

Meeting of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet

TO BE HELD ON

Tuesday, 1 March 2005 at 7.00pm

A G E N D A

FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate.

If you wish to let us know in advance that you will be attending the meeting, please telephone John Marr on 020 8359 2031 or Janet Rawlings on 020 8359 2156 (direct lines). People with hearing difficulties who have a text phone, may telephone our minicom number on 020 8203 8942.

FIRE/EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by Committee staff or by uniformed porters. It is vital you follow their instructions.

- **You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts.**
- **Do not stop to collect personal belongings.**
- **Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions.**
- **Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.**

Council Meeting

1 March 2005

Please Note: In accordance with Paragraph 3 of the Council Procedure Rules only Parts 1 and 6 of the timetable apply to meetings of the Council to deal with the budget and council tax

Agenda and Timetable

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<u>Part 1 - Statutory formalities/ Announcements (15 minutes)</u>	7.00pm – 7.15pm	
1.	Apologies for absence		
2.	Prayer		
3.	Minutes of last meeting		1-46
4.	Official announcements		
5.	Declarations of interest		
6.	Any business remaining from last meeting		
7.	To discuss the Mayoralty for the year 2004/2005		
	Part 6 - Statutory Council Business	7.15– 11pm	
8.	Report from Cabinet <u>Report of Cabinet held on 19 Council Budget and Council Tax 2005/06</u>		To Follow
9.	Reports from overview and scrutiny committees		
10.	Reports from other council committees		
11.	Reports of officers		
11.1	Head of Committee		47 -76
11.1.1	Statutory Proper Officer: Head of Committee		
11.1.2	Members Allowances Scheme 2005-2006		
11.1.3	Changes to Committee Membership		
11.1.4	Vacancies on School Governing Bodies		
11.1.5	Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies		
11.2	Monitoring Officer		

R S Goddard
Head of Committee
Town Hall, The Burroughs, Hendon, NW4 4BG

Minutes

OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET held at
The Town Hall, Hendon, NW4, on Tuesday, 18 January, 2005

PRESENT:

- *The Worshipful the Mayor (Councillor Wendy Prentice)
- *The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Brian Coleman, AM, FRSA)

Councillors:

*Steve Blomer	Arun Ghosh BSc BVSC AH	*Susette Palmer BA (Hons)
*Maureen Braun	Mphil CBIOL MIBIOL,	*Kanti Patel MEng, MCIOB
*Fiona Bulmer	MAPHV, MRSM	FFB, MCMI
*Terry Burton	*Brian Gordon, LL.B	*Barry Rawlings
*Anita Campbell	*Eva Greenspan BA, LL.B	*Colin Rogers
*Wayne Casey BA (Hons)	*Christopher Harris	*Paul Rogers
MIIA	*Helena Hart	*Brian Salinger
*Danish Chopra	*Lynne Hillan	*Gill Sargeant
*Jack Cohen	*Sean Hooker, BA (Hons)	*Joan Scannell
*Melvin Cohen	*Daniel Hope	*Alan Schneiderman
*Katia David BSc, MBA, JP	* Anne Hutton	*Gerard Silverstone
*Jeremy Davies BA (Hons),	*Mark Langton	* Agnes Slocombe
CPFA	*Malcolm Lester FCCA	*Ansuya Sodha MBA (Middx)
*Peter Davis Ctext, FTI,	*Victor Lyon, BA (Hons)	DipM (CIM), Cert Ed
FCFI	* Kitty Lyons	Susan Steinberg
*Aba Dunner MCIJ	*John Marshall	*Leslie Sussman, MBE
*Kevin Edson	*Linda McFadyen	*Andreas Tambourides
*Olwen Evans ACIS	*Kath McGuirk	*Soon-Hoe Teh
*Claire Farrier	*David Mencer	*Jim Tierney
*Anthony Finn B.Sc (Econ)	*Alison Moore	*Allan Turner
FCA	*Jazmin Naghar	*Phil Yeoman
*Mike Freer	*Robert Newton	Vacancy
*Vanessa Gearson BA	*Matthew Offord	
AKC, PhD	* Monroe Palmer OBE FCA	

*denotes Member present

118. PRAYER (Agenda Item 1):

The Mayor's Chaplain offered prayer.

119. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2):

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Susan Steinberg, Arun Ghosh, and from Councillor Jeremy Davies, Jack Cohen, Kitty Lyons and Jazmin Naghar for lateness.

120. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2005 (Agenda Item 3):

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 14 December, 2004, be approved.

121. OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda Item 4):

A minute's silence was held to remember all those who had died during the tsunami and their families.

The Worshipful the Mayor voiced the Council's appreciation of all the work of the Council's staff who had been involved in the successful emergency evacuation of residential properties in Cricklewood, over the weekend of the 8/9 January 2005.

The Worshipful the Mayor then congratulated Max Caller, past Chief Executive, on being awarded a CBE in the New Year's Honours List.

Finally, The Worshipful the Mayor also congratulated Councillor Vanessa Gearson on the birth of her daughter, Olivia.

122. MOTIONS AND VARIATION OF BUSINESS

With the consent of the Council, Councillor Brian Coleman withdrew his motion, 8.1.

With the consent of the Council, Councillor Phil Yeoman withdrew his motion 8.3 in favour of the amended motion 8.4 in the name of Councillor Andreas Tambourides, which was circulated at the meeting.

Moved by Councillor Yeoman, duly seconded and

RESOLVED – That the order of business be varied to allow the amended motion in the name of Councillor Tambourides to be taken before that in the name of Councillor Sodha.

The Worshipful the Mayor stated that, using her discretion under Rule 34.2, she would allow 30 minutes for debate on each Motion.

123. QUESTION TIME FOR MEMBERS (Agenda Item 7):

Questions were put to the Leader and the relevant Members of the Cabinet. Those questions, together with the original answers provided and the text of any supplementary questions and answers are set out in the Appendix to these minutes.

124. MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR ANDREAS TAMBOURIDES (Agenda item 8.4)

Motion 8.4, as amended in the name of Councillor Andreas Tambourides was moved.

Debate ensued. Upon being put to the vote, The motion was declared carried.

RESOLVED - Council sends our sympathies to all the Countries and communities in the Borough of Barnet that have been affected by the Tsunami disaster. Council is horrified at the devastation caused to millions of families and communities, and extends its thoughts, prayers and deepest sympathies to all affected.

Council commends our Mayor and Deputy Mayor for their timely initiative in organising a multi faith Civic Service of prayer and remembrance on 16th January. Council supports the actions taken by the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council in responding to the disaster, and Council thanks its staff and residents for the support and donations given.

Council is grateful for the efforts being made throughout our many diverse Communities in Barnet to help with the immediate relief for the survivors who have lost their homes and livelihoods.

Council requests support from all parties to set up a steering committee involving Members and officers, under the auspices of our Mayoralty, to look at bringing together all communities in the Borough of Barnet in order to raise funds to adopt a village in one of the areas most severely affected, to assist with immediate basic essentials and ultimately to help in the rebuilding of their infrastructure, particularly to include a school, medical centre and orphanage.

**125. MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR ANSUYA SODHA
(Agenda item 8.2)**

Motion 8.2 in the name of Councillor Ansuya Sodha was moved.

An amendment in the name of Councillor Brian Salinger was moved. Debate ensued. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment moved by Councillor Brian Salinger was declared carried. The substantive motion was declared carried.

RESOLVED - Council condemns all forms of domestic violence, recognising that such violence involves not just males on their female partners, but females on male partners, violence within same sex relationships and inter-generational violence.

Council welcomes and supports the action taken by Barnet Council staff and others including the work done by the Barnet Domestic Violence Forum. (The Forum chaired by Lesley Williams of Williams & Co Solicitors, includes representatives from the Police, the Council, Magistrates, Barnet Women's Aid, Jewish Women's Aid, Victim Support, and the Domestic Violence Support Service). Council will continue to work closely with the Police in tackling the perpetrators and supporting the victims of domestic violence. Council recognises the efforts that have been made across council departments, (Housing, Children and families, Education, Cultural and Corporate services) to deal with the implications of domestic violence for our residents.

Council acknowledges the success of Barnet's Sanctuary Project which has been recognised as a model of good practice by the ODPM, Audit Commission and Greater London Authority. (In its 2004 Annual Report, the GLA's London Domestic Violence Forum highlights the Barnet Sanctuary Project...."In LB Barnet, the Domestic Violence Support Services (DVSS) is a key partner in Barnet's newly inaugurated Sanctuary Project. This installs security measures in the homes of domestic violence survivors, helping them to remain there and maintain contact with family, friends, schools and other support networks. The local authority's Homeless Prevention Manager secured ODPM funding for the project and it is offered to anyone who presents, or is likely to present, to the Housing Department as homeless due to domestic violence")

Council will continue to support both the Barnet women's refuge and the Barnet Jewish women's refuge, and the Christian Action HA project (Elevate) which supports victims of domestic violence.

Barnet Council is aware that a Best Value Review of Community Safety is currently being undertaken - and considers that it would be premature to anticipate any recommendation with regard to the possible creation of a post of co-ordinator for Domestic Violence services."

126. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

In accordance with the Agenda, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for 15 minutes. The meeting reconvened at 8.56pm

127. ADMINISTRATION POLICY ITEM (Agenda Item 9.1)

Councillor Fiona Bulmer proposed the item and moved that it be adopted. An amendment in the name of Councillor Jack Cohen was moved. Debate ensued. Upon being to the vote, the amendment in the name of Councillor Cohen was declared lost. Upon being put to the vote, the substantive motion was declared carried

RESOLVED - Council notes the progress this administration has made in reducing bureaucracy and increasing efficiency of services for Barnet residents. Council further notes that these efforts are being hampered by the Government's policy of heaping additional regulations and

responsibilities on local authorities including an inspection regime that costs £100 million a year. Council supports the LGA's campaign to overhaul this wasteful and ineffective regime and condemns the excessive regulation and increased bureaucracy imposed on Barnet taxpayers by the Labour government since 1997.

128. OPPOSITION POLICY ITEM (Agenda Item 9.2)

Councillor Alison Moore proposed the item and moved that it be adopted. Debate ensued. Upon being to the vote the motion was declared lost.

**129. COMMENTS ON THE WORK OF THE CABINET (Agenda items 10 and 15.5)
Councillor Monroe Palmer commented**

Barnet Council under the current Administration has embarked on what Sir Humphrey would have described to Jim Hacker as a courageous decision to remove traffic calming measures. Does the Cabinet Member have any conscience on hearing the latest published details of traffic accidents in London? Barnet Council has the worst increase of all London boroughs in the league table for traffic accidents. It is up 1.8% on previous years' figures. It also appeared to have the second highest number of actual casualties at 802 of all London boroughs. Westminster, the borough with the higher actual casualty rate, reduced their casualties by 7.5%. Merton reduced traffic casualties by 30.6%. To be the worst protector in all London is not anything to be proud of. I am not someone, as the previous Cabinet Member will know, who wants bumps and humps at any cost but to remove them and to continue to remove them and other calming measures to the extent we have in Barnet must now worry anyone with a conscience. The Transport Research Laboratory has reported that 20 mile per hour zones reduce killed and seriously wounded by 57%, whereas, when I asked for a meeting with you, Councillor Offord, to discuss the possibility of such a zone within Childs Hill, you responded by email, which I have in my hand, that you would see me for two minutes on a night of a 2004 Council meeting together with Councillor Harris. As even that two minutes did not materialise, I realised then that your offer was at best facetious.

Would you please comment on this policy as it puts people's lives at risk.

Councillor Matthew Offord Responded

I am not going to engage in a slanging match with the council member. First of all I remind you that the Council does have a policy, which does not include the wholesale removal of traffic calming measures.

The one point I am going to mention in the short amount of time I have available is that reducing the number of road accidents is a priority for this Administration. The Transport 2000 report, which you referred to, is based on statistics for the first six months of 2004 and comparing the accident rate for such a short amount of time is misleading because it is influenced by many random factors and there are considerable seasonal variations. Had the report published the figures for the first nine months of 2004 it would have showed a 2% reduction in the accident casualty rate. If it had published the figures for the ten months of 2004 it would have showed a reduction of 4% in the accident casualty reduction rate.

However, I am consoled by figures produced by Transport for London. It is reassuring to note that their statistics comparing the accident casualty rate in Barnet for the year 2002, the year we took control of the Council, and the year 2003 shows a reduction of 10.4%. Better than the London-wide average of 7.1%. There has been a lot of misrepresentation about Barnet's traffic policy. I hope what I have said tonight puts that to rest.

Councillor Susette Palmer Commented:

In May 2002 our Administration handed over to you an admired and excellent Library Service. The excellence of our service had been recognised by the Government with a Beacon Award and I thought that the entire Council was proud of our 17 libraries, two mobiles and house-bound reader service. You constantly assured us that our libraries were safe in your hands.

They were not, were they?

It was a Tory Prime Minister who coined the phrase 'lies, damn lies and statistics' and it certainly applies to your promise about the Library Service. Totteridge Library is closed and it was only pressure brought by the residents and Opposition Councillors that prevented the closure of South Friern. You are now planning to sell one of the mobiles which take the library services to places such as the West Hendon Estate and the Terrace community in Cricklewood which have no easily accessible library. You are also planning staff cuts for the staff you care so much for, Councillor David, of 12.5 people, which is two and half posts at my local library of Childs Hill. This constant cutting of staff across the Library Service, however you rationalise it, makes for unhappy staff and I assure you they are fed up with constant reorganisation, and it gives residents a reduced service no matter how you look at it.

You have constantly cut the media fund. Book and subscription costs go up all the time. Residents already complain, certainly to me and I am sure to everyone else, that there are fewer new books. If you continue with this madness the future of libraries looks bleak indeed. Are you hoping lack of books will mean less people use our libraries and you can justify further closures? I hope not. As usual, the people to suffer most will not be the prosperous ones. Nice middle class people like us can phone up Amazon and order the books we want or need for school, for college or for business. It is the poorer residents who rely on public libraries who will suffer.

Where is the money to come from? Liberal Democrats proposed a saving of £450,000 on the Corporate Performance Office. To spend money on a Corporate Performance Office while Beacon Services and performance indicators go down the plughole is truly fiddling while Rome, or in this case Barnet, burns.

The Library Service is one relevant to all age groups across the Borough, from the babies bookstart scheme to old people, and we the opposition feel strongly that you should reconsider these plans and would like to hear your views.

Councillor Katia David responded:

Madam Mayor, unlike Councillor Palmer, I do not only think about the library in my Ward like she says.

We do not only think about libraries in our Ward. That is why the one-hour difference in the mornings is across the board. In proposing reductions to the Customer Care Service budgets, the principle adopted is, as far as possible, to minimise the impact on our Barnet residents who use the services but at the same time recognising that savings have got to be made to share the reductions across the Borough. All libraries will therefore lose opening hours in order to make a necessary saving of £226,000. The proposal is that they will open at 10am on weekdays and 9.30 on Saturdays, as this is the busiest day. Sunday opening at Hendon, Chipping Barnet and Golders Green will continue at the currently advertised hours. This has not been an easy proposal to put forward but in taking hours from every library and protecting evening and weekend opening, it is intended that all Barnet residents who wish to use the library will continue to be able to do so. This is combined with a review of staff responsibilities at junior levels to ensure that there will be sufficient staff to cover the revised hours effectively and minimise the risk of any unplanned closure. In proposing a reduction to the mobile and home library service, Councillor Palmer, although the loss of one mobile will mean that half the existing sites will have to go, I am seeking to ensure that there will be sites

retained across the Borough and that the best used sites are, as far as possible, kept and I am saying that most sites are not used.

I am still discussing the revised pattern of sites and hours for the one remaining vehicle and reduced number of staff with officers in the Library Service.

130. STATUTORY COUNCIL BUSINESS (Agenda Item 11)

In accordance with Procedure Rule 43, the Worshipful the Mayor allocated 35 minutes for Agenda Items 14.1 and five minutes for Agenda Item 15.

131. REPORT OF THE GENERAL FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE 6 JANUARY 2005 (Agenda Item 14.1):

Councillor Joan Scannell moved reception and adoption of the Report of General Functions Committee dated 6 January, 2005, with the following recommendations:

- 1. Budget 2005/2006 (CI 14/12/05) Report of the Head of Human Resources – Agenda item 5);**
 - (1) That the list of posts affected by the budget proposals as set out in Appendix A to this Item be approved.**
 - (2) That, following completion of the statutory consultation with Trade Unions, the Head of Human Resources be instructed to serve the necessary notices to take effect immediately.**
- 2. RESTRUCTURE OF THE LAW AND PROBITY SERVICE (Report of the Borough Solicitor- Agenda item 7)**
 - (1) That the proposed restructure of the Law and Probity Service as set out in the Borough Solicitor's report and the revised Appendix B be approved.**
 - (2) That the Borough Solicitor be instructed to issue notice of redundancy as appropriate**

An Amendment to Item (1) was moved by Councillor Steve Blomer. Debate ensued. On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared lost. The substantive motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

RESOLVED - That the Report of the General Functions Committee of 6 January 2005 be approved and adopted.

132. CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP (Report of the Head of Committee)

RESOLVED – That Councillor Maureen Braun replace Councillor Kevin Edson on the Healthy Hospitals Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

133. VACANCIES ON SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (Agenda Item 15.1(3) and (9)):

The Head of Committee's report set out details of the appointments or nominations to be made.

Nominations in the names of Councillors Joan Scannell and Alison Moore were moved. Councillor Susette Plamer advised the Council that the Liberal Democrat Group would not be submitting nominations, pending the outcome of the review agreed at the last meeting (CI 14/12/04 – 113).

RESOLVED –

- (1) That the following persons be appointed or nominated as the case may require to fill the vacancies referred to for the period indicated:**

P2.2	Barnet Hill JMI and Nursery School	Defer
VP33.1	Beis Yaacov Primary School	Defer

P.44.1	Broadfields Primary School	Mrs Leslie Williams (Dr P Bhattacharyya unsuccessful)
P.44.2	Broadfields Primary School	Mrs I Mann
P.44.;3	Broadfields Primary School	Defer (Mrs Norma Fisher unsuccessful)
NP.46.1	Brookhill Nursery School	Mrs J Last
NP.46.2	Brookhill Nursery School	Defer
P.23.1	Brookland Infant and Brookland Junior Schools	Defer
P.10.3	Brunswick Park Primary School	Defer
P.25.2	Chalgrove Primary School	Defer
P.11.2	Church Hill School	Defer
P.28a.1	Clitterhouse Infant and Nursery School	Mr John Scott
P.28a.3	Clitterhouse Infant and Nursery School	Mr Morton Morris
P.39.1	Courtland JMI School	Defer
P.41.1	Dollis Infant School	Defer
P.41.4	Dollis Infant School	Defer
S.04.3	East Barnet School	Councillor Terry Burton
P.43a.1	Edgware Infant and Nursery School	Mrs Barbara Sherling
S.07.1	Friern Barnet School	Mr Timothy Benjamin (Councillor Kath McGuirk unsuccessful)
P.42.1	Frith Manor Junior and Infant School	Mr Richard Cornelius
P.45.1	Grasvenor Avenue Infant School	Mrs Pat Duntonr
P.45.2	Grasvenor Avenue Infant School	Defer
P.48.2	Hampden Way Nursery School	Defer
P.09.3	Monkfrith JMI School	Defer
SP.02.2	Northway School	Defer
SP.03.2	Oakleigh School	Defer
VP14.2	St Catherines RC JMI School	Defer
VP32.2	St Johns CE Primary, N11	Defer
VP.21a.1	St Johns NW4	Defer
VP.16.1	St Josephs RC Junior School	Defer
P.16.1	Summerside Primary School	Defer
P.33.1	The Hyde Primary School	Defer
P.50.4	The Orion Primary and Goldbeaters Primary Schools	Defer
P.1a.3	Underhill Infant School	Defer

(2) That no further representatives be appointed to Edgware District Reform Synagogue Youth Club, Relate North London, SPEC Jewish Youth and Community Centre and Watling Community Association and the current appointments to these organisations be terminated with immediate effect.

134. REPRESENTATION OF THE COUNCIL ON OUTSIDE BODIES (Agenda Items 15.1.5):

The Head of Committee's report set out details of the appointments or nominations to be made.

Upon nominations in the names of Councillors Joan Scannell and Alison Moore, it was

RESOLVED – That the following persons be appointed or nominated as the case may be to fill the vacancies referred to for the period indicated:

VACANCY REFERENCE	PARTICULARS OF APPOINTMENT OR NOMINATION	PERSON APPOINTED OR NOMINATED
1002	Almshouse Charities of Samuel Atkinson and Others	Defer
4526	Continuing Care Review Panel	Mrs Helena Davis
1167	Hampstead Garden Suburb Institute Council	Defer
1167	Hampstead Garden Suburb Institute Council	Defer
1079	Nicholl and Daniel Homes Charity	Mr Fabio Seccatorie

135. CHIEF OFFICER APPOINTMENT PANEL – CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S ANNUAL APPRAISAL(Report of the Head of Committee - Agenda item 15.4).

Nominations in the names of Councillor Jona Scannel, Alison Moore and Susette Palmer were moved.

RESOLVED – That the following appointments be made to the Chief Officer Appointment Panel - Chief Executive’s Annual Appraisal:

Chairman : Councillor Victor Lyon
Vice – Chairman : Councillor Anthony Finn
Councillors : Joan Scannell
John Marshall
Phil Yeoman
Alison Moore
Monroe Palmer

Substitutes:
Councillors: Katia David
Danish Chopra
Wayne Casey

the meeting finished at 10.41 pm

**Council Questions to Cabinet Members
18 January 2005
Questions and Responses**

Question No. 1**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Please could you provide details of the refurbishment work being planned for Stoneyfields Park, Hale, as part of the Council's excellent policy on the improvement of local green spaces.

