



SUMMONS TO ATTEND COUNCIL MEETING

Monday, 12 September 2011 at 7.00 pm
Council Chamber, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,
Wembley, HA9 9HD

To the Mayor and Councillors of the London Borough of Brent and to each and every one of them.

I hereby summon you to attend the MEETING OF THE COUNCIL of this Borough.

GARETH DANIEL
Chief Executive

Dated: Friday, 2 September 2011

For further information contact: Peter Goss, Democratic Services Manager
020 8937 1353, peter.goss@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Agenda

Apologies for absence

Item	Page
1 Minutes of the previous meeting	1 - 16
2 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on this agenda.	
3 Mayor's announcements (including any petitions received)	
4 Appointments to committees and outside bodies and appointment of chairs/vice chairs (if any)	
5 Debate	
To debate key issues affecting the Borough.	
One year ago, the Borough Police Commander attended a Council meeting to debate crime and community safety in the borough. The Borough Commander will attend this meeting to provide an update with particular reference to the recent disturbances in parts of London and elsewhere in the country.	
6 Report from the Leader or members of the Executive	17 - 18
To receive reports from the Leader or members of the Executive in accordance with Standing Order 42.	
7 Questions from the Opposition and other Non- Executive Members	
Questions will be put to the Executive	
8 Reports from the Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	
To receive reports from the Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees in accordance with Standing Order 41.	
9 The Treasury Management Annual Report 2010/11	19 - 32
The purpose of this report is to provide information to members on	

borrowing and investment activity, and performance compared to prudential indicators during 2010/11.

Ward Affected: All Wards **Contact Officer:** Clive Heaphy, Director of Finance and Corporate Services
Tel: 020 8937 1424
clive.heaphy@brent.gov.uk

10 Proposed changes to Area Housing Boards

33 - 48

This report proposes to move from the current Area Housing Board structure to a model based on a more open style consultation approach which will continue to focus on scrutiny and monitoring by residents of housing service delivery but will aim to significantly increase the numbers of council tenants participating in such events.

Ward Affected: All Wards **Contact Officer:** Andrew Donald, Director of Regeneration and Major Projects
Tel: 020 8937 1049
andrew.donald@brent.gov.uk

11 Motions

To debate any motions submitted in accordance with Standing Order 45.

12 Urgent business

At the discretion of the Mayor to consider any urgent business.



- Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
 - Toilets are available on the second floor.
 - Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near The Paul Daisley Hall.
 - A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

Minutes of the ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
held on Monday, 11 July 2011 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor M Aslam Choudry

The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Michael Adeyeye

COUNCILLORS:

Aden	Al-Ebadi
Allie	Arnold
Ashraf	Mrs Bacchus
Baker	Beck
Beckman	Beswick
Brown	Butt
Castle	Cheese
Chohan	S Choudhary
Clues	Colwill
Crane	Cummins
Daly	Denselow
Gladbaum	Harrison
Hashmi	Hector
Hirani	Hossain
Hunter	John
Jones	Kabir
Kansagra	Kataria
Long	Lorber
Mashari	Matthews
McLennan	Mitchell Murray
J Moher	R Moher
Moloney	Naheerathan
Oladapo	BM Patel
CJ Patel	HB Patel
HM Patel	RS Patel
Powney	Ms Shaw
Sheth	Singh
Sneddon	Thomas
Van Kalwala	

Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from: Councillors Leaman and Mistry

1. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the annual meeting held on 11 May 2011 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

2. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

Councillor Beck declared a personal interest in item 7 - Debate, by virtue of his employment at the GLA.

Councillor Powney declared a personal interest in item 5 - Report from the Leader or members of the Executive, by virtue of being a member of the West London Waste Authority.

3. **Mayor's announcements (including any petitions received)**

The Mayor said that he was honoured to be chairing his first Council Meeting and looked forward to the year ahead. He advised the meeting that he had chosen Brent Mind and the Central Mosque of Brent as his charities for the coming year.

The Mayor stated that in accordance with Standing Orders a list of current petitions showing progress on dealing with them had been circulated around the chamber.

The Mayor explained that a procedural motion would be submitted to bring forward the debate on the Olympics and the meeting was lucky to have two senior officials present who would each be giving a talk on the preparations for the Olympics.

4. **Appointments to committees and outside bodies and appointment of chairs/vice chairs**

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that Councillor R Patel be appointed to Health Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee in place of Councillor Hirani;
- (ii) that Ms Elsie Points be appointed a voting co-opted member of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2011/12 municipal year, representing the Church of England.

5. **Procedural motion**

Councillor Moloney moved a procedural motion proposing a change in the order of business.

RESOLVED:-

that the order of business listed on the summons be amended to allow for Item 7 - Debate on the Olympics - to be brought forward and taken immediately following item 4 - Appointments to Committees/Appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs - after which the order shall be as listed on the summons.

6. **Debate**

The Mayor welcomed Neale Coleman, the Mayor of London's Olympic advisor and Richard Sumray, chair of the London 2012 Forum at LOCOG (The London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games).

