

2005 – 2006
December 2005 Volume 7



**CABINET
AND
COUNCIL
MINUTES**

CABINET AND COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

VOLUME 7: DECEMBER 2005

CONTENTS

Meeting

Date 2005

COUNCIL AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL <i>(See Notes 1 & 2)</i>	22 September
JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL <i>(See Note 1)</i>	14 December
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)	6 December
Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Special)	5 December
Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee	13 December
STANDARDS COMMITTEE	6 December
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE	7 December
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)	19 December
STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	8 December
Licensing Panel	8 December
Licensing Panel	19 December
Licensing Panel	20 December
Social Services Appeals Panel	15 December
Early Retirement Sub-Committee	22 December

Meeting

Date 2005

THE CABINET, ADVISORY PANELS AND CONSULTATIVE FORUMS

CABINET

15 December

HOST Project Panel

1 December

Town Centre Project Panel

8 December

Strategic Planning Advisory Panel

1 December

Grants Advisory Panel

5 December

Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel

13 December

* *Notes: (1) Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the scrutiny of the redevelopment of Northwick Park Hospital, established under the statutory provisions of the Health and Social Care Act 2001: Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002;*

(2) the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2005 were inadvertently omitted from the September Minute Volume (Minute Volume 4, 2005-2006) and are therefore included in this Volume.

COUNCIL
AND
COUNCIL
COMMITTEES

JOINT OVERVIEW
AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE

JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL RECONFIGURATION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2005 AT 7.30 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC CENTRE, HARROW, MIDDLESEX

Members Present

Councillor Howard Bluston, Chair (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Myra Michael (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Simon Woodroofe (London Borough of Ealing)
Councillor Mary Farrell (London Borough of Brent)

Reserve Members:

Councillor Vina Mithani (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Rekha Shah (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Richard Porter (London Borough of Ealing)

Observing:

Councillor Eric Silver (London Borough of Harrow)

Also Present

Lynne McAdam (Scrutiny Service Manager, London Borough of Harrow)
Barbara Gill (Acting Director of Strategy, North West London Strategic Health Authority)
Nick Hulme (Director of Operations, North West London Hospitals NHS Trust)
Anne Landau (Local Liaison Committee, Northwick Park & St Marks)
Nahreen Matlib (Senior Scrutiny Officer, London Borough of Harrow)
Betty Mdoe (Scrutiny Administrator, London Borough of Harrow)
Dhara Vyas (Policy and Performance Officer, London Borough of Brent)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Fiegel (London Borough of Brent), Cllr Mrs Ware (London Borough of Ealing), Mr Nigel Spalding (London Borough of Ealing).

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2. Cllr Vina Mithani – Health Protection Agency.
3. Cllr Eric Silver declared he is a pharmacist contractor for the London Borough of Harrow, Primary CareTrust.
4. Cllr Howard Bluston declared he is Chair of the Health and Social Care Committee, London Borough of Harrow, and also on the Development Control Committee considering the Hospital's Planning application.
5. Cllr Simon Woodroofe declared he is Chair of the Health and Social Care Panel, London Borough of Ealing.

6. Cllr Myra Michael declared that her husband was a member of the Board on the Paul Strickland Scanner.
7. Cllr. Mary Farrell declared that she is Chair of the Health Overview Panel, London Borough of Brent.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE AGENDA

8. There were no changes to the arrangement of the agenda.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2005

9. The minutes were agreed as a correct record, to be signed by the Chairman.

INFORMATION FROM NORTH WEST LONDON STRATEGIC HEALTH AUTHORITY

10. The Chairman welcomed Barbara Gill to the meeting.
11. Ms Gill had attended the JOSC meeting on 26 July 2005 to give the background to the strategic plan, 'Our Healthy Future' and was attending this meeting to inform members of the process and to hear their views. The papers 'The Case for Change' (Paper A) and 'Principles of the Review of Health Services in North West London' (Paper B), circulated to the Committee, were the basis for discussion and members' views would be recorded.
12. Ms Gill outlined the objectives, principles and success criteria and invited members' comments. With regard to the timescale, she said that informal consultation would be carried out throughout the process. In November a broad scenario would be known, with options still available on how health care in North West London would look. Formal consultations would be held post May 2006. Redevelopment plans for Northwick Park Hospital had been put on hold because of this process. However it was possible, depending on the progress of the process, that this could be moved forward. The SHA was seeking to develop a broad framework for future developments but consultations would be held around local issues.
13. On the question of the case for change, Ms Gill said there was considerable scope to provide services locally. Many services being provided in acute hospitals could be placed in more local settings, particularly in the light of changes in technology. Some services were badly located to work together at their optimum. Problems with real estate needed to be addressed.
14. Ms Gill said that the SHA was aware that services were not operating as efficiently as possible, for example length of stay was considerably higher than the national average. This was good for neither patients nor services. Improving quality of care and efficiency would reduce costs. The major financial problems of the sector had to be addressed. The expectations of a changing population had to be met. There were underlying fundamental problems. A more sensible arrangement of services would ensure services were not competing with each other.
15. Commenting on the case for change, Cllr Silver said that it would be unfair for some services to be left with the Local Authority because of the SHA's overspend. Ms Gill acknowledged that this was an important issue. There was currently a major initiative in the NHS for PCTs to divest themselves of provider services. This would have to be

planned and managed very carefully. Cllr Silver stressed that it would be important to give early consideration to this to ensure problems did not develop.

16. Cllr Michael thought that extra money would be needed to provide this change. Sufficient resources should be put into the care of patients, not administration.
17. Cllr Mithani queried whether services would be centralised. Ms Gill said that specialist services were currently in three or four locations. In some areas services needed to be kept together for clinical reasons, so that they worked well together. These issues had been discussed with the specialists so that it was understood what they needed to function at their best.
18. Ms Gill went on to outline the overall goal and objectives of the Strategy. It was essential to create a patient centred service, taking into account patient pathways of care. It had to address the real health needs of the population; identify the optimal configuration of facilities; create a planning framework for local services. There were recruitment and retention issues in some areas. A plurality of providers (including the voluntary and private sectors) was needed to give patients more choice. Research and clinical services would require organisational redevelopment.
19. Principles and success criteria had been identified. A high quality service had to meet agreed standards and national guidance, achieve good patient outcomes, be valued by patients and staff, be local and convenient across the area, provide a sufficient volume of care, meeting waiting time targets. A greater emphasis should be placed on prevention and promoting healthy life styles. Fit for purpose accommodation meeting design standards was needed. The services must be affordable. Financial balance was essential. In the areas of education and training, services must be accredited and training provided. Ms Gill invited the Committee's views.
20. Cllr Woodroffe welcomed these proposals but queried how they would be implemented and the financial pressures. Ms Gill advised that many costs arose from inefficient services. Focussing on getting the quality right would reduce these costs. Some services would be provided locally, some at secondary or tertiary levels but it was important to ensure they worked efficiently. Investment would need to be made in primary care to a level which ensured it functioned well.
21. Cllr Bluston reminded members and Ms Gill that the JOSc had been formed because of the pending redevelopment of Northwick Park Hospital and following the demise of the Paddington Basin project. He queried how these resources would be utilised taking into account the current deficit. It would be necessary to know the outcome of meetings at Board and chief executive level over the next few months.
22. Ms Gill advised that the Sector Strategy was at the top of the agenda. The October Board meeting of the Health Authority would consider lessons to be learned from the Paddington Basin project. A broad framework would be presented by end of November and outside views would be sought. The JOSc had been very helpful in enabling liaison with three local councils. The SHA also wanted to speak to community groups and local PCTs in order to engender as much discussion as possible.
23. Cllr Farrell agreed that a broad framework was needed. However she was concerned that public health should be much higher on the agenda and should be considered with a long-term view. She felt the emphasis was on secondary care rather than primary care but both were intertwined.

24. Cllr Michael thought that planning had moved away from 'big is best'. More emphasis had to be placed on primary care issues, such as recruitment and retention, in the plan. primary care was best placed to look at prevention of illness.
25. Ms Gill confirmed that public health was being taken into account. Plans were in hand to consider prevalence rates, populations, and uptakes. She acknowledged that secondary and tertiary care had been considered before primary care because these had been seen as the areas in particular need of being addressed. However primary care services would now be looked at in a more robust way.
26. Cllr Farrell expressed concern that November was an optimistic timetable for even a broad brush plan for secondary and tertiary care. More time was needed in order to give equal weighting to public health, primary care, and secondary and tertiary care. Ms Gill recognised that the timetable was tight. However proposals at the end of November would be very much broad brush and for consultation with local NHS, the public and patients in order to help translate into specific local plans.
27. In response to the Chairman's query on the timetable of future meetings, Ms Gill advised that it would be helpful to meet with the JO SC in mid December.
28. Cllr Bluston queried whether there would sufficient information as to final outcomes by end of November for the JO SC to consider. He also asked whether planning applications for Northwick Park Hospital would be amended in the light of the SHA's input. Ms Gill assured the Committee that it would have ample material to consider in December and would welcome its contributions.
29. Ms Gill accepted that the time scale was tight but emphasised that November was one stage in the process and the JO SC would be involved at each stage. The points raised on primary care would be taken on board. A more flexible and more local service was envisaged, taking into account population growth and changes.
30. Cllr Woodroffe stressed that the Committee had been set up to consider Northwick Park Hospital and asked when the SHA would have concrete proposals. Ms Gill assured the JO SC that the sector review would not hold back the NPH redevelopment plans that there would be concrete options and implications for all services across the sector available for the JO SC to consider in December.
31. Cllr Silver asked Ms Gill how the SHA's deficit would be cleared. Ms Gill said that the SHA was implementing an agenda to improve efficiencies in the short term but the Sector Strategy felt that problems would be solved in the longer term only by fundamental reconfiguration.
32. Cllr Farrell was concerned that the focus on NPH overspend would leave the public health and primary care agendas with insufficient weighting. One of the key weaknesses in the past was a lack of integration between NPH and the primary care sector. Ms Gill stressed that the strategy was looking at all service delivery in the area and seeking to integrate services.
33. Cllr Bluston drew attention to the need to liaise with other Health Authorities to exchange information. On the question of staffing, it was necessary to be competitive to keep or replace staff.
34. The Chairman thanked Ms Gill for attending the meeting. The Committee agreed to meet mid December to consider the SHA's framework.

INFORMATION FROM 'BETTER CARE WITHOUT DELAY' PROGRAMME BOARD

35. Nick Hulme presented the Finance Report (Paper C) and an update on the present position of the BCWD programme. It was the Board's intention to still hold a three-month consultation and present an outline business case in March 2006. In the meantime, detailed work was being done on the clinical strategy and a revised version would be sent to the JOSOC in the following six to eight weeks. Investment in primary care was essential.
36. Cllr Farrell was concerned that sufficient resources were not put into primary care.
37. Mr Hulme stressed that the strategy would not restrict what was happening at local level. There was a need to provide a variety of options for patients. Inpatient length of stay, diagnostics, and theatre utilisation were all being looked into. All proposals would go into the consultation paper in November.
38. Cllr Bluston drew attention to current areas of concern in hospital. Improvements had to be made in the present, resources had to be managed and future plans developed. Mr Hulme acknowledged that a huge task had been set but there was a lot of commitment within the organisation to make the hospital the best in the country.
39. Cllr Michael expressed concern that diagnosis was being held up and therefore treatment delayed. Mr Hulme advised that this had arisen from GP referral to scanner or specialist. 100% of patients start first treatment within 62 days.
40. A&E at NPH has the highest attendance in the country, following demographic changes. Cllr Michael queried whether awareness of other available services might improve this. She feared another crisis with the lack of money. It would also be demoralising for staff working in an organisation skimping to save money.
41. Mr Hulme stated that economies ensure patient do not stay one night longer than necessary. Waiting times have been reduced. Dealing with the day job informs strategic thinking. Walk-in centres could reduce attendance at A&E.
42. Cllr Mithani raised the question on non-attendance for appointments. Mr Hulme advised that waiting lists had been reduced, making it less likely that patients would forget or not attend their appointments. A new system of patients choosing and booking appointment dates had brought about improvements.
43. Cllr Silver asked whether the NHS Direct service is being used rather than call out GPs. Mr Hulme said that a leaflet was being produced to inform people of options
44. The Chairman thanked Mr Hulme for attending the meeting.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE REGARDING THE COMMITTEE'S FUTURE STATUS

45. It was agreed to hold a meeting on Wednesday 14 December 2005 with the proviso that information would be available from the SHA for the Committee's consideration. It was agreed that the Chairman would write to Mary Wells asking for clarification on the timescale, and the scope of the consultation.
46. The Committee adopted option 1: Continue but work on an amended programme.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

47. The Chairman thanked Cllr Fiegel and all members present at the last meeting held on 26 July for their work in his absence.

The meeting ended at 9:15 p.m.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

48. Wednesday 14th December, 7:30 p.m. Harrow Civic Centre.

JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL RECONFIGURATION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14TH DECEMBER 2005 AT 7.30 P.M. IN COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 AND 2, HARROW CIVIC CENTRE, HARROW, MIDDLESEX

Members Present:

Councillor Howard Bluston, Chair (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Gideon Fiegel (London Borough of Brent)
Councillor Myra Michael (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Simon Woodroffe (London Borough of Ealing)

Reserve Members:

Councillor Brian Gate (London Borough of Harrow)
Councillor Vina Mithani (London Borough of Harrow)

Observing:

Councillor Eric Silver (London Borough of Harrow)

Also Present:

Jacqueline Casson (Policy and Performance Officer, London Borough of Brent)
Nahreen Matlib (Senior Scrutiny Officer, London Borough of Harrow)
Sir Graham Morgan (Director of Strategy, North West London Hospitals Trust)
Steve Saunders (Director of Strategic Development, North West London Strategic Health Authority)
Nigel Spalding (Scrutiny Officer, London Borough of Ealing)
Dhara Vyas (Policy and Performance Officer, London Borough of Brent)
Mary Wells (Chief Executive, North West London Hospitals Trust)
Alex White (NPSM & BECaD PFI Project Manager, North West London Hospitals Trust)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mary Farrell (London Borough of Brent), Councillor Richard Porter (London Borough of Ealing - observer) and Councillor Mrs Hazel Ware (London Borough of Ealing - reserve).

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2. Councillor Howard Bluston declared he is Chair of the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee, London Borough of Harrow and is also on Harrow Council's Development Control Committee considering the Hospital's Planning application.
3. Councillor Simon Woodroffe declared he is Chair of the Health and Social Care Panel, London Borough of Ealing.
4. Councillor Vina Mithani declared that she works for the Health Protection Agency.
5. Councillor Eric Silver declared he is a pharmacist contractor for Harrow Primary Care Trust.

6. Councillor Myra Michael declared that her husband was a member of the Board on the Paul Strickland Scanner.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE AGENDA

7. It was agreed to consider item 6 before amending the Committee's terms of reference (item 5).

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22ND SEPTEMBER 2005

8. The minutes were agreed as a correct record, to be signed by the Chair and circulated.

OUTCOMES FROM 'OUR HEALTHY FUTURE' STRATEGY REVIEW

9. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for officers from the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) and North West London Hospitals Trust (NWLHT) to update on the Sector Strategy review of healthcare services in North West London.
10. Steve Saunders commented that the strategy review which started in June had completed its first stage of the work. As the work has progressed, the timetable has proved quite challenging. Steve Saunders has met with colleagues at the Department of Health to discuss the impact of the imminent White Paper which is expected at the end of January 2006. The implications of the White Paper are to be incorporated in the SHA's strategy. Therefore it was agreed that the timetable be changed. As a result, the Trust and PCT are planning for consultation on the Northwick Park Hospital (NPH) proposals from June next year.
11. In addition, there will be a six month period of engagement during the latter half of 2006 on the general findings of the overall SHA review, with possible formal public consultation on proposed changes in 2007.
12. The Strategic Health Authority sees Northwick Park Hospital as key to delivering healthcare in North West London in the future, however the current fabric of the building is not appropriate for 21st century standards and therefore redevelopment is needed. As the NPH consultation has been put back to June, this now gives the Trust extended time to develop the scheme.
13. Mary Wells, Chief Executive of NWL Hospitals Trust said that her Trust is happy with the new outline given by the SHA as the original timetable would have been problematic. The Trust now has the time to develop a fuller consultation document which will include greater detail on the delivery of the new care model.
14. Councillor Fiegel commented that he was rather disappointed with the letter from Gareth Goodier (Chief Executive, North West London SHA) that had been tabled at the meeting. He is very well aware that the facilities at Northwick Park Hospital do not lend themselves to the attention of modern care and local residents can suffer. With the imaginative plans to redevelop the hospital, members all wish to deliver modern care. When the consultation on the project starts from next June onwards,

the Committee would need assurances that local people would see improvements by 2007.

15. Steve Saunders commented that changes within the NHS have speeded up quite considerably. The Department of Health is responsible for approving the outline business case and will take the opportunity to ask stringent questions. Therefore the SHA needs to be assured that the plans are robust and fit in with national reforms and local plans. Steve Saunders does understand the frustrations of delay however this delay gives the health organisations a chance to consolidate information from a range of sources. The Committee was assured that the NPH project is definitely going ahead.
16. Graham Morgan said that much of the NHS reforms had focused on the acute sector whereas 90% of public contact is with primary care. The White Paper will take this into account and will also acknowledge the role played by Social Services. Health and social care would be delivered in different ways.
17. Consultation on one Strategic Health Authority to cover the whole of London is underway at the moment and concludes in March 2006. North West London SHA is planning a framework that the London SHA could inherit.
18. When questioned by members, Steve Saunders reported that Barbara Gill has taken a career break from the SHA. Councillor Bluston reported the thanks of the Committee for her helpful input on this project.
19. Councillor Woodroffe commented that there was concern about the costs incurred so far, including the costs arising from postponement of the aborted NPH consultation. Steve Saunders said that the SHA did not believe that money is being wasted. Mary Wells reported that a consultation document had been printed, costing a few hundred pounds. The Trust has continued with the work in the way intended and will make sure that it carries on in the same vein. As this project is very complex, the consultation document can now be a more detailed one. Steve Saunders said that all work done to date would be used to inform the work going forward.
20. Councillor Gate asked how the new building was going to pay for itself in the long term and deliver services. Buildings need a holistic approach so that energy is used and re-used to give back a more sustainable input.
21. Steve Saunders said that overall the NHS has energy and sustainability targets with energy consumption levels laid down to PFI process/standards. Mary Wells said that they were looking at more work being done outside the hospital. Alex White said he was looking at putting together a sustainable energy agenda – a combined heat and power energy sustainability brief within the PFI output specifications. He reported he was looking to network all PFI Directors with good communication and ensure that lessons from previous PFI projects were heeded.
22. Graham Morgan commented on the design of the building. The design should follow the function and not the other way round. The time lag helps with primary and secondary care exploring this together.

23. Steve Saunders commented that acute Trusts will be smaller as modern technology will reduce time that patients spend in hospital.
24. Councillor Silver asked about financing the scheme, especially given the Trusts' current deficit. Steve Saunders said that the Secretary of State had announced a zero tolerance policy for financial deficits. Current spending does not affect the proposed plans as deficits will need to be remedied before the redevelopment of Northwick Park Hospital. Part of the project's work will be to demonstrate if this project is affordable.
25. Mary Wells said that an acute hospital at Northwick Park Hospital site will be required. It will be fit for the purpose intended, but will do slightly less acute work and therefore the new hospital will not be bigger (fewer beds). The hospital will be a resource that offers acute emergency and elective care and treatment in a prompt and appropriate manner.
26. Councillor Woodroffe sought clarification about the public consultation timetable for the Northwick Park Hospital project. Steve Saunders confirmed that the public consultation will start in June next year and run through to September.
27. Councillor Michael asked what the personnel structure was going to look like until the project was completed and reiterated that members are clearly worried about cost implications.
28. Steve Saunders said that the SHA Board had recently considered a report on the lessons learnt from collapse of the Paddington Basin scheme. The SHA will work with Alex White to ensure that the same mistakes are not replicated within the NPH project. The Paddington Basin project was very different to NPH in that more than one trust was involved in the procurement of services. Quite a lot has changed in the way schemes are monitored now. This project has been through one gateway review. There is no doubt that there is going to be a redevelopment of Northwick Park Hospital, being a different facility than what it is today. It will continue to offer the care that it does today.
29. Councillor Bluston asked whether the recent national advertisement for a project director would still be pursued. Mary Wells said that the Trust may not need a Project Director for this project as existing staff have the required skills to oversee the project.
30. Following Councillor Mithani's question, Steve Saunders confirmed that the outline business case would now be presented to the Department of Health in October 2006 and would reflect the outcomes of the public consultation.
31. In response to Councillor Silver's question on marketplace drivers for such schemes, Steve Saunders said that he does not anticipate a problem with funding as bidders are still keen to invest.
32. Graham Morgan commented that the process of clinical care delivery in most areas of the UK is grossly inefficient and that will not change overnight or just because North West London has a new hospital building. However the NPH project does offer plans to address the future delivery of clinical care.

33. Councillor Fiegel mentioned that clinical care has changed considerably in operations and methods. More technology requires more money. How do we plan to organise this? Steve Saunders said that some aspects of medical equipment, e.g. the capacity of medical equipment in what it can do requires more money, i.e. PET Scanners. Graham Morgan mentioned that the development of networks primarily within surgery networks in terms of diagnostics is relatively cheap. With the development of network scanners, there is not the number of people to operate these scanners. Shared diagnostics are achievable by the use of I.T.
34. Councillor Bluston asked what effect the delay had had on staff and also the project costs. Mary Wells said that the ringfenced funding comes direct from the Department of Health and equates to 2% of the overall value of the project for set period of time. The staff at Northwick Park are happy with the new timetable although consultants are the most concerned about the delay. Staff morale is good and staff are enthusiastic and looking to develop new ideas and engage in good care. Staff are aware that this is a long and complex exercise.
35. Alex White said that Brent Council had granted planning permission in principle for the building. There are some issues to resolve with Transport for London.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMMITTEE – TIMESCALES

36. It was noted that the wording on the agenda for item 5 should read "...for a period not exceeding 3rd May 2006" and not "2005".
37. Nigel Spalding explained that the proposed revised wording of the terms of reference had been written at a time when it was expected that the consultation would start in December 2005. Judging by the Committee's discussion and the legal advice received within Harrow and Brent Councils, he suggested that each Council be asked to re-establish the Joint Committee in the new municipal year and make a fresh set of appointments, in readiness for the start of consultation in June 2006 and so that the Committee was in place to consider a draft consultation document prior to the public consultation. By maintaining the Committee until May 2006, the Committee could decide to meet again in this municipal year should developments require this.

