

# Meeting of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet

TO BE HELD ON

Tuesday, 20 December, 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 Janet Rawlings and Flick Heron on 020 8359 2156 and 020 8359 2205 respectively (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

20 December 2005

### Agenda and Timetable

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<b><u>Part 1 - Statutory formalities/ Announcements (15 minutes)</u></b>	7.00pm – 7.15pm	
1.	Prayer		
2.	Apologies for absence		
3.	Minutes of last meeting held on 8 November, 2005		1 - 67
4.	Official announcements		
5.	Declarations of interest		
6.	Any business remaining from last meeting		
	<b><u>Part 5 - Accountability: Agenda Item 10.1 – Comments on the work of Cabinet</u></b>		
10.1	<b>From Councillor Anita Campbell</b>  To comment on the work of the Cabinet with regard to the re-provision of Barnet Register Office.		
10.2	<b>From Councillor Steve Blomer</b>  How does the Councils policy of removing Children's play equipment from the boroughs smaller parks, for what ever reasons including health and safety requirements, and then not replacing such equipment, measure up to the Council often quoted commitment to Barnet's Youth. "		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
10.3	<p><b>From Councillor Linda McFadyen</b></p> <p>To comment on the work of the Cabinet with regard to the lack of festive lights in Burnt Oak.</p>		
10.4	<p><b>From Councillor Wayne Casey</b></p> <p>Comment on the work of the cabinet in relation to access to aids and adaptations for those residents suffering from arthritis.”</p>		
	<p><b><u>Part 2 – Question Time (30 minutes or until 7.45pm, whichever is the longer)</u></b></p>	7.15pm – 7.45pm	
7.	Questions to the Leader and Cabinet		To be circulated separately
	<p><b>Part 3 – Members’ Motions (60 minutes)</b></p>	7.45pm – 8.45pm	
8.	Motions in the order in which notice has been given		
8.1	<p><b>From Councillor Fiona Bulmer</b></p> <p><b>Keep Operations at Barnet!</b></p> <p>Council notes plans to alter services at Barnet and Chase Farm Hospitals.</p> <p>Council further notes these could mean Barnet General stops performing routine operations.</p> <p>Council understands that many ill and infirm people will find it very difficult to travel over to Chase Farm to receive the treatment they desperately need.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council believes that, instead of this rationalisation, the Department of Health should be investing in Barnet and Chase Farm Hospitals to ensure they continue to provide and improve the services they do at present.</p> <p>Council welcomes the campaign spearheaded by local MP Theresa Villiers to ensure the government listens to our concerns.</p> <p>Council calls on Cabinet to support the campaign to keep routine operations at Barnet Hospital, and asks Cabinet to write to the Secretary of State for Health informing her of our opposition to the current proposals.</p>		
8.2	<p><b>From Councillor Kath McGuirk</b></p> <p>Council regrets that graffiti continues to be a problem blighting Barnet's neighbourhoods, and that repeat attacks of graffiti are expensive for residents to repeatedly remove. Council believes that the failure to remove graffiti simply encourages other anti-social behaviour and vandalism, and leads to neighbourhoods feeling run-down and neglected.</p> <p>Council notes that the Conservative administration has broken its 2002 manifesto commitments for "removing all reported graffiti within 48 hours", and to start "a programme to treat all street furniture with anti-graffiti paint". Council regrets that the administration fails to remove graffiti from the vast majority of the borough's roads.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council rejects the view of a Conservative Councillor that graffiti has “artistic merit” and shows “talent”. Council condemns all graffiti, and Council urges the Cabinet to take urgent steps to combat graffiti across the borough.</p> <p>Councillor Kath McGuirk has requested, under Part 4 of the Council’s Constitution, Section 1, 31.5, that if the item is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it be voted upon at the council meeting.</p>		
8.3	<p><b>From Councillor Claire Farrier</b></p> <p>Council supports the existing alcohol free zones of Hendon Central, North Finchley and Finchley Central. Council urges the Cabinet to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the zones, including consideration of any displacement of street drinkers outside of the alcohol free zones into residential areas - such as homeless drinkers and underage drinkers - and any impact on encouraging evening activity in town centres.</p> <p>Council notes that it is not an offence to drink or carry alcohol in alcohol free zones, but that an offence is only committed if the drinker is asked by a police officer to stop or if the person does not surrender alcohol to a police officer when asked to do so. Council supports this discretion given to police officers to target drinkers causing problems.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council notes that Burnt Oak has some of the highest levels of disorder in the borough according to the 2004 Barnet Crime Audit. Council notes that the major complaint of residents to Burnt Oak's Safer Neighbourhood Police Team concern fear of anti-social behaviour, crime and intimidation related to street drinking. Council therefore urges the Cabinet to consider introducing as a priority an alcohol free zone in Burnt Oak.</p> <p>Councillor Claire Farrier has requested, under Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, Section 1, 31.5, that if the item is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it be voted upon at the council meeting.</p>		
8.4	<p><b>From Councillor Ansuya Sodha</b></p> <p>Council believes there should be a firm commitment to equality for all, including elderly and disabled residents, and that the Council should be doing all it can to enable elderly and disabled people to live with dignity in their own homes when they wish to do so.</p> <p>Council regrets that the Administration is now informing elderly and disabled residents needing adaptations to continue living in their own homes that the Council will not fund their adaptations for the remainder of the 2005/6 financial year. Council notes that this means elderly and disabled people may have to wait for 6 to 8 months before they may get adaptations, for example to more easily have a shower or use</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>the toilet, and that this is causing a great deal of hardship and distress to the most vulnerable people in our borough who are trying to live independently.</p> <p>Council urges the Cabinet to urgently review the failure to provide adaptations to elderly and disabled people and to bring forward an urgent report on this matter to the Cabinet meeting on 23 January.</p> <p>Councillor Ansuya Sodha has requested, under Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, Section 1, 31.5, that if the item is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it be voted upon at the council meeting.</p>		
8.5	<p><b>From Councillor Brian Salinger</b></p> <p>Council supports the work undertaken by the Leader of Barnet Council to find a new home for Barnet FC within the Borough.</p> <p>Council notes this has led to his offer for the Club to use part of Montrose Park.</p> <p>Council recognises that planning permission will still be required, and that should an application be made it will be decided on planning merits.</p> <p>Council further recognises that there will need to be ongoing discussions with the Club on the terms on which they would be able to lease the land.</p> <p>Council believes that Barnet Football Club has a valuable role to play in the Borough and will do their best to work with the club to fulfil their potential.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council further calls on the Directors of Barnet FC Ltd and its associated companies to recognise the constraints imposed on the Council by various acts of Parliament, not least in relation to the disposal of property or land.</p>		
<p><b>8.6</b></p>	<p><b>From Councillor Matthew Offord</b></p> <p>Council notes that Transport for London have deposited a Private Bill in Parliament which aims to confer further powers upon TfL in a range of transport related matters.</p> <p>Council is aware that Transport for London inherited several road schemes from the Secretary of State when trunk roads in London were transferred to the Greater London Authority and arrangements were made for the continuity of scheme orders made by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Council notes that such orders were made for improvements to the North Circular Road at Henlys Corner and Golders Green Road, following lengthy public consultation and examination of the proposals at public inquiries. The Council and other stakeholders invested significant effort in the consultation process and public inquiries to ensure that Barnet residents and road users were protected and gained maximum benefit from the schemes.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council is aware Transport for London have been unable to secure funding for the inherited schemes on the North Circular Road, but have confirmed the need for major improvements to reduce congestion, pollution, delays to road users and to improve safety. TfL have been unable to produce alternative proposals to resolve the current problems and to ensure that additional traffic resulting from the growth in North London, as predicted in the London Plan, will be accommodated on the North Circular Road rather than diverting onto borough roads.</p> <p>Council notes that the draft Bill contains a clause which allows Transport for London to revoke orders made by the Secretary of State, but does not specify the process required to do so. Council also notes that orders made by the Secretary of State normally can only be revoked following consultation and if unresolved objections to the revocation are received, a public inquiry must be held.</p> <p>Council believes the Bill may allow Transport for London to revoke the orders without consultation or public inquiry and this could deny the Council, residents, road users and other interested parties, the opportunity to have their views heard and considered.</p>		

Item	Subject	Time for Debate	Page Nos.
	<p>Council also believes that when funding for the major schemes becomes available, the need to remake scheme orders would add to the delay and cost of finally resolving the problems with the unimproved sections of the North Circular Road.</p>		
	<p>Council notes that other clauses in the Bill may have an adverse effect on the Council or the Borough's residents.</p> <p>Council resolves that-</p> <p>1) The Chief Executive be instructed to take all necessary steps to oppose those clauses in the Transport for London Bill which, if enacted, would have an adverse effect on the borough or be against the interests of the Council or the Borough's residents.</p> <p>2) The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Members of Parliament for the borough explaining the Council's position and seeking their support.</p> <p>Councillor Matthew Offord has requested, under Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, Section 1, 31.5, that if the item is not dealt with by the end of the meeting, it be voted upon at the council meeting.</p>		
	<b>Break</b>	8.45pm – 9.00pm	
9	<b>Part 4 – Policy Development (60 minutes)</b>	9.00pm – 10.00pm	
9.1	Administration Item: Budget 2006/07		68
9.2	Opposition Item: Libraries		69

	<b>Part 5 – Accountability (20minutes)</b>	10.00 pm- 10.20pm	
10	Comments on the work of the Cabinet (10 minutes) –		
10.1	<b>From Councillor Wayne Casey</b> To comment upon the work of the Cabinet in relation to the roles and responsibilities of parking control officers.		
10.2	<b>From Councillor Steven Blomer</b> To comment on the work of the Cabinet with regard to anti-social behaviour at Moat Mount and Scratchwood.		
10.3	<b>From Councillor Ansuya Sodha</b> To comment on the dog waste bins which are always so full in West Hendon's parks.		
11.	Questions to council representatives on outside bodies (10 minutes)		
	<b>Part 6 – Statutory Council Business (40 minutes)</b>	10.20pm – 11.00pm	
12.	Reports from Cabinet		
13.	Reports from Overview and Scrutiny committees		
14.	Reports from Other Committees		
15.	Reports of Officers		
15.1	Chief Executive		
1.	Resoulgts of Bye – election : High Barnet ward		To Follow
15.2	Democratic Services Manager		70 - 80
1.	Vacancies on School Governing Bodies		

2.	Vacancies arising from reconstitution of School Governing Bodies		
3.	Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies		
4.	Report exempted from the call – in process		
15.3	Monitoring Officer		

John Marr, Democratic Services Manager  
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, 8 November, 2005

### PRESENT:

\*The Worshipful the Mayor (Councillor Andreas Tambourides)

\*The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Victor Lyon, BA (Hons))

### Councillors:

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

\*denotes Member present

### 81. PRAYER (Agenda Item 1):

The Mayor's Chaplain offered prayer.

### 82. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2):

None.

### 83. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 13 SEPTEMBER 2005 (Agenda Item 3):

**RESOLVED –That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September, 2005 be approved.**

**84. OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda Item 4):**

A minute's silence was held to remember former Councillor Michael Cohen, who served on the Council from 1972.

The Worshipful the Mayor referred to the achievements of the Council's Waste and Sustainability Team for winning the trophy for the Best Local Authority Initiative in the National Awards for Excellence in Recycling and Waste Management. The Initiative that impressed the judges was Barnet's compulsory recycling scheme and the hard work and dedication of the Waste and Sustainability Team in ensuring the success of the Initiative, together with ECT Recycling Ltd.

The Worshipful the Mayor also congratulated Nicola Buck, Environmental Services Manager (Waste Strategy), on winning the trophy for the Recycling Officer of the Year at the prestigious National Recycling Awards, for her work in breaking new ground with the introduction of the compulsory recycling initiative.

The Worshipful the Mayor presented the trophies and the Council congratulated all the members of the Waste and Sustainability Team.

**85. TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS (Agenda Item 5):**

The Members listed below declared personal and prejudicial interests in the Report of the Director of Resources relating to the erection of a Spike Milligan Statue at Avenue House, East End Road, N3 (Agenda item 15.1) because they were either Trustees or Substitute Trustees of Avenue House Estate Management. The members concerned left the room during the discussion of the item and did not participate in the decision – making process:

- Councillor Leslie Sussman (Trustee)
- Councillor Jeremy Davies (Trustee)
- Councillor Alan Schneiderman (Trustee)
- Councillor Jim Tierney (Substitute)
- Eva Greenspan (Substitute)
- Susette Palmer (Substitute)

The Members listed below declared personal and prejudicial interests in Motion 8.6 in the name of Councillor Wayne Casey relating to the Licensing Act 2003, because of their involvement with the Licensing Committee:

- Councillor Blomer
- Jim Tierney
- Soon – Hoe Teh

Council noted the Borough Solicitor's advice that, generally, Members appointed to a Council Committee by the Council did not have to declare that appointment as an interest.

Councillor Robert Newton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the Report of Cabinet dated 11 October, 2005, relating to the Unitary Development Plan because of his involvement in representations concerning "Local Agenda 21" issues. Councillor Newton left the room and did not participate in the decision – making process.

Councillor Soon- Hoe Teh declared a personal interest in Agenda item 9.1, the Administration Policy Item relating to Barnet PCT, because he was a non – executive member of the PCT.

Councillor Jeremy Davies reported that, although he worked for the NHS, he had received a dispensation from the Secretary of State to speak and vote on Agenda item 9.1.

**86. PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES:**

In accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure rule 14.1.2, Councillor Alison Moore moved that the Council Suspend Council Procedure Rules to enable the blind workers to speak before Motion 8.3. The Motion was duly seconded by Councillor Danish Chopra.

Upon being put to the vote the Motion was lost.

**87. MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Worshipful the Mayor made a statement on the way he intended to manage future Council meetings, and his expectations regarding Members' conduct.

**88. 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.

**89. VARIATION OF ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Joan Scannell, duly seconded, moved that the order of business relating to Agenda Item 8 be varied so that Motions 8.4, 8.6 and 8.5 be heard first.

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

**RESOLVED – That the order of business be varied to allow Motions 8.4, 8.6 and 8.5 to be heard first.**

Councillor Alison Moore, duly seconded, moved that the order of business relating to Agenda item 8 be varied so that Motions 8.3, 8.5 and 8.6 could be heard first.

Upon being put to the vote the Motion was lost.

Councillor Wayne Casey, duly seconded, moved an amendment to the Council's decision that Motion 8.3 be heard in place of Motion 8.6.

Upon being put to the vote the Motion was lost.

**90. MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR CHRIS HARRIS (Agenda item 8.2)**

Motion 8.2 in the name of Councillor Chris Harris was moved by Councillor Andrew Harper.

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

**RESOLVED - Council notes that there are around 380 Looked After Children in Barnet. Council is aware that all too often, these young people suffer from poorer educational attainment than those not in care.**

**Council believes this is a situation that must be tackled, in order that all children can reach the same goals in life whatever background they come from.**

**Council therefore welcomes Barnet’s pioneering “Education Champions for Children” pilot scheme, which gives looked after children a dedicated Council Official who looks out for their interests just as a parent would.**

**Council *believes* that this is the only such scheme in the entire country, and notes it is proving so successful that other authorities now want to copy it.**

**Council welcomes the news that, as a result of this scheme, twice as many children in care in Barnet have achieved 5 or more A\* to C Grades at GCSE this year as in Britain as a whole, and 10 per cent more than last year in Barnet.**

**Council calls on Cabinet to welcome the achievements of all our children in care this year, and to ensure this excellent scheme is fully supported.**

**91. MOTION 8.6 IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR WAYNE CASEY (Agenda Items 8.6 and 15.2 10(v))**

With the consent of the Worshipful the Mayor, in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 17.B.1, Councillor Wayne Casey amended this motion. The Motion, as amended was moved. An amendment in the name of Councillor Alan Schneiderman was moved. Debate ensued.

Upon being put to the vote the amendment was declared lost. Ten Members demanded a Division on the voting on the amendment. Upon being taken, the results of the Division were declared as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>	<b>Absent when vote taken</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Campbell	Tambourides	Blomer	Turner
Chopra	Lyon	Farrier	
Ghosh	Braun	Slocombe	
Hutton	Bulmer	Sodha	
Langton	Burton	Teh	
Lyons	Casey	Tierney	
McFadyen	Jack Cohen		
McGuirk	Melvin Cohen		
Mencer	Coleman		
Moore	David		
Rawlings	Davies		
Colin Rogers	Davis		
Paul Rogers	Dunner		
Gill Sargeant	Edson		
Schneiderman	Evans		

Yeoman	Finn		
Zubairi	Freer		
	Gordon		
	Greenspan		
	Harper		
	Harris		
	Hart		
	Hillan		
	Hooker		
	Hope		
	Lester		
	Marshall		
	Naghar		
	Newton		
	Offord		
	Monroe Palmer		
	Susette Palmer		
	Prentice		
	Salinger		
	Scannell		
	Silverstone		
	Steinberg		
	Sussman		

For 17  
Against 38  
Not Voting 6  
Absent 1  
Vacancy 1

The amendment was declared lost.

