club that everything that we do in our long term partnership must be done in compliance with relevant

regulations.

Supplemental Question: As part of the Section 106 conditions relevant to Stanmore Place planning consent, can the Committee formally include and ensure the planting of twenty three mature trees on the north west boundary of The Hive, be fulfilled together with the proper landscaping, a plan for which as of this morning has still not been submitted and the replacement of two oak trees felled without consent during the previous works on the site?

Supplemental Answer: I can assure you that the landscaping condition which has yet to be fulfilled will contain those items.

19.

Questioner: Mrs Annette Morant, Chairman, Canons Park Residents' Association (CAPRA)

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "When Barnet FC was first granted permission for this site, the public were promised that there would be no professional league matches. How can the Council now possibly consider allowing the change in terms of reference. i.e. for league games.

Barnet FC say that this is temporary. They will surely not be investing the necessary sum of money on a temporary basis. Hence, how can the Council ensure that they are not hoodwinked into letting the temporary becoming permanent."

Answer: The Prince Edward Playing Field project with Barnet Football Club has been in place since August 2006, when Cabinet formally approved the commencement of the project which is now well developed.

Much has changed in the intervening period and Barnet Football Club has presented a reasonable request to the Council for consideration. This was subject to events which occurred in the last twelve months when they were unable to extend their lease at the Underhill site.

The officer report to be considered sets out both the benefits and the concerns attached to agreement of the request to play Professional League Football at The Hive.

I am of the opinion that agreement of the request will be good for Harrow over the long term. I strongly believe that there are good economic reasons why we should

embrace this opportunity and I am equally clear that the reasonable concerns which have been raised by the residents can be managed in an effective way.

I have heard the Chairman of Barnet Football Club say on a number of occasions that he sees the move to The Hive as being a temporary arrangement. His long term ambition I think is to build a proper stadium back in Barnet.

Clearly the officer recommendation in tonight's Cabinet report which proposes only a ten year approval for Professional League Football Matches, is by and large a temporary arrangement in long term business planning terms.

Supplemental Question: As there is no mention of temporary in the documentation and the lease was completed on 16 March 2010 includes a clause discouraging Barnet Football Club from making a request in respect of professional league games until an expiry of five years from the date of completion, why is Option 1 regarding Phase 1 to be completed not recommended?

We the local community think that we will be adversely affected if professional football is played at The Hive but consider it a reasonable compromise if the temporary period is three years rather than ten to allow Barnet Football Club to obtain a suitable venue instead, possibly with better transport links?

Why cannot this be done?

Supplemental Answer: In 2015, the lease says that they could ask for permission to play there and we would not reasonably refuse it.

What has happened in the intervening time is that I do not think that Barnet ever intended that they would play their first league matches at The Hive but as I pointed out before, they have now been told they cannot use Underhill after the end of the next season, that is in July 2013, that is why they have come forward with their suggestion.

The other point about making it for a three year period, the league regulations do not allow you to have league membership of either League One or League Two unless you can show security of tenure for at least ten years.

20.

Questioner: L Halsey, Chair William Ellis Residents' Association

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: "Given Harrow Council's initial reluctance to grant permission for Barnet FC to play first team football at PEPF, what has changed in terms of the original concerns voiced to make that original decision invalid?"

Answer: I do not agree that the original decision is necessarily invalid. I believe that the current lease clause was relevant and appropriate and that the approach that we have taken to consider Barnet Football Club's request demonstrates the sensitivity of the issue that we are being asked to determine this evening.

This evening's Cabinet decision needs to consider the benefits, in particular the economic and community benefits that will be realised, if Barnet Football Club's request is approved and we have to balance these against our ability to deal with the reasonable concerns which have been expressed by residents.

On balance I believe that approval of Barnet's request will ultimately be shown to be a good thing for Harrow and I am personally committed to ensuring that all necessary interventions are taken forward in an effective way, so as to minimise any adverse impacts.

Supplemental Question: Could you please answer the question in terms of what has changed?

Supplemental Answer: What has changed now is that the authorities in Barnet will not renew their lease for Underhill.

If we go back to the planning permission which was granted in April 2008, there was a Travel Plan. In my view, the Travel Plan needs enhancement because I do not consider it was good enough. It was good enough for the Planning Committee at that time to grant planning permission for a 5,176 capacity stadium. So nothing has changed in planning terms at all.

454. Councillor Questions

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

1.

Questioner: Councillor William Stoodley

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: I understand that a Planning Brief was drawn for the new Anmer Lodge development being built in Stanmore. Would you please kindly inform me as to who it was that signed off this Planning Brief?

The question from Cllr Stoodley was deferred until September.

2.

Questioner: Councillor William Stoodley

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: Please would you advise me how much of and which aspects of the aforementioned Planning Brief have been complied with?

The question from Cllr Stoodley was deferred until September.

3.

Questioner: Councillor William Stoodley

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

Question: Please could you inform me as to whether any other local authority administrations have copied any of our administration's new innovative ideas such as "Let's talk" or the "pop-up sofas"?

The question from Cllr Stoodley was deferred until September.

4.

Questioner: Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar, Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts
[Answered by Cllr Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and

Regeneration]

Question: With regard to the planned redevelopment of Whitchurch Pavilion and Playing Fields, and the proposed move of Barnet FC from Underhill to Prince Edward Playing Fields/The Hive; is it your view that two such sizeable sporting developments in a fairly small area of the borough - both of which will have noticeable impacts on their respective locations - are truly necessary?

Answer: The project, which ultimately became The Hive, Football Centre of Excellence, was initiated in 2005.