Neale Coleman expressed his gratitude for being given the opportunity to address the meeting and referred to his association with the borough dating back to the time of the construction of Wembley Stadium and the visit by the International Olympic Committee's evaluation panel, which had turned out to be very successful. The collaboration between the Mayor's office and the Council had continued to be strong and he referred to the borough's Chief Executive being a member of the steering group looking at the Olympic operation right across London. Mr Coleman explained that the GLA had given consideration to the extra costs associated with hosting the Games and the Council had been awarded £700,000 which was in the process of being paid over. He reminded members that it was not just the stadium that would be used during the Olympics but also Wembley Arena and so there would be a large number of visitors to the borough which would make it a very exciting place to be. Mr Coleman stated that there were discussions taking place between the Mayor's office and the IOC to ensure that London would present itself as an Olympic city and in turn there was close liaison with the boroughs over this. The GLA would be allocating an additional sum of £50,000 to every London borough to support activities designed to achieve this. Details on this would emerge soon. A volunteer programme was being run by the GLA to recruit ambassadors who would be present at all the Olympic venues to welcome and assist the people visiting the games and many people from Brent had put themselves forward for this role. Neale Coleman reported that the Mayor had recently announced a scheme to provide free tickets for schools in London with the only requirement being for schools to ensure they registered with the LOCOG Get Set network. He was aware that there were still a large number of schools in Brent who had yet to do this. It was pointed out that being registered with Get Set was not the same thing as being a member of the Get Set network and that registered schools and colleges had to ensure they joined the network.

Richard Sumray stated that this was his third visit to the borough in recent months which was symptomatic of Brent's involvement in the Olympics. He re-iterated the importance of schools registering with the Get Set network by saying that of 107 schools in the borough, 71 had registered with Get Set but only 29 had joined the network. There continued to be significant progress made on preparing the venues which was ahead of schedule and within budget. Test events were already underway at some venues and there would be a badminton tournament held at Wembley Arena shortly. The number of tickets available for the events taking place in Brent would not be far short of one million. Consultations were taking place on the need to close Engineers Way during the Olympics in order to allow for temporary changes to be made for Wembley Arena. Mr Sumray reported that the torch relay was due to arrive in Brent on 18 May 2012 and if the experience of

Sydney was anything to go by, this would galvanise interest in the Olympics. He was sure there would be people from Brent who had been nominated as deserving of being one of the 8,000 being sought to carry the torch. A cultural festival would open prior to the Olympics and run through to the end of the Paralympic Games. Interviews were taking place to appoint volunteers to help with the running of the Games and it would be a challenge for the boroughs to harness this spirit of volunteering as a legacy of the Games. Brent had eight projects included in the Inspire programme which was designed to deliver projects and events genuinely inspired by the London 2012 Games. Mr Sumray felt that with one year to go, people around the UK were enthusiastic about the Games coming to London. The sale of tickets had given opportunities to a lot of people to purchase them and there were still around one million to sell. He had been to the last five Olympics and seen how it brought the host cities to life. The year 2012 would be a unique year in the life of Londoners and he suggested that as representatives of the people of Brent, members were in a position to ensure the year was special and had a lasting impact for the benefit of generations to come.

Councillor John thanked the speakers for their contributions. She wanted it to be known that Brent was proud to be an Olympic borough hosting football, badminton and gymnastics. She was glad that past support for the Olympics had been cross party. Councillor John added that the borough was also proud to be able to contribute to the cultural aspect of the Olympics. Her personal experience of attending an Olympic Games had given her an insight to the effect it had on a city and she felt Brent was ready and willing to play its part.

The Mayor opened the issue up for discussion. There was endorsement of the sentiment that Brent was proud to be a host borough and congratulations were passed on to all those involved in the hard work so far undertaken into making the arrangements. The hope was expressed that there would be a fair allocation of tickets for schools. A primary concern expressed was the effect the games would have on transport in the borough, especially the impact on the North Circular Road. Another concern was for those residents that would be affected by parking restrictions and road closures. It was pointed out that the residents of Wembley were already inconvenienced by parking restrictions on event days and the hope expressed that any restrictions imposed by the Games would be for the minimum duration possible.

Neale Coleman responded by explaining that a lot of work had already gone into formulating an overall transport plan for the Games. The ambition was for all spectators for all events to use public transport in getting to them. It was of paramount importance to ensure that the athletes and officials would be able to travel around London efficiently. There were no proposals to create a priority lane along the North Circular Road. It was the intention to impose parking restrictions around venues only during the time events were taking place. It was re-iterated that the only criteria for the allocation of tickets to schools was for them to be registered with the Get Set programme. Richard Sumray added that the closure of Engineers Way required some overlay and so would have to be closed for a longer period than the time the Games took place. His experience from the Sydney Games was that it changed people's travelling habits towards greater use of public transport and lessons for London needed to be learnt from this.

Further views expressed were that it was felt to be wrong to propose banning London taxis and cyclists from the priority road lanes created to each of the venues. The question was asked if the appropriate agencies would get additional funding to meet the increased public safety needs so that their normal duties could be carried out as well as covering the Olympics. A message of support was provided from the Lead Member for Highways and Transportation that the Council would do whatever it could to facilitate the Games taking place, using the considerable experience it had of catering for the events that took place at Wembley Stadium. Further clarification was sought over plans for the North Circular Road because some residents had received letters about it.

In response, Neale Colman re-iterated that there were no plans for a priority lane on the North Circular Road but that there might be some other changes made to the road such as different signalling or turning arrangements. All residents affected had been written to and all the changes were detailed on the Transport for London (TfL) web site. A lot of representations had been received from the taxi trade concerning use of the priority lanes and these were under consideration by the Mayor. However the point was made that the main way in which traffic would be moved through the London road network would be by signalling and so the impact on taxis might not be as great as feared. There was a determination to keep the period during which priority lanes were enforced to a minimum and their operation would always be with a view to ensuring athletes and officials were able to get to their events. Richard Sumray explained that a huge amount of effort by the emergency services was going into ensuring public safety. Evidence showed that during the Olympics crime levels fell in the hosting city but that the level of domestic violence increased. A significant number of extra police would be drafted in from other parts of the country and trained in their duties around countering the terrorism threat that would inevitably exist.

Final comments put forward were that whilst the Olympics offered an opportunity to encourage people to use public transport, the level of London fares would not and it was suggested that action needed to be taken to make public transport more affordable for all. In mentioning crime, the significant issue of prostitution and trafficking was raised on which the Council had carried out a detailed study, the findings of which could be useful in the planning for the Games.

In his final comments, Neale Coleman stated that the issue of trafficking was a problem that was being looked at closely by the police. He stated that a substantial amount of work had gone into preparing a transport plan for the Games and pointed out that every ticket for an event included with it a free travel card for zones 1-6.

The Mayor thanked Neale Coleman and Richard Sumray for their attendance.

7. Report from the Leader or members of the Executive

(a) Items reported by the Executive

Leader's meeting with Mayor of London

The Leader reported on her and the Chief Executive's meeting with the Mayor of London at which Wembley and Crossrail were discussed. He had also asked about the library transformation programme and expressed a wish to visit Brent.

Arts and festivals strategy

Councillor Jones (Lead Member for Customers and Citizens) reported that a review of the strategy was well overdue and that the current arrangements had developed in an ad hoc way. The proposal was to support a transition from Council supported festivals to self-supporting events. It was timely in view of the impact of the Equality Act 2010 and the perception by some people that the strategy was divisive. The review took account of the move to the civic centre where there would be performance space and of the need to save money. It moved away from faith based festivals to ensure there was not a bias towards certain groups and to deliver one Brent Celebrates event, a fireworks event and Holocaust Memorial Day.

Waste strategy

Councillor Powney (Lead Member for Environment and Neighbourhoods) reported that the Waste Strategy was well on its way towards implementation on 3 October 2011.

Stonebridge adventure playground and SEN after schools clubs

Councillor Arnold (Lead Member for Children and Families) was pleased to report that the adventure playground and SEN after schools club had been protected from the cutbacks the Council was having to make and outlined the services provided.

John Billam Adult Day Care centre

Councillor Crane (Lead Member for Regeneration and Major Projects) reported that the contract for the construction of a new building for the day care centre to replace the provision at Albert Road had recently been awarded and that the use of the Albert Road site was the subject of a report to the Executive.

Day Opportunities strategy review

Councillor R Moher (Lead Member for Adults and Health) reported that following a three month consultation exercise in the Spring, work had been undertaken in partnership with the health service to produce a very different set of proposals to those outlined in the consultation which would provide an improved service for people in the borough with mental health issues.

(b) Decisions taken by the Executive under the Council's urgency provisions

RESOLVED:

that the decisions taken by the Executive under the Council's urgency provisions relating to the following item be noted:

Crest Academies

8. Questions from the Opposition and other Non- Executive Members

Councillor Kansagra referred to the closure of Fryent Way for the UEFA Champions League final at Wembley Stadium. He felt this had been an unnecessary measure and reflected on the terms of the planning permission for the stadium which had restricted the provision of parking and this meant there was extra pressure put on the surrounding roads. He asked if it was intended that this would be repeated for the Olympics. Councillor J Moher replied that the Champions League final had

been the biggest event to take place in the borough and was run by UEFA who set out the requirements for hosting the game. Upon the award of the game to Wembley Stadium a planning team had worked on the logistics of preparing for two, at that time, unknown teams from unknown parts of Europe bringing their fans into the area. The closure of Fryent Way had not been a complete closure and lessons from it had been learnt. Councillor Kansagra responded that he was not satisfied with the arrangements and wondered if fees were paid for parking coaches in Fryent Way. He made reference to the difficulties people faced when attending funerals in the area and suggested the experience showed there was not enough parking provided.

Councillor Hunter stated that she understood lead members had received representations from residents asking that Veolia be excluded from the current procurement exercise for waste disposal because they felt the company had demonstrated racist recruitment practices with reference to its activities in the West Bank and Israel. Councillor Powney replied that West London Waste was embarking on a waste procurement exercise and it could not jeopardise this by not following the proper processes. Councillor Hunter responded by saying that she would like to see West London Waste take the concerns of local residents seriously and that she had been shocked to see the advertisement for jobs on the Jerusalem Light Railway which effectively prevented the majority of local Palestinian citizens from applying. She asked how it could be allowed that Veolia was treated as a suitable contractor and felt that the matter needed to be given serious consideration.

Councillor Beckman asked how often would Brent residents have their rubbish collected under the new waste and recycling strategy. Councillor Powney replied that from October food and organic waste would be collected weekly, with dry recyclables and waste going to landfill being collected every alternate week. He added that under the new strategy all households would be able to recycle more waste material. Councillor Beckman thanked Councillor Powney for his reply.

Councillor Beck stated that whilst he was glad the Council had secured the funding for the CREST Academies he was concerned over the effect of the redevelopment plans on the residents in Hillcrest Gardens and Vincent Gardens who were concerned about overlooking from the buildings and the access road. He felt the residents had asked for reasonable changes to be made but this had so far been met by a poor response from the Council and asked if any further help could be given to them. Councillor John replied by saying that she had already received a lot of messages about this matter and that she would be only too pleased if planning solutions could be found that would satisfy the residents. She added that she was happy to receive the views of residents on this matter. Councillor Beck acknowledged the answer to his question.

Councillor R Patel asked if residents of South Kilburn would be affected by the coalition Government's desire for social housing tenants in London to pay rents of up to £450 a week. Councillor Crane replied that the tenants would be rehoused into new homes provided in phase 1 of the redevelopment owned by Fortunegate and London & Quadrant Housing Associations. It had been agreed that the new tenants would only pay up to 10% more than their current rent when they transferred. An example of the effect of this was that the rent on a 2 bed property would be £88 per week (or £352 per month) rather than the target rent of £103 per

week (£412 per month). The amount they paid would increase over a period of time until it hit the target rents. As a further example, Councillor Crane stated that the market rent for similar properties was £260 per week or £1040 per month. Councillor Patel responded by expressing reassurance over the reply he had received but felt it showed how the Government wanted to move families out of areas such as Kilburn. He was pleased that the Council had been able to keep the promises it had made to its tenants living in Kilburn.

Councillor Ashraf asked why the school crossing patrol at Dollis Hill Lane had already been withdrawn. Councillor J Moher replied that from time to time it was necessary in specific cases to remove school crossing patrols. However he gave a re-assurance that no decision had been made to permanently remove any school crossing patrols. Further consideration would be given to the issue and any decision to remove patrols would be implemented in January 2012. Councillor Ashraf responded by saying he was not happy with the reply and that it came as no surprise that residents were suspicious of the Council's actions especially given the short consultation period that took place over the half term holiday and now that a final decision would be taken during the summer holiday period. He stated that the Council needed to be clearer about its position on the matter if it wanted to gain the confidence of local people.

Councillor Van Kalwala stated that the Evening Standard had recently reported that London councils were failing to collect hundreds of millions of pounds of Council Tax and asked if Brent was letting tax dodgers get away with it. Councillor Butt replied by assuring members that the council was not letting people get away with not paying their Council Tax. For the financial year 2010/11 the Council had achieved record collection rates and since 2002 had managed to collect 99% of all Council Tax. The objective was to make sure that whoever was liable for Council Tax and had the means to pay would pay. Councillor Van Kalwala responded by congratulating the Council on the collection rate achieved and asked that the new contract being entered into for Council Tax collection should ensure this continues.

Councillor Brown asked how axing school crossing patrols could be justified and how accident data was used to justify such action. Councillor J Moher replied by first reminding members that the Government had required the Council to find £43m savings from its budget and that in such circumstances every aspect of the Council's services had to be reviewed. Proposals for school crossing patrols had been put out to consultation and it had to be remembered that this was not a statutory service. The feedback to the consultation had been considered and as a result an extended period of consideration had been undertaken because of the concerns expressed. Councillor Moher was therefore able to reassure members that child safety was taken very seriously. Councillor Brown responded by saying that he felt the key driver behind the proposals was a financial one and that he had not received a reply regarding the use of accident data. He added that parents were worried about the proposals. Fourteen of the busiest roads in the borough were faced with losing a school crossing patrol and he felt it was important to explain how the proposals had been assessed.

Councillor Oladapo asked, given the considerable concerns of many residents about the use of khat, what steps were being taken to address this problem, when a report would be received from the task group looking at the issue and could an assurance be given that the affected communities would receive the support they

needed to tackle the issue. Councillor R Moher replied by saying that stopping the use of khat was a difficult issue because it was not a banned substance in Britain. She was aware that it posed a particular problem in some communities because of the side effects it could have; it could put a great strain on family relations and it did not always get the attention it needed which was why a task group had been established to look into this issue which would report in the autumn. She had also asked the Chair of Health Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee to keep the issue on the committee's work programme. Councillor Oladapo expressed the hope that similar action on the use of khat might be taken as was taken in dealing with the use of paan in Wembley.

Councillor Lorber asked if the Executive was ready for the confusion that would follow the publicity on the future arrangements for the collection of waste. Councillor Powney replied by referring to the publicity set out in the Brent magazine and saying that he felt it was clear enough. In addition further publicity would be undertaken so that as the new arrangements were put in place people would be clear about them. Councillor Lorber criticised the presentation and use of colour in the publicity, saying that it was not representative and that many people did not have a green and a grey bin. He felt the use of language would be misleading to many, given the many languages used in the borough. He submitted that the biggest obstacle to increasing recycling was in getting the message across and that required good communication. He felt the current publicity was misleading and that the bins should be clearly labelled.

9. Reports from the Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees

Councillor Gladbaum (Chair of Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee) reported on behalf of the chairs of the overview and scrutiny committees. She first welcomed the two new Chairs, Councillor Kabir and Councillor Ashraf to the scrutiny function and stated that all the overview and scrutiny chairs would soon be meeting to discuss co-ordinating work programmes, agreeing the annual report, scrutiny training and engaging with residents. She thanked the outgoing chairs, Councillor Ogunro and Councillor Castle, for their work.

Councillor Gladbaum reported that since the last update to full council three overview and scrutiny task groups had either reported or were about to report. These were:

Fuel Poverty in Brent, chaired by Councillor Long – this report looked at the work being undertaken in Brent to tackle fuel poverty, how the council, NHS, voluntary sector and the private sector need to work in a collaborative way to tackle the issue and the need to tackle general poverty to address fuel poverty.

Car Repair and Spray Painting Garages, chaired by Councillor Moloney – this task group was set up following a motion to Full Council. The main areas the task group looked at were the scale and nature of the problem, enforcement activity and enforcement action.

Preventing Youth Offending, chaired by herself. This task group would be reporting to the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee the following evening and its key findings centred around:

- a change in emphasis to effective early intervention
- changes in practice

- collaboration between agencies
- the crucial role of schools
- the crucial role of parents, and
- other organisational issues.

Councillor Gladbaum reported that for the first time three of the committees – Children and Young People, Partnership and Place and One Council had held a joint meeting. The agenda enabled all members of these committees to have the opportunity to hear from and question the Leader of the Council about the administration's priorities for the year ahead and to receive a presentation on key issues facing Brent including:

- demographic and population projections
- health and well-being
- child poverty and the local economy, and
- housing

Information on the implications and responses to the Localism Bill was also provided so that Members of the committees could make suggestions for the overview and scrutiny work programmes. She added that the committee's work programmes were flexible enough to pick up issues as they arose and strongly encouraged Members to make suggestions for agenda items or task group reviews at any time.

The Health Partnerships Committee had met to discuss plans for the North West London Hospital Trust, provided comments on the North West Hospital NHS Trust Quality Accounts, received an update on GP Commissioning Consortia and agreed to start a new task group looking at the health and social impact of Khat.

The One Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee had recently discussed the Housing Needs Transformation Project which focuses on the work of the Housing Needs Resource Centre and Housing Solutions. It also received an update on the One Council Programme, its status, risks, dependencies and management.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee was to meet the following evening and would be receiving its regular updates from Brent Youth Parliament and on school places. The input from representatives of the youth parliament continued to have a very good impact on the work of the committee. The committee would also be looking at the provision of services for children with disabilities and the implications of Government policy on Academies and Free Schools.

Finally, Councillor Gladbaum reported that the Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Budget and Finance Overview and Scrutiny Committee were due to meet later in the month.

10. **Site Specific Allocations DPD adoption**

Members had before them the report which explained that the Council had received an Inspector's report into the Examination of the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and that the Inspector had found the document to be sound, subject to

recommended changes being made. The Executive had considered the matter on 11 April 2011 and was recommending to Full Council that the DPD be adopted with the changes incorporated.

RESOLVED:-

that the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document, taking account of the recommended changes, be adopted.

11. **Statement of Gambling Licensing Policy and Procedure**

The Gambling Act 2005 requires Licensing Authorities to publish a Statement of Principles that sets out their policy for dealing with applications and regulating gambling premises within their borough, which Brent did in January 2007. These Statements of Principles are required to be reviewed, revised and published to reflect changes in legislation, the Gambling Commission's Guidance to Licensing Authorities, and on the experience of administration and enforcement by authorities. The Executive agreed the final Statement of Principles on 11 April 2011 for approval by Full Council and members now had the report before them for consideration.

Members expressed concern that the Council's licensing responsibilities did not extend to being able to take into consideration the proliferation of gambling premises within an area. Looking at the map of the borough attached as appendix A of the Statement of Principles it was clear that gambling establishments were targeting areas of deprivation in which to conduct their business. It was important to take account of the effect on crime and disorder and for the Council, with its local knowledge, to be able to influence how many similar establishments operated within a given area.

RESOLVED:-

that the Council's revised Statement of Gambling Licensing Principles be approved for publishing.

12. **Revised London Councils Grant Scheme 2011/2012**

Members had before them a report which informed them of a revision to the proposed level of contribution Brent would make to the London Councils Grant Scheme in 2011/12. This increase in the contribution previously agreed by Full Council in January 2011 was required following the outcome from the judicial review of changes to the London Councils Grant Scheme.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the revised contribution to be paid by the Council in the sum of £460,929 as recommended by London Councils towards the London Boroughs Grants Scheme for 2011/12 be agreed;
- (ii) to note that the additional £24,584 required as a result of the outcome of the judicial review of changes to the London Grants scheme would be met from centrally held funds;

- (iii) to note that Full Council in February 2011 agreed that the 2011/2012 budget include reallocation of the funding no longer expected as a contribution to the London Councils Grants Scheme and that of the funding no longer required for the London Councils Grant Scheme, £231,500 was reinvested in safeguarding advice and guidance services provided by the voluntary sector and £249,000 was allocated to savings.