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

Recently, the following work has been carried out on the play area.

The areas between the play equipment have been laid with tarmac to create a level surface.

The vandalised safety surface has been repaired and three sets of swing seats have been reinstalled.

The grass turf in the play area will be re-laid in the spring after the area has been levelled using topsoil. We also intend to provide heavy duty five-a-side football goals.

There are also plans to replace missing fencing and carry out work to the pond, cutting back the overhang and removing debris.

Supplementary Question No. 1**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Councillor Offord, the excellent work which is being done in Stoneyfields Park is appreciated by many residents in Hale. Could you please endorse what I am sure many of us feel? Over the last couple of years the improvements that have been made to many of our parks has been quite noticeable and is a refreshing change from the sad legacy of ill maintenance of the parks which existed from the previous Administration.

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

Yes I will Councillor Gordon. As you may be aware, I did receive some criticism of our policy on the introduction of the Premier Parks scheme. I would like to remind Members that this park is actually a non-premier park and I think it is a demonstrable action that we will not neglect such green spaces.

Question No. 2**Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Could the Cabinet member for Resources detail the amount of unsupported Prudential Borrowing undertaken in 2004/05 and the cost to the Revenue cost to the General Fund.

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

Full details on the level of unsupported borrowing were provided to Cabinet Resources Committee in November 2004.

It is not feasible to provide an exact figure as the incidence of expenditure across the year is not even and the timing of long-term borrowing is also dictated by the market as we obviously aim to enter into long-term borrowing commitments when the rates are in our advantage. At this time there is expected to be minimal impact to the General Fund in 2004/05 as a result of this increase in unsupported borrowing.

Question No. 3**Councillor Phil Yeoman**

If the Leader of the Council could explain how the £117,000 staff reduction in Legal Services will improve the quality of service provided to residents and other council services?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

We are constantly seeking to improve the quality of service provision both to residents and other Council Services. That is why we are implementing the new case management system and also hopefully (subject to Council approving the General Functions Committee report) the restructuring of the department. Both are critical to improving service delivery.

One of the other key drivers to improving service delivery is to ensure that the time and energy of lawyers is spent on doing the work which really requires specialist legal skills. For some years now we have been working with other Council Services in identifying other areas of work which the "client department" could carry out themselves without needing a lawyer's involvement. Where some limited training of non-lawyers is necessary, this is provided along with guidance notes and precedent documentation. There are significant efficiency savings where this is achieved, not least because the paper movement between lawyers and other Council departments is simply removed.

Supplementary Question No. 3

Councillor Phil Yeoman

I thank the Cabinet Member for his response. Madam Mayor, the written answer given by Councillor Finn does not tally with the confidential email sent by Law and Probity to Heads of Service and Directors in December. I would say confidential because that is what it says across the top of the email. The email says that these budget reductions mean that the legal practice will need to identify areas of work that it would cease to carry out or have to give a very low priority to and in some of these instances the work concerned can be transferred to client departments. Can the Cabinet Member now come clean and tell us which areas of work will no longer be carried out and which will be given a low priority by Legal Services, and will he now apologise for attempting to mislead Members of this Council in his written answer. Thank you Madam Mayor.

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

I was going to be nice to Councillor Yeoman because he has been cooperative on the other motion but he now has put the cat amongst the pigeons by speaking like this. There is nothing we are hiding in our answer. There is nothing which is hiding in any confidential messages or memos which I have not seen. What we are saying very simply is that we will be more rigorous in identifying areas of work which can be discontinued, some which will be dealt with by non-lawyers and some will be given lower priority. We are going to adopt a pragmatic approach and within the areas of what we can do we would do well and we would continue to offer the borough the service that it deserves and the service it has always expected.

Question No. 4

Councillor Brian Gordon

What is your reaction to the reply of the Mayor of London to Barnet's Chief Executive (27th October) in which the Mayor tried to defend his sharing of a platform with the extremist cleric Sheikh Qaradawi?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

I am disappointed but not surprised at the Mayor of London's attitude. In my opinion, he has long appeared to support those whose alleged objectives include the use of violence and are contrary to the principles which we uphold in Great Britain of tolerance, free speech and the use of the democratic process to affect change.

Supplementary Question No. 4

Councillor Brian Gordon

Are you aware, (I am sure you are), that recently this Sheikh Qaradawi was quoted as saying that people deserved to die in the South Asian earthquake. Yet it still seems that Livingstone is defending this man.

Do you not agree that Livingstone's extremism and wild and maverick behaviour has done nothing but bring opprobrium and bring disgrace upon the Mayoralty and we should all treat this man, that Livingstone, with contempt that he deserves.

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

I am grateful to Councillor Gordon, Madam Mayor, for his supplementary question. I have always found the actions of the Mayor of London somewhat strange. I think the bedfellows that he seems to associate with leave some of us feeling that perhaps his real objective is not the support of Great Britain but possibly somewhere else. That is purely a personal view of course.

Question No. 5

Councillor Jeremy Davies

Could the Cabinet member for Resources detail the following assets/debts balances as at 31 December 2004 for the following: Bank Borrowing & other Short-term Borrowing; Short-term investments.

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

As at 31 December 2004 the position was:-

- long-term borrowing £28.5m;
- short-term borrowing £nil;
- short-term investments £58.8m.

Question No. 6

Councillor Alan Schneiderman

The draft budget includes a £226,000 cut from library opening hours and re-designation of posts. Please set out in detail:

- the proposed changes to library opening hours for every library,
- how the posts will be re-designated - from what to what, and
- how many posts will be lost?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The proposed change will be applied across all 16 libraries. They will all open every week day at 10 a.m. and 9.30 on Saturdays instead of 9, 9.30 or 10 at larger libraries on Thursdays.

Posts at the most junior level, Library Assistants will be re-designated Library and Information Officers. The next levels of Senior Library Assistant and Assistant Branch Administrator will be merged and there will be fewer posts, they will be re-designated Senior Library and Information officers. These changes will require a greater level of responsibility from these levels of staff and balance the reduction of more senior posts so that the revised opening hours can be maintained.

12.5 posts will be lost under this proposal.

Supplementary Question No. 6

Councillor Alan Schneiderman

Thank you Madam Mayor. The reduced library opening hours mean that over fifty hours a week are now being lost from the Library Service.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Cabinet vetoed the original proposal from the service to close libraries for one afternoon a week to achieve the savings, solely because of the bad publicity it would generate? What other proposals did she veto and what is being done now to resolve the chaos that the current proposals are having on the rota system for the staff who themselves, as are we, appalled at the way this is being handled?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Thank you Councillor Schneiderman. Madam Mayor, there were three questions in Councillor Schneiderman's supplementary. The answer to one is no. The answer to the second one is no and the answer to the third one is in my answer. Thank you Madam Mayor.

Question No. 7**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Are you aware of the jubilation of numerous Hale residents at the recent first class resurfacing of the roadway in Hale Lane?

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

I certainly am now Councillor Gordon! This question echoes the positive comments that were received during the residents' survey undertaken following the works. In overall terms it shows that 90% of residents responding have stated that they also strongly agree or agree with the adequacy of information provided, method of working and quality of the work carried out. A resident from Hale Lane responded to the customer satisfaction survey by saying 'It is an excellent job long overdue'.

I am aware that such sentiments have been conveyed to the resurfacing work contractor (Granville Steel Contracting) road markings contractor (Bellstan), advance warning signs contractor (Highway Maintenance Service), London Buses and the police who were all involved in the project. They are pleased that their efforts have been recognised.

The comments are an endorsement of the Council pledge to target resources to address the repairing of roads and pavements as one of its five key pledges. It will continue to do so by providing a massive investment in the short term thereby eliminating the backlog of outstanding maintenance work we inherited from the last Liberal/Labour administration, within five years.

This will contribute to the delivery of the Corporate Plan 2004/5-2007/8 condition targets for each class of road network as set out in the new Corporate Plan's Service Performance Tables.

Supplementary Question No. 7**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Councillor Offord, is not the improvement that is being made to so many roads within Barnet, such as the one I highlighted in Hale, just another indication that we are genuinely concerned about traffic, about the motorist and about the easy flow of people from one place to the other, rather than a contempt for the motorist and a discrimination against private car users which has been the hallmark of the Labour Party and the previous Administration.

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

Thank you Councillor Gordon. While I do actually agree with a lot of what you say, the policy of this Council is to protect all road users and I can assure you many people on cycles for example did complain about the many potholes that failed to be repaired under the past Liberal and Labour Administration.

I am sure that you will be interested to know at the end of the third quarter of this financial year, 205 borough roads schemes have already been completed and that figure is two to three times greater than the previous year's work programme. I think this is another area where this Administration is delivering the residents' priorities.

Question No. 8**Councillor Barry Rawlings**

The budget headlines agreed by the administration on 14 December included £300,000 cut from the youth service. How will the service be affected and how much money will be left in the youth service budget for 2005/6?

Answer by Councillor John Marshall

The savings will be made in various ways. For example administrative expenses will be pared to the bone. The partnership with North London Connexions will help to reduce management costs.

Greater use will be made of shared premises. The move of Oasis from the Herbert Wilmot Centre to shared premises in Barnet Burnt Oak Leisure Centre with vastly improved facilities for young people is an example of an economy which has resulted in a much better service for young people. We will also seek to maximise the use of external grant and other sources of funding. Thus 6 of the 8 members of the Drug support team will be externally funded. The Finchley Youth Theatre is generating income by working with schools. Housing associations are also providing facilities as Peabody has done on Strawberry Vale.

There will be many exciting developments in our provision for young people. The savings we are making have meant that at a time when the government is asking local authorities to reduce costs the schools budget remains very strong. The need for redundancies is not envisaged.

Supplementary Question No. 8

Councillor Barry Rawlings

Thank you. I will see if the Cabinet Member can actually answer directly the supplementary, which is simple, which is whether he agrees with this quote.

That, 'because young people often find themselves in difficulty this can lead to anti-social behaviour or crime and that the Youth Service offer help to disaffected young people and is absolutely essential and that Youth Service cuts are reflected in the increase in petty crime on our streets. So without early intervention and help to put these youngsters on the right road we are simply encouraging a criminal society'. These are the words of Councillor Lynne Hillan at the Council meeting in January 2002. Could he say whether he thinks Councillor Hillan is right to condemn cuts in Youth Service or is it just a case of Tory hypocrisy?

Answer by Councillor John Marshall

What Councillor Hillan was talking about, Madam Mayor, was the disgraceful way in which the previous Labour Administration ignored the Youth Service and created the problems to which she was referring. What we are seeking to do is to ensure that the Youth Service has reduced administrative costs so that the money can be put into service with the young people rather than people sitting in offices. And we are also seeking, as I have said in my answer, to secure external funding for some of the work of the service which again is to the advantage of the service as well as the advantage of young people and the Council Tax payer.

Question No. 9

Councillor Brian Coleman

Will the Leader of the Council support the proposed alternative GLA Budget proposed by the Conservative Group on the London Assembly?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

I always support the judgement of the Conservative Members of the Greater London Assembly in trying to reduce the unnecessarily high precepts of the Mayor of London. No doubt, Cllr Coleman as the elected Member of the Assembly will be casting his vote appropriately.

Supplementary Question No. 9

Councillor Brian Coleman

Thank you Madam Mayor. I am always grateful for the deep personal support of the Leader of the Council.

Will the Leader of the Council welcome the announcement that the Conservative Group on the Greater London Assembly will be proposing a precept rise of 0 percent?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

Madam Mayor, Councillor Coleman will of course know that my feelings are reciprocal and of course I support anything that will keep the GLA precept down. All I know is that we have tried as far as possible in our Administration to be extremely careful and our suspicion with the over-90 percent increase in four years, which the Mayor of London has imposed on Londoners, is unacceptable and cannot continue.

Question No. 10

Councillor Danish Chopra

The Council is proposing to scrap the £50,000 grant to Barnet Action 4 Youth in 2005/6. What work does the group do, how long has the Group been receiving a grant from the Council, and what help is the Council offering to ensure the group continues its work in future?

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

The council offers a mix of funding types to the voluntary and community sector, including fixed-term 'project' grants over a maximum of three years, essentially to support a specific programme of work or to help set up a new activity.

All fixed-term grants require an 'exit strategy', showing how a recipient expects the project to end naturally or to continue with other funding sources once the council's grant ends. The aim is to help more groups to expand and develop their services by periodically recycling funds in favour of new projects.

Barnet Action 4 Youth (BA4Y) has been supported annually towards delivery of its 'SPLASH' programme, offering activities during the school holidays for 11-16 year-olds to divert them away from crime and anti-social behaviour, since 1993. More recently, the funding was converted into a three-year grant on the basis of an undertaking from BA4Y to seek sustainability funding from other sources to replace the council's grant when it expires in March 2005.

Since April last, the cost of the SPLASH programme has been met from a new funding stream, 'Positive Activities for Young People', and the final year of the grant has been reallocated to other elements of BA4Y's work, in particular a series of 'Youth Action Groups', targeting young people with behavioural or attendance problems at school.

The main purpose of the grant has therefore come to an end.

BA4Y will, nevertheless, be considered for a smaller one-year grant in 2005/06 towards other diversionary activities for young people, subject to the availability of funds.

Supplementary Question No. 10

Councillor Danish Chopra

Thank you Madam Mayor. Labour Government funding, of course, for the 'SPLASH' programme is certainly welcome but the Council should also be investing in youth activities to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour. Taken with the Youth Service the cuts amount to £350,000.

Councillor Freer says that Barnet Action4Youth can apply to the grants budget but that is also being cut.

How can the Tories, Councillor Freer, be taken seriously on anti-social behaviour when all their actions prove the very opposite.

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

Thank you Madam Mayor. We always take Councillor Chopra seriously which is how we take anti-social behaviour seriously. You will find over the last two years the grants budget actually has achieved reductions whilst maintaining grants to the voluntary sector. I call that improved efficiency.

As I have said in my answer, Barnet4Youth will continue to be funded the way they used to be for their activities and I do not expect them to cease what they are doing.

Question No. 11

Councillor Brian Coleman

What is the proposed subscription payable to the Local Government Association for the year 2005/6 and does he think Barnet receives value for money from that Organisation?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

The proposed subscription to the LGA is £88,293 which is an increase of 1.4% on the current subscription. At the half yearly Assembly, I voted for a Conservative amendment for a nil increase. This was voted down by the Labour and Liberal Democrat members.

Supplementary Question No. 11

Councillor Brian Coleman

Would the Leader agree with me that it is highly regrettable that the Labour/Liberal Democrat Groups at the General Assembly of the LGA did not vote to freeze subscriptions and it rather knocks a hole in their argument that they provide value in local government, and would he also agree with me that there are significant economy savings to be made in the running of the Local Government Association?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

Yes. Can I thank Councillor Coleman for his supplementary and to say you will see in my answer, Madam Mayor, that I voted for that amendment because I believe it is so. There is waste. I am hopeful now that the LGA has a Conservative Leader and Chairman that we may well find those economies which he is talking about.

Question No. 12

Councillor Linda McFadyen

If the Cabinet Member would make a statement on how the proposed £200,000 budget reduction by learning disability 'reprofiling' will be achieved and detail any changes to the eligibility criteria?

Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer

The reduction will be achieved through the deletion of vacant posts and revisions to working arrangements. There will be no changes to the eligibility criteria and I believe the changes will allow us to provide a more appropriate and modern service and so improve the experience of those using these services.

Supplementary Question No. 12

Councillor Linda McFadyen

Thank you Madam Mayor, yes I do have a supplementary and the reply from the Cabinet Member is not particularly helpful and nor was the reply I got back from the Service.

Fortunately, for me, I have the Community Care Budget Briefing handed to staff members that says that the cut involved is going to get rid of five full-time jobs, although I accept that the Council has deliberately left them vacant and downgraded the services to make this cut more palatable. The Briefing also says the Council is moving away from residential care for people with learning disabilities to supported living.

Can the Cabinet Member explain what consultation has been undertaken, in general terms, with service users and their families and whether individual service users and their families will have the right of veto over any changes to their living arrangements? After all, these are some of the most vulnerable people in our community.

Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer

There has been consultation over a number of months and we will continue to provide the services we are required to, to those families, and do so in a sensitive manner and I think that the consultation that has been carried out has been done in that sensitive way. I think, as I said in my answer, that the changes we are making to the service will actually improve services for users and I am always surprised that the Labour Party wants to leave these kinds of services stuck in the past rather than trying to provide a modern and appropriate and non-patronising service to these vulnerable people.

Question No. 13

Councillor Brian Coleman

What is the proposed subscription payable to the Association of London Government for 2005/6 and does he agree with the London Borough of Bromley that membership of both the LGA and the ALG is unnecessary duplication?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

The proposed subscription to the ALG is £163,462. I disagree with Bromley as I believe that as the LGA is largely composed of Authorities outside London many of whom are District Councils they are unlikely to take a sufficient interest in London's problems. It is therefore important there is a separate body composed of all political parties who can lobby for London. However, I am disappointed that the review by the "three wise men " into the financial running of the A.L.G. including grants paid to Outer London Boroughs has been delayed.

Question No. 14

Councillor Kath McGuirk

The budget headlines propose a £90,000 cut in the noise service. How will this be implemented/what are the changes to the service?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

The Out of Hours Service currently operates from Monday to Sunday with two Noise and Nuisance Officers working from 20.00 Hrs to 0700 Hrs the following day. A single officer covers the period from 15.00 Hrs to 2000 Hrs dealing with new service requests arriving in the late afternoon and being the link person between the 'In Hours' Service and the 'Out of Hours' Service.

Two shifts are worked on Saturdays and Sundays commencing at 0700 Hrs and 1400 Hrs to provide single officer cover over the weekend. On Saturday nights throughout the summer an additional patrol operates from 2000 Hrs to 0400 to cover the seasonal increase in complaints. This additional patrol is made up from day staff volunteers who are paid overtime for their additional work.

The total number of complaints received during 2003 / 4 was 4336. The lowest number of complaints received in any one month was 263 (October 2003) and the highest 597 (July 2003). The number of complaints received during the summer months were greater than the number received during the winter months with the busiest months being June, July and August.

There was also a weekly pattern for complaints received with the busiest period being between 2000 Hrs and 0000 Hrs on Saturdays and 0000 Hrs to 0700 Hrs on the Sundays. The weekly pattern can be summarised as follows:

Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
%age of calls	9.66	9.09	8.67	9.54	10.89	26.04	26.1

Note: Since Sunday calls include calls made after Saturday midnight, the Saturday night/Sunday morning period of the week can be seen to have generated the greatest number of complaints.

Taking the above into account the restructured service proposes to reduce from a 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 52 weeks per year service to:-

- 0900 to 1700 Hrs Monday Friday ('In Hours' Service);
- Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights from 2000 Hrs to 0700 Hrs.
- Double patrol on Saturday nights during periods of high demand.
- Saturday and Sunday day time patrol between 0700 Hrs and 2000 Hrs.

The 'Out of Hours' team currently consists of seven officers working 25 hour shifts per week. The weekend service described above is to be provided for the equivalent cost of three officers (one team of two working nights and one officer working days). The estimated saving of £90,000 takes into account the cost of providing additional cover by the 'In Hours' staff during the busy summertime weekend periods, annual leave and sickness.

The new service will focus on periods of peak demand. Where weekday/evening night visits or monitoring is necessary then special operations funded by one off overtime will be arranged.

Supplementary Question No. 14

Councillor Kath McGuirk

Thank you. I thank Councillor Salinger for his precis of the service as it was and as it is going to be, but the short answer is that there will be no noise service to help residents from Monday to Friday after 5pm until 9am the next morning. This is going to be about as popular as scrapping the rat catchers' service was last year. Will the Cabinet Member give an undertaking to reconsider this cut so that this Council can take anti-social behaviour seriously?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

This Council does take anti-social behaviour seriously and if Councillor McGuirk does not believe that she might just as well leave now because she is standing on her own.

The changes to this service have been developed to reflect the use of the service, bearing in mind that you have got there the figures for the average number of calls over that period, and I have been assured by officers that if there are persistent problems in any one area on any particular time that is recurrent from week to week that we will have the facility and the staff available to deal with it.

Question No. 15

Councillor Brian Coleman

What consultation with Opposition and backbench Councillors did Councillor Finn undertake before signing the delegated powers report introducing the new bureaucratic, inconvenient and frankly stupid arrangements for Councillors equipment allowance?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

The action was taken under delegated powers by the Head of Committee in consultation with myself. As ever I am ready and willing to meet with councillors from all groups to see if improvements can be made to the arrangements.

Supplementary Question No. 15

Councillor Brian Coleman

Madam Mayor, I assume Councillor Finn meant to answer 'none' to my question because that appears to be the answer. Does he now regret the way this decision was taken and will he go about ensuring that appropriate arrangements that meet agreement from all parties, backbench and executive member councillors or whatever we are supposed to call them, are now implemented?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

No!

I am happy the decision I took was correct and I believe it is correct. However, I did not realise that other people found it difficult to maintain records and to fill in little boxes in tax returns which I am very used to and perhaps I did not appreciate the difficulty and the time that other people, Members, have to spend on these things, which I take very naturally.

So, perhaps, I should have consulted others, which I will now do and if anybody comes up with better ideas for managing the system we will, as ever, listen and take on board if they are so desirous.

Question No. 16

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

The Human Resources Occupational Health Service is being closed to save £80,000. How will the Council offer support to staff with occupational health problems in future and what assessment has been made of the impact of the loss of the service on staff sickness absences?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The contract with the existing provider for the Council's Occupational Health Service will not be renewed in April 2005 when the doctor and nurse retire. Two options were identified to continue occupational health provision. The first which was discounted, was to enter into a contract with another provider on similar terms. The second option, which will be progressed subject to Council agreement is for service areas to access occupational health facilities through a range of local providers with costs billed directly to service areas. Other than specific health promotion, existing service level provision will remain unchanged, i.e. pre-employment screening, statutory medicals, attendance management referrals etc.

This change of service provision is therefore not solely related to costs savings, as the service areas will pay for the service provided and should ensure that service areas utilise occupational health provision efficiently.

The change in service delivery of the occupational health function should have no impact on levels of staff sickness.

Supplementary Question No. 16

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

Yes I have a supplementary here. Thank you.

Service areas will be required to pay for pre-employment screening, medical assessments for ill-health retirement, medical assessments for attendance, management cases and statutory medicals, by accessing GPs.

Could the Cabinet Member explain how much extra money each of the individual service areas is getting in this year's budget to specifically meet the extra responsibility that is being placed upon them to deal with occupational health?

Councillor Katia David

Madam Mayor, just to let you know that last month 31 hours in total were spent by senior HR staff on researching Councillor Sodha's questions. I rest my case.

Question No. 17

Councillor Brian Coleman

In what way does Cllr Finn consider the loss of a half time member of staff in Mayor and Member support help either the Mayor or members?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

It would result in a saving of £13000 per annum which of course is to the benefit of all Barnet residents.

Supplementary Question No. 17**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I am desperate to be patronised again by Councillor Finn so here we go. Would Councillor Finn agree there is a serious piece of work to be done on providing modern and effective support to councillors of all parties, both non-executive and executive members and will he undertake to do that piece of work?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

Councillor Coleman, I do not mean to patronise you because it is my new year's resolution to be nice to Councillor Coleman. I made two new year's resolutions. One to be nice to Councillor Coleman and not to patronise him and the second one was not to listen to any new year's resolutions which I made.

Quite seriously though I am always open, as you know, to looking into ways where we can improve member services. The idea of this was not particularly to improve member services so your question is really a bit fallacious. It was not meant to help the Mayor or Members, it was just to make a saving and in fact it was a saving of £13,000, which we intended to make.

However, what I suggest is when we do meet, and I hope you will find time to come to this meeting to discuss any arrangements which we can improve on, we will talk in general about improving Member services and I hope that will go a long way to satisfying you and everybody else. If you look to my other answer it was extended to everybody who wants to come. I will arrange a time and invite everybody to come along who wants to participate.

Question No. 18**Councillor Paul Rogers**

The Council meeting on 14 December 2004 agreed to consult on cutting £37,000 from community centres. Could the Cabinet Member for Housing provide a detailed explanation of how this will be achieved and what impact there will be on the services offered?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

Following consultation with Barnet Homes, and to reflect the usage by Council tenants, it has been agreed that a higher proportion of the costs will be met from the HRA resulting in a saving to the general fund.

There will be no impact on the service provided.

Supplementary Question No. 18**Councillor Paul Rogers**

Thank you Madam Mayor.

Is it not bad enough that tenants and leaseholders, many of them are on low incomes, are expected to pay twice for everything already, once through the Council Tax, once through the rent and service charges, without the extra burden being placed upon them of their limited levels of income, is this not just yet another unfair tax on them by the Conservatives?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

No, it is bringing one community centre into line with the same way that we finance most of the other community centres.

Question No. 19**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Which areas of the Council Services are dragging us down in relation to our CPA rating?

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

The Council continues to make good progress towards our goal of being an Excellent Authority. Even though the evaluation goal posts have moved we have continued to make progress. However we will continue to rectify many of the inherited weakness; in particular:

- it would be advantageous to regain a point on Social Care (adults). Positive results include the success at limiting the number of delayed discharges of people from hospital to a care place per week. These are now regularly zero and the total number of reimbursable days is, on average, less than seven. In addition, 84 per cent of new care packages for older people met waiting time standards (2nd band);
- by continuing work to address weaknesses in human resource and financial management systems. This Administration's investment in SWIFT and MCS is reversing the under investment in IT by the previous Administration will allow us to make a quantum leap in these areas.

Supplementary Question No. 19

Councillor Brian Coleman

When does Councillor Freer expect our CPA rating to improve?

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

At the next inspection.

Question No. 20

Councillor Allan Turner

In his reply to question 22 at the December council meeting, the Cabinet Member gave details of commuted payments in respect of Section 106 agreements in the years 2003 and 2004. In those two years there was a total of £5.05million in commuted payments. Would the Cabinet Member provide Council with a breakdown of the schemes where this money has been spent, and the number of units that have been developed with this money? Why were there no figures for commuted payments in 2002, given that there were figures for the subsequent years, and what are these 2002 figures?

Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen

In 2003 and 2004, the council received commuted sum payments for affordable housing totalling £1.929 million. The £1.929 million is the total currently available to spend and the council has 5 years from the date the payments were received to spend this money on suitable schemes. £1.300 million of the amount available to spend was received and banked in November and December 2004.

In March 2003, the council spent a total of £98,000 of commuted sums monies received for affordable housing, this commuted sum monies contributed toward the costs of providing 13 homes, 8 of these homes were at Days Almshouse scheme in Edgware and 5 at Farm Court in NW4. The contribution made towards the Days Almshouse scheme allowed the Almshouse to secure £312,975 external funding from the Housing Corporation and without our contribution this funding would have been lost.

In 2002, the council received £40,000 in commuted sums for affordable housing.

Based on current planning permissions approved to date, the council are expecting to receive further commuted sum payments in the coming year if the planning permissions approved are acted on.

Supplementary Question No. 20

Councillor Allan Turner

Thank you Madam Mayor. I have got two supplementaries. One is filled with rhetoric and the other one is vaguely sensible. I say vaguely sensible.

It is a two-fold question. Given inflation and the market forces that impact upon building costs, i.e. when there is a slump, building labour and costs are much less than during the boom years, if the money was spent now we would get better value for money than if we spent in five years time, we would increase the number of units overall that we could gather by this means.

And, secondly, if the sums are invested, where does the interest accrued from the invested sums go? Does it go to the building fund to build more or does it go into the Council's central coffers?

Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen

I have not a clue. It is not my portfolio. This question that you just raised should really be raised to the Housing Department. If you like, I will ask the Lead Member for Housing to respond to you on that but it is not something which is within my portfolio.

Question No. 21

Councillor Brian Coleman

What was the cost of the "Civic Reception " held at the Arts depot ?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

The cost of the reception following the Civic Opening by the Mayor on 23 November 2004 was £9526.11. This was a modest but prestigious event which gave an opportunity for the Borough to show its support for the Arts and to give those involved with Community Focus and Barnet College, as well as some Barnet schools, the opportunity to present some of their work. It also gave the Borough the chance to show its gratitude to organisations and private individuals who have donated money towards the Arts Depot. As invitations were sent to many Authorities and organisations in North London, it is likely to have obtained future bookings for events at the Depot. I therefore regard the event as a marketing operation as well as a civic event. The Borough has spent several million pounds in supporting the building of the Arts Depot and gives a substantial subsidy to the Arts Trust Board each year, so apart from the artistic advantage of ensuring its success, there is a financial one as well.

I am sure as a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Councillor Coleman was sorry that other commitments prevented his attendance at the function.

Supplementary Question No. 21

Councillor Brian Coleman

Thank you Madam Mayor. Yes, I think I had an urgent appointment washing my hair that night.

Madam Mayor, has the Leader of the Council had the latest flyer from the Arts Depot for their new production of New Lives, showing twice nightly between the 26th of January and the 28th of January, which says "Have you ever walked the streets at dusk observing the lives going on behind the windows? Your journey begins when you enter a dark and silent forest. Gradually a pathway appears lit by a myriad of whispering domestic lamps. Follow the light, listen to the voice, keep to the path and watch out for the roar of the hoovers. New Lives takes a fresh look at the way we live by letting you spy into the lives of people in their private rooms. Are they really living there or are they merely waiting for time to pass. New Lives celebrates the Arts Depot's new building".

Will the Leader of the Council be attending this performance at the Arts Depot?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

I cannot. Actually I got the invitation today. That particular night I have another commitment. This is only one part, Madam Mayor, of an extensive programme that I understand the Arts Depot is compiling that will appeal to different tastes, different age groups, people of different ethnic backgrounds, and as far as I can tell, I have only been to one performance there, which was a pantomime to which I took my grandchildren.

And I have to say that although it was intended for very young children, it was superbly done and if their other productions are of the same high quality I am sure that people in the borough will support them.

The important thing, and I cannot emphasize this too much, that this Arts Depot admittedly when it was originally proposed, our Group opposed it because we were not told the truth about the costs. We did not like the monstrosity of the building itself. It is now up. It is essential, in my view, that we support it. It will give pleasure to a great many people and I am not the artistic director but I have every confidence in the people who are now forming part of the Trust and I hope all Members and all citizens of this borough will do their best to support this valuable enterprise.

Question No. 22

Councillor Gill Sargeant

When will the agreement with Choices for Grahame Park be signed and what is the latest update on progress with the regeneration?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

The agreement between the Council and Choices for Grahame Park (including the two RSLs) will be signed as soon as possible after it has been agreed by The Cabinet. It is hoped to take a report to the Cabinet meeting in March 2005 if all the outstanding issues have been resolved.

Following the resolution to grant planning consent to the proposals last year, the Officers and Choices for Grahame Park have been working together to develop the business plan, which will be the basis around which the legal agreement is structured, so that it meets the specific requirements of the finance company which has provisionally agreed to provide the substantial amount of funding required for this project. This is an extremely complex proposal that needs to reflect a variety of different potential situations that could arise over the life of the project, and is taking longer than was originally envisaged.

The Council is committed to the Regeneration of Grahame Park proceed as quickly as possible, and the Officers have assured me that as soon as the project has been to Cabinet and the necessary resolutions obtained, it should be possible to set a firm timetable for the works to begin, and to advise all of the residents who I know are also keen to see progress.

Supplementary Question No. 22

Councillor Gill Sargeant

Thank you very much Madam Mayor. I just want to say that the Cabinet Member refers to some outstanding issues with regards to Choices for Grahame Park and the signing. Could he tell us what these outstanding issues are please?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

There are a number of detailed outstanding issues. I will write to the Member and list them for her.

Question No. 23

Councillor Brian Coleman

Does the Cabinet Member know what the London Diocesan Board for Schools plan to do with the site of Christ Church Secondary school when the school closes in July 2005?

Answer by Councillor John Marshall

As Councillor Coleman knows the School will become an annexe to St Mary's High school so that current year 10 can complete their secondary education and sit external exams.

So far as the future is concerned discussions have taken place between Barnet officers, the DfES and the London Diocesan Board. The outcome of these discussions has been handicapped by the fact that the DfES tends to penalise those boroughs with successful Education Services and rewards those who are performing badly. However there is agreement with the LDBS that the answer to the future is not a Christ Church Mark Two. For many years Christ Church has failed to appeal to parents who were happy to send their children to local CofE primary schools. Those who are publicly mourning the loss of the School all too often failed to support it.

There are various educational uses which should be considered for the site. Possibilities could include additional single sex places for girls, a Greek School or a multi faith school.

It is unfortunate that Stephen Twigg's visit to Barnet has been cancelled following his promotion. I hope that it can be quickly reinstated so that we can discuss the future of this important site and other educational matters. It should after all be relatively easy for him to 'pop over the border' and visit us.

Supplementary Question No. 23

Councillor Brian Coleman

Will Councillor Marshall give a guarantee to this Council that he is still pursuing the Conservative Party Manifesto commitment for a new girls' secondary school in the Finchley area?

Answer by Councillor John Marshall

Yes, and I am also pursuing other possibilities. I think it is very unfortunate that Stephen Twigg cancelled a visit to the Authority which was due to take place next month and I hope that he can be bothered to come over and talk to the Authority as it is neighbouring his constituency and it should not take him very long to come across the border so that we can discuss this and other issues.

Question No. 24

Councillor Jim Tierney

If the Cabinet Member could explain how cutting £109,000 worth of jobs in the Planning Service will improve the quality of service provided to residents?

Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen

In line with other service areas planning is obliged to make budget savings for 2005/6 which amount to £124,000; of this amount £109,000 will be met by reduction in planning and enforcement posts. It is accepted that the loss of these posts will not improve services to residents but the impact will be kept to a minimum by targeting non-statutory areas of the service.

Supplementary Question No. 24

Councillor Jim Tierney

Thank you Madam Mayor. I thank Councillor Melvin Cohen for his answer. Unlike some other Cabinet Members at least Councillor Cohen has the good grace to admit that the service is getting worse and it is something confirmed in the residents' survey when only 18 percent of people thought the actual service was improving.

And this is notwithstanding the £450,000 planning delivery grant 2003/4 and £750,000 this year. The Planning Service has some major pieces of work coming up over the next year. The final version of the UDP, the beginning of the LDP, and so on.

Can you assure us that none of these areas will be affected and could you explain which non-statutory areas of the service will be cut and downgraded as a result of the budget proposals? Thank you.

Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen

I am not going to take any lectures on the Planning Service from Councillor Tierney. I am rightly proud of the Administration's record in Planning. It brought up the Planning Service from just being taken over by the ODPM to a borough which has now got opportunity borough status. I will not take that criticism from you Councillor Tierney.

Question No. 25**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Will the Cabinet member facilitate the formation of a group of London Boroughs through which the Northern line runs to put concerted lobbying pressure on London Underground Limited and TfL?

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

Yes I will. I think all of us who are forced to use the Northern Line every day are sick and tired of the repeated delays and disruptions to the service.

Supplementary Question No. 25**Councillor Brian Coleman**

I welcome, Madam Mayor, Councillor Offord's commitment and look forward to working with him on what I hope can be an all-party effort to sort out the mess that is currently the Northern Line that is giving hours and hours of misery to tens of thousands of residents of this borough on a daily basis.

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

Thank you very much Councillor Coleman. I would like to just briefly congratulate you on your recent performance at the plenary session of the GLA. I hear they are going to call that Coleman's Question Time. Well either that or this one here tonight.

Anyway, my prime concern at the present time is the extent of the signal failures on the line and the recent failure of the cab radios, which led to the adoption of double manning which in turn, reduced the service frequency drastically. I know back in August of 2004 there were 55 and 40 signal faults respectively and 72 in October 2004. I think I was caught in every single one of them on my way here to the Town Hall.

Of course I will take up your proposals. I am very keen on inviting other boroughs to engage with this and if I can find someone to chair it, perhaps even the Chairman of the Greater London Assembly will be prepared to do that and we could speak about that at a later time?

Question No. 26**Councillor Colin Rogers**

Now that the Cabinet has decided not to impose a 'pavement tax' on small business across the borough, can the Cabinet Member explain how the administration intends to extract more money to cover this shortfall, as they have threatened in the local media?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

As is usual prior to the formulation of the annual budget, Cabinet will review many possibilities for improving its sources of income. Although it is a practice employed by some other local authorities, the possibility of imposing a fee for premises which were utilising pavements to add to their usable floor space was one of the options considered by Cabinet but rejected as it might have impacted unfairly on small businesses. There are no plans for replacing this possible source of income and Councillor Colin Rogers should not be naive enough to believe everything he reads in the local newspapers.

Supplementary Question No. 26**Councillor Colin Rogers**

Thank you Madam Mayor. Thank you Councillor Lyon for his advice not to believe everything I read in the newspapers. I think the best advice is actually not to believe anything Councillor Lyon says.

I saw in the local newspapers last May that Councillor Lyon was promising a zero increase on the Council Tax, so why should anyone believe him now when he says there will not be a pavement tax or a replacement tax.

Should not this Council be helping our local town centres to thrive? Encouraging a café type culture that starts to reclaim our streets from anti-social behaviour.

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

I am grateful of course to Councillor Colin Rogers. Unfortunately, his hearing is as bad as his reading I suspect because I have never promised a zero Council Tax. What I have said all along is that I would work towards as near to zero as is possible, and that is exactly what I am doing. As far as the remainder is concerned, I suggest that Councillor Rogers takes on board what is said and, you know, just, in fact, to be quite honest Madam Mayor, I have forgotten the end of his question. So, all I can say is that if he cares to talk to me afterwards I will try and give him an answer.

Question No. 27**Councillor Phil Yeoman**

If the Leader of the Council could set out how many posts will be lost in Legal services as a result of the £117,000 cut?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

Four posts will be deleted - three full time (two currently unfilled solicitors posts and one legal executive post currently occupied by a temporary member of staff) and one part time (vacant half of a job share solicitor post).

Supplementary Question No. 27**Councillor Phil Yeoman**

The Tory Group really are a happy bunch are they not?

The email I have received to the Heads of Service paints a completely different picture to the one painted by Councillor Finn. I wonder whether he actually knows what the views of his senior managers and Heads of Service actually are. Madam Mayor, it is not acceptable for Cabinet Members to attempt to mislead councillors in their written answers. Councillor Finn knows full well that he has been caught out and he should apologise to the Council and I will be allowing everyone and the press to see the actual email that I have received.

The stopping of work within the legal practice includes no longer drafting witness statements, witness statements this is, not collecting evidence and not carrying out investigations relating to evidence, all of which will adversely affect the Council tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Services are being told to do the specialist work or, we have heard this one before, pay consultants to do the work for them, and as the email concludes the scale of the capacity reduction has meant, unfortunately though, there is no alternative.

Will the Cabinet Member now give us a guarantee that any costs of hiring consultants to do the work undertaken, which the Legal Department previously undertook will not exceed the £117,000 identified as the cut in the Legal Service budget?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

The supplementary question you asked is nothing to do with the question. The question you asked was how many posts were left, and the answer is given in my answer but if you really wish to go into off-the-beat things I will so do and I will be pleased to meet and talk with you.

What we are saying is very simply that some items which are being dealt with by lawyers at the moment are not economic so to be continued to do. With limited training, non-lawyers can provide the guidance notes and precedent documentation which will allow the same actions to be taken on a much cheaper scale with savings, efficiency savings to the Council, efficiency savings to the members of the community. We will be pragmatic to choose which items we are going to give to non-lawyers and to trained lawyers and we will be making savings. I can guarantee you that we will not, as a result of this, incur anything like in outside costs the £117,000. That is a guarantee.

Question No. 28

Councillor Alan Schneiderman

How will the mobile library service change as a result of the scrapping of one of the mobile library units? Will there be shorter stops/less frequent stops/stops cancelled altogether?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

50% of the Mobile Library Service timetable will be lost. Busier sites will be retained as far as possible with a priority also to parts of the borough where access to a static library is difficult. The exact details of the timetable are still being worked on and I will let you have this when it is available.

Supplementary Question No. 28

Councillor Alan Schneiderman

I thank Councillor David for her written answer, which at least gives some information, unlike her answers to my supplementary questions.

Can she give an assurance that the same number and duration of mobile library stops will be continued to the borough's housing estates where access to books for children is of vital importance? And will she give a specific assurance that no cuts will be made to the stops on the Dollis Valley Estate?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Thank you Madam Mayor. In proposing a reduction to the mobile and home library service, although the loss of one mobile will mean that half the existing sites will have to go, I am seeking to ensure that there will be sites retained across the borough and that the best used sites are as far as possible kept, and I am still discussing the revised pattern of sites and hours for the one remaining but I will write to you with the sites that will be remaining, hopefully most of them.

Question No. 29

Councillor Barry Rawlings

The budget headlines agreed by the administration on 14 December included £140,000 from further staff savings. Could the Cabinet Member explain what this means in detail, which posts are affected, and how the service will be affected?

Answer by Councillor Christopher Harris

Further staff savings' - (£140,000) will be achieved by the deletion of the following;

- 3 posts at Curtis family centre
- 1 post in the C&F central commissioning team
- 1 post in the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service

All 5 posts are currently vacant hence there will be no resulting need for redeployment or redundancy.

Clearly, given that all of these posts have been vacant for some time, there will be no immediate impact on the service. Evidently this means that service provision will continue as at present moment at time but in future years that may be reviewed.

Supplementary Question No. 29

Councillor Barry Rawlings

Thank you for your answer.

What seems to be happening is that staff posts are actually frozen, not advertised, so when the cuts come, you can say we are getting rid of these posts and it makes no difference to the service because the service has already gone downhill.

Now we know that the Council is planning another series of budget cuts this July. Will the Cabinet Member now rule out cuts to the Children's Services in that round of budget cuts?

Answer by Councillor Christopher Harris

Councillor Rawlings, I certainly will not discuss anything to do with July. My Service is a very well funded service and you said that the Service has gone downhill. During that eighteen months in which these posts have been frozen, for good reason because we were thinking about restructuring, during that eighteen months I may remind you that we had a CSCI inspection where our Service had considerably improved since the last time they came under your Administration. We went into the top 15% of the country in terms of children's services rather than dragging in the bottom quartile. That is not to say that if we are once more generously funded, if we get a Conservative central government, we may not reconsider how we deliver some of these services, but for the moment I think we can say that we are doing very, very well and that we certainly having made a great improvement during that eighteen months as the CSCI report shows.

Question No. 30

Councillor Danish Chopra

The Council is proposing to scrap the £12,500 grant to the Barnet Retired and Senior Volunteer Programme in 2005/6. What work does the group do, how long has the Group been receiving a grant from the Council, and what help is the Council offering to ensure the group continues its work in future?

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

Like BA4Y, the grant in this case is another fixed-term award over three years, approved in 2003, specifically to help BRSVP develop a joint project (with Disability Action in the Borough of Barnet) to expand volunteering opportunities in the community for disabled people.