Upon being put to the vote the substantive motion was declared carried. Ten Members demanded a division on the voting on the substantive motion. Upon being taken, the results of the division were declared as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>	<b>Absent when vote taken</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Tambourides	Lyons	Blomer	Turner
Lyon		Campbell	
Braun		Chopra	
Bulmer		Farrier	
Burton		Ghosh	
Casey		Hutton	
Jack Cohen		Langton	
Melvin Cohen		McFadyen	
Coleman		McGuirk	
David		Mencer	
Davies		Moore	
Davis		Rawlings	
Dunner		Colin Rogers	
Edson		Paul Rogers	

Evans		Gill Sargeant	
Finn		Schneiderman	
Freer		Slocombe	
Gordon		Sodha	
Greenspan		Teh	
Harper		Tierney	
Harris		Yeoman	
Hart		Zubairi	
Hillan			
Hooker			
Hope			
Lester			
Marshall			
Naghar			
Newton			
Offord			
Monroe Palmer			
Susette Palmer			
Prentice			
Salinger			
Scannell			
Silverstone			
Steinberg			
Sussman			

For 38  
Against 1  
Not Voting 22  
Absent 1  
Vacancy 1

The substantive motion was therefore carried and the Council

**RESOLVED –**

**Council Notes –**

**That the Prayer against the Licensing Act 2003 has been defeated by the government’s majority**

**15% national rise in “violent offences committed in connection with licensed premises” in the last year to almost 1,000 a week.**

**In England and Wales there was an increase by 18.4% in alcohol-related deaths in 2004 on 2003 figures.**

**The overall cost to society of alcohol related problems is up to £20bn.**

**Considerable local disquiet regarding increasing opening hours of licensed premises.**

**The difficulty for councillors to effectively represent their ward residents in regard to applications.**

**The Prayer mechanism currently being debated in Parliament.**

**Council Believes –**  
That the Licensing Act 2003 was poorly drafted, and enacted.

That this new regime will bring further problems to the health and safety of the residents of Barnet

That if the Licensing Act 2003 is scrapped it will not bring chaos to the system, as these licenses are not coming into effect until 24<sup>th</sup> November and that existing licensing will cover it.

**Council Requests –**  
The Chief Executive to write to all three Members of Parliament in Barnet to lobby their colleagues in the House of Lords to vote in favour of the Licensing Laws motion during the Opposition Day debate.

**92. MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR JOHN MARSHALL (Agenda items 8.5 and 15.2.10(iv))**

Motion 8.5 in the name of Councillor John Marshall and an amendment in the name of Councillor Barry Rawlings were put to the vote without debate. The amendment was declared lost and the substantive motion declared carried.

**RESOLVED – Council welcomes the excellent GCSE and A-Level results across the Borough, and praises our children's achievements.**

Council notes that, in the provisional tables for 2005, the Borough comes in at 14<sup>th</sup> place nationwide this year for GCSE results, out of nearly 150 authorities, with 62% of our students gaining 5 A\*-C Grades.

Council further notes this compares very well to England and Outer London at 56% and the Capital as a whole at 54%. Our place in the table contrasts favourably with neighbouring Harrow (25<sup>th</sup>), Brent (46<sup>th</sup>), Camden (93<sup>rd</sup>), and Haringey (123<sup>rd</sup>).

Council welcomes the dramatic decline in the number of Barnet Schools in Special Measures in the past 18 months.

Council believes these achievements are testament to the hard work of pupils and teachers across the Borough, working in partnership with the Council to drive up standards.

Council calls on Cabinet to support the ongoing hard work of schools, staff and students across this Borough, and to work to raise standards in Barnet still further.

**93. MOTION 8.1 THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR ALAN SCHNEIDERMAN (Agenda Items 8.1 and 15.1.10 (i))**

Motion 8.1 in the name of Councillor Alan Schneiderman and an amendment in the name of Councillor John Marshall were put to the vote without debate. The amendment was declared carried. The substantive motion was declared carried.

**RESOLVED - Council welcomes the work the administration has done in involving *Connexions* service with our youth work, and other improvements made to the service since 2002.**

**Council further welcomes ongoing initiatives to improve the Youth Service, including providing after-hours activities for young people through the Extended Schools programme.**

**Council notes that the YMCA-run venture facility at Church Farm was initiated by Barnet Council through the efforts of local ward Councillors Hillan and Evans and the scheme was passed unanimously by Cabinet earlier this year.**

**Council calls on Cabinet to welcome the innovative changes made to Youth Services since 2002, and urges them to keep up the good work.**

**94. MOTION 8.2 IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR DANISH CHOPRA (Agenda Items 8. and 15.1.110 (ii):**

Motion 8.2 in the name of Councillor Danish Chopra and an amendment in the name of Councillor Mike Freer were put to the vote without debate. The amendment was declared carried. The substantive motion was declared carried.

**RESOLVED – Council notes the administration continues to work to involve residents in meaningful consultation as part of decision-making.**

**Council welcomes the Annual Residents' Survey 2004/5 that found 73 % of residents feel the Council keeps them informed, as against only 57% for London as a whole.**

**Council also notes that Survey found 71% thought the Council is doing a "Good Job" – the highest in the Capital.**

**Council notes that no Council can ever consult on the final level of Council Tax: this depends on the amount of Grant available from Central Government, which is decided after consultation has begun.**

**Council further notes that the overwhelming majority (over 90 %) of London Boroughs do not use a mailshot as part of Budget Consultation.**

**Council welcomes the news that, in addition to the Open Day, residents will be able to email their views on the Budget, and will be kept up to date using *Barnet First*, which is delivered free to every home in the Borough.**

**Council urges Cabinet to support the initiative of using both  
*Barnet First* and the Open Day to consult with its residents.**

**95. MOTION 8.3 IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR ALISON MOORE (Agenda items 8.3 and 15.2.10(iii)).**

Motion 8.3 in the name of Councillor Alison Moore and an amendment in the name of Councillor Fiona Bulmer were put to the vote without debate. The amendment was declared carried. The substantive motion was declared carried.

Ten Members demanded a division on the voting on the substantive motion. Upon being taken, the results of the division were declared as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>	<b>Absent when vote taken</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Tambourides	Blomer		Turner
Lyon	Campbell		
Braun	Casey		
Bulmer	Chopra		
Burton	Jack Cohen		
Melvin Cohen	Jeremy Davies		
Coleman	Farrier		
David	Ghosh		
Davis	Hooker		
Dunner	Hutton		
Edson	Langton		
Evans	Lyons		
Finn	McFadyen		
Freer	McGuirk		
Gordon	Mencer		
Greenspan	Moore		
Harper	Monroe Palmer		
Harris	Susette Palmer		
Hart	Rawlings		
Hillan	Colin Rogers		
Hope	Paul Rogers		
Lester	Gill Sargeant		
Marshall	Schneiderman		
Naghar	Slocombe		
Newton	Sodha		
Offord	Teh		
Prentice	Tierney		
Salinger	Yeoman		
Scannell	Zubairi		
Silverstone			
Steinberg			
Sussman			

For           32  
Against      29

Not Voting	0
Absent	1
Vacancy	1

The substantive motion was declared carried and Council

**RESOLVED – Council notes the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee has referred Cabinet decision on Sheltered Workshop Funding back to Cabinet in order to ask the employers of the affected individuals to review again whether there are any alternative sources of funding.**

**Council notes that research by the Local Government Association shows that there is a £800 million gap between the funding provided by central government and the amount council social services departments need to meet the demands on their services.**

**Council notes and appreciates the excellent work carried out by Barnet's Social Services department in managing those funding pressures and supporting thousands of vulnerable people across the Borough. This includes providing more than 800,000 hours of home care a year, 185, 000 day care places a year, as well as a range of residential provision and other support for those with more complex needs.**

#### **96. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

In accordance with the Agenda, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for 15 minutes.

The meeting reconvened at 9.17pm

#### **97. ADMINISTRATION POLICY ITEM (Agenda Items 9.1 and 15.2.10. (vi))**

Councillor Brian Salinger proposed the item and the amendment in his name and moved the item as amended be adopted. An amendment in the name of Councillor Linda McFadyen was moved. Debate ensued. Upon being to the vote, the amendment in the name of Councillor Linda McFadyen was declared lost. Upon being put to the vote, the substantive motion was declared carried.

**RESOLVED - Council notes that Barnet Primary Care Trust (PCT), which currently provides primary and community healthcare for Barnet residents and which also commissions hospital and community services for them, works in co-terminosity with Barnet Council.**

**Council further notes the Government had put forward proposals to decrease the number of PCTs across London, and enlarge the areas they cover.**

**Council believes that this could have damaged the current joint working relationships between the PCT and Barnet Council, especially work to support the vulnerable, including the elderly and children, as well as efforts to tackle anti-social behaviour.**

**Council notes the ALG Leaders' meeting on 11 October, which saw Borough Leaders, of all political parties, calling for PCTs to continue to be coterminous with London Borough boundaries.**

**Council further notes that while the ALG committee agreed with proposals to make PCTs commissioners of a wider range of healthcare, they pressed for a stronger role for local Councils both within this arrangement, and in their powers to scrutinise local changes in the delivery of healthcare.**

**Council however welcomes the recent announcement by the Secretary of State for Health that co-terminosity between PCTs and Boroughs will be preserved.**

**Council calls on Cabinet to write to the Department of Health to applaud this decision to preserve co-terminosity that Council feels is in the best interests of all ill and infirm people in Barnet.**

**98. OPPOSITION POLICY ITEM (Agenda Item 9.2, and 15.2.10 (vii))**

Councillor Anita Campbell proposed the item and moved that it be adopted. An amendment in the name of Councillor John Marshall was moved. Debate ensued. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried. The substantive motion was declared carried.

**RESOLVED – Council welcomes the improvement in the Youth Service since 2002.**

**Council believes that the emphasis on detached youth workers is correct.**

**Council welcomes the development of the extended schools concept that will provide additional facilities to the young people of Barnet.**

**Council calls on Cabinet to reiterate our commitment to a First Class Education Service, access to which should be the birthright of every child, and our commitment to improving the quality of vocational training.**

**99. VARIATION OF ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Brian Salinger, duly seconded, moved that the order of business relating to Agenda Item 8 be varied so that Part 6 Statutory Business be dealt with before Part 5, Accountability. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was declared carried.

**RESOLVED – That the order of business be varied to allow Part 6, Statutory Business to be heard before Part 5, Accountability.**

**100. STATUTORY COUNCIL BUSINESS (Agenda Items 12 and 15.)**

In accordance with Procedure Rule 43, the Worshipful the Mayor allocated 25 minutes for Agenda Item 12, and 15 minutes for Agenda Item 15.

**101. REPORT OF CABINET 11 OCTOBER 2005 (Agenda Items 12.1 and 15.2.6 and 13.)**

Councillor Brian Salinger moved reception and Councillor Melvin Cohen moved adoption of the Report of Cabinet dated 11 October 2005, with the following recommendations:

**“1. UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – DECISION TO ADOPT (Cab Dec 16/6/2003 – 4) (Report of the Cabinet Member for Planning & Licensing Services – Agenda Item 4):**

Cabinet considered the report of the Cabinet Member for Planning & Licensing Services which has been circulated separately to all members of the Council.

In introducing his report the Cabinet Member made a statement in relation to press reports about Barnet Football Club and the Green Belt section of the Plan. He indicated that the Council had received no formal objection from Barnet Football Club to the advertised post-inquiry modifications. The Council had however received a request from the Chairman of the Club to advise him of the latest position on the UDP. A meeting had taken place with the Chairman and he had been advised of the latest proposed changes to the Green Belt section of the Plan as a result of formal representation from GOL. The Chairman had discussed an alternative form of wording with an officer and this had been taken away for further consideration. Upon further consideration, including discussion with Legal officers and reference back to the Inspector’s report, the proposed wording had not been considered appropriate and alternative wording had been included as set out on page 51 of the Cabinet Member’s report. The Cabinet Member stated that he was satisfied with the latest proposed changes to paragraph 5.3.22 contained in his report.

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Member’s report, Cabinet

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND**

**That Council**

- a) agree the schedule of proposed modifications to the draft UDP set out in Appendix A to the Cabinet Member’s report;
- b) agree that these modifications will not materially affect the Plan; and
- c) agree to give notice to adopt the Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) England Regulations 1999.”

Councillor Melvin Cohen also referred to the schedule attached to the Democratic Manager’s Report, which contained the corrected typographical errors.

Debate ensued.

Upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED – That the Report of Cabinet dated 11 October, 2005, as amended by Appendix Revised E be approved and adopted.**

**102 ERECTION OF SPIKE MILLIGAN STATUE, AVENUE HOUSE, EAST END ROAD, N3 (Finchley – Church End Ward) (Report of the Director of Resources Agenda Item 15.1).**

Councillor Mike Freer advised that the correct total fees payable by the Avenue House Estate Management were £850.

**RESOLVED – That, in its capacity as Corporate Trustees of The Avenue House Estate, the Council consents to the erection of a full life-size bronze statue of Spike Milligan in the grounds of Avenue House by Avenue House Estate Management; that the Legal Department be instructed to complete the necessary documentation; and that the total fees payable to the Council be £850.**

**103. EXECUTIVE DECISIONS AND THE CALL – IN PROCESS - REVIEW  
(Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Agenda Item 15.2 .1):  
RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report of the Democratic Services Manager be noted.**
- (2) That the Constitution Review Committee consider the operation of the provisions for call-in and urgency and whether there is a need for change and report on the outcome to the Council, and that the Democratic Services Manager be instructed to make the appropriate arrangements.**
- (3) That the Chief Internal Auditor be instructed to report to the Audit Committee on the robustness of the project planning procedures undertaken by Heads of Service to ensure that adequate provision is made for the Council’s formal decision – making processes.**

**104. VACANCIES ON SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Agenda Item 15.1.2):**

The Democratic Services Manager’s report set out details of the appointments or nominations to be made.

Nominations in the names of Councillors Joan Scannell, Danish Chopra and Jeremy Davies were moved.

**RESOLVED –**

**That the following persons be appointed or nominated as the case may require filling the vacancies referred to for the period indicated in the report of the Democratic Services Manager:**

<b>VACANCY REFERENCE</b>	<b>PARTICULARS OF APPOINTMENT OR NOMINATION</b>	<b>PERSON APPOINTED OR NOMINATED</b>
VP3.1	Annunciation RC Infant School	Mr Charles Macauley
P.23.1	Brookland Infant and Brookland Junior Schools	Mr Bilal Dogar
P.10.3	Brunswick Park Primary School	Mrs Lisa Rutter
P.11.1	Church Hill School	Defer
P.39.1	Courtland JMI School	Mr David Michael Rose
P.07.2	Danegrove Primary School	Mr Robert Rams
P.38.a.1	Deansbrook Infant School	Defer
S.04.4	East Brnet School	Councillor Fiona Bulmer
S.04.5	East Barnet School	Ms Cathy Glasman
P.40.2	Fairway Primary School	Defer
P.48.2	Hampden Way Nursery School	Mr Daniel Webber
SP.02.2	Northway School	Defer

SP.03.2	Oakleigh School	Defer
VP10.2	Our Lady of L:ourdes	Mrs S Ramsden
S11.1	Queen Elizabeth's Girls	Mr Stephen Sowerby
S11.3	Queen Elizabeth's Girls	Mrs Kathy Levine
VP.32.2	St Johns CE Primary School	Mr Gareth Knight
VP.21a.1	St Johns NW4	Defer
VP.16.1	St Joseph's RC Junior School	Defer
P.16.1	Summerside Primary School	Mr Reuben Thompstone( Mr Geof Cooke was unsuccessful)
P.50.4	The Orion Primary and Goldbeaters Primary Schools	Defer (Councillor Farrier was unsuccessful)

**105. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW TEMPORARY GOVERNING BODY FOR THE AKIVA SCHOOL (Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Agenda item 15.2.3).**

A nomination in the name of Councillor Joan Scannell was moved.

**RESOLVED –**

**That Councillor Andrew Harper be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Temporary Governing Body for the Akiva School.**

**106. VACANCIES ARISING FROM RECONSTITUTION OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (Report of the Democratic Services Manager - Agenda Item 15.2.5):**

The Democratic Services Manager's report set out details of the appointments or nominations to be made.

Nominations in the names of Councillors Joan Scannell, Danish Chopra and Jeremy Davies were moved.

**RESOLVED –**

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

VACANCY REFERENCE	PARTICULARS OF APPOINTMENT OR NOMINATION	PERSON APPOINTED OR NOMINATED
P.41.1	Dollis Infant School	Ms S de Lance
P.41.4	Dollis Infant School	Mr Vinod Sodha
P.40.1	Fairway Primary School	Mrs Gwen Brandon
P.40.3	Fairway Primary School	Ms Jackie Irvén

**107. REPRESENTATION OF THE COUNCIL ON OUTSIDE BODIES (Report of the Democratic Services Manager - Agenda Item 15.2.5):**

The Democratic Services Manager's report set out details of the appointments or nominations to be made.

Nominations in the names of Councillor Joan Scannell and Councillor Danish Chopra were moved.

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

the period indicated in the report of the Democratic Services Manager:

VACANCY REFERENCE	PARTICULARS OF APPOINTMENT OR NOMINATION	PERSON APPOINTED OR NOMINATED
0112 Member	Adoption and Permanency Panel	Councillor Agnes Slocombe
0228c Member	Arts Depot Trust Ltd	Councillor Katia David (Councillor Alan Schneiderman was unsuccessful)
1055 Member	Eleanor Palmers Charity	Councillor Wendy Prentice (Mr Tim Roberts)
1062	Fostering Approvals Panel	Councillor Maureen Braun
1063	Fostering Approvals Panel	Councillor Anne Hutton

**108. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Report of the Democratic Manager – Agenda item 15.2.7)**

The Council were advised that Councillor Alison Moore was now the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Moore being the Leader of the largest political group other than the group of which the Leader of the Council is a member.

**109. AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION (Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Agenda Item 15.2.8)**

**RESOLVED – That the Democratic Services manager be instructed to make the amendments listed below to the Council's Constitution, and to publish the changes:**

Constitution Reference	Amendment
Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions - Powers delegated to Chief Officers Paragraph 6.1	Third bullet point to be altered to refer to the limits placed on Chief Officers by Contract Procedure Rules.
Part 4 – Council Procedure Rules- Section 3 – Panels and Consultative Bodies Paragraph 1	The reference to Substitute Members in the fourth column should be replaced with “Employees’ Side Members”
Contract Procedure Rules – Paragraph 9 Post Tender Negotiations – Paragraph 9.1	The reference to the Cabinet Member for Value and Effectiveness to be replaced with “ the Cabinet Member with portfolio responsibility for Procurement”
Rules for the Disposal of	Replace reference to the Director of

Land and Real Property	Community and Economic Development (DE&CD) with “Director of Resources (DOR)”
Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules – Paragraph 6	References to paragraph 9 (virement) and paragraph 10 (in year changes to the statutory policy framework) to be replaced with “ paragraphs 3.8 and 6.6 of Part 3, of the Council’s Constitution (virement)” and “paragraph 8 (in year changes to the statutory policy framework”, respectively.

**110 CHANGES IN COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS (Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Agenda Items 9 and 14):**

**RESOLVED - That the following changes be made to the membership of the Committees indicated:**

- **Teachers Joint Negotiation and Consultation Committee – Councillor Gill Sargeant to replace Councillor Alison Moore**
- **Audit Committee – Councillor Ansuya Sodha to replace Councillor Alison Moore as a Substitute.**
- **Resources, Performance and Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Soon-Hoe Teh to replace Councillor Alison Moore as Substitute**
- **Councillor Schneiderman to replace Councillor Yeoman as a Member of the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee**
- **Councillor Tierney to replace Councillor Schneiderman as a Substitute Member of the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee**
- **Councillor Yeoman to replace Councillor Moore as a Member of the Planning and Environment Committee.**

**111. MEMBERS’ ALLOWANCES SCHEME 2005 – 2006 : AMENDMENT (Report of the Democratic Services Manager – Item 15.2.12):**

**RESOLVED –**

1. **That, having regard to the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel on 23 September 2005, the Members’ Allowances Scheme for the year 2005/06 be amended:**
  - i. **In Schedule 1 of the Scheme, to include payment of a Scale 4 Special Responsibility Allowance (currently £4,250) to the Chairman of the Audit Committee, backdated to the appointment of that Committee by the Annual Meeting of Council on 17 May 2005;**
  - ii. **In Section 4.4.1 of the Scheme, to include an express statement that the allowance be paid on a “per cared for” basis; and**
  - iii. **To delete Appendix A of Schedule 2 to the Scheme (List of Approved Conferences), and to delete existing Paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 to the Scheme, and substitute the words: “Conferences and meetings 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 outside bodies being conferences where it is considered that there is a direct connection with a function of this Council.**

**"The IRP will review uptake of allowances in connection with attendance at such conferences and meetings annually to ascertain whether any recommendations need to be made to the Council in this respect."**

- 2. That the Cabinet Resources Committee be requested to consider financial provision for payment of the SRA for the Audit Committee Chairman from 6 April 2006; and**
- 3. That the Democratic Services Manager be instructed to publish the changes to the Scheme.**

The meeting finished at 10:58pm

Note : The business in Part 5, Agenda Item 10, Comments of the Work of Cabinet and also as contained in Item 15.2 .11 of the Democratic Services Manager's Report, would be placed on the Agenda for the next meeting, at Agenda Item 6.

**Council Questions to Cabinet Members  
8 November 2005  
Supplementary Questions and Responses**

**Question No. 1**

**Councillor Robert Newton**

What was the net cost per tonne collected of the collections through the "Black Box" doorstep recycling scheme in the years 2002/3, 2003/4, 2004/5 and 2005/6 (to date)?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The following table shows the net cost per tonne collected on the black box recycling scheme:

Year	Net cost per tonne collected
2002/03	£127.17
2003/04	£93.36
2004/05	£76.32
2005/06	£47.19*

\*The figure for 2005/06 is an estimate based on predicted tonnage collected.

**Supplementary Question No. 1**

**Councillor Robert Newton**

Thank you Mr Mayor. These are very impressive recycling results and a tribute to the driving vision of Councillor Offord and Councillor Coleman before him. My supplementary question is, would the Cabinet Member join me in congratulating our officers and our contractors ECT for their excellent work in achieving such a cost effective doorstep recycling service and would he also allow me to ask him to pass on my personal congratulations to Nicola Buck for winning the Recycling Officer of the Year Award and also all those involved in the Council's Compulsory Recycling Scheme for winning the awards for the Best Local Authority Initiative in 2005. Thank you.

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Not only will I join in with your congratulations as I did earlier on behalf of the Council, but I'd also like to thank yourself and Councillor Evans who have always been very good in supporting both myself and, I believe, Councillor Coleman who was very proactive in the recycling agenda, but most of all I think it's important to stress the way we worked with ECT, again with our staff, in sweating the contract and making it work.

The Conservatives had initial reservations about the particular contract and we've taken that from our initial reservations and we have now made it work, even though some of the Opposition Members now call for certain goods to be recycled but they originally did not want to see the contract. We will continue with our successful recycling policy. We will continue to achieve our targets and will continue to be a beacon to the rest of the country in the recycling initiatives we promote.

**Question No. 2**

**Councillor Jack Cohen**

Is it correct that Planning Officers have been asking applicants to withdraw their applications to assist the council in meeting government targets?

**Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

The Planning Service does not ask applicants to withdraw applications simply to meet ODPM targets. It offers them the option of a refusal in time with government statutory targets should a proposal be unacceptable and significant changes are necessary to accord with UDP policies, perhaps for instance involving detailed officer negotiations and further public consultations. Alternatively, an applicant has at their discretion the opportunity of withdrawing an unacceptable scheme thereby avoiding a timely refusal and allowing possible amendments to be more fully considered. Applicants often prefer this route, as does the planning service, since it reduces potentially abortive work, appeals and costs and importantly in most cases delivers better quality development. As the Planning Service provides a pre-application advice service many of these problems can be avoided before applications are submitted, and we strongly encourage developers to use the service. Recent Government analysis shows that there is no general evidence of any increased tendency for withdrawn applications since the Government introduced tougher targets. The same applies to Barnet's situation.

**Supplementary Question No. 2**

**Councillor Jack Cohen**

Thank you Councillor Melvin Cohen for your detailed response. I take it from the final two sentences that the government must have had some concerns that councils were using the ploy of asking developers to withdraw their applications in order to meet government targets. Can I draw your attention to two specific cases and ask you to comment on them?

The first relates to an application in my Ward, Tudor House, Llanvanor Road, Golders Green. I have in my possession a letter that was circulated to residents by the applicant dated the 23<sup>rd</sup> of September 2005 in which he tells the residents that he has withdrawn his application in order to assist the Council in meeting its targets. Now, even if that's his interpretation, would you not agree in that case that members of the public may feel that a relationship has been struck up between the applicants and the Council whereby one favour deserves another?

Secondly, I would draw your attention to the most recent planning application at the Planning and Environment Committee earlier this month, the Lonsdale Care Home, Tarling Road, London, N2. In those papers we were told that a planning application was withdrawn on the 26<sup>th</sup> of August 2005 and by a simple deduction on the planning papers that application was resubmitted on the 30<sup>th</sup> of August. The 26<sup>th</sup> of August was a Friday, the 30<sup>th</sup> of August was a Tuesday and the Monday the 29<sup>th</sup> was a bank holiday. So is this an example of bed and breakfasting planning applications whereby it is withdrawn one day and resubmitted the next day simply to meet government targets.

**Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

I cannot comment on individual applications. I will certainly ask the officers to look at these two specific applications. It's a pity you didn't ask me specifically about these before, otherwise I would have had a clear and precise answer for you, but I will have these two particular matters which you refer investigated and you'll be advised.

**Question No. 3**

**Councillor Alison Moore**

If the council really is going to cut the jobs funding for the blind workers, would it be possible for the council to look at alternative methods of maintaining the jobs possibly by phasing out the funding and negotiating with the charities or by giving the workers affected a breathing space to move over to mainstream employment?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

Discussions to date with the three employers have not identified any potential alternative funding sources which could fully or partially replace the existing level of funding provided by the Council. A further request has been made to those employers to review possible alternatives.

**Supplementary Question No. 3**

**Councillor Alison Moore**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I have circulated the letters sent by the three blind charities to the Council offering further negotiations and discussions, which asked that their letters be circulated to Members of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee. Could the Cabinet Member explain why those letters were not circulated to Committee Members and why she persists in saying that the charities are not interested in negotiating with the Council, and I would draw Members' attention particularly to the letter from Stephen Rimmington, and I quote for the fourth time in recent months, 'I am asking that we enter into a dialogue'.

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

What is circulated at Cabinet Scrutiny Committees is not my responsibility, that's the responsibility for the Scrutiny Committee and it would be quite improper for me to intervene in that. I was not asked directly to circulate these things and clearly I would not intervene in that way.

Mr Rimmington, we have had frequent correspondence and conversations with him but have not yet been able to come up with a solution. I've made clear that, in the light of the Cabinet Overview decision, that it would go back to the employers to see if they can come up with alternative sources of funding but as yet they have not been able to do so. But the reality is that we are faced with a budget shortfall that the Local Government Association have made quite clear across the country, that the central government is providing £800million less than it should be for adult social services and that means we have to take tough budget decisions and if the Labour Party don't understand, well I wonder why they didn't put a provision in their alternative budget six months ago. So I think Councillor Moore's points on all this are completely spurious.

**Question No. 4**

**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Are there any proposals for the future of the Edson Centre in Pavilion Way (off Deansbrook Road)?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Officers have been giving consideration to the future of this property.

When it was originally transferred to the Council the previous freehold owner imposed some restrictions on the use of the premises to a public sports facility only. The history of the premises since it was transferred to the Council has demonstrated that it is not financially viable to operate the facility (by the Council or by the private/voluntary sector) for public.

The restrictions are frustrating alternative methods of using the existing facilities or consideration of suitable alternative uses for the premises. Because of this officers have been in communication with the previous owners and a release of the restriction has been discussed. This will need to be the subject of discussions with Sport England and officers will be doing this shortly.

In the meantime the premises has been secured against trespass and maintenance and rubbish clearance is undertaken when necessary.

**Supplementary Question No. 4**

**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Mr Mayor, will the Cabinet Member before he decides to use this site for any purpose or recommends using this site for any other purpose, will he ensure that all sporting options have been explored.

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

I'm happy to give that reassurance to Councillor Coleman.

**Question No. 5****Councillor Susette Palmer**

Is the cabinet member ashamed that Barnet has the second lowest expenditure on the Youth Service of any Borough in the entire country?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

I believe that the effectiveness of the Youth Service is measured by out-turns rather than expenditure. When she was in the Cabinet the youth service was in disarray as evidenced by the 2002 OFSTED. It has subsequently improved dramatically.

**Supplementary Question No. 5****Councillor Susette Palmer**

Perhaps Councillor Marshall will be kind enough to furnish me with details of how many youth workers there were in this Borough, detached youth workers there were in this Borough in 2001/2 and how many there are now? How many youth clubs there were in 2001/2 and how many there are now? And how many sailing and canoe clubs were supported in 2001/2 and how many there are now? I'm happy to have this circulated in writing later.

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

Mr Mayor, of course that information will be provided. If Councillor Palmer wanted it she could have asked for it as part of her question. She failed to do so. What I will point out to Councillor Palmer is this, that in 2002 when the Youth Service was examined by Ofsted as a result of the neglect of eight years of Labour and Liberal control, it failed the Ofsted inspection. She should hold her head in shame because of the fact that when she had influence on this Council as a Member of the Cabinet she failed to use it to build up the Youth Service, she ran it down.

**Question No. 6****Councillor Danish Chopra**

If the new cabinet member for resources would pay tribute to the former cabinet member for resources Mr Kanti Patel's achievement of overspending by £6million in the first four months of the current financial year including over £1million on private consultants, offices, staff, agency staff and management.

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Former Councillors achievements are wide and varied but Councillor Chopra's assertion is fallacious. Councillor Chopra seems to have forgotten the endemic budgetary overspends and virements when he was responsible for the Council's finances and in phrasing this question he has forgotten the underspends achieved through careful budgeting that have been achieved. The budget monitoring report to Cabinet Resources reported a small overspend.

**Supplementary Question No. 6****Councillor Danish Chopra**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Clearly despite the overspend Councillor Freer thinks that former Councillor Patel did a good job. Does he therefore intend to follow in his footsteps?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

First of all could I congratulate Councillor Chopra on his elevation to the Deputy Leader of the Labour Group? After three leaders in three years you're slowly inching forward to the prize but rather like Gordon Brown he remains dark and broody but financially incompetent.

Former Councillor Patel's achievements are far and wide and there are many steps of his that I will follow in but his most recent ones are not the ones I'll be following in.

**Question No. 7****Councillor Brian Coleman**

Will the Cabinet Member update the Council on progress towards a more "healthy eating" agenda in relation to our School meals service?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

The introduction of healthier lunches proceeds apace. I know that the Councillor has enjoyed a healthy lunch at Ravenscroft School. I have enjoyed healthy lunches at several schools. Where healthy lunches have been introduced they have been very popular with pupils and teachers. In addition behaviour has improved. The roll out will continue next term with more schools enjoying these meals. Barnet currently spends more on school lunches than most boroughs.

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

Thank you Mr Mayor. Can I ask Councillor Marshall, in pursuance of the healthy agenda, would you like to tell the Council the position of beef on our school menus?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

Mr Mayor, I'm very happy to tell the Council that I have signed a delegated powers report which is going to bring beef back onto the menu. I think it's long overdue and I'm sure many children and many parents and many teachers will welcome the fact that additional choice is going to be given to Borough children. I think that everyone who has seen the new healthier meals recognises that they're innovative and successful and those teachers I've spoken to have said that the behaviour of the children in the afternoons when they've had a healthy lunch is very much better than it was before, and I know how much Councillor Coleman enjoyed the lunch he had at Ravenscroft School.

**Question No. 8****Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Would the Cabinet Member for Resources please confirm the current actual budget overspend and what is the projected year end position?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The report to Cabinet Resources of 26<sup>th</sup> September reported a small overspend of £781,000. I and my colleagues expect to deliver a balanced budget.

**Supplementary Question No. 8****Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Could I ask the Cabinet Member, Mike Freer, if the savings that he's proposing within his monitoring report, and bearing in mind we're about half-way through the year, are not realised and the Gershon efficiency savings that are yet to be realised aren't realised, what would the budget overspend be of the Council on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March next year?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

I'm afraid the Councillor is dealing on a false premise. As I've said in my answer, the efficiency savings will be delivered and we will bring budgets in as balance, as I have said. In terms of the Gershon and efficiency savings, the Councillor might want to do some research as to whether he means cashable or non-cashable Gershon savings because if he talks about cashable Gershon savings as opposed to the inflated figures by many Labour and Liberal Authorities he'll find that this Authority is one of the best in the country for actually delivering cashable savings. So our record on actually delivering Gershon savings and efficiencies as we've taken over this wasteful Authority from the previous Administration stands for itself. I have no hesitation in saying we will deliver a balanced budget.

**Question No. 9****Councillor Linda McFayden**

The proposed privatisation of the meals at home service, including the sacking of 32 workers, will mean replacing freshly cooked food with frozen food, despite the fact that most people are pushing for more fresh, healthy food in schools at present. Why can't the council set the same high standards of fresh, healthy food for pensioners?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

Meals are not necessarily more nutritious if they are freshly cooked. There are a number of factors such as freshness of food, length of cooking and the ingredients used which determine how nutritious the meal is. The council is fully committed to ensuring that the meals service will provide healthy food options and is working with the PCT dietician to achieve this.

**Supplementary Question No. 9****Councillor Linda McFayden**

Thank you Mr Mayor. It was actually a very simple question. Will the Cabinet Member give a guarantee that the Council will not cut the quality or quantity of each meal at home or the amount of money spent on each meal? It's just a yes or a no.

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

That's an entirely different question to the one she put down, but the reality is that by tendering this service, by going jointly with Enfield Council, I have every expectation that we will be able to improve the quality and standard of meals we provide and I don't know why the party opposite are trying to oppose that.

**Question No. 10****Councillor Brian Coleman**

Is the School transport budget over or underspent so far this financial year and if so by how much?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

The transport budget is currently overspent. However the overspending is being reduced. More importantly the whole education budget is being well controlled.