13. **Changes to the Constitution**

Members had before them a report which proposed three changes to the Council's Constitution: firstly the inclusion of a protocol on Call in of Executive decisions, secondly the inclusion of the new Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity, and lastly some minor amendments in relation to Contract Standing Orders.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the Constitution be amended to incorporate the changes to the Standing Orders relating to Call in of Executive decisions as set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
- (ii) that the Constitution be amended to replace the old Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity with the new Code set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
- (iii) that the Constitution be amended to incorporate the changes to Standing Orders relating to contracts as set out in Appendix 3 of the report.

14. **Dates of Council meetings for 2011/2012**

RESOLVED:-

that the removal of the October meeting of Full Council from the 2011/12 meetings programme be noted.

15. **Motions**

15.1 **DNA records of innocent people**

Councillor Allie moved the motion circulated in his and Councillor Lorber's names. He made it clear that this was not to be seen as an attack on the local police but hoped that the Council would take a lead on this matter and that in turn the local police would write to everybody affected explaining what they would have to do to get their names removed from the records.

In supporting the motion, the view was endorsed that efforts needed to be made to continue to lobby for the necessary changes in law to be made and that there was no justification in keeping the DNA records of innocent people.

The motion was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

(i) that Council notes that:

- in January 2007 Brent Council called for the destruction of DNA records held by the police on innocent people who have not been charged with or found guilty of any offence, and measures to monitor this,

- the Supreme Court and the European Court of Human Rights have stated unequivocally that the retention of DNA records of innocent citizens is unlawful and that that practice violates Article (8) of the European Convention on Human Rights and that the current ACPO guidelines are unlawful,

- Brent Police does not have local discretion to delete the DNA records of innocent Brent residents,

- Council believes that the continued practice of retaining DNA records of innocent Brent residents can no longer be justified in light of the recent rulings by the Supreme Court and the European Court of Human Rights;

(ii) that a letter be sent to the Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority and the Mayor of London requesting them to advise the Metropolitan Police to contact every innocent Brent resident on the DNA data base to inform them of the procedure to remove their records from the DNA database;

(iii) that continuing concerns be expressed about:

- the continued taking of DNA samples for Fixed Penalty and Public Order offences which has contributed to the heavily imbalanced racial profile of the DNA register, and

- the lack of any effective independent scrutiny of the DNA database.

15.2 Proliferation of betting shops

Councillor Lorber moved the motion circulated in his and Councillors Allie, Brown and CJ Patel's names which was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

(i) Council notes:

a. the proliferation of betting shops in Wembley, Alperton, Sudbury, Tokyngton and other parts of Brent,

b. the concerns expressed by many local residents about the increasing number of betting shops in small areas including by the newly formed Sudbury Town Residents' Association about the opening of a third betting shop in a small shopping parade,

c. residents' concerns about the impact this has on the community by encouraging addiction to gambling, the consequent effect on health and well-being and the link with anti-social behaviour in some streets,

d. that the Government is currently consulting councils and other interested parties about the control of change of uses through its

consultation paper: *How Change of Use is handled in the Planning System*;

- (ii) that Council's view is that local communities should have more influence over the mix of uses permitted in their area;
- (iii) that:
 - a. a response be submitted to the Government's change of use consultation expressing the Council's concern about betting shops and proposing measures to enable more effective control of betting shops and similar uses,
 - b. the implementation of Article 4 directions be considered in areas with a particular concentration of betting shops in order to prevent the further proliferation in Brent,
 - c. continuing regard be had to the management of gambling activity during the progress of the Local Development Framework,
 - d. Government and local MPs be lobbied to reform those provisions in the 2005 Gambling Act which relaxed controls over gambling and made effective control of betting shops difficult.

15.3 Cutting back-office functions, not libraries

Councillor Lorber moved the motion circulated in his and Councillors Ashraf, Beck, Castle, Green, Hashmi, Leaman, Matthews and CJ Patel's names which called for management structures to be cut in order to save the money needed to keep six libraries open. The motion was put to the vote and declared LOST.

15.4 School crossing patrols

Councillor Lorber moved the motion circulated in his and Councillors Allie, Ashraf, Brown, Hunter, CJ Patel and Sneddon's names which called on the Council to abandon proposals to withdraw some school crossing patrols. The motion was put to the vote and declared LOST.