Arising from delays in launching the scheme, the grant has been re-phased to extend to December 2006, and the provision in this year's budget (to support the final year of the award) will be carried forward to 2005/06.

BRSVP has been in receipt of a small annual revenue grant towards its main programme of activities, currently including a Sunday lunch service for homeless people, since 1999/2000 and there are no proposals to discontinue this core assistance.

Supplementary Question No. 30

Councillor Danish Chopra

Thank you Madam Mayor.

Can Councillor Freer tell me what work is the Council planning to do until the 4th of May next year to help BRSVP access other funding to ensure their work helping people with disabilities to volunteer will be continued?

Answer by Councillor Mike Freer

We will continue to offer the support we offer to all the voluntary sector, both through our Grants Unit and through the Voluntary Service Council in terms of the vast database we hold accessing additional funding streams.

Question No. 31

Councillor Linda McFadyen

If the Cabinet Member would provide Council with a detailed explanation for the £1.174m allocated for higher inflation and other pressures within the budget headlines announced in December, including setting out the current rate of inflation within community care and providing a breakdown of the 'other pressures'?

Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer

A prudent figure has been set aside to allow for inflation. The precise level of inflation will vary between different contracts, and the specific terms on which these contracts are settled are commercially sensitive.

Supplementary Question No. 31

Councillor Linda McFadyen

What is written on the papers may be a reply but it certainly is not an answer. Turning to the inflation level, the performance management plan shows pressures of over £5 million for 2005/6 including £1.1million for inflation, but less than £1 million in 2006/7 including no extra money for inflation.

How is it possible that inflation in social services can be rampant this year and non-existent in a Council election year? Perhaps the Cabinet Member can explain which contracts the Council has entered into where the annual increase in the contract price is above inflation?

Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer

I know the Labour Party does not know much about contracting and procurement and the way the commercial world works but it would be completely inappropriate for me to stand here and start outlining the precise details of the contracts which we are entering into.

Question No. 32

Councillor Kath McGuirk

The budget headlines propose a £70,000 cut in grounds maintenance. How will this be implemented/what are the changes to the service?

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

It will be implemented by officers and will result in the rationalisation of redundant sites and a revision of staff responsibilities.

Question No. 33

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

Since 14 May 2002 the Tory Council has scrapped over 400 council jobs. Can the Cabinet Member confirm that there will be no more jobs cut before 4 May 2006?

Answer by Councillor Victor Lyon, Leader of the Council

Cllr Sodha should not be confused between posts and actual numbers of people who have lost their jobs. She is well aware that the on-going policy of this Administration is wherever possible to redeploy people into other positions where their posts are made redundant. She will also know that when this Administration took control in May 2002, the organisation of many departments was a shambles and it has been necessary to reorganise the workings of the Council. This of course is also part of the Governance policy of the Gershon report to make Councils more efficient. I cannot give any guarantee on the establishment up to May 2006

Question No. 34**Councillor Allan Turner**

The Cabinet Member rightly noted in his response to question 47 at the December council meeting that there is always a time lag between planning approvals and completed constructions. Given this time tag, could the Cabinet Member inform Council how many units of affordable housing have been given planning approval since 14 May 2002? Would the Cabinet Member provide a breakdown of the type of affordable housing that has been given planning approval since 14 May 2002, i.e. for rent, shared ownership, key worker, etc?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

In total 437 affordable homes have been given planning permission of which 355 of these homes are rented.

Question No. 35**Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Could the Cabinet Member explain why there have been continuing delays on the opening of the sports pitch in Grahame Park?

Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger

I refer the member to the answer that she was given the identical at the last council meeting. If Cllr Sargeant has any influence with EDF energy, now is the time for her to use it.

Question No. 36**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What works are required to bring East Finchley library up to the standard required by the Disability Discrimination Act?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The requirements of The Disability Discrimination Act are not just about physical access. The library can be used as it is at present. Some added signage would aid the visually impaired but the library can continue to function without major works.

Question No. 37**Councillor Barry Rawlings**

The school meals charge is increasing to £2. What was the schools meal charge in 2002/3, 2003/4, and 2004/5?

Answer by Councillor John Marshall

The figures are:-

02/03 £1.50p

03/04 £1.60p

04/05 £1.70p

Those children who are entitled to free school meals-some 16% of Barnet schoolchildren- are exempt from these charges.

Question No. 38**Councillor Danish Chopra**

What projects/borrowing are the proposed extra £3million prudential debt repayments covering in 2005/6?

Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn

This information was provided to Cabinet Resources Committee in November 2004.

I should point out that the £3m does not only cover prudential (unsupported) borrowing, it also covers supported borrowing (which is included in the Capital Finance FSS block) and interest on balances. £1.5m of the £3m was already included in the Financial Forward Plan approved by Council in March 2004.

Question No. 39**Councillor Linda McFadyen**

If the Cabinet Member would make a statement on the proposed changes to funding of Age Concern announced in the budget headlines in December, and their impact on the future configuration of services within the borough?

Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer

This change stems from a proposal from Age Concern who believe that they can provide an improved service by operating from two centres, Ann Owen and the Meritage Centre.

Question No. 40**Councillor Kath McGuirk**

The budget headlines propose a £90,000 cut by SEN transport efficiencies. How will this be implemented/what are the changes to the service?

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

It will be implemented by officers and will result in the redundancy of one post that has been responsible for computerising route planning. This work is now completed and hence the post is redundant, saving £30,000. Retendering the minicab service included the introduction of discounts based upon the level of work commissioned. The retendered rates along with discounts offered by suppliers will deliver a £60,000 saving.

I am sure you will agree that there is no reduction in service but a significant improvement in service efficiency.

Question No. 41**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

Amongst the proposed redundancies, can the Cabinet Member please give a breakdown of age, gender, and race? Can the Cabinet Member also please say which services will be cut as a result?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

For the 2004/5 efficiency savings, a maximum of 37 employees will be made redundant with 1 post yet to be identified. A number of staff have lodged appeals against selection for redundancy, therefore a full breakdown of staff by age, gender and race cannot be provided until the appeals have been completed. Also several employees may be redeployed to vacant posts and the final figure should be reduced. As agreed at the Corporate JNCC, Human Resources will provide the requested breakdown once all the individuals have been identified.

The services affected by these savings are:

Committee and Special projects – 2 posts

Customer Care – 9 posts

Education 2 posts

Environment – 19 posts

Human Resources – 5 posts

In Customer Care, the Interpreter and Translation Service will no longer be operated in house but the service will be commissioned by Heads of Service from external providers. Other service areas will maintain service provision with minor service reorganisation addressing reduced staffing levels.

For the 2005/6 Budget reductions, the Budget report to the Corporate JNCC on January 5th 2005 and General Functions Committee on January 6th 2005 identified that 78 posts were at risk of redundancy and the areas where current service provision would be altered. At this point, prior to Council approval, it is too early to identify many of the individuals at risk of redundancy and therefore a breakdown by age, gender and race cannot yet be undertaken.

Question No. 42**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

How much money will it cost to bring East Finchley library up to the standard required by the Disability Discrimination Act?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Basic works, including signage would cost in the region of £14k to improve access to the ground floor.

Question No. 43**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

What is member doing to improve access for wheelchair users in public buildings in Barnet?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Audits of the all the public buildings have been carried out to ensure that services are offered to the public in the most accessible way. The audits have also informed the Corporate Asset Strategy and the provision of services is being focussed in to buildings which do not present barriers to users, while moving out of sites which cannot reasonably be adapted.

Had Councillor Sodha bothered to attend the public forum on disability on 7th December 2004 to which she was invited, where access to public buildings was discussed, she would be aware that the increased use of the more accessible buildings such as Building 5 at North London Business Park as well as the improvement works now under way at Barnet House were welcomed by those attending.

Other works schemes to public areas such as the Housing Benefits reception at Fenella due to start early in 2005 also include full access for all.

Question No. 44**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What works do the Council believe are necessary to refurbish and modernise East Finchley library?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The library can continue to function as a library without any extensive refurbishment works. To maximise the use of space in the building, a lift would need to be added to the first floor.

Changes are however limited by the listing order on the building.

Question No. 45**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

Does Barnet have a Directory of accessible public toilets in the borough?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Yes.

Question No. 46**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

How much money will it cost to refurbish and modernise East Finchley library?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

An initial meeting has been held with English Heritage indicated that the listing order on the building would make the works complicated and by implication costly, particularly if a lift were to be installed to the first floor. The listing order includes much of the internal layout, shelving and counter which will limit the amount of change possible. The works needed to modernise and refurbish East Finchley have not been costed as there is at present no identified capital funding.

Question No. 47**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

What is the percentage of staff employed by Barnet who have a disability?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

Human Resources have been conducting a data cleanse exercise on information held on employees. Prior to this exercise the percentage of staff identified as being disabled was 0.7%. The revised figure is 1.1%, however, data questionnaire forms are still being processed. Once a full return has been achieved HR will be contacting staff who have identified themselves as being disabled to determine what the Council can do to address their needs as part of a comprehensive Disability Action Plan.

Question No. 48**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What meetings have been held between English Heritage and Cabinet Members/ Directors/ Heads of Service on the future of East Finchley library, and what is the outcome of these meetings?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

There has been one meeting of officers with English Heritage, including an in house architect. At the meeting the likely implications of the listing order on the library were explored. It was clarified which internal fixtures, fittings and partitions would have to be retained and the practicality of installing a lift was looked at. No further action has been taken because of the limitations of the budget and the overall financial position on the council.

Question No. 49**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

Are you aware of the Scope campaign 'Time to get Equal now' and if so what is the Council doing about equality for all in Barnet?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

I am aware of the Scope campaign, 'Time to get equal now' which has been endorsed by amongst others Nelson Mandela and Bill Clinton. This campaign is focused on disability and the negative perceptions of disability. The Council, whilst recognizing the merits of this campaign intends to take a strategic, inclusive and holistic approach to all equality issues, e.g. The Barnet Race Equality Scheme, the Disability Action Plan and the ongoing commitment to achieving level 3 of the Equality Standard for Local Government.

Question No. 50**Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What is the cost of bringing all the borough's libraries up to the standards required by the Disability Discrimination Act?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

We are continuing to provide a service within the constraints of some of our buildings. There is work that needs doing on a rolling programme as budgets permit. The priority is to have improvements to at least one library each year in each area as set out in the Performance Management Plan.

Question No. 51**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

What did the Cabinet Member do in 2004 to promote equal access for all to public transport?

Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord

On bus matters, virtually all buses in Barnet are now low floor and wheelchair accessible.

The Council's programme for roads and parking schemes involves the protection of bus stops through parking restrictions and the imposition of greater disciplines on motorists. During 2004 schemes at North Finchley, Finchley Church End and Temple Fortune resulted in better car parking disciplines and easier access for buses at stops.

Last year's BSP included a bid for some £44,000 for bus stop improvements but this bid was not accepted.

London Underground and Network Rail are responsible for public access to their stations within the borough. No stations are currently fully accessible. I shall continue to seek that such works are undertaken by the relevant organisations.

Question No. 52

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

The Equal pay act was passed nearly thirty years ago. Does the Cabinet Member believe it right for Barnet women to have to wait until 2007 for a review of the Equal Pay audit that Barnet Council is undertaking? Is it not time for fair pay for women?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The Council fully complies with the 1970 Equal Pay Act and does not operate pay differentials for male and female staff. By 2007, the Council will have conducted a Pay and Grading Review as required by 2004 National Pay Agreement. The Pay and Grading Review is far wider than an equal pay audit and will examine the following;

- A new pay and grading structure
- Details of the approach to be taken to determine the relative sizes of the jobs included*
- Proposals for protection
- Proposals for premium rates
- Proposals for progression
- Proposals for back pay
- Proposals for appeal against assimilation proposals
- An Equality Impact Assessment of proposed changes to grading and pay and other conditions.
- An Equal Pay Audit where local pay reviews have been completed without such an audit.
- Proposals for bonus and other performance payments
- Proposals for any cost savings or productivity improvements required to offset the cost of implementation
- A timetable for implementation by 31 March 2007
- Resources necessary for the pay review and their estimated cost.

Question No. 53

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

How will the Council mark International Women's Day?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The Council has no plans to mark this event which falls on 8th March this year and has not done so in previous years.

Question No. 54

Councillor Ansuya Sodha

At the council meeting on 8 July 2003, in response to my question: "Will the Cabinet Member confirm that the definition of institutional racism will continue to be used by this administration?", the Cabinet Member responded by saying she could not answer the question because she did not understand it. Has the Cabinet Member since found the time to read the MacPherson Report and could she now say whether the definition of institutional racism continues to be used by the Council?

Answer by Councillor Katia David

The comments attributed to me at the Council meeting on 8th July 2003, are inaccurate. I recall clearly that I was unable to answer the question posed because it was unclear and inaudible as Cllr. Sodha was referring to her notes, not through any lack of understanding on my part.

I am fully aware of the recommendations of the report made by Lord McPherson of Cluny and the definition of institutional racism will continue to be used by the Council.

Report of Cabinet

21 February 2005

Cabinet Members:

*Cllr Victor Lyon BA (Hons) (Chairman)

Councillors:

* Fiona Bulmer	* Anthony Finn BSc	* John Marshall
* Melvin Cohen, LL B	* Econ FCA	* Matthew Offord
* Katia David BSc MBA JP	Mike Freer	* Brian Salinger
	* Christopher Harris BA BSc MPhil	

* denotes Member present

\$ denotes Member absent on Council business

1. **COUNCIL BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2005/06 (Report of the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Resources – agenda item 4):**

The Cabinet Members submitted their proposed recommendations to Council on the 2005/6 budget and council tax.

The Council's budget was a financial expression of its services and levels of provision but also a conditioner of them. It reflected the priorities of the Council as expressed in the Corporate Plan having regard to resources available and taxation consequences of spending decisions.

The Council was required by law to set its budget having considered its estimates of expenditure and income, and for its call on the collection fund to be sufficient to meet its budget needs. This had to be done before 11 March 2005 and a meeting of the Council had been arranged for 1 March 2005 to achieve this.

Budgets had been prepared on the basis of latest estimates of expenditure and income, but nonetheless variations could arise during the year. Budgets and projects with financial implications considered to represent a higher risk that required particularly close monitoring in 2005/06 were as follows (in no particular order):-

- budgeted savings (in particular where there were contractual issues and statutory consultation requirements)
- income (in particular parking, local land charges, catering and all new or substantially increased fees and charges)
- licensing (activity, appeals and income)
- housing benefit and temporary accommodation income
- interest rates (investment of balances and capital borrowing)
- insurance settlements (and impact on the insurance provision)
- looked after children (placements, fostering and adoption)
- adult placements
- joint commissioning
- asylum seekers
- supporting people
- corporate purchasing savings
- schools in special measures
- schools in deficit that are working to recovery plans
- traded services to schools and Barnet Homes
- special educational needs (including transport)
- specific grants

- planned asset disposals
- single status
- joint UNISON/GMB 2003 London Weighting pay claim
- regeneration schemes (including underwriting agreements)
- Local Public Service Agreement anticipated Reward Grant
- capitalisation of redundancies & development activity

In finalising the 2005/06 budget, Cabinet had reviewed the 2004/05 budget savings monitor. Where delays in delivering savings in full were occurring, Cabinet had ensured that these had been corrected in the 2005/06 base budget, e.g. local land charge income, retention of South Friern library, zero-based budget review within Environmental Services of catering and greenspaces.

The one area in 2004/05 that remained a significant risk for the next year and which had been highlighted in paragraph 4.1 of the Cabinet Members' report was parking income. This had also been highlighted in budget monitoring reports to the Cabinet Resources Committee throughout 2004/05. To address this risk in 2005/06, commitment of revenue highways and footways maintenance would be managed in conjunction with the monitoring of parking income. This action was not expected to have an impact on the £5m capital programme of highways reinstatement.

Replacement of core financials, HR, payroll, procurement and works order management systems represented a significant step being taken during 2005/06 to modernise the council's corporate infrastructure. The project also represented a significant risk in that failure to achieve a smooth transition from the legacy systems (in terms of system functionality, data migration and council-wide training and engagement with new business processes) could jeopardise effective budgetary control. A robust project management structure was in place to mitigate these risks and manage those that remained.

The Cabinet Members pointed out that the Borough Treasurer was recommending that balances be increased by £3m in 2005/06, and that it was a requirement of the Local Government Act 2003 that any decision by Council on the level of reserves that differed from that of the Chief Finance Officer be recorded.

The Council's Constitution (see Part 7 of the Cabinet Member's report) required Cabinet to take account of recommendations from the external auditor on matters such as the level of reserves and provisions.

The Local Government Act 2003 required the Chief Finance Officer (Borough Treasurer) to report to Council as part of the budget process on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, although the final decision on the level and utilisation of reserves rested with the Council. The Borough Treasurer was of the view that the Council's process for setting the 2005/6 budget had been robust and took account of the key financial assumptions underpinning the budget and consideration of the council's financial management arrangements.

The requirement to provide an annual statement on earmarked reserves was addressed in Sections 5 and 8 of the Cabinet Members' report. Factors taken into account in advising Council on the level of reserves and balances included:-

- services' record in delivering budget developments and reductions;
- capacity to manage in-year budget pressures;
- key financial assumptions underpinning the budget (e.g. inflation provisions);
- robustness of forward plan estimates;
- general debt outstanding and tax collection rates;
- adequacy of insurance arrangements and budget provisions to cover major unforeseen risks;

- year end accounting arrangements (e.g. whether services are permitted to retain underspends);
- financial reporting arrangements.

- Financial Regulations (Part 1, Section 2) within the Council's Constitution stated:
- (i) Cabinet would finalise its recommendations to Council on the budget, council tax and rent levels taking account of the results of budget consultation. This would normally be in February, following announcement of the Final Local Government Finance Settlement.
 - (ii) Cabinet's recommendations to Council must be made in time for Council to set the budget and council tax before 11 March of the preceding financial year to the financial year to which the recommended budget and council tax related.
 - (iii) The budget that Cabinet recommended to Council must be based on reasonable estimates of expenditure and income, and take account of:-
 - outturn forecasts for the current year;
 - guidance from the Borough Treasurer on the appropriate level of reserves, balances and contingencies;
 - financial risks associated with proposed budget developments, reductions and ongoing projects;
 - affordability of prudential borrowing over the period of the council's financial forward plan;
 - recommendations from the external auditor on matters such as the level of reserves and provisions.
 - (iv) The budget recommended by Cabinet to Council would incorporate the proposed level of fees and charges for the year. During the year the Cabinet Resources Committee might approve changes to fees and charges, including the introduction of new charges.

COUNCIL BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2005/6

The Budget Process

A preliminary assessment of the 2005/06 budget had been set out in the Financial Forward Plan approved by Council in March 2004, which had forecast a council tax increase of 5.9%. Since then, Cabinet Members had worked with Directors and Heads of Service to update the base budget and identify potential service developments and reductions in line with Corporate Plan priorities.

Budget consultation had followed ODPM guidance. It had begun in October 2004, and had used Local Democracy Week to begin the process with a budget game/focus group run with young people attending the Time for Change event. Consultation had included:

- a questionnaire mailed directly to every household during November/December 2004. It had outlined the council's financial position and factors which affect the process of budget and council tax setting;
- a sustained process of feedback on results from previous consultations through 'Barnet First', the internet as well as continued feedback on progress and outcomes to Committee;
- schools budget and passporting had been discussed at the Schools Forum;
- a Budget Open Day – the Cabinet Member for Resources had been available to talk to residents about the budget throughout the whole day on 23 November 2004;
- opposition parties on the Council had been invited by the Cabinet Member for Resources to discuss the budget, although they had declined this opportunity;

- Overview & Scrutiny Committees had reviewed the draft budget and performance management plans. Their comments were reported separately to Cabinet, and discussed by the Cabinet Members at the meeting.
- the Audit & Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the budget process, interviewing the Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources;
- annual consultation with business ratepayers had taken place during November and December;
- staffing implications of the budget had been discussed at the Area and Corporate JNCCs.

Overall, there had been a sustained programme of consultation on what residents wanted their council to focus on and what mattered to them, which enabled the council to target funding towards services that residents had identified as important to them.

Based on the lessons learnt from previous years, residents did expect to be able to play a real part in the budget setting process, and not just be asked for their views when they would have no real input in detailed budget setting.

The National Framework & 2005/6 Settlement

The Local Government Minister had announced the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement on 2 December 2004; Government consultation had closed on 11 January 2005, and the Final Settlement had been debated in Parliament on 2 February, although the Minister had released the details on 27 January 2005.

The Final Settlement had set out national totals for spending and for Aggregate External Finance (AEF), together with each authority's share of the relevant totals. The national totals compared to adjusted 2004/5 figures were as follows: -

<u>National Figures</u>	2004/5 Adjusted	2005/6
	£bn	£bn
Total Assumed Spending (TAS)	75.2	79.6
Aggregate External Finance (AEF):-		
Revenue Support Grant (RSG)	27.3	26.7
National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR)	15.0	18.0
Other Specific Grants	14.3	15.4
	56.6	60.1
Assumed Council Tax Yield (ACTY)	18.6	19.5

In line with the Local Government Act 2003, from 1 April 2005 there would be two multipliers, the small business non-domestic rating multiplier for small business qualifying for a new small business relief scheme (i.e. those with a rateable value in London of less than £21,500); and the non-domestic rating multiplier which included a supplement to pay for the new scheme. The non-domestic rating multiplier to be applied in 2005/06 was 42.2p, which was reduced to 41.5p for small businesses.

The Settlement continued the system of 'floors' but ceilings were abolished with all authorities above the floor now contributing a fixed proportion of their excess above their floor to finance the floor authorities. In 2005/06, authorities with education and social services responsibilities would receive a grant increase of at least 4.0% or a higher amount sufficient to meet the school passporting requirement. Barnet was above the floor in 2005/06 and so made a contribution to the floor protection.

There had been no changes in the methodology for calculating Formula Spending Shares (FSS) in 2005/6. New 2001 Census data had not been incorporated into FSS as it would create turbulence in grant distribution during the period of the formula freeze. The following significant changes in funding responsibility have been made:-

- Social Services Training Support Grant, part of Residential Allowances and Preserved Rights Grant, and Home Office Civil Contingencies Grant have been subsumed into FSS;
- a transfer out of FSS is made for Magistrates Courts which will now be funded directly by the Government.

The Settlement for Barnet

The Local Government Finance Settlement for Barnet was as set out in the following tables:-

FSS Block	2004/05		2005/06	INCREASE / (DECREASE)	
	Original	Adjusted			
	£	£	£	£	%
Education	171,197,999	167,939,805	179,205,507	11,265,702	6.7
PSS	89,701,269	92,414,509	98,032,981	5,618,472	6.1
Highways	9,409,987	9,409,987	9,704,517	294,530	3.1
EPCS	74,070,710	73,825,837	76,458,254	2,632,417	3.6
Capital Finance	6,915,348	6,927,176	7,810,378	883,202	12.7
Total	351,295,313	350,517,314	371,211,637	20,694,323	5.9

PSS = Personal Social Services EPCS = Environment, Protective & Cultural Services

FSS & Funding	2004/05		2005/06
	Original	Adjusted	
	£	£	£
Formula Spending Share	351,295,313	350,517,314	371,211,637
Formula Grant	(135,195,180)	(134,417,181)	(130,929,998)
Grant Floor / Contribution	125,423	125,423	556,313
Business Rate Income	(89,498,785)	(89,498,785)	(108,093,535)
	126,726,771	126,726,771	132,744,417

The Secretary of State for Education & Skills had the power to set a target for passporting to the Schools Budget¹. There was no passporting target for the LEA Budget², nor was there any target for the element of the Schools Budget that was directly managed by schools.

The Settlement provided an adjusted grant increase of £14.677m compared to a passporting target of £10.391m leaving £4.286m to meet the cost of inflation, full year effects, service demands and funding transfers for all non-school services, which amounted to £202m in 2004/05.

The 2005/06 Settlement for Barnet, whilst better than the previous two was still inadequate to meet all the demands and pressures faced by the council.

From April 2003 there is a 'Schools Budget' and an 'LEA Budget'.

1 The Schools Budget is basically expenditure on direct provision of educational services, which can be managed by schools themselves (i.e. the Individual Schools Budget) or by the LEA (e.g. SEN out of borough provision).

2 LEA Budget is expenditure on strategic management and indirect service provision managed by the LEA (e.g. including home to school transport).

Capping

Government Ministers continued to threaten councils with capping. In a January letter to the Local Government Chronicle, Nick Raynsford had said "No decisions have been taken on capping principles for 2005/06, but authorities would be very unwise if they pre-judged that these will be more favourable than in 2004/05".

Since the Provisional Settlement was announced, Ministers had been reported in the press as saying that council tax increases should not exceed 5%. It had also to be borne in mind that the Final Settlement assumed a 3.8% increase in council tax yield.

The capping legislation itself required the Secretary of State to determine whether the budget requirement (not the level of council tax) for a financial year was excessive, and this had to be done by reference to criteria specified and published by the Secretary of State. The criteria had to be decided in accordance with a set of principles, which had to include comparison with a previous year – the earliest year for this purpose being 1998/9. Different principles could be used for different classes of authority (e.g. London Boroughs, Districts, Counties) and in previous years when some councils had been formally warned the criteria used were a combination of change in budget requirement and council tax over a 1-year and 3-year period. The legislation allowed the SoS to designate councils for "in-year" capping, or to nominate a maximum budget requirement for the following year.

Authorities that were either designated or nominated could make representations to the Secretary of State. There was also the option to challenge in the courts, but from previous experience councils had found that the House of Lords had viewed the question of whether a budget requirement is excessive to be a matter of political judgement for the Secretary of State, which was not bound by an authority's own view of expenditure needs.

A copy of the capping regime was set out in Appendix B of the Cabinet Members' report.

If Barnet were challenged to explain its budget and tax increase there were clearly a range of issues the council might want to highlight, including:-

- the disastrous 2003/04 settlement, which was also referred to in the Annual Audit Letter and had not been redressed by subsequent settlements;
- the 2004/05 settlement leaving Barnet 3rd from bottom in London in respect to grant headroom after allowing for education passporting, a position which had not improved much in 2005/06 with Barnet now 13th from bottom in London in respect to grant headroom;
- that Barnet had budgeted for £35m reductions in the base budget over the last three years;
- the continued need to rebuild balances following the Section 11 Notice issued in 2003/04 by the external auditor, which although removed in 2004/05 was still crucial to current budget considerations.

Revised Requirements for 2004/5

The latest revenue monitoring position, as reported to the Cabinet Resources Committee on 10 February 2005 had advised that balances were forecast to increase from £0.93m at 31 March 2004 to £4.856m at 31 March 2005. The Committee had instructed Heads of Service to achieve budgeted savings, contain any emerging budget pressures and identify further savings to achieve the target of £5m balances by 31 March 2005.

There had been no significant budget variations to the Housing Revenue Account with any variations to be met from the accumulated HRA balance.

Budget 2005/6

Following an assessment of the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement, Cabinet's draft budget proposals had been announced to Council on 14 December 2004 and would have resulted in a council tax increase of 3.6%.

The budget to be recommended to Council on 1 March 2005 was set out in detail in Appendix A to the Cabinet Members' report. A net reduction of £2.14m in the budget was being proposed over the draft discussed at Council in December. All payments, fees and charges arising from the placement of children and adults had been reviewed. Proposals for 2005/06 along with any major variations were explained in Performance Management Plans. In this respect Cabinet noted a correction to Section 4.1 of the PMP for Environmental & Neighbourhood Services; the increased charge for school meals being £ 1.85 rather than £2.

The proposed contribution from reserves comprised £6.691m in respect to the Special Parking Account³ and £0.075m in respect to the Borough Lottery & Edward Harvist Funds.

The Prudential Code enabled councils to borrow without Government approval, subject to certain controls and reserve powers. Provision for prudential borrowing to fund the capital programme and the additional cost of this borrowing were explained further in the cabinet Members' report report.

From 2004/5, HRA Rent Rebates and related subsidy were transferred to the General Fund. The new arrangements might have an adverse effect on the General Fund and Ministers had decided that for a two year period authorities should be permitted to make transfers between their HRA and General Fund to allow them to adjust to the impact of the new arrangements. Authorities could now apply to the ODPM specifying how much they might wish to transfer. It was recommended that the Borough Treasurer be empowered to seek a Direction if it was in the financial interests of the Council as a whole to do so.

General Fund Balances & Reserves

The estimated General Fund balance at 31 March 2006 was £7.856m. This incorporated the latest monitoring position for 2004/05 and the planned £3m contribution to balances in 2005/06.

Specific reserves had been set aside to fund projects or provide funding for future potential costs. Practically all the reserves were committed to meet specific costs, the most significant being -

- Special Parking Account (SPA) – used to support transport expenditure within the General Fund;
- capital projects reserve – set up to finance capital projects; and of this £211,000 was committed to financing education NDS Condition schemes leaving £32,000 available;
- donations comprised of money given to the council for specific schemes for the benefit of the community;
- the Lottery Fund was used to help finance annual grants to voluntary organisations;
- Section 106 monies were committed by legal agreement to finance specific projects;

The following table summarised the position on these specific reserves:-

³ This was in line with the decision of Council in November 1997 – the contribution will be a general support for public transport operations and highway improvement projects that fall within the criteria set out in the Highways Act 1980. Although expressed as a contribution from reserves the majority of funding is generated in year as a surplus on the Special Parking Account

	Estimated Balance 1.4.2005	Planned Variations	Estimated Balance 31.3.2006
	£000	£000	£000
Capital Projects	(243)	211	(32)
Donations	(267)	-	(267)
Borough Lottery	(142)	-	(142)
Special Parking Account	(20)	-	(20)
Revenue Section 106	(178)	-	(178)
Total	(850)	211	(639)

Greater London Authority

The Greater London Authority (GLA) precept incorporated the following budget requirements:-

- Mayor, Assembly, and corporate administration
- Transport for London;
- London Development Agency;
- Metropolitan Police Authority;
- London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority.

The Mayor had commenced consultation on the budget and precept requirements on 14 December 2004, proposing a precept increase of 7.2%. This increase would fall regardless of any decisions taken by the Mayor, since there would be an increase in the London-wide council tax base.

The increase had been rejected by the London Assembly on 26 January 2005. Revised proposals would be discussed by the London Assembly on 14 February, and changes agreed at that meeting were reported separately to Cabinet. The component parts of the final precept were.

	2005/06	2004/05	Increase
Metropolitan Police Authority	£196.28	£184.08	6.6%
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority	£44.15	£42.30	4.4%
Transport for London	£6.99	£9.09	-23.1%
Greater London Authority	£8.18	£7.04	16.2%
London Development Agency	-	-	-
Surplus on Borough Collection Funds	(£0.98)	(£1.18)	16.9%
Total GLA Group	£254.62	£241.33	5.5%

Collection Fund

On 15 January 2005 (a date determined by Regulations) a forecast of the collection of previous years' council tax as at 31 March 2005 had been made. This calculation identified a deficit on the fund of £1.626m, which had been divided allocated between Barnet and the GLA, with the cost to Barnet being £1,303,050. The deficit had arisen as a result of the assumed collection rate (99.25% from 2001/02 to 2003/04, and 99% in 2004/05) not being achieved – the target was one of the highest in London. Based on current performance the estimated collection rate for 2005/06 had been reduced to 98.50% which also took into account the effect on debt recovery that would result from changing over to a new local taxation system - this would require some system downtime during live data conversion

Council Taxbase

There were two measures of the taxable capacity of the Authority. The first was the Inland Revenue Valuation Office list, which was adjusted for discounts and exemptions on the council tax system and was used by Government in Formula Grant calculations. The second was used for tax setting purposes and was a calculation made by the Council, representing the estimated taxable capacity for the year ahead and incorporating the estimated collection rate.

Under delegated powers, the Borough Treasurer had calculated the 2005/06 taxbase as 135,353 Band D Equivalents.

	Band D Equivalent
Number of properties	155,759
Estimated changes	(5,363)
Estimated discounts	(13,259)
Total Relevant Amounts	137,137
Estimated non-collection (1.5%)	(2,057)
Contribution in lieu from MoD	273
Council Taxbase	135,353

Council Tax

The calculation of the council tax for Barnet was as set out below:-

	£
Net Service Expenditure	375,102,230
Less : contribution from reserves	(6,766,000)
Plus : contribution to balances	3,000,000
BUDGET REQUIREMENT	371,336,230
Formula Grant	(130,373,685)
Business Rate Income	(108,093,535)
Collection Fund Transfers	1,303,050
DEMAND ON COLLECTION FUND	134,172,060
Council Taxbase	135,353
Basic Amount of Tax	£991.28

The GLA precept was £34,463,581 making the total demand on the collection fund £168,635,641

The Council was required to set levels of council tax for each category of dwelling. As there were no special items within Barnet's or the Greater London Authority's budgets affecting parts of the borough, there are only eight amounts of tax to set, as set out below:-

Council Tax Band	Barnet	GLA	Aggregate
	£	£	£
A	660.85	169.75	830.60
B	771.00	198.04	969.04
C	881.14	226.33	1,107.47
D	991.28	254.62	1,245.90
E	1,211.56	311.20	1,522.76
F	1,431.85	367.78	1,799.63
G	1,652.13	424.37	2,076.50
H	1,982.56	509.24	2,491.80

Individual Council Tax bills would reflect occupancy status with discounts for low occupancy (one or no adults) and exemptions for specific circumstances. In addition, some residents would be eligible for Council Tax Benefit.

Financial Forward Plan

It was now a requirement under the Prudential Framework that decisions on the budget must be taken in the context of the Forward Plan, with particular attention being paid to the affordability of prudential borrowing over a period of at least 3 years.

An update on the Forward Plan previously presented to Council in March 2004 was attached at Appendix E to the Cabinet Members' report, based on the following key assumptions:-

- most of the forecast budget increases related to inflation, estimated passporting targets, London-wide levies, employer's pensions contributions and prudential borrowing costs;
- the Spending Review (SR) 2004 had been used to forecast resources for 2006/07 and 2007/08. The 2008/9 forecast assumed similar levels of Government support to 2007/8 since SR 2004 did not extend beyond three years;
- the 2005/6 national settlement included £630m of one-off additional resources. Resource forecasts for 2006/7 assumed this would not be repeated and after allowing for protection of grants to schools there would be a £2m loss of grant;
- Residential Allowances would be totally rolled into FSS in 2006/07 whilst Preserved Rights would reduce from £348m in 2005/06 to £298m in 2006/07 and £275m in 2007/08. Overall this was forecast to reduce specific grants by £2m in 2006/07 and £0.17m in 2007/08. Furthermore, the additional £100m for Access & Systems grant in 2005/06 was for one year only, resulting in £0.826m being added back to the draft 2006/07 budget subject to allocation changes nationally;
- a repayment of advance of grant to schools via reduction in Standards Fund grant was no longer required, since the council had not proceeded with this in 2004/05;
- to address the council's inadequate level of reserves and balances, the Forward Plan at this stage assumed an ongoing annual contribution to balances of £3m.

As indicated by the previous section, the Financial Forward Plan did not include significant future pressures and risks as there was insufficient information upon which to base costs accurately – the one exception to this being unsupported (Prudential) borrowing, where the full year effect of the capital programme was reflected.

If the Government introduced 3-year grant settlements, which it was currently consulting on, this could provide a much more stable environment within which to undertake effective financial forward planning; not least because there could be far greater certainty over future grant levels, but also because changes in responsibility for local authorities would be less likely to take place at short notice.

The fact that Government had less than a month ago still been considering the level of licensing fees under the regime transferred from Magistrates Courts just served to highlight the problems that local authorities currently faced in being able to make sensible decisions about next year's budget, let alone planning effectively for 3-4 years ahead.

Section 4 of the Cabinet Members' report set out some of the risks within the 2005/06 budget. A number of these would be ongoing, and be added to over the coming 3-4 years by the following risks and opportunities, none of which had so far been incorporated in the financial forward plan: -

- Direct Schools Grant (2006/07), including transitional arrangements and distributional impact on non-schools grant;
- council tax revaluation (2007/08)
- Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (possible eligibility from April 2005)
- Spending Review 2006 and 2008

- Balance of Funding review
- 3-Year grant settlements
- Census 2001 data being used in the grant settlement
- AEF grant floor (in each year)
- Opportunity Borough
- levies
- LPSA Reward Grant (2006/07 and 2007/08)
- Local Authority Business Growth Initiative
- Children Act
- Government's 10-Year Childcare Strategy
- ICT refresh (infrastructure and PCs)
- Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Bill
- Traffic Management Act 2004
- Housing Benefit reform
- Planning fees and Planning Delivery Grant
- Primary Schools Capital Strategy
- Highways street lighting PFI
- Office accommodation strategy
- Service developments

The implementation of SAP should improve financial forward planning and provide scope for additional resources to be allocated to Corporate Finance to work closer with services in developing more comprehensive financial and performance management plans.

The Government's efficiency initiative (Gershon) to ensure local authorities met 2.5% annual efficiency savings targets had significant implications for Barnet. In recent years the council had consistently needed to achieve significant efficiencies in order to restrict council tax increases whilst maintaining quality services. Government guidance had recently been received on how the efficiency targets would be calculated and monitored, allowing the council to build figures into the Forward Plan. Work was currently being done to ensure that the council achieved its targets, and that their achievement was carefully monitored.

A report on Government consultation on 3-year grant settlements had been made to the Cabinet Resources Committee on 10 February 2005. This would have a major impact on annual grant distribution and would impact fully in 2006/07.

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

The HRA was a statutory ring-fenced account of the Council, covering all revenue expenditure and income relating to the housing stock. The Council was required to construct a budget to ensure that the account for the year did not show a debit balance.

The summary HRA was shown in Appendix A to the Cabinet Members' report. This included a number of development proposals, which were shown in detail in the Performance Management Plan.

Housing Subsidy

There had been a major change in 2004/5 whereby housing benefits for Council tenants were no longer accounted for in the HRA but in the General Fund, and housing benefit subsidy was likewise credited to the General Fund. Housing Benefit resulting from rents being above guideline and not attracting subsidy remained a charge to the HRA, although this would diminish as rent restructuring took effect.

In relation to housing benefit the calculation of subsidy included a specified amount to cover incentive areas such as overpayments and fraud. This was due to transfer to the General Fund, but there were transitional arrangements whereby authorities could apply for 50% of the net cost of these to be met from the HRA in 2005/6. The application could be made at any time before the accounts for 2005/6 were closed, but for budgetary purposes it had been assumed that the cost (around £100,000) fell within the HRA. These arrangements would not apply in 2006/7.

Management and Maintenance Allowances had been considerably reworked for 2004/5, and only minor changes had been made for 2005/6. These related mainly to the calculation of the crime factors, although the maintenance allowance was now based on 13 property archetypes in place of the previous eleven. The management allowance increased to £598.37 per dwelling (2.53%) while the maintenance allowance was increased to £1,021.95 per dwelling (7.6%). The discrepancy occurred as Barnet's management allowances were deemed to be above target and thus only attracted an inflationary increase.

The Major Repairs Allowance was also paid as part of housing subsidy. This was an allowance per dwelling for capital expenditure on HRA dwellings, and did not have to be spent within the year the allocation is made. In 2005/6 this allocation was £8.112m: a reduction of £180,000 from 2004/5.

Rent Restructuring

The Government had introduced rent restructuring and convergence for local authority and registered social landlords (RSLs) over a 10-year period starting April 2002. All rents would be calculated on the same basis, with 70% based on average earnings for the region (adjusted for numbers of bedrooms) and 30% based on the valuation as at January 1999.

The Government had undertaken consultation during the summer on its three-year review of rent restructuring. Its proposals to change the basis of local authority rent calculations and to introduce further weightings for larger properties had, however, been deferred in the light of objections from tenants across the sector.

For 2005/6 rents for housing properties would continue to be set in line with the rent restructuring formula, moving towards the target figure. Formula rents increased by 4.03% (ie inflation of 2.53% plus 1.5%), and this led to an average increase in actual rents of around 4.56%. The increase for any individual property was limited to 2.53% plus 0.5% plus £2 per week (52 week basis).

In order to achieve rent restructuring levels more quickly it was proposed that where properties were relet for whatever reason the rents be moved to the formula rent where actual rents were currently below the formula rent. Based on relets during 2004/5 this was estimated to generate additional income of around £50,000 in 2005/6. There was no adverse effect on subsidy as a result.

Service Charges

Service charges for tenants had been introduced in 2003/4 for specific services (mainly caretaking), and it was proposed that these be increased in line with the overall rent increase cap of 3.03%. A new quarterly service for caretaking to dispersed blocks was proposed at a rate of £0.60 per week (48 week basis). Consultation would take place before such a service was introduced. The overall rent increase cap did not apply in respect of new services.

HRA Summary & Working Balance

Total expenditure for 2005/6 was estimated at £46.360m, which took account of proposed changes in fees, charges and allowances set out in the Performance Management Plan. It also took account of a reduced requirement in relation to the regeneration projects of some £365,000 as a number of the one-off costs in relation to consultancy etc fall out. The proposed rent increase (average 4.56%) and service charge introduction would raise £1.358 million before the effect of sales was taken into account.

It was proposed that charges for space and water heating be increased by 10% reflecting above inflation rises in fuel prices.

It was proposed that rents for the Council's shared ownership schemes and hostels be increased in accordance with the general rent increase. It was also recommended that rents on garages be increased by 5%.

2005/6 would be the second year of Barnet Homes' management of the housing stock. There had been some changes to the management fee during 2004/5 as a result of additional pension costs, the firming up of support service costs and some clarification of responsibilities. Further adjustments remained necessary in respect of service level agreements, both in respect of Barnet Homes and of the 'retained' HRA.

The HRA working balance stood at £7.0m on 31 March 2004. The contribution from the working balance to revenue for 2004/5 was now estimated at £987,130, meaning that the starting point for 2005/6 was a balance of some £6.0m. It was necessary to hold a balance of around £4.3m, against any possible call on underwriting agreements for the regeneration schemes. The 2005/6 estimates provided for a contribution to the balance of £634,680 meaning that the year-end balance would be in the region of £6.6 million.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Introduction

The capital programme set out the plans for investment in buildings, roads, equipment, other assets and capital grants over 2004/5 to 2007/8.

Decisions on capital expenditure depended on the availability of the following sources of funding:-

- borrowing and revenue resources available to meet financing costs
- grants to meet capital expenditure
- the Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) within the HRA
- Section 106 agreements
- capital receipts (proceeds from the sale of land and buildings)
- direct revenue contributions
- Special Parking Account
- contributions from school balances
- Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits
- Other public-private partnerships.

Total capital expenditure planned for 2005/06 was £91.310m. The programme was based upon current forecast resources details of which as referred to below.

