

Lesley Clarke,
Organisational Development Manager,
HRD Department, 3rd Floor South Wing,
Civic 1, Civic Centre,
Station Road,
Harrow,
Middlesex,

2nd January 2014

Dear Lesley,

Re: Modernisation of Terms and Conditions-Collective Agreement

Harrow Unison LG formally responds to your reply dated 23rd December 2013, which is factually inaccurate.

The first case which you briefly refer to is not the case, allow this union to elaborate. The individual in question was as you state not at risk, however the HRD department attempted to provide this individual with a 'bumped' status, which of course was progressed to such a position that his role was openly advertised to PRS supervisors who were unsuccessful in their interview process. This was advertised by Environmental service managers in order that the said individual would leave Harrow by reasons of a bumped redundancy. Unison directly intervened to stop this unnecessary cost being levied against the Council; this of course identifies a benefit not available to any other employee in this project. The question this Union poses is why an HRD business partner progressed and supported this process to the benefit of one person?

One is a lonely number, join UNISON and you're one in a million.....
Harrow UNISON:

The second case, which has not factored into your reply is even-more concerning. The said employee was not in receipt of an 'at risk' notice yet was able to gain VR and has now duly left the council. Unison has to question why employees are acting up into the deleted position of Operations Manager PRS and receiving salaries for this deleted post at G10, this situation suggests that the early release of a post holder simply cannot be justified. The other factor was that this redundancy application was progressed throughout the pause enacted by the CEO.

Let's turn our attention to the sub-group of the Early Retirement sub- committee; this group should be consistent in their application of process which is farcical when viewing previous applications. Let's look at the ORG review 2006 which saw an employee leave this council on an agreed application of redundancy by this group, at the cost of approximately £63,000 only to return to the councils employ 31 days later in a permanent position. This is in total contravention of employment policy Ref:3.39 section 2.1.3. Do you not think this is highly suspicious when considering that all employment practices should be robust?

The attempted diversion to debate this at DJC which factors in your reply simply cannot be reasonably justified. Especially when considering that redundancy applications are council wide and not solely a directorate issue. Redundancy is a primary function and not as the HRD department stipulate a secondary function which factored highly in Ms Jerath's response of following the PMOC which as you are fully aware is the secondary function.

The challenge under section 6, by this Union supported by the GMB is both reasonable and justified when considering the evidence presented in Unisons submission. The council cannot continue to dictate whether a challenge is reasonable when processes are seemingly manipulated to benefit select employees. It is also evident that consistent and robust processes are non-existent within this council; Unison can provide many examples of poor practice, this is further supported and identifiable within the councils equalities report.

Finally, and akin to the same theme is the previous Head of Public Realm services, who failed to secure a new role within the Councils employ, but surprisingly a new role suddenly manifested itself to which this individual was matched. This new role never factored in the new structure nor was it advertised to any other council employee. It just appeared miraculously at the same time that this individual was due to go. What a strange coincidence. Employed on the same remuneration package and in a new role that nobody seems to know much about??? Robust and fair employment practices we think not. It is evident by this one example alone that the council is making up the rules as they go along.

One is a lonely number, join UNISON and you're one in a million.....
Harrow UNISON: An award winning Branch

What do you think that any external independent body would make of these unusual and grossly unfair practices that do not even come close to the employment laws identified on all council employment policies.

A further strange aspect to your reply is who actually authored the response?

On Page 2 it is signed off by both you and Jon Turner?

Perhaps this somewhat unique double signoff process is designed reduce responsibility for some of the worst employment practices that exist within the UK?

It is now evident that a balanced, fair and proportionate relationship with the Trade Unions does not exist, due to the fact that the employer seeks to gain or have an advantage over a body that fully complies with the Law. Or may I quote Stanley Baldwin **"If employers had acted fairly at the start then Trade Unions would cease to exist"** How true this is.

Yours sincerely,



Gary Martin.
Branch Secretary
Harrow Unison LG Branch

- C.C. John Noblemunn, Regional Officer Unison
- C.C. Steve Sweeney, Regional Officer GMB
- C.C. Cllr Susan Hall, Leader of the Council
- C.C. Cllr Paul Osborn, Portfolio Holder
- C.C. David Perry, Labour Group Leader
- C.C. Chris Noyce, Leader of the Liberal Democrats
- C.C. James Bond, Leader of the Independent Group
- C.C. Thaya Idaikkadar, Leader of the ILG
- C.C. Paul Najsarek, Acting Head of Paid Services
- C.C. Tom Whiting, Corporate Director Resources
- C.C. Jon Turner, Divisional Director of HRD & Shared Services

One is a lonely number, join UNISON and you're one in a million.....
Harrow UNISON: An award winning Branch