Planning permission was granted in April 2008 and the superb facilities which are now available at Prince Edward Playing Fields were open to the public in the autumn of 2009.

I also understand that the Whitchurch Playing Fields project was initiated in November 2008.

Clearly the thinking in 2008 under the previous Conservative administration, whilst you were the Portfolio Holder, assumed that both projects could be taken forward successfully in the eastern part of the borough.

I am of the opinion that the thinking in 2008 was sound and given the very challenging economic situation that we face in Harrow and across the country today, we really ought to be maximising each and every opportunity that can help us realise growth in our local economy.

I believe strongly that the Council both in 2008 and now in 2012 has taken a very careful approach in the development of these two important projects.

Supplemental Question: Councillor Ferry, Keith, just for the record. As you know our administration ceased all activity on Whitchurch Pavilion Playing Fields and the reason why we did is because we were concerned about the impact on local residents.

So before I ask the supplementary question, let us not mislead people.

Now about this issue. I am really puzzled by this and I think this is the reason why, on both sides, both on the Barnet FC side and also those residents who live abutting the Whitchurch Playing Field site, there is some confusion because within five minute walk really, if you just walk down Whitchurch Lane, you have got two potentially really active centres and what with Barnet FC moving onto this

centre, it is going to become very active and you have just said they have opened a gym and it is all going to be marvelous.

Would you tell us what the justification is? We stopped doing it for a very good reason. What is it that Whitchurch Consortium are going to offer that is not offered?

Supplemental Answer: What is offered is a far better sporting offer for the children of this borough both at Whitchurch and at The Hive.

The use of these two facilities is totally different. The Hive will be used for a maximum of thirty home matches every year and each of those matches will last for about ninety minutes or so. It is a short amount of time and people can come along. Grandfathers can bring their grandchildren to watch football which we have all done in the past. It is a very cheap way of watching football.

The Whitchurch one is providing much used facilities. You are fully aware of the PP7 study we did. In quantity we have an enormous number of sports grounds in Harrow. In quality none of those are worth using. If you count them in apples, we have a bag full of apples, two thirds of those are rotten, so you cannot count them and we hope that the Whitchurch development will provide much needed facilities for the use of this borough.

5.

Questioner: Councillor Amir Moshenson

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: The Prince Edward Playing Fields report to Cabinet includes some five or six pages of concerns raised by Councillors and residents alike to the proposal of league games at Prince Edward Playing Fields. Yet these concerns are dispensed with in a few paragraphs, distributing some of the responsibility elsewhere and plainly ignoring the remainder; including anti-social behaviour, the impact on local infrastructure, the peaceful enjoyment of the local community and the combined impact of major projects in the area that are not yet in full capacity, such as Stanmore Place. Why isn't Cabinet being presented with a full impact report and resolution plan to address residents' concerns before making the irreversible decision of allowing league games?

Answer: Firstly I must be absolutely clear that planning permission

for a 5,000 seat stadium was granted in April 2008. At that time the impact of the stadium would have been properly and appropriately considered by the Planning Committee.

Clearly there is a substantial cost associated with the development and operation of any stadium, even a relatively modest facility and any operator will need to ensure that an appropriate commercial return is realised on the investment.

I understand that the average spectator attendance at Barnet Football Club home matches is between 2,000 and 2,500 people. In recent months I have personally attended a number of Barnet Football Club matches in an entirely private capacity.

In considering Barnet Football Club's request to play Professional League Football Matches at The Hive, a number of Members and Officers have undertaken a fact finding visit to Underhill.

The result of these visits leaves me in no doubt at all that Barnet football matches are exceptionally well managed at the Underhill Stadium and there is minimal adverse impact on the locality and in particular the many homes that surround the existing stadium.

Cabinet are being asked to determine a request to amend the lease at Prince Edward Playing Fields. If this is approved and the report makes absolutely clear that all necessary interventions will be taken forward as required and this will be resourced by Barnet Football Club.

If Barnet Football Club's request is approved I anticipate that the stadium will be used for Barnet home matches on approximately 30 occasions each year. This allows for League matches and Cup Games.

Barnet's absolute priority will be to maintain an excellent playing surface in first class condition.

If Barnet's request is refused and the Council enforces the requirement for the stadium to be built, the priority will be driven by a commercial consideration which I anticipate will result in a much more intensive use of the facility, perhaps measured with events two or three times a week, at maximum spectator capacity, most weeks of the year. I also take exception to your use of anti social behaviour when you are talking about football crowds as well. That is well in the past. Barnet in particular have just got an award for the family atmosphere that you get at their

football grounds.

Supplemental Question: I was merely repeating the concerns that were raised in the report and using the same language that was used in the report.

Now with the few changes that are recommended for immediate implementation including the widening of the roads on Camrose Avenue and the CPZ, can you tell me how much the investment from the Council will be in all the measures that are recommended and what will the cost be of maintaining them for at least the ten years of that lease?

Supplemental Answer: The interventions we will work out with Barnet Football Club will be financed 100% by Barnet Football Club. If they do not agree with the interventions that we put forward and they think it is too expensive then we will not change the lease so there is no capital cost at all. The maintenance cost, I cannot identify because we would just be changing the configuration of the grass verges, so the maintenance would be negligible.

6.

Questioner: Councillor John Nickolay

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Question: By the time Barnet FC successfully tendered in 2006 to lease Prince Edward Playing Fields from Harrow Council, Wealdstone FC had invested some £300,000 (plus a modest amount of Lottery Money) in preliminary work towards levelling pitches and for 70% of the construction of a 3,000 capacity stadium. So far they have not been compensated in any way and seem to have little or no prospect of benefitting from that commitment. In view of the financial strain on non-League football clubs like Wealdstone (and others in our Borough) whose volunteers work so hard to provide much valued facilities for the community (particularly for young people) is there any way that our Council could act as "honest broker" in securing some degree of recompense for this football club that has deep roots in our Borough for more than a century and an admirable record both on and off the pitch?