**Supplementary Question No. 10****Councillor Brian Coleman**

Mr Mayor, mine's a very simple question as well, and I do regret Councillor Marshall's been unable to answer it. Exactly how much is the budget overspent?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

Mr Mayor, as Councillor Coleman knows, the answer would be given on one day, would be received on another and the figure would obviously be different. What is important is that the figure is coming down, that the overall education budget is being, we are living within our budget and we will have a net overspend for the year. In so far as the transport budget is concerned, a major factor has been the price of petrol and if anyone in the Council can forecast oil futures I suspect they'd be working in the City and not working for the Council.

**Question No. 11****Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Would the Cabinet Member for Resources please confirm what action is being taken to reduce the budget overspend?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

All relevant Officers and Cabinet Members will continue to seek ongoing and increased efficiencies.

**Supplementary Question No. 11**

**Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Could the Cabinet Member confirm, referring to his last remark he made to the question I asked him, maybe he could confirm to us tonight, if he's dead set on going ahead with his efficiency savings, that they include cuts to Age Concern, they also include the closure of the Wood Street Registry Office and also they include major other service cuts which are headlined as efficiency.

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Yes, yes, yes and yes.

**Question No. 12**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

Over the next three years, will the Council freeze the cost of CPZ resident parking permits (as promised by the Cabinet Member in June 2005) OR will the Council increase by inflation the cost of CPZ resident parking permits (as set out in the current Local Implementation Plan)?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

A formal decision has not yet been made on the future cost of parking permits as this is a decision that will be made as part of the budget setting process and unlike some politicians I do not make what you describe as a 'promise' in response to inquiries such as this one.

At the June Full Council meeting I set out my views on parking and in that I indicated my intention to freeze the cost of the permit and maintain that view.

**Supplementary Question No. 12**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

Is the proposal for the increase at the end of the three years to be one year's inflation or will the increase be three years worth of inflation added on in one go, as set out in the Scrutiny Committee's report?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

If the Member had bothered to listen to the announcement I made at a June Council meeting, indeed if any of the Members opposite had the courtesy indeed to listen, she would have not have needed to have put down as many questions which she has. But can I remind you that any decision is as part of the budget process and she will see the answer to that as part of the budget setting process.

**Question No. 13**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

What inference do you think we can draw from the surprise decision of the Leader of the Opposition Councillor Yeoman to resign?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

If the Labour party thought that they had any chance of winning the election in May next year, then I am certain that Councillor Yeoman would have stayed on to lead the comrades.

**Supplementary Question No. 13**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Leader, do you think the Labour Group have any chance of winning the election in May and, if not, perhaps you could give us an idea as to why you think not?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I'm exceedingly confident Mr Mayor that there will be more Conservatives in this Council after May the 4<sup>th</sup> and there will be less Members of the Labour Party.

**Question No. 14**

**Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Would the Cabinet Member for Resources please explain why the Council has decided to end the annual budget consultation exercise?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I refer Councillor Davies to the minutes of the Resources, Performance and Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19 September 2005 where this matter was discussed in detail.

**Supplementary Question No. 14****Councillor Jeremy Davies**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I'd like to ask the Leader whether he's actually going to reconsider the cancellation of the budget consultation exercise. It was introduced by the last Administration. It was seen to be ultimately very successful in eliciting from members of the public what priorities they had for services, what level of Council Tax increase they were willing to accept to protect those services. Now, Councillor Salinger has claimed in the press that there's a £70,000 saving from this but surely you need to consult the public to understand what services they want to see provided and surely that's the only democratic way you can do that on a budget of in excess of half a billion pounds.

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

Mr Mayor, the Borough consults on a whole range of things and currently through the LSP we're consulting on the community plan which again where we look at people's hopes and aspirations and expectations, not just for one year but indeed through until 2016, over a ten year period. I understand, Mr Mayor, that the following boroughs have decided not to carry out a full scale borough-wide consultation this year; they include Hounslow, Croydon, Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Barking and Dagenham, Lewisham, Merton, Brent, Camden, Bexley, Newham and Harrow. Although Harrow are having an extensive open budget process which is somewhat different. The truth of the matter is, and it came across indeed at the Scrutiny Committee, and it came from Members not from my side but from the Opposition side who said that the public wanted to be consulted on the level of Council Tax. And the fact of the matter is that that is the one issue on which we cannot consult them in that timescale because until we get details of the government grant through and details of the levies that are going to come through from the GLA and the waste authority, we are not in a position to give any real indication. And, frankly, the £70,000 that we are spending on it, I think, can be better spent. At the end of the day, Mr Mayor, the real consultation on Council Tax levels will come on May the 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Question No. 15****Councillor Paul Rogers**

The Government Office for London has told the Council: "The Secretary of State has concluded that in these particular circumstances, the policy should be modified to provide a threshold of 10 dwellings." When the Secretary of State directs the Council to reduce the threshold from 15 to 10 units on a site before a developer must provide affordable homes, does the Cabinet Member believe the Council should challenge this direction in the High Court?

### **Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

This response reflects the response provided to the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee 27 October on the same issue. It would not be appropriate to pre-empt the Secretary of State's decision on whether to issue a direction on Barnet's UDP. As part of responsible governance a risk assessment has been provided on next steps and procedures.

Following a lengthy and robust UDP inquiry with lengthy debate on affordable housing last year the Government Inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State agreed, with the Council to adopt a 15 unit affordable housing threshold. The Mayor's London Plan contains no specific thresholds for boroughs. The Government Office for London has recommended that Barnet adopts a 10 unit threshold following an objection from the GLA based on a London wide analysis, rather than borough by borough housing need. Barnet has responded with detailed submissions giving reasons why each borough in London is different and why this borough should not be treated the same as other parts of London as a general rule. There is no one size fits all with regard to affordable housing.

Officers have been engaged in constructive discussions with the Government Office for London about the implications for housing delivery in Barnet of a lower affordable housing threshold. The Council have submitted an amplified justification on the basis of the Government Inspectors recommendations, which we consider robust and reasonable. The Council's case will help the Secretary of State to reach his decision on affordable housing policies and on the threshold.

### **Supplementary Question No. 15**

**Councillor Paul Rogers**

Thank you Mr Mayor. If the Council fails to meet the target for the approval of the UDP, for example, by taking the Secretary of State to the High Court, how much money does the Council stand to lose in the planning and delivery grant?

### **Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

How many times are you going to ask the same question? I'm not so arrogant as to presume that the Secretary of State is going to direct us at all. If he does, we will consider the matter at that time, not now.

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

### **Question No. 16**

What is your reaction to the recent announcement that crime figures in Barnet have reduced?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I am always pleased to see any reduction in crime, but we are never complacent. Barnet is a comparatively low crime area and our local police have the best detection rate in the Met. We want and aim to keep it that way.

**Supplementary Question No. 16**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Leader, do you not think that Barnet's crime figures will be reduced still further if it weren't for the appalling way our Borough has been treated in the allocation of Police resources by the Government and by the GLA?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

Yes I do, and I'm full of support and praise for the campaign that the Barnet Press have been mounting over several weeks, and indeed several months now, to try and bring home to people the inequity in the way in which resources are allocated, and none more so than in the way that Neighbourhood Policing Schemes are being rolled out. And the size of our Wards, compared to other places, it's quite disproportionate and in that respect, in terms of resources per heads of population we get a raw deal out of that and we will continue to campaign for more Police resources.

**Question No. 17**

**Councillor Wayne Casey**

What specific action has the Council taken as a result of the new powers gained by Local Authorities under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act (CNEA) 2005 gave local authorities new and enhanced powers, some of which are in force and others yet to come into force. The measures delineated below are measures that are relevant to the work of the Street Enforcement Service (SES) and other services of the Council. A strategy is currently being prepared that will detail how the act can be applied and it's implications for the Council. The Council's SES are utilising those parts of the act that are currently available.

Measures which came into force from 7<sup>th</sup> June 2005

Section 3 of the Act – Exposing vehicles for sale on a road.

- It is an offence to expose or advertise vehicles for sale on roads in the borough
- **This has been implemented – First prosecution is under way.**

Section 4 of the Act – Repairing vehicles on a road

- It is an offence to repair vehicles on roads in the borough.
- **This provision has been implemented into SES processes.**

Section 5 of the Act – Liability of directors, etc.

- Directors and officers of a company offending against sections 3 and 4 above could be liable.
- **The provision has been implemented into SES processes.**

Section 18 of the Act – Extension of litter offence to all places

- This provision makes it an offence to drop or deposit litter anywhere in the open air within the borough regardless of ownership where the public have access. The offence extends to dropping litter into rivers or lakes or ponds.
- **It has been implemented by amending section 87 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990.**

Section 27 of the Act – “Litter”

- The definition of litter now includes discarded ends of cigarettes or cigars and chewing-gum.
- **It has been implemented by amending section 98 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990.**

Section 40 of the Act – Defence of acting under employer’s instructions

- This defence is no longer available to an offender who fly-tips in the borough.
- **It has been implemented by amending section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990.**

Section 41 of the Act – Penalties on conviction

- This provision has increased the penalty for fly-tipping from a fine of £20,000 and/or 6 months imprisonment to a fine of £50,000 and /or 5 years imprisonment.
- **It has been implemented by amending section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990 and other prosecution material.**

Measures which came into force on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2005

Section 11 of the Act – Notice of removal (of abandoned vehicle)

- This provision revokes the current law and replaces it with a provision which enables local authorities to immediately remove any vehicle “in such a condition” that it ought to be destroyed if they think the vehicle has been abandoned.
- It is being implemented into SES operational procedures.

Section 42 of the Act – Investigation and enforcement costs.

- This provision empowers the courts to award investigation and enforcement costs to local authorities and the Environment Agency (EA) in fly-tipping cases where there is conviction.
- The SES will be asking for such costs where applicable in future prosecutions.

Section 43 of the Act – Clean-up costs.

- This provision empowers the courts to award clean-up costs to local authorities and the EA in fly-tipping cases where there is conviction.
- The SES will be asking for such costs where applicable in future prosecutions.

Section 44 of the Act – Forfeiture of vehicles.

- This provision empowers the courts to deprive the owner of a vehicle used in the commission of a fly-tipping offence where the owner of that vehicle is convicted.
- It has been implemented by amending section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990 and other prosecution material.

The SES will be looking to use this power in future fly

### Measures which came into force on 18 October 2005

Section 11 of the Act – Notice of removal (of abandoned vehicle)

- This provision revokes the current law and replaces it with a provision which enables local authorities to immediately remove any vehicle “in such a condition” that it ought to be destroyed if they think the vehicle has been abandoned.
- **It is being implemented into SES operational procedures.**

Section 42 of the Act – Investigation and enforcement costs.

- This provision empowers the courts to award investigation and enforcement costs to local authorities and the Environment Agency (EA) in fly-tipping cases where there is conviction.
- **The SES will be asking for such costs where applicable in future prosecutions.**

Section 43 of the Act – Clean-up costs.

- This provision empowers the courts to award clean-up costs to local authorities and the EA in fly-tipping cases where there is conviction.
- **The SES will be asking for such costs where applicable in future prosecutions.**

Section 44 of the Act – Forfeiture of vehicles.

- This provision empowers the courts to deprive the owner of a vehicle used in the commission of a fly-tipping offence where the owner of that vehicle is convicted.
- It has been implemented by amending section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990 and other prosecution material.
- **The SES will be looking to use this power in future fly-tipping prosecutions.**

**Supplementary Question No. 17**

**Councillor Wayne Casey**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Mr Mayor, in Barnet, since the 7<sup>th</sup> of June, how many maximum fines and custodial sentences have been issued for fly-tipping and how many spot fines have been issued to those dropping chewing gum and cigarette butts?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

I have the information previously but I will have to write to you upon that.

**Question No. 18**

**Councillor Agnes Slocombe**

If the Cabinet Member would please provide a breakdown by ethnicity and gender of the 80 mentors he referred to at the previous Council meeting in September, along with an outline of the recruitment process, training undertaken, their aims & objectives, and contact with the young person being mentored?

**Answer by Councillor Christopher Harris**

I will be outlining details of the Looked After Children Education Mentors in the following debate when I will also reveal how the numbers will be expanded. Presently we have no data of the ethnicity of these champions, although they will reflect the profile of council staff who, as Councillor Slocombe knows are we're endeavouring to reflect the ethnicity of the local population.

The schools mentoring scheme has been rolled out in 4 local secondary and 19 primary schools. The LEA supports them with a co-ordinator. The data of their ethnicity has not been collected but if Councillor Slocombe would like to receive this information we can collect it where the mentors are directly on the Barnet payroll.

**Supplementary Question No. 18**

**Councillor Agnes Slocombe**

The Cabinet Member has failed to answer my question. Perhaps he could try again on a key simple point. What is there between the young person being mentored and the person doing the mentoring?

**Answer by Councillor Christopher Harris**

I've lost my voice so if you wouldn't mind I could write the answer to you. Thank you.

**Question No. 19**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

What can this Council do to ensure that Barnet tax payers are not overcharged by the GLA in their contribution to the 2012 London Olympics?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

Not a lot, unless the government acts to ensure that the limit is capped. It could do worse than starting by ensuring that the £20 per household Olympic levy is included in the capping limit calculations for the GLA precept, but somehow I suspect that they will wriggle out of that.

**Supplementary Question No. 19****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Do you think that the Mayor of London has been deliberately avoiding the issue of informing Londoners as to what his extravagant plans within the Olympics is likely to cost the Barnet taxpayers and indeed all citizens of London?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I think there's certainly a need for a great deal more clarity and the issue was raised today at the ALG Leaders Committee where leaders of all Parties were agreed unanimously of the need to continue to press for a cap on the expenditure that's raised through the £20 per band D equivalent household.

**Question No. 20****Councillor Wayne Casey**

Upon what basis does the Council now justify charging the Lawrence Street Allotments Society for parts of the site that are difficult to grow on due to their being wet or overshadowed?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Perhaps you can give me more information over the area in which you understand the site to be overshadowed or wet as I don't recall such a problem when I visited. In fact the site was so good that one allotment holder was growing grapes that he used to make wine.

I also recall the fantastic expansion of the site at the top of the grounds through the removal of brambles and other vegetation, making the allotments more attractive not only to plot holders but also to local residents.

**Supplementary Question No. 20****Councillor Wayne Casey**

Thank you very much, Mr Mayor. Mr Mayor, will the Cabinet Member give us his assurance that he will go away and look at the correspondence between his officers and the Lawrence Street Allotments and Gardens Association where he will find the answer to his question and will he then come back and answer mine.

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Thank you Councillor Casey. I actually do now have the correspondence in my possession and I can advise you that the wrong figure was inserted. In regards to reading the correspondence, it was sent to your Ward colleague, Councillor Davies. Perhaps the two of you should speak to each other.

**Question No. 21****Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

How are the Council's procedures for the disposal of land and buildings to be amended to ensure that the highly unsatisfactory process surrounding the sale of the Deansbrook day centre is not repeated?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

At its meeting on 16 June the Cabinet Resources Committee agreed to accept the highest tender offer for the property. A late unconditional offer was then received from another organisation. In selling a property, the Council is legally bound by Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to achieve the best consideration. To avoid the Council breaching the provisions of Section 123 of the Act, Cabinet Resources Committee agreed to suspend the sale. Officers then received Delegated Powers authority to invite binding tender offers from the 4 highest bidders. Those bids have now been received.

**Supplementary Question No. 21****Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

Thank you Mr Mayor. How are the Council's procedures for the disposal of land and buildings to be amended to ensure that the highly unsatisfactory process surrounding the sale of the Deansbrook Day Centre is not repeated?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

We can't change the Council's procedures because they're in compliance with the law, so unless the government changes the legislation. I have discussed this with the chief officers because we found it a deeply unsatisfactory position to find ourselves in, but we applied the law and live within the law so unless the government want to change the legislation we have to keep to our existing procedures.

**Question No. 22****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Is there some way in which the Council can use its influence to have the hideous graffiti removed from the high railway bridge above the street next to Mill Hill Broadway Station?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

This graffiti has been reported to Network Rail (NR) for removal. Network Rail has said that all work of this nature is planned in their maintenance schedule. In this and similar cases on railway bridges the graffiti is at high level and requires specialist equipment and possible rail line closure. NR have so far been unable to give the council a date when the work will take place.

**Supplementary Question No. 22****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Will you please direct our relevant Council officers to keep plugging away to ensure that Network Rail get their fingers out and apply the same concern for removing graffiti that Barnet Council does.

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Unfortunately, while we have a power to direct certain individuals, utility companies such as Network Rail, for example, are exempt from the legislation. But we will always keep on top of it. We will continue to push Network Rail and any other utility provider to play their part in our cleaner, greener agenda.

**Question No. 23****Councillor Wayne Casey**

Earlier this year the Council cleared away rubbish from half the alleyway which services houses in Bittacy Hill (running behind houses in Bittacy Rise). This alleyway is once again filled of rubbish. When is the Council proposing to remove this unsightly health hazard and establish a regime of regular cleansing?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

This alleyway is not a public highway and along with many such other sites in the borough, the Council is unable to take on responsibility for the regular clearance.

An Environmental Health Technical Officer has visited this particular site and is currently undertaking a Land Registry search to identify the land owner who will be responsible for the upkeep.