The new self-regulatory Prudential system gave local authorities freedom to determine the amount of capital investment they could fund by borrowing based on affordability, prudence, sustainability and good practice. The Government supported some of this investment by the use of Supported Capital Expenditure (SCE) allocations. These might be revenue or capital, which would be further classified as either a single capital pot or ring fenced:-

- SCE(R) – notional capital allocations that fed into either the Capital Financing FSS (providing Formula Grant) or the Housing Subsidy and which were often called supported borrowing. Borrowing over and above these allocations would not attract Government grant support, and so would need to be financed from the council tax;
- SCE(C) – capital grants, which might be ring fenced to specific projects or form part of the single capital pot and be available for general use.

The 2005/6 SCE-R for Barnet was as set out below:-

	£000
<u>Supported Capital Expenditure (Revenue)</u>	
Housing Investment Programme (HRA & GF)	7,504
Education	1,346
Personal Social Services	286
	9,136
ALMO Supported Capital Expenditure	15,094
Total SCE-R	24,230

Allocations relating to Transport were provided by Transport for London grants. The Government did not make allocations in respect to Environmental, Protection & Cultural Services.

Based on past expenditure, Government would allocate non-ALMO financing between the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account as follows –

	£000
Housing Revenue Account Subsidy	2,883
General Fund - Revenue Support Grant	6,253
Total SCE (R)	9,136

The Council was permitted to borrow subject to limitations contained within the Prudential Code (see Part 4). Borrowing for capital projects and redundancy costs in 2005/6 was forecast to be :-

	General Fund Non- Housing	General Fund Housing	Housing Revenue Account	Total
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
SCE (R) 2005/06	1,632	4,621	17,977	24,230
SCE (R) rolled forward 2004/05	1,233	-	-	1,233
Unsupported borrowing 2005/06	11,386	-	-	11,386
Unsupported borrowing rolled forward 2004/05	13,619	-	-	13,619
Total borrowing	27,870	4,621	17,977	50,468

The full revenue cost of this borrowing was provided in the respective revenue accounts.

The capital programme in 2005/06 also assumed funding from capital receipts of £4.4m and HRA MRA of £6.266m. The balance of financing would be met from capital grants and other contributions.

Barnet's street lighting PFI had now received Policy Review Group endorsement and was expected to commence March 2006.

The capital programme was as set out by Service in Appendix A to the Cabinet Members' report. The planned spend in 2005/06 was £48.624m of which £20.56m related to education (including slippage of £8.4m from 2004/05).

A major source of education funding came from the DfES school formula capital allocations which had been announced on 29 November 2004. The allocations were a combination of Formula Grant (to meet the financing of the capital allocations) and capital grants.

A summary of Government capital allocations for schools in 2005/06 and later years was given as follows:-

Supported Capital Expenditure Allocations	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	TOTAL
	£000	£000	£000	£000
<u>Funding of financing charges by Formula Grant</u>				
Schools Access	410	416	416	1,242
New Pupil Places	936	850	863	2,649
	1,346	1,266	1,279	3,891
<u>Funding of capital by Capital Grant</u>				
NDS Modernisation	3,668	3,946	4,003	11,617
Devolved Formula	3,035	3,809	4,009	10,853
	6,703	7,755	8,012	22,470
Total	8,049	9,021	9,291	26,361

The total education spend in 2005/06 had been financed by 2005/06 SCE allocations shown above (£8m), 2004/05 SCE rolled forward (£4m), unsupported borrowing (£6m) and other contributions including grant from the Big Lottery Fund and Surestart (£3m).

Detailed proposals for some school programmes had yet to be approved. The Chief Education Officer would liaise with the Cabinet Member for Education, Children & Lifelong Learning and a report on proposed programmes would be made to the Schools Panel covering LEA Coordinated Voluntary Aided Schools, NDS Condition Funding, Seed Challenge and School Access Initiatives. Decisions would be reflected in capital monitoring reports to Cabinet Resources Committee.

Apart from education, the other major elements of the 2005/06 programme were highways (£10.6m) and the Modernisation of Core Systems project (£3.5m). Expenditure was being met by Transport for London highways grant (£4m) and either by borrowing or capital receipts (£14m).

Housing Capital Programme

The HRA capital programme planned to spend £28.668m in 2005/06 of which £27.548m related to Barnet Homes (excluding £0.5m cash incentives).

The HRA-related programme for improvement of homes was managed by Barnet Homes. Its success in attaining a two star rating at inspection meant that the first tranche of additional resources could now be released. A programme of £27.548m was proposed in 2005/6 as summarised in the appendices to the Cabinet Members' report, with investment up to 2010/11 in the order of £150m planned. Funding in 2005/6 was via the ALMO approval, other Supported Borrowing, the Major Repairs Allowance and contributions from leaseholders. Partners had been selected for the packages of work,

and as more detailed surveys took place it was likely that the programme would require some amendment in terms of timing and scope on individual schemes.

The non-HRA programme totalled £14.018m in 2005/06. It included expenditure supporting housing association projects and Disabled Facilities Grant schemes. The programme included funding from S106 monies of £5.3m.

PRUDENTIAL CODE & BORROWING LIMITS

The prudential system gave freedom to local authorities to invest as long as their capital plans were affordable, prudent and sustainable. The CIPFA Prudential Code set out the indicators that local authorities must use and the factors that they must take into account to show that they had fulfilled these objectives.

The principal constraint on capital investment would be the financial impact on the council tax and rent levels of the housing revenue account, which would be reflected in the indicators of affordability. It would be for the Council to decide on an appropriate level of borrowing in relation to its net capital financing costs and the level of council tax and housing rents.

For 2005/6, Government had provided local authorities with a mix of revenue support for capital financing costs based on notional capital allocations and capital grants via the single capital pot, but Government had still to decide whether to continue with the current arrangements or change the balance between revenue support for borrowing and capital grants.

The financial indicators under the Prudential Code and the 2005/06 Treasury Management Strategy & Annual Plan requiring Council approval were set out in Appendix D to the Cabinet Members' report along with full details of their calculation and purpose.

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Members' report, Cabinet

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

Revenue Budget and Council Tax

1. **That:-**
 - (a) **the forecast revenue outturn for the year 2004/5 and the estimates of income and expenditure for 2005/6 be approved; and**
 - (b) **in approving the estimates of expenditure and income for 2005/6, Council notes that balances will be increased by £3m and the self-insured provision will be increased by £0.5m.**
2. **That it be noted that the Borough Treasurer under his delegated powers has calculated the amount of 135,353 (band D equivalents) as the Council Tax base for the year 2005-6 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.**
3. **That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2005-6 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-**
 - (a) **£689,398,070 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act;**
 - (b) **£318,061,840 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act;**
 - (c) **£371,336,230 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;**

- (d) £237,164,170 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant or additional grant increased or reduced (as appropriate) by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from:-
- (i) its collection fund to its general fund and;
 - (ii) its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with Sections 97(3) and (4) and 98 (4) and (5) respectively of the Local Government Finance Act 1988;
- (e) £991.28 being the amount at 3(c) above less the amount at 3(d) above, all divided by the amount at 2. above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year 2005-2006;

Valuation Bands (£)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
660.85	771.00	881.14	991.28	1,211.56	1,431.85	1,652.13	1,982.56

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 3(e) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which is in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2005-6 the Greater London Authority has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:-

Valuation Bands (£)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
169.75	198.04	226.33	254.62	311.20	367.78	424.37	509.24

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(e) and 4. above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2005/6 for each of the categories dwellings shown below: -

Valuation Bands (£)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
830.60	969.04	1,107.47	1,245.90	1,522.76	1,799.63	2,076.50	2,491.80

- 6 (i) That in accordance with Section 38(2) of the Act the Chief Executive be instructed to place a notice in the local press of the amounts set under recommendation 2.5 above pursuant to Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 within a period of 21 days following the Council's decision.
- (ii) That the Borough Treasurer be authorised to apply to the ODPM for a transfer of cost between the HRA and General Fund if he considers it to be in the financial interest of the authority overall following the transfer of HRA benefits from the HRA to the General Fund.

Housing Revenue Account and Rents

7. That the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2005-6 be approved.
8. That, with effect from Monday 4 April 2005:-
- (a) The rent of all Council dwellings, with the exception of those included under Recommendation (1.9), be changed in line with the Government's proposals on rent restructuring outlined in this report, producing an average increase of 4.56%.
- (b) The rents of all properties relet for whatever reason be moved upwards to the formula rent. Where formula rent is below actual rent no reduction will be made.
- (c) Service charges for all tenants of all flats and maisonettes based on the services they receive be increased to the following charges (per week, 48 week basis):-
- | | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Caretaking | £4.59 |
| Caretaking Plus | £5.94 |
| Block Lighting | £0.73 |
| Grounds Maintenance | £0.47 |
- and that a new charge of £0.60 per week (48 week basis) be introduced for a quarterly caretaking service to dispersed blocks.
- (d) There shall be an increase of 10% on the charge for space and water heating.
9. That, with effect from Monday 4 April 2005: -
- (a) The basic rents of dwellings in the Council's equity sharing scheme at Moorlands Avenue, NW7 be increased as follows:-
- Current basic rents of £2,004 to £2,097 per annum
 - Current basic rents of £1,848 to £1,932 per annum.
- (b) The net rents of dwellings in the equity share scheme at Friern Hospital be increased by 4.56%.
10. That, with effect from Monday 4 April 2005, the rents of Council garages be increased by 5%.
11. That the Chief Executive be instructed to take the necessary action including the service of the appropriate Notices.

Performance Management Plans

12. That the Performance Management Plans be approved.
13. That the Chief Officers be authorised to implement the detailed proposals set out in the Performance Management Plans within the resource constraints identified, in consultation with lead Members as appropriate.

New Prudential Code and Borrowing Limits

14. That the Prudential Indicators set out in Appendix D to the Cabinet Members' report approved to Council and that the Borough Treasurer be authorised to raise loans, as required, up to such borrowing limits as the Council may from time to time determine and to finance capital expenditure from financing and operating leases subject to:
- (i) the appropriate provision having been made in the estimates for 2005-2006;
 - (ii) authorisation (where necessary) of the expenditure by the appropriate Government Department;
 - (iii) a decision of the committee concerned or under delegated/urgency powers to incur the capital expenditure and that the Cabinet Resources be instructed to approve new projects up to the value of surplus resources outlined in this report, having regard to the priorities identified.

Capital

15. That the capital programmes be approved, and that the Chief Officers be authorised to take all necessary action to implement them.

Note:

The appendices to the Cabinet Members' report, comprising the revenue and capital budgets, the Performance Management Plans, the capping regime, the Prudential Code and the Forward Plan Summary are being circulated separately to all members of the Council

Council Meeting

1 March 2005

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMITTEE

Agenda item 11

1. **Statutory Proper Officer : Head of Committee**

Roy Goddard, Head of Committee was appointed by the Council on 1 June 2000 as Statutory Proper Officer for the Council's democratic function with a number of other matters. In view of his retirement on 31 March 2005 it is necessary to appoint a replacement.

RECOMMEND: That with effect from 1 April, 2005, John Marr, Democratic Services Manager, be appointed statutory proper officer for:

- **All Head of Committee functions in the Constitution**
- **Members' declarations of acceptance of office**
- **Members' notice of resignation**
- **Giving notice of casual vacancies**
- **Convening Council to fill Mayoral casual vacancy**
- **Signing summonses for council meetings and receiving notices as to Members' addresses for summonses.**
- **Receiving notification of political groups for the calculation of political balance**
- **Returning Officer for election of parent governor representatives to Committee**
- **Deposit of documents**
- **Certification and authentication of documents, notices, orders, byelaws, copy minutes.**

This therefore includes power to sign all formal documents such as traffic orders, requisitions for information, notification of public inquiry, notices connected with tree preservation orders, notices relating to budget, council tax, accounts inspection and audit, housing sales and other landlord issues.

2. **Members Allowances Scheme 2005 - 2006**

The Council is required under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 to make a Members' Allowances Scheme before the beginning of each year providing for the payment of a basic allowance to each member. The scheme may also provide for the payment of Special Responsibility Allowance, Childcare and Dependent Carers Allowance, Travel and Subsistence Allowance and Co-optees Allowance.

Before making or amending a scheme the Council must have regard to the recommendations of an independent remuneration panel.

The council considered such recommendations from the Independent Remuneration Panel in July 2003 covering all the above requirements. The

Panel's report dated 16 July 2003 is still current and valid and is the basis of the Scheme for 2005/6.

The Scheme provides for an annual adjustment of allowances commencing from July 2003 by reference to an index specified by the Council, and where that is the only change made the scheme is deemed not to have been amended. The Scheme authorises the Borough Treasurer to increase allowances from 1 April in line with the RPI. Allowances were increased by 1.4% from 1 April 2004. RPI is currently 3.5% but the actual increase cannot be confirmed until the April RPI is published.

The Independent Remuneration Panel were invited to review two aspects of the Scheme, the payment of special responsibility allowance for licensing functions and an entitlement to claim traveling and subsistence allowances for attending training courses outside the Borough.

The Independent Remuneration Panel have considered these matters and their report to the Council is attached. Their recommendations have been included in the Scheme for 2005/6 attached to this report.

The maximum cost of the additional SRAs is £35,415 subject to RPI adjustment. The cost of reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses should be minimal. The Borough Treasurer confirms that provision has been made in the Council budget for 2005/6.

RECOMMEND

That having regard to the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel the Members Allowances Scheme attached for the year 2005/6 be approved for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006.

3. Changes to Committee Membership

- (i) The Conservative Group wish to alter their membership of the Licensing Committee by replacing Councillor Aba Dunner with Councillor Joan Scannell.
- (ii) The Liberal Democrat Group wish to alter their membership of the Special Committee (Constitution Review) by replacing Councillor Jeremy Davies as the Substitute with Councillor Monroe Palmer.

RECOMMEND –

- (1) That Councillor Joan Scannell replace Councillor Aba Dunner on the Licensing Committee.**
- (2) That Councillor Monroe Palmer replace Councillor Jeremy Davies as Substitute on the Special Committee (Constitution Review).**

4. Vacancies on School Governing Bodies

Appendix C lists (in bold) all current vacancies now needing to be filled in the Council's representation on school governing bodies.

Since the last Council meeting, the total number of LEA governors has reduced as the governing bodies for Broadfields Infant and Nursery School and Broadfields Primary School have ceased to exist following their amalgamation, as has the temporary governing body for Woodcroft Primary

School, and the governing bodies of Hasmonean Primary School, Queen Elizabeth's Girls School, Rosh Pinah Primary School and Bell Lane Primary School have all reconstituted with the loss of one LEA governor each. No action is required in respect of the latter three schools as each had one LEA vacancy.

In order to reflect the political balance of the Council, the political balance on school governing bodies (as at 8 February 2005) should be: -

Conservative	156
Labour	114
Liberal Democrat	28
Total	298

The current balance on school governing bodies is: -

Conservative	151
Labour	94
Liberal Democrat	20
Non political	1
Vacancies	32
Total	298

All persons appointed will hold office for four years from the date of appointment.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

RECOMMEND: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.

5. Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies

Appendix D lists in bold the vacancies in the Council's representation on Outside Bodies.

The Council currently has one representative on the National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection, being the Head of Environmental and Neighbourhood Services. The Society has advised the Council that a further four representatives may be nominated and the Head of Environmental and Neighbourhood Services has recommended that two further appointments be made. The appointments are annual, to be renewed at the Annual Council Meeting and there are no special conditions attached.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

RECOMMEND: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported, including to the National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection.

RS Goddard
Head of Committee

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

2 FEBRUARY 2005

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL

Members

Albert Wright	Representative of the Barnet Voluntary Service Council & Chair of the Panel
Firoozeh Ghaffari	Chair of Accounting & Finance Academic Group, Middlesex University Business School
David Clarke	Representative of the Barnet Chamber of Commerce Executive

Member's Allowances 2005/6

The Panel's report dated 16 July 2003 is still current and valid, but there were two aspects of the Scheme that we were invited to review, the payment of Special Responsibility Allowances in respect of the Licensing Committee and Sub-Committee and an entitlement to claim traveling and subsistence allowances for attending training courses outside the Borough.

1. Licensing Functions

We were advised of the new responsibilities of the Council for licensing from February 2005 and the arrangements made by the council to discharge them through a Licensing Committee and Sub-Committee.

We considered the payment of Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) to:

i) All members of the Licensing Committee in respect of the time required in performing their Licensing Sub-Committee responsibilities.

The Regulations on allowances permit SRA to be paid for acting as a member of:

- a) a committee or sub-committee which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods;
- b) any committee or sub-committee that deals with any function arising from any enactment authorising the authority to license the carrying on of any activity.

We noted that it had been estimated that there could be about 60 hearings of the Sub-Committee. Each would require the attendance of 3 members, a total of 180 member attendances or 12 per member. Based on the ALG Panel rate for co-opted members of £100 per meeting this equates to £1,200. The nearest Barnet Scheme SRA to this is Scale 7, 0.15 x basic = £1,275.

ii) The Chairman of the Licensing Committee.

We consider the responsibility of chairing this committee would be less than that of chairing the Licensing Sub-Committee or other major committee chairmen. A SRA of Scale 6, 0.25 x basic = £2,125 would in our view be appropriate, in addition to the allowance as a committee member.

iii) The panel of Chairmen of the Licensing Sub-Committee.

There are 5 members on the Panel. In our view their responsibility for presiding at hearings will justify a SRA at Scale 5, $0.33 \times \text{basic} = \text{£}2,833$, in addition to the allowance as a committee member.

The Regulations permit SRA to be paid to any member presiding at meetings of a committee or sub-committee.

2. Travel and subsistence for training courses

We were advised of a growing emphasis on training and development for members by both the provision of general courses for all members, by specialist training for groups of members (e.g. training for the Licensing Committee on the new Act) and by personal training plans for individual members.

Training in the first two categories was normally met from council funds and was commissioned and delivered locally in the Borough. Travel and subsistence costs of members were therefore covered by the lump sum allowance of £350 for all in-borough travel.

However, personal courses in the last category commissioned by the council's learning and development unit were often held outside the Borough.

Under the Allowances Scheme members may claim reimbursement for travel and subsistence expenses for "approved duties" outside the borough as defined in the scheme. This does not include attendance at training courses arranged by the Council. We consider the definition should be amended to include this.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That Special Responsibility Allowance be allocated as follows:**
 - i) All members of the Licensing Committee – Scale 7**
 - ii) The Chairman of the Licensing Committee – Scale 6, in addition to the allowance as a committee member.**
 - iii) The five members of the Panel of Sub-Committee chairmen – Scale 5, in addition to the allowance as a committee member.**
- 2. That the definition of approved duty for the reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses outside the borough be amended to include attendance at training courses arranged by the Council.**

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET
MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME
2005/2006

The Scheme

This scheme is made by Barnet London Borough Council under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) and the Local Government Pension Scheme and Discretionary Compensation (Local Authority (Members in England) Regulations 2003 ("the Regulations").

- 1.1 The scheme may be cited as the Barnet London Borough Council Members' Allowances Scheme and replaces the Scheme previously approved by the Council for 2004/2005.
- 1.2 It has effect for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006.
- 1.3 In this scheme,
 - 1.3.1 "councillor" means an elected member of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - 1.3.2 "year" means the twelve months ending with 31 March.
 - 1.3.3 "Co-optee" and "co-opted member" means a person not a councillor who is appointed by the Council to a committee discharging a statutory local authority function.
2. Basic Allowance
 - 2.1 A basic allowance of £8,500 shall be paid to each councillor.
 - 2.2 Payment of the basic allowance is subject to the conditions set out in sections 9, 10, 12 and 13.
3. Special Responsibility Allowance
 - 3.1 Allowances are payable to recognise the special responsibilities attached to certain positions to which councillors may be appointed. The allowances are graded in bands which are multiples of the basic allowance excluding the travel allowance.
 - 3.2 The bands, the multiples of the basic allowance which they represent, the positions concerned and the sums payable are set out in Schedule 1. During that period a councillor other than the Leader of the Council may receive more than one special responsibility allowance subject to a maximum equivalent to 2 times the basic allowance.
 - 3.3 Other conditions attached to the payment of special responsibility allowance are set out in sections 9, 10, 12 and 13.
4. Childcare and Dependent Carers' Allowance
 - 4.1 An allowance shall be payable to any councillor or co-opted member or member of an appeals committee established under the Education Act 1996 who incurs expenditure for the care of dependent relatives or children whilst undertaking the approved duties listed in section 4.3 below.

- 4.2 Dependent relatives and children are defined as:-
- children aged 15 years or less
 - elderly relatives requiring full-time care
 - relatives with disabilities who receive full-time care
- 4.3 The approved duties referred to in section 4.1 above are:-
- a) The attendance at a meeting of the authority or of any committee or sub-committee of the authority, or of any other body to which the authority makes appointments or nominations, or of any committee or sub-committee of such a body;
 - b) The attendance at any other meeting, the holding of which is authorised by the authority, or a committee or sub-committee of the authority, or a joint committee of the authority and at least one other local authority within the meaning of section 270(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, or a sub-committee of such a joint committee, provided that –
 - I. where the authority is divided into two or more political groups it is a meeting to which members of at least two such groups have been invited; or
 - II. if the authority is not so divided, it is a meeting to which at least two members of the authority have been invited.
 - c) The attendance at a meeting of any association of authorities of which the authority is a member;
 - d) The attendance at a meeting of the executive or a meeting of any of its committees;
 - e) The performance of any duty in pursuance of a standing order requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened;
 - f) The performance of any duty in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises;
 - g) The performance of any duty in connection with arrangements made by the authority for the attendance of pupils at any school approved for the purposes of section 342 of the Education Act 1996 (approval of non-maintained special schools; and
 - h) The carrying out of any other duty approved by the authority, or any duty of a class so approved, for the purposes of, or in connection with, the discharge of the functions of the authority or any of its committees or sub-committees.
- 4.4 The allowance shall be paid at the rate of £5.20 per hour for up to 8 hours' care.
5. Travel and Subsistence Allowance
- 5.1 A lump sum annual allowance of £350 shall be paid to each councillor to recognise the cost of all travel within the Borough. The duties which qualify for the payment of travel outside the Borough are set out in Schedule 2 with the amounts payable set out in Schedule 3.
- 5.2 The duties which qualify for the payment of travel allowance to a co-opted member or member of an appeals committee established under the Education Act 1996 are set out in Schedule 2 with the amounts payable set out in Schedule 3.
- 5.3 The duties which qualify for the payment of subsistence allowances to a councillor, co-opted member or member of an appeals committee established under the Education Act 1996 are set out in Schedule 2 with the amounts payable set out in Schedule 3.
- 5.4 The payment of allowance is subject to the conditions set out in sections 9 and 10.