Answer: I am personally involved in acting as an 'honest broker', in discussions with Wealdstone Football Club, who I have met with several times over the last few months; Harrow Borough Football Club, who I have had discussions with and went to watch a match there at the end of last

season; to determine how football can be supported, promoted and developed in our borough.

I am personally committed to working in particular with our two local clubs, that is the Ryman Premier League local clubs, to ensure their future success.

During the period that we have been considering the Barnet request there have been meetings and discussions, which I have attended, with Directors of the Wealdstone Football Club.

The existing provision in the lease relating to the use of the Stadium by Wealdstone Football Club will remain unchanged as I stated previously.

It is acknowledged that historically Wealdstone Football Club were involved in forming a consortium to try and develop Prince Edward Playing Fields. Unfortunately, this venture proved not to be financially viable and ultimately collapsed with work on site stopping in mid 2004. The Freehold of this 44 acre site was returned to the Council unencumbered in July 2005.

A number of organisations which were party to the original scheme sustained significant loss, including the Football Foundation /National Lottery.

The Council subsequently took over the project and has now enabled the delivery of the superb facilities which are now available for use by our residents, schools and sports clubs. As I said previously, I will work as hard as I can to make sure that Wealdstone have a permanent home in this borough.

Supplemental Question: This is reassuring as far as it goes. If it is expecting too much to compensate Wealdstone Football Club, might it be possible for our Council to negotiate with Barnet FC for an arrangement where they could ground share on affordable terms because Barnet has just about avoided dropping out of the League, very closely in the last two seasons. We do hope they do rather better but what if they do drop out of the League?

The other thing is, what will happen when Barnet move away from The Hive? Do we not need somebody on site that is going to continue to operate there and would not Wealdstone be a good take over for that?

Supplemental Answer: Yes, if Barnet move from The Hive they would still keep their training facility there. I could envisage the possibility that Barnet might build themselves a stadium somewhere

back in Barnet and make their stadium, having used it for eight or nine or ten years, available to Wealdstone but that is looking too far ahead.

I have spoken to the Chairman of Barnet Football Club and I have said before, he is quite happy to accommodate Wealdstone as much as he possibly can. He is not allowed under Football League rules to be in control of two clubs, therefore he cannot provide any financial assistance to Wealdstone. He has said that he will allow them to use The Hive Stadium on a purely cost neutral basis.

7.

Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall

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

Question: Can you explain why the recycling rate for Q4 2011/12 has fallen to 43% from 51% in Q3, and what you propose to do to both restore and improve Harrow's recycling rates?

Answer: Recycling rates vary across the year as a result of seasonal trends. Green waste, in particular, is always more prevalent in spring and summer months and quite low during the winter months. This is the main cause of the fall in Quarter 4 compared with Quarter 3.

Supplemental Question: I am more than aware of recycling rates. I lived with them for years and I still think that this is a drastic reduction, bearing in mind how good the Department is doing at this. I am very concerned about these figures because they do not seem right to me.

So therefore can you tell me whether you have confidence in the figures that are given to you from West Waste?

Supplemental Answer: Yes, I am confident in the figures given to this authority by the West London Waste Authority.

8.

Questioner: Councillor Paul Osborn

Asked of: Councillor David Perry, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services

Question: The proposed contract for private companies or external bodies to run the Council's library service is 10 years with

no break clause. Do you think it sensible to commit the Council to a contract of this length; binding not just your administration but the next two administrations as well?

Answer: The proposed contract length for libraries is five years with the ability to extend for a further five if Harrow and partners agree, so there is a slight difference from ten to just five with an additional five if we would like to extend.

Cllr Osborn: I am grateful for that because that is not what was said when we discussed at some degree of length at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting. It was quite clear that it was a ten year contract and we actually specifically went into why it was ten years and why ten years should be appropriate.

I am glad it is five years. It is a much better way forward.

9.

Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

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

Question: Though they are not listed as one of the partners in the Mental Health Services Review, NHS Harrow clearly has significant a role to play in the provision of mental health care in Harrow. Do you share our concerns with NHS Harrow's poor performance in this area; recently ranked in the bottom third in both London and nationwide?

Answer: We have not done a review of mental health service. We have been doing a review of Mental Health Day Services and we will be reviewing mental health service. I understand your question but the PCT have challenges which have affected their financial standing and that is over a really long period, and historically it was absolutely appalling. You and I would go to meetings and every time we went, month on month, the debt would get bigger and bigger.

Recently, they have become more stable so that over the past two years they have actually managed to maintain within their budget in their turn around and recovery budget, so it is improving. For example, for the first time they are meeting their targets for introducing Psychological Therapy.

I do though continue to be concerned about the underlying financial position of the PCT. I think we all are, and its possible impact on performance. One of the

things I have seen over the past couple of years is that mental health is one of things that they continually cut and I have protested about that at their meetings. We are continuing to work with the our Commissioning Board colleagues and with the PCT as long as it is there, which is not long now, and to ensure that resources are used to deliver the best possible services for the people of Harrow but you are absolutely right. It is really, really difficult.

Supplemental Question: Thank you for the answer.

I do have a supplementary and I do tend to agree with your commentary on the PCT which leads me into my supplementary which is, given the fact that mental health and public health has been cut historically by the PCT in efforts to try to balance its finances, when the public health comes across to the Council from next year, are we actually going to be getting the required amount of money allocated to us to meet our real public health needs within Harrow or is it going to be a question of extra need there without sufficient finance and are we just going to see yet another cosh under the PCT?

Supplemental Answer: You are absolutely right that some of the things they have cut over the past years have also been public health.

What we will be getting is a ring fenced budget based on 2010/11. If it had been based on 2009/10 we would have been getting more because there were cuts made both that year and further cuts. We will be getting approximately £7m.

We are working hard to make sure that we can meet our statutory requirements when we take that over. That will be a ring fenced budget and we will not be wanting money from the Council but we will have to be very careful with the spend. The health checks which were introduced last year, having supposed to have been in place year on year, is something that is part of the gap.

10.

Questioner: Councillor Susan Hall

Asked of: Councillor David Perry, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services

Question: While plans to bid for Heritage Lottery Funding for Harrow Museum are welcome, what are the contingencies for the Museum if the Council is unsuccessful in obtaining any of this funding, and is there a risk of the alternative options in the report being introduced?

Answer: The Heritage Lottery Application and the vision for the whole site can be taken in part or in totality and we have got the costings in the report. If we are unsuccessful, we can refine the application based on lessons learnt and re-submit; or we can deliver some improvements using existing and other potential sources of match-funding.

11.

Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Asked of: Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar, Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts

Question: Can the Portfolio Holder give a written assurance that he will effect changes to the covenants applying to Whitchurch Playing Fields to prevent any of the land relating to the playing fields, pavilion, car-park or other parts of the site being used for private or social housing, and that such changes to the covenants will be made prior to the final signing and letting of the contract with Whitchurch Consortium?

Answer: The Whitchurch Playing Fields are exactly that, sports playing fields.

They are sports playing fields of strategic importance in the eastern part of the borough.

The playing fields are classified as open space which the Council is both keen to protect and improve. Improvement initiatives may, as possibly in this case, create a requirement for accommodation for a site manager.

Other than for this provision I would have no hesitation whatsoever in giving a clear and categorical, written assurance that there will be no other private or social housing development on important sport and business site.

Supplemental Question: I believe at a previous meeting of Cabinet, it passed the deed documents relating to Whitchurch. It said not for accommodation, not for housing purposes. Can you give a written assurance that no part of the Pavilion site/ Playing Fields will be used for any housing, private or social at all and that you will be changing the covenants to prevent that happening?

Supplemental Answer: I can only repeat the answer I gave you. I did say that except for the provision for accommodation for a site

manager, there is no other social housing.

12.

Questioner: Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

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

Question: Can you confirm whether any of the Portfolio Holder assistants will be receiving backdated allowances, and will you also take this opportunity to guarantee that none of the assistants who can serve on Overview and Scrutiny will be involved in scrutinising decisions covering their portfolio areas, or which they had a role in making?

Answer: The change of Portfolio Assistants will be implemented at the same time as the Cabinet decisions are implemented and the new allowances for Portfolio Holder Assistants will be implemented at the same time. I will do everything in my power to assure that Portfolio Assistants are not involved in scrutinising things which are in their area. I hope I can work with Scrutiny to make sure that does not happen.

Supplemental Question: Whilst I congratulate you on transparency and accountability, why is it that you did appoint people, backdate them and appoint them in secret before and allow them to serve and scrutinise things that they were involved in doing at the time? Why have you gone back on that, given that was your track record?

Supplemental Answer: I have not got a track record and I refer to the answers I have given you time and time again. When we came into power, we had new Members there. I had Portfolio Assistants and we did backdate them because we had been trying them out. Since then I have assured you over and over again. There were special circumstances there and I do not think it is much use in going over all that old ground.

455. Forward Plan 1 July 2012 - 31 October 2012

The Leader of the Council informed Cabinet that the 'Housing Act 2004 – Charges for Enforcement Action' had been deferred to the October Cabinet meeting, item on 'Development of Apprenticeships and Work Experience Opportunities for Unemployed Graduates' was no longer considered to be Key, as the report presented was for information only, agenda items 13 'Print Services Contract' was considered to be Key and the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been notified that this matter would be included on the Cabinet agenda for decision.

RESOLVED: To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 July and 31 October 2012 be noted.

456. Progress on Scrutiny Projects

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

RESOLVED ITEMS

457. Harrow Partnership Board

Cabinet received a report of the Assistant Chief Executive, which summarised the discussion at the meeting of the Partnership Board held on 28 June 2012.

The Leader of the Council stated that the report provided an opportunity for Cabinet Members to ask further questions in relation to the business discussed at the Board meeting.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

Reason for Decision: To note the work of the Partnership.

[Call-in does not apply]

458. Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel - Proposed Changes to the Terms of Reference

RESOLVED: That the Panel's Terms of Reference be amended to include 'promotion of road safety' at paragraph 1 and 'bus consideration' and 'cycle schemes' at paragraph 2.

Reason for Decision: To reflect other areas of the Panel's work.

459. Appointment of Portfolio Holder Assistants

Cabinet received proposals from the Leader of the Council for named Portfolio Holder Assistants, Wards they represented and their areas of responsibility under the identified Cabinet Members.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety made an amendment to his prospective assistant's remit.

RESOLVED: That, subject to Councillor Asad Omar's identified remit being amended to cover Community Safety aspect only, the appointment of the identified Portfolio Holder Assistants and responsibilities and payment of SRA Allowances be approved.

Reason for Decision: To enable the support to Cabinet Members in terms of information provision and management to contribute to and ensure an effective decision-making framework as part of the democratic process.

460. Libraries - Motion

RESOLVED: That the Motion be agreed.

Reason for Decision: To enable action to be taken to progress the Motion as suggested.

461. Modernising Terms and Conditions of Employment

Cabinet received a report of the Divisional Director Human Resources, Development and Shared Services, which set out progress in Modernising the Terms and Conditions of Employment for Council non-teaching employees, as considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 19 January 2012.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services thanked the Divisional Director Human Resources, Development and Shared Services and his staff for their exceptional work in progressing the modernisation process. The Portfolio Holder added that the Trade Unions had reflected on their prior position and entered into constructive negotiations with the Council on the proposals following the holding of consultation meetings with staff which had resulted in the development of the proposals. He informed Cabinet that an 'in principle' agreement had been reached with local Trade Unions who were seeking a view from the respective national bodies. Following this process, staff would be balloted on the proposals by their Trade Unions.

The Portfolio Holder added that it was intended that the proposals for staff would be reflected in the allowances received by Councillors. He expected the matter to be submitted to November Council meeting, once the Trade Unions had balloted their members.

The Leader of the Council added that it was intended to submit a motion to Council at an appropriate time, and expected Councillors to be treated in the same way as staff. He sought cross party support.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

Reason for Decision: To note the progress in Modernising Terms and Conditions of Employment for Council non-teaching employees.

[Call-in does not apply]

462. Key Decision - Print Services Contract

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services introduced the report, which outlined the process for the procurement of a new supplier of Print Services to the Council. The Portfolio Holder added that, as a decision had to be made during August 2012, the report sought delegated authority for the award of the contract to a preferred supplier.

RESOLVED: That the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Property and Major Contracts and Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services, be authorised to:

- select the preferred supplier and award the Print Services contract to the preferred supplier on such terms as are agreed, acting in the best interests of the Council;
- implement the new Print Service in accordance with the contract.

Reason for Decision: To award a new print services contract to the preferred supplier that meets Council's future needs, reduces costs, and maintains the uninterrupted provision of print services to the Council.

463. Strategic Performance Report (Q4)

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services introduced the report, which summarised Council and service performance against key measures and drew attention to areas requiring action, including how these would be addressed.

The Portfolio Holder was pleased to report that performance in many areas was exceptional when compared to other Councils and at a time when the Council was facing significant challenges. Moreover, the Council had set itself high targets to achieve. He stated that significant improvements had been made in the figure relating to staff sick leave which continued to move in the right direction, and the Transformation Programme continued to deliver a range of projects to enable the Council to meet new demands and improve services whilst reducing costs. He was particularly pleased to report on the award winning 'My Harrow Account'.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the Portfolio Holders continue working with officers to achieve improvement against identified key challenges.

Reason for Decision: To consider performance against key measures and to identify and assign corrective action where necessary.

464. Key Decision - Future Organisation of Roxbourne Infant School and Roxbourne Junior School

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director Children and Families, which set out the position following the publication of statutory proposals in May 2012 regarding the amalgamation of Roxbourne Infant School and Roxbourne Junior School.

The Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools and Families outlined the main reason for the proposed amalgamation, and informed Cabinet that no objections have been received during the representation period. He commended the report to Cabinet which would enable the two schools to combine in January 2013.

RESOLVED: That, having determined the statutory proposals in relation to Roxbourne Infant School and Roxbourne Junior School, the two schools be amalgamated in January 2013, namely to:

- (1) extend the age range of Roxbourne Infant School to establish a primary school with an age range of 4 years (Reception) to 11 years (Year 6) with attached nursery class from 1 January 2013;
- (2) expand the capacity of Roxbourne Infant School from 1 January 2013;
- (3) discontinue Roxbourne Junior School on 31 December 2012.

Reason for Decision: Combining the two schools would give the opportunity to further improve educational standards by enabling planning as a coherent whole across the primary phase of the national curriculum and providing greater flexibility across and between key stages.

Having previously agreed the publication of statutory proposals, Cabinet was under a statutory duty to determine the proposals within two months from the end of the representation period, which ended on 2 July 2012, or the matter would have to be referred to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator for determination.

465. Response to Overview and Scrutiny Committee Report 'Redefining Youth Engagement'

Cabinet considered a report of the Corporate Director Children and Families responding to the recommendation set out in the Scrutiny Review 'Redefining Youth Engagement'.

Cabinet welcomed key representatives of Harrow's Youth Parliament and invited them to address the meeting. In their presentation, representatives of the Youth Parliament thanked the Chairman and Members of the Scrutiny Review Group for their support and made the following points:

- young people were not a homogenous group;
- Councils and politicians had a key role to play in inspiring the next generation and making politics more relevant to teenagers;
- young people did not know what the Council did or how it related to them;
- young people wanted consistent conversations with feedback and a visible demonstration of follow up;
- young people wanted opportunities to genuinely influence debate and decision-making.

They added that in terms of the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review Group, recommendation 8, the Council should lead a major 'Youth Summit'

with partners, politicians and local businesses as part of Harrow Youth Week which recognises and celebrates Harrow's young people and as part of the Council's ongoing Let's Talk programme and commitment to engage with people, provided a gateway to the other recommendations. They were of the view that the Council had a role to play in giving young people support and direction and in so doing the Council could learn from the youth and gain valuable insight to help plan ahead with service provision.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Review Group addressed the meeting and outlined the desire of young people for change. She added that the implementation of the recommendations would not be a costly and it was important that the young people were celebrated with the report being used as a main vehicle for such a celebration and investment in the youth of the borough. She was concerned that the recommendations had not received a multi-partner response.