**Question No 24****Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

If the Cabinet Member could please explain what is happening to the youth services building in Park Road, West Hendon, in particular whether the building is likely to be used by Metropolitan West Hendon for their offices to run the regeneration scheme or to be converted into flats or kept as a youth facility or sold to a faith group as a youth and community building?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Because the building at 4A Park Road is in close proximity to the West Hendon regeneration area, Metropolitan West Hendon has been asked whether the premises could be suitable for relocating any of the existing occupiers who are to be affected by the regeneration proposals.

There has been no suggestion that it should be used as offices by Metropolitan West Hendon or converted to residential use.

If the premises are not required for relocation purposes, officers will deal with the letting or disposal of the premises in accordance with the Constitution and delegated powers. This will include giving consideration to the expressions of interest already received.

**Supplementary Question No 24**

**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

If the building is not used for relocation, will the Council consider invoking General Disposal Consent 2003 to ensure the building can be used for community benefit and will you let me know the timescale as to when we'll have some of these answers please?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

We will consider all options when the site is ready for disposal and, of course, all Members will be circulated with that as it comes up on the Agenda items.

**Question No. 25**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

To what do you attribute the fact that local Barnet schools are officially amongst the best in Britain, as shown by the recent Key Stage Results?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

I am tempted to answer that it is due to the charm of Councillor Gordon. More seriously, it is due to the hard work and commitment of many teachers, our pupils and their parents. I should like to pay tribute to everyone who has brought about this satisfactory state of affairs including my two immediate predecessors.

**Supplementary Question No. 25**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

I've not referred to your three immediate predecessors but only to the past two. Very wise. Do you not agree that our Party's firm commitment to excellence in education and freedom of choice for parents, as opposed to that of the Labour Party, is one of the many reasons why the public should vote for the return of another Conservative Administration next May?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

What I would say is this Mr Mayor, that in 2002 the Conservative Group inherited a shambles in the Education Department. The so called Ofsted Action Plan could have been better called the Ofsted 'Inaction' Plan. As a result of the actions we and senior officers have taken, this is very much an improving Education Authority and I'm willing to wager with any Member of the Labour Party that when the APA result is produced next month it will show that Barnet is a very much improving Education Authority and it's certainly not the worst Education Authority in London as the Labour Party so irresponsibly and inaccurately have claimed.

**Question No. 26**

**Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Given the proposed increase in population in Grahame Park is the Council going to ensure that the re-provision of the library, day care centre, log cabin and Wingfield Nursery will be reprovided to cope with increased population?

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

The Choices for Grahame Park master plan, to which outline consent was agreed in September 2004, shows the re-provision of each of these facilities within the estate. The Section 106 Agreement, that will be executed between the Council and Choices for Grahame Park/Genesis Housing Group will require the re-provision of these facilities within the Grahame Park estate and to a level whereby they fulfil the needs of the increased population. It is not envisaged that there would be any reason to re-provide any of those facilities elsewhere.

**Supplementary Question No. 26**

**Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Thank you very much. I wanted to ask this question because the re-provision of the library, the day care centre, the log cabin and the Wingfield Nursery on Grahame Park are, at the moment, some of the best facilities that we have in the Borough. The library is one of the most used provisions in Grahame Park and my concern is that when the regeneration takes place, that the re-provision of these facilities will not be at the same high standard that there is at the moment, and I'm rather concerned about the rather loose wording that there is and I wonder if we can firm that up so that we can ensure that the library, the day care centre, the log cabin and the Wingfield Nursery are reprovided at the same level. And I would also like to further add that my concern is about the timetable that this is done because I could well see there being a gap between these being taken down and new provision being done.

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

I'll be very short. I refer the Councillor to the answer to my question at number 63.

**Question No. 27****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Does this Administration approve of the recent call by the London Government Association for decentralisation of power? How might this be to the benefit, or otherwise, of Barnet?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I am in favour of the decentralization of power but in London we are under threat of powers going to The Mayor of London, rather than coming to or even staying with the Boroughs. Where power is decentralised it is also important that the resources follow.... or better still proceed.

**Supplementary Question No. 27****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Leader, do you not think that the only form of decentralisation which Mayor Ken Livingstone is interested in is the kind of decentralisation that vests in him alone and in his own very large extravagant and arrogant ego?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I've not been close enough to examine his ego that closely. The problem with decentralisation is that we want it all devolved down from central government. We want it devolved down from central government. We want greater control over our own destinies and affairs and we want the resources that are needed to deliver that to come with them. Ken Livingstone, on the other hand, also not only wants powers devolved down from government to him but he also wants to suck powers up from us to him as well, and that is an unhealthy situation indeed. We should be looking at which of his powers might well be devolved back down to local authorities instead.

**Question No. 28****Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What is the latest position with regard to the removal of the Hendon FC covenant and what is the timetable for the issue to be resolved?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

There has been no change to the timetable explained to the last meeting of Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny; a committee of which you are a member and a meeting at which you were present.

**Supplementary Question No. 28****Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

Thank you Mr Mayor. There's not much of an answer there to thank Councillor Freer for, but I will ask, what representations has he received from the Golders Green Councillors against the lifting of the covenant and what are the Councillor's contingency plans if and when the covenant is not lifted.

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The answer to the second part of that question remains the same as I gave him at Cabinet Scrutiny. With regards to the representation from the Golders Green Ward Councillors, I can assure you that the three Ward Councillors have bent my ear at considerable length and at various decibel levels, and they continue to represent their Ward extremely well.

**Question No. 29****Councillor Brian Coleman**

Has the Labour Government given any indication what increase in Council Tax they expect to see next year?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The Government data would suggest they are expecting Council Tax rises to be at least 7% due to financial black hole the Government has created by inadequate funding of local government and the incessant loading of additional responsibilities by central Government. The tax rises are taken from HM Treasury data and the funding black hole confirmed by a recent report by the ALG.

**Supplementary Question No. 29****Councillor Brian Coleman**

Mr Mayor, would the Leader care to forecast what sort of tax rate rise in Council Tax would be unacceptable and would he care to cast where the blame for any tax rise might lay?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Well I wouldn't like to answer for the Leader. I wouldn't want to put words in his mouth but, of course, all increases in Council Tax are regrettable and this Administration will continue to strive for the lowest possible tax rise but I have to say that the tax rises that this Administration has had to impose are laid firmly and squarely at the cause of underfunding and additional responsibilities that this Government has continued to give us without the funds.

If the Members of the Labour Party, while groaning and moaning, would care to go to Gordon Brown's own red book they will find that their Treasury themselves are forecasting that Council Tax rises will be at least seven percent but I can assure Council that that shocking rise is something that we are striving to avoid.

**Question No. 30****Councillor Steve Blomer**

What is the Council doing about the use of motorcycles in the borough's parks, and in particular Lyndhurst Park, which is against Council byelaws and is causing a great deal of nuisance to residents whose homes back onto the park?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The Council is working in partnership with the police and trying to combat the problem with regular patrols and monitoring of this and other locations across the borough.

The Council is also aware of the motorcycle problems associated with Lyndhurst Park and is taking the following measures to secure the park from this misuse:

1. At The Meads entrance to Lyndhurst Park, the single bar gate will have extension bars welded to the right hand side to stop motorcycles getting through the gap, and on the left hand side of the gate (stream side) a 'K' type motorcycle barrier is being fitted. This will allow pedestrians access but prevent motorcycles.
2. At the main entrance to Lyndhurst Park off Lyndhurst Avenue, the double gates are being reinforced with locking bars and the path will be extended to the right of the gate where a large steel kissing gate is being installed in the fence. This will allow pedestrian and wheelchair access but stop access by motorcycles but allowing pedestrian and disabled access. This kissing gate will require a small area of new tarmac path construction.

**Question No. 31****Councillor Brian Gordon**

Forgive my harping on about the Mayor of London, but do you not think that his recent comment drawing an analogy between Sheikh Qaradawi and the previous deceased Pope was highly offensive to many citizens of this borough, and hardly conducive to good community relations?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

I agree.

The Mayor seems to go out of his way to antagonise the community and I am sure Councillor Gordon and others will continue to remind the community which party the Mayor represents.

**Question No. 32****Councillor Alison Moore**

If the Cabinet Member could explain how it is acceptable for a blind resident to lose their job just because they have moved out of the borough, when there is a long-standing agreement of London councils to continue to fund blind people working in sheltered workshops if they move around London?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

Despite extensive investigation within the council and with the Chairman of the Association of Directors of Social Services (London Region) no evidence of this long-standing agreement has been produced.

**Question No. 33****Councillor Brian Gordon**

The recent issue of "Barnet First" had a beautiful picture on the front cover sporting the headline "The Writing's on the Wall for Barnet's Graffiti Vandals". Would you please elaborate on this?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The headline refers to the Council's success in reducing graffiti across the Borough. There are now 13 launched town centres where new graffiti is inspected and removed daily by the town keeper service. Additionally, there are other town centre sites where graffiti is being cleared on a weekly basis. As a result, there has been a large decrease in the amount of graffiti in these areas.

Regular cleaning, the recording of new graffiti tags and working with partners such as Barnet Police and British Transport Police has meant some graffiti offenders have been identified and prosecuted. Joint surveillance operations have taken place and in the most recent case three youths were identified and their parents have been invoiced for the damage caused.

There were 20 arrests for graffiti in Barnet over the last year. The council, the Probation Service and Safer Neighbourhoods Police Teams have been working together on Operation Payback. Offenders serving community sentences have been clearing large areas of graffiti in New Barnet and Burnt Oak. In addition, Youth Offenders working with the Youth Offending Team/Graffiti Officer have also carried out graffiti removal on eight parks pavilions across the borough. Playground furniture and park benches have also been cleaned or re-painted during these projects.

An Environmental Officer carries out educational visits to schools and there have been poster campaigns to highlight that graffiti is criminal damage. The Council's policy of graffiti removal, prevention, education and prosecution is reducing the amount of graffiti seen on the streets of Barnet.

**Question No. 34**

**Councillor Danish Chopra**

Does the Cabinet Member agree that all residents in Barnet should be properly consulted on the level of council tax they will have to pay for 2006/07, and how is the Council going to achieve this?

**Answer by Councillor Brian Salinger, Leader of the Council**

The level of Council tax is the one thing in which the public are interested and at the same time is the one aspect of the budget that we have never been able to consult on satisfactorily as it is so dependent on the level of grant to be made available by the government, and the levies demanded by other bodies like the GLA and NLWA.

Residents are being invited to the open day and interested residents are being invited to comment on budget matters through the next edition of the Barnet First magazine, which will be delivered to every household. In addition leaflets will be placed in local libraries; messages placed on the council website. Residents can also email comments into the First Contact point.

**Question No. 35**

**Councillor Brian Coleman**

Will the Leader tell the Council what indication he has had from the Labour Government on the level of increase in grant that Barnet might expect for the year 2006/7 (excluding Education funding)?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Indications are that excluding the schools block the Council is likely to receive a 0% increase in its grant from Central Government. Despite additional costs due to Governments continued transfer of unfunded responsibilities e.g. the Licensing Act and ongoing cost pressures on vital budgets such as the 7% inflationary pressure on Social care contracts.

**Question No. 36****Councillor Linda McFayden**

For the financial years 2002/3, 2003/4 and 2004/5, please provide a breakdown for festive lights showing:

- which high street trader associations received Council grant funding;
- how much each association received from the Council;
- what contribution was made by each trader association; and
- how much the Council contributed over and above the grant aid gifted?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

I think the following figures answer your question.

The 'Festive Lighting Cost Summary 2001, 2002 and 2003 (Table 1) shows the grants awarded to each of the traders associations who made an application to install festive lights. Over the period from 2000 to 2002 the traders received a grant and made their own arrangements for the purchase and installation of the equipment.

In 2003, for the first time the Mayor expressed a wish to switch on the lights in each of the town centres and therefore council officers arranged to check each of the sites to ensure the switching on ceremony went smoothly. This identified a number of problems with the installations and therefore additional work was required to resolve these issues – the cost of this work which included call out and repair over the festive period amounted to the additional sums shown in the LBB Add. Works column on the spreadsheet. Hence in 2003 the Council incurred an additional cost of £10,605.78 over and above the grant sum of £40,000.

When requesting a grant, not all the traders identified the cost of the installations, those that did are identified in the Trader Est. column for the years 2002 and 2003. As an example Golders Green identified that in 2003 the cost of the installation would be £6,629.39 – A grant of £4,300 was made towards this figure and a further sum of £62.65 was spent on callout and repair.

Due to the problems encountered in 2003 and the additional costs incurred it was agreed that new arrangements should be put in place for 2004 onwards. This involved collecting up all of the festive lighting displays from all of the traders and inspecting them for structural and electrical integrity. This identified the poor state of 90% of the equipment that was deemed to be unsafe and in the main uneconomic to repair. The solution was for the Council to purchase new equipment and provide a service of supply, installation, maintenance and removal. Traders were consulted on this proposal which involved traders making a small annual contribution towards the cost over a two year period – 2004 and 2005. The second table titled 'Festive Lighting Cost Summary 2004/5 to 2005/6 shows the breakdown of costs for equipment purchase and labour costs over this two year period and also shows the annual contribution required by each of the traders.

There were also further costs involved in 2004 as the electrical installation and switching devices in each of the lighting columns were due for electrical inspection and following inspection a number of units were in need of rewiring and replacement. The cost of this is shown in the LBB column on the spreadsheet.

As an example : the cost to install festive lighting in High Barnet over the two year period amounts to £14,812.89, plus the one-off cost of £14,225.43 for electrical inspection and repair. The traders have been asked to contribute £2,000 per year, thus making a total contribution of £4,000 over this two year period.

(Table 1)

Site Location	Motif Qty	Year 2000 Grant £	Year 2001 Grant £	Year 2002 Grant £	Trader Est. 2002 Install £	LBB Add. works	Year 2003 Grant £	Trader Est. 2003 £
High Barnet. EN5	41	£4,215.00	£4,050.00	£3,800.00		£62.65	£4,300.00	
East Barnet. EN4	9	£1,660.00	£1,600.00	£0.00	£3,900.00	£197.98	£2,300.00	£3,500.00
Whetstone. N20	15	£3,265.00	£3,100.00	£1,900.00	£3,735.00	£478.03	£2,300.00	£4,324.00
North Finchley. N12	16	£4,215.00	£4,050.00	£3,800.00		£1,606.21	£4,300.00	
East Finchley. N2	19	£4,215.00	£4,050.00	£3,800.00	£11,161.09	£62.65	£4,300.00	
Ballards Lane. N3/N12	28	£4,215.00	£4,250.00	£3,800.00	£4,850.00	£62.65	£4,300.00	
Golders Green. NW11	10	£6,000.00	£5,500.00	£3,800.00		£62.65	£4,300.00	£6,629.39
Cricklewood. NW2 *	10	£0.00	£0.00	£6,000.00	£5,082.00	£62.65	£4,300.00	£1,834.00
West Hendon. NW7	12	£3,000.00	£2,000.00	£1,900.00	£2,286.00	£2,351.34	£0.00	
Burnt Oak.	13	£0.00	£6,000.00	£3,800.00	£4,303.75	£333.31	£4,300.00	£3,200.00
Mill Hill. NW7	16	£0.00	£3,000.00	£1,900.00		£3,095.65	£0.00	
Edgware. HA8	33	£4,215.00	£4,050.00	£3,800.00	£5,560.00	£1,355.01	£4,300.00	
Hampden Square Xmas Tree	1	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00		£875.00	£1,000.00	£2,505.00
Totals:	223	£36,000.00	£42,650.00	£39,300.00	£40,877.84	£10,605.78	£40,000.00	£21,992.39

Information for Years 2000, 2001, and 2002 has been collated from a selection of historical documents.

Information for Year 2003 has been collated from documentation and records kept from the period

Trader Est. values have been collated from the Festive applications completed thoroughly, and returned

LBB Add. Works covers callout and repair attendances during the 2003 installations, arranged and installed by others

(Table 2)  
Festive Lighting Cost Summary 2004/5 to 2005/6

Site Location	Motif Qty	LBB Works	Material Purchase £	Labour 2004/5 £	Labour 2005/6 £	Total £	Annual Contribution Request	Total £	% Value
High Barnet. EN5	40	£14,225.43	£7,332.89	£3,740.00	£3,740.00	£14,812.89	£2,000.00	£4,000.00	13.8%
East Barnet. EN4	14	£4,253.80	£2,949.98	£1,309.00	£1,309.00	£5,567.98	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	20.4%
Whetstone. N20	17	£3,130.60	£4,464.20	£1,589.50	£1,589.50	£7,643.20	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	18.6%
North Finchley. N12	40	£15,962.34	£8,911.58	£3,927.00	£3,927.00	£16,765.58	£2,000.00	£4,000.00	12.2%
East Finchley. N2	29	£6,910.44	£2,530.72	£2,851.75	£2,851.75	£8,234.22	£1,500.00	£3,000.00	19.8%
Ballards Lane. N3/N12	28	£4,363.61	£4,805.15	£2,695.00	£2,695.00	£10,195.15	£1,500.00	£3,000.00	20.6%
Golders Green. NW11	17	£4,509.68	£4,103.71	£2,678.50	£2,678.50	£9,460.71	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	14.3%
Cricklewood. NW2 *	14	£4,505.95	£3,216.75	£0.00	£0.00	£3,216.75	£0.00	£0.00	0.0%
West Hendon. NW7	12	£6,769.98	£2,591.66	£1,122.00	£1,122.00	£4,835.66	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	17.2%
Burnt Oak.	15	£9,745.89	£3,570.80	£1,402.50	£1,402.50	£6,375.80	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	12.4%
Mill Hill. NW7	16	£5,544.83	£3,060.00	£1,496.00	£1,496.00	£6,052.00	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	17.2%
Edgware. HA8	16	£1,048.90	£4,525.70	£1,776.50	£1,776.50	£8,078.70	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	21.9%
Container & Carriage	1	£0.00	£0.00	£2,350.00	£2,350.00	£4,700.00			
Totals:	259	£80,971.45	£52,063.14	£26,937.75	£26,937.75	£105,938.64	£14,000.00	£28,000.00	17.1%
Hampden Square Xmas Tree	1	£7.68	£1,940.00	£525.00	£350.00	£2,815.00	£200.00	£400.00	14.2%

Festive Years 2004/05 and 2005/06: 2-Year Package Arrangement agreed with Specialist Contractor following Trader Consultation = £108,556.64

Allocated Budget from Barnet: £40,000.00 per annum, over two years = £80,000.00 plus estimated contributions of £28,000.00, total: £108,000.00

If equipment is NOT installed in year 2005, in areas that fail to contribute, LBB could receive a labour cost saving of approx. £20,000.00

Taking this saving into account, the Festive 2-Year Package could finally cost LBB: £89,000.00 (approx) the original budget and received contributions.

