

# CABINET MINUTES

## 13 SEPTEMBER 2012

**Chairman:** † Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:**

* Bob Currie	* Thaya Idaikkadar (Vice-Chair in the Chair)
* Margaret Davine	
* Keith Ferry	† Phillip O'Dell
* Brian Gate	* David Perry
* Graham Henson	* Sachin Shah

**In attendance:** Susan Hall Minute 482  
**(Councillors)** Paul Osborn Minute 482

\* Denotes Member present  
† Denotes apologies received

### 478. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

### 479. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2012, be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 465, Response to Overview and Scrutiny Committee Report 'Redefining Youth Engagement', paragraph 5, to delete the word 'social' in line 7 and to add the following after 'skills':

'It was important to ensure that engagement activities were crucial 'progression routes' to employment because of the soft skills young people gain, which employers were demanding. It was the links between engagement and progression routes to jobs that were the most important

factors because what young people told the Review was that what they wanted most was: Council influence and a prospect of a job when they left school'.

#### **480. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following petition was received and referred to the Divisional Director of Environmental Services:

Yeading Avenue – Petition for a gate for the service road

Councillor William Stoodley submitted a petition on behalf of Councillor Krishna Suresh with the following terms of reference:

“This is a petition for a gate to be installed by the Council for the service road behind our houses. We will pay for a gate key each so that we can have access to the road.”

The petition was signed by 10 residents of Yeading Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow urging the Council to help protect their properties from burglaries and flytipping.

#### **481. Public Questions**

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

1.

**Questioner:** Alan Brown

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

**Question:** We would like to know, what the mental health preventative services are going to consist of?

**Answer:** As you know, the plan for Harrow’s remodelled mental health day service which was agreed at the last Cabinet meeting, includes a Hub service which will be based at The Bridge and be open to anyone who is experiencing mental illness. There will be a particular focus on preventing people’s health from deteriorating and requiring more intensive support. We hope they will be making it more widely available and working with people on a low base with low mental health problems that will be a prevention from them going onto more serious problems.

The details of the services will be commissioned are being developed at the moment, in consultation with the project Steering Group, which you are a member of, which includes the Harrow User Group and Harrow Rethink.

I know we have only had one meeting so far but that is where we are developing the actual content of the service and the full range of activities on offer at the start of the new service will not be confirmed and made public until the provider is in place. However, you will be kept informed because you are part of that project Steering Group.

In addition to these services there are a number of other preventative services available to people in the borough including some funding through the Council's agreement with CNWL such as Mind's befriending service and the Phoenix Employment Service, as well as services provided directly by CNWL, such as the Early Intervention Service and the Recovery College.

NHS Brent and Harrow have responsibility also for a range of mental health services and commissions service like the IAPT, giving access to psychological therapies for people with more common mental health problems.

**Supplemental Question:** I actually was in the original question looking for clarification on exactly what preventative service would consist of so I understand from your answer that this is being developed.

My supplementary question was, we would like to be assured that service users will be involved in the development of these preventative services.

**Supplemental Answer:** I certainly assure you of that and as I say, I know we have only had one of the project Steering Group meetings thus far but you are part of that and a number of service users are with you in that Group and we will continue working with them to guide it.

2.

**Questioner:** Adam Salem

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

**Question:** With reference to your written answer from the July 19<sup>th</sup> 2012 Cabinet Meeting, which you stated that at the time of writing the consultation report there were 191 mental health service users registered with the Bridge and 126 registered with Marlborough Hill, how will it be possible for a combined total of 317 service users to access the Hub at one building?

**Answer:** I am confident that The Bridge is big enough to support a

mix of drop in and group work at different times. The aim is that it becomes a much more thriving place than it is at the moment, with a range of community activities.

Both The Bridge and Marlborough Hill currently support a number of people for varying lengths of times at different time of the week and at different frequency. There is spare capacity in both of them, particularly at The Bridge. We are not using all the space that we could and using it effectively and also by using for longer times and into the evenings and weekends, we hope to make it a much more thriving place. We are confident that we would have enough space for all services there.

**Supplemental Question:** It costs at least £2,000 per person per year attending one day per week to run a sustainable service. Is it possible to support this number of mental service health users and run a sustainable service on £1,360 per person, which is the proposed future budget for running The Bridge as a unit cost?

**Supplemental Answer:** I think by using the place more effectively, having more drop-ins and groups there, we will be able to cater for more people in the way that they were asking for. I believe that the per person cost would go down.

If you are not using a building to its capacity then obviously it costs more and we have both been to The Bridge and seen it and sometimes it seems very empty and quiet and we are hoping to change that.

3.

**Questioner:** Raksha Pandya

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

**Answer:** I refer to your regarding Preventative Day Support for Mental Health Service Users in which you stated quote 'the expectation is that the HUB element of the service would receive about £260,000 funding and give support in a preventative way so that people experiencing different mental health needs rather than those with a statutory need' end quote.

There seems to be no reference to preventative provision to be provided in community settings which are much more accessible to BME and Young adult communities, which formed part of the consultation without which, you will not be able to meet the identified needs and address the inequalities which were highlighted in the consultation

findings. How will you address this?

**Answer:** The remodelling of the service offers an opportunity to make better use of the existing spaces so they are more attractive and more suited to the needs of a wider selection of people using them.

The intention is to involve people from different communities in shaping new services and The Bridge is a community setting. I understand if you walk into it you might not think it was. You would think it was some kind of small institution but it is a community setting which, as a result of the changes, will be more accessible to BME and young adults, where they will be able to access a range of services. We want to involve them in finding out exactly what they would want and probably young adults are more likely to use it during the evening. If we open in the evenings there are a number of things we can do and you will remember that the Cabinet also agreed to the development of a market of community services which would be funded through personal budgets. I know you know that system well and I hope these services will develop both confidence and independence and help to prevent people going on to more serious mental health problems.