Representatives of Harrow Youth Parliament responded to various questions from the Portfolio Holders. They stated that their participation in the Scrutiny Review Group had expanded their knowledge of the way the Council worked but it was important that such knowledge was not concentrated amongst a few individuals. It was essential that the Council reached out to some 60,000 young people who lived in Harrow to make them aware of the Council's role in the community. In order to improve the job market for young people, the Council should look to re-introduce a Summer University Scheme which would also help improve social skills. Portfolio Holders were invited to attend meetings of the Youth Parliament and their attention was drawn to recommendation 10 of the Review Group which looked for greater dialogue between the Council and young people.

The Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools and Families assured the Youth Parliament that the recommendations would be taken forward in partnership with key stakeholders in order to ensure that the aspiration of young people were met.

An officer from the Children and Families Directorate congratulated the Youth Parliament for their participation in the Scrutiny Review Group and the numerous meetings and consultations that had been delivered on. He acknowledged the need for an established dialogue with the young people of Harrow and undertook to explore the potential which could involve the entire Council.

The Corporate Director Children and Families stated that the recommendations were challenging and had cost implications. However, she would work alongside Cabinet Members with a view to reviewing service provision for young people to ensure that served their purpose for the future. She supported the holding of a Youth Summit and would investigate the possibility of using the budget allocated to the Council's Transformation Programme.

The Leader of the Council thanked all participants of the Scrutiny Review Group for an excellent report and the ideas put forward. The Leader would discuss ways in which the recommendations could be taken forward by the

Council and how various stakeholders could engage in the process. He acknowledged that the Council had not always succeeded in engaging with the young people but gave an assurance that the recommendations would be taken seriously and moved forward.

Representatives of the Youth Parliament stated that a key aspect of the debate had been about the costs associated with the recommendations. However, the recommendation should be seen in the context of an Invest to Save Strategy. It was acknowledged that Invest to Save and Early Intervention Strategies had a 3-year time lead and that savings were not always easy to quantify. The Portfolio Holder for Finance stated that he would be sympathetic to the use of the Transformation Programme money to help move the recommendations forward.

Cabinet applauded the contributions from the representatives of Harrow Youth Parliament.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Corporate Director Children and Families, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools and Families, be authorised to develop and implement the response, in partnership with local schools and the Harrow Youth Parliament;
- (2) it be noted that the development and implementation of the response would include joint working with the Council's Grants Advisory Panel and contact with those local authorities referred to in the report, (such as Camden, Hammersmith and Fulham and Tower Hamlets), each offering different approaches to youth engagement;
- (3) it be noted that with the Council's focus on statutory and targeted work, significant decisions have previously been put into effect which had already removed many universal services for young people.

Reason for Decision: The Council's 'resident involvement' agenda aimed to change the culture of youth engagement and to establish stronger links with young people living and being educated in the borough. This would inevitably be a dynamic process, requiring the commitment of officers across all departments and Councillors alike, and would take time to embed.

The 'Youth Engagement' report had already become a key document underpinning the work of the Youth Development Team within Children and Families Service and was compatible with the priority actions of the Harrow Youth Parliament.

Bearing in mind the current operating model with the Children and Families Service and the ongoing pressure to achieve further short and medium term savings, it is important to note that additional resources would be required in order to fully consider the cost benefits to the Council and to find external funding sources and sponsorship.

466. Key Decision - Harrow Mental Health Day Services Review

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director Community, Health and Wellbeing, which set out proposals to modernise day services for people with mental ill health, deliver a step change in the quality of services and assist people to achieve better outcomes and greater levels of wellbeing, as well as delivering services within a constrained budgetary situation.

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing reported that the report followed a 2-year review of day services for people with mental illness in Harrow and had involved a number of stakeholders. The Portfolio Holder identified the key components of the review, as follows:

- reviewing best practice and government guidance with the aim of refocusing of day services for working-age adults with mental problems into community resources that promote social inclusion;
- considering the current services available in harrow, provided through CNWL at The Bridge, 76 Marlborough Hill, Wiseworks, Sneh and Mind's Briefing and Stepping Stone's services;
- extensive consultation and equality impact assessment, as set out in section 2.7 of the report.

The Portfolio Holder added that visits were also carried out to a number of neighbouring boroughs to see how they delivered their day services. A number of workshops and participatory sessions were held with users and carers of existing services and questionnaires were also issued widely. Themes from the consultation included:

- anxiety about change and fear at losing a current resource or service which may lead to isolation;
- valuing and having a place to go to meet with people who understood and had similar experiences;
- importance of groups and activities;
- people currently using services might not use alternative ones and risked becoming isolated;
- young people were not accessing services as they did not meet their needs.

The Portfolio Holder added that following evaluation of the various options as set out in section 2.5 of the report, a number of recommendations were proposed to support the achievement of outcomes sought from the review which best meet the needs of people with mental illness within available resources. She explained that the proposal was to redesign mental health day services in Harrow by closing 76 Marlborough Hill as a mental health day service. Services would be redesigned and reinvigorated to provide better

quality provision that had greater impacts for those who used it. Services would be more entrepreneurial, work-focused to meet the wide range of needs. A saving of £250k per year would be achieved and would help make the day service sustainable. The final detail of a model had yet to be agreed, as a result of which authority for a delegation was being sought.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted the work done by the Day Services Steering Group and commended the report to Cabinet. She added that if the proposals were approved, it would result in an 'in principle' decision with further work to be carried out in conjunction with the service users.