15.5 Preston Road parking

Councillor HB Patel moved the motion circulated in his and Councillor Kansagra's names which asked that the proposal to replace the one hour free parking in Preston Road with pay and display parking meters be re-considered in favour of retaining the current system. He submitted that the consultation documents had been misleading and that the views of local people were not being heard. Councillor J Moher stated that the Highways Committee had received a deputation from traders in Preston Road but the problem was that there were parking restrictions in adjoining roads that put pressure on Preston Road. He referred to the part of the motion concerning competition from supermarkets and stated that local shops were closing because of the recession, not because of competition from those supermarkets able to provide parking. The matter would be considered at the Highways Committee on 27 July 2011 when the outcome of the consultation would be taken into account. Councillor Brown pointed out that other shopping areas were surrounded by CPZs but the Preston Road area was not and so parking would be displaced, which in turn would lead to pressure for a CPZ. He felt the proposal

was just a means to raise money at a cost to hard working families. The motion was put to the vote and declared LOST.

15.6 Safer Neighbourhood Teams

Councillor Beswick moved the motion circulated in his name. He was grateful for the work undertaken by the Safer Neighbourhood Teams but these were now facing being cut and asked where the commitment was to protect local residents. He submitted that following the London Mayoral elections and the Olympics the teams would face being cut again and asked members if they wished to see this happen. Councillor Hunter moved an amendment to the motion seeking to remove the name of Ken Livingstone and inserting 'any mayoral candidate'. She felt the motion as drafted was clear electioneering and that if it was amended as she suggested it would get much wider support. Councillor HB Patel stated that it was because of the actions of the last government that such cuts were having to be made. He submitted that crime was falling under the current Mayor and that the proposals would still leave the same number of police officers as during the time of the previous Mayor so the motion did not make sense. The amendment to the motion was put to the vote and declared LOST. The motion was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) to note that police Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) were first launched in Stonebridge by Mayor Ken Livingstone and the Labour Government, that since the introduction of SNTs crime has fallen steadily, while resident satisfaction with policing has increased;
- (ii) that the Conservative Mayor's cuts to frontline policing which will remove five police Sergeants from Brent's SNTs and break up the ward based neighbourhood policing model which has protected residents so well be condemned; and Ken Livingstone be congratulated on his clear pledge to Brent residents to restore SNT officer levels once he is re-elected in May 2012.

15.7 Housing

Councillor Long moved the motion circulated in her name which was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

that this Council believes it has a moral duty to ensure all its residents have a roof over their heads, in particular families with young children; following the leak of Eric Pickles' letter to David Cameron which showed the government expect their policy to make over 40,000 families homeless, deplores the callousness of a Liberal and Conservative Government knowingly prepared to make tens of thousands of families homeless; and expresses concern that the cost of housing the victims of this government's social apartheid could stretch this Council's resources to breaking point.

15.8 **Legal Aid**

Councillor J Moher moved the motion circulated in his name which was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

that this Council believes that access to justice is a fundamental right, without which there can be no fair society; condemns the coalition Government's assault on the legal aid system, under which at least half a million people will lose access to legal advice, not-for-profit advice agencies such as the Brent CAB and Brent Community Law Centre will be severely hampered in their ability to help the most needy in society, and many thousands of people will suffer avoidable poverty and distress; and calls on the government to abandon this economic cleansing of our civil courts.

16. **Urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm

COUNCILLOR M ASLAM CHOUDRY
Mayor

FULL COUNCIL – 12 SEPTEMBER 2011

Report from the Executive

1. Items to be reported by the Executive

The Leader has given notice that the Executive will report to Council on the following items:

- i. Civil disturbance – Council and partner response
- ii. Schools contracts – joint procurement of school services
- iii. Consultation on schools for the future and school places strategy
- iv. Town centre improvement - Willesden Green
- v. Park Royal business improvement district status
- vi. Village School temporary building
- vii. School crossing patrols

2. Decisions taken by the Executive under the Council's urgency provisions

Under the provisions of rule 38 of the Access to Information Rules in the Constitution, the Executive is required to report to the next Full Council for information on any key decisions taken by them but which did not appear in the Forward Plan.

Consideration of representations to proposals to introduce pay and display parking controls in Preston Road and Bridge Road

The above item was considered by the Highways Committee on 27 July 2011 when the decision was taken to introduce pay and display parking controls in Preston Road and Bridge Road and to review the scheme within 12 months of implementation.

Reason why it was impractical to defer the decision until it could be included on the Forward Plan:

To defer the decision would result in delaying consideration of representations until the meeting of the Highways Committee in October 2011.

This would delay a decision on the scheme which would:

- (i) either result in a loss of anticipated (budgeted) income to the Council or reduce the opportunity to investigate and implement other proposals to ameliorate the financial impact of any decision not to implement the proposals


- (ii) increase the period of uncertainty in relation to the proposals with an associated impact on those businesses and residents that have made representations in response to the proposals.

Removal and replacement of contaminated soil from St Raphael's and Brentfield estates

The above item was considered by the Executive on 17 August 2011 when the decision was taken to proceed with the remediation work at St Raphael's and Brentfield Estates in accordance with the remediation design approved by the Environment Agency using the £1,422,525 grant monies allocated; to note that Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) proposes to make a contribution from its capital budgets for necessary works outside the scope of the grant such as re-instatement of sheds etc; note that an exemption from Standing Orders has been granted from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources on grounds of extreme urgency pursuant to Standing Order 84(b) after consultation with the Director of Legal and Procurement, exempting the procurement from the requirement to seek Executive authority to go out to tender for remediation works and exempting the requirement to use a single stage or two stage tender process; to note the procurement process for remediation works being followed as set out in paragraphs 3.16 and 3.17 of the report and authorise the Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services to award the contract for remediation works following the identification of a preferred contractor.