**Supplemental Question:** How will the disadvantaged groups ie the BME communities and younger adults, be involved in developing the new day service specifications and preventative service provision?

**Supplemental Answer:** We have the Steering Group. We will also have to look for ways that we can actually approach these groups and, probably through MIND, talk and see what suggestions they have and what they are specifically asking for.

#### 482. 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?

**Answer:** The Council's Corporate Plan 2009/10 which was agreed at a meeting of Cabinet in 2009, included a 'Flagship Action' to develop a Planning Brief for the Council car park in Stanmore District Centre.

Savills were commissioned by the Place Shaping Directorate in the autumn of 2009 to compile a Planning Brief for 'Stanmore Car Park'.

The work to compile the Planning Brief was completed by the end of March 2010. However, the Planning Brief was not taken forward as part of the Local Development Scheme. There was therefore no need for the document to be formally signed off to enable the consultation required to adopt a Planning Brief to be undertaken.

**Supplemental Question:** Councillor Marilyn Ashton appears to be extremely keen on public consultation. As she was Chair of Planning at that time, did she put the contents of this Planning Brief out to public consultation before she approved it?

**Supplemental Answer:** I do not believe so. As you know there was an election in May 2010. She may not have had the time. I do not believe there was any public consultation before the Planning Brief and the marketing brief was drawn up.

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?

**Answer:** The Stanmore Car Park Planning Brief document was adapted for use as a comprehensive marketing brief for the Stanmore Car Park and Anmer Lodge site.

Cabinet on 14 September 2010 approved the disposal of Anmer Lodge, adjacent surface level car park and associated access.

The indicative development response which was set out within the original planning brief document was carried forward into the marketing brief and asked for the following:

- residential development located in the central and northern parts of the site close to existing housing to ensure a good level of amenity for existing and future occupiers;
- an average of 1:1 parking ratio for all residential units, the majority of which would be on-street or in rear parking courtyards;
- commercial development comprising a small/medium retail food store located at the southern end of the site so that it is in close proximity to The Broadway and helps to divide the residential elements from the retail and associated traffic;
- re-provision of existing car parking spaces currently located on the southern end of the site through the provision of a multi-storey car park at the southern end of the site;
- an element of community space;
- heights between one and five storeys across the site which take advantage of the site's topography so that lower elements are situated on the northern part of the site and higher elements towards the southern end;
- a north-south link between The Broadway and the existing recreation space;
- unrestricted pedestrian routes through the site from north to south;
- restriction of vehicles entering into the southern end of the site and assuming vehicular access for residential units from the north.

All of these items were contained in the original planning brief.

Based on the information received to date from the preferred supplier, I am confident that the requirements of the marketing and the Planning Brief will be delivered. There will, of course, be a full and robust assessment of the detailed proposals throughout the planning process and, before that I would hope that the preferred bidder would have their own public consultation with the residents.

As has been clearly stated at Cabinet on previous occasions, disposal of this important asset will only take place once full planning permission has been achieved by the Council's development partner and of course, as I have said before, the sale of the land will include a covenant that that planning permission is the only planning permission that will be allowed on that site.

**Supplemental Question:** Do you share my confusion over Councillor Marilyn Ashton's criticism of this administration's actions with respect to this development, in light of the fact that this administration has pretty well complied with everything in the Planning Brief that Councillor Marilyn Ashton herself approved, albeit she did not apparently consult the residents of Stanmore before she did so, a question that could equally be applied to the Hive?

**Supplemental Answer:** Yes. We have had in the last two years a good record of consulting the community on everything that we have done, particularly as the recent change of lease for the Hive was concerned.

We will consult residents through the planning process and also ask the preferred developer to have their own consultations. I am at a loss to understand why Councillor Ashton is continuing to say that there should be a Supplementary Planning Document prepared, when I believe that the course of action that we have outlined by having full planning permission written into the covenant for the sale of the land is a far more robust process.

3.

**Questioner:** Councillor William Stoodley

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

**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"?

**Answer:** The Leader is not here but he has taken time to draft a suitable answer as follows:

You and I heard a presentation about communications

when the top table talked about their 'Let's Talk' initiative in Newcastle, a pop-up café in Oldham. I encountered a pop-up café in Ludlow on my holiday.

Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Nobody mentioned Harrow where it all started.

There are a number of 'Let's Talk' approaches that other Councils across the country have started to run but very few have the same street based feel that Harrow's Let's Talk campaigns have had. "Let's Talk" was launched back in 2010 as a dynamic street campaign involving Councillors and senior officers going out to residents rather than expecting them to come to Council meetings to discuss the things that matter to them. Through an innovative approach with pop-up living rooms and gardens we created an environment that encouraged residents to stop for a chat and experience the living room and garden on the high street.

This approach has now been taken on board, extended, modified in many of our specific consultations such as on Children's Services, Adult Social Care, Housing and the Area Action Plan.

Whilst Councils such as Newcastle and Wandsworth have examples of "Let's Talk" campaigns which have followed a similar vein to Harrow in that they are about a real and authentic discussion with residents on the choices ahead, the only Council we have found to date setting up something similar has been Charnwood Borough Council who have set up a 'mock-up sitting room'.

Value for money has also significantly featured in Harrow's approach where, for example, the items for the living room were sourced from our recycling depot, charity shops and value retailers in order to make it as cost effective as possible. A priority for this administration is to create a better relationship with our residents, working with them in these difficult times. As residents are experiencing tough financial challenges we need to manage our connections with them without the use of expensive gimmicks. Through our "Let's Talk" we have therefore uniquely combined both innovation and value for money which is something we are proud of.