**LBB Works:** These works caused additional cost to the Street Lighting Budget for Survey, Electrical Inspection, Repairs & Tests.

*Cricklewood. NW2 \**: London Borough of Brent installed Festive along Broadway, so Barnet allowed risk over to Brent.

*Mill Hill. NW7 and Edgware. HA8* have verbally confirmed payment has been passed and should be with LBB soon

**DELEGATED POWERS REPORT - Serial No.HW111**

### Question No. 37

**Councillor Maureen Braun**

Would the cabinet member please comment on this year's Annual Performance Assessment.

### Answer by Councillor John Marshall

Unfortunately the results of the APA will not be known until early December. I would however be grateful if Councillor Braun would ask this question again at the next Council meeting as I might be able to offer some seasonal cheer.

### Question No. 38

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

Who are the members - including elected Members - of the working party (referred to in the Local Implementation Plan) undertaking "detailed work on parking issues to look at how CPZ' are working and delivering for local communities, and to consider future options relating to cashless systems, charging, permits and vouchers and enforcement and representation issue"; on what dates have they held meetings; and if the Cabinet Member would provide a detailed update on progress made so far?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Councillor Olwen Evans, & Councillor Colin Rogers are the members of the working group. Initial meetings between officers and Members have taken place to determine the scope of the project and the group is engaging with key community groups to inform the process. The Cleaner Greener Transport & Development Scrutiny Committee, of which you are a member, will meet on 10 November to give consideration to a range of parking measures and offer their views.

**Question No. 39**

**Councillor Brian Gordon**

Will the Cabinet Member for Environment join me in praising Councillor Joan Scannell, the Conservative Chairman of Hendon Environment Sub-Committee's instigation in getting mirrors installed to cut anti-social behaviour in Stoneyfields Park in my Ward? Will he also welcome the decision to erect a sign informing local people of the opening times of the park?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

I will certainly join with your praise of Councillor Scannell who is working very hard as the Hendon Area Environment Sub Committee chairman and in the praise for the installation of the Park's new sign.

**Question No. 40**

**Councillor Paul Rogers**

Why has the Council ignored objections from the London Mayor and the Government Office for London to the Council's proposed increase in the UDP of the threshold for developers to build affordable homes from 10 to 15 homes on a site?

**Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

The Council has not ignored the London Mayor or Government Office for London and has taken their representations into account when recommending the intention to adopt the UDP. The Council has responded by setting out a reasonable robust case for not adopting a lower threshold of 10 units.

It is the Council's case that smaller sites are more difficult to deliver affordable housing in Barnet and the overall contribution will be small compared to medium to large sites. Smaller sites can be highly marginal in terms of viability on a 50% affordable housing requirement. It will be a lot of effort for a small gain. There is also a risk of generating schemes of a much poorer quality in terms of density and design. We would also expect developers to sit on land or develop uses other than housing.

**Question No. 41****Councillor Maureen Braun**

Would the cabinet member please comment on the government's failure to support the Jewish Community Secondary School bid?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

I am appalled by the decision of the government not to support the JCROSS proposal. The promoters of the scheme were led to believe that it had the support of the Prime Minister. We were led to believe before the General Election that it had ministerial approval. I am sorry that the government reneged on these promises.

**Question No. 42****Councillor Agnes Slocombe**

Since the Council believes the youth club in Park Rd, NW4 is surplus to requirements - as set out in the reply by Councillor Finn at September's council meeting - is the building now up for sale and, if so, who has expressed an interest?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Because the building at 4A Park Road is in close proximity to the West Hendon regeneration area, Metropolitan West Hendon has been asked whether the premises could be suitable for relocating any of the existing occupiers who are to be affected by the regeneration proposals.

If the premises are not required for relocation purposes, officers will deal with the letting or disposal of the premises in accordance with the Constitution and delegated powers. This will include giving consideration to the expressions of interest already received.

**Question No. 43****Councillor Maureen Braun**

Would the cabinet member express his welcome to St Mary's School emerging from Special Measures?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

I am delighted that St Mary's School has come out of Special Measures which justifies the optimism I expressed when answering a question from Councillor Coleman at the last Council Meeting

**Question No. 44****Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

What is the likely impact on the future disposal of land and buildings caused by the precedent of the highly unsatisfactory process surrounding the sale of the Deansbrook day centre?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The unsatisfactory situation the Council found itself in is a symptom of the way the law applies to Council disposals. To suggest that the Council is in some way at fault is wholly inaccurate. I am sure the Councillor is not suggesting the Council breaks the law.

Accordingly there will be no impact on future disposals in financial terms or the numbers of property offered for sale.

**Question No. 45****Councillor Robert Newton**

Would the Cabinet Member please advise:

- a) What range of densities (u/ha and hr/ha) in central, urban and suburban locations respectively would be expected where the PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility) rating is 2, and
- b) What factors might allow a current PTAL rating of 2 in a given location to be increased to a rating of 3, 4 or 5 over time?

**Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

- a) The range of densities is provided in paragraph 8.3.58 of the revised draft UDP, as modified. This states that in the Borough's Opportunity Area and Areas for Intensification; in urban areas around town centres Chipping Barnet, Edgware, North Finchley, Brent Street, Burnt Oak, Church End Finchley, Cricklewood, East Finchley, Golders Green, Mill Hill, New Barnet, Temple Fortune and Whetstone) and other locations where appropriate, development should not be below 250 habitable rooms per hectare. Outside these areas, but nearby and along transport corridors with bus stops, residential development should not be below 200 HRH. Other areas should be above 150 HRH. The Council approved a new vision strategy last year: Three Strands Approach which sets out the direction of travel on development and regeneration in the future Local Development Framework indicates likely density ranges across different parts of the Barnet to ensure protection, enhancement and growth (PEG) of a first class borough.
- b) The PTAL matrix is set out in the London Plan. The PTAL measure reflects:  
Walking time from the point-of-interest to the public transport access points;  
The reliability of the service modes available;  
The number of services available within the catchment; and  
The level of service at the public transport access points - i.e. average waiting time.

So an improvement to the PTAL value at a location could be achieved by:

- Creating New PT Access points - Reduce the walk time to Public Transport access points - create new bus stops etc
- Creating New services - Increase the number of services within the catchment area. (New or diverted routes)
- Improve existing services - Increase the frequency of existing services in order to reduce the waiting time.

**Question No. 46**

**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

What has been the increase in the number of ethnic minority staff employed to reflect the composition of borough since the equality services were devolved, and can the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown by service area?

**Answer by Councillor Katia David**

The attached Table compares figures from January 2004 and March 2005. The “% Ethnic Minority Staff” column excludes *all* white groups (British, Greek Cypriot, Turkish Cypriot, Irish and Other).

The Barnet-wide figure for **March 2005** is **2.6%** higher than **January 2004**, signifying a 12.75% increase in ethnic minority staff representation across the workforce.

In most Services representation has increased but in a few there has been an apparent reduction, such as the Strategic Development Unit although this team contains very few staff

For Law and Probity only 59 forms had been returned by January 2004 but after a programme of reminders this figure rose to 107 by March 2005. During this period the only category to change substantially was ‘White – British’ which rose by 36, an increase of 11.5%. This consequently reduced the percentage representation of all other groups.

Similarly, the reminders project helped to increase the number of forms from Information Systems staff from 49 to 80. Again the only category to change substantially was ‘White – British’ which rose by 22, an increase of 4.6%.

In Human Resources a large number of staff has been devolved to various Services to the extent that forms representing central staff dropped from 120 in 2004 to 69 in 2005. This level of change inevitably skews percentage figures, especially if the majority of those who moved represented only a few different ethnic groups. As the majority of these staff have become deployed to other Services this does not represent a reduction in real terms.

The only other area where representation reduced was Strategic Directors. There was one member of staff from an ethnic minority group in both surveys but the overall forms returned figure increased by 1 giving a marginally decreased proportionate figure.

The BVPI 17 (% council employees from minority ethnic communities) outturns for 2003/04 and 2004/05 were:

- 2003/04 (i.e. at end March 2004): 20.3%
- 2004/05 (i.e. at end March 2005): 23% (which is an impressive 88.5% fit versus % economically active minority ethnic community population in the borough).

**Question No. 47**

**Councillor Robert Newton**

Would the Cabinet Member please advise:

- a) In what circumstances a development control officer would not ascertain the gross and net site areas and the density (u/ha and hr/ha) of a proposed development when considering a planning application for a residential redevelopment scheme?
- b) What part density plays in the consideration of planning applications for residential redevelopment schemes?

**Answer by Councillor Melvin Cohen**

- a) development control officers ascertain gross site areas and the density of a proposed residential redevelopment in most cases to inform the scale and impact of development against UDP policies.
- b) density is one of a number of policy and material considerations in the UDP and supplementary planning guidance to be taken into account when assessing a residential redevelopment proposal, including for instance design and character considerations. What density is not intended to be is a prescriptive "hard and fast rule" where a breach is automatically considered unacceptable on planning grounds. Density policies and density matrices are to assist and guide local planning authorities as to the scale and acceptability of a development in a particular area, alongside other material policies and development control considerations. A development proposal that exceeds the density guide or a density policy could be acceptable in all other respects and supportable if there is no significant demonstrable harm. On the other hand, excessive density may result in harm by reason of over development of a particular site, its relationship to the prevailing character of the area or by traffic impacts etc. In such cases density guides and policies may support a refusal of a proposal.

**Question No. 48**

**Councillor Gill Sargeant**

How is the Council to consult residents on the proposed sale of and building on the Grahame Park open space?

### **Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

The sale of part of the open space to Choices for Grahame Park, and the construction of the homes on that part of the open space, being the outer edge of the existing open space, has always been part of the proposed regeneration project on which there has been extensive consultation with residents. This consultation has included the test of opinion that showed a substantial majority in favour of the proposals, and through the planning process.

Further consultation on the overall proposals is taking place with Grahame Park residents this week and next week.

In addition, the proposal for appropriation of the section of open space to be developed, prior to its disposal, will be advertised locally for 14 days, and members of the public have 28 days in which to submit comments, prior to referral back to Cabinet for a final resolution

### **Question No. 49**

**Councillor Robert Newton**

On 14 September 2004, the then Cabinet Member for Housing advised in answer to Council Question No. 48 that 32,742 new residential units were projected to be built in the Borough between 1997 and 2016. Would the Cabinet Member please advise:

- a) What the current figure of new residential units projected to be built in the Borough between 1997 and 2016 is (split between growth areas and infill development) and what the projected population of the Borough will be in 2016?
- b) What these projections are for the Borough in the London Mayor's "2004 Housing Capacity Study" published in July 2005 and what period they cover?

### **Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

- a) The current figure for additional homes in the borough is contained in the revised deposit UDP, as modified. The figure is 17,780 for the period 20 year 1997 to 2016 (Policy GH1). This is for the borough as a whole and is the minimum target set out in the London Plan (Table 3A.1). At last year's UDP Inquiry evidence submitted demonstrated that the annual target of 890 units was being delivered for the period 1997-2004 (6,230 units for the first 7 years of the monitor period).

(The Council's Three Strands Approach Strategy anticipates the UDP housing target would be provided predominantly by a mix of infill, conversions, changes of use, windfall sites. Approximately 15,000 units are planned on the Council's regeneration sites such as Cricklewood although the phasing of the schemes may fall into a longer delivery period beyond 2016/17).

- b) The Mayor's Housing Capacity figure for Barnet is 19,600 for the ten year period 2007/8 to 2016/17. This draft figure is a Mayoral proposal and will be examined through the review of the London Plan.

**Question No. 50****Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

Has the Council now agreed on terms with Hendon FC and the Youth Sport and Leisure Foundation on the sale of the Hendon FC land, and what are the terms?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The answer remains the same as that given at Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee; a committee meeting the Councillor attended.

**Question No. 51****Councillor Alison Moore**

Has the Council contacted Barnet residents funded by other London Boroughs to explain that their sheltered workshop jobs could be at risk if Barnet goes ahead with its plans to cut the funding, and what have been the replies received?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

The Council does not have any specific information regarding other Barnet residents who may be attending similar Sheltered Workshops. The focus of social services in Barnet must be on providing support to residents who meet the council's eligibility criteria.

**Question No. 52****Councillor Linda McFayden**

The meals at home privatisation will mean the end of 30,000 meals every year for the elderly attending day centres run by Friends in Need and Age Concern. What assessment has been undertaken of the increased burden and costs on social services from these vulnerable people becoming less independent and more reliant on other social services?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

We have not yet had discussions with the voluntary sector. However, the meals tender will include the option for the voluntary sector to buy meals from the meals provider. Older people attending the day centres therefore stand to benefit from the tender process.

**Question No. 53****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

How is the Council consulting residents and Members on the current version of the Local Implementation Plan?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The consultation draft version of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) was approved by Cabinet in July 2005 for the Statutory Consultation to commence and the LIP was subsequently considered by the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny committee. Amendments were made to the LIP immediately prior to the start of the consultation and approved under delegated authority to ensure the consultation draft LIP was as up to date as possible.

The LIP is published on the Council's website and residents are invited to send in any comments they wish.

**Question No. 54**

**Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

What investigations has the Council undertaken to ascertain whether the original report agreeing the sale of the Deansbrook day centre was leaked to any of those individuals or organisations interested in buying the building, and what is the outcome of these inquiries?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

As far as we are aware there is no suggestion of a leakage of confidential information and no investigation has been undertaken. The unsolicited bid was in fact received from one of the original tenderers and in a sum significantly in excess of the amount previously tendered. This does not suggest that there had been any leak of confidential information

**Question No. 55**

**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

Will the Council make West Hendon town centre an alcohol-free zone?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

I am pleased to see that the Councillor supports the introduction of Alcohol Free Zones, as some of her colleagues have flip-flopped on their introduction. I want to see further Zones where they are warranted through identified problems and where the police agree to enforce their introduction.

The police are in favour of some further zones being introduced in the Borough, in particular they would like to see zones in Edgware, Cricklewood, Golders Green and Chipping Barnet. The Police consider these areas more of a priority than West Hendon and, having heard the Councillor herself talk about recognising police priorities, I think we should be guided by their views.

However I would of course, be prepared to look further at other supporting evidence to see whether this should be an area for consideration.

**Question No. 56****Councillor Gill Sargeant**

What are the contingency plans if the Grahame Park regeneration project costs increase or the sale values drop?

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

The viability of the project will be kept under review at all times, and actions that may be taken will depend upon the precise change of circumstances at any time.

- The initial viability is based on prudent assumptions of costs and future sales values, so it should be possible to absorb some small adverse changes.
- Fixed rate building costs are being negotiated between Choices for Grahame Park and Countryside plc for each phase before the contract is let, to control costs.
- The first stage of the project can accommodate adverse changes, but if they arise, there may need to be a delay during the project, and potentially slowing down the scheme until improved market conditions prevail.
- A number of other factors may also need to be considered such as reviewing the precise mix and number of homes for sale.
- With the life of the project spanning approximately 16 years there are likely to be cycles of enhanced market conditions and adverse conditions. Enhanced periods will produce improved surpluses that will act as a buffer for periods of adverse conditions.
- Additionally, in the unlikely event of prolonged adverse conditions, there are likely to be opportunities to apply for additional grant funding.

It would be inappropriate to proscribe actions at this stage, as they will depend upon the actual circumstances as the project progresses. A complex agreement is being developed that gives both sufficient control to ensure that the regeneration meets requirements, but has sufficient flexibility to react to future market circumstances.

Actions that will be considered include pausing the project temporarily during adverse market conditions, varying the mix of homes for sale and seeking additional grant aid.