6. Co-optees' Allowance

6.1 An allowance of £240 per annum shall be paid to co-opted members for attendance at committee meetings.

6.2 Payment of the allowance is subject to the conditions set out in sections 9, 10, 12 and 13.

7. Annual Adjustment

For the period of 4 years from 1 April 2004 the basic allowance, childcare and dependants' allowance, in-borough travel allowance and co-optees' allowance shall be adjusted annually by the Borough Treasurer on 1 April in accordance with the Retail Price Index.

8. Pensions

With effect from 1 September 2003 all councillors shall be eligible to join the Local Government Pension Scheme and both basic allowance and special responsibility allowance shall be pensionable.

9. Financial Limits

Any payment under this scheme is subject to the budget provision for members' allowances during the year not being exceeded.

10. Suspension

Allowances shall be withdrawn where a councilor or co-opted member has been wholly or partially suspended because of a breach of the Local Code of Conduct.

11. Renunciation

A councilor or co-opted member may decline to receive any part of his or her entitlement to an allowance under this scheme by notifying the Borough Treasurer in writing.

12. Part-year Entitlements

12.1 This section regulates councillors' entitlement to allowances if during the year

- the scheme is amended
- the councillor is newly elected
- the councillor ceases to be a councillor
- the councillor accepts or gives up a position eligible for a special responsibility allowance.

12.2 If the scheme is amended so as to change the basic allowance or the special responsibility allowance then the annual amount to be paid to each councillor shall be re-calculated. The councillor will be paid a proportion of the old allowance and a proportion of the new allowance. The proportions will reflect the number of days in the year before and after (starting with the day on which the change takes effect) the change. Further amendments will be treated in the same way.

12.3 If during the year

- a councillor is newly elected or ceases to be a councillor,
- a councillor accepts or gives up a position eligible for a special responsibility allowance, or
- a councillor becomes or ceases to be eligible to a special responsibility allowance because of an amendment to the scheme

then the annual amount to be paid to the councillor will be altered. The alteration will discount a proportion of the relevant allowance, to reflect the number of days in the year that the councillor was not a councillor, or was not eligible for the special responsibility allowance, as the case may be. If the scheme is amended during the year as set out in 12.2 above, then the alteration will be calculated separately for the periods before and after each amendment, in accordance with the Regulations.

13. Claims, Payments, Repayments, Restriction to entitlement

13.1 Payments of basic allowance and special responsibility allowance will be made in twelve equal monthly instalments at the end of each month.

13.2 If making a payment of one twelfth of the annual entitlement of basic allowance and special responsibility allowance for any member would result in a breach of the restrictions set by Section 12 of the scheme, then actual payments must be reduced to comply with those restrictions.

13.3 Where an allowance has already been paid for any period during which the councillor concerned:

- (a) is suspended or partially suspended for a breach of the Local Code of Conduct;
- (b) ceases to be a councillor; or
- (c) is otherwise not entitled to receive the allowance for that period,

such part of the allowance as relates to any such period shall be repaid to the Council.

13.4 Where a member of the authority is also a member of another authority that member may not receive allowances from more than one authority in respect of the same duties.

Special Responsibility Allowances 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006

Allowance	Scale	Factor	Amount
			£
Leader	1	3	25,500
Deputy Leader (if appointed)	3	1	8,500
Leader of major opposition group	2	1.5	12,750
Leader of smaller political group	3	1	8,500
Cabinet Members	2	1.5	12,750
Chairman of Planning and Environment Committee	5	.33	2,833
Vice-Chairman of Planning and Environment Committee	7	.15	1,275
Chairman of General Functions Committee	5	.33	2,833
Chairman of Area Planning Committee	5	.33	2,833
Vice-Chairman of Area Planning Committee	7	.15	1,275
Chairman of Area Environment Committee	5	.33	2,833
Vice-Chairman of Area Environment Committee	7	.15	1,275
Chairman of Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee	4	.5	4,250
Vice-Chairman of Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee	6	.25	2,125
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee	4	.5	4,250
Chairman of Standards Committee	7	.15	1,275
Chairman of Area Forum	6	.25	2,125
Group Secretaries	5	.33	2,833
Group Whip	6	.25	2,125
Shadow cabinet members of major opposition group	7	.15	1,275
Member of Licensing Committee	7	.15	1,275
Chairman of Licensing Committee	6	.25	2,125
Panel of Chairman of Licensing Sub- Committee	5	.33	2,833

SCHEDULE 2

APPROVED DUTIES

The following are approved duties for the payment of travel and subsistence allowances.

(For Councillors the meeting must take place takes place outside the borough of Barnet):

1.
 - i) The attendance at a meeting of the authority or of any committee or sub-committee of the authority, or of any other body to which the authority makes appointments or nominations, or of any committee or sub-committee of such a body;
 - j) The attendance at any other meeting, the holding of which is authorised by the authority, or a committee or sub-committee of the authority, or a joint committee of the authority and at least one other local authority within the meaning of section 270(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, or a sub-committee of such a joint committee, provided that –
 - I. where the authority is divided into two or more political groups it is a meeting to which members of at least two such groups have been invited; or
 - II. if the authority is not so divided, it is a meeting to which at least two members of the authority have been invited.
 - k) The attendance at a meeting of any association of authorities of which the authority is a member;
 - l) The attendance at a meeting of the executive or a meeting of any of its committees;
 - m) The performance of any duty in pursuance of a standing order requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened;
 - n) The performance of any duty in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises;
 - o) The performance of any duty in connection with arrangements made by the authority for the attendance of pupils at any school approved for the purposes of section 342 of the Education Act 1996 (approval of non-maintained special schools; and
 - p) Attendance at training courses arranged by the Council.
 - q) The carrying out of any other duty approved by the authority, or any duty of a class so approved, for the purposes of, or in connection with, the discharge of the functions of the authority or any of its committees or sub-committees.

(The following bodies or their committees or sub-committees are specifically included in the above definition:

Welsh Harp Joint Consultative Committee
Hampstead Heath Management Committee

London government statutory bodies, joint committees, forums, consortiums,
employers' associations, etc
Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE)
Local Government Association
Association of London Government
Joint Negotiating Councils for Council employees
Local Government Management Board)

2. Subject to the Base Budget not being exceeded, duties undertaken by members in receipt of Special Responsibility Allowances who are members of the Executive, provided that they are undertaken outside the borough of Barnet and that the Chief Executive is satisfied that the duties are for the purposes of, or connected with, the discharge of the functions of the Council.
3. Attendance as the council's duly authorised representative at meetings of the following bodies.
 - (a) School admission, exclusion and reinstatement appeals panels
 - (b) Statutory complaints boards or panels relating to the council's education or social services functions
4. The conferences and meetings described below (convened by a person or body whose objects are neither wholly nor partly political, and otherwise than in the course of a trade or business, for the purpose of discussing matters which in the council's opinion will relate to the interests of Barnet or its inhabitants or of part of Barnet or the inhabitants of part of it) are approved for the purposes of payment of travel and subsistence allowance. They are those conferences and meetings convened by bodies at present included on the council's 'approved list' of conferences or subsequently added thereto, being conferences where it is considered that there is a direct connection with a function of this council.

The approved list was originally agreed by the former General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 26 March 1979 (Dec. 2) and is attached as Appendix A.

SCHEDULE 3

TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Travel

1. An allowance of £350 per annum shall be payable to each councilor to recognise the cost of all travel within the borough.
2. Other travel allowance shall paid be at the same rates as those applying at the time to council staff for motorcar, motorcycle and bicycle use.

For public transport actual expenditure shall be reimbursed.

Subsistence

3. For a councillor attending an approved duty that takes place inside the borough of Barnet the rate of subsistence and travel allowance shall be nil.

Other subsistence allowance for meals taken on duty shall paid be at the same rates as those applying at the time to council staff.

For overnight costs reasonable approved expenses shall be paid.

Other Reimbursements allowed:

1. Not more than the amount of any expenditure incurred on tolls, ferries or parking fees.
2. Where day subsistence is payable, the reasonable cost of meals taken on trains, subject to a reduction of subsistence allowance of four hours for each meal taken, and a maximum of one main meal during an absence of more than four hours, two for more than eight hours' absence and three for more than twelve hours' absence.
3. The actual cost of overnight garaging of a car or other vehicle.

Payment

4. Evidence of expenditure incurred shall be required when claims are made and any unreasonable claim shall be referred to the Chief Executive.

NOTE:

The Council has agreed that an allowance of £41.40 for any period of 24 hours (for which purpose a period of 24 hours shall begin at 3am) and £20.70 for a 12 hour may be paid to reimburse financial loss incurred by external witnesses giving evidence at any of the Council's overview and scrutiny committees and by external members of the Independent Remuneration Panel for members' allowances.

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET
REVISED LIST OF APPROVED CONFERENCES
(MARCH 1979, REVISED 2004)

KEY:

- A = Members to attend
 B = Representatives to attend if papers warrant

Name of Conference	Category	Max. No. of Members to Attend
National Playing Fields Association	A	1
Public Libraries Conference	A	1
LGA Annual Cultural Services Conference	A	1
British Records Association	B	1
London Council of Social Service Conferences on Arts Matters	B	2
Council of Local Education Authorities Conference	A	2
LGA Education Committee Annual Conference	A	2
Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy	A	1
Local Government Association	A	2
International Union of Local Authorities including British Section Conferences	B	1
Association of London Government	A	According to the matters discussed
National Housing and Town Planning Council (in conjunction with Environment PDC) Annual and Regional Conferences	A	1
Chartered Institute of Housing Annual Conference	A	1
National Road Safety Congress	A	2
Local Government Association	A	2
Association of Directors of Social Services Autumn Conference	A	2
National Association of Mental Health Conference	B	1
Central Council for the Disabled Conference	B	1
Society of Chief Personnel Officers	A	!

Register of Appointments and Nominations on School Governors

1. Organisation: Barnet Hill JMI and Nursery School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mr Gordon Massey | (Appointed 27/06/2001) | P2.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 28/06/2001 to 27/06/2005 | Labour |
| 2 - Mr J Tyler | (Disqualified 13/06/2003) | P2.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Conservative |
| 3 - Councillor Linda McFadyen | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | P2.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |

2. Organisation: Beis Yaacov Primary School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 - Mr Jason Moleman | (Resigned 18/10/2004) | VP33.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 11/06/2003 to 10/06/2007 | Liberal Democrat |

3. Organisation: Blessed Dominic RC School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 - Mr Jimi Odumosu | (Expires 21/03/2005) | VP.04.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 22/03/2001 to 21/03/2005 | Labour |

4. Organisation: Broadfields Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Mrs L Evans | (Appointed 18/01/2005) | P.44.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/01/2005 to 18/01/2009 | Conservative |
| 2 - Ms I Mann | (Deceased 19/01/2005) | P.44.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/01/2005 to 18/01/2009 | Labour |
| 3 New Vacancy | | P.44.3 |

5. Organisation: Brookhill Nursery School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mrs J Last | (Appointed 18/01/2005) | NP.46.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 04/02/2005 to 03/02/2009 | Conservative |
| 2 - Councillor Susan Steinberg | (Disqualified 29/04/2003) | NP.46.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/03/2002 to 18/03/2006 | Conservative |

6. Organisation: Brookland Infant and Brookland Junior Schools

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Mr Simon Berger | (Deceased 20/09/2004) | P.23.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Labour |
| 2 - Mr Jeffrey Leifer | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.23.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Labour |
| 3 - Councillor Leslie Sussman | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.23.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Conservative |
| 4 - Councillor John Marshall | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.23.4 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Conservative |

7. Organisation: Brunswick Park Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Ms Elizabeth Lawrence | (Appointed 09/07/2002) | P.10.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr Robert Pavitt | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | P.10.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |
| 3 - Councillor Daniel Hope | (Resigned 24/06/2004) | P.10.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 26/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Conservative |

8. Organisation: Chalgrove Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Councillor Leslie Sussman | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.25.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Ms R Montague | (Expired 08/07/2004) | P.25.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2000 to 08/07/2004 | Labour |
| 3 - Councillor Helena Hart | (Appointed 04/11/2001) | P.25.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 04/11/2001 to 03/11/2005 | Conservative |

9. Organisation: Childs Hill School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Ms Beverley Burchell | (Resigned 18/03/2005) | P.29.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 12/10/2004 to 11/10/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Ms Margo Clegg | (Appointed 09/07/2002) | P.29.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 | Labour |
| 3 - Mr Simon Kovar | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | P.29.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Liberal Democrat |

10. Organisation: Church Hill School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Ms Kelly Liza Tebb | (Appointed 19/03/2002) | P.11.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/03/2002 to 18/03/2006 | Labour |
| 2 - Mr Stanley Blitz | (Resigned 09/09/2004) | P.11.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs Joanna Tambourides | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | P.11.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |

11. Organisation: Courtland JMI School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 - Mrs J Burton | (Resigned 13/07/2003) | P.39.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2000 to 08/07/2004 | Liberal Democrat |
| 2 - Mr K Dyll | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.39.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs A Pottinger | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.39.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Labour |

12. Organisation: Dollis Infant School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 - Mr Vinod Sodha | (Resigned 27/09/2004) | P.41.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 11/01/2001 to 10/01/2005 | Labour |
| 2 - Councillor Wayne Casey | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | P.41.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Liberal Democrat |
| 3 - Councillor Jeremy Davies | (Appointed 26/07/2001) | P.41.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Liberal Democrat |
| 4 - Mr G O Williams | (Resigned 30/09/2002) | P.41.4 |
| Period of appointment: | 24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005 | Labour |

13. Organisation: Edgware Junior School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Dr M Grenfell | (Appointed 19/11/2002) | P.43b.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 | Conservative |
| 2 - Councillor Joan Scannell | (Expires 21/03/2005) | P.43b.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 22/03/2001 to 21/03/2005 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mr K Dyll | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | P.43b.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Conservative |

14. Organisation: Fairway Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Mrs Gwen Brandon | (Expires 21/03/2005) | P.40.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 22/03/2001 to 21/03/2005 | Labour |
| 2 - Mr K Lyon | (Appointed 19/11/2002) | P.40.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 | Conservative |
| 3 - Ms Jackie Irvén | (Appointed 16/12/2003) | P.40.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 17/12/2003 to 16/12/2007 | Labour |

15. Organisation: Garden Suburb Infant and Garden Suburb Junior Schools

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Ms Mary Ogle | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.24.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mrs Barbara Harris | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.24.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Ms S Prentice | (Resigned 31/08/2004) | P.24.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 07/07/2004 to 06/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 4 - Mrs Rachel Silverstone | (Appointed 18/05/2004) | P.24.4 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/05/2004 to 18/05/2008 | Conservative |

16. Organisation: Grasvenor Avenue Infant School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Mrs Pat Dunton | (Appointed 18/01/2005) | P.45.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/01/2005 to 18/01/2009 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr J Tyler | (Disqualified 30/05/2003) | P.45.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Conservative |

17. Organisation: Hampden Way Nursery School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Mrs J G Lodhi | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.48.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |

2 - Mrs Sandra Hope (Resigned 15/09/2004) P.48.2
Period of appointment: 19/05/2004 to 18/05/2008 Conservative

18. Organisation: Monkfrith JMI School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

1 - Councillor Andreas Tambourides (Appointed 19/11/2003) P.09.1
Period of appointment: 19/11/2003 to 18/11/2007 Conservative
2 - Mrs J G Lodhi (Appointed 06/07/2004) P.09.2
Period of appointment: 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 Conservative
3 - **Mrs Jackie Carlowe** (Resigned 21/07/2003) P.09.3
Period of appointment: 07/12/2000 to 06/12/2004 Labour

19. Organisation: Northway School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

1 - Mrs M Stannard (Appointed 16/12/2003) SP.02.1
Period of appointment: 06/01/2004 to 05/01/2008 Conservative
2 - **Mr Hugh Rayner** (Resigned 25/11/2003) SP.02.2
Period of appointment: 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Conservative
3 - Ms Dadia Conti (Appointed 08/07/2003) SP.02.3
Period of appointment: 01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007 Labour

20. Organisation: Oakleigh School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

1 - Mr John Tiplady (Appointed 06/07/2004) SP.03.1
Period of appointment: 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 Conservative
2 - **Mrs Anne Jarvis** (Resigned 25/07/2004) SP.03.2
Period of appointment: 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Labour

21. Organisation: St Catherines RC JMI School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

1 - Mr David J Barton (Appointed 10/09/2002) VP14.1
Period of appointment: 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 Liberal Democrat
2 - **Councillor Gerard Silverstone** (Resigned 28/06/2004) VP14.2
Period of appointment: 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 Conservative

22. Organisation: St Johns CE Primary N11

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

1 - Mrs Eileen Botham (Appointed 10/02/2004) VP.32.1
Period of appointment: 17/02/2004 to 16/02/2008 Conservative
2 - **Councillor Terry Burton** (Resigned 05/02/2003) VP.32.2
Period of appointment: 30/03/2000 to 29/03/2004 Conservative

23. Organisation: St Johns NW4

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

1 - **Mrs R Levy** (Expired 16/02/2004) VP.21a.1
Period of appointment: 17/02/2000 to 16/02/2004 Conservative

24. Organisation: St Josephs RC Junior School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- 1 - **Mr P Theobald** (Deceased 31/08/2004) **VP.16.1**
Period of appointment: 07/11/2000 to 08/11/2004 **Conservative**

25. Organisation: Summerside Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- 1 - **Mrs J Underhill** (Resigned 25/09/2004) **P.16.1**
Period of appointment: 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 **Conservative**
- 2 - Mr T Renouf (Appointed 06/07/2004) P.16.2
Period of appointment: 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 **Conservative**
- 3 - Councillor Mark Langton (Appointed 07/01/2003) P.16.3
Period of appointment: 08/01/2003 to 07/01/2007 **Labour**

26. Organisation: The Hyde Primary School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- 1 - **Mr R Braun** (Resigned 22/05/2004) **P.33.1**
Period of appointment: 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 **Conservative**
- 2 - Mr Gordon Mott (Appointed 18/11/2004) P.33.2
Period of appointment: 07/12/2004 to 06/12/2008 **Labour**
- 3 - Mr G Kirby (Appointed 26/08/2004) P.33.3
Period of appointment: 12/10/2004 to 11/10/2008 **Conservative**
- 4 - Mr A Bornstein (Appointed 19/11/2002) P.33.4
Period of appointment: 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 **Conservative**

27. Organisation: The Orion Primary and Goldbeaters Primary Schools

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- 1 - Ms Nargis Narenthira (Appointed 14/09/2004) P.50.1
Period of appointment: 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 **Labour**
- 2 - Councillor Gill Sargeant (Appointed 14/09/2004) P.50.2
Period of appointment: 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 **Labour**
- 3 - Mr Vinay Sharma (Appointed 14/09/2004) P.50.3
Period of appointment: 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 **Conservative**
- 4 - **Mr J Hart** (Resigned 04/11/2004) **P.50.4**
Period of appointment: 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 **Conservative**

28. Organisation: Underhill Infant School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- 1 - Councillor Anita Campbell (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.1a.1
Period of appointment: 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 **Labour**
- 2 - Mr Duncan Macdonald (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.1a.2
Period of appointment: 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 **Liberal Democrat**
- 3 - **Ms R Burrage** (Expired 05/01/2004) **P.1a.3**
Period of appointment: 06/01/2000 to 05/01/2004 **Liberal Democrat**

29. Organisation: Wessex Gardens Primary School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mr F Dannenburg | (Appointed 18/05/2004) | P.27.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 19/05/2004 to 18/05/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Councillor Eva Greenspan | (Appointed 26/07/2001) | P.27.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Conservative |
| 3 - Dr John Gearson | (Expires 21/03/2005) | P.27.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 22/03/2001 to 21/03/2005 | Conservative |
| 4 - Councillor Monroe Palmer | (Appointed 23/10/2001) | P.27.4 |
| Period of appointment: | 24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005 | Liberal Democrat |

30. Organisation: Whitefield School

No. of Representatives: 5

Current Representatives

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Vac Ref |
| 1 - Mr Mark Landau | (Resigned 11/01/2005) | S.13.1 |
| Period of appointment: | 08/01/2003 to 07/01/2007 | Conservative |
| 2 - Councillor Melvin Cohen | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | S.13.2 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mr S Deller | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | S.13.3 |
| Period of appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Liberal Democrat |
| 4 - Councillor Agnes Slocombe | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | S.13.4 |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Labour |
| 5 - Mr Dave Robinson | (Appointed 08/07/2003) | S.13.5 |
| Period of appointment: | 01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007 | Labour |

Register of Appointments and Nominations on Outside Bodies

1. Organisation: Almshouse Charities of Samuel Atkinson and Others

Special Conditions:

Persons appointed need not be Members of the Council but they must be nominated by the Councillors representing the Edgware Ward.