**Supplemental Question:**

In the light of the fact that other authorities have adopted these groundbreaking ideas would you agree that this demonstrates that the opposition and criticism to these new, innovative ideas is groundless?

**Supplemental** I agree with you.

**Answer:**

4.

**Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
(asked by Councillor Paul Osborn)

**Asked of:** Councillor Graham Henson, Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services

**Question:** Can you confirm that all Harrow Council meetings, including this meeting of Cabinet, are compliant with the requirements of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, which came into force on 10<sup>th</sup> September?

**Answer:** No one can fail to notice the paradox in this open and transparent agenda set by government that these regulations were laid before Parliament in the middle of recess on 15 August and came into force on 10 September. As you will appreciate from the title of the regulations, they only apply to Executive side decisions so I cannot confirm that all meetings comply, as they are not required to.

In relation to Executive decisions, in the main Harrow was already complying with the regulations – most meetings are open the public, agendas and reports are on the website. Where we need to amend our processes, steps are being taken to do this, for example we have published the new notice required for key decisions which replaces the Forward Plan.

**Supplemental Question:** Are you not aware that Section 5 of the regulations talks about private meetings and that it defines as meetings that the press and public are wholly or partly excluded from and required to give 28 days' notice of that or Section 9 of the regulations which talks about the Key Decisions and the notice you have to give?

I ask specifically because the PRISM item on the agenda has both Part II items which no notice has been given and also has not been included in the most recent Forward Plans nor has any notice been given at the front of the building?

**Supplemental Answer:** As I have said, the Regulations came into force on 10 September. The notice of this meeting was given prior to regulations coming into force but if you look at

the regulations themselves, it is to cover Councils that do not have the same openness and transparent agenda that we have.

5.

**Questioner:** Councillor Paul Osborn

**Asked of:** Councillor Sachin Shah, Portfolio Holder for Finance

**Question:** Can you explain why there were only two bids received for the Corporate Bailiff Contract?

**Answer:** In our tender, we made it clear that we would not be allowing bailiffs to keep 100% of their fees. The bailiff industry threw their 'toys out of the pram' over this. They knew it was a great idea, would be copied by many boroughs and they would lose money. They told their members not to bid. Two companies broke ranks and that is why we only received two bids.

**Supplemental Question:** How can you publicly speak about protecting Harrow's most vulnerable people whilst pushing ahead with a scheme that is so aggressive even the bailiffs of this country want nothing to do with it?

I take it you are aware of the letter that the Civil Enforcement Association sent to the Leader, which talks about its concern about kickbacks which forms part of this new contract, calling them totally abhorrent and immoral?

**Supplemental Answer:** You obviously wrote that supplementary before I gave you the answer because I said very clearly the reason we only got two bids was because the bailiff industry threw their 'toys out of the pram'. That was the reason and as you talk about vulnerable people, I agree with you and we have got an excellent Debt Challenge Panel chaired by Councillor Ferrari who provided good recommendations which we have accepted.

This contract will allow us to separate people who will not pay with those who cannot pay and it allows us to treat people differently. The vulnerable, which we all accept we need to treat differently and that is what we will be able to do in this contract which we were not able to do before.

6.

**Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question:** As the new grants process opens for applications in under two weeks – on 24th September – what assistance has been given to the voluntary sector to inform them of the new process and its requirements?

**Answer:** To ensure that the voluntary sector does not miss out on the opportunity to apply for Council funding this year there are numerous ways in which we have kept them up-to-date throughout the whole process, as follows:

- there have been regular updates throughout the process to update the sector, including tonight's report;
- there is a website, it is now updated;
- officers will attend the Voluntary Sector Forum;
- once the application window opens, as always, information sessions will be held inviting all to attend and they are very well attended in helping people with the new proposals;
- there will be 1-1 support from our interim CVS, especially from funding which again, is well received when they receive their funding advice from them. One of the most important things is the consistency of approach from previous years on which we have listened to the voluntary and community sector. Instead of making masses of changes, we have incorporated the best of what is commissioning from what we said we would and the current process of grants and moving them into a model which is, a Harrow model, which is an outcomes based grants system. Although there are changes, there are many consistencies. I would like to think that the sector, with all the support we have given them, they will have the best opportunity to succeed in application for funding.

**Supplemental Question:** Given the major problems that you had during your first year of administration, are you absolutely confident therefore that you can assist people through the process and that there will not be issues as there have been in the past?

**Supplemental Answer:** Well I think from the time we have spent getting to this process, as I have said, we have tried to make changes throughout. That is especially with the Grants Advisory Panel's help.

We have tried to iron out creases which we have had in previous years and an example is the application form. Where we have received feedback from the sector as well as colleagues on the Grants Advisory Panel, we have made changes, minor changes in order to iron out the creases.

I am therefore confident that we are in as best position we can be.

*The following questions were not reached in the time limit of 15 minutes. It was noted that written responses would be provided, which have been reproduced below:*

7.

**Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question:** Given the new grant model being proposed appears to provide funding on a three-year cycle, could you provide clarification on how the process will work - if at all - for organisations wanting to apply for funding during the next two years?

**Written Answer:** The new Outcomes Based grants programme being proposed offers two separate funding streams. In developing this process we have been very aware of the need to offer longer-term funding to organisations that require ongoing funding for their activities but at the same time recognising that we have a very diverse voluntary sector in the borough with a range of different funding requirements. On this basis we have developed a process that enables larger organisations to apply for funding for up to three years as well as a programme for smaller organisations who would be able to apply for grants on an annual basis under the small grants programme.

8.

**Questioner:** Councillor Simon Williams

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

**Question:** Could you advise me which neighbouring boroughs you have personally spoken with to base a decision on whether Harrow commissions a complaints advocacy service from a pan-London organisation, a multi-borough service or remains solely within Harrow?

**Written Answer:** As the Cabinet report makes clear, we have not yet reached a decision on the best approach to take to commissioning health complaints advocacy.

I have personally not spoken to any Boroughs about this but officers have discussed this issue with all London Boroughs including our WLA neighbours. At the moment some of our neighbours are undecided or are opting for Pan-London/Multi-Borough arrangements.

Our decision will be based on a number of considerations – value for money, local responsiveness and quality, and our sustainable procurement policy tries to ensure that local organisations benefit from our approach to commissioning.

9.

**Questioner:** Councillor Paul Osborn

**Asked of:** Councillor Graham Henson, Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services

**Question:** Given the work done by Bevan Brittan and Trowers & Hamblins on the legal services merger with Barnet was not mentioned in the original Cabinet paper, can you confirm how much this work cost and whether it was included in the original project budget or not?

**Written Answer:** Trowers & Hamblins acted for Barnet, so we don't have information about how much they charged to support this project. The cost of Bevan Brittan's legal advice to Harrow on the shared practice with Barnet was £74k, which was budgeted for as part of the project. We are ensuring we get maximum value out of that spend by using the work Bevan Brittan did on the legal project as a basis for the shared public health project.

10.

**Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

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

**Question:** What steps have been taken to ensure that the soon-to-be-appointed Director of Public Health will have Harrow's interests at heart, given the role is to be shared between boroughs?

**Written Answer:** I am pleased to report that we have agreed with Barnet Council that the Director of Public Health will be a Harrow Council employee and we have agreed in principle that Harrow should host a shared public health service for the two Boroughs. Harrow will continue to maintain a separate JSNA and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Harrow will also continue to have their own Health and Wellbeing Board to ensure Harrow's public health interests are identified.

The shared Director of Public Health will be accountable to the Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing and myself.

Harrow Council has agreed with Barnet Council that the Director of Public Health will equally share their working time physically between Harrow and Barnet.

Harrow Council will set out which Harrow meetings we expect the DPH to attend as part of the Inter Authority Agreement. This will include Cabinet and Portfolio Holder briefings.

A 3 year public health mandate will be developed for Harrow for the Director of Public Health. This will form the basis of a performance agreement with the Director of Public Health. This will be reviewed regularly and refreshed annually.

11.

**Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question:** What guarantee can you offer that the PRISM reorganisation of Public Realm will not have a negative impact on the day-to-day services on which Harrow residents rely?

**Written Answer:** The PRISM restructuring of the Environment Division will be a change in the approach to the delivery of services that will enable the Council to continue to provide a wide range of functions despite the need to make savings due to pressures on public sector budgets. Although there will be a lower number of staff

overall the Council's on street staff presence will be maintained and through a significant investment in new technology the service to the public will be continued. There will also be an additional benefit of a reduced burden on small businesses because the Council will consolidate away from the current arrangement where a premises may be visited by a number of different officers all looking a different aspects of the business.

12.

**Questioner:** Councillor Susan Hall

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

**Question:** Could you provide an update on the investigation into the miscalculated £2.7 million underspend at West Waste?

**Written Answer:** At the West London Waste Authority meeting on 20 July 2012 Members of the Authority received a full report on an over-estimate of balances from the 2011/12 budget reported to the January Authority meeting, which lead to the use of £2.8m of Authority reserves to support the fixed cost levy which is charged to the boroughs. In calculating the provisional 2011/12 financial outturn the actual under spend was found to be only £495,000 meaning that there was risk in the budget set by the Authority. To fully understand how this error occurred and to help understand the impact on the 2012/13 budget the WLWA Treasurer engaged PriceWaterhouseCoopers to undertake a detailed review of how costs were not accounted for, and why this error was not highlighted earlier.

The West London Waste Authority agreed a number of actions in response to the report to deal with the issue in the current financial year.

13.

**Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

**Asked of:** Councillor Sachin Shah, Portfolio Holder for Finance

**Question:** Can you confirm that the Council's financial projections and costings continue to operate on the assumption that Harrow's Council Tax is to rise 2.5% in 2013-14?

**Written Answer:** No decisions on Council Tax have been made yet, and there are many unknowns in the budget, including the level of government funding. We haven't changed the assumption in the budget passed by full Council in February, so yes the 2.5% increase is still the assumption we are using.

14.

**Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

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

**Question:** What is the Council doing to address the high crime and youth and gang violence in Wealdstone as mentioned in the Community Safety Plan?

**Written Answer:** The Community Safety Plan details the responses of the Council, the Police and the other agencies that make up Safer Harrow, the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, to the patterns of crime and anti-social behaviour recorded in the previous year. This means that high levels of crime and youth and gang violence detailed in the plan in the Wealdstone corridor actually occurred between October 2010 and September 2011.

The most recent crime figures for the Borough as a whole show that serious youth violence, in the period 1 April 2012 – 26 August 2012 is down 25% compared to the same period in 2011. This follows an 8% increase in 2011/12, a 7% increase in 2010/11.

Ward level data for youth offending is not yet available for this period although total crime data is and this shows that, for the period January to June 2012, there has been a 4% increase in total notifiable offences in Wealdstone compared with the same period in 2011 offset by a reduction of 13% in Marlborough for the same periods.

The Plan noted that Crime in Wealdstone Ward fell by 10% in 2011 compared with 2010.

In view of the success of the actions co-ordinated by Safer Harrow, as shown by the reduction across the Borough as whole in serious youth violence, the Plan proposes to continue operations around Wealdstone where youth workers have been embedded into Safer Neighbourhood team patrols to provide a range of responses to the issues presented by young people.