**Question No. 57****Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

What impact is there on the Copthall proposals due to the fact that the Arbiter Group no longer wants to be involved in running Hendon FC; and what are the long-term implications for Copthall given that there is currently no financially secure individual or organisation to ensure the upkeep of the stadium, and the fact that Hendon FC will never get promotion because Copthall does not meet the ground standards due to it being an athletics stadium?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

Councillor Schneiderman is ill-informed. The Arbiter Group have confirmed they remain committed to Hendon FC playing at Copthall.

The answer to this question remains the same as to the same question asked by the Councillor at Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny.

**Question No. 58**

**Councillor Alison Moore**

Why did the Council fail to undertake a comprehensive re-assessment of needs of the blind people affected by the withdrawal of grant funding to sheltered workshops prior to the decision being taken in March?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

After the Cabinet decision to consult on this proposal a comprehensive Community Care Assessment was undertaken in respect of the three service users.

**Question No. 59**

**Councillor Linda McFayden**

Research of the private meals at home market undertaken by Council staff shows it will be difficult to cut costs through privatisation, as the current cost is in line with the market average. Will the Cabinet Member give a guarantee that any joint privatisation with Enfield Council will not reduce the quality and/or quantity of each meal at home provided or the amount of money spent on each meal, and could she explain what costs the Council is expecting the contractor to cut in order to reduce the overall costs?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

The benefit of a joint tender is that the number of meals purchased will double and the council should therefore benefit from a reduced price due to economies of scale that can be achieved from a larger contract. It is clear the tendering process offers the opportunity to improve the standards of the meals provided.

**Question No. 60**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

The current version of the Local Implementation Plan expresses an intention to extend and introduce CPZ's and that the Council will "consider pro-actively proposing controlled parking zones in areas where the parking demands exceed the safe capacity of the streets." How will the Council consult local residents on any such pro-active proposals, and how will the Council deal with these areas if the majority of residents do not want a CPZ?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Concerning consultation, the intent is to be pro-active and to go beyond the legal requirements for consultation. Proposals for new CPZ's will generally be based on the outcome of initial consultation that seeks peoples' opinion on whether a controlled zone might be supported, and if so what some of the key features should be in the eyes of the respondent. A scheme is then designed on this basis with proposed boundaries, hours and days of operation and other key features based on the returns and put forward as a detailed proposal for a further round of consultation.

**Question No. 61**

**Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

How does the Council warn those interested in purchasing council land and buildings before they submit an offer as to what the Council will consider as a legitimate offer and what will be construed as out of order, and how will this advice and information be improved upon following the highly unsatisfactory process surrounding the sale of the Deansbrook day centre?

**Answer by Councillor Mike Freer**

The original tender document contained 19 pages of terms for the tender. To ensure a level playing field between the tenderers no guidance on the price expected for the property is given. Concerning the future, the terms of the tender are reviewed on each occasion that they are used to ensure that best consideration is obtained as quickly as possible.

**Question No. 62**

**Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

What are the penalties if the contractors do not empty dog waste bins in West Hendon, and across the borough?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The contractor is deducted £1.06 per bin for those bins that are proven to be missed. In the last couple of months where we have proved failure by monitoring we have stopped over £200.00 in payments - but you should note that penalties for contractors cannot be punitive.

**Question No. 63**

**Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Will the Cabinet Member give a guarantee that all the library, community hall, day care centre, log cabin, Wingfield Nursery and housing office will all be re-provided on Grahame Park estate itself, and not moved off the estate?

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

I refer the Member to my answer to Question 26.

**Question No. 64**

**Councillor Alison Moore**

Why did the Council fail to include the views of the sheltered workshops blind people and their representatives following the supposed consultation in the report to Cabinet, and could the Cabinet Member now set out those views in public?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

The response to the consultation was made clear to members of the Cabinet. A letter from their trade union representative was circulated to Cabinet and one of the individuals affected spoke at the Cabinet meeting.

**Question No. 65**

**Councillor Linda McFayden**

Included with the meals at home privatisation will be the 25,000 kosher meals, which are currently produced, along with kosher school dinners from the council's kosher kitchen under Kedassia supervision that costs £25,000 a year. What impact will the meals at home privatisation have on the cost and production of kosher school meals, and charges to schools/parents?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

I am very supportive of the need for the provision of kosher meals. I have taken part for the past 14 years in the annual Walk for Hospital Kosher Meals. Clearly the Council will await the receipt of tenders before deciding on the best way forward. refusing to consider tenders is the attitude of mind of individuals who do not seek value for money.

**Question No. 66**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

The current version of the Local Implementation Plan notes that there has been an increase in motorists abusing school keep clear markings, and that "as it is not feasible to cover many schools by a concurrent parking attendant presence, consideration may be given to other enforcement strategies such as cameras." Does the Cabinet Member support the use of cameras to: (a) enforce school keep clear markings, (b) bus lanes, and (c) moving traffic offences?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

If you are asking if I support your policy, as stated as the last council meeting, where you would put in fixed enforcement cameras at every opportunity the answer is no.

However, I cannot answer this question adequately because different locations require different solutions and your simplistic question does not allow for the consideration of different kinds of camera enforcement (fixed, manual, CCTV, inside buses) and I would not like you to misinterpret my answer.

**Question No. 67****Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

There are three blind workers facing redundancy as a result of the Council's proposal to withdraw grant funding from the sheltered workshops. Could the Cabinet Member please explain why she is making these people redundant, and can she explain what advice she would give to them for the future?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

There is no statutory obligation to organise and fund Sheltered Employment schemes and indeed this type of arrangement would not be identified, as a Substantial or Critical need in accordance with the Fair Access to Care Services legislation. Any redundancy will be dealt with by employers of these workers.

**Question No. 68****Councillor Ansuya Sodha**

How many temporary accommodation units, and families, are there on the West Hendon Estate?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

There are currently 91 non-secure tenancies on the West Hendon estate. It is not possible to be precise about the number of families without reviewing every file, but 62 of the tenancies are of 2-bed or larger properties.

**Question No. 69****Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Will the Cabinet Member give a guarantee that the promised new open space to replace the lost Grahame Park open space will be provided by the end of the regeneration project?

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

The approved master plan shows re-provision of better located and higher quality open across the estate and this will be provided within the phased development of the regeneration scheme. Choices for Grahame Park and Genesis Housing Group (or any other developer) are obliged to comply with the planning consent.

**Question No. 70****Councillor Alison Moore**

Why is the Community Flat on the Grange estate not open?

**Answer by Councillor Fiona Bulmer**

The community flat is currently closed to allow works to improve accessibility to be carried out. The target date for completion and re-opening is November 28th.

**Question No. 71****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

What is the likely timetable for the Council to consider and evaluate moving away from paper-based permit parking schemes towards new technology schemes?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The market for the provision of new-technology replacements for permits is very new, though a few authorities are now going through or have recently concluded a tendering process for this. It is desirable that such schemes might offer alternatives to having to pay and display so that residents could get the maximum benefits from such a scheme whilst using their cars in the borough as well as at home. It is also desirable that such cashless pay and display alternatives be compatible - if possible - with schemes in use in other authorities. There are several rival companies, but there are now moves to improve compatibility between systems.

It is therefore intended to review how this market has developed in the course of 2006, and to outline whether a case can be made to apply such a scheme in Barnet - and to what timetable.

**Question No. 72****Councillor Zakia Zubairi**

Why is the provision of youth services not a priority for the Council?

**Answer by Councillor John Marshall**

The Labour Group has demonstrated the importance it attaches to this question by placing it very low down the order. We inherited a demoralised youth service from the Labour and Liberal administration in 2002. It is now a much more effective organisation. That demonstrates the importance we attach to the youth service.

**Question No. 73****Councillor Gill Sargeant**

Could the council let us know the rescheduled date for the consultation on the report from Renaisi on the Socio- Economic strategy?

**Answer by Councillor Anthony Finn**

The draft report from Renaisi is currently under review and it is envisaged that consultation on an appropriate socio-economic strategy for Grahame Park will take place at a time to be advised.

**Question No. 74****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

At the Council meeting on 28 June 2005, the Cabinet Member said: "The council also needs to consider whether or not, as part of future Parking Permit issues, residents should be entitled to a number, say 5, complimentary visitor parking vouchers." Given that this has been omitted from the Local Implementation Plan, could the Cabinet Member explain when and how a final announcement on this proposal will be made?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The exact detail of the application of visitor parking vouchers is not a matter for the parking plan. Before I make any announcement I would like to hear the views of the Cleaner Greener Transport & Development Scrutiny Committee, who are meeting in two days time on 10 November.

**Question No. 75****Councillor Gill Sargeant**

What plans are there to make Rushgrove Park a premier park as there is no premier park in Colindale?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Following on from the Greenspaces Best Value Review in 2004, the Council identified 16 principle parks for designation as Premier Parks. These were picked for their location in the Borough to give as near as possible a coverage across the whole Borough so that as many people as possible would be within 1 mile of a Premier Park, irrespective of ward boundaries.

Colindale Ward is covered by the following premier parks; Watling Park, Sunnyhill Park and West Hendon Playing Fields.

Other parks may be considered as premier parks in the future. At present the 16 premier parks have a five year improvement plan to bring them up to a high standard and it is important that this programme is carried through.

The Premier Parks strategy does not mean that we are neglecting other sites. Rushgrove Park has benefited from a number of improvements. Working closely with the local community, borough officers have increased the money available to the site by gaining a grant to refurbish the pond, waterfall and shrub beds as well as installing an additional item of play equipment in the play area.

**Question No. 76****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

How many parking attendants does the Council currently employ (as at 1 November 2005)?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

67 officers were employed by the Council as Parking Attendants.

**Question No. 77**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

The Council measures the number of parking tickets issued against benchmarks for specific parking attendant beats. How have the benchmarks been set; what is the process if a particular beat regularly does not meet its benchmark; what is the process if a particular parking attendant does not meet the benchmark and how often has this occurred since April 2005?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

Benchmarks are derived from analysis of specific beats looking at the numbers of vehicles on a given beat identified. This can be done on historical information and on the basis of specific patrols. Supervisors or Senior officers will carry out specific patrols, and individual officers' penalty issues can also be recorded. There is no single benchmark for a beat. There will be a range because of daily variation and this is because parking patterns change as people react to differing levels of enforcement. However if a parking attendant over a period of time, for a specific beat or over a range of beats, is consistently identifying significantly less contravening vehicles than their peers or supervisors, and if their abilities in this regard are consistently at the lower end of the benchmarking range, performance management meetings will take place to seek to identify why this might be so with the aim of identifying training needs or providing support or mentoring, which can include on-street support of senior staff. The meetings also contribute to identifying whether changing local parking demands might have improved local compliance. Further benchmarking may take place to gauge this. 12 officers have been involved in performance management meetings since April, and this is an ongoing process.

**Question No. 78**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

The current version of the Local Implementation Plan proposes that an observation loading time be introduced for "all vehicles likely to be used in a loading or delivery act – vans, lorries, estate cars with the seats down, motorcycles and hackney carriages, etc" with the vehicle observed for at least five minutes before a PCN is issued. The use of the phrase "estate cars with their seats down" appears to exclude non-estate cars and estate cars with their seats up from the observation time. Could the Cabinet Member please indicate whether non-estate cars and estate cars with their seats up will be given an observation loading time?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The draft LIP refers to consideration being given to observation issues including the possibility of a 5 minute observation time for some classes of vehicles. That consideration will be given firstly by the Cleaner Greener Transport & Development Scrutiny Committee that will consider the matter in detail and offer its views. This will then inform a report on the matter.

**Question No. 79**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

On which date and to which meeting will the final version of the Local Implementation Plan be considered by Members?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The final version of the LIP was due to be considered by Cabinet on 5 December 2005. Due to late receipt by the Council of TfL's consultation response, that was essential to allow the finalisation process to take place, TfL have sought and obtained the GLA's agreement for the Council's programme deadline to be extended. It is now proposed to take the final version of the LIP to Cabinet on 23 January 2006 to seek agreement to recommend it to Council for approval on 31 January 2006.

**Question No. 80**

**Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

Is the Council producing a revised parking/CPZ policy to be announced after the Local Implementation Plan is agreed and, if so, what is the timetable for the additional parking policy, how are residents and elected Members to be consulted, and what issues will the revised policy cover?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

When the Local Implementation Plan is agreed, the Parking and Enforcement Plan within it will be the definitive document setting out parking policy in Barnet. It is expected that after the conclusion of the LIP process, we will review the need to produce a document setting out issues relevant to the implementation or application of the Plan.

After the conclusion of the LIP process, we will review the need to produce a further document clarifying the application of the policy in the specific context of the operational issues that it may impact on. The timetable and scope of this will depend entirely on the outcome of the LIP process as the final agreed version of the LIP may differ from current drafts if further change is required in order to meet the requirements of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

**Question No. 81****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

On which date will the street lighting PFI contract commence, and when will the proposed replacement of street lights actually begin?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

The timetable is to commence the contract on 31 March 2006 with the Core Investment Programme (replacement programme) commencing within the first 3 months of the contract commencement.

The project has to date run in line with the timetable but it should be understood that the project has just entered the negotiation stage and it is this period that is most susceptible to slippage in the timetable. This is due to the reliance on the private sector bidder being proactive and responsive to addressing issues in line with our timetable. Furthermore, we will need to obtain approval from the Department for Transport on a number of derogation issues and on the Final Business Case and the time taken to receive this approval could adversely affect the timetable.

Officers and Advisors will be doing everything in their power to achieve the original timetable but as identified above this is not wholly in our control.

**Question No. 82****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

In the Hendon Times on 25 February 2004 it was reported on pest control that: "Unison has argued that the service could be made self-financing, and even profitable, by simply increasing the charges. Mr Salinger responded that the council could not take such a financial risk." Why is it OK to take such a financial risk now?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

A similar question was put to Councillor Salinger when the pest control report was called in and considered by Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> October. I am advised that Councillor Salinger's response was that under this Administration the Council's finances are now better placed, in particular with regard to levels of balances, to allow for a self-funding pest treatment service to be introduced.

**Question No. 83****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

From February, the Council proposes to employ just two pest control staff which will result in longer response times to complaints and likelihood that appointments will be missed. What will the service standards in terms of response times be and how will controlled appointments be organised?

## **Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

These issues are referred to in Sections 8.10 to 8.12 of the Pest Treatment Services report to 11 October Cabinet.

8.10 Because of this uncertain level of demand and the need to ensure recovery of costs through fees and charges, it is proposed that resource levels would initially be established to meet the lower end of demand. This may put at risk the responsiveness of the service, and particularly if there is substantial initial demand.

8.11 If it is assumed from the information in Appendix 4 that service requests would have been maintained at a mean of 3522 per year, and that the introduction of the proposed level of fees and charges would lead to a drop in service requests to 70% of those levels, then the service would require 2 full time equivalent Pest Control Officers to respond to those requests, together with covering the number of revisits that would be necessary. The service would be managed from within the Public Health and Nuisance Group in Environmental Health with administrative support from the existing administration team. An allowance for management and administrative costs has been included. The operatives and their equipment and materials would be based at Mill Hill Depot and these accommodation costs have also been included. The budget for the service is detailed in Appendix 1 and includes a contingency sum of £20,000 to provide a degree of financial flexibility given the uncertainties surrounding the demand projection.

8.12 With a low staffing base it will be necessary to maintain maximum flexibility in terms of work scheduling so that time lost in transit around the borough is minimised. This will mean that service standards in terms of response times and controlled appointments will initially need to allow for this maximum flexibility. Once base levels of demand and income are established and profiled we will review staffing, service standards, and operational arrangements.

To avoid time lost in transit it is intended that appointments will be grouped on a geographical basis rather than first come first served. We cannot give a commitment at this stage to respond within a particular time frame and it is likely that some residents will have to wait some period of days before a visit can be made. We hope to be able to offer residents a morning/afternoon window for the appointment time but again we will need to see what impact this will have on efficient routing of appointments.

There is no reference in the report to appointments being missed. We will not offer more appointments than we can keep. If demands are greater than can be met then we will review the resources allocated to the service but only on the basis that the service remains fully self-funding. Local residents will of course always have the alternative option of using private sector providers.

**Question No. 84****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

The Council has admitted that high pest control “fee levels may reduce demands” because “the previous service was heavily subsidised”. Why would residents go for the Council service with a poor standard of appointments and service, compared to spending a few pounds more for a quality private service?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

I am not sure where you acquired the quote but the Council will be offering a good quality, reliable pest control service. What we are doing is providing choice of service provider.

**Question No. 85****Councillor Kathy McGuirk**

What contingency plans are there in place to deal with a lack of full paying pest control service users and the resulting impact on the cross-subsidy for the reduced rate service users, and therefore the entire viability of the pest control service being self-financing?

**Answer by Councillor Matthew Offord**

These issues are referred to in Sections 8.11 and 8.13 of the Pest Treatment Services report to 11 October Cabinet.

8.11 If it is assumed from the information in Appendix 4 that service requests would have been maintained at a mean of 3522 per year, and that the introduction of the proposed level of fees and charges would lead to a drop in service requests to 70% of those levels, then the service would require 2 full time equivalent Pest Control Officers to respond to those requests, together with covering the number of revisits that would be necessary. The service would be managed from within the Public Health and Nuisance Group in Environmental Health with administrative support from the existing administration team. An allowance for management and administrative costs has been included. The operatives and their equipment and materials would be based at Mill Hill Depot and these accommodation costs have also been included. The budget for the service is detailed in Appendix 1 and includes a contingency sum of £20,000 to provide a degree of financial flexibility given the uncertainties surrounding the demand projection.