The Committee considered and agreed the following resolution:

That the Committee's terms of reference be amended to: "The Committee be extended until 3rd May 2006 and, subject to confirmation by each of the three councils, be re-established with new appointments being made as soon as possible in the new municipal year. And that the Committee recommends accordingly to each Council"

38. Councillor Fiegel noted that some members of the present Committee may not be here post-election to continue its work. It would be advantageous however not to lose the expertise gained to date.
39. Brian Gate commented that the idea of a Joint Committee is a good one and concurred that the handover period for members who do not come back as elected members was critical for continuity purposes. Dhara Vyas said that if members are no longer members of the Committee, the Chair could always welcome comments from the former members.

FUTURE MEETINGS AND WORK PROGRAMME OF THE COMMITTEE (PAPER A)

40. Nahreen Matlib pointed out that this report had been written before the new date for consultation had been confirmed and therefore the dates given within the paper were no longer applicable. She advised that the work programme provided could still form the basis for the Committee's work once it reconvened. The Committee agreed to take forward this work programme. Nahreen Matlib stressed the importance of maintaining the liaison between Harrow, Ealing and Brent boroughs.

The Committee considered and agreed the following resolution:

That the Committee's work programme given in this report is carried forward to when the Committee reconvenes following the recommencement of the public consultation.

41. Dhara Vyas noted that each borough had agreed to use one of its free advisory days provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny to support the Committee's work. However, as these could not be carried over into the next financial year, these would now be used for other purposes within the boroughs.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

42. Councillor Bluston suggested that the Committee issues a Press Statement on the current status of the Committee's work. This is to be circulated to all members and reserve members for their comments.

The Committee considered and agreed the following resolution:

That the Committee issues a press statement to the local press of the three boroughs.

43. Councillor Bluston thanked the committee for all their tremendous support and contribution to this project over the last six months or so. He also expressed his thanks to the Officers, namely Nahreen Matlib, Nigel Spalding and Dhara Vyas and their predecessors who had done absolutely sterling work. He felt the Committee has been organised very well and it is sad that some of the current members would not see the culmination of the project. The Committee hoped that its successors would be just as conscientious.

The meeting finished at 9.40pm.

Councillor Howard Bluston
Chair

OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Jean Lammiman

Councillors: * Blann * Lavingia (4)
 * Bluston * Myra Michael (1)
 * Gate * Pinkus
 * Mitzi Green * Seymour
 Mark Ingram * Versallion

* Denotes Member present
 (1) and (4) Denote category of Reserve Members

[Note: Councillor Mrs Bath also attended this meeting to hear the responses of the Leader and the Chief Executive in relation to Question 11 (see Minutes 363 and 366)].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES

 362. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Osborn Councillor Thammaiah	Councillor Myra Michael Councillor Lavingia

 363. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
5. Budget - Question and Answer Session with the Leader and the Chief Executive	Councillor Mrs Bath (in attendance in the public gallery)	The Member indicated an interest in that she was the Ward Councillor for Stanmore Park in which the car park referred to under Question 11 was situated. She would remain in the room to listen to the responses of the Leader and the Chief Executive.
	Councillor Bluston Councillor Myra Michael	The Members indicated an interest in that they were Members of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the redevelopment of Northwick Park Hospital. They would remain in the room to ask questions and listen to the responses of the Leader and the Chief Executive in relation to questions on the Hospital/Primary Care Trust.
	Councillor Gate	The Member indicated an interest in that his partner was employed by the Health Service. He would remain in the room to ask questions and listen to the responses of the Leader and the Chief Executive in relation to questions on the Hospital/ Primary Care Trust.

Councillor Lavingia

The Member indicated an interest in that he was a Hindu Religious Adviser at Northwick Park Hospital. He would remain in the room to ask questions and listen to the responses of the Leader and the Chief Executive in relation to questions on the Hospital/ Primary Care Trust.

364. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

365. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2005 be deferred to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

366. **Budget - Question and Answer Session with the Leader and the Chief Executive:**

The Chair welcomed the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive to the meeting.

The Chair stated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was trialling the holding of separate meetings on the question and answer sessions with Members and the Chief Executive from the main Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings.

The Chair invited Members to put their questions to the Leader and the Chief Executive. Members also asked supplemental questions which were duly answered.

Expected Budget Outturn 2005/06

Question 1: *What are the anticipated areas of overspend and what action is being taken to try to reduce this?*

The Chief Executive responded that the second quarter budget monitoring report had been submitted to the Cabinet meeting held on 10 November 2005. The report showed a forecast overspend this year of £2.9m and she advised that there were a number of reasons for this.

Firstly, the Council was spending more on demand led services, particularly children's services. The Council had a statutory duty to look after children.

Secondly, there were wider economic factors which were beyond the Council's control such as the state of the housing market (which meant the Council was losing income from land charges), interest rates (which affected the Council's investment income) and the rate of business growth (which affected how much of the business rates the Council could collect and retain under the new scheme).

Thirdly, whilst the majority of the new savings in this year's budget, which totalled more than £6m, were being achieved, there were a few areas where these had not been delivered. Officers were continuing to work on the various projects to ensure that the savings were delivered in due course.

In relation to procurement, the Council had achieved savings of £4.2m to date (against a cumulative target of £6.7m) and was seeking to deliver a further £1m by the end of the year. The Council had been using innovative techniques, such as e-auctions and collaborating with other councils on projects, wherever possible. The Council was also carrying out intensive pieces of work in the main service areas and reviewing all contracts. The new Business Transformation Project (BTP) would give more scope and capacity to find efficiencies in the future.

The Chief Executive explained that the procurement card was being re-launched as the take-up had been lower than anticipated. She added that the low take-up had had an adverse effect on the procurement savings.

The Leader reiterated some of the points made by the Chief Executive and stated that, whilst budgets for some of the services provided by the Council were outside its control, it was essential that the overspends that were within the Council's control, were known and controlled. He added that the Council was not being complacent about the situation and that detailed budget reviews were underway in all areas to identify further action to reduce the overspend and that the relevant Portfolio Holders would keep a

close watch over this exercise. It was noted that the Council had also introduced a number of cost controlling measures including controls over the use of agency staff.

2006/07 Budget

Question 2: *The rumour is we are going to get a poor settlement this year. Can you comment?*

The Leader responded that it had been anticipated that the increase in the general grant would be in the region of 1.5% but that Harrow was likely to receive an increase of 2%. He drew attention to table 5 of a paper tabled at the meeting which set out the changes in formula grant by type of authority and region. The Leader explained that, in comparison to the figure of 2.6% for the Outer London boroughs, Harrow's grant of 2%, whilst better than the anticipated increase of 1.5%, was low. He added that London as a whole had lost out when compared with the rest of the country.

The Chief Executive stated that a full analysis of the settlement would be undertaken and tabled at the Cabinet meeting on 15 December 2005. In response to an additional question, the Chief Executive stated that 1.5% equated to £250,000 only and that this was not a huge sum of money when compared to the overall budget.

Question 3: *What are the priorities and budget changes over the next 3 years?*

Question 4: *How have these been decided?*

[Note: Questions 3 and 4 were taken together].

The Leader stated that the outcome of the local election in May 2006 would have a major impact on the priorities. He added that whilst the priorities might alter, his administration was looking at the strategic issues of performance management and the Corporate Plan. It had been agreed that the corporate priorities set previously would be retained for next year as they were still appropriate.

The Council had developed its high level service plans for next year which included service options under three budget scenarios. High level service plans had been tested with residents at the Open Budget process on 23 October 2005. The next step was to develop more detailed plans and budgets. It was too early to give any detail about budget changes for the next 3 years. However, the key themes continue to be waste management and recycling, managing the ever increasing demand for social care services, and responding to residents' concerns in relation to crime and the public realm. There were several pieces of legislation and Bills in the pipeline in relation to Children and Young People and the Council's relationship with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) was another key driver. This too would have an impact on the Council's priorities.

The Chief Executive referred to the National Framework which, together with a new Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) regime and the Local Area Agreement (LAA), would be key to shaping or altering the priorities for the Council. In addition, new legislation on the empowerment of neighbourhoods and residents had recently been enacted and that too could impact on the Council's provision. All of these together formed a basis for the Council to assess its priorities for coming years.

Question 5: *Once all statutory obligations have been budgeted in, what pressures will there be on the total budget for 2006/07 and in what areas?*

The Chief Executive responded that most of the pressures that the Council might face during 2006/07 had been set out in some of the answers provided above. She stated that inflation was increasing, interest rates were falling, the property market was flat and the income from land charges continued to fall. There were considerable service pressures, particularly in social care. Many of the severely handicapped children would be reaching adulthood and their care costs would fall on the Council.

She stated that there was likely to be a fairly significant increase in the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept due to policing costs and the Olympics. In addition, the Metropolitan Police was facing a crisis in its funding. She added that the Metropolitan Police had submitted a paper to the Mayor for London which might result in large increases in the precept.

In response to additional questions, the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council stated that:

- discretionary budget formed a small part of the Council's total budget

- most of the budget spent in the social care area was statutory and that an element of the non-statutory budget spent was embedded in the Performance Indicators
- the income from Land Charges had fallen by 25% as the growth in the housing market had slowed down
- the target set in the budget in relation to income from Land Charges had been based on trends and historical data
- a clear picture would emerge in January 2006.

Question 6: *What action will be taken to prevent overspend?*

The Chief Executive stated that all budgets were monitored on a monthly basis and that quarterly reports were submitted to the Cabinet. She stressed that the overspend of £2.9m reported recently to the Cabinet was considered to be a small amount when compared with the Council's total budget.

She explained that those budgets within the Council's control and those that were outside its control because they were statutory were differentiated and separated out. In addition, officers would be asked to present a business case before committing to any expenditure.

The Chief Executive stated that demand-led budgets were the main cause of the overspend. She added that a new financial Management Information System would be installed next year. She added that this was a sophisticated system which would help track budgets more effectively. This would be assisted by the profiling of budgets, expected to be completed shortly.

Finally, the Chief Executive stated that monitoring of the budgets was a key factor in preventing overspends and that the officers would continue to monitor the forecast overspend closely.

Value for Money (VFM)

Question 7: *How is the council investigating whether or not our services represent VFM?*

Question 8: *What was the outcome of use of resources assessment by Audit Commission?*

[Note: Questions 7 and 8 were taken together].

The Chief Executive stated that the Council received an annual judgement from the Audit Commission of 'Use of Resources' which measured unit costs, volumes and other indicators against comparable outer London Boroughs. She added that the Council used this statement to assess its performance and identify areas where improvement was required. In addition, the Council undertook some benchmarking work in individual service areas to assess comparative performance. This year the Council had also started to develop its own value for money methodology to assess whether performance was improving in key areas where resources were being invested. Finally, this year, the Council's high level service planning process would be looking to draw a direct link between performance commitments and budget requirements so that growth requirements across the Council were being compared in the light of the level of performance that they could deliver.

The Council's overall score on Use of Resources was 2 and it had come close to getting a score of 3 in a couple of areas. Additionally, the Council had received some helpful feedback from the External Auditor on the process, and officers were developing an action plan to move the score up to 3 next time.

In addition, the new IT systems would assist the Council in ensuring VFM.

External Pressures

Question 9: *It would be fair to say there is no consensus on the best way to fund local authorities. If you could change one thing about our funding structures or sources what would it be?*

In response, the Leader stated that, at the national level, changes in income tax were necessary in order to make the system more equitable. He added that at the local level, he would call for a review of the council tax system which would provide benefits

to those on low income and the elderly. In addition, local authorities should be able to set their own priorities based on local needs and for these to be funded adequately.

The Chief Executive referred to the business rate and indicated that changes were needed. In response to additional questions on this issue, the Chief Executive stated that:

- a strong retail business base was essential
- Harrow's independent retail businesses were struggling to remain competitive with the large retail chains. It was therefore essential that Harrow Town Centre was developed which would help attract big retail businesses, thereby revitalising the Town Centre and the Borough as a whole
- big retail businesses would help contribute 'in-kind' which would further help revitalise the Borough
- collaboration with local residents' groups could be extended under existing structures
- the owner of the St Ann's Centre had minimal interest in attaining a high return on its investment which did not help the Harrow Town Centre.

[Note: The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee stated that the Committee ought to scrutinise this final point].

The Leader stated that:

- existing strategic partnerships needed to be developed further
- there was a need to engage with businesses regarding the empty sites in the Borough.

Question 10: *This Committee has been advised that the Council will not reach some of the LPSA targets and may thus forfeit some of the £5m reward grant. What in your view is still achievable and what can we learn from this experience?*

The Chief Executive outlined the current position which was that the Council would fully meet five targets, partially meet two targets and not meet the remaining five. Overall, this meant that the Council would receive half of the expected reward grant. She added that unrealistic expectations had been set and that this position was unsatisfactory.

The Chief Executive added that the Council had taken a different approach when setting targets for the LAA which had superseded the LPSA. She reported that targets were being tested first, that the Council was liaising closely with its partners when setting the targets and that the targets had been linked to the priorities of the Council.

Question 11: *This Committee was advised of the requirement to repay S106 monies in respect of the agreement between the Council and Sainsbury's re the Stanmore car park. The Director of Urban Living has advised that the subsequent proposal to rebuild a surface level car park will cost the council in the region of £400k. Where will the funds for this development come from and what will be the impact on other programmes that will be denied the opportunity of these funds? How did you feel about returning the £300k and when were you first aware that this might happen?*

The Leader acknowledged that a number of errors had been made in the agreement which had resulted in a disappointing outcome. He added that lessons would be learnt and that further reports would be submitted to appropriate bodies of the Council in due course.

He informed Members that the new surface level car park (to include the demolition of the existing multi-storey structure) would cost £420,000. £302,000 would be funded from the Stanmore commuted car parking fund and £118,000 from Capital money.

He stated that the return of this substantial resource was of significant concern to him and that he was confident that operational processes would be amended to avoid a recurrence in the future. He referred to an e-mail that had been received and undertook to provide further information to Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Question 12: *Are the Leader and the Chief Executive perturbed at the communication between Northwick Park Hospital, Harrow PCT and our Social Services personnel in*

People First? Were they aware, before the press were, that wards may be closed in the hospital when we were assured that the Council would hear about any changes first? We were assured by the PCT that their £12m deficit would break even by the end of the financial year without substantial cuts in services to the Council's users however, reports to the contrary are rife? What if any might the implications of this deficit be for Council funds?

In response, the Leader stated that the NHS had its own duties and responsibilities to achieve financial balance. He added that the Council had been aware that the PCT had a financial deficit of £12.7 million pounds and had recognised that the PCT would need to take steps to reduce this deficit in line with the Secretary of State's requirements placed upon all NHS Chief Executives. It had been noted that this situation would impact upon the Council and its constituents.

The Leader informed the Committee that the partnership had not functioned well and that, as a result of the recent news and the issues facing the PCT, a private meeting had been arranged with all the partners, the Chief Executive and the Chair of Harrow Primary Care Trust.

The Leader explained the measures that the Council was considering in order to safeguard both its financial commitments and legal position with the PCT. He stated that the Council was also liaising with the local MPs.

The Chief Executive stated that local authorities across the country would be in similar positions to Harrow, however the situation in London was acute. She identified examples where the situation had already impacted on patients who were terminally ill. She reported on the actions that could be taken and the implications.

The Chief Executive stated that the Council had not received formal notification of the closures and reiterated that a private meeting had been arranged. She added that the Council was working with its auditors and investigating all options. She was of the view that decisions were being taken without any accountability to partners.

Question 13: *Harrow is looking forward to full participation to the Olympics 2012 - what steps are being taken to have a full complement of staff in Urban Living to enable Harrow to be a prime sporting borough when several key staff have resigned recently, when the relationship between the schools, Leisure Connections and Harrow Sports Council is possibly at an all time low?*

The Leader sought justification of the statement that morale was low. He stated that the Council's Sports & Leisure Unit had been moved across to the People First Directorate, sitting within its Community and Culture team. This structural change would enable the unit to work alongside a range of Cultural Services, helping to deliver the Council's Cultural Strategy. The Community and Culture team was being restructured, which would enable a strengthening of capacity across its range of services, including Sports and Leisure. A Working Group had been set up to steer the project.

The Chief Executive stated that the whole Council would be involved in the work leading up to the Olympics and that, besides the West London Alliance, work with schools, partners and Harrow's diverse communities would be essential. The Council was committed to supporting Olympics 2012 and was working with other West London boroughs to develop a strategy.

It was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be scrutinising the Council's participation in the build up to the Olympics, as part of its work programme.

The Chief Executive informed the Committee that regular reports would be submitted to the Cabinet on this matter.

Business Transformation Project

Question 14: *Capita has not got a good reputation amongst the general public for the delivery of public sector projects. Can you explain to us the main risks and rewards that you see coming from the BTP? How are you managing these risks?*

The Leader acknowledged the statement made in the question but stated that Capita was a large organisation and that a thorough assessment had been made before the contract had been awarded. He added that the success and the risks would be actively managed. He identified a number of risks, which are set out below:

- Employee relations and the need to ensure the partner is fully involved
- Commitment needed by the organisation to deliver the projects

- Dissatisfaction with our chosen partner
- Loss of key staff
- Inadequate Governance arrangements

The Leader stated that all contractual matters would be overseen by the Business Transformation Partnership Project Board.

The Chief Executive stated that the contract agreed was ground breaking and outlined the benefits of the agreement. She stated that all individual projects would have to be delivered by Capita year on year before undertakings on remaining projects were given. In addition, a risk matrix has been produced and the risks listed above were those which had been identified as requiring active management. An action plan had also been produced to actively manage the risks and this was reviewed on a regular basis. The Council was managing the risks jointly with Capita to ensure that both parties could contribute to the mitigation.

The Chief Executive identified relationships between officers and Capita as an area of concern and informed Members that an independent person might be appointed to oversee these aspects of the project. Finally, she stated that the project would also provide benefits to Harrow.

Question 15: *How will the 'one stop shop' affect Councillors and in particular Councillor casework? Would you envisage Councillor casework being channelled through a section of the one stop shop process?*

The Leader stated that an additional workshop had been arranged for Members on this issue. He added that both the One Stop Shop and the Contact Centre would improve the service given to Councillors in respect of their casework. The introduction of 'Customer Relationship Management' (CRM) software would ensure that all enquiries were logged and tracked through to their completion. This would make it easy to provide Councillors with a complete history of contacts made and to ensure that their own enquiry was dealt with speedily. It would also aid and speed up the resolution of enquiries that involved more than one service, as was often the case with Councillors' casework.

The Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented that officers ought to address enquiries from the public and that the culture where constituents had to refer an enquiry to a Member should not happen.

Members suggested the need for private rooms where they could hold surgeries to be included in the works being carried out.

Question 16: *There appear to be a number of 'hidden costs' in relation to the preparation for the First Contact project, for example staff participating in a number of forums are doing so in addition to undertaking their normal duties. Were these costs factored in to the overall costs of the project?*

The Chief Executive stated that the decision had been taken not to cost ad hoc attendance at forums as it would not be practical to back fill the participation of forums where staff might only attend for one-off workshops. The Council had also taken the decision to only cost the full-time and part-time posts required from Harrow to deliver the projects. She did not consider the costs to be 'hidden costs'.

Question 17: *Whilst increasing accessibility through longer opening hours is a key priority for the First Contact project, has any analysis been undertaken as to the format of this additional opening time and why is extending opening hours a priority over improving other services?*

The Leader stated that this was seen as a pilot and would provide the Council with an opportunity to provide a better service. He was of the view that by extending opening hours, the Council would provide a better service and that the two issues referred to in the question were not mutually exclusive.

The Chief Executive reported the results of the market research that had been carried out. She stated that the contract provided flexibility and that the matter would be kept under review.

Open Budget Process

Question 18: *The highest scoring budget priority for those at the Open Budget Assembly was Adult Social Care, the lowest priority was congestion. How do you propose to respond to these priorities?*

The Leader stated that the Council would be receiving a detailed report on the Assembly and the Open Budget Panel, set up following the Assembly. It was not possible therefore to give a commitment at this early stage.

The Chief Executive informed Members that the Open Budget Panel had only met twice and that the report from the Power Inquiry was awaited.

Question 19: *How could the Council integrate the principles of the Open Budget process with the Council's existing engagement and consultation processes?*

The Chief Executive stated that the Cabinet would be considering a Community Engagement Strategy in January 2006. She added that the Strategy would be proposing that the Council build on the principles of the Open Budget process in future engagement activity. She added that this process had demonstrated that it was possible to engage the community with the Council, even on a Sunday. She was of the view that the technique had, so far, worked well but that it was one technique amongst many others that the Council could use. In response to additional questions about whether the technique provide 'Value for Money' (VFM), the Chief Executive stated that democracy had both a hidden and direct cost attached to it.

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee stated that she was pleased that there was a commitment to setting up a Community Engagement Unit.

MMR

Question 20: *What is the cost to the Council of the Middle Management Review and in next year's budget will there be any additional cost and any associated costs to the Local Government Pension Scheme?*

The Chief Executive stated that the medium term budget for 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 included savings of £370k a year or £1.1m in total, from restructuring and reviews. The savings for this year had been achieved. The MMR had, to date, had no significant impact on the pension fund.

The Chief Executive added that, to date, there were ten officers whose jobs were at risk. She reported that money had been included in the budget to mitigate any strain on the pension fund.

Summary

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee thanked the Leader and the Chief Executive for their responses. She reported that the Portfolio Holder for Business Connections and Performance would be invited to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee. In conclusion, she stated that the Committee would include procurement in its work programme, and thanked the Leader for the additional information he had undertaken to provide in relation to Stanmore Car Park.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.48 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JEAN LAMMIMAN
Chair

SCRUTINY
SUB-COMMITTEES

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)**5 DECEMBER 2005**

Chair: * Councillor Blann

Councillors:	* Arnold	Miles
	* Knowles	* John Nickolay (1)
	* Lavingia	* Anne Whitehead

* Denotes Member present
 (1) Denote category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor O'Dell also attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Minute 211 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**203. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Seymour	Councillor John Nickolay

204. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Blann	Declared an interest in that he was secretary of an organisation with a concessionary let of a community hall.

205. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) agenda item 9 be considered after item 7 and before item 8;

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

206. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2005 be deferred until the next ordinary meeting of the Sub-Committee.

207. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8.

208. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 9.

209. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.

210. **Stanmore Multi-Storey Car Park: Reference from the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 22 November 2005:**

Further to the reference from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 22 November 2005, consideration of which had been deferred from the Sub-Committee's meeting on 29 November 2005 to this meeting, the Executive Director (Urban Living) tabled a document which included a draft response to issues that had been raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting, as well as additional information

compiled at the request of a Member. He proposed to present a detailed chronology of events dating back to the 1990s at the Sub-Committee's next meeting on 9 March 2006. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would also receive an update on his research at its 30 January 2006 meeting.