It also suggests that continued support for the ever closer working between the Council's two anti-social behaviour teams (Environment and Housing) and the Police to provide a joined up and graduated menu of responses as well as the opportunity for early intervention to try to prevent problems from escalating. The remodelling of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams to provide flexibility of deployment to the areas of most need on a daily basis and the new 'Grip and Pace' management arrangements introduced by the Police (and which are influencing the speed of the Council's response to intelligence and events) all contribute to a more proactive and speedy response to anti-social behaviour and more serious offending.

This places the Council and the Police (as well as voluntary and community groups involved in this work) in a good position to take advantage of the new community safety powers as and when they become available and to be able to respond to the Community Trigger provisions if they are brought into law.

However, the plan also notes that every year, there is a new cohort of young people who may be susceptible to the attraction of gang membership and may also be attracted to crime and violence. The work that has been done in the past needs to be renewed constantly to help and support the next cohort and to be developed as new thinking and approaches are developed here and elsewhere. Successes in this work are often about things that didn't happen – reductions in the number of young people injured through violence and less reported gang activity – but it is the intention in this year to identify positive things that have been achieved by young people who have previously been in or associated with gangs as role models and, hopefully, active proponents of the benefits of change.

In particular, the founding and launch of the Mothers Against Gangs group offers hope that, with the appropriate support, advice and guidance, the community itself can contribute significantly to reducing the impact and influence of gangs.

15.

**Questioner:** Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

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

**Question:** Newspapers have reported about the growing problem of the Horse Chestnut Leaf Miner Moth and the associated problem of bleeding canker that threaten our lovely horse chestnut trees; what assessments has Harrow Council undertaken about the impact of the moth and canker to the borough's trees?

**Written Answer:** This is a concerning threat to the chestnut trees in the borough and unfortunately there is no treatment for either issues mentioned. We are currently carrying out an updated risk assessment of all our street tree stock, and we are following advice from the Forestry Commission on actions to be taken for this problem.

From observations by our tree officer this summer the level of leaf minor has been less than previous years - probably due to the weather - and the level of bacterial canker is not significant. Where decay or decline in a tree is observed it is noted for a more regular inspection to monitor the progress. Appropriate works are then carried out to ensure the safety of the tree. This would range from reducing the size of the tree to complete removal.

16.

**Questioner:** Councillor Paul Osborn

**Asked of:** Councillor Graham Henson, Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services

**Question:** Can you please provide a comprehensive explanation of the Council's policy and procedures regarding the appointment of 'interim' staff members – particularly for interims at SPM grades and above?

**Written Answer:** In order to provide a comprehensive response, it is important to be clear about what we mean by interim workers.

The National Audit Office helpfully defines interim workers as *'people fulfilling 'business as usual' roles within the current organisational structure that would otherwise be undertaken by a salaried permanent member of staff.'* and my response relates to council workers who fall under this definition.

Interim workers may be engaged in 3 ways:

- By direct employment; where the interim worker is employed by the council on a temporary

employment contract and paid through the council's payroll. In these circumstances the Council's recruitment and selection policy would apply.

- Or, under a contract for services; where the interim worker is a contractor and the council is charged for the services provided under the contract. In these circumstances the Council's contract procedure rules would apply.
- Or, through an employment agency; where the interim worker is engaged via the agency who charge the council for the services of the worker. In these circumstances the Council's contract procedure rules would again apply.

The Council's recruitment and selection policy and contract are readily available to the questioner.

17.

**Questioner:** Councillor Paul Osborn

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

**Question:** Why was no money spent from the Transformation and Priority Initiatives Fund in Q1 2012-2013?

**Written Answer:** There were a number of bids for funding that were put on hold during 2011-2012. Of these the only one that Directorates are still proposing for implementation is that relating to the People's Network. The costs of this project are currently being reviewed, however the majority of costs are capital in nature and so this is potentially a request for virement within the capital programme.

There have to date been no applications for funding in 2012-13, however it is anticipated that there will be during the Autumn when Directorates make their medium term financial strategy (MTFS) proposals. It is anticipated that some of these will involve the need for an initial investment in 2012-13 that has not been included within the current year's budget.

18.

**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 you have appointed any Portfolio Holder assistants in secret, and which other Councils you've shared this method with – given you said it 'worked well'?

**Written Answer:** All Portfolio Holders which I have appointed have been publicly announced in line in accordance with Constitution.

**483. Forward Plan 1 September - 31 December 2012**

The Deputy leader of the Council informed Cabinet that reports relating to 'Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation, 'Revenue and Capital Monitoring for Quarter 1' and 'Public Realm Integrated Services Model' had not been included on the September Forward Plan. He added that the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been notified that these items would be included on this Cabinet agenda.

**RESOLVED:** To note the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 September to 31 December 2012.

**484. Progress on Scrutiny Projects**

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

**RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

**485. Community Safety Plan**

Cabinet received a report of the Assistant Chief Executive, setting out a joint response of the Council, the Police and Partners to the crime and anti-social behaviour issues identified in the Strategic Assessment as well as broadening the definition of community safety by including other aspects of safety, such as: safeguarding vulnerable adults and young people, addressing domestic violence, hate crime and community tensions and helping people recover from abuse of drugs and/or alcohol.

An officer informed Cabinet that the Community Safety Plan was a statutory requirement for the Council to approve each year in response to the Strategic Assessment, which looked at the previous year's crime statistics with a view to formulating a Plan to reduce crime in the borough. The priorities identified for 2012/13 were: residential burglary, robbery and antisocial behaviour.

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing welcomed the Community Safety Plan and the particular reference given to domestic violence which had not been included in previous Plans. She congratulated officers and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety in this regard.

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

That the Community Safety Plan be adopted.

**Reason for Decision:** To meet with the statutory requirement for the Council to adopt a Community Safety Plan, which forms part of the Policy Framework.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report.

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

*[Call-in does not apply, as the decision is reserved to Council]*

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **486. Scrutiny Review Report - Private Sector Rented Housing in Harrow**

**RESOLVED:** That the report of the Scrutiny Review Group be welcomed and the Divisional Director of Housing Services submit a report to the October 2012 meeting of Cabinet responding to the recommendations of the Review Group.

**Reason for Decision:** To consider a response to the recommendations of the Review Group.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** None.

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

### **487. Strategic Performance Report (Q1)**

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 identified areas where performance had been exceptional. Of particular note were:

### Adults' Services

- the Reablement Service continued to show positive outcomes and 96% of respondents had rated overall satisfaction with the service as satisfactory. Good or very good;
- 97% of those surveyed in the quarter 1 had agreed that Personalisation of services had improved their quality of life.

### Housing Services

- a Tenant Scrutiny Panel had been established to promote resident involvement;
- a new Grants Scheme for landlords was launched to increase supply and tackle disrepairs.

### Community and Cultural Services

- the borough had proudly received the prestigious Olympic Torch Relay and was proud of the achievements of Team GB in both the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services agreed with these sentiments and outlined many other successes leading to the London 2012 Olympic Games, such as the London Youth Games for which Harrow had received the most improved score, improve adult participation rates leading up to the Olympic Games, including greater awareness of disability, and increased participation rates in swimming. He added that a great deal of work in these areas would feed into both the housing and adult service areas.

### Children's Services

- a new operating model had gone 'live' and continued to bed down;
- the incorporation of a children's access team with a multi-agency safeguarding hub had been well received and supported by Harrow's Borough Commander.

### Environment

- in relation to the recycling rates, Harrow was one of the top performing boroughs;
- the development and implementation of the Public Realm Integrated Service Management (PRISM) Project was on schedule;
- the Neighbourhood Champions Scheme was being expanded with training session planned during September 2012 following a recruitment drive.

### Place Shaping

- a suite of planning documents, including the Heart of Harrow Area Action Plan had provided a confident base of significant strategic planning decisions which were expected to bring considerable investment in the borough;
- a contract with JobCentre Plus was providing work experience for unemployed graduates.

### Resources

- Access Harrow had retained the prestigious Cabinet Office Customer Service Excellence Standard for the fourth year running;
- customer satisfaction with the One Stop Shop remained high;
- the MJ Award winning MyHarrow Account continued to grow;
- the Shared Legal Practice was in place.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services added that without the Council's Transformation programme in place, it would not have been possible to meet the MTFS targets. He added that the Mobile and Flexible Working implementation continued to progress, the Modernising of Terms and Conditions of Employment proposals had received the approval of staff. Equality Objectives adopted during 2012 continued to help measure progress by the use of data collected for scorecards.

In conclusion, the Portfolio Holder stated that, overall, the Council was performing well whilst facing significant financial challenges.

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

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

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** None.

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

#### **488. Local HealthWatch**

An officer introduced the joint report of the Assistant Chief Executive and the Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing, which explained that the Local Healthwatch would be the new local health and social care watchdog that would represent the views of local residents of all ages,

advocating and influencing the delivery and commissioning of health and social care services on their behalf.

Cabinet was informed that, under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, the Council had a duty to commission a fully operational Local Healthwatch by April 2013. National guidance specified the key functions that a Local Healthwatch must deliver, but left the local specification up to local authorities to determine the best model to meet the needs of their local residents.

The officer explained the current situation and how complaints advocacy could be shaped in various ways, including buying into a pan-London concept. He added that a decision in this regard would need to be taken during September as a result of which a delegation was being sought from Cabinet.

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing stated that the success of Healthwatch was important and the contribution from the community was an important factor to its success.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services added that the consultation had been wide. In terms of how complaints advocacy was delivered a balancing act would need to be struck, as delivering an individual borough service could be costly. It was important that Healthwatch was run by local groups.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the proposals for Healthwatch nationally be noted;
- (2) the progress made at the local level to set up Local Healthwatch in Harrow be noted;
- (3) a contract be awarded for a 2-year period to commence on 1 April 2013 at a cost within the funding for Local Healthwatch provided by the Department of Health;
- (4) the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised to determine the procurement process for advocacy services in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing and Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services;
- (5) the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised to award the contract in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing and Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services;
- (6) 10% of the Department of Health Grant be retained to fund the additional Council responsibilities associated with Local Healthwatch.

**Reason for Decision:** The meet the Council's legal obligations for the tender process for a local Healthwatch.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report.

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

#### **489. Award of Corporate Bailiff Contract**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance introduced the report, which set out the outcome following a recent tendering exercise for a bailiff contract. He added that terms of the contract would provide support to the vulnerable and encapsulated the recommendations of the Debt Recovery Scrutiny Review Group.

Cabinet also considered a confidential appendix and

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) as a result of the evaluation of the tendering exercise, the contract be awarded to Newlyn plc and Chandlers Limited;
- (2) it be noted that there were no other tenderers;
- (3) it be noted that there would be a 10-day cooling off period following the decision before the agreements were formally fully signed;
- (4) the Director of Legal and Governance Services be authorised to sign the contracts on behalf of the Council;
- (5) it be noted that the ongoing management of the contract was delegated, under existing authorities, to the Divisional Director of Collections and Housing Benefits within the Resources Directorate.

**Reason for Decision:** To obtain approval to enter into a contract for an initial 3 years and with an extension for up to 5 years depending on performance.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** None.