Appointment is four years, or for the remaining unexpired term if an appointee is replaced mid-term.

No. of Representatives: 3 (Representative Trustees)

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 - Councillor Joan Scannell | (Resigned 02/12/2003) | 1002 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 09/07/2003 to 06/12/2004 | |
| 2 - Mrs Jackie Page | (Appointed 20/03/2002) | 1003 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 20/03/2002 to 19/03/2006 | |
| 3 - Councillor Brian Gordon | (Appointed 26/11/2002) | 1004 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 26/11/2002 to 25/11/2006 | |

2. Organisation: Hampstead Garden Suburb Institute Council

Special Conditions:

(a) One representative must be a Garden Suburb Ward member.

(b) The other two representatives must not be elected members of the Council.

(c) Appointments are for three years and must be ratified by the Institute before taking effect.

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 - Councillor John Marshall | (Resigned 18/11/2003) | 1167 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 08/07/2003 to 07/07/2006 | |
| 2 - Mr Gerald Shamash | (Appointed 08/07/2003) | 1168 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 08/07/2003 to 07/07/2006 | |
| 3 - Ms Marjorie Harris | (Appointed 08/07/2003) | 1169 Member |
| Period of appointment: | 08/07/2003 to 07/07/2006 | |

Council Meeting

1 March 2005

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMITTEE

Agenda item 11.1

6. Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies

The Administration wishes to change its representatives on the Barnet Community and Police Consultative Group, by replacing Councillor Katia David with Councillor Aba Dunner, replacing Councillor Victor Lyon with Councillor Olwen Evans, and replacing Councillor Olwen Evans as a substitute with Councillor Victor Lyon.

Details of the conditions relating to appointments to this body and current representatives are shown below:

Organisation: Barnet Community and Police Consultative Group

Special Conditions:

Representatives must be Members of the Council

The Group suggests that appropriate appointees would be Members dealing with the issue of community safety or with an interest in a broad spectrum of groups within the community, such as youth and minority groups, or dealing with health, social care or the environment.

No. of Representatives: 6 members plus 6 substitutes

Current Representatives

		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Victor Lyon	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1032 Member
Leader of the Council		
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
2 - Councillor Christopher Harris	(Appointed 06/07/2004)	1033 Member
Period of appointment:	07/07/2004 to 17/05/2005	
3 - Councillor Katia David	(Appointed 06/07/2004)	1034 Member
Period of appointment:	07/07/2004 to 17/05/2005	
4 - Councillor Brian Salinger	(Appointed 06/07/2004)	1035 Member
Period of appointment:	07/07/2004 to 17/05/2005	
5 - Councillor Soon-Hoe Teh	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1036 Member
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
6 - Councillor Sean Hooker	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1037 Member
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
7 - Councillor Olwen Evans	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1038 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
8 - Councillor Melvin Cohen	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1039 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
9 - Councillor Gerard Silverstone	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1040 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
10 - Councillor Terry Burton	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1041 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
11 - Councillor Alan Schneiderman	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1042 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	
12 - Councillor Susette Palmer	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	1043 Substitute
Period of appointment:	19/05/2004 to 17/05/2005	

RECOMMEND: That Council approve the following changes to its representation on the Barnet Community and Police Consultative Group.

- (i) **Councillor Aba Dunner to replace Councillor Katia David.**
- (ii) **Councillor Olwen Evans to replace Councillor Victor Lyon.**
- (iii) **Councillor Victor Lyon to replace Councillor Olwen Evans as a substitute.**

7. Amendments to Items on the Agenda

Agenda item 8: Report from Cabinet .

Report of Cabinet held on 19 February 2005: Budget and Council Tax 2005/06

- (i) the amendment in the name of Councillor Monroe Palmer, Appendix A
- (ii) the amendment in the name of Councillor Phil Yeoman, Appendix B

8. Petitions

In connection with Agenda Item 8, the following petitions have been received from the "Barnet "It Ain't Fair " Campaign To Lower Council Tax and Resume Borough Services in Association with the National Campaign "Is it Fair" Under the auspices of the Royal British Legion ", as follows:

- (i) "(Barnet people against high Council Tax and cuts in services)
We Demand:-
 - A substantial reduction in our Council Tax for year 2005/6
 - Restoration of cut Council Services.
 We call upon the people of Barnet to support these demand."

This petition contains 3,271 signatures.

- (ii) "(Barnet people against high Council Tax and cuts in services)
We Demand:-
 - A substantial reduction in our Council Tax for year 2005/6
 - Restoration of cut Council Services.
 - Our petition also supports the National "Is it Fair" Campaign's demands for reform of the council tax, which asks that:
 - The Council Tax in its current format be ABOLISHED and replaced by a system of local taxation that reflects the individual's ability to pay.
 - All Councils are treated equally and fairly.
 - No council taxpayer is stealthily overtaxed in one area in order to subsidise the tax costs of council taxpayers in another area.

The "Is it Fair" petition is supported by the Royal British Legions. We call upon the people of Barnet to support these demands DON'T COMPLAIN..- DO CAMPAIGN"

This petition contains 212 signatures.

At the time of writing this report, both petitions were in the process of being validated.

R S Goddard
Head of Committee

Council Meeting

1 March 2005

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMITTEE

Agenda item 11.1

9. Agenda Item 8: Report of Cabinet dated 21 February:

(i) Amendments to the Performance Management Plans

The Appendix to this report indicates changes to the Performance Management Plans to accord with the budget figures which were reported to Cabinet on 21 February, 2005, and contained in the Revenue Section of the Cabinet Members' report.

(ii) Petitions

With reference to Item 8 of my report, the analysis of the petitions is as follows:

Petition containing 3,271 signatures:

Of the 614 checked against the electoral register, 555 were validated.

Petition containing 212 signatures

49 were validated against the electoral register.

RECOMMEND: That the position on (i) and (ii) be noted.

R S Goddard
Head of Committee

Service Area	Type of change	Section	Original	Changed and final version
Children & Families	Wording	Efficiencies	Efficiency savings (Young Person's Team)	Efficiency savings within Young Peoples Team
	Wording	Pressures	Training support programme -transfer from grant to base funding	Training support programme - transfer to FSS
	Wording	Budget Reductions	Principal Projects & Strategy Officer (Young People's Team)	Principal Projects & Strategy Officer
	Wording / deletion	Draft Budget	Draft Budget (with 2 line comment)	Budget (removal of 2 line comment)
Committee & Admin	Figures	Virements 2005/6	112,220	175,840
	Figures	Revised budget 2005/6	2,546,050	2,609,670
	Figures	Base & revised budget	2,525,360	2,640,980
	Figures	Base & revised budget	2,539,860	2,655,480
	Figures	Base & revised budget	2,604,620	2,720,240
	Wording deletion	Efficiencies	Reduction of half FTE post within member support team	
	Figures	Efficiencies	73,000	60,000
	New wording addition	Pressures		Members Allowances (Licensing Committee)
	Figures	Pressures		39,000
	Figures	Pressures	84,000	123,000
	Wording	Final line	Draft budget	Budget
	Figures	Final line	2,525,360	2,640,980
	Figures	Final line	2,539,860	2,655,480
	Figures	Final line	2,604,620	2,702,240
	Figures	Final line	2,671,180	2,786,800
New wording addition	4.2 Staffing Summary		Note: An efficiency saving of £13,000 agreed in September 2004 relating to half an Administrative post dealing with Member Allowances has been removed following further consideration	

Community Care	Wording	Efficiencies	Placement	To reduce expenditure on placement & home care costs
	Wording	Full year effects	Crisis resolution (Staffing 4 posts)	Staff for crisis resolution & home treatment teams – FTE of 4 posts
	Wording addition	Full year effects	Closure Springwood	Closure Springwood day centre
	Wording addition	Pressures		(ex grant)
	Wording addition	Pressures	LD	Learning disabilities – children to adults
	Wording addition	Pressures	LD	Learning disabilities – from hospital
	Wording addition	Pressures	LD	Learning disabilities
	Wording deletion	Pressures	Higher inflation & other contract pressures	Higher inflation & other pressures
	Wording	Budget reductions	Age Concern reduction from 3 to 2 centres	Age Concern – reduce from 3 to 2 centres
Cultural Services	Wording	Efficiencies	Savings on IT expenditure in Customer Care	Savings on IT expenditure in Customer Media Fund
	Wording	Efficiencies	Revised base budget	First Team
Education	Wording	Budget reductions	Targeted support for schools causing concern (whole budget)	Targeted support for schools causing concern
Environment	Figures	Base & revised budget 2006/7	24,292,140	23,916,140
		Base & revised budget 2007/8	25,535,350	25,159,350
		Base & revised budget 2008/9	26,219,440	25,843,440
	Wording	Full year effects	Licensing Act 2003	Licensing Act 2003 (slipped from 2005/6)
	New lines added	Budget reductions		Cease HECA survey programme (22,000) Ground Maintenance efficiencies (25,000) Capitalise Environmental Health Officer (40,000) Public Health – reduction of 0.5 post (13,000) Waste Performance Grant (276,000)

	Figures	Budget reduction final line	725,000	1,1010,000
	Figures	Budget 2005/6	24,292,140	23,916,140
	Figures	Budget 2006/7	25,535,350	25,159,350
	Figures	Budget 2007/8	26,219,440	25,843,440
	Figures	Budget 2008/9	26,944,000	26,568,000
Highways	Wording	Full year effects	Asbestos Survey – one off – 250k in 2004/5	Asbestos Survey (one-off)
	Wording	Budget reductions	Highways – increase in fees/charges	Highways – general increase in fees/charges
	Wording deletion	Final line	Draft budget	Budget
	Wording deletion	Notes	Note: Parking fee income relates to both off-street car parks & on-street parking. Inflation/virement figures to be confirmed	
Law & Probity	Wording	Efficiencies	Revised base budget	Revised IT budgets

Council Meeting

1 March 2005

REPORT OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

Agenda item 11.2

1. Standards Committee : Independent Members

1. Article 9 of the Council's Constitution stipulates that the Council's Standards Committee will be composed of three councillors and four persons who are not councillors. Following the resignation of Mr Anil Goonewardene, one of the independent members of the Standards Committee, a replacement has been sought.
2. I sought expressions of interest by public advertisement with a view to making a recommendation to Council for appointment. The advertisement was placed in the Press Group of Newspapers at the end of November 2004.
3. The criteria for selection were set out in the advertisement, which stated that an independent member of the Standards Committee would be likely to:-
 - have a substantial background in public service, the professions, industry, commerce, trades unions or religious or community life that enables him or her to make judgements about ethical issues that will command respect within the Council.
 - have the analytical skills needed to assess detailed allegations of impropriety
 - be able to show a continuing interest in public life and in probity issues generally.

It also stated that political allegiance would not be taken into account, and the Council's commitment to promoting equality of opportunity.

4. I received 3 expressions of interest, all accompanied by a personal history and statement. I undertook up references on all the people who applied. Despite the relatively low number of expressions of interest, the applicants were of a very high calibre and met the criteria well. Each applicant was interviewed by a panel comprising myself and the Deputy Borough Solicitor. We assessed the applicants against the criteria to decide whom to recommend. We also had regard to the need to balance legal and ethical input to the Committee.
5. A synopsis of all the applicants is attached.
6. The Chairman of the Committee, Professor Brian GOMES da COSTA BSc MA JP has confirmed his intention to stand down at the end of the current Council year.
7. Accordingly, I recommended the following as independent members of the Committee.

Mr Stephen Ross (with immediate effect)

Mrs Susan Riddle (from the Council's annual Meeting in May 2005).

8. The new Members will undergo an induction process so as to familiarise them with the workings of the Council and the Standards Committee.
9. The Council will be asked to appoint a new Chairman of the Standards Committee at the Annual Meeting in May 2005.

10. Article 9 of the Council's Constitution stipulates that the Council's Standards Committee will be composed of three councillors and four persons who are not councillors. Following the resignation of Mr Anil Goonewardene, one of the independent members of the Standards Committee, a replacement has been sought.
11. I sought expressions of interest by public advertisement with a view to making a recommendation to Council for appointment. The advertisement was placed in the Press Group of Newspapers at the end of November 2004.
12. The criteria for selection were set out in the advertisement, which stated that an independent member of the Standards Committee would be likely to:-
 - have a substantial background in public service, the professions, industry, commerce, trades unions or religious or community life that enables him or her to make judgements about ethical issues that will command respect within the Council.
 - have the analytical skills needed to assess detailed allegations of impropriety
 - be able to show a continuing interest in public life and in probity issues generally.

It also stated that political allegiance would not be taken into account, and the Council's commitment to promoting equality of opportunity.
13. I received 3 expressions of interest, all accompanied by a personal history and statement. I undertook up references on all the people who applied. Despite the relatively low number of expressions of interest, the applicants were of a very high calibre and met the criteria well. Each applicant was interviewed by a panel comprising myself and the Deputy Borough Solicitor. We assessed the applicants against the criteria to decide whom to recommend. We also had regard to the need to balance legal and ethical input to the Committee.

Jeff Lustig
Borough Solicitor & Monitoring Officer

MR ROY BOHRER JP MA CQSW

Mr Bohrer is a resident of Barnet. He is a retired Local Authority Social Services Area Director with experience of working in a number of local authority settings. He is non-executive Director and Vice-Chair of the Barnet Enfield & Haringey Mental Health Trust and also non-executive Director of Enfield Community Care Trust. He has been a magistrate since 1983.

MRS SUSAN RIDDLE BA JP

Mrs Riddle is a resident of Barnet. Following various posts in Children's and Social Services departments, Mrs Riddle served for 13 years as an investigator for the Commission for Local Administration (Ombudsman) and since 2001 as the London Borough of Brent's Corporate Complaints Officer.

A magistrate for several years, Mrs Riddle has recently acted as Bench Chairman.

MR STEPHEN ROSS ACII FRSA

Mr Ross is a resident of Barnet. He is Director, Finance & Administration, Company Secretary and Member of the Board of Governors. Leo Baeck College – Centre for Jewish Education. He is a chartered accountant with over 25 years experience as a financial controller or director in the private sector. Mr Ross has been a member of the Charity Finance Directors Group, Chief Executive's Forum, British Insurance Brokers Association IT Forum, lay member of South Barnet Primary Care Group Board (1999-2001) delegate Barnet Racial Equality Council (1989-1993) and Regional Chairman British Insurance Brokers Association (1999).

AGENDA ITEM: 11.2.2 Page nos. 85 - 89

Meeting	Council
Date	1 March 2005
Subject	OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT – "MR BARKER"
Report of	Monitoring Officer
Summary	This is a further report to the Council concerning a finding of maladministration against the Council

Officer Contributors	Monitoring Officer
Status (public or exempt)	Public
Wards affected	Not applicable
Enclosures	None
For decision by	Council
Function of	Council
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in (if appropriate)	Not applicable

Contact for further information: Hema Parmar (020 8359 2515)

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That, having previously noted the contents of the Ombudsman's report dated 4 February 2003 and 3 previous reports from the Monitoring Officer, the Council note the action taken as referred to in paragraph 7 of this report.**
- 1.2 That the Council note the Ombudsman's intention to issue a further report if the Council does not pay compensation without conditions.**
- 1.3 That having taken account of these reports and the factors set out in paragraph 7, the Council make a decision to accept the Ombudsman's recommendation that "the Council pay the complainant £136,166 to account for any losses to the child and his family, and to compensate the complainant for his time and trouble in pursuing his complaints".**
- 1.4 That the Borough Solicitor be instructed to inform the Local Government Ombudsman of the Council's response to his recommendations.**
- 1.5 That the Borough Solicitor be instructed to notify the solicitor acting for Mr and Mrs Barker and their son of the Council's decision.**

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

- 2.1 Council 4.3.03 – Noted the Monitoring Officer's Report informing the Council of the finding of maladministration.
- 2.2 Council 18.11.03 – Instructed the Borough Solicitor, working in consultation with the Borough Treasurer and the Council's external insurers, to approach and open negotiations with Mr Barker and/or the family's solicitors or other advisors on a "without prejudice" basis seeking to achieve a complete and final settlement of the recommended compensation award for maladministration and all other claims arising out of the same events.
- 2.3 Council 26.10.04 – Decision to accept the Ombudsman's recommendation that "the Council pay the complainants £136,166 to account for any losses to the child and his family, and to compensate the complainant for his time and trouble in pursuing his complaints" on the following basis:
 - That this payment is in full and final settlement incorporating all antecedent claims and complaints made by Mr and Mrs Barker and or by their son against the Council whether yet made or not arising from the delivery of special educational and social care provision during the period from January 1998 to the date on which these terms are incorporated into an agreement signed by the Council and or on behalf of Mr and Mrs Barker and their son.
 - That Mr and Mrs Barker use all reasonable endeavours to co-operate with the Council and facilitate the carrying out of a community care assessment of their son by 31 December 2004 to properly plan future provision and that any payment in full and final settlement be delayed until the satisfactory completion of the community care assessment;
 - That the judicial review proceedings be discontinued;
 - That the costs of the judicial review proceedings form part of this full and final settlement.
- 2.4 The Borough Solicitor was also instructed on each occasion to inform the Ombudsman of the Council's decision.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 None.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

4.1 As referred to in the body of the report.

5. FINANCIAL, STAFFING, ICT AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The Council's external insurers have been provided with a copy of the Ombudsman's report. The excess under the policy is £50,000 and the insurance department has confirmed that the first £50,000 of any settlement reached will be payable from the Insurance policy pursuant to the internal arrangements as agreed. Any payment over and above £50,000 would require further consideration by the Council's external insurer, however, if this is not payable from the Insurance policy, the excess which represents an uninsured loss will have to be funded from balances.

6. LEGAL ISSUES

6.1 My earlier report dated 18 November 2003 concluded that the finding of maladministration and the Council's response to the Ombudsman's recommendations falls to be reported to and decided by the Council.

6.2 Where the Ombudsman has made a finding that injustice has been caused to a person aggrieved in consequence of maladministration the Council must consider the report and notify the Ombudsman of the action which the Council has taken or proposes to take.

6.3 If the Ombudsman

- (a) does not receive the notification required within the specified time, or
- (b) is not satisfied with the action which the Council has taken or proposes to take, or
- (c) does not receive confirmation from the Council that it has taken action as proposed within the specified time to the Ombudsman's satisfaction, he may make a further report setting out those facts and making recommendations.

6.4 In the circumstances referred to in paragraph 6.3, the Ombudsman may require the Council to publish a statement in a local newspaper for two consecutive weeks. The statement shall give details of any action recommended by the Ombudsman, such supporting material as the Ombudsman may require and, if the Council so requires, a statement of the reasons for having taken no action on, or not the action recommended in the report.

7. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

7.1 Constitution: Article 4.02 (l)

8. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

8.1 At its meeting on 26 October 2004, the Council noted my report which recommended that the Council accept the Ombudsman's recommendation on a conditional basis as set out in paragraph 2.3 above. The Council's decision was confirmed in writing to both Mr and Mrs Barker's solicitor and the Ombudsman on 27 October 2004. The offer of payment of compensation on the conditions stated above was rejected and a further claim for judicial review challenging the Council's decision dated 26 October 2004 was

issued in the High Court on 25 January 2005. The Ombudsman has subsequently indicated that he would issue a further report unless the Council agreed to make an unconditional payment. In addition, the Ombudsman indicated on 22 February 2005 that he intends to make an application to be joined as a party to the new court proceedings to enable him to file evidence in respect of his recommendation, which was accepted subject to conditions by the Council on 26 October 2004. It is the Ombudsman's involvement and the new court proceedings which has led Officers to urgently review this case and undertake a further "best interest" analysis at this juncture.

- 8.2 The recommendation and subsequent Council decision on 26 October 2004 to make a conditional payment was genuinely intended to bring closure to these longstanding complaints and legal proceedings and thereby avoid further costs being incurred by the Council. This offer, which in Leading Counsel's opinion was a very generous offer, was surprisingly rejected and has not brought closure.
- 8.3 The Council's Community Care Service have worked unremittingly to engage Mr and Mrs Barker in the carrying out of the community care assessment, which is now complete. The Council's Officers have also worked conscientiously on the establishment of the User Independent Trust, a mechanism for the delivery of the complex care package which is due to be effective before Mr and Mrs Barker son reaches 19 years of age in July 2005.
- 8.4 The Council's Officers continue to believe that it is in the best interests of the parties to bring closure to all of the existing legal proceedings and complaint with the Ombudsman to enable both the Council and the family to move forward in dealing with future provision for Mr and Mrs Barker's son. Closure of all existing matters will enable both parties to make a fresh start, which will be essential to the effective establishment, operation and management of the User Independent Trust. Although in Leading Counsel's opinion, there is a 70% chance that the Council can successfully defend the new court claim, the need to bring closure and move forward with Mr and Mrs Barker coupled with the inherent risks of the further litigation, inevitable costs, and the further Ombudsman report which could leave the Council exposed to further criticism from the Ombudsman and elsewhere outweigh the reasons (which are still valid) for sustaining the previous decision dated 26 October 2004 and continuing to defend the court proceedings. In the circumstances, and given the nature of the findings of maladministration that have been accepted by the Council, the case for defending the new court claim as well as the existing ongoing claim and Ombudsman complaint is outweighed by the reasons to settle and bring closure.

9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 9.1 Local Government Ombudsman's Report dated 4 February 2003.
- 9.2 Any person wishing to inspect this document should telephone 020 8359 2515

10. AUTHOR

- 10.1 Jeff Lustig – Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer

BS: HP