In response to questions posed by Members, the Executive Director (Urban Living) stated that there were two reasons for which a Section 106 Agreement payment made to the Council had been subsequently repaid:

1. When the costs of this refurbishment had been weighed against the future lifespan of the car park structure itself, it had not represented good business sense to use the Section 106 monies to refurbish the existing structure, yet the terms of the Agreement required the funds to be used solely for this structure;
2. The Section 106 Agreement had required work to commence on the car park within 5 years of the start of work on the Sainsbury's store; this period had now elapsed.

RESOLVED: That (1) the reports be noted; and

(2) a report, including an outline of the history and concerns surrounding parking in Stanmore, be presented at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee to be held on 9 March 2006.

211. **Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing:**

Members were invited to pose questions to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing, who was in attendance at the meeting.

- 1) Has the lack of an Executive Director, the numerous vacancies as a result of the Middle Management Review (MMR), and the loss of the Director of Strategy had an effect on the services in your portfolio?

The Portfolio Holder informed the Sub-Committee that, despite some dramatic changes across the Council, there had also been significant improvements, including:

- The Building Control Department was recognised as one of the best in London
- The development of the Local Development Framework was ongoing, and key deadlines had already been met
- The Housing Options Appraisal had been completed and was about to be signed off by the Leaders of the Labour and Conservative groups
- Harrow had won an E-Government excellence award
- 98% of rent had been collected
- The number of families housed in Bed and Breakfasts had been reduced
- A Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy had been introduced

Responding to questions from Members, the Portfolio Holder stated that the whole of London had experienced difficulties in recruiting Planning Officers, and that Harrow would consider a range of measures to fill current vacancies. He stressed that these vacancies would not impact negatively on services as there was now a new Director of Strategy, and steps had already been taken to recruit a permanent Director of Corporate Property.

- 2) Are you content with the level of Planning Enforcement?

The Portfolio Holder informed the Sub-Committee that, at the time of the meeting, there was one Enforcement Manager who worked two days per week, and six and a half full-time Planning Enforcement Officers. The Council was attempting to recruit staff to fill further vacancies, and this recruitment exercise would have a positive impact on the delivery of services.

In response to questions posed by Members, the Portfolio Holder informed the Sub-Committee that the legal processes of enforcement were long and cumbersome, and that officers were dealing effectively with their caseloads.

- 3) Are you confident that we have sufficient measures in place to achieve the Decent Home Standard by 2010?

The Portfolio Holder informed the Sub-Committee that Harrow had made good progress in meeting the Decent Home Standard by 31 March 2010. It was also

noted that the Decent Home Standard had been determined by Harrow, and set higher targets than those set by Central Government. The process of recruiting partner contractors had already begun. One such project had started work in October 2005, while the remainder of projects would commence in September and October 2006.

4) Are there any significant areas where you see an overspend in the year 2005/6?

The Portfolio Holder stated that Urban Living was expected to achieve the agreed outturn by March 2006. Although there had been concerns expressed about the Utility Expenditure Budget, the Portfolio Holder stated that this would be contained within the existing departmental budgets.

212. **Your Home, Your Needs Best Value Review Update:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Corporate Property, which provided an update on progress against key recommendations highlighted by the Audit Commission in their inspection of the Housing Service in November 2003. The officer present noted that recommendations pertaining to ALMO were no longer applicable as Harrow had chosen to disband ALMO.

The following key areas of improvement were identified:

- A Black and Minority Ethnic housing strategy had been introduced
- Performance Indicator targets had now been set for the top quartile
- A review had been conducted into leaseholders
- Contact information had been improved and a handbook produced
- Good progress had been made on tenant arrears

The officer stated that there was still work to be done on the Tenant Compact, which would incorporate the outcome of the Housing Options Appraisal, while staffing issues had caused the launch of the decoration voucher scheme to be postponed until March 2006. The decision not to opt for ALMO had also called for a review of the current staffing structure.

Responding to questions from Members, the officer stated that since September 2005, some tenancy checks had been completed, but that, as yet, there was no information available regarding feedback; she agreed, however, to provide Members with information as it became available. It was explained that the main purpose of the tenancy checks was to ensure that properties were not being sub-let or overcrowded by their official tenants. In response to concerns raised by a Member, officers acknowledged that the performance of the community hall care-taking staff had been unsatisfactory, but stated that steps had been taken to make sure that, in the future, staff would be present to open halls at the times booked.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

213. **Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy - Update:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Corporate Property, which outlined progress made following the introduction of the Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy. An officer provided Members with a background to the Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy, explaining that the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 had removed many of the provisions governing the way authorities carried out private sector housing renewal, and at the same time had given them wider powers to provide assistance to repair and improve private sector housing. The Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy was a requirement of the Regulatory Reform Order, and had been adopted by Cabinet on 15 July 2003.

The officer informed the Sub-Committee that the largest number of grants awarded in 2005/06 were Home Safety Grants, which provided sums of up to £1000 for home security measures. The Sub-Committee was informed that a review of the Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy would be conducted on the basis of the results of the Private Sector Stock Condition Survey and the Housing Needs Survey, once these were completed in mid 2006.

Responding to questions from Members, the officer explained that under the Safesome Project, the Police informed the Council of individuals who had been victims of multiple crimes. Community groups had been approached to determine whether minority ethnic groups could be better incorporated into the project. The officer noted that elderly women were more likely to be the victims of crime, and that, as such, this group were awarded a large number of the grants. At the request of a Member, the officer agreed

to provide the Sub-Committee with a breakdown indicating the gender of grants recipients.

The officer informed the Sub-Committee that there were around eighty referrals for Disability Facilities Grants pending at the time of the meeting. As a result of staffing problems since December 2004, together with the length of the process itself, which involved the premises being visited by both an Occupational Therapist and Surveyor, there had been some difficulties in dealing with referrals quickly. Now that there was a full complement of staff, however, the officer advised that this situation would improve.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report be noted;

(2) an information item on the proposed amendments to the Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy be presented to the Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee at its September 2006 meeting;

(3) the amended Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy, upon its completion, be presented at a future meeting of the Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.32 pm, closed at 8.56 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ALAN BLANN
Chair

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**13 DECEMBER 2005**

Chair: * Councillor Bluston

Councillors: * Mitzi Green (2) * Vina Mithani
 * Lavingia * Mrs Joyce Nickolay
 * Myra Michael * Mrs R Shah

Advisor (non-voting): Jean Bradlow

* Denotes Member present
 (2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillors Margaret Davine and Silver also attended this meeting in a speaking capacity.]

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES****277. Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following duly appointed Reserve Member was in attendance at the meeting:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Gate	Councillor Mitzi Green

278. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

- (i) Councillor Bluston declared an interest in that he was Chair of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Northwick Park, and had recently been a patient at Northwick Park and St Mark's hospital;
- (ii) Councillor Mitzi Green declared an interest arising from the fact that a close family member had recently been in Northwick Park Hospital, and also had a disability parking allowance;
- (iii) Councillor Lavingia declared an interest in that he was a Hindu adviser and organizer of religious services;
- (iv) Councillor Myra Michael declared an interest in that she was a Member of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Northwick Park;
- (v) Councillor Vina Mithani declared an interest arising from the fact that she worked for a Health Protection Agency.

279. Arrangement of Agenda:

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
8. Northwick Park Hospital - Update on Implementing Maternity Services Action Plan and Maintaining Changes Post Action Plan	This report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider the report, to inform their discussion on this agenda item.
13. Annual Report on Social Services Complaints	This report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated because the Complaints Service had incorrectly given Directors a deadline of Monday 5 December to respond instead of Friday 2 December. Members were asked to consider the report, to enable them to receive information on complaints whilst the complaints information contained within is still relevant.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

280. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record; and

(2) the minutes of the Special meeting held on 6 October 2005 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

281. **Public Questions:**

In variation of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8.3, the Sub-Committee

RESOLVED: That the following question be received:

Questioner: Ms Joan Penrose

Asked of: The Chair of the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Question: “No doubt Councillors are aware that, contrary to what they have been told for a number of years, Mental Health services in Harrow are not integrated. Are there any plans to progress integration, using Section 31, to comply with Department of Health requirements?”

[Note: In light of the lack of notice for this question, the Chair undertook to provide a written response.]

282. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 9.

283. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.

284. **Northwick Park Hospital - Update on Implementing Maternity Services Action Plan and Maintaining Changes Post Action Plan:**

The Sub-Committee received an update on the implementation of the Maternity Services Action Plan for Northwick Park Hospital, which also briefed Members on how these changes would be maintained after the completion of the Action Plan. Nick Hulme, Director of Operations for North West London Hospital NHS Trust, attended the meeting on behalf of Mary Wells, the Chief Executive of North West London Hospital NHS Trust. Mr Hulme stated that the Action Plan had been drawn up in 2005, following an investigation by the Health Care Commission into the unusually high number of maternity deaths on the Maternity Unit. The Sub-Committee was informed that part 2 of the report, the detailed investigation into the maternal deaths, would not be available until early 2006. In the area of staffing, the Sub-Committee was informed that having granted 20 new midwifery posts in 2005, Northwick Park Hospital now had one of the highest midwife-to-birth ratios in the country. Morale on the Unit had improved markedly, with a vacancy factor of only 7% of midwives, compared to up to 30% in some units.

Responding to a request from a Member, Mr Hulme agreed to provide the Sub-Committee with a quarterly finance update. Mr Hulme informed Members that the financial work programme was being supported by Price Waterhouse Cooper, but led by NHS managers. Although significant financial savings for the current financial year were unlikely, savings were forecast to reach £10-15 million from 2007/08. Mr Hulme highlighted the need to make the implementation of the Action Plan subject to strenuous review to ensure changes were sustained. In this way, the Action Plan would be a working document, developed in line with weekly meetings between the Chief Executive and clinicians. Staff development and appraisal, risk management, and early identification of trends in clinical incidents would also help to maintain changes in the wake of the Action Plan.

Mr Hulme informed the Sub-Committee that a culture in which both staff and patients could report incidents and make complaints was essential for the improvement of services, but recognised that the complaints mechanism for patients was not as clear as it could be. A Member requested that the Sub-Committee be sent a copy of the new complaints protocol, once the review by the new Director of Nursing had been completed. Mr Hulme confirmed that high and low risk elective caesarean section

patients were being recommended for transferral, and that there were plans to cut a number of beds. The Sub-Committee was informed that these closures would improve efficiency, and that no ward would be closed, or bed cutting made, without a contingency plan in place for it to be re-opened.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

285. **The Risk of Healthcare Acquired Infection in Hospitals:**

The Sub-Committee received a report on the risk of Healthcare Acquired Infections in hospitals and also a Power Point display as illustration, from the Director of Infection Prevention and Control at Northwick Park Hospital. The Sub-Committee was informed that the rise in cases of MRSA, of particular concern in London, was attributable to a number of factors, including lack of infrastructure, the culture in hospitals, and rapid changes in the provision of health care which meant that, for example, patients were now discharged from hospital as soon as they could be treated in the community.

Responding to questions from Members, the Director of Infection Prevention and Control at Northwick Park Hospital stated that much good work had been done in recent years to prevent and control infections in hospitals. Two years previously, the position of Director of Infection Prevention and Control had been created at Northwick Park Hospital, which meant that infection prevention and control could now go beyond simply recording infections, and would now make interventions to tackle the problem. The Sub-Committee was informed that, other countries in Europe, with lower rates of MRSA infection than the UK, spent a greater proportion of their health care budget on infection control than the UK.

The Director of Operations for North West London Hospital NHS Trust informed the Sub-Committee that it was incumbent on him to publish monthly MRSA figures for hospitals. However, he also stated that in order to meet government targets, auditing would need to be conducted differently so that statistics were published for individual units and wards, rather than whole Trusts.

RESOLVED: That (1) the above be noted; and

(2) the Director of Infection Prevention and Control at Northwick Park Hospital be invited to a meeting of the Sub-Committee in approximately one year's time.

286. **Harrow Primary Care Trust - Financial Recovery Plan and Joint Position of the Chief Executive:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Executive of Harrow Primary Care Trust (PCT), which laid out Harrow PCT's distance from the NHS target allocation, and its financial position for 2004/05 and 2005/06. The Chief Executive of the Harrow PCT also informed Members that although Hillingdon PCT had a financial recovery plan in place, it did not have the same break-even statutory duty as Harrow PCT; rather, its budget deficit had to be reduced from £31 million to £12 million by the end of the current financial year. Hillingdon PCT would need to identify its likely year-end position, report back to the Secretary of State, then work with KPMG to achieve a secure financial footing for the PCT.

The Chair stated that although action plans to save £12.7 million in Harrow PCT had been identified, there had been disputes over which authority would cover which costs. It was vital, then, that all partners worked together to achieve this target.

Responding to questions from Members, the Chief Executive of Harrow PCT stated that it had been the final decision of the PCT Board not to proceed with the Kenmore development. Members were informed that there had been many changes in NHS policy since 2002, when the original decision to develop Kenmore had been taken, and that this original plan was now out of date in terms of what the NHS needed to do. This decision was primarily service and strategy driven, rather than a financial issue.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee highlighted the need to continue the partnership between Harrow Council and Harrow PCT, and said he hoped that Harrow PCT would be able to offer the Council advice on this scheme in the future. It was also noted that changes in the community in recent years meant that Kenmore was now needed more than ever before. For his part, the Chief Executive of Harrow PCT stated that the partnership was good, and that Harrow PCT still wanted to work with Harrow Council on Learning and Resource Centres.

The adviser to the Sub-Committee noted that one danger of planning schemes long in advance of their eventual implementation was a poor fit with reality. She also emphasised the need to concentrate on delivery of services, rather than buildings.

Responding to questions from Members, the Chief Executive of Harrow PCT stated that management costs had already been reduced by 10%, and that two directors had been made redundant. There were plans to reduce management costs by a further £800,000, and only front-line staff were being recruited. It was noted, however, that these budgetary cuts would have an impact on the work the PCT could do, especially in terms of partnership working. The Chief Executive of Harrow PCT informed the Sub-Committee that, in terms of Council services, the Financial Recovery Plan of Harrow PCT would impinge most on Continuing Care and provider costs.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

287. **Mount Vernon Hospital:**

The Sub-Committee received a verbal report of the Director of Strategy and Information, Hillingdon Hospitals NHS Trust, which addressed various issues in relation to Mount Vernon Hospital. The Sub-Committee was informed that following the decision to relocate Mount Vernon Cancer Centre to Hatfield, a working group had been set up by the North West London Health Authority to review options around providing ambulatory radiotherapy to patients who would be affected by this move. Out of consideration for clinical safety, it had been decided that this could not be on the Mount Vernon site. Options around siting the service at neighbouring hospitals had been appraised by a group involving key stakeholders. Hammersmith Hospital, which had the infrastructure to accommodate this, had been most favoured in the exercise, with Northwick Park and Hillingdon in joint second. This would now be taken to the 4SHA radiotherapy group for a final decision and to carry out work with regard to impact and affordability. The Sub-Committee was also informed that there would be another meeting that week to discuss the site for Burns and Plastics, although it was likely that these would remain on the Mount Vernon site. The Scrutiny officer present at the meeting agreed to feedback to Members on the outcome of this meeting. It was noted that, although there continued to be uncertainty around many areas, which was itself the cause of some concern, the phase in which options were being considered had now been reached.

RESOLVED: That (1) the above be noted; and

(2) the draft of Mount Vernon Hospital's service plan be considered at its March 2006 meeting.

288. **CSCI Annual Review Monitoring Letter and Star Rating and Published Tables of the Personal Social Services Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) Indicators:**

RESOLVED: That the verbal report be postponed to the February meeting of the Sub-Committee due to the absence of the Director of Community Health for reasons of ill health.

289. **Annual Report on Social Services Complaints:**

The Sub-Committee received the Annual Report for 2004/05 on Social Services Complaints. The officer informed the Sub-Committee that efforts made by the Complaints Service to improve logging of complaints had succeeded in increasing recorded complaints from 90 to 156 complaints in the last year. The quality, thoroughness and independence of Stage 2 investigations meant few complaints escalated to Stage 3 or the Ombudsman. However, it was noted that to achieve this quality and satisfaction, meant that investigations usually over-ran the statutory time-scale.

The Sub-Committee was advised that the Complaints Service had seen little take-up of advocacy by young people. The Complaints Service was examining how advocacy usage could be increased for both young people and parents. Advocacy organisations at the Advocacy Forum had fed back that recent efforts by the Complaints Service to increase take-up had had a positive effect.

The Sub-Committee was informed of a draft protocol for handling overlapping complaints between the Social Services and Harrow PCT. This protocol would cover services that fall under Section 31 Agreements.

The Adviser to the Sub-Committee congratulated officers on the report and stated it would be helpful for the Sub-Committee to receive quarterly reports.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

290. **Update on Provision of Parking Permits to Key Care Workers:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Head of Public Realm and Infrastructure, which provided an update on the provision of parking permits to Key Care Workers. The officer present stated that all plans for parking permits had to be incorporated into the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP), which was currently still in draft form. Responding to questions from Members, the officer stated that the final version of the LIP had to be approved by full Council in April 2006, while the Traffic Order had to be rewritten in time for the March 2006 meeting of Cabinet. Responding to concerns raised by some Members about the length of time it had taken to find a resolution to the issue, the officer stated that not only had Transport for London (TfL) delayed issuing guidance in 2003, but it took TfL from March 2005, when the LIP closed, until the end of August 2005, to respond to Harrow's draft LIP. Another major difficulty encountered was in determining which care staff needed parking permits to carry out their day-to-day tasks.

The Chair requested that Members be updated on timings and plans for consultation, as well as relevant changes in Government policy touching on the issue. The officer agreed to circulate further information on parking permits once the LIP had been published, probably in April in 2006.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

291. **Older People's Inspection - Initial Feedback:**

RESOLVED: That a written report be presented at the February meeting of the Sub-Committee due to the absence of the Director of Community Health for reasons of ill health.

292. **Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Northwick Park Hospital Redevelopment:**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of People, Performance and Policy, which provided an update on the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the Northwick Park Hospital Reconfiguration. Members were informed that a key element of the reconfiguration was a re-design of clinical care. Members were also informed that a key problem was the uncertainty surrounding the future of Northwick Park Hospital, although a member of the Sub-Committee stated that delays were necessary in order to give full consideration of different options and the Government White Paper. A Member stated that it would be useful for the Sub-Committee to receive regular reports on improvements.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

293. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting::**

In accordance with the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 6.7(ii)(b), it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) at 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(3) at 11.00 pm to continue until 11.15 pm.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.35 pm, closed at 11.12 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR HOWARD BLUSTON
Chair

STANDARDS
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Janet Cowan

Councillors: * Branch * Mrs Joyce Nickolay
* Ann Groves * Thammaiah
Harrison

Independent Persons: * The Rt Revd Peter Broadbent Mrs Bijal Shah

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillor Mrs Kinnear also attended this meeting in a participatory role].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION I - Independent Members**

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced the report which set out proposals for the recruitment of Independent Members of the Standards Committee.

Members noted that the term of office for the current Independent Members was due to expire in May 2006 and that new Independent Members were required to go through the recruitment and selection process in preparation for the forthcoming 4-year term in office for the Municipal Years 2006 to 2010. The officer outlined the timescale in which the vacancy needed to be advertised, candidates shortlisted and interviewed.

Members suggested that the number of Independent Members on the Standards Committee should be increased in order to allow greater flexibility. There were currently two Independent Members, and should one Independent Member be absent, the onus was for the other member to attend otherwise the Standards Committee would not be quorate.

Having appointed Members to the Selection Panel for the appointment of Independent Members it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Council)

That four Independent Members be appointed to the Standards Committee.

(See also Minute 130).

PART II - MINUTES122. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

123. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

124. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

125. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Special meeting held on 17 November 2005 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

126. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

127. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were put at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

128. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

129. **Planning Protocol:**

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced a report which sought to clarify the status of the Council's Planning Protocol by asking Members to determine whether it ought to be seen as guidance or rules and how they were to be enforced.

The Director suggested that the Protocol ought to be seen as guidance for Members based on key principles, and recommended that an informal joint working group, consisting of 3 Members from the Standards Committee and 3 from the Development Control Committee, be established to oversee revisions to the Protocol and make recommendations back to the Standards Committee.

A Member suggested that separate guidance be provided for Councillors who were not members of the Development Control Committee on how to deal with planning related queries. It was also suggested that guidance in relation to the link with licensing applications could be usefully included.

The Committee requested that Members of the Development Control Committee be consulted to consider revisions to the Protocol. This working party would then report to the Standards Committee who may then make a recommendation to Council to agree a revised Protocol.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Planning Protocol be revised to clarify its status and enforceability, including its relationship with the Members' Code of Conduct;

(2) the Protocol form guidance re-enforced by key principles;

(3) all Members have regard to the revised Protocol and be guided by the principles when making a judgement;

(4) breaches of the revised Protocol should be referred to the Hearing Panel of the Standards Committee;

(5) procedures for the Hearing Panel should set out its powers;

(6) an informal joint working party consisting of 3 Members from the Development Control Committee and 3 Members from the Standards Committee be established to consider revisions of the Planning Protocol;

(7) the terms of reference of the joint working party include provision for an evaluation to be carried out of planning protocols of other local authorities.

130. **Independent Members:**
(See also Recommendation I).

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced the report which proposed the appointment of Members to a Selection Panel, established by Council on 20 October 2005, for the recruitment of Independent Members.

Having recommended the appointment of four Independent Members to the Standards Committee to Council, it was

RESOLVED: That Councillors Janet Cowan, Branch and Ann Groves be appointed to the Selection Panel established to appoint the Independent Members.

131. **Outcome of Training:**
Members were updated on the Members' Code of Conduct training session on 15 November 2005.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.40 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JANET COWAN
Chair

DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL
COMMITTEE

REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors:	* Marilyn Ashton	* Janet Cowan
	* Mrs Bath	* Idaikkadar
	* Billson	* Mrs Joyce Nickolay
	* Bluston	* Thammaiah (3)
	* Choudhury	* Thornton

* Denotes Member present
(3) Denotes category of Reserve Members

[Note: Councillors Mrs Kinnear and John Nickolay also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 1040 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES
1039. Attendance by Reserve Members:

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Miles	Councillor Thammiah

1040. Right of Members to Speak:

RESOLVED: That in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillors, who were not members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda items indicated:

Councillor Mrs Kinnear	Agenda Item 5 – Minutes and Agenda Item 14 – Planning Protocol
Councillor John Nickolay	Agenda Item 15 – Variation of S106 Agreement, Heathfield School

1041. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: (1) To note the following declarations of interest made by Members present relating to business to be transacted at this meeting:

- (i) Planning Application P/2593/05/CDT – Stanmore Cricket Club, The Common, Stanmore
Councillor Bluston declared a personal in the above application arising from the fact that he had played cricket at the club and knew some of the officials. Accordingly, he remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

1042. Arrangement of Agenda:

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following item/information be admitted to the agenda by reason of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Reasons for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's despatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

Second Addendum

This contained information on two planning applications that required determination before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee on 11 January 2006.