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

#### **490. Commissioning and Integrated Planning Report 2013/14 to 2016/17**

Cabinet received a joint report of the Corporate Director of Resources and the Assistant Chief Executive, which set out the framework for the development of the new Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2013-14 to 2016-17, in line with the Council's strategy to utilise a greater commissioning approach in making future service decisions.

The Portfolio Holders for Finance; Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services and Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing set out the national context and the challenges facing the Council, as follows:

- budget cuts by central government were putting pressures on Councils;
- cuts in benefits could result in a significant increase in homelessness which would put pressures on the Council's own budgets. That, whilst the homelessness figures were currently low due to innovative ideas, the long term prospects would be challenging;
- that, in order to reduce costs and pressures on the budget, Harrow Council was exploring the sharing of services amongst boroughs, including collaboration, together with different ways of delivering services which were outcome based and implementing a commercial approach to help drive down costs whilst raising revenue;
- people were living longer and there would be more pressures on the Council to meet their needs;
- changes in welfare benefits and employment law would impact on the Councils adversely;
- that Harrow would be hosting the Shared Public Health Service with Barnet Council with the Director of Public Health being employed by the Harrow Council.

**RESOLVED:** That the timetable at appendix 1 to the report be noted and the strategy for closing future funding gaps at appendix 2 be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To promote effective medium to long term planning.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** None.

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

#### **491. Revenue and Capital Monitoring for Quarter 1 as at 30 June 2012**

Cabinet received a report of the Corporate Director of Resources setting out the Council's revenue and capital monitoring position as at 30 June 2012.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance referred to a small forecast overspend in the revenue budget but was confident that this would be managed in-year. He was pleased to report that, following Council decision to change the Council's Counterparty Policy in February 2012, an additional income of £180k had been generated.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the Revenue and Capital forecast outturn position at end of June 2012 be noted;
- (2) the virement detailed in paragraph 32 of the report be approved;

- (3) the changes to the Capital Programme, set out in paragraph 34, be approved.

**Reason for Decision:** To approve the forecast financial position and actions required to be taken.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** None.

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

#### **492. Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation**

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing introduced the report, proposing a review of six residential care services for people with learning disabilities provided by the Council. She added that the report contained proposals for the model of care and support that was needed in the future, ensuring that local needs are met in the most effective way possible. The aim was to deliver a modernised service that offered improved outcomes and provided value for money, including savings.

The Portfolio Holder added that the proposals would form one part of an emerging Community Living Strategy and would link together a range of support and accommodation services designed to support adults with social care needs to live independently within the community. She added that the Review would focus on the most vulnerable in the community with a view to providing care and support to allow them to live independently, whilst achieving savings for the Council.

Cabinet was informed that consultation would be wide and would include staff and unions. The purpose was to ensure a better service delivery model for all those with learning difficulties.

Cabinet also considered a confidential appendix and

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the development of a Model for Care and Support within the residential care homes provided by the borough be approved with the Model focusing on providing high quality, individually tailored support to service users who are most vulnerable;
- (2) it be noted that through the development and implementation of this new Service Model the Council expects to achieve between £600k and £1m towards the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) savings of £2.25m from residential services;
- (3) a formal consultation exercise be carried out on service proposals with current service users, their families and potential users of services, for example, young people and their families in transition from children to adult services;

- (4) staff and unions be consulted on the proposals for each service;
- (5) the Corporate Director for Community Health and Wellbeing be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing to:
  - design and implement the consultation plan for residents, families, staff and unions
  - undertake more detailed work to fully develop the Model of Respite Care to ensure that it has the most positive impact
  - prepare a final report with the results of the consultation and detailed recommendations for consideration by Cabinet in February 2013.

**Reason for Decision:** To develop a new model for in-house care and support for people with learning disabilities that would:

- enable local residential service provision for adults with learning disabilities that responded to current and future demand for specialist residential services
- contribute to the achievement of MTFS savings of £2.275m in relation to residential care
- ensure that meaningful consultation was carried out prior to the reconfiguration of in-house residential services
- consider whether there were any residents who may be supported to live more independently.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report.

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

#### **493. Voluntary Sector Commissioning: Outcome Based Grants 2013/16**

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services introduced the report, which set out the new application process for the distribution of Council grant funding, previously the Main Grants Programme, to Voluntary Sector organisations during 2013/14 and future years.

The Portfolio Holder added that the core outcomes had been developed corporately, based on assessment of activity, consultation, equalities impacts and needs analysis. The outcomes selected for the Outcome Based Grants process had been consulted on and reflected the types of services that had traditionally been funded through the Main Grants Programme. The Council

also proposed to continue to offer an annual small grants scheme for smaller organisations. The application processes and timetable for both schemes were based on the existing application process, incorporating feedback from consultations. Information sessions, and other support for organisations would be offered in the application process, including an appeals process for both funding streams.

Feedback from the voluntary sector indicated an ongoing need for support with fundraising, capacity building and recruitment of volunteers. An interim support service had been in place since October 2011 and those services had been monitored by an Interim Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) Board. The Board consisted of both Council and voluntary sector representatives. The Board had developed a draft specification for a new, permanent service. To support the development of this new service it was proposed that £75,000 of the budget in 2013/14 be ringfenced to fund any proposals that were received from local groups wishing to provide this service. In addition the Council would be working separately with the voluntary sector in Harrow to determine the kind of support that was required and the skills that could be developed to deliver this, using local resources.

The Portfolio Holder added that the aim of the Outcome Based Grants and small grants report was to ensure that organisations delivered services that the Council had identified as a priority, that local organisations were offered sustainability and smaller organisations supported. He was of the view that this process would have a positive impact on equalities, in terms of providing an improved funding model to support the diverse voluntary and community sector in Harrow to deliver to the needs of its diverse communities.