The Portfolio Holder responded to questions from the Portfolio Holder for Finance on the equality impact assessment. She replied that the assessment had highlighted the services valued most by the users and how these can be improved as well as a gender imbalance and the need to ensure that young people were engaged.

The Leader of the Council acknowledged that Cabinet faced a challenging decision and referred positively to the meetings of the Day Services Steering Group which he had attended. He indicated his support for the proposals as they would provide a more inclusive service which should be seen as a positive development.

RESOLVED: That the new Service Model described in section 2.5.3 of the report be agreed, and specifically to:

- (1) the closure of Marlborough Hill Day Service;
- (2) implement a "Hub" resource and mixed-use community space for people with mental ill health, which at least initially will be at The Bridge;
- (3) the continued use of Wiseworks service as a vocationally-focused service for adults requiring support to develop new skills in a safe, supportive and recovery focused environment;
- (4) note the development of a marketplace of community-based services for people with personal budgets delivered through Shop4Support;
- (5) authorise the Corporate Director for Community, Health and Wellbeing, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder(s), to:
 - agree and implement the appropriate route of securing the Hub Service, whether by a tender, via the section 75 Agreement with CNWL, or by direct provision;
 - agree and implement the appropriate route of securing services at Wiseworks, whether by a tender, via the section 75 Agreement with CNWL, or by direct provision.

Reason for Decision: To enable the creation of a new model for Mental Health Day Services in Harrow that improves outcomes for service users.

467. Key Decision - Appointment of Contractors to Housing Capital Framework

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director Community, Health and Wellbeing, which set out the results of the tender process for the provision of capital works to housing stock. In making its decision, Cabinet also considered a confidential appendix to the report, which set out an analysis of the tenders received from various bidders.

The Portfolio Holders for Property and Major Contracts, and Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services thanked residents for their involvement in reviewing the service and how it ought to change and reported on the savings that would ensue as a result of the re-tender.

The Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts commended the report to Cabinet as the proposals would provide value for money and improve Council housing stock. It would result in an annual saving of up to 20% than the previous contract and the money saved would be reinvested to expand the service to pay for additional jobs year on year. Moreover, the new contractors had employed former staff and recruited local staff.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the appointment of the contractors identified in Table 1 of the report to the Framework for the Provision of Capital Works for Housing be approved;
- (2) the appointment of Durkan Ltd for the delivery of the 2012/13 Programme of Kitchen and Bathroom Renewals, using the available budget in a revised Capital Programme, be approved;
- (3) that the confidential appendix be noted.

Reason for Decision: The evaluation of the tenders received had been conducted to arrive at the most economically advantageous bids. The Framework Structure was designed to maintain a degree of competitiveness and resilience throughout the 4-year framework period.

468. Key Decision - Harrow Museum Heritage Lottery Fund Round 1 Application

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services introduced the report, which set out a draft strategic vision for the restoration of Harrow Museum site, including Headstone Manor in order to deliver a long-term sustainable future. He outlined the total grant money that would ensue should the application be approved.

The Leader of the Council welcomed the report and complimented the proposals as a first step forward in providing a sustainable future for a key site.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the draft vision for the future of the Harrow Museum Site and its buildings to become the strategic Heritage Centre for Harrow, as outlined in Appendix A to the report, be approved;
- (2) authority be delegated to the Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services, to submit a Round 1 application to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a development grant towards a Round 2 submission for a total grant of up to £2million to support the upgrading and refurbishment of the Harrow Museum site, subject to the parameters set out in the report;
- (3) in due course, a further report, to approve the submission for a Heritage Lottery Fund Round 2 application if Harrow was successful at Round 1, be submitted to Cabinet.

Reason for Decision: To upgrade and restore one of the borough's major heritage assets in order to provide a high quality facility as the Community Museum and Heritage Centre for Harrow. To celebrate the cultural and community history of the borough, deliver the Council's heritage service offer and secure a sustainable future for the asset.

469. Key Decision - Housing Changes Review: Update on Tenancy Strategy, Housing Strategy, Housing Business Plan and other Key Policies

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report, which provided progress updates on key strategies and policies included within the Housing Changes Review since the December 2011 Cabinet.

The Portfolio Holder added that the final strategy would be submitted to Cabinet in December 2012 for approval whilst aligning it with other housing related strategies as part of the Housing Changes Review. Consultations had been carried out with the TLRCF on 17 July and the Housing Policy Task Group on 18 July. He gave a vote of thanks to officers for the report and commended it to Cabinet.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the responses to the draft Tenancy Strategy 2012 be noted;
- (2) the further Housing Policy changes either introduced, or in consultation, since the Cabinet meeting on the 15 December 2011 be noted;
- (3) Cabinet supports the Direction of Travel set out in the various updates attached at Appendices 1 – 6 of the report and that, following further consultation, final approval be sought for these Strategies and Policies at the Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2012;

- (4) It be noted that delegated authority had already been granted to the Corporate Director Adults and Housing (now the Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, to approve draft documents for formal consultation.

Reason for Decision: To enable the completion of Key Housing Policy and Strategy documents required by the Localism Act 2011.

470. Key Decision - Commercial Safety Service Plan 2012/13

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety introduced the report and explained that the Council, as a statutory enforcement authority, had a duty to have in place an Annual Food Service Plan. The Plan, known as the Commercial Safety Service Plan, also incorporated the Health and Safety Service Plan.