Agenda Item 22 - Special Meeting of the Committee to Discuss Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital

This item had been added to the agenda at the request of the Nominated Member for the Conservative Group, as the Special Meeting would be taking place before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee on 11 January 2006.

and

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

1043. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November and 16 November 2005, those minutes having been circulated, as a correct record of that meeting, once printed in the Council Bound Volume, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Minute 1015 – Declarations of Interest
Delete: “(iii) Planning Application 1/02 – The Grove, 31 Warren Lane, Stanmore
Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay declared a personal interest in the above application and, accordingly, she remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.”
- (ii) Minute 1015 – Declarations of Interest
Delete: “(viii) Planning Application 2/24 – 3 Welbeck Road, South Harrow
Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay declared a personal interest in the above application and, accordingly, she remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.”
- (iii) Minute 1015 – Declarations of Interest
(xii) Agenda Item 18 – 102, 104, 106 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
Amend to read: “Councillor Mrs Kinnear, who was not a Member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in the above agenda item, having taken advice from the Director of Corporate Governance, but wished it to be noted that she was not of the view that she had any interest in the item.”
- (iv) Minute 1015 – Declarations of Interest
Add: “(xiii) Planning Application 2/07 – Welldon Centre, Welldon Crescent, Harrow
Councillor Choudhury declared a personal interest in the above application and, accordingly, he remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.”
- (v) Item 2/09 on the Schedule attached to the Minutes – 24 Uxbridge Road, Stanmore
Add to Notes: “(4) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan, Mrs Joyce Nickolay and Thornton wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision to grant the application.”
- (vi) Item 2/11 on the Schedule attached to the Minutes – 9 Welbeck Road, South Harrow
Amend Note (4) to read: “Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Bluston, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to refuse the application.”
- (vii) Minute 1027 – Declarations of Interest
Delete: “(ix) Agenda Item 18 – 102, 104, 106 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
Councillor Mrs Kinnear, who was not a member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in the above agenda item”.

(2) arising from discussions in relation to (1) above, it be noted that, for clarity, Members be requested to state the nature of their interest when declaring personal or prejudicial interests.

(See also Minute 1040).

1044. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18.

1045. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15.

1046. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16.

1047. **Petition Relating to the Erection of an O2 Mobile Telephone Mast at the rear of Cannons Newsagent, Coronation Parade, Cannon Lane: Reference from the meeting of Council held on 20 October 2005:**

The Committee received a reference from the meeting of Council held on 20 October 2005 in the above matter.

Officers advised that there had been a considerable level of objection to the erection of the telephone mast. An application for a Certificate of Lawfulness had been submitted to the Council and this was currently being determined.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

1048. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of item 2/02 on the list of planning applications.

1049. **Planning Applications Received:**

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Group Manager (Planning and Development) to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

1050. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

RESOLVED: (1) That the report be noted;

(2) to note that Councillor Marilyn Ashton would be attending the public enquiry for 15 Gordon Avenue on 14 December 2005.

1051. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**

Officers advised that the above report, which provided a regular update on enforcement activity and had been marked 'To follow' on the agenda, was not available as it was being reworked in response to comments made by the Committee at its meeting on 9 November 2005. An improved version of the report would be submitted to the Committee's next ordinary meeting on 11 January 2006.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

1052. **Planning Protocol:**

The Director of Corporate Governance introduced a report on the above matter, which proposed the creation of a joint working party to clarify the status of the Planning Protocol and enable Members to review the contents of the Protocol. The Standards Committee had considered the same report at its meeting on 6 December 2005, and a copy of the draft minute of that meeting setting out the Standards Committee's resolutions on the matter was tabled.

The Director of Corporate Governance advised that the Protocol differed from the Members' Code of Conduct in that it provided guidance, rather than rules, and so could not be enforced by the Standards Board. The Standards Committee had supported the view that the Protocol could be enforced internally by referring breaches of the Protocol to a Hearing Panel of the Standards Committee.

Some Members expressed concern that maintaining the Protocol as guidance rather than rules would leave it open to interpretation, which could prove problematic. A Member questioned whether there was a need for a Planning Protocol separate from the Code of Conduct. In response, the Director of Corporate Governance advised that he considered it beneficial to have separate guidance for planning because of the sensitive financial and legal issues that could be encountered in the determination of planning applications.

The Committee supported the creation of a joint working party to revisit the Protocol and requested that a joint meeting of the Standards Committee and Development Control Committee be held to consider the findings of the joint working party.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Planning Protocol be revisited to clarify its status and enforceability, including its relationship with the Code of Conduct;

(2) an informal joint working party consisting of three Members of the Development Control Committee and three Members of the Standards Committee be established, with support from officers, to consider revision of the Protocol;

(3) the terms of reference of the joint working party include a provision for an evaluation to take place of planning protocols of other local authorities;

(4) the findings of the joint working party be reported to a joint meeting of the Development Control Committee and the Standards Committee;

(5) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Thornton and Anne Whitehead be appointed to the joint working party as the three Members representing the Development Control Committee.

(See also Minute 1040)

1053. **Variation of S106 Agreement, Heathfield School:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) on the above matter.

RESOLVED: To refuse the request to vary the S106 Agreement as applied for.

[Note: (1) Upon being put to a vote, the motion to refuse the request to vary the S106 agreement as applied for was carried;

(2) Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision to refuse the request to vary the S106 agreement].

(See also Minute 1040)

1054. **16A Whitchurch Lane, Edgware:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the gantry
- (ii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first requirement (i) from the land.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of one (1) month from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

1055. **108 Waxwell Lane, Pinner:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the rear decking
- (ii) the demolition of the screen fencing to a height not exceeding 2 metres above ground level
- (iii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first (1) and second (ii) requirements above from the land
- (iv) grade the level of the land exposed by the removal of the decking to meet the natural contours of the land of the adjoining properties, and lay to turf.

(i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) should be complied with within a period of two (2) months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

1056. **131 Malvern Avenue, Harrow:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the front porch extension and canopy
- (ii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first requirement (i) from the land.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of two (2) months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

[Note: (1) Upon being put to a vote, the motion to authorise the Director of Legal Services to issue and enforcement notice was carried;

(2) Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision to authorise the Director of Legal Services to issue an enforcement notice].

1057. **38 Headstone Gardens, Harrow:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the single storey rear extension
- (ii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first requirement (i) from the land.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of three (3) months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

1058. **67 Argyle Road, Harrow:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the rear decking and railings
- (ii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first requirement (i) above from the land.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of one (1) month from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

1059. **83B Hindes Road, Harrow:**

The Committee received a report of the Group Manager (Planning and Development) in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to:

(1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the gates and railings to a height not exceeding 1 metre in height above ground level
- (ii) the permanent removal of the materials arising from compliance with the first requirement (i) above from the land.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of one (1) month from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control;

(3) institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:

(i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or

(ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

[Note: (1) Upon being put to a vote, the motion to authorise the Director of Legal Services to issue and enforcement notice was carried;

(2) Councillor Marilyn Ashton wished to be recorded as having abstained from the vote].

1060. **Any Other Urgent Business:**

Special Meeting of the Committee to Discuss Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital

The Nominated Member for the Conservative Group expressed concern that the Special Meeting to discuss the application for the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH) would be taking place on a date when a number of Members would be unable to attend. The Chair reported that the application needed to be considered before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED: To note that a Special Meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday 19 December 2005 at 7.30 pm to consider the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital application.

1061. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: (1) At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) at 10.30 pm to continue until 10.40 pm;

(3) at 10.40 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(4) at 11.00 pm to continue until 11.05 pm;

(5) at 11.05 pm to continue until 11.10pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.08 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD
Chair

LIST NO: 2/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1829/05/DFU
LOCATION: 139 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Kishore Karia for Dr Hatim Kapadia
PROPOSAL: Two storey rear extension; double garage at rear; 1 vehicle crossover at front
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2433/05/CFU
LOCATION: Headstone Manor Recreation Ground, Pinner View
APPLICANT: Harrow Council, Urban Living
PROPOSAL: Construction of temporary silt lagoons (associated with de-silting of moat)
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, as amended on the Addendum.

LIST NO: 2/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2449/05/DFU
LOCATION: 12 Warham Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: David R Yeaman & Associates for Mr J Cooper
PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and conversion to two self contained flats
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Note: The Committee noted the correction to the description, as set out in the Addendum].

LIST NO: 2/06 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2476/05/CFU
LOCATION: Cornerways, 13 South View Road, Pinner
APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs A Watkinson
PROPOSAL: Renewal of Permission WEST/649/01/FUL: Two storey side to rear extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Note: The Committee noted the correction to the description, as set out in the Addendum].

SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

LIST NO: 4/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2546/05/CNA
LOCATION: 158 Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware
APPLICANT: London Borough of Barnet

PROPOSAL: Consultation: Details of access, siting, design, external appearance of residential phase, pursuant to outline permission

DECISION: RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development as set out in the application.

[Note: The Committee noted that the development proposal had been considered by Barnet Council and refused by them for the reasons set out in the Addendum].

LIST NO: 4/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2660/05/CNA

LOCATION: 158 Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware

APPLICANT: London Borough of Barnet

PROPOSAL: Consultation: Details of access, siting, design/external appearance of residential phase, pursuant to outline permission (duplicate)

DECISION: RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development as set out in the application.

[Note: The Committee noted that the development proposal had been considered by Barnet Council and refused by them for the reasons set out in the Addendum].

SECTION 5 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENTS

LIST NO: - **APPLICATION NO:** P/2593/05/CDT

LOCATION: Stanmore Cricket Club, The Common, Stanmore

APPLICANT: LCC Development Services

PROPOSAL: Determination: Installation of 15m high imitation flagpole phone mast and equipment cabinets

DECISION: (1) RESOLVED that prior approval of details of siting and appearance is required.

(2) REFUSED approval of details of siting/appearance for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and the visual amenity of the surrounding locality.

[Notes: (1) The Group Manager (Planning and Development) had recommended that the above application be granted;

(2) the officer's report for the above application had been circulated on the Second Addendum].

(See also Minute 1041)

LIST NO: - **APPLICATION NO:** P/2776/05/CDT

LOCATION: Land at Roundabout of Streatfield Road, Harrow

APPLICANT: T Mobile

PROPOSAL: Installation of a 10m high imitation telegraph pole and 2 equipment cabinets

DECISION: (1) RESOLVED that prior approval of details of siting and appearance is required.

(2) REFUSED approval of details of siting/appearance for the reasons and informative reported.

[The officer's report for the above application had been circulated on the Second Addendum].

REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

(SPECIAL) MEETING HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Idaikkadar
 * Billson * Miles
 * Blann (2) * John Nickolay (4)
 * Branch (1) * Mrs Joyce Nickolay
 * Janet Cowan * Mrs R Shah (4)

* Denotes Member present
 (1), (2) and (4) Denote category of Reserve Members

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**1062. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Mrs Bath
 Councillor Bluston
 Councillor Choudhury
 Councillor Thornton

Reserve Member

Councillor John Nickolay
 Councillor Mrs R Shah
 Councillor Blann
 Councillor Branch

1063. **Right of Members to Speak:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, Councillor John Cowan, who was not a Member of the Committee, be allowed to speak on agenda item 7 – planning application relating to the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, Brockley Hill, Stanmore.

[Note: Councillor Jean Lammiman, who had written to the Chair with a request to speak on item 7, was unable to attend the meeting.]

1064. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note the following declarations of interest made by Members present relating to the business to be transacted at this meeting: -

- (i) Planning Application (Item 7) – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH), Brockley Hill, Stanmore
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in the above application in that she was a member of the Stanmore Society with a non-executive role. Accordingly, she remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (ii) Planning Application (Item 7) – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH), Brockley Hill, Stanmore
 Councillor Janet Cowan declared a personal interest in the above application in that she was a member of the Stanmore Society with a non-executive role. Accordingly, she remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (iii) Planning Application (Item 7) – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH), Brockley Hill, Stanmore
 Councillor John Cowan, who was not a Member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in the above application in that he was a member of the Stanmore Society.

(See also Minute 1063).

1065. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information Act 1985, the following information be admitted to the agenda by reason of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated:-

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances / Reasons for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contained information relating to item 7 in the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda was despatched. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the item before them for decision.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

1066. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations had been received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

1067. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of the planning application at item 7 – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (RNOH), Brockley Hill, Stanmore.

1068. **Planning Applications Received:**

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Group Manager (Planning and Development) to issue the decision notice in respect of the application considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.16 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD
Chair

- ix) The submission of, and compliance with, a phasing plan prior to the submission of any application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to the planning permission that ensures that the first phase of development is the construction of the hospital. The phasing plan shall include full details of the phasing of the demolition of those existing buildings to be demolished as part of the development.
- x) The use of reasonable endeavours by the applicants to promote and recruit employees, contractors and sub contractors from within the Council's geographical area throughout the construction phase of the development.
- xi) Compliance with an Environmental Management Plan to be agreed in writing with the Council prior to the implementation of the development. This will mitigate the impact of the demolition of the buildings on the land and the construction of the development on the surrounding environment.
- xii) Compliance with the Ecological Management Plan submitted with the application, or an amended plan as agreed in writing with the Council.
- xiii) Compliance with the Landscape Management Plan submitted with the application, or an amended plan as agreed in writing with the Council.
- xiv) The provision of 10% renewable energy in the development by one or a combination of the alternative renewable energy options set out in the Renewable Energy Statement that has been submitted with the application.
- xv) Prior to the demolition of the southern extensions to Eastgate House, the preparation of an appropriate standing building record of the building following any necessary survey that shall be submitted to the Council for its retention, and the use of all reasonable endeavours to retain key structural elements from the aforesaid demolition and to incorporate in these new structures where possible.
- xvi) The submission within eighteen months of the implementation date of details of works for the restoration and continued maintenance of the Ancient Monuments, to include provision of paths and seating and the erection of interpretation boards, and the agreement of arrangements for public display of any archaeological finds from the site.
- xvii) The payment to the Council of a Green Belt Management contribution of £250,000.
- xviii) Access to the car parking area adjacent to the existing sports field shall be maintained, and the car park retained, for public use in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Council.
- xix) The provision of a replacement Hospital School and measures to ensure continuity of provision during, and post, construction, in conjunction with the Local Education Authority.
- xx) To enter into highway agreements, prior to implementation, with the Council and other highway authorities as appropriate regarding works to:
 - the access off Wood Lane on the southern and western boundaries;
 - improvements to the main access from Brockley Hill; and

- the construction of a new roundabout at the existing Brockley Hill / Wood Lane priority junction at the south east of the land.

(2) A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions reported, be issued only upon the completion, by the applicant, of the aforementioned agreement.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from two objectors and two representatives of the applicants, which were noted. Following receipt of the representations, some Members of the Committee and a Member, who was permitted to speak in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, asked questions of the applicant's representatives;

(2) it was noted that an e-mail (and not a letter as stated in the addendum) had been received from the RNOH Trust confirming that it would welcome the continuing involvement of local groups including HA21, the Nature Conservation Forum and the Harrow Heritage Trust in the finalisation of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plans and their implementation;

(3) prior to the Committee taking a decision on the application, additional questions from members of the public present were answered by the Director of Strategic Planning during which he indicated that regular Part I progress reports would be provided to future meetings of the Development Control Committee on the RNOH development;

(4) Councillors Blann, Idaikkadar, Miles, Mrs R Shah and Anne Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to grant the application;

(5) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Billson, Janet Cowan, Mrs Joyce Nickolay and John Nickolay wished to be recorded as having abstained from voting on the application].

(See also Minutes 1063, 1064 and 1067).

STANDING ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR
RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION

177. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read, and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- a) Membership list:
That the correct spelling of Mr Liversedge's name be noted.
- b) Minute 172 – SACRE Venues
Councillor Anjana Patel had offered to investigate whether the SACRE meeting on 9 March 2006, not 9 March 2005, could take place at the Hindu temple in Neasden.

178. **Collective Worship:**

There was some discussion regarding the role of SACRE and the approaches taken by schools in providing collective worship. It was agreed that, after the Agreed Syllabus had been drafted, SACRE would work on a project to share good practice to encourage schools in the provision of suitable collective worship which gave appropriate reference to Christianity as well as to the faiths practiced by the school community.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

179. **Determination: Whitmore High School:**

The Chair gave a verbal report of issues that she had raised with Whitmore High School's Headteacher regarding the submission for a determination.

RESOLVED: That the determination in relation to Whitmore High School should be given, subject to the remarks listed below:

- a) Question 5: The Governing body had been consulted about the application for a determination and there had been a vote at a full governors' meeting;
- b) Question 6: All parents had all been consulted by letter and there had been discussions regarding the determination application at parents' evenings for each year group. 20% of parents had responded to the consultation letter; of those, 88% had supported the application. There had also been verbal consent;
- c) Question 7: Staff at the school were all aware of the application and their views had been invited;
- d) Question 8B: The correct response for 8B was 'No'.

180. **Progress on Determinations:**

The Chair reported that she was supporting several schools with their applications for determinations, encouraging full and well thought out submissions.

181. **SACRE Report 2004-05:**

Draft headlines for the report were tabled and discussed. It was noted that Religious Education results in a number of Harrow high schools were favourable against average scores in other subjects.

RESOLVED: That the following amendments be made to the headlines and that the revised version be circulated to members:

- a) The Muslim packs should be mentioned in the report, but they should not be headlined;
- b) The words "and participation" be added to give the heading "Links and Participation with Other Bodies";
- c) "Holocaust Memorial day" be deleted;
- d) "Participation with synagogues in Northwood and Whitchurch schools on Holocaust Memorial Day" be added to the local list;
- e) Under Administration, the word "Report" be replaced by "Arrangements";
- f) Under Enclosures, the first bullet point should read "Religious Festivals during which...".

182. **Guidelines on Meeting the Needs of Muslim Pupils:**

It was reported that currently the national guidelines were in use in Harrow.

RESOLVED: That the Muslim members of SACRE be invited to set up a working party to update the guidelines for local needs.

183. **Correspondence:**

- a) NASACRE Young Inter Faith Projects
SACREs were encouraged to bid by 7 April 2006 for funding for projects which would enable young people to have an interfaith perspective.
- b) Barnet SACRE
Barnet SACRE had suggested that SACREs work together, and use email to informally exchange views on consultations, current initiatives and other good practice.
- c) Save the Children
It was noted that Save the Children had sent a questionnaire for completion by SACRE.

RESOLVED: That (1) Harrow join Barnet in the above-mentioned venture; and
(2) the questionnaire sent by Save the Children be completed.

184. **Any Other Business:**

- (i) Membership of SACRE
Following Council's decision at the meeting held on 20 October 2005, the following revised Conservative Group membership was noted:

- Ordinary Member: Councillor Mrs Champagne
- Reserve Members:
 1. Councillor Anjana Patel;
 2. Councillor Janet Mote;
 3. Councillor Janet Cowan.

A revised agenda was tabled showing the correct Conservative Group membership, which had been omitted from the agenda circulated prior to the meeting.

Mrs X Thurston had expressed an interest in representing the Free Churches on SACRE.

Following a declaration by the Chartered Commission of Human Rights that Humanism was a belief, it was proposed that Mr Liversedge join the 'Representatives of Christian and other religious denominations' group of SACRE membership.

RESOLVED: That (1) the revised membership be noted;

(2) the Chair write to Mrs Thurston inviting her to become a SACRE member;

(3) Mr Liversedge join the 'Representatives of Christian and other religious denominations' group of SACRE membership with immediate effect.

- (ii) Next Meeting of SACRE

With regards to the next meeting of SACRE, it was

RESOLVED: That (1) Councillor Anjana Patel be asked if the SACRE meeting on Thursday 9 March 2006 could take place at the Hindu temple in Neasden. (The meeting would probably start at 6.00 pm and would incorporate a tour of the temple.)

(2) it be noted that Mrs Hale had tendered her apologies for the March meeting.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.00 pm)

(Signed) MS P STEVENS
Chair

LICENSING AND
GENERAL PURPOSES
PANELS

LICENSING PANEL

8 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Branch

Councillors: * Choudhury * John Nickolay

Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**321. **Appointment of Chair:**

RESOLVED: That Councillor Branch be appointed Chair of the Panel for the purposes of this meeting.

322. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

323. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

324. **Minutes:**

(See Note at conclusion of these minutes).

325. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received, at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 18, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

326. **Licensing Procedures:**

The Chair introduced the Panel and officers present and outlined the procedure for the conduct of an oral hearing, which was set out in the agenda.

327. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Pizza Hut, 420 Alexandra Avenue, Rayners Lane:**

The Chief Environmental Health Officer's representative at the meeting informed the Panel that the representations made by both the Metropolitan Police and Environmental Health in respect of the application for a new Premises Licence for Pizza Hut, 420 Alexandra Avenue, Rayners Lane had been withdrawn that afternoon, and that, as a result, the application would not now require determination by the Panel.

It was noted that the application for the new Premises Licence would therefore be granted by the Chief Environmental Health Officer under the provisions set out in the Council's Licensing Policy and Delegation of Licensing Functions.

328. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Pizza Hut, 151 Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill:**

The Chief Environmental Health Officer's representative at the meeting informed the Panel that the representations made by both the Metropolitan Police and Environmental Health in respect of the application for a new Premises Licence for Pizza Hut, 151 Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill had been withdrawn that afternoon, and that, as a result, the application would not now require determination by the Panel.

It was noted that the application for the new Premises Licence would therefore be granted by the Chief Environmental Health Officer under the provisions set out in the Council's Licensing Policy and Delegation of Licensing Functions.

329. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Chicken Cottage, 153 Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer, which outlined the application for a new Premises Licence for Chicken Cottage, 153 Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill. The application, which had been made by Mr Kirupakaran Nadarajah, sought the provision of late night refreshment between 11.00 pm and 12.00 am on Sundays to Thursdays, and between 11.00 pm and 1.00 am on Fridays and Saturdays,

as well as opening hours of 10.00 am until 12.30 am on Sundays to Thursdays, and 10.00 am until 1.30 am on Fridays and Saturdays.

The application had been referred to the Panel as there were unresolved representations from the Planning Department and the Metropolitan Police. Members were informed that the hours sought by the applicant, if granted by the Panel, would exceed the opening hours stipulated in Condition 5 of the premises' Planning Permission granted in 1999. However, the Legal Officer present at the meeting advised the Panel that it could grant the application notwithstanding the representation from the Planning Department, provided Members were satisfied that there was evidence that the premises could operate without offending the licensing objectives.

The applicant confirmed that he understood the need to apply for Planning Permission, and would be doing so in the near future. The Planning Officer present at the meeting informed the Panel that, given the close proximity of similar premises which opened later than Chicken Cottage, she would have no objections to Chicken Cottage being allowed to extend its opening hours to 12.30 am. The applicant indicated that he was prepared to amend his application accordingly.