Reason why it was impractical to defer the decision until it could be included on the Forward Plan:

The £1,422,525 was awarded by the Environment Agency to undertake the remediation works at St Raphael's and Brentfield estates on 27 July 2011. The Environment Agency has applied a condition to the grant that monies must be spent this financial year. Notification of grant monies awarded was received on 27 July 2011. Hence the report could not be included in the forward plan.

	<p style="text-align: center;">Full Council 12 September 2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Services</p>
Wards Affected: ALL	
The Treasury Management Annual Report 2010/11	

1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide information to members on borrowing and investment activity, and performance compared to prudential indicators during 2010/11. As the Treasury Management Annual Report should be agreed by Full Council, the Executive is asked to recommend it to Full Council for approval. The report will also go to the Audit Committee as part of the scrutiny function required under the 2009 Treasury Management Code of Practice issued by CIPFA.

The Executive, at its meeting on 23 August 2011, resolved to submit the recommendations in the report to Full Council without any further comments.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Full Council:

- 2.1 Approves the Treasury Management Annual Report (section 3); and Annual Investment Strategy Report (section 4)
- 2.2 Notes the outturn for prudential indicators (section 5)
- 2.3 Notes the updated position in 2010/11 (para.3.25).

3. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

- 3.1 Full Council adopted the 2009 CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management in Local Authorities in September 2010. The Code stipulates that the Chief Financial Officer should set out in advance to Full Council the treasury strategy for the forthcoming financial year, issue a progress report during the year, and subsequently report the treasury management activities at year-end. The report will also go to the Audit Committee. This section of the report details:-

- a) The economic background for 2010/11 (paras 3.6 to 3.7)
- b) The agreed treasury strategy (para 3.8)
- c) Borrowing activity during 2010/11 (paras 3.9 to 3.12)
- d) Lending activity during 2010/11 (paras 3.13 to 3.21)
- e) Overall interest paid and received (para 3.22)
- f) Developments since the year end (paras 3.23 – 3.24)

3.2 Treasury management in this context is defined as ‘the management of the local authority’s cash flows, its banking, money market (short term borrowing and lending) and capital market (long term borrowing) transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of the optimum performance consistent with those risks.’ This means that the pursuit of additional returns must be placed within the framework of the protection of the council’s cash balances and a rigorous assessment of risk.

ECONOMIC AND MARKET BACKGROUND DURING 2010/11

- 3.6 The world economy grew by 4.5% in 2010, whereas the UK grew by 1.6%, USA by 2.9%, and the Euro area by 1.7%, and the Chinese and Indian economies continued to grow rapidly (around 10%). In the UK growth remained slow as banks were unable / unwilling to lend and borrowers were unwilling to increase existing debts. In the USA, quantitative easing (governments buying back debt and increasing the money supply) supported activity and reduced longer term interest rates. In the UK, Retail Price Inflation rose by 4.6% (Consumer Price Index 3.3%) as VAT increased to 20% and energy and other commodity prices rose sharply. However, the bank rate remained at 0.5% as monetary policy sought to encourage economic growth and assumed that inflation would fall to reflect low economic activity. Overnight interest rates remained very low, at 0.25% - 0.45%. Fiscal policy has also been very loose, with the government running a large payments deficit, but policy has been tightened in 2010/11. Markets experienced renewed volatility in April 2010 as Greece, followed by Ireland and Portugal later in the year, required bailouts from the International Monetary Fund and European countries. Concerns about the cost of country bailouts, and the potential impact of their default on European banks and the euro, have encouraged a cautious approach to lending.
- 3.7 Table 1 shows interest rates charged during the year by the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB), the government agency that provides long term credit to local authorities. Previously, the PWLB enabled local authorities to borrow at similar rates to the government (gilt yield plus 0.15%). However, on 20th October 2010 it was decided that local authorities would pay rates set at gilt yield plus 1% in order to increase revenue to the Treasury, discourage capital projects and encourage local authorities to use their cash reserves. It can be seen that, although PWLB rates have increased, underlying gilt yields have fallen during the year, reflecting the low demand for credit.

Table 1 – PWLB Interest rates during 2010/11

	1st April 2010 %	30 June %	30 Sept. %	31 March 2011 %
10 year	4.19	3.59	3.14	4.58
25 year	4.47	4.31	3.95	5.23
50 year	4.70	4.32	4.01	5.23

STRATEGY AGREED FOR 2010/11

- 3.8 On the basis of advice and research from Arlingclose, Capital Economics and treasury / pension fund managers, it was anticipated that the bank rate would remain at 0.5% (possibly rising to 1% by the end of the financial year). It was agreed that lending would be kept fairly short (less than one year), that long term loans would be allowed to mature, and that the lending list would be expanded when market conditions allowed. It was also agreed that borrowing would remain flexible, but that the Council would take short term or variable debt if it was likely that rates would stay low. It was also agreed that officers would look for opportunities to restructure debt, but that