In summing up, the Portfolio Holder referred to the tabled recommendation from the Grant Advisory Panel meeting held on 11 September and undertook to take into account the recommendations on the assessment process. He moved an amendment to the recommendation to Cabinet and it was

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the proposed Outcome Based Grant funding principles, application and administration process for 2013/14 and future years, as outlined in paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.4 to 2.2.9, of the report be approved;
- (2) the ring-fencing of £75,000 of the grants budget in 2013/14 to support the development of a new infrastructure support service for voluntary organisations, as outlined in paragraph 2.2.8 of the report, be approved;
- (3) the Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services, take into consideration the tabled recommendation from the Grants Advisory Panel meeting held on 11 September 2012 and be authorised to administer the process and determine final allocations between the Outcomes Based Grants and Small Grants Programmes, as outlined above and in paragraph 2.9.2 of the report.

**Reason for Decision:** To distribute Council grant funding to Voluntary Sector organisations in 2013/14 and future years.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report. Option 1 was rejected.

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

#### **494. Restructure of the Sheltered Housing Service**

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report, which proposed a restructure of the Sheltered Housing Service.

The Portfolio Holder added that providing support and housing management services enabled Sheltered Housing tenants to live independently in their own homes. The process also helped improve and maintain their quality of life and the proposals were intended to improve support for the vulnerable and their lives by giving choice and control in the services they used. The proposals would also help achieve savings.

Members were briefed of the current situation and informed that retaining the status quo was not an option. A restructured service would provide flexibility and enhance service provision. Moreover, resident and non-resident wardens worked to different job descriptions and were on different pay scales. It was essential that the Service was restructured due to a reduction in the grant received with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) having to meet any shortfall.

The Portfolio Holder added that the proposals would address various issues, such as staff working in isolation by the creation of a central hub, tenants feeling vulnerable when staff were on vacation. He referred to a transition period and a further 12 month review to enable the Council to review any operational arrangements. Moreover, he acknowledged the changes in welfare benefits which would also impact on the Council but the service charge proposed as part of the proposals was considered to be fair and would withstand scrutiny.

The Corporate Director of Community, Health and Wellbeing acknowledged that the proposal would result in major changes for the wardens and it was important that staff were supported and organisational change was managed.

**RESOLVED:** That Cabinet supports and approves the proposed restructure, which included the following key changes:

- (1) a move away from one designated Warden per Scheme, which includes removal of the remaining 5 resident warden posts;
- (2) fund enhanced Housing Management Services through a service charge.

**Reason for Decision:** To improve service delivery and facilitate a reduction in Supporting People funding over the next 3 years (to deliver a £200,000 in savings to Adults as set out in the MTFs).

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report. Option of retaining the status quo was rejected.

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

#### **495. Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case**

The Divisional Director of Environmental Services introduced the report, which set out a summary of the full business case developed for the Public Realm Integrated Services Management (PRISM) transformation project intended to change the arrangements for service delivery in the Environment Division of the Directorate of Environment and Enterprise. The proposals would also achieve savings for 2013/14 previously identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Cabinet also considered a confidential appendix setting out the full business case for the proposals.

The Divisional Director added that the proposals, if approved, would entail an increased use of new technology which would also help ensure a greater presence and visibility on the borough's streets, reduce the number of staff employed although front line service would be protected, and a different way of working.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise, corrected the reference to the Trading Standards service in paragraph 7 on page 459 of the agenda. The service was described as outsourced to Brent, but it was in fact a formal partnership between Harrow and Brent Councils, hosted by Brent. The Portfolio Holder asked how the project impacted on Service Standards.

The Divisional Director acknowledged the correction made and, in relation to the question, replied that the project protected current Service Standards and would introduce greater efficiency and performance management, thereby improving value for money.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the implementation of the Transformation Project for the Public Realm Integrated Services Model, as set out in the Full Business Case, be agreed;
- (2) the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise, in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, take the necessary actions to implement the Project.

**Reason for Decision:** To achieve the savings targets agreed previously in the MTFs and transform the services covered by the Project.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in appendix 2 of the officer report.

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

**496. Proposed Letting of Community Resource Centre - 27 Northolt Road**

The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts introduced the report, which sets out proposals and terms for leasing Community Resource Centre at 27 Northolt Road to Carramea. He thanked the work done by the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services in bringing the proposal to fruition and stated that the proposals would ensure that the property remained available to community organisations and the cost to the Council would reduce.

**RESOLVED:** That Corporate Director Place Shaping, in conjunction with the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts, be authorised to approve the leasing of the Community Resource Centre at 27 Northolt Road to Carramea on the terms outlined in paragraph 14 of the report together with any other terms considered appropriate.

**Reason for Decision:** To permit the continued operation of Community Resource Centre at 27 Northolt Road as a Community Premises.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer report. Option 1 was rejected.

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

**497. Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation**

**RESOLVED:** That appendix 3 be noted.

**Reason for Decision:** To allow the appendix to be considered in conjunction with the main report at agenda item 14.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out under item 14.

**Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member / Dispensation granted:** As set out under item 14.

**498. Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case**

**RESOLVED:** That appendix 2 be noted.

**Reason for Decision:** To allow the appendix to be considered in conjunction with the main report at agenda item 17.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out under item 17.

**Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member / Dispensation granted:** As set out under item 17.

**499. Award of Corporate Bailiff Contract**

**RESOLVED:** That appendix A be noted.

**Reason for Decision:** To allow the appendix to be considered in conjunction with the main report at agenda item 11.

**Alternative Options considered and rejected:** As set out under item 11.

**Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member / Dispensation granted:** As set out under item 11

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR THAYA IDAIKKADAR  
Chairman