The Police representative present at the meeting informed the Panel that, prior to the meeting, he had established with the applicant that CCTV had already been installed and was operated in the premises, and that notices asking customers to leave the premises quietly were already in place. Although the premises were not fitted with an alarm system, the Police representative informed the Panel that, since no monies were kept on the premises overnight, this was not a Police requirement that an alarm be fitted.

Responding to questions from the Panel, the applicant stated that he had applied to extend the opening hours of the premises to allow time for cleaning at the end of the day, rather than because he wished to do more business. The Licensing Officer informed the applicant that he could clean the premises after closing time, and would not need to extend the premises' opening hours for this purpose. In light of the representations made by the responsible authorities, the applicant stated that he now wished for the premises to remain open to the public until 12.00 am on Sundays to Thursdays, and until 12.30 am on Fridays and Saturdays.

RESOLVED: That the application for a new Premises Licence for Chicken Cottage, 153 Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill be granted with the following amendments and additional conditions:

AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICATION:

Provision of late night refreshments:

Sundays to Thursdays: 11.00 pm – 12.00 am
Fridays and Saturdays: 11.00 pm – 12.30 am

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

1. Premises to have CCTV installed and operating during hours the premises are open to the public, in accordance with Police requirements.
REASON: Prevention of crime and disorder
2. An alarm to be installed in the premises if money is kept at the premises after closing.
REASON: Prevention of crime and disorder
3. Signs are to be prominently displayed in the premises asking patrons to be quiet on leaving the premises.
REASON: Prevention of public nuisance

330. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Dominos Pizza, 397 Kenton Lane, Harrow:**

The Chief Environmental Health Officer's representative at the meeting informed the Panel that the representation made by the Planning Department in respect of the application for a new Premises Licence for Dominos Pizza, 397 Kenton Lane, Harrow had been withdrawn that afternoon, and that as a result, the application would not now require determination by the Panel.

It was noted that the application for the new Premises Licence would therefore be granted by the Chief Environmental Health Officer under the provisions set out in the Council's Licensing Policy and Delegation of Licensing Functions.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 1.35 pm, closed at 2.30 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JOHN BRANCH
Chair

[Note: Licensing Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chair for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Licensing Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chair and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

LICENSING PANEL

19 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Knowles

Councillors: * Dharmarajah * Ray

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**331. **Appointment of Chair:**

RESOLVED: That Councillor Knowles be appointed as Chair of the Panel for the purposes of this meeting.

332. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of personal or prejudicial interests made by Members of the Panel arising from the business transacted at this meeting.

333. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
8. Application to Vary a Premises, The Three Wishes, Harrow, HA2 6ED	This report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated due to staff absence. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency.
9. Application to Vary a Premises Licence for Crazy Horse, 43 Church Road, Stanmore.	This report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated due to staff absence. Members were requested to consider this item, as a matter of urgency.
9. Application to Vary a Premise Licence for Crazy Horse, 43 Church Road, Stanmore.	Part of the Chief Environmental Health Officer's Report was tabled at the meeting as it was not available at the time the supplemental agenda had been printed and circulated.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

334. **Minutes:**
(See Note at conclusion of these minutes).335. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 18, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

336. **Licensing Procedures:**

The Chair introduced the Panel and officers present and outlined the procedure for the conduct of an oral hearing, which was set out in the agenda.

337. **Application to Vary a Premises, The Three Wishes, Harrow, HA2 6ED:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer which detailed an application for a variation to the Premises Licence for Three Wishes, 20 Broadwalk, Pinner Road, HA2 6ED.

The application for a Premises Licence had been made by Unitscore Limited. The application had been referred to the Panel as there were two unresolved representations from two Responsible Authorities, the Local Planning Authority and Environmental Health Services, and a petition from members of the public. Lucy Haile from the Local Planning Authority, who had made the representation, did not attend and was not represented at the meeting. Chris Nwokoro from Environmental Health Services was in attendance.

The application sought an extension to licensable activities. The premises were situated in a predominantly commercial part of Pinner Road. There was a car park behind the premises.

The applicant's representative stated that, following agreement with the Metropolitan Police, the applicant wished to withdraw the application for extended hours on Burns Night, Valentine's Night, St. David's Day, Commonwealth Day, F.A. Cup Final Day, Halloween, Guy Fawkes Night, St. Andrew's Day, 27 December, 28 December, 29 December and 30 December.

A representative from Headstone Residents' Association, who had not made a representation but was allowed to speak following agreement by the Panel and the applicant, showed the Panel photographs.

The representation from the Local Planning Authority cited one of the four Licensing Objectives, namely the prevention of public nuisance. Lucy Haile, in her representation, had focused on the applicants seeking an extension to the premises hours without obtaining permission of the Local Planning Authority. The applicant's representative stated that a planning application had recently been submitted and that, if the application to vary the Premises Licence were granted, the premises' extended hours would only apply once planning permission had been obtained.

The applicant's representative referred the Panel to the steps the applicant would take to promote the four Licensing Objectives as a result of the proposed variation and stated that the applicant would be willing to accept these as conditions.

The representation from the Local Planning Authority cited two of the four Licensing Objectives, namely public safety and the prevention of public nuisance. Chris Nwokoro focused on a lack of evidence of risk assessment, health and safety systems, staff training on how to handle emergencies and difficult situations, and evacuation procedures in case of outbreak of fire. The applicant's representative explained that evidence of the above was contained within the Group's Risk Assessment and Health and Safety documentation. Chris Nwokoro had seen these documents and confirmed that he was satisfied with the evidence.

Two objectors, who represented a number of residents who had signed a petition raising concerns about the impact of the premises being granted extended opening hours, explained that local residents had been very unhappy with the noise emitting from the premises. In response the applicant acknowledged that he was aware there had been occasions when noise emitted from the premises. This had been due to the breakdown of the air conditioning and an error of judgement on the part of the manager who had opened the doors. The air conditioning had taken weeks to repair but was now fixed.

Following the Panel's withdrawal from the meeting for the consideration of the application and representations received it was

RESOLVED: That the application be rejected.

REASON: Under the terms of the Licensing Policy of the London Borough of Harrow section 8.7: "where an applicant seeks to apply without resolving the necessary planning requirements, it will be for the applicant to detail the special circumstances that justify a departure from the policy." The Panel felt that the applicant had not detailed the special circumstances that had justified a departure from the policy.

338. **Application to Vary a Premises Licence for Crazy Horse, 43 Church Road, Stanmore:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer which detailed an application for a variation to the Premises Licence for Crazy Horse, Church Road, Stanmore.

The application for a variation to the Premises Licence had been made by Davenport Lyons Solicitors on behalf of Admin Solutions Ltd. The Premises held a converted premises licence. The application had been referred to the Panel as there were eleven

unresolved representations from local residents. The applicant had two legal representatives present at the meeting.

The application sought to extend the terminal hour for the sale and supply of alcohol, regulated entertainment and late night refreshment and to amend or remove certain conditions attached to the converted licence. The premises were situated in a semi commercial part of Church Road. There was residential accommodation close to the premises and the Local Authority had received numerous complaints regarding the anti-social behaviour of patrons from Crazy Horse since the premises had opened for business. A recent inspection by Licensing Officers had found five breaches of Licence Conditions. The Police had also visited the Premises on 10 December 2005 as part of 'Operation Optic' to ensure compliance with the Licensing Act 2003 and to tackle drunken and anti-social behaviour inside the premises and the vicinity. A witness statement from the police was tabled.

In response to the comments made in the witness statement, the applicant's representative explained that 10 December 2005 was not a typical evening as a Christmas party had been taking place. The manager of the premises had written to the manager of the company that had used the premises on 10 December 2005 to notify him that the applicant was unhappy with the behaviour of some members of the party. The manager had received a letter of apology which commended staff at Crazy Horse on how they had dealt with the situation. The applicant's representative informed the Panel that apart from the incident on 10 December 2005, there had been a good relationship between the management of the Crazy Horse and the police.

The applicant reported that when he had applied for a Public Entertainment Licence there had been resistance from residents living nearby but that he had met with them to address their concerns.

Objectors raised concerns about the impact of the premises being granted extra hours, particularly as the car park of the premises did not have the capacity to accommodate many cars and so patrons were parking in a nearby supermarket car park and a lot of alcohol related anti-social behaviour was taking place there. Residents had telephoned the police regularly to inform them of problems in this regard.

In response to objectors' concerns, the applicant's representative informed the Panel that they were unable to stop patrons from parking in the supermarket car park, they could only discourage them, and that not all of the behaviour in the car park was attributable to Crazy Horse. The applicant's legal representative advised that he had contacted the supermarket to investigate whether the supermarket would erect a barrier. Although the supermarket was not planning to erect a barrier, it was considering introducing a clamping system. The applicant's legal representative stated that he was willing to keep contacting the supermarket and suggested that regular meetings take place between the applicant and objectors to try to solve the problem. The applicant advised that he would also provide objectors with his telephone number and was prepared to include statements on Crazy Horse literature requesting patrons not to park in the supermarket car park. Door supervisors could ask patrons to leave quietly and monitor the car park as their presence could be a deterrent to anti-social behaviour.

Referring to the breach of Licence Conditions, the applicant's representative reported that the conditions had been put in place at a time Crazy Horse was not trading and so it had not been clear at the time which conditions would be appropriate. The difficulty in obtaining female door supervisors was highlighted and the Police had agreed that the application should be amended to remove this condition. Since the visit from Licensing Officers, the breach of Licence Conditions had been addressed.

In response to an objector's comment that she had seen people entering the premises after 11.00 pm, the Chair informed objectors that if the premises did not keep to the Licence Conditions, objectors could request a review.

Following the Panel's withdrawal from the meeting for the consideration of the application and representations received it was

RESOLVED: That the application be rejected.

REASON: The Panel had not been convinced that the Management of the Crazy Horse had been tight enough with its procedures regarding the 6 October 2005 letter from the Licensing Section and the Police Statement arising from Operation Optic on 14 December 2005.

339. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**
[In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14.2 (ii)(a) "Varying the Closure Time" (part 4B of the Constitution), the meeting continued beyond 10.00 pm in the normal manner for the completion of the business remaining on the agenda, the Chair having regard to the qualification in the Rule not to prejudice third party rights or interests affected by the remaining business and the quasi-judicial nature of the Panel's proceedings.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.31 pm, closed at 11.19 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ADRIAN KNOWLES
Chair

[Note: Licensing Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chair for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Licensing Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chair and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

LICENSING PANEL

20 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Janet Cowan

Councillors: * Branch * John Nickolay

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**340. **Appointment of Chair:**

RESOLVED: That Councillor Janet Cowan be appointed Chair of the Panel for the purposes of this meeting.

341. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interest made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

342. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

343. **Minutes:**

(See Note at conclusion of these minutes).

344. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received, at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure rules 18, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

345. **Licensing Procedures:**

The Chair introduced the Panel and officers present and outlined the procedure for the conduct of an oral hearing, which was set out in the agenda.

346. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Everest Tandoori, 905 Ground Floor, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer which detailed an application for a new Premises Licence for Everest Tandoori, 905 Ground Floor, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore. The application had been referred to the Panel as there were unresolved representations from the Metropolitan Police Service and Harrow Environmental Health Services as Responsible Authorities.

The application for a Premises License had been made on behalf of Mount Everest Limited by Mr Shiba Hari Tiwari, who was present at the meeting. Sergeant Carl Davis of the Metropolitan Police and Ms Lisa Wallace and Ms Vikki Stubbs of Harrow Environmental Health Services were also in attendance.

The application sought the provision of late night refreshment and the sale of alcohol as listed in the report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer.

The applicant stated that he had taken action to address a number of the concerns raised by the Responsible Authorities. He had arranged for the installation of an alarm system including a panic alarm, digital CCTV and a secure shutter to be completed by January. The applicant stated that he would be agreeable to the installation and maintenance of these systems to be included as conditions should the Panel be minded to grant the Premises Licence.

Following questions from the representative of the Metropolitan Police Service, the applicant confirmed that he would accept conditions requiring all cash left on the premises overnight to be stored in a safe and the placing of notices requesting patrons to leave the premises quietly.

An Environmental Health Officer stated that, prior to the meeting, she had agreed with the applicant that he would accept conditions requiring a minimum of two staff to be on duty at any time, the collection of refuse by an approved organisation, the annual

servicing of refrigeration, ventilation and air-conditioning equipment and daily litter collection by staff.

In response to a question from a Member of the Panel, the applicant confirmed that children were not allowed on the premises unless supervised by a responsible adult, the premises did provide a no-smoking area, and children were not allowed in the bar area.

Following the Panel's withdrawal from the meeting for the consideration of the application and the representations received it was

RESOLVED: That the new Premises Licence for Everest Tandoori, 905 Ground Floor, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore be granted with the following additional conditions:

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

1. CCTV equipment shall be installed, operated and maintained in good working order and in accordance with the recommendations of the Police or Crime Prevention Officer
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
2. Money is to be kept in a safe at the premises when the premises are closed.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
3. Tills must be regularly skimmed off, to reduce the impact should a robbery occur. They must also be emptied at night.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
4. Signage must be displayed in the customer area, and front window, highlighting that access to cash and valuables is controlled by time delay.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
5. A monitored central station alarm is required and must be installed by either a NACOSS or SSAIB affiliated installer.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
6. The monitored security system must be equipped with a signal terminating at a recognised Alarm Receiving Centre (ARC) and must comply with the current version of the EN50131-1 standard and be eligible for a police response as defined by the ACPO Policy on Police Response to Security Systems, Level 1 status.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
7. The monitored security system should incorporate fixed personal panic attack buttons for the use of staff behind the counter and remoter panic buttons for staff when they are away from the counter area.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
8. There are to be no children under the age of 16 on the premises after 10.00pm each night.
REASON: For the protection of children from harm.
9. Notices are to be installed both inside and outside the premises, requesting that patrons leave the premises quietly.
REASON: For the prevention of public nuisance.
10. A minimum number of two staff will be working at any one time after 7pm each day.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
11. Annual servicing of ventilation systems, air conditioning and refrigeration units are required to minimise the impact of noise and odour.
REASON: For the prevention of public nuisance.
12. Regular litter picking activities must take place in the immediate vicinity at least once every opening evening and upon closing.
REASONS: For the prevention of public nuisance and for public safety.
13. Refuse and waste oil to be stored in closed containers.
REASONS: For the prevention of public nuisance and for public safety.

14. Refuse must be collected on a frequent basis by an approved waste collector to prevent overflowing, with a system in place for emergency collections should this be necessary.

REASONS: For the prevention of public nuisance and for public safety.

15. Closed refuse containers and the surrounding refuse area must be cleaned and disinfected at least monthly and kept in a tidy condition.

REASONS: For the prevention of public nuisance and for public safety.

347. **Application to Vary a Premises Licence for Golden Sip, 496-500 Northolt Road, Harrow, Middlesex:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer which detailed an application to vary a Premises Licence for Golden Sip, 496-500 Northolt Road, Harrow, Middlesex. The application had been referred to the Panel as there were unresolved representations from the Metropolitan Police Service and Harrow Environmental Health Services as Responsible Authorities.

The application had been made by Mr Sukhvinder Singh Mukhal, who was present at the meeting. Sergeant Carl Davis of the Metropolitan Police Service and Ms Lisa Wallace and Ms Vikki Stubs of Harrow Environmental Health Services were also in attendance.

The application sought an extension of hours for the sale of alcohol, the performance of live music, the playing of recorded music, the performance of dance and anything of a similar nature, the provision of facilities for dance and the provision of late night refreshment.

The applicant stated that he had recently expanded the premises by purchasing 500 Northolt Road which was to be used as a function hall. He was aware that he did not presently have planning consent to operate the premises during the extended hours requested, but had applied for planning consent on 1 December 2005.

In response to questions from the representative of the Metropolitan Police, Mr Mukhal stated that he had owned and managed the premises for eight years. He confirmed that he had been present during an incident in March 2005 when the Police had been called to the premises.

Mr Mukhal stated that he had not read the representation from the Metropolitan Police representative. Following advice from the Council's legal adviser, the Chair asked Mr Mukhal if he would prefer to adjourn the meeting to consider the representations received and whether to amend his application. Mr Mukhal stated that he was happy to continue.

Mr Mukhal stated that he was willing to amend his application by reducing the extended hours applied for, as set out in additional amendments 1 and 2 below. He also stated that he agreed to the conditions requested by the Police that a CCTV system would be in operation whenever the premises was open, Security Industry Association (SIA) registered door supervisors would be on the premises when regulated entertainments took place and amusement with prizes (AWP) machines would be emptied nightly or fitted with a protective security device.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Mukhal stated that he had never received any complaints regarding noise, that he would not be providing adult entertainment and that he wished to have earlier opening hours so he could show televised sporting events such as cricket from the Southern Hemisphere.

The representative of the Metropolitan Police stated that he did not object to the amended hours requested by the applicant but emphasised that door supervisors would be vital given the incidents that had required Police attendance.

A representative of Harrow Environmental Protection Services stated that Mr Mukhal had agreed to a condition that a minimum of two staff would be working when the premises was open after 10.00 pm.

Following the Panel's withdrawal from the meeting for their consideration of the application and the representations received, it was

RESOLVED: That the variation to the licence for Golden Sip, 496-500 Northolt Road, Harrow, Middlesex be granted with the following additional amendments and conditions.

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICATION

1. Licensed hours for all licensable activities to be 8.00 am – 12.00 midnight Sunday to Thursday and 8.00 am – 12.30 am Friday to Saturday.
2. The premises would be open to the public from 8.00 am – 12.30 am Sunday to Thursday and 8.00 am – 1.00 am Friday to Saturday.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

1. CCTV equipment shall be installed, operated and maintained in good working order and in accordance with the recommendations of the Police or Crime Prevention Officer.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
2. A monitored central station alarm is required and must be installed by either a NACOSS or SSAIB affiliated installer.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
3. The monitored security system must be equipped with a signal terminating at a recognised Alarm Receiving Centre (ARC) and must comply with the current version of the EN50131-1 standard and be eligible for a police response as defined by the ACPO Policy on Police Response to Security Systems, Level 1 status.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
4. The monitored security system should incorporate fixed personal panic attack buttons for the use of staff behind the counter and remoter panic buttons for staff when they are away from the counter area.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
5. There shall be a minimum of one door supervisor on duty at the premises at all times during opening hours.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
6. After 7.00 pm each day, there will be one door supervisor per 50 patrons or part thereof.
REASONS: For public safety and the prevention of crime and disorder.
7. All door supervisors will be SIA badged.
REASONS: For public safety and the prevention of crime and disorder.
8. All door supervisors will wear an identification badge, conspicuously displayed, and carry proof of SIA registration.
REASONS: For public safety and the prevention of crime and disorder.
9. There are to be no children under the age of 16 on the premises after 10.00pm each night.
REASON: For the prevention of children from harm.
10. Any S.34 AWP machines will be emptied nightly or fitted with an appropriate recommended security device (eg a 'boot' or 'metal roller shutter'.)
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
11. A safe controlled by a time delay method is to be installed at the premises.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
12. Notices are to be displayed, inside and outside the premises, requesting that patrons leave the premises quietly.
REASON: For the prevention of public nuisance.
13. Notices are to be displayed prominently at the premises stating that access to cash and valuables is controlled by time delay.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
14. The designated premises supervisor, or in their absence a licensee for the premises, is to participate in the Pubwatch scheme for the area that includes the premises.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.

15. There are to be a minimum of two staff working on the premises after 10.00pm each day.

REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.

348. **Application for a New Premises Licence, Kings Snooker Club, 342 Station Road, Harrow, Middlesex:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer which detailed an application for a new Premises Licence for Kings Snooker Club, 342 Station Road, Harrow, Middlesex. The application had been referred to the Panel as there was an unresolved representation from the Metropolitan Police Service, a Responsible Authority.

The application for a Premises Licence had been made by Henry Y Smith & Co on behalf of Mr Serif Carmichael Alma and Mr Imam Toprak who attended the meeting with their representative, Mr Ian Mann. Sergeant Carl Davis of the Metropolitan Police Service was also in attendance.

The application sought a licence to supply alcohol on and off the premises as listed in the report of the Chief Environmental Health Officer.

The applicants' representative stated that the premises would operate as a private members' club. An officer stated that the written application submitted was for a standard premises licence and club rules had not been included in the operating schedule. The applicants' representative stated that a document amending the application had been sent to the Metropolitan Police and the applicants' solicitors had informed him that it would be submitted to the Panel Members prior to the meeting. It was confirmed that the document had not been received by the Panel. The document consisted of a letter from Henry Y Smith & Co, solicitors, to Sergeant Carl Davis of the Metropolitan Police, dated 16 December 2005, together with enclosures. The document was tabled at the meeting.

Following a short adjournment to allow the Panel to read the document, the applicants' representative stated that identification cards would be issued to members and would need to be shown to gain entry. Guests would only be allowed if vouched for by a member. No children under 16 years of age would be allowed in the premises and those of 16 to 17 years of age would have to be accompanied by an adult. The premises would be on the first floor when it was constructed and would contain eight snooker tables. The applicants' representative anticipated that the maximum capacity would be around 60 patrons but did not expect more than four patrons per table to be in the premises at any one time. He stated that the premises would be quiet, with no loud music and most patrons staying for long periods of time. The supply of alcohol would be ancillary to the playing of snooker and pool. He also stated that the applicants had managed a previous private club which had opened until midnight.

Following questions from the Panel, the applicants stated that the club would allow women members and anticipated a total membership of around 150-250 persons. Members would be allowed to book tables in advance but would not be allowed to enter the premises if it was full. The membership fee would be a nominal sum of approximately £5. The applicants also stated that they would be willing to call taxis for members and that members would not be able to purchase alcohol on credit.

Following questions from the Metropolitan Police representative, the applicants stated that they would be willing to meet the reasonable requirements of a Crime Reduction Officer when constructing the premises and that there had been two incidents at their previous premises when the Police were called. The applicants stated that they would accept conditions requiring them to display 'Members Only' signage, operate a CCTV system, make membership records available to the Police, operate an intruder alarm and attach protective devices to Amusement With Prizes (AWP) machines. The applicants also stated that they believed it was necessary for the premises to be open until 4.00 am as patrons would play snooker for many hours at a time, and would not come to the premises earlier if they would not have time to finish their game.

The Metropolitan Police representative stated that the Borough Commander had asked officers to seek full cost recovery from any premises open after 2.00 am on Friday or Saturday and after 12.30 am on Sunday to Thursday. He also stated that while he was not requesting door supervision as a condition on the licence if the premises were to open until 1.00 am, but believed it would be vital if the premises were to open later. The applicants stated they were willing to accept full cost recovery but did not feel they would need door supervisors as they had previously operated successfully using an intercom system. The applicants' representative stated that a later closing time would assist in creating a staggered departure from licensed premises.