8.13 Proposed fees and charges for the service are set out in Appendix 5. These include for a discounted rate for recipients of the following means tested

**ETHNICITY  
COMPARISON  
JANUARY 2004  
AND MARCH  
2005**

<b>Jan-04</b>			<b>Mar-05</b>			
<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Forms Returned</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Forms Returned</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Community Care	445	33.0%	Adult Social Services	532	38.3%	5.3%
Borough Treasurer	312	29.5%	Borough Treasurer	252	31.0%	1.5%
Children & Families	200	29.5%	Children & Families	293	34.1%	4.6%
Corporate Performance	39	10.3%	Corporate Support	24	12.5%	2.2%
Customer Care	263	21.7%	Cultural Services	269	24.2%	2.5%
Education	340	18.2%	Education	449	23.8%	5.6%
Environmental Services	801	21.7%	Environmental Services	967	22.0%	0.3%
Highways & Design	186	25.8%	Highways & Design	257	26.5%	0.7%
Human Resources	120	33.3%	Human Resources	69	30.4%	-2.9%
Housing	294	25.5%	Housing	168	42.3%	16.8%
Information Systems	49	28.6%	Information Systems	79	26.6%	-2.0%
Law & Probity	59	33.9%	Law & Probity	102	30.4%	-3.5%
Property & Valuation	13	0.0%	Property & Valuation	14	7.1%	7.1%
Planning	50	20.0%	Planning	69	26.1%	6.1%
Schools	3,564	15.9%	Schools	4,450	18.8%	2.9%
Strategic Directors	13	7.7%	Strategic Directors	14	7.1%	-0.6%
Cricklewood & SD	2	50.0%	Strategic Development Unit	5	0.0%	-50.0%
<b>LBB</b>	<b>6,750</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>LBB</b>	<b>7,965</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>

**Council: 20 December 2005**

**Administration Policy Item:** Cllr. Brian Salinger

**Budget 2006/07**

Council notes the components of the budget 2006/07.

Council further notes the Budget will be set after careful consideration.

Council believes this authority continues to be under-funded by government, again receiving a Formula Grant increase lower than the London and England averages.

Council calls on Cabinet to work to produce the Budget for 2006/07 within the constraints imposed by government.

**Council, Tuesday 20 December 2005**

**Opposition Policy Item to be moved by Councillor Alan Schneiderman**

Council recalls the success of staff in winning Beacon Council status for Barnet's libraries, the refurbishment of Hendon Library, the extension of library opening hours and improvement to library facilities under the leadership of Councillor Susette Palmer when Labour and the Liberal Democrats led the Council.

Council also recalls that in July 2002 the Conservative administration promised: "Barnet Council has no plans to reduce the number of libraries," before agreeing to close South Friern library and Totteridge library.

Council condemns the Administration for breaking its subsequent promise to re-provide Totteridge Library.

Council notes the Administration's attempt to close South Friern Library has been thwarted by local residents campaigning against the closure and sale. Council urges the Cabinet to publish the winning specification for the new library, and to provide a guarantee that the floor-space, staffing, facilities and opening hours will match or improve on the current South Friern library.

Council regrets that in 2005/6 the administration cut £369,000 from libraries by cutting over 42 hours of library opening, scrapping a mobile library van and 22 weekly mobile library visits, and buying fewer new books.

Council urges the Cabinet, when considering its proposals for the 2006/7 budget, not to close more libraries, not to cut more library opening hours and not to cut more library staffing levels. Council particularly urges the Cabinet not to proceed with the Cabinet Member's preference to close ten libraries. In contrast, Council urges the Cabinet to invest in libraries, including the extension of opening hours.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Council Meeting</b> <b>20 December 2005</b></p>
---

REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC SERVICES MANAGER

Agenda item 15.2

**1. VACANCIES ON SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES**

Appendix A lists (in bold) all current vacancies now needing to be filled in the Council's representation on school governing bodies. There are a number of other vacancies on governing bodies which are due to reconstitute over the course of the next year. However, as this may lead to a reduction in the number of LEA governors on those bodies, it is not proposed to fill those vacancies until the position at each school is clarified. The table below gives numbers for all LEA governors, including those vacancies which are not presently being filled.

In order to reflect the political balance of the Council, the political balance on school governing bodies (as at 1 December 2005) should be: -

Conservative	148
Labour	107
Liberal Democrat	27
Total	282

The current balance on school governing bodies is: -

Conservative	148
Labour	93
Liberal Democrat	21
Vacancies	20
Total	282

All persons appointed will hold office for four years from the date of appointment or until the governing body has been reconstituted under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003 if this has not already occurred.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

**RECOMMENDATION: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.**

## **2. VACANCIES ARISING FROM RECONSTITUTION OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES**

Under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003 the governing bodies of all schools in England must re-constitute themselves by 31 August 2006. The term of appointment of any governor appointed after 1 September 2003 finishes when the governing body reconstitutes and those governors may be reappointed. Appendix B lists (in bold) vacancies due to arise in the near future in the Council's representation on school governing bodies as a result of the Regulations.

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

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

**RECOMMENDATION: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.**

## **3. REPRESENTATION OF THE COUNCIL ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

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

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

Members are asked to note that the Ann Sims Charity has recently been wound up and appointments to this organisation are no longer necessary. The appointed representatives have been advised.

**RECOMMENDATION: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.**

## **4. REPORTS EXEMPTED FROM THE CALL – PROCESS**

In order to meet Constitutional requirements, Council are being advised that the following report has been exempted from the call – in process because the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the action proposed was reasonable in the circumstances and that the matter could be treated as urgent.

**Report of the Cabinet Members for Regeneration, Resources and the Leader: Hawfinch, 1 and 3 Harriett and adjacent garages, Grahame Park Estate.**

The Cabinet Members approve a further variant of the terms of the freehold disposal of the above properties and the adjacent garages to Choices for Grahame Park (Choices) for a first phase redevelopment project to ensure that the scheme proceeds at the earliest opportunity.

*Reason for Urgency:* There was a urgent need to complete the transfer of the Premises to Choices so that demolition and clearance of the existing vacant buildings could be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. On occasions the

property had been used by squatters and it had taken time and expense to remove them. The demolition of the property would remove the constant risk of squatters.

John Marr  
Democratic Services Manager

## Register of Appointments and Nominations on School Governors

**1. Organisation: Church Hill School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- |   |   |                                |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1 - <b>Ms Kelly Liza Tebb</b><br>Period of Appointment: | <b>(Resigned 02/03/2005)</b><br><b>19/03/2002 to 18/03/2006</b> | <b>P.11.1</b><br><b>Labour</b> |
| 2 - Councillor Daniel Hope<br>Period of Appointment:    | (Appointed 28/06/2005)<br>29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009              | P.11.2<br>Conservative         |
| 3 - Mrs Joanna Tambourides<br>Period of Appointment:    | (Appointed 14/05/2003)<br>14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007              | P.11.3<br>Conservative         |

**2. Organisation: Coppetts Wood Primary School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- |  |   |                                |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1 - Mrs V Tyas<br>Period of Appointment:           | (Appointed 02/03/2004)<br>30/03/2004 to 29/03/2008              | P.14.1<br>Labour               |
| 2 - Mr G Old<br>Period of Appointment:             | (Appointed 06/07/2004)<br>09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008              | P.14.2<br>Conservative         |
| 3 - <b>Ms M Mitchell</b><br>Period of Appointment: | <b>(Resigned 08/05/2005)</b><br><b>20/04/2005 to 19/04/2009</b> | <b>P.14.3</b><br><b>Labour</b> |

**3. Organisation: Deansbrook Infant School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- |  |   |                                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 - <b>Mrs Marilyn Manning</b><br>Period of Appointment: | <b>(Resigned 16/05/2005)</b><br><b>09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006</b> | <b>P.38a.1</b><br><b>Conservative</b> |
| 2 - Ms M Goodman<br>Period of Appointment:               | (Appointed 11/11/2003)<br>11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007              | P.38a.2<br>Labour                     |
| 3 - Councillor Brian Gordon<br>Period of Appointment:    | (Appointed 11/11/2003)<br>11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007              | P.38a.3<br>Conservative               |

#### 4. Organisation: Fairway Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

1 - Mrs Gwen Brandon (Appointed 08/11/2005) P.40.1  
Period of Appointment: 09/11/2005 to 08/11/2009 Labour

2 - **Mr K Lyon (Disqualified 07/09/2005) P.40.2**  
**Period of Appointment: 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 Conservative**

3 - Ms Jackie Irven (Appointed 08/11/2005) P.40.3  
Period of Appointment: 09/11/2005 to 08/11/2009 Labour

#### 5. Organisation: Northway School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

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

#### 6. Organisation: Oakleigh School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives Vac Ref

1 - Mr John Tiplady (Appointed 13/09/2005) SP.03.1  
Period of Appointment: 20/11/2005 to 19/11/2009 Conservative

2 - **Mrs Anne Jarvis (Resigned 25/07/2004) SP.03.2**  
**Period of Appointment: 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Labour**

#### 7. Organisation: Pardes House Primary School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives Vac Ref

1 - **Councillor Anthony Finn (Expires 22/01/2006) VP.29a.1**  
**Period of Appointment: 23/01/2002 to 22/01/2006 Conservative**

#### 8. Organisation: St Johns NW4

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives Vac Ref

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

**9. 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

**10. 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

APPENDIX B  
Register of Appointments and Nominations on School Governors  
**Posts which will expire on reconstitution of the Governing Body**

**1. Organisation: Coppetts Wood Primary School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                        |                               |              |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Mrs V Tyas         | (Appointed 02/03/2004) P.14.1 |              |
| Period of Appointment: | 30/03/2004 to 29/03/2008      | Labour       |
|                        |                               |              |
| 2 - Mr G Old           | (Appointed 06/07/2004) P.14.2 |              |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008      | Conservative |
|                        |                               |              |
| 3 - Ms M Mitchell      | (Resigned 08/05/2005) P.14.3  |              |
| Period of Appointment: | 20/04/2005 to 19/04/2009      | Labour       |

**2. Organisation: Copthall School**

No. of Representatives: reducing to 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                                 |                               |                  |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 - Mr J Howard                 | (Appointed 28/06/2005) S.03.1 |                  |
| Period of Appointment:          | 09/07/2005 to 08/07/2009      | Labour           |
|                                 |                               |                  |
| 2 - Mrs D Iwi                   | (Appointed 10/09/2002) S.03.2 |                  |
| Period of Appointment:          | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006      | Liberal Democrat |
|                                 |                               |                  |
| 3 - Councillor Maureen Braun    | (Appointed 08/07/2003) S.03.3 |                  |
| Period of Appointment:          | 01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007      | Conservative     |
|                                 |                               |                  |
| 4 - Mr Richard Weider           | (Appointed 18/11/2004) S.03.4 |                  |
| Period of Appointment:          | 19/11/2004 to 18/11/2008      | Conservative     |
|                                 |                               |                  |
| 5 - Mrs Doloranda Hannah Pember | (Resigned 03/10/2005) S.03.5  |                  |
| Period of Appointment:          | 01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007      | Labour           |

**3. Organisation: Deansbrook Infant School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                             |                                |              |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Mrs Marilyn Manning     | (Resigned 16/05/2005) P.38a.1  |              |
| Period of Appointment:      | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006       | Conservative |
|                             |                                |              |
| 2 - Ms M Goodman            | (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.38a.2 |              |
| Period of Appointment:      | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007       | Labour       |
|                             |                                |              |
| 3 - Councillor Brian Gordon | (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.38a.3 |              |
| Period of Appointment:      | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007       | Conservative |

#### 4. Organisation: Deansbrook Junior School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                             |                                       |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 - Mr Paul Amsterdam       | (Appointed 09/07/2002) P.38b.1        |
| Period of Appointment:      | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Conservative |
| 2 - Ms M Goodman            | (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.38b.2        |
| Period of Appointment:      | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 Labour       |
| 3 - Councillor Brian Gordon | (Appointed 11/11/2003) P.38b.3        |
| Period of Appointment:      | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 Conservative |

#### 5. Organisation: Frith Manor Junior and Infant School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                          |                                       |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 - Mr Richard Cornelius | (Appointed 18/01/2005) P.42.1         |
| Period of Appointment:   | 19/01/2005 to 18/01/2009 Conservative |
| 2 - Mr Martin Butcher    | (Appointed 19/11/2003) P.42.2         |
| Period of Appointment:   | 19/11/2003 to 18/11/2007 Conservative |
| 3 - Mr R Chopra          | (Appointed 08/07/2003) P.42.3         |
| Period of Appointment:   | 21/07/2003 to 20/07/2007 Labour       |
| 4 - Mrs Y Broom          | (Appointed 02/11/2002) P.42.4         |
| Period of Appointment:   | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 Conservative |

#### 6. Organisation: Grasvenor Avenue Infant School

No. of Representatives: increasing to 3

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 - Mrs Bridget Perry  | (Appointed 13/09/2005) P.45.2         |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/09/2005 to 13/09/2009 Conservative |
| 3 New Vacancy          | P.45.3                                |

#### 7. Organisation: Mathilda Marks Kennedy School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- |                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 - Ms Ruth Nyman      | (Appointed 11/11/2003) VP.30.1  |
| Period of Appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 Labour |

**8. Organisation: Oak Lodge School**

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>1 - Mr G Kirby</b><br><b>Period of Appointment:</b>              | <b>(Appointed 26/10/2004) SP.04.1</b><br><b>09/11/2004 to 08/11/2008 Conservative</b> |
| <b>2 - Councillor Alison Moore</b><br><b>Period of Appointment:</b> | <b>(Appointed 10/09/2003) SP.04.2</b><br><b>10/09/2003 to 09/09/2007 Labour</b>       |
| <b>3 - Ms Mary Phillips</b><br><b>Period of Appointment:</b>        | <b>(Appointed 09/07/2002) SP.04.3</b><br><b>09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Conservative</b> |

**9. Organisation: The Henrietta Barnett School**

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>1 - Councillor Andrew Harper</b><br><b>Period of Appointment:</b> | <b>(Appointed 19/11/2003) VS.05.1</b><br><b>19/11/2003 to 18/11/2007 Conservative</b> |
| <b>2 - Councillor Eva Greenspan</b><br><b>Period of Appointment:</b> | <b>(Appointed 14/05/2003) VS.05.2</b><br><b>14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 Conservative</b> |

APPENDIX C

Register of Appointments and Nominations on Outside Bodies

**1. Organisation: Adoption and Permanency Panel**

Special Conditions:

(a) Term of office is for three years. If a representative resigns or does not complete their term of office, the person appointed to replace that representative will serve the unexpired term of office.

(b) Representatives must be Members of the Council, one appointed from each of the main political parties.

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
<b>1 - Councillor Susan Steinberg</b>	<b>(Resigned 31/12/2005)</b>	<b>0111</b>
		<b>Member</b>
<b>Period of Appointment:</b>	<b>01/07/2005 to 30/06/2008</b>	
2 - Councillor Agnes Slocombe	(Appointed 08/11/2005)	0112
		Member
Period of Appointment:	26/11/2005 to 25/11/2008	

**2. Organisation: Poors Allotment Trust for Chipping Barnet and East Barnet**

Special Conditions:

(a) Term of office is for four years.

(b) Representatives may, but need not, be Members of the Council. Meetings are held once a year in October/November.

No. of Representatives: 6 (Representative Trustees)

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mr Don Goodman	(Appointed 13/09/2005)	1109
		Member
Period of Appointment:	05/11/2005 to 04/11/2009	
2 - Councillor Wendy Prentice	(Appointed 14/05/2002)	1110
		Member
Period of Appointment:	14/05/2002 to 13/05/2006	
3 - Mrs M Leggett	(Appointed 09/07/2003)	1111
		Member
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2003 to 08/07/2007	
4 - Councillor Olwen Evans	(Appointed 26/08/2004)	1112
		Member
Period of Appointment:	27/08/2004 to 26/08/2008	
<b>5 - Councillor Katia David</b>	<b>(Expires 22/01/2006)</b>	<b>1113</b>
		<b>Member</b>
<b>Period of Appointment:</b>	<b>23/01/2002 to 22/01/2006</b>	
6 - Mr John Tiplady	(Appointed 14/05/2002)	1114
		Member
Period of Appointment:	14/05/2002 to 13/05/2006	

### 3. Organisation: Valentine Poole Charity

Special Conditions:

(a) Term of office is for four years.

(b) Representatives may, but need not, be Members of the Council.

No. of Representatives: 4 (Nominative Trustees)

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mr Ronald Neil	(Appointed 18/05/2003)	1135 Member
Period of Appointment:	14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007	
2 - Ms B Sandford	(Appointed 01/04/2004)	1136 Member
Period of Appointment:	30/04/2004 to 29/04/2008	
<b>3 - Councillor Olwen Evans</b>	<b>(Disqualified 15/11/2005)</b>	<b>1137 Member</b>
<b>Period of Appointment:</b>	<b>14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007</b>	
4 - Ms Helena Davis	(Appointed 22/10/2003)	1138 Member
Period of Appointment:	22/10/2003 to 21/10/2007	