The Portfolio Holder added that health and safety aspects of the Plan fell within the remit of the Licensing and General Purposes Committee and these aspects would be considered by the Committee in due course. He reported that voluntary enforcement action had increased due to a greater focus on non-compliant establishments and better use of staff. The Service had elected to retain NI184 'Percentage of premises with the borough that were Broadly Compliant' after it had been removed from the national list. It was welcomed that 78% of premises were compliant against Harrow's target of 74% and the focus was on the remainder 28% that were non-compliant.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Commercial Safety Service Plan for 2012/13 be approved as the Council's Annual Food Service Plan for 2012/13;
- (2) it be noted that the health and safety service aspects of the Plan were subject to approval by Licensing and General Purposes Committee.

Reason for Decision: By virtue of the requirements contained in the Food Standards Act 1999 and the National Food Framework Agreement (FA), issued by the Food Standards Agency (FSA), the Council was required to have an annual Service Plan in place.

471. Key Decision - Materials Recycling Services Framework Contract

The Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts introduced the report, which set out the establishment of a Framework for the procurement of Material Recycling Services for the disposal of materials collected by the Council's refuse collection services that were suitable for recycling.

The Portfolio Holder added that the Council was one of the first Councils in the country to adopt an income generation model for the processing and sale of dry recyclable waste, and there was now an opportunity to improve on the income previously received. He thanked officers for their work and commended the report to Cabinet.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the inclusion of the following organisations be agreed on a four year framework for a service to commence on 1 September 2012:

Biffa Waste Services Limited
Bywaters (Leyton) Ltd
Viridor Waste Management Limited;

- (2) the Head of Corporate Procurement and the Divisional Director of Environment, in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts, be authorised to undertake and award annual E-auctions or mini-competitions under the Framework Terms and Conditions.

Reason for Decision: To enable cost effective disposal of materials collected by the Council that are suitable for recycling.

472. Development of Apprenticeships and Work Experience Opportunities for Unemployed Graduates - Progress Report

Cabinet received an information report of the Corporate Director Place Shaping, which provided an update on the development of apprenticeship opportunities and the new provision for unemployed graduates which began in May 2012.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

Reason for Decision: To note the progress in line with the original decision of 19 January 2012 Cabinet meeting.

[Call-in does not apply]

473. Key Decision - Prince Edward Playing Fields Amendment to Lease Terms to Permit Playing of Professional League Football Matches

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director Place Shaping, which set out the background to the development of the Prince Edward Playing Field, as The Hive Football Centre and sought determination of Barnet Football Club's request for Professional League Football Matches to be allowed to be played at the facility.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration briefed Cabinet on the background to the proposal and the current situation, as detailed in the report. He added that following extensive consultations, which included drop-in sessions, proposals were developed for a decision by Cabinet that evening which would involve an 'in principle' change to the terms of the existing lease agreement. He acknowledged that a considerable number of concerns had been expressed and assured Cabinet that all concerns would be addressed before the lease was altered.

In response to questions from the Portfolio Holder for Finance, the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration replied that further discussions would

take place with local Ward Councillors and traffic officers with a view to alleviating parking problems experienced by residents. He added that the problems were mainly during the weekend when the existing Controlled Parking Zone(s) were not in operation. There was an added problem of match days at Wembley Stadium in Brent when football fans used areas of Harrow to park their vehicles and travel by public transport to Wembley Stadium.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance was re-assured by the response and identified Camrose Avenue as one of the many roads that was affected. He was pleased that the terms of the lease would be strengthened and indicated his support for the proposal.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration referred to the current lease and stated that an amended new lease would allow more control over the number of matches played at the site.

The Leader of the Council thanked residents for their participation in this matter in the form of public questions submitted to the meeting.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) it be agreed that Professional League Football Matches may be played at the Prince Edward Playing Fields, subject to agreement in respect of the conditions shown in Option 3 of the report and Commercial Terms;
- (2) authority be delegated to the Corporate Director Place Shaping, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts, and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, to negotiate and determine necessary interventions and mitigation measures, to minimise as far as was reasonably practical, adverse impacts on the locality and to implement all necessary amendments to the Lease and the associated Service Level Agreement;
- (3) it be noted that the amendment to the Lease would permit Barnet Football Club to use the Prince Edward Playing Fields, The Hive, as their Home Ground, and that the amendment to the lease would apply solely to Barnet Football Club and may not be assigned;
- (4) authority be delegated to the Corporate Director Place Shaping, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts, to negotiate and determine commercial terms with the tenant, and to implement all necessary amendments to the Lease and the associated Service Level Agreement;
- (5) it be noted that the amended Lease and Service Level Agreement would not be completed, until all outstanding planning issues had been resolved.

Reason for Decision: To secure the further development of the Prince Edward Playing Fields, The Hive, as a Football Centre of excellence and hospitality venue, for the benefit of the entire community of Harrow and to help stimulate growth in the local economy.

474. Key Decision - Harrow Community Infrastructure Levy - Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration provided introduced the report and provided a summary of the process involved in preparing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and the key evidence that supported it.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved for a six week period of public consultation in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement;
- (2) the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, be authorised to approve the consultation documents which will accompany the Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

Reason for Decision: To commence the process of preparing and adopting a CIL Charging Schedule that will enable the Council to charge CIL on new development to help pay for social and physical infrastructure within the Borough.

475. Termination of Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 9.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At 9.50 pm to continue until 10.30 pm, at 10.28pm to continue until 10.45 pm or earlier upon the conclusion of business.

476. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED: That in accordance with Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) for the reasons set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Reason</u>
28	Appointment of Contractors to Housing Capital Framework	Information under paragraph 3 (contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

477. Appointment of Contractors to Housing Capital Framework

RESOLVED: That the appendix be noted.

Reason for Decision: To allow the appendix to be considered in conjunction with the main report at agenda item 18.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.31 pm, closed at 10.36 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON
Chairman