Following the Panel's withdrawal from the meeting for their consideration of the application and the representations received it was

RESOLVED: That the Premises Licence for Kings Snooker Club, 342 Station Road, Harrow, Middlesex be granted, as amended by the applicants' solicitors' letter of 16 December 2005 with the following additional amendments and additional conditions.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

1. Licensed hours for the sale of alcohol to be 10.30 am – 1.30 am each day.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.
2. The premises may be open to the public from 10.30 am – 2.00 am each day.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.
3. CCTV equipment shall be installed, operated and maintained in good working order and in accordance with the recommendations of the Police or Crime Prevention Officer.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
4. The premises shall be operated in accordance with the rules provided in the letter from Henry Y Smith & Co, solicitors, to Sergeant Carl Davis of the Metropolitan Police, dated 16 December 2005, and entitled Rules of Kings Snooker Club, a copy of which should be annexed.
REASONS: For the prevention of crime and disorder, the prevention of public nuisance, public safety and the prevention of children from harm.
5. A monitored central station alarm is to be installed at the premises and must be installed by either a NACOSS or SSAIB affiliated installer.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
6. The monitored security system must be equipped with a signal terminating at a recognised Alarm Receiving Centre (ARC) and must comply with the current version of the EN50131-1 standard and be eligible for a police response as defined by the ACPO Policy on Police Response to Security Systems, Level 1 status.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
7. The monitored security system should incorporate fixed personal panic attack buttons for the use of staff behind the counter and remoter panic buttons for staff when they are away from the counter area.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
8. A safe controlled by a time delay method is to be installed at the premises and must achieve the following:
 - Restrict access for at least three minutes, to deter criminals from accessing the surplus or reserve value during any robbery.
 - Have a drop facility with anti-fish mechanism.
 - Include the safe being either bolted to a solid wall and/or solid floor or buried in a solid wall and/or solid floor.**REASON:** For the prevention of crime and disorder.
9. Tills must be regularly skimmed off.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
10. Any money kept on the premises after closing must be stored in the safe.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
11. Signage must be displayed in the customer area, highlighting that access to cash and valuable items is controlled by time delay.
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
12. Any S.34 AWP machines will be emptied nightly or fitted with an appropriate recommended security device (eg a 'boot' or 'metal roller shutter'.)
REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.
13. A register of members and a guestbook must be available for inspection by the Metropolitan Police Service and the London Borough of Harrow whenever the premises are open to the public.

REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder.

14. A sign is to be installed at the front entrance of the premises that states 'Members Only Club'.

REASON: For the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 1.30 pm, closed at 5.57 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JANET COWAN
Chair

[Note: Licensing Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chair for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Licensing Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chair and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

SOCIAL SERVICES APPEALS PANEL**15 DECEMBER 2005**

Chair: * G Bridge (Independent Person)

Councillors: * Blann * Omar

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**31. **Appointment of Chair:****RESOLVED:** That Dr Gillian Bridge be appointed Chair of the Panel for the purpose of this meeting.32. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That the item listed in Part II of the agenda be considered with the press and public excluded for the reason indicated below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
6. The Keeping of a Child in Secure Accommodation	This item was considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 6 of Part I to Schedule 12A of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 in that it contains information relating to the care of a particular child.

33. **Terms of Reference:****RESOLVED:** That the terms of reference of the Panel be noted.34. **Guidance Notes:****RESOLVED:** That the guidance notes setting out the nature of the Panel be noted.35. **The Keeping of a Child in Secure Accommodation:**

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Children's Services which set out the background to the current situation and outlined the reasons why a secure placement was still considered necessary. The Panel also considered a report from the Independent Investigator setting out the views of the child, and a report from the Secure Unit.

The Panel carefully reviewed the case, taking into account the verbal updates from the Social Services Officer and the Independent Investigator. The Panel also considered additional reports from the Secure Unit which were tabled at the meeting.

Having considered all the views expressed at the meeting including the wishes of the child who was present at the meeting, the Panel

RESOLVED: That the child remain in the Secure Unit for a period of 6 weeks from 19 December 2005.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 11.40 am, closed at 12.28 pm)

(Signed) DR GILLIAN BRIDGE
Chair

[Note: Social Services Appeals Panel minutes are:-

- (1) approved following each meeting by the Members serving on that particular occasion and signed as a correct record by the Chair for that meeting;
- (2) printed into the Council Minute Volume, published monthly;
- (3) not submitted to the next panel meeting for approval.

Reasons: The Social Services Appeals Panel is constituted from a pooled membership. Consequently, a subsequent Panel meeting is likely to comprise a different Chair and Members who took no part in the previous meeting's proceedings. The process referred to at (1) above provides appropriate approval scrutiny].

EARLY RETIREMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

22 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Bluston

Councillors: * Branch * Knowles

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**46. **Attendance by Reserve Members:****RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.47. **Declarations of Interest:****RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.48. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of special circumstances and grounds for urgency as detailed below:-

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances / Grounds for Urgency</u>
10. Exercise Discretion under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (as amended)	This report was not available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated, due to the delay in receiving the final approval from the relevant officers.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following items for the reason set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
9. Exercise Discretion under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2000	Both of these items were considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 in that they related to a particular employee.
10. Exercise Discretion under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (as amended)	

49. **Minutes:****RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.50. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:****RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 18, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

51. **Exercise Discretion under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2000:**

The Executive Director (People First) reported on an application by an employee under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2000 (as amended), requesting that the employer exercise discretion and agree early retirement.

RESOLVED: That (1) this was a suitable case for consideration under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2000 (as amended); and

(2) having determined that the application met the criteria, discretion be exercised and the early retirement of MS under Regulation 8 be agreed and awarded with an additional period of 6 years and 243 days.

52. **Exercise Discretion under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (as amended):**

The Executive Director (Urban Living) reported on an application by an employee under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (as amended), requesting that the employer exercise discretion and agree early retirement.

RESOLVED: That (1) this was a suitable case for consideration under Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Early Termination) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (as amended); and

(2) having determined that the application met the criteria, discretion be exercised and the early retirement of IS under Regulation 8 be agreed and awarded with an additional period of 4 years and 8 days.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.50 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR HOWARD BLUSTON
Chair

THE CABINET,
EXECUTIVE SUB-COMMITTEES,
AND
CABINET ADVISORY PANELS

CABINET

REPORT OF CABINET

MEETING HELD ON 15 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor N Shah

Councillors: * D Ashton * Marie-Louise Nolan
 * Burchell * O'Dell
 * Margaret Davine * Bill Stephenson
 * Dighé * Thornton
 * C Mote

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

857. **Norman Kember:**
 Cabinet stood and observed a minute's silence for Norman Kember and the other hostages held in Iraq.

858. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interest was declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
20. Community (Extended) Schools Rollout	Councillor Dighé	The Member indicated a personal interest in that his children attended schools that would be included in the rollout. He would remain in the room whilst this matter was considered and voted upon.

859. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

860. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

The Chair indicated that he would be varying the order of business to enable consideration of item 14, the Draft Corporate Community Engagement Strategy, after item 5, Public Questions, as Deven Pillay of Mencap was in attendance.

The Chair reported that, due to recent developments in relation to items 19 and 23, LIFT/PFI Project, both of these items would be considered in Part II of the agenda.

Cabinet noted that items 18 and 27, Clarendon Road Public Realm Improvements had been withdrawn from the agenda as the Town Centre Project Panel had the delegated authority to make the decisions required.

RESOLVED: That all business be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following items for the reasons set out below:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
19 & 23. Key Decision – LIFT/PFI Project	The report contained exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 9 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of the negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of services.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 24. | Arts Culture Harrow – Moving Forward | The report contained exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to the financial affairs of an external body. |
| 25. | Key Decision - Joint Waste Strategy | The report contained exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to advice received in connection with the determination of any matter affecting the Authority. |
| 26. | Key Decision - Conservation Area Appraisals Programme | The report was exempt by virtue of Paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information relating to advice received in connection with the determination of any matter affecting the Authority. |

861. **Petitions:**

- (i) Councillor Marie-Louise Nolan presented a petition containing 570 signatures in relation to the traffic enforcement scheme in Wealdstone. She read the terms of the petition to the meeting which were as follows:-

“We, the traders, shoppers and delivery men of Wealdstone hereby request the immediate termination of the camera traffic reinforcement scheme currently operating in Wealdstone High Street.”

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and noted.

- (ii) Councillor Mrs Kinnear presented two petitions in relation to South Harrow Controlled Parking Zone and requested that they be referred to the Traffic Advisory Panel for consideration. The first petition contained 49 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“We, the undersigned, are Harrow residents living close to Dudley Gardens. We are strongly opposed to the proposed CPZ extension introducing parking restrictions into Dudley Gardens.”

The second petition contained 105 signatures, the terms of which were as follows:-

“South Harrow Controlled Parking Zone Review and Possible Extension

We, the undersigned residents of Brooke Avenue and South Hill Avenue object to the proposed changes to the parking bays in our roads under the aforementioned review, on the following grounds:

1. Making some of the Residents Permit Bays incorporate Long Stay Pay & Display Bays as well will:
 - (a) Create difficulty for residents to park outside or near to their homes.
 - (b) Encourage rather than discourage commuters to use their cars to travel to work.
 - (c) Create difficulty for residents who are elderly or who have mobility problems to carry out every day activities, such as shopping by not being able to park near their property.
 - (d) Increase the likelihood of vehicle crime because residents will be forced to park further away from their homes and in less overlooked parts of Brooke Avenue.
2. Issuing Business Permits to local Businesses (Maximum of two per Business at £300 each, per annum) will:

- (a) Further increase all the problems listed in point 1.
 - (b) Possibly make it impossible for residents to park outside their homes during the day.
 - (c) Give preferential treatment to businesses, rather than provide residents with the parking they need.
3. Putting new Permit Bays on the bend in Brooke Avenue will:
- (a) Cause difficulty for delivery lorries, waste disposal lorries and other large vehicles to pass the parked vehicles.
 - (b) Increase risk of damage to parked vehicles due to restricted space in which moving vehicles may pass.
 - (c) Increase the risk of accidents due to the restricted line of vision of the road ahead.
 - (d) Cause inconvenience as drivers will need to reverse when meeting oncoming traffic."

RESOLVED: That the petitions be received and noted.

862. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions had been received.

863. **Draft Corporate Community Engagement Strategy:**

The Director of People, Performance and Policy introduced the report which sought approval to the draft Community Engagement Strategy and endorsement of the action plan for implementation of the Strategy. He reported that the Strategy had been consulted upon extensively.

Deven Pillay, Mencap, advised that, as Chair of the Community Cohesion Reference Group and through the Community Consultative Forum, in his view there had been consultation on the Strategy and that these groups had had an input. He welcomed the Strategy as a starting point as it set some standards and would improve the quality of life of residents. He added a note of caution that care should be exercised on the use of certain terms.

The Portfolio Holder for Communications, Partnership and Human Resources welcomed the Strategy and advised that a scrutiny review would be submitted to Cabinet in the New Year. This Strategy and the scrutiny review would build on good practice.

RESOLVED: (1) That the Council's draft Corporate Community Engagement Strategy be approved;

(2) that the action plan for the implementation of the Strategy be endorsed;

(3) that the Council's draft Corporate Community Engagement Strategy be referred to the Harrow Strategic Partnership with the view to developing a joint Community Engagement Strategy.

Reason for Decision: The Strategy aimed to ensure that service areas involved the community in decision making in a consistent and relevant way. The implementation of the strategy should lead to residents feeling more informed about the work and performance of the Council. The Comprehensive Performance Assessment of local authorities would look for evidence of effective public engagement in the development and delivery of Council services.

864. **Forward Plan 1 December 2005 - 31 March 2006:**

RESOLVED: That the Forward Plan 1 December 2005 – 31 March 2006 be noted.

865. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

866. **Harrow, West London and London 2012:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report, which sought to raise awareness of national, London and West London Alliance activity, and to seek cross-Council involvement in developing Harrow's own plans to be involved in, and benefit from, the London 2012 Olympics. She added that a recent development was that the sporting events would be supported by cultural activities.

A Member indicated that there was a risk of public disquiet in relation to the cost of the Games but acknowledged that it was necessary to work together positively. The Chair confirmed that consideration of cost issues were not appropriate in the context of this report and that the Council's views were very clear as per a resolution at the full Council meeting. The Portfolio Holder for Education and Lifelong Learning advised that the Council and Association of London Government had put forward some robust proposals.

RESOLVED: (1) That the direction and scope of the outline ideas and plans to take forward London 2012, as set out in the report of the Executive Director (People First) and Director of Strategic Planning, be approved;

(2) that an informal Member-led cross-party "Harrow Olympics Task Force" be established.

Reason for Decision: To raise awareness of national, local and West London alliance activity to seek cross-Council involvement in developing Harrow's own plans to be involved, and benefit from, the London 2012 Olympics and to link to Harrow's corporate priorities.

867. **Business Transformation Partnership - Sub-Committee:**

The Chief Executive introduced the report which sought approval to the establishment of an Executive Sub-Committee, to exercise decision making powers in relation to the Business Transformation Partnership (BTP) on behalf of the Authority and enable the proper discharge of the Council's functions in a more speedy and timely manner than if it was necessary to refer to full Cabinet. She advised that the proposals had been discussed with the BTP Board and the Members' IT Forum.

RESOLVED: (1) That an Executive Sub-Committee, the Business Transformation Partnership Sub-Committee, be established;

(2) that the terms of reference set out in the report of the Chief Executive be approved.

Reason for Decision: To provide a Member level mechanism within the formal structure for monitoring the implementation of the BTP.

868. **HOST Project Panel:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2005 be received and noted.

Reason for Decision: To inform Members of the decision in relation to the amendment to the capital programme.

869. **Key Decision - 2006/07 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Budget Strategy 2006/07 to 2008/09:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report which sought approval to the draft Revenue Budget and draft Medium Term Budget Strategy for consultation with stakeholders. She drew Members' attention to the revised Appendix B which had been tabled and which set out further details of the settlement now that there had been opportunity to further analyse it.

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy reported that there was ongoing technical work and a need to review the growth and savings options. The settlement announcement suggested that the capping level would be set at 5% and that the risk was minimal. She added that the Greater London Authority draft budget had been released on 14 December 2005 and proposed a precept of 16%, which equated to £42.00 per household per year.

A Member asked a series of questions in relation to the shortfall in procurement, sickness absence and restructuring costs and the Business Transformation Partnership guaranteed savings. He emphasised that it was a 'moving' budget and that care should be taken to ensure that there was no double counting.

The Portfolio Holder for Business Connections and Performance advised that the budget was not advanced at this stage and that the figures included approximately £6m growth and savings. He advised that the Budget Review Working Group would be considering the detailed budget on 6 February 2006 and that he hoped that this additional time would enable consideration of options.

RESOLVED: (1) That the draft Revenue Budget £148.579m for 2006/07 and the draft Medium Term Budget Strategy for consultation with stakeholders be approved;

(2) that the proposal to use a risk assessment to determine the appropriate level of reserves be noted;

(3) that the draft Housing Revenue Account for 2006/07 and the draft three year financial strategy for Housing be approved;

(4) that the draft Housing Revenue Account for 2006/07 be referred to the Tenants' and Leaseholders' Consultative Forum on 5 January 2006.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that the Council was planning the use of resources effectively.

[Note: Councillors D Ashton and C Mote wished to be recorded as not approving the draft budget].

870. **Association of London Government (ALG) Grants Scheme 2006/07:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report which sought approval to the provisional ALG Grants Committee budget for 2006/07.

Members expressed concern that outer London Boroughs did not fare as well in the scheme as the inner London Boroughs. The Chair advised that the needs of outer London Boroughs had been put to the ALG Leaders' Committee.

RESOLVED: (1) That the provisional ALG Grants Committee budget for 2006/07 be approved and that Harrow's contribution to the Grants Scheme be noted;

(2) that a letter be sent to Harrow's MPs seeking guidance as to how an increase in the grant for Harrow could be achieved.

Reason for Decision: The ALG Grants Committee budget for 2006/07 must be agreed by two thirds of the constituent Councils before 1 February 2006.

871. **Statement of Accounts 2004/2005:**

The Director of Financial and Business Strategy introduced the report which outlined a recommendation from the Audit Committee meeting held on 27 October 2005 in relation to the Statement of Accounts 2004/2005. She reported that a review was underway and would be reported to Cabinet before the end of the financial year.

RESOLVED: That (1) a full review of debt recovery policy, sums outstanding, write offs required, the appropriate level of bad debt provision for the Authority and the adequacy of the current provision be carried out as a high priority and in time for the next annual audit;

(2) adequate provision be made in future budget plans for effective debt management; and

(3) action be taken to write off debt where required.

Reason for Report: To ensure that the Council was planning the use of resources effectively and to strengthen the financial accountability of the Authority.

872. **Key Decision - Joint Waste Strategy:**

An officer introduced the report, which sought approval to the Council's formal response to the consultation draft of the strategy. He reported that whilst only four responses to the consultation had been received, this was consistent with the experience of other authorities. Members noted that there was also a confidential report appearing elsewhere on the agenda in relation to the Strategy.

In response to a suggestion from a Member, the officer indicated that a representative from each school could be invited to attend the official launch of the office recycling scheme at the Civic Centre on 19 December 2005.

RESOLVED: That the draft Joint Waste Strategy be approved and that the West London Waste Authority and other collection authorities be requested to consider:

(a) the establishment of a West London Waste Authority-wide campaign to promote reusable nappies within the Health Service and childcare professions;

- (b) an investigation into the possibility (and costs) of the inclusion of kitchen waste (as one of the five materials collected from every household by 2010);

Reason for Decision: The agreement of a Joint Waste Strategy would allow West London Waste Authority and the six constituent authorities to make progress on procuring new waste disposal processes, meet their obligations under the Landfill Directive, reduce their reliance on landfill, and reduce their financial liabilities under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme.

(See also Minutes 860 and 879)

873. **Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05:**

The Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the recommendations of the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel. The Government required all local authorities to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and to submit it to the Government Office for London by 30 December 2005.

A Member indicated that not all policies appeared to be working correctly and reiterated the concerns expressed by members of his Group at the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel meeting.

RESOLVED: That (1) the contents of the AMR 2004-05 be noted;

(2) the AMR 2004-05 be submitted to Government Office for London by 30 December 2005, subject to the completion of further detailed work on aspects of the AMR, and taking on board any decision on the approach to Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.

Reason for Decision: The first annual monitoring report was a key part of the new planning system and its preparation was a requirement noted in the Local Development Scheme. Failure to submit the AMR on time would be a breach of the regulations governing the new planning system and would also lead to a reduction in the Planning Delivery Grant, which would have an impact on resources for Planning and Development Services.

874. **Key Decision - Conservation Area Appraisals Programme:**

The Executive Director (Urban Living) introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the recommendations of the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel and to the confidential report appearing elsewhere on the agenda in relation to the Programme.

A Member indicated that the view expressed by members of his Group at the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel meeting was that option B was the better option as option C could weaken the authority's ability to appeal.

RESOLVED: That (1) option C, as set out in the confidential officer report considered by the Strategic Planning Advisory Panel, be approved;

(2) the Local Development Scheme be amended accordingly and the approach be reviewed in light of any revised guidance issued.

Reason for Decision: The Council would be working towards its statutory requirements under Planning Policy Guidance 15 of improving its performance against the new Best Value Performance Indicator 219 on conservation areas and clarifying the production of documents in relating to conservation areas in the Local Development Scheme.

[Note: Councillors D Ashton and C Mote wished to be recorded as having voted against Resolution (1) above.]

(See also Minutes 860 and 880)

875. **Community (Extended) Schools Rollout:**

The Director of Learning and Community Development introduced the report which set out the evaluation of the Community Schools Pilot. This report had been prepared following Cabinet's previous decision in July 2004 to extend the Community Schools Pilot and it was the view of officers that the existing clusters had achieved the original ambitions and it was proposed that the roll out be extended.

In response to a Member's question in relation to informing residents who lived close to the schools concerned about the proposed changes in hours, the Director of Learning and Community Development advised that the project management groups would be

dealing with the consultation to varying degrees. He acknowledged that it was necessary to have a standardised approach and to have full consultation.

A motion in the name of Councillor Bill Stephenson was moved and it was

RESOLVED: That (1) the proposals from the Park and Whitmore clusters for developing the Community (Extended) Schools approach be approved and that the Nower Hill Extended Schools Initiative begin, subject to a satisfactory plan being submitted to Cabinet;

(2) that the Director of Learning and Community Development's report be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for Decision: The appointment of coordinators would enable schools to pool expertise and resources, as well as draw in additional support from agencies such as health, social care, crime and disorder reduction partnership. Coordinators would work with the headteachers to develop extended activities that were sustainable over time. The proposal would enable the clusters to work in partnership with agencies to improve the way that services that were delivered to children and families and allow the clusters to deliver activities within their priority areas in consultation with pupils, parents and their wider local communities.

(See also Minute 858).

876. **Primary Care Trust Joint Working - Member Representation Within New Governance Arrangements:**

The Executive Director (People First) introduced the report and Members noted that Cabinet, the Primary Care Trust Board and the Harrow Strategic Partnership Board had agreed the new governance arrangements for integrated working with the Council's NHS partners earlier that year. The membership of the bodies now required establishment as soon as possible to enable the first meeting of the integration board to be convened.

RESOLVED: That (1) two elected Members serve as the Council's representation on a new Health and Social Care Integration Board and on its related bodies – the Adult Health and Social Care Partnership and the Children and Young People's Partnership as follows:

Health and Social Integration Board	–	Councillors Margaret Davine and Silver
Adult Health and Social Care Partnership	–	Councillors Margaret Davine and Silver
Children and Young People's Partnership	–	Councillors Bill Stephenson and Miss Bednell

(2) the Member representation on these bodies should be reviewed on an annual basis at the first Cabinet meeting falling after the Annual Council meeting.

Reason for Decision: To enable the first meeting of the Integration Board to be convened. The establishment of both the Health and Social Care Integration Board and its related partnership groups would provide a basis for Members to be directly involved in determining the direction and pace at which further joint working proceeded. It would provide a formal opportunity to raise and discuss issues of mutual concern.

877. **Key Decision - LIFT/PFI Project:**

Members considered both the public and confidential reports of the Executive Director (People First) in relation to the LIFT/PFI project.

The Chief Executive advised Members of the contents of a letter recently received from the Primary Care Trust (PCT). The Director of Strategy (People First) introduced both the public and confidential reports.

Given the complexities of the issues involved in the project, Cabinet considered the options for the establishment of a Sub-Committee to consider the matter in detail.

Members considered the tabled amendments circulated by officers and it was

RESOLVED: (1) That the appropriation of land on the sites at Kenmore Road, Christchurch Avenue and Vaughan Road, as identified on the plans in Annex 1a, 1b

and 1c to the report of the Executive Director (People First) under Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 to facilitate development of the sites, be approved;

(2) that the Director of Strategy (People First) be authorised to seek agreement from the Strategic Partnering Board to the LIFT Co Stage 1 Tender Submission and progress to Stage 2, subject to any adjustments required to the Stage 1 proposal agreed with LIFT Co in the light of response from the Department of Health, decision by the Primary Care Trust and other relevant factors;

(3) given the financial uncertainties facing the PCT, the Director of Strategy (People First) explore all possible alternative strategies to deliver the three projects in consultation with the party leaders;

(4) that, if appropriate, in the light of (3) above, following approval by the Strategic Partnership Board, the Director of Strategy (People First) be authorised enter Stage 2 negotiations with LIFT Co;

(5) that subject to Cabinet approval once Stage 2 negotiations had been completed, the final agreement of this scheme be approved;

(6) that the HOST Project Panel (with the addition of Councillor Burchell) be delegated responsibility for the development of the Business Case and subsequently the business plan with the final decision to be made by the Leaders of the Labour and Conservative Groups and Councillor Thornton.

Reason for Decision: The new Neighbourhood Resource Centres would significantly improve the quality of service to clients who currently used the Brember and Vaughan Day Centres. The Centres would also contribute to the area model of working and become an important community resource linked with other local provision, have the potential to impact positively on the Council by improving Harrow's performance in relation to PAFC29 people with learning disabilities helped to live at home. The Centres would also meet the aims and objectives of the Valuing People white paper and make better use of resources by enabling more joined up working and simplifying/carers' contacts with service providers through the co-location of care management and outreach workers with staff from provided (daycare) services.

(See also Minute 860)

878. **Arts Culture Harrow - Moving Forward:**

Members considered an amended tabled, confidential report of the Director of Learning and Community Development in relation to Arts Culture Harrow (ACH). Members expressed their serious concerns about the problems with ACH.

RESOLVED: (1) That the work done to stabilise ACH's operational and financial and property management situation be noted;

(2) that an Arts Services options report be submitted to Cabinet in February 2006;

(3) that the statement of liabilities contained in the report of the Director of Learning and Community Development be noted;

(4) to extend the credit to ACH to the figure set out in the report of the Director of Learning and Community Development and be repaid in future financial years on dates to be agreed to assist the organisation with its cashflow difficulties;

(5) to note that the rolling loan arrangement be subject to the London Borough of Harrow being designated as preferred creditor of ACH and that the Director of Learning and Community Development be delegated authority to extend the credit;

(6) that the rolling credit line be reviewed in April 2006 when budget plans for ACH for the coming year were known.

Reason for Decision: The creation of a long-term plan for Arts Culture Harrow strategic development and to stabilise Arts Culture Harrow's current financial situation.

(See also Minute 860).

879. **Key Decision - Joint Waste Strategy:**

Members received a confidential report from the Executive Director (Urban Living) in relation to the Joint Waste Strategy.

RESOLVED: To note the issues in relation to the Mayor for London's approval of the Joint Waste Strategy.

Reason for Decision: To note the implications if the Mayor for London did not approve the draft strategy.

(See also Minutes 860 and 872)

880. **Key Decision - Conservation Area Appraisals Programme:**
Members considered a confidential report of the Executive Director (Urban Living) in relation to Conservation Area Appraisals.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(See also Minutes 860 and 874)

881. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**
In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 2.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution), it was

RESOLVED: At 10.00 pm to continue the meeting until 10.15 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NAVIN SHAH
Chair

EXECUTIVE
SUB-COMMITTEES

HOST PROJECT PANEL

1 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Dighé

Councillors: * D Ashton † Thornton
* Margaret Davine

* Denotes Member present

† Denotes apologies received

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**1. **Appointment of Chair:**

One nomination was received for the appointment of Chair, which was duly seconded and it was

RESOLVED: That Councillor Dighé be appointed as Chair of the Panel for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2005/06.

2. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interest made by Members in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting.

3. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

RESOLVED: That Councillor David Ashton be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Panel for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2005/06.

4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all business be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following item for the reason set out below:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
10. HOST Programme - Appendix A	The Appendix contained exempt information under paragraph 8 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it related to the amount of expenditure proposed to be incurred by the Authority under a particular contract.

5. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

6. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions had been received under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

7. **Terms of Reference:**

RESOLVED: To note the Panel's terms of reference.

8. **HOST Programme (Harrow Online Social Care Technology):**

The Director of Strategy (People First) introduced the report, which sought the approval of an amendment to the capital programme in order to ensure adequate capital provision for the delivery of the Harrow Online Social Care Technology (HOST) Programme.

Members received a presentation, in which officers outlined the reasons for replacing Harrow's Social Care System, the choice of Framework-I, and the benefits of the system. Officers explained the processes and the screens that could be viewed in the system.

The Director of Strategy (People First) advised that it had been recognised that improvements to the programme and budget management of HOST were required and outlined those measures that had been implemented. He drew attention to a tabled paper, which provided background information in relation to Programme Management in Harrow for Members reference.

Members were advised that, when it had been identified that there were significant areas in relation to training and the secondment of staff that had not been incorporated into capital programme although they had been included in the costing for HOST, the project plan had been re-visited. This had resulted in a programme cost of £3m. Officers advised that they were now attempting to renegotiate the licenses and training to reduce costs.

In response to a Member's question in relation to Phase 2 of the HOST programme, the Director of Strategy (People First) advised that the current estimated cost was £1.7m but that this was subject to Cabinet approval of the business case. He added that there would be a correlation between Phase 2, if approved, and the Business Transformation Partnership. The Member responded that he was seeking a reassurance that there would not be a reoccurrence of the problems experienced with Phase 1 of the project and added that Members should have a greater input in projects of this size. It was acknowledged that whilst the Members' IT Forum had been kept informed it appeared that there had been a weakness in communication in relation to HOST.

Members indicated that a framework for Member involvement in projects such as HOST was required. The Director of Strategy (People First) advised that a Programme Board had been established and that the budget issues, such as those experienced with the implementation of HOST, should therefore not arise in the future but he acknowledged the need for Member consultation and involvement in such projects. He suggested that, in future, a series of Member workshops be arranged to demonstrate the added value of a new system and added that this would also enable Members to ask questions and to become familiar with the system. The Director of Strategy (People First) indicated that a Member level group should, in future, oversee Phase 1 of the process.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Strategy (People First) advised that the Programme Board met on a monthly basis and operated a traffic light system for all projects. The Programme Board reports were incorporated into the Strategic Performance Report considered by Cabinet on a quarterly basis. A Member indicated that it was necessary to identify at the outset those areas that required particular attention and suggested that there be a quarterly review of projects.

RESOLVED: That (1) the amendment to the capital programme be approved in order to ensure adequate capital provision for the delivery of the HOST project in line with the full costs of the programme set out in Appendix E to the report of the Director of Strategy (People First);

(2) the measures set out in section 2.2.3 of the report of the Director of Strategy (People First) be endorsed and that the Executive Director (People First) be instructed to ensure that all future projects are subject to these standards of programme and budget management;

(3) Cabinet be advised of the Panel's decision at their meeting on 15 December 2005 and that the action plan for the implementation of a framework for consulting Members on such projects be reported on the Information Circular in January 2006.

9. **HOST Programme:**
Members received a confidential appendix to the report of the Director of Strategy (People First).

RESOLVED: That the appendix be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 6.35 pm, closed at 7.49 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR SANJAY DIGHÉ
Chair

TOWN CENTRE PROJECT PANEL

8 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Burchell

Councillors: * D Ashton
* C Mote* O'Dell
* Bill Stephenson (1)* Denotes Member present
(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL****PART II - MINUTES**61. **Attendance by Reserve Members:****RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at the meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-Ordinary MemberReserve Member

Councillor N Shah

Councillor Bill Stephenson

62. **Declarations of Interest:****RESOLVED:** To note that the following interest was declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
10. Harrow-on-the-Hill Station	Councillor Bill Stephenson	Declared a personal interest in that he was a Governor at Harrow College. Accordingly, he remained in the room whilst matters was considered and voted upon.

63. **Arrangement of Agenda:****RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following items for the reasons set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
10. Harrow-on-the-Hill Station	The report contained exempt information under paragraphs 7 and 9 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person and any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property
11. Clarendon Road Public Realm Improvements	The report contained exempt information under paragraph 8 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it contained information concerning the amount of any expenditure proposed to be incurred by the Authority under any particular contract for the acquisition or the supply of goods or services.

64. **Minutes:****RESOLVED:** That, subject to the following amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record:

Minute 58, Café Culture: Resolution be amended to read:
"That the draft Café Culture Guide for Harrow Town Centre be approved."

65. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received at this meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

66. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

67. **Harrow-on-the-Hill Station:**

The Director of Strategic Planning reported orally at the meeting on this matter, both in the public and private sessions of the meeting. He reported that the Council had received a planning application from Dandara Ltd for the redevelopment of 51 College Road, the old Post Office site.

The Director advised that the Council was consulting widely on the planning application. He stated that the application would be considered by the Development Control Committee in due course and that the merits of the application would be judged against the Council's adopted policies for Harrow Town Centre and the Planning Brief for the Harrow-on-the-Hill Station site.

The Panel was also informed that the office building adjacent to the bus station in Harrow Town Centre had been purchased by a property company and that officers were discussing whether this could be included in any future development.

Additionally, the Council was holding discussions with Harrow College on their accommodation strategy which they intended to submit to the Learning and Skills Council in January 2006.

RESOLVED: That the oral report be noted.

68. **Harrow Town Centre Public Realm Strategy:**

The Director of Strategic Planning and an officer introduced the report and responded to questions from Members of the Panel.

The Director sought the Panel's approval to the appointment of a consultant design team to prepare a public realm strategy for Harrow Town Centre and the Brief circulated with the agenda. He also sought Members' views on the extent of their own involvement in the selection process for a consultant.

An officer reported that it was intended to create a high quality public realm in conjunction with a multi-disciplinary consultant team who had a proven track record in public realm design and its delivery. He explained that the consultant team would implement the proposals and deal with all engineering and technical issues. He added that, subject to the approval of the draft Brief, the tender process would commence after Christmas 2005 with a view to appointing a consultant by March 2006.

In response to questions from Members of the Panel on the Brief, the Director and the officer responded as follows:

Vision and Objectives

- that it was intended to create a distinct identity for Harrow Town Centre in order to distinguish it from its competitors such as Brent Cross and Watford Shopping Centres;
- that whilst there may be some benefits in taking a consistent approach to the public realm for Harrow as a whole, it was important for Harrow Town Centre to have a distinct identity which would distinguish Harrow from competing shopping centres;
- that the priority was to regenerate Harrow Town Centre and to create a high quality public realm that provided a unique sense of place and a unique Harrow identity that was distinctive;

- that lessons could be learnt which could be developed for Harrow's other District Centres;
- that the Council's procurement team would be involved in the process;
- that the consultant appointed would be expected to develop designs to a stage where they could be implemented and that the Council was not looking to appoint a contractor to implement the design at this early stage.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport considered this scheme as a pilot and supported the concept. He stated that officers should be mindful of asking the consultant appointed to create a design that could be adapted for Harrow's District Centres. He emphasised the need for close liaison between the consultant appointed and the Council's procurement team, and the Director undertook to ensure that this issue was addressed in the Brief.

Two Members opposed the proposal to pay a maximum of £5,000 to consultant teams shortlisted to cover the costs of preparing a detailed tender and an outline design approach in response to the Brief. They noted the reasons behind this approach but were of the view that this approach was fundamentally inappropriate.

In response to comments from other Members of the Panel, the Director stated that:-

- the consultant appointed would be asked to create a physical environment which had economic/commercial benefits on the scheme but emphasised that the scheme was intended to be a design-led approach.
- the Council's intention was to ensure that Harrow Town Centre was able to compete with other shopping centres such as Brent Cross and Watford, whereas Harrow's district centres were considered to be complementary shopping areas to its Town Centre. It was acknowledged however, that there would be a spin-off for the district centres when Harrow Town Centre was developed.

The Director responded that these aspects would be emphasised in the Brief.

The Portfolio Holder for Education and Lifelong Learning requested that the Brief ought to include requirements of costs and design. The Director responded that these aspects would be emphasised in the Brief. These are listed in resolution (2) below.

Members of the Panel expressed the view that they be invited to take part in the selection process of the consultant.

RESOLVED: (1) That the proposed appointment of a consultant design team to prepare a Public Realm Strategy for Harrow Town Centre be endorsed;

(2) that the Draft Consultants' Brief be approved, subject to the inclusion of the following:

- the need for the consultant appointed to liaise closely with the Council's procurement team
- that the design would be straightforward and not to lead to maintenance problems or excessive expense;
- that both revenue and capital costs for future years should be projected by the consultant(s) so that the Council was aware of its commitments.

(3) that all Members of the Panel be invited to take part in the selection process.

[Note: Councillors D Ashton and C Mote wished to be recorded as having voted against the proposal included in the Brief that a maximum of £5,000 be paid to consultant teams shortlisted to cover their costs for preparing a detailed tender and an outline design approach].

69. **Clarendon Road Public Realm Improvements:**

The Panel considered a confidential report of the Director of Strategic Planning which provided a brief history of the proposed 'Hanging Gardens' and surface treatment works in Clarendon Road.

The Director reported on the changes in the scheme prepared by Alsop & Partners, the consultants appointed by the Council to oversee improvements to Clarendon Road. He

sought the Panel's views on whether the proposed scheme should proceed in whole or in part, and advised Members of the benefits or otherwise of each of the options. He advised that the surface treatment works provided good value for money.

RESOLVED: That the provision within the agreed Capital Programme for Harrow Town Centre, to reflect the omission of the 'Hanging Garden' element from the Clarendon Road Public Realm proposals, be agreed.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.29 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL
Chair

CABINET
ADVISORY
PANELS

STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL

1 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Burchell

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Mrs Kinnear
* Mrs Bath * N Shah
* Bluston (2) * Anne Whitehead

Non-voting Councillor Branch
Co-opted Member:

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05**

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Property Services (Urban Living) which explained the requirement for the Council to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the Municipal Year 2004-05. The draft AMR was provided as an appendix to the report and the Panel noted that the deadline for submission of the AMR to the Government Office for London was 30 December 2005.

Officers advised that, prior to the meeting, they had distributed to Members of the Panel a sheet of amendments that they were proposing to make to the AMR. The amendments were discussed in detail at the meeting and Members confirmed their agreement to the proposed changes being incorporated into the draft AMR.

During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- Noting that the Executive Summary (Section 4.5) of the draft AMR stated that "an overall net gain of 12,006 m² gross external floorspace was achieved for employment use", it was requested that officers provide Members of the Panel with details of employment use space in the Borough.
- The Executive Summary (Section 4.9) of the draft AMR stated that "No Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP) policies have been identified which do not appear to be working well". A Member wished it to be noted that, in her opinion, policy H9 of the HUDP was not working well.
- Members requested that officers provide clarification of what was meant by "other modes" in the Accident Rate statistics provided in Section 4.3(B) of the AMR. A Member also commented that the figures provided did not seem to add up and suggested that they be checked.
- Noting that Section 4.4(A) of the report stated that the Borough's "average residential density is 237 habitable rooms per hectare", it was requested that officers provide Members of the Panel with information on the densities in other comparable boroughs.

The Panel supported the officers' view that it would be necessary to make further amendments to the AMR prior to submitting the final version of the report to Cabinet.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That (1) the contents of the AMR 2004-05 be noted;

(2) the AMR 2004-05 be submitted to the Government Office for London by 30 December 2005, subject to the completion of further detailed work on aspects of the AMR, and taking on board any decision on the approach to Conservation Area appraisals and management plans.

[REASON: Preparation of the AMR is a requirement of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) which Cabinet approved on 23 June 2005. Failure to submit the AMR on time would be a breach of the regulations governing the new planning system and would also lead to a reduction in the Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) which would have an impact on resources for Planning and Development Services].

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Key Decision - Conservation Areas Appraisals Programme

The Panel received a confidential report of the Director of Property Services (Urban Living) in this matter.

The Panel considered the proposed approach to the production of conservation area documents as set out in the report and the priorities and timetables for action and, upon being put to a vote, it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That (1) Option C of the officers' report be approved;

(2) subject to the approval of (1), the Local Development Scheme (LDS) be amended accordingly and the approach be reviewed in light of any revised guidance issued.

[REASON: To enable the Council to work towards its statutory requirements under PPG15, towards improving performance against the new BVPI 219 on conservation areas and to clarify the production of documents relating to conservation areas in the LDS].

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against paragraph (1) of the recommendation above].

PART II - MINUTES

70. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Idaikkadar	Councillor Bluston

71. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

72. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following item for the reasons set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
9. Conservation Areas Appraisals Programme	The report relating to this item contained exempt information under paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 in that it contained legal advice.

73. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2005, those minutes having been circulated, as a correct record of the meeting, once printed in the Council Bound Volume.

74. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 15, 13 and 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

75. **Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05:**

See Recommendation 1.

76. **Conservation Areas Appraisals Programme:**

See Recommendation 2.

77. **Date of Next Meeting:**

RESOLVED: That a Special Meeting of the Panel be held on Wednesday 4 January 2006 at 7.30 pm to enable deadlines to be met for submissions to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.32 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL
Chair

GRANTS ADVISORY PANEL

5 DECEMBER 2005

Chair: * Councillor Mrs R Shah

Councillors: * Nana Asante * Omar (1)
 * Marilyn Ashton * Anjana Patel
 * Billson (1) * Thammaiah
 * Bluston * Thornton (2)
 * Mrs Joyce Nickolay

Adviser: * Deven Pillay - Chief Executive, Harrow Mencap

* Denotes Member present
 (1) and (2) Denote category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Grant Funding 2006/07**

Your Panel received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy, which presented the applications for funding and grants-based service level agreements for 2006/07.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Cabinet)

That Cabinet (1) agree the 'in principle' decisions on grant funding and grants-based service level agreements, as set out in Appendix 1 to the minutes, subject to the Council approving its overall Revenue Budget for 2006/07;

(2) note that the overall grants budget for 2006/07, subject to the Council approving its overall Revenue Budget for 2006/07, is £1,163,694, and agree that the amount of £24,094 accounts for inflation additions to salary;

(3) agree that £3,500 from the 2005/06 grants budget be used to fund four new applicants, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the minutes;

(4) agree to approve in 2006/07 a Heritage Grant of £15,000 to the Harrow Heritage Trust out of the Council's Capital Programme.

[**REASON:** To enable the allocation of funding to voluntary organisations in 2006/07.]

See also Minute 221.

PART II - MINUTES212. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Paddy Lyne
 Councillor Arnold
 Councillor Harrison

Reserve Member

Councillor Thornton
 Councillor Billson
 Councillor Omar

213. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note the declarations of interest declared by Members in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting, as set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

214. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present with the exception of the following item for the reasons set out below:

ItemReason

Submitted applications from both new and currently funded applicants contained within the supporting documents to Agenda Item 12, "Grant Funding 2006/07".

These documents contained exempt information as defined under paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that they relate to particular applicants for financial assistance provided by the Authority.

215. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2005, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

216. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

217. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 13 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

218. **Deputations/Representations:**

- (1) Prior notice had been received from the Harrow Association for the Blind of the wish to make a deputation to the Panel in relation to their grant application. The Chair put this request to the meeting and it was agreed at the discretion of the Panel to hear the deputation.
- (2) Prior notice had been received from the Harrow Refugee Forum of the wish to make a deputation to the Panel in relation to their grant application. The Panel did not agree to hear the deputation, as it did not comply with the procedural requirement to submit a deputation two clear working days before the meeting and contain 10 signatures.
- (3) Additionally, the Panel considered written representations submitted prior to the meeting from the following organisations:
 - Sangat Centre
 - Ansar Youth Project
 - Harrow Mencap
 - Ignite Trust
 - Ashiana
 - Harrow Refugee Forum
 - Harrow Association for the Blind
 - Kids Can Achieve
 - Harrow Pre-School Learning Alliance

RESOLVED: That the deputation and representations be received and noted, in the context of the consideration of grant funding for 2006/07.

[Note: The Panel's policy in principle is not to receive deputations relating to individual grant applications (Minute 60 of the meeting held on 28 July 2003 refers)].

219. **HAVS Appointment on the Grants Advisory Panel:**

The Panel received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy which advised the Panel of the Cabinet's recommendation that an independent adviser selected by representatives of the voluntary sector be appointed to the Panel. The Panel was informed that the election of the adviser had been coordinated by Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS).

The report outlined the rights and responsibilities of the adviser. It was proposed that the report be amended, in that:

- Paragraph 2.3.3, which stated: "the adviser should be allowed to speak whenever the Chair considers it appropriate", be removed;

- A new paragraph be added to the rights and responsibilities of the adviser, stating: "the adviser would have the opportunity to consult officers during the entire course of the assessment of the applications".

It was agreed by the general assent of the Panel that paragraph 2.3.3 be removed, and that the additional paragraph not be accepted. It was noted that the rights and responsibilities of the adviser should enable him to have the same speaking rights as Members in the meeting, and a distinction was drawn between the role of Member and adviser.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Cabinet's recommendation for an independent adviser nominated from within the voluntary sector to be appointed to the Panel at the start of its meeting on 5 December 2005 and to all subsequent meetings of the Panel be confirmed;

(2) no reserve adviser be appointed at this time;

(3) the rights and responsibilities of the adviser, as outlined in the report, be accepted, with the following amendment:

Section 2.3.3: "the adviser should be allowed to speak whenever the Chair considers it appropriate", be removed.

220. **Edward Harvist Trust - Grant Applications:**

The Panel received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy which presented the applications for funding that had been made to the Edward Harvist Trust in the second round of applications.

The Chair proposed that as 15 out of the 19 applicants had also applied for grants in 2006/07, these applications should be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel, pending outcome of the grant applications. In subsequent discussion, Members agreed that all 19 applications should be deferred to the January meeting of the Panel.

Members discussed the criteria for administering the Edward Harvist Trust funding. A Member of the Panel referred specifically to the criteria that the Trust funds were meant to support primarily small, unfunded organisations and new and emerging groups. The Panel adviser emphasised that the Panel needed to be clear on the parameters and principles that underpinned the process for administering the funds.

A Member clarified that the proposal had intended that both the Edward Harvist Trust applications and the grant applications be deferred until January 2006. Upon being put to the vote it was carried with the casting vote of the Chair that the grant applications of any applicant who had also applied to the Edward Harvist Trust be deferred until January 2006.

RESOLVED: That (1) the 19 applications to the Edward Harvist Trust be deferred until the January 2006 meeting of the Panel;

(2) the grant applications of applicants who applied for funding from the Edward Harvist Trust in the second round of applications be deferred until the January 2006 meeting of the Panel.

