

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday 24 February 2015

AGENDA - PART I

6. (a) Reference from Cabinet on 19 February 2015: (Pages 3 - 6)

Note: In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item has been admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and urgency detailed below:-

Agenda item

Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency

6. References from Council /
Cabinet

The petition was referred to Overview and Scrutiny Committee after the main agenda was printed and circulated. Members are requested to consider the petition and decide on further action.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

19 FEBRUARY 2015

Record of decisions taken at the meeting held on Thursday 19 February 2015.

Present:

Chair: * Councillor David Perry

Councillors:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| * Sue Anderson | * Graham Henson |
| * Simon Brown | * Varsha Parmar |
| * Margaret Davine | * Sachin Shah |
| * Keith Ferry | * Anne Whitehead |
| * Glen Hearnden | |

In attendance:

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| James Bond | Minute 119 |
| Ramji Chauhan | Minute 119 |
| Susan Hall | Minute 119 |
| Barry Macleod-Cullinane | Minute 119 |

* Denotes Member present

118. Petitions

Petition: Reconsider the Park Cuts in relation to Pinner Memorial Park

On behalf of the Users of Pinner Memorial Park, the Leader of the Council reported that an e-petition had been received signed by 1,200 people opposing some of the proposals in the budget which could have severe or negative impact.

RESOLVED: That the petition be received and, once validated, be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank

change.org

The Users of Pinner Memorial Park

Recipient: Harrow Council

Letter: Greetings,

The undersigned would like to petition the council to re-consider the Park cuts in relation to Pinner Memorial Park. The proposals will result in the removal of the Park Keeper (T■■■■) from the park, this together with the other changes to park maintenance, will result in the nicest and best kept park in the London Borough of Harrow deteriorating.

Pinner Memorial Park is used by thousands of people a week, walking to school, playing in the playground or visiting West House and enjoying the park for what it is - an oasis of green and beauty. From an environmental perspective the changes will result in an accumulation of litter in long grass, an accumulation of branches and rubbish in the pond, and the park becoming more of a haven for crime.

During the summer T■■■■ spends up to three hours a day litter picking up to 23 bags of rubbish. If these proposals are passed this litter will remain in the long grass.

With regard to potential crime from having the gates unlocked, this week alone has seen bottles of vodka left by benches, and grass being ripped up by bikers after the gates were locked.

As well as the environmental benefits and the crime benefits of keeping T■■■■ in the park, there is the social. This Park is used by everyone from children to pensioners, the fact that the park is so well maintained makes it a pleasure to visit. With more flats being built in Pinner this Park will become more peoples' back garden. Also the daily visibility of T■■■■ is a comfort to young and old, removing her will be a great loss to the village.

The total savings borough-wide are predicted to be £327,000, and whilst we accept that savings need to be made we would question the actual savings -vs- maintaining T■■■■ in the park. This costs of re-instating daily litter picking (which will be needed whether on a formal or on an emergency basis), and the repairs required to maintain your statutory obligations will far exceed T■■■■ salary of ■■■■■■

This park was gifted by the people of Pinner, in honour of those who'd died in two world wars and its upkeep entrusted to the local authority. The people of Pinner are asking the local authority to honour the basis under which the park was placed in their trust.

Out of respect those who lost their lives in who's name the park was gifted, out of respect to the council tax payers who elected you with a remit to look after the park, and out of respect of your employee, T. [REDACTED], who has worked tirelessly and passionately for years to maintain and improve this park, we urge you to reject these proposals.

This petition has been signed by over 1200 people in 10 days, which will give you some idea of how strongly the local population feel about the matter.

Thank you