

## Amendment for Motion (1) – Fair Deal Motion

To amend as below:

“This Council believes that there is room for a sensible debate on the amount of grant funding Harrow receives. It notes that Harrow receives around £450 less per-resident than the outer London average.

This Council does not believe, however, that talking Harrow down and comparing it with boroughs which suffer far more deprivation is the best strategy in arguing for more funding. When other outer London boroughs such as Merton have similar levels of deprivation to Harrow – while also receiving nearly £50 grant per-resident less – it is disingenuous to compare Harrow with Brent, which is the 24<sup>th</sup> most deprived local government area nationally.

Additionally, this Council notes that it is much harder to make the case to the Government that Harrow needs more funding after the Council’s administration turned down nearly £1 million to assist in freezing council tax, and over £300,000 to assist with the localisation of council tax benefit.

This Council therefore believes that representations made to the Government regarding Harrow’s grant funding should be logical and reasonable in both ambition and approach.

This Council resolves the following:

1. That representations be made to relevant government Ministers and officials to bring this matter to the attention of those in positions of decision making.
2. That Officers are instructed to examine the formula that is used for the funding calculation and to identify parameters that could be considered to unfairly weigh against the interests of the Borough.
3. That Officers are instructed to consult the results of the 2011 census and to establish, where possible, a basis for appeal to the government on grounds of the population characteristics and diversity of the Borough having regard to the characteristics of other comparable Boroughs.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition

## Amendment for Motion (2) – Police Service Motion

To amend as below:

“This Council believes that the safety and security of Londoners, including the residents of Harrow, is being put at risk as a result of cuts to police service being pushed through by the London’s Mayor and the Coalition Government and therefore calls upon the Mayor of London to publicise more vigorously that closing rarely-visited police stations and counters, the disposal of surplus police properties and reducing high-paid managers will not only release more officers to patrol our streets but also will enable the Met Police to recruit extra officers over and above the increases secured so far.

The Council believes that the unprecedented cuts are going too far and too fast and that these cuts to the budget of the Metropolitan Police Service will inevitably endanger families and communities across London and Harrow and that, to counter this false belief, the Mayor must do more to explain the positive impact on police numbers and crime levels that these changes will bring about. This council believes that the cuts are being carried out without consideration of the impact on Londoners’ safety and that the Mayor could do more to explain how public safety will be improved by more police patrolling than sitting behind desks.

Most inadequate and sham of a consultation undertaken in Harrow by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) has raised more questions than answered, not least why the MP for Harrow West left halfway through the MOPAC consultation held in Harrow. We have serious concerns about the Mayor’s proposed ‘New Policing Model’ for London and its impact on Harrow and raise the following issues:

1. Reduction of Police: There will be loss of 17 police officers as compared to police officers in the year 2010 (Reduction from 402 to 385).
2. Scrapping of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs): Replacing the current dedicated SNT of six in each and every ward of Harrow with only one Police Constable will see the end of the current successful ward-wide policing and leave the local areas exposed to more crime and increase the fear of crime – something not helped by this council’s decision to reduce funding of the town centre policing team.
3. Base Stations for SNTs: We are concerned that no assurance is given that these will not be closed.
4. Closure of Police Stations and Front Counters: We oppose the plans to close the police stations at Pinner and Wealdstone and oppose the loss of police facilities at the Harrow Civic Centre. The Mayor has promised new and better front counters before closing the police stations but we have not seen any evidence of this for any of our areas in Harrow.
5. Closure of Custody Suites: We are concerned that MOPAC has not yet finally confirmed the future of Harrow’s custody suites which are planned for closure. We are opposed to any such closure as we do not believe that the alternative of Kilburn is a viable one.

[This Council is additionally appalled by the decision of the Council’s administration to cut the size of the Council-funded police team, while refusing to take up an offer from the MPA/MOPAC which would have allowed it to be increased in size while still saving money.](#)

[This Council also notes the various public comments from the new councillor for West Harrow regarding police numbers, and therefore encourages and invites her to add her voice to the campaign against the police cuts made by the Council’s administration.](#)

This Council challenges the Mayor’s position that the scale of the cuts are necessary and acceptable. This council calls on the Chief Executive of Harrow Council to respond to MOPAC’s consultation and oppose the Mayor’s planned changes for policing of Harrow, as well as to note how this council has already cut its local funding for policing in Harrow, whilst, under the Mayor of London’s plans, police numbers would rise. The Council also calls upon Harrow’s MPs and Harrow’s Assembly Member to oppose the Mayor’s plans and draconian cuts in policing, except in so far as they will reduce crime and the fear of crime in Harrow.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition

## **Amendment for Motion (5) – Indian Rape Victim / Violence Against Women Motion**

To amend the motion as below:

“The recent rape case leading to the murder of Jyoti in New Delhi was a deeply distressing event.

This incident brought into focus the amount of violence perpetuated towards women and lack of value and respect accorded to numerous women around the world, for example:

- Malala was shot in Pakistan for trying to promote education amongst girls.
- In England, a woman giving evidence against a rapist taking her own life during the trial.

These incidents are all linked together with the number of female foetuses aborted in India and perhaps in this country too. According to some estimates 50 million females are missing in India causing gender imbalance.

This Council also believes that, as community leaders and local representatives, councillors have a responsibility to speak out against and tackle the issue of violence against women closer to home. This includes, but is not limited to, the issue of domestic violence, which affects the whole of society – with over a million women in the UK each year suffering abuse, and with the highest repeat victimisation rate of any crime.

The Council resolves to:

Do more than simply pass Council motions in response to national and international instances of violence against women, and to adopt a formal commitment to promote prevention events and to raise awareness of the issue. This Council can do more than simply express distress; it can take action, and stand alongside those women who have been and are continuing to be victims of violence.

Take this opportunity to write to the outgoing Borough Commander Chief Superintendent Dal Babu thanking him for implementing a Zero Tolerance policy towards Violence Against Women & Girls during his term of office.

The Council further reiterates its support to all Women’s Organisations in the borough especially as we approach International Women’s Day/Month in March.”

Proposed by:

Cllr. Susan Hall  
Leader of the Opposition

Seconded by:

Cllr. Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
Deputy Leader of the Opposition