221. **Grant Applications 2006/07:**

Further to Recommendation 1 above, officers informed the Panel that several applications had been received after the deadline for receipt of completed forms, which was 30 September 2005. Members discussed the implications of accepting or rejecting the late applications. Whilst some Members argued that it was important to be consistent and apply the same deadline to all applications, others, whilst agreeing with this principle, emphasised that the funding for some of these organisations would need to come from another budget within the Authority. It was suggested that the late application be accepted this year, and that the deadline be enforced more stringently in future years. Upon being put to the vote, this was not carried. Accordingly, late applications from the following organisations were not considered:

Bentley Priory Nature Reserve; Harrow Crime Prevention Panel; Harrow Pre-School Learning Alliance; Harrow Weald Common Conservators; Harrow Women's Centre; Women's Aid Harrow; and Harrow Agenda 21 Environmental Forum.

RESOLVED: That the applications received after the deadline of 30 September 2005 not be accepted.

[Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Billson, Mrs Joyce Nickolay and Anjana Patel asked to be recorded as having voted for the motion].

222. **Revised Service Level Agreement Template:**

The Panel received a report of the Director of Financial and Business Strategy, which informed Members that the standard SLA template had been revised to take account of recent legislative changes.

The Panel noted that comments from the voluntary sector advisor had been incorporated into the report.

RESOLVED: That the changes be noted.

223. **Community Premises Review - Update:**

The Panel received a verbal update on the progress of the Member-led review of the community premises. The meeting was advised that in February 2005, the Panel had agreed to a Member-led review of the community premises, and that in June 2005 an officer had been appointed to support the process.

A Member of the Panel presented the following motion to the Panel:

- (i) "The officer appointed to the Community Premises Review Group be asked to complete interviews with Community Premises user groups on her own in the first instance."

Further to this, an amendment to the motion was presented:

- (ii) "The officer appointed to the Member-led Community Premises Review Group should support Members in carrying out the said review; that she communicate dates of the interviews in reasonable time so that Members can attend, diaries permitting. She may however carry out the interviews regardless of whether any Councillors are able to attend, so long as they have received reasonable notice."

The Member who had presented the motion stated that if Members were to attend the interviews, it was her view that all political parties should be represented. In acknowledging the difficulty of organising this and progressing the review, she proposed that the officer leading the review should attend the interviews on her own in the first instance. She cited concerns expressed by some of the community premises users on the impacts of Member attendance at the meetings.

The Member who had presented the amendment to the motion suggested that other users had asked for Members to be present at the interviews, and emphasised that the review should be led by elected Members. It was suggested that the review should follow the scrutiny model of cross-party working. Further to this a second motion was proposed:

- (iii) "In the interests of efficiency and using Scrutiny as a model, the Grants Advisory Panel appoint a chairperson for the Review."

Upon being put to the vote:

- the amendment to the first motion set out at (ii) above was carried with the casting vote of the Chair;
- the second motion set out at (iii) above was carried with the casting vote of the Chair and Councillor Omar was appointed Chairperson of the review group.

It was further agreed that Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay be appointed Vice-Chair of the review group.

RESOLVED: That (1) the amended motion as set out at (ii) above be adopted;

(2) that the motion set out at (iii) above be adopted, and that Councillor Omar be appointed Chair of the member-led review of community premises;

(3) that Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay be appointed Vice-Chair of the review.

224. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**
Further to Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 12.1 (Part 4E of the Constitution) requiring the termination of the meeting at 10.00 pm, and during the course of the debates then in progress, the Chair proposed at 10.00 pm that it be agreed to extend the 'guillotine' until 10.30 pm (subsequently, the Panel approved further extensions until 11.00 pm).

RESOLVED: That the Panel's meeting be continued beyond the procedural closure time to enable the items on the agenda to be completed.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.50 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR REKHA SHAH
Chair

APPENDIX 1**PROPOSED GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS 2006/2007**

Further to Recommendation 1, the following "in principle" decisions were made in relation to the applications for grants in 2006/07.

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Reason/Comments</u>
Organisations funded under Service Level Agreement in 2005/2006		
Arts Culture Harrow	373,008	Already agreed by Cabinet. Inclusive of salary inflation.
Bentley Priory Nature Reserve	Nil	It was moved that all applications received after the deadline of 30 September 2005 not be accepted. Upon being put to the vote, this was carried with the casting vote of the Chair (see also Minute 221).
Harrow African-Caribbean Association	6,600	
Harrow Association of Disabled People	45,018	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS)	90,995	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow Crime Prevention Panel	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221)
Harrow In Business	65,875	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow In Europe Association	5,000	
Harrow Pre-School Learning Alliance	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221)
Harrow Shopmobility Scheme	14,570	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow Sports Council	27,000	
Harrow Weald Common Conservators	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221)
Harrow Women's Centre	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221)
K.S.I.M. Senior Citizen's Association	2,387	
Mind in Harrow	7,722	
National Autistic Society – Harrow Branch	1,650	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to £1,650. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Relate	23,185	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Welldon Activity Group	22,150	
Women's Aid Harrow	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221)
Organisations currently funded		
ADHD Support Group	8,319	
Afghan Association	1,500	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to £1,500. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Angolan Civic Communities Alliance	Deferred	It was moved that all applicants who had submitted applications to both the Edward Harvist Trust and the grant funding 2006/07 be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel. Upon being put to the vote, this was carried with the casting vote of the Chair (see also Minute 220).
Asian Elderly Group	3,950	
Association of Senior Muslim Citizens	2,000	
Carramea	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Community Link-Up	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Connaught Opera	2,200	
Girlguiding Middlesex North West	2,000	
Harrow Agenda 21 Environmental Forum	Nil	Late application (see also Minute 221).
Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance (HARA)	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Harrow Association for the Blind	4,670	It was moved that the level of funding be increased from £4,670, in light of the deputation received from the association. Upon being put to the vote, this was not carried with the casting vote of the Chair.
Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary	Deferred	It was moved that consideration of this item

Organisations (HASVO)		be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel, to allow it to be considered in conjunction with the deferred items for Harrow Somali Women's Action Group and East African Welfare and Development Concern. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Harrow Bangladeshi Association	1,860	
Harrow Bengalee Association	2,675	
Harrow Bereavement Care	7,181	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow Citizens Advice Bureau Service Limited	100,543	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Harrow Council for Racial Equality (HCRE)	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Harrow Emerald Circle	500	
Harrow Heritage Trust	9,000	In addition to £15,000 heritage grant (see also Recommendation 1).
Harrow Iranian Community Association	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Harrow Pensioners' Action Group	750	
Harrow Public Transport Users' Association	300	
Harrow Refugee Forum	6,000	
Harrow School of Gymnastics	2,500	
Harrow Somali Women's Action Group	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Harrow Tamil School Association	4,500	
Harrow Youth and Community Project	2,000	
Herga Road & Masons Avenue Community Association	Nil	It was moved that the proposed level of funding be amended to nil. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Hindu Council	Deferred	It was moved that consideration of this item be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel in order to allow further information to be requested from the organisation. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Home Start Harrow (First Time Mother's Group)	5,000	
Ignite Trust	10,000	
Islamic & Cultural Society of Harrow	Deferred	It was moved that consideration of this item be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel in order to allow further information to be requested from the organisation. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Jaago Punjabi Women's Group	2,750	
Kala Anjali Arts Circle	Deferred	It was moved that consideration of this item be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel in order to allow further information to be requested from the organisation. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Kids Can Achieve	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Multiple Sclerosis Society – Harrow Branch	1,000	
Pakistan Society of Harrow	6,642	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Parkinson's Disease Society – Harrow Branch	2,400	
Persian Senior Citizen Club	500	
Russian Immigrants Association	1,500	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to £1,500. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Sangat Advice Centre	1,000	
Special Connection	2,000	
Tongues on Fire	5,000	
UK Asian Women's Conference	2,750	
Victim Support Harrow	16,129	Inclusive of salary inflation.
Vitalise (formerly Winged Fellowship Trust)	Nil	The organisation was referred to the Carers' Grant.
The WISH Centre	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Woodlands Community Association	4,000	

Grants – New Applicants – Not Funded Currently		
9 th Kenton Scout Group	Nil	The organisation was referred to the Edward Harvist Trust and other funding organisations.
Academy of South Indian Arts (A.S.I.A.)	Nil	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to nil. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Ansar Youth Project	1,500	To be paid from the 2005/06 budget.
ASHIANA	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Community Accountancy Self-Help	Nil	
Deafplus	Nil	
East African Welfare and Development Concern	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Edo State Women's Association	Deferred	Edward Harvist Trust applicant (see also Minute 220).
Elmsleigh Avenue Residents Association	500	To be paid from 2005/06 budget.
Flash Musicals	Nil	The organisation was referred to other funding opportunities within the Authority.
Harrow Family Learning Network	Nil	
Harrow Kuwaiti Community Association	Nil	
Harrow Mencap	Deferred	It was moved that consideration of this item be deferred until the January meeting of the Panel in order to allow further information to be obtained on alternative funding opportunities within the Council. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Harrow Unemployed Teens Forum	Nil	
HAVS – Trans-Age Project	Nil	
Indian Association of Harrow	Nil	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to nil. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
Light and Colour Workshop UK – VITAL (Vision is the Art of Learning)	Nil	
Navnat Yuva Vadil Mandal	500	To be paid from 2005/06 budget.
Pakistan Women's Association Harrow	1000	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to £1,000. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel. To be paid from 2005/06 budget.
Srishti Nana Rajarani Dance Creations	Nil	It was moved that the proposed level of grant be amended to nil. This was carried by the general assent of the Panel.
U Can Do It	Nil	

APPENDIX 2DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1. The following Members declared personal and prejudicial interests in the items indicated arising from their involvement with the organisations listed. Accordingly they left the room and took no part in the discussion or voting on the applications relating to those organisations:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Organisation and nature of interest</u>
10. Grant Applications 2006/07	Councillor Nana Asante	* Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS) , son has a part-time job at HAVS
		* HAVS Trans-Age Project , the A-Connexion's Global Village which I chair is a member of HAVS. My son has a part-time job at HAVS. Julia Smith, Director of HAVS, co-chairs the Hear/Say Scrutiny Review of which I am a member
	Councillor Marilyn Ashton	* Harrow Mencap , husband is a fundraiser for organisation
	Councillor Anjana Patel	* Harrow Mencap , board member
	Deven Pillay, Adviser	* Harrow Council for Racial Equality (HCRE) , Executive member
		* Harrow Mencap , Chief Executive

2. The following Members declared interests from the public gallery:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Organisation and nature of interest</u>
10. Grant Applications 2006/07	Councillor Arnold	* Harrow Citizen's Advice Bureau , Council appointed representative on management committee
		* Harrow in Europe , personal interest
	Councillor John Nickolay	* Harrow in Europe , personal interest
	Councillor N Shah	* Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance (HARA) , trustee of HARA Trust

3. The following Members declared an interest in the items indicated arising from their involvement with the organisations listed, and remained and took part in the discussion and voting on the applications relating to those organisations:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Organisation and nature of interest</u>
9. Edward Harvist Trust Applications 2006/07	Councillor Nana Asante	* Angolan Civic Communities Alliance , African-led organisation; I have known the chairperson Alex Da Costa for a number of years. He is also a member of Harrow Refugee Forum (HaRF) and I attended their AGM in October.

-
- * **ASHIANA**, met MC member at a Voluntary Sector Forum meeting at Harrow Council in July this year.
 - * **CARRAMEA**, was a member of HARA IN 1998 and HARA is a founding member of CARRAMEA. I have not renewed my membership of HARA.
 - * **Community Link Up**, invited Mike Coker, the Director to speak at the last meeting of the Community Consultative Forum.
 - * **East African Welfare & Development Concern**, African led organisation. The coordinator, Ms Lulah Salah asked me to attend a meeting at Youth & Connexions meeting to advocate on her behalf a few months ago. Board of HaRF.
 - * **Edo State Women's Association**, African-led organisation.
 - * **Harrow Anti-Racist Alliance (HARA)**, was a member of HARA in 1998. Attended a conference in Manchester on behalf of the organisation and wrote a report in 1998. I have not renewed my membership of HARA.
 - * **Harrow Council for Racial Equality**, attended their conference at the Civic Centre on ?. Chairperson Trevor Chisholm worked with me on Black History Month early this year.
 - * **Harrow Iranian Community Association**, met Pari Nouroozi in 1998 at Community Premises. She is on the Board of HaRF. She was present at the interview of her organisation which I attended in October.
 - * **Harrow Shopmobility**, attended their AGM at HAVS earlier this year.
 - * **Harrow Somali Women's Action Group**, wrote a successful funding application for the organisation in 1999. Asha Kalib, the coordinator is on the Board of HaRF.
 - * **Harrow Youth & Community Project**, met Carlton, one of the organisers, at the Open Budget meeting and he sent me a copy of his to the Council about Kenmore Park Community Centre.

-
- * **Kids Can Achieve**, was invited to their AGM but was unable to attend.
- * **National Council of Vanik Associations**, led carol singing at their Christmas Concert last year. Have been asked to do the same this year on 17 December 2005.
- * **West London YMCA Winter Shelter**, I am a member of Stanmore Baptist Church, a Christian faith group. I am Vice Chairperson of SACRE.
- * **The Wish Centre**, attended the AGM of The Wish Centre at the Civic Centre in October 2005.
- Councillor Marilyn Ashton * **Ashiana**, knew someone involved in the organisation
- Councillor Bluston * **Kids Can Achieve**, attended a meeting involving the organisation.
- * **Edward Harvist Trust**, Council appointed representative
- Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay * **Ashiana**, personal interest
- Councillor Omar * **Harrow Council for Racial Equality**, member of the Executive Committee
10. Grant Applications 2006/07 Councillor Nana Asante * **Harrow African-Caribbean Association (HACAS)**, met Chairperson at Caribbean meeting in Wealdstone in 2003 and again at Black History Month Forum 2004. Worked with him on BHM Evaluation Report in 2005.
- * **Harrow Crime Prevention Panel**, I am a member of a Scrutiny Review Group on Reducing the Fear of Crime.
- * **Harrow in Business**, attended Harrow in Business training in 1997/8. Also used to attend monthly business club between 1997 and 1999.
- * **Harrow in Europe Association**, Council appointed representative on the Management Committee.
- * **Harrow Shopmobility Scheme**, attended AGM early this year at HAVS.
- * **Harrow Weald Common Conservators**, attended presentation of Open Spaces Review Group.
- * **Harrow Women's Centre**, attended

International Women's Event in 1997. Cllr Margaret Davine who chairs the organisation is my ward councillor.

- * **KSIM Senior Citizen's Association**, The mother organisation KSIM is a member of SACRE. Attended the Earthquake Appeal at Harrow High School where they were present and made a sizable pledge.
- * **Mind in Harrow**, met Paul Burns at meeting of Harrow PCT Health & Race Forum of which the A-Connexion is a member.
- * **Afghan Association of London (Harrow)**, worked closely with Sami Aziz at Community Premises in 1998/99.
- * **Angolan Civic Communities Alliance**, African-led organisation. Alex Da Costa used to chair the Harrow Refugee Forum. Invited me to the AGM and actively requests support for member organisations.
- * **CARRAMEA**, was a member of HARA in 1998 and HARA is a founding member of CARRAMEA. I have not renewed my membership of HARA.
- * **Community Link Up**, Invited Mike Coker, the Director to speak at the last meeting of the Community Consultative Forum.
- * **HARA**, was a member of HARA in 1998 and HARA is a founding member of CARRAMEA. I have not renewed my membership of HARA.
- * **HASVO**, met many members of HASVO in 1998/99 at community premises. Helped them with funding applications.
- * **Harrow Bengalee Association**, met the secretary last year at BHM Forum. Attended their event in February and was invited to speak. Was invited to their event this year but was unable to attend but I have been told my name appeared on the programme.
- * **HCRE**, Chairperson Trevor Chisholm worked with me on Black History Month matters early this year.
- * **Harrow Emerald Circle**, the group is based at St Joseph's Church, Salvatorian College. My two sons

attended Salvatorian (they are both in university now).

- * **Harrow Iranian Community Association**, met Pari Nouroozi in 1998 at Community Premises. She is on the Board of HaRF. Attended interview of organisation in October 05 as part of Review of Community Premises.
- * **Harrow Public Transport Users Association**, use public transport.
- * **Harrow Refugee Forum**, have known the secretary Alex Da Costa for a number of years. I attended their AGM in October at his invitation.
- * **Harrow Somali Women's Action Group**, wrote a successful funding application for the organisation in 1999. Asha Kalib, the coordinator is on the board of HaRF.
- * **Harrow Youth & Community Project**, met Carlton, one of the organisers, at the Open Budget meeting and he sent me a copy of his letter to the Council about Kenmore Park Community Centre.
- * **Herga Road & Masons Avenue Community Association (HAMCA)**, Dr Raechel Kenny was a member of Hear/Say Scrutiny Review Group until October 05.
- * **Islamic Cultural Society of Harrow**, was at Community Premises when I organised a fundraiser to buy a microwave for the kitchen.
- * **Kala Anjali Arts Circle**, helped Punitha Perinparaja with her constitution in 1998. Also with a lottery funding application to Awards for All. Kala Anjali Arts Circle is also
- * **Kids Can Achieve**, received invitation to Open Day but was unable to attend.
- * **Pakistan Society of Harrow**, attended Pakistan Day, an event organised by the society in 2004 and 2005. Signed the Friendship declaration organised by Hindu Council and the Society.
- * **Russian Immigrants Association**, was at Community Premises when I organised a fundraiser to buy a microwave for the kitchen. Attended

interview of organisation in October 05, as part of Review of Community Premises.

- * **Sangat Advice Centre**, Kanti Nagda took a lead role in the review of the Community Consultative Forum Agenda and presented a paper to the CCF meeting on behalf of Community Groups. Sangat Centre hosted the BHM Forum meetings this year.
- * **The WISH Centre**, attended AGM at Civic Centre. Also Julia Smith of HAVS co-chairs Hear/Say Scrutiny Review and I chair one of the Case Study Groups as part of the review.
- * **ASHIANA**, met MC member at a Voluntary Sector Forum meeting at Harrow Council in July this year.
- * **East African Welfare & Development Concern**, African-led organisation. The coordinator Ms Lulah Salah asked me to attend a meeting at Youth & Connexions meeting to advocate on her behalf a few months ago. Board of HaRF.
- * **EDO State Women Association**, African-led organisation.
- * **Harrow Mencap**, Deven Pillay is a member of the Black History Month Forum.
- * **Indian Association of Harrow**, was at Community Premises when I organised a fundraiser to buy a microwave for the kitchen.
- * **Pakistan Women's Association Harrow**, attended REU Harrow Action Learning Set with Mrs Mahmoud. Also attended their Eid Party at the Teachers' Centre in November 05.
- * **Hindu Council Harrow**, was at Community Premises when I organised a fundraiser to buy a microwave for the kitchen.
- * **Harrow Weald Common Conservators**, Council appointed representative
- * **Pakistan Society of Harrow**, husband is a member of society
- * **Ashiana**, knew someone involved in the organisation

Councillor Marilyn Ashton

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Elmsleigh Avenue Residents Association, knew someone involved in the organisation
Councillor Bluston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow in Business, Council appointed representative on Board of Management * Harrow Sports Council, Council appointed representative * MIND, Chair of Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee which had considered MIND * Herga Road & Masons Avenue Community Association, attended a meeting involving association * Kids Can Achieve, attended a meeting involving the organisation * Harrow Agenda 21 Environmental Forum, attended a meeting of the Forum * Sangat Advice Centre, association through the North West London Community Foundation, to which he is a Council appointed representative * Welldon Activity Centre, personal involvement with Centre * Aspire, personal involvement with organisation
Councillor Mrs Joyce Nickolay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow in Europe Association, board member * Personal involvement with Ashiana, Elmsleigh Avenue Residents Association and Pakistan Woman's Association
Councillor Omar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow Council for Racial Equality, member of the Executive Committee
Councillor Mrs R Shah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Welldon Activity Group, attended events at the centre
Councillor Thammaiah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow Crime Prevention Panel, member
Councillor Thornton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow Weald Common Conservators, Council appointed representative
Deven Pillay, Adviser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Harrow Association of Voluntary Services * Harrow Refugee Forum

4. An officer declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the WISH Centre, as he was a board member. Accordingly he left the room and took no part in the discussion relating to that organisation.

**EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS
ADVISORY PANEL****13 DECEMBER 2005**

Chair: * Councillor Toms

Councillors: * Choudhury * Janet Cowan

Advisers: * Mr D A Jones
(Vacancy)

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Admissions to County Schools**

On 13 December there were 7 children for whom the admissions staff could make no reasonable offer of a school place. The Education Admissions and Awards Advisory Panel was requested to authorise the admission of these pupils to a school, where no place existed in the relevant year group.

The Panel acknowledged a letter that had been received from the Headteacher at Harrow High School.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That an offer of admission to a school be made as follows:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Year Group</u>	<u>Admitting School</u>
H93	10	Bentley Wood
H94	10	Rooks Heath
H95	10	Rooks Heath
H96	10	Whitmore
H97	10	Hatch End
H98	10	Park
H99	10	Canons

PART II - MINUTES494. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

495. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business transacted at this meeting.

496. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
8.(a) Admissions to County Schools	Page 1 of the report attached to the main agenda contained errors in the 'number if all cases admitted' column. Members were requested to consider this amended version as a matter of urgency.
8.(b) Admissions to County Schools	
8.(c) Admissions to County Schools	

The applications detailed in these reports had been received after the main agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider this report, in order to allocate appropriate places to the applicants.

9. Dates of Future Meetings This item was inadvertently omitted from the main agenda.

(2) the item appearing in Part II of the agenda be considered with the Press and Public excluded on the grounds indicated below:

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
8. Admissions to County Schools	These items were considered to contain exempt information as defined in Paragraph 4 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 in that they contained information relating to any particular applicant for, or recipient of, any service provided by the Authority.
8.(a) Admissions to County Schools	
8.(b) Admissions to County Schools	
8.(c) Admissions to County Schools	
8.(c) Admissions to County Schools	

497. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October, 1 November, 15 November and 29 November 2005 be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume.

498. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

499. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 13 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

500. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

501. **Dates of Future Meetings:**

RESOLVED: That meetings of the Panel be scheduled for 5.00 pm on the following days:

Tuesday 3 January 2006
 Tuesday 17 January 2006
 Tuesday 31 January 2006
 Tuesday 14 February 2006
 Tuesday 28 February 2006
 Tuesday 14 March 2006
 Tuesday 28 March 2006

502. **Admissions to County Schools:**
 See Recommendation 1.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 3.04 pm, closed at 3.20 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH TOMS
 Chair

