

<b><u>MEETING</u></b> <b>CONSTITUTION AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE</b>
<b><u>DATE AND TIME</u></b> <b>TUESDAY 9TH APRIL, 2019</b> <b>AT 7.00 PM</b>
<b><u>VENUE</u></b> <b>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ</b>

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
5.	PUBLIC QUESTION AND COMMENTS (IF ANY)	3 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

**CONSTITUTION AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday 9 April 2019**

**ITEM 5 – PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

**Note**

At the meeting a total of 30 minutes is available for public questions and comments. The questioner may ask one supplementary question at the meeting which will be answered without discussion. The supplementary question must be relevant to the original question put to the Chairman.

**Public Comment (up to 3 minutes per comment)**

Agenda Item No	Public Comment Request
Item 8 – Constitution Review	Mr John Dix
Item 8 – Constitution Review (Appendix B)	<p>Mr Levy</p> <p>I have found that where the Chairman of a Residents Forum instructs an officer to provide information within 20 days (item 3.5), it is currently often unsatisfactory because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. if information is not provided within 20 days, it can then be very protracted to obtain the information because then officers have no further deadline to fulfil; and</li> </ul> <p>if this provision is used to obtain a response or part response to a tabled question that was not provided in time for the printed response/meeting, then;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. other interested residents will not see the response and will have to inquire separately to obtain the information;</li> <li>iii. the resident loses the opportunity to address the Forum with the light of the deferred response until six months have elapsed, which may mean waiting for another 9-12 months.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM 5

	<p>I am therefore seeking that the following text be considered for insertion into the Constitution, Appendix B, 3.5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After "within 20 days to provide an additional response", add "; if this occurs or if an officer has undertaken to follow up with such full response, this response shall also be printed in the final draft and published minutes of that Forum, captioned as a NOTE, within the minuting of that agenda item"</li> <li>2. At end of paragraph beginning "The Six Month rule", add "An exception is that where additional time following a Residents Forum is required to provide a full response to an issue tabled at a particular Forum, the same resident will promptly be advised that (s)he may speak for 3 minutes in response to that response at any subsequent Residents Forum for the same area within the six month period following the said Forum, or appoint another Barnet resident to do so, other than a Councillor, MP or Assembly Member. At least three working days' notice must be given of such intention to speak; the original issue and proceedings to date shall be appear in full in the agenda and noted as a deferred item; and the Chairman will determine the issue in the same manner as other issues at the Forum, see below, save that (s)he shall seek to avoid duplication within the six-month period."</li> </ol>
--	--

Qn No	Agenda Item No	Raised By	Question Raised	Answer
1.	<b>Item 8 – Constitution Review Appendix G</b>	Mr Roots	The Council intends to end the possibility of residents addressing questions to the Leader at full Council meetings. Many people, including myself, were unaware that this was a possibility. Instead of removing this facility, why does the Council not publicize it?	The provision is included in the Council Procedure Rules a part of the Constitution. The Constitution is published on the Council's website and the provision is therefore publicised. Until the meeting of Council as Trustee on 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2019, the provision was never used and it is therefore proposed for deletion. There are several other mechanisms for the public to make representations to the Council as detailed in Article 3 (Residents and Public Participation) – see <a href="#">here</a>

2.	<b>Item 8 – Constitution Review Appendix G</b>	Mr Roots	<p>The Council intends to raise the number of objections to planning applications from 5 to 10, before an application must go before a planning committee. Planning applications are badly publicized. This proposal will mean that virtually every application will be decided upon by officers. It is a serious threat to public participation. Why do it?</p>	<p>Planning applications are advertised in accordance with statutory requirements. The reason for the proposal is as detailed in the committee report.</p>
----	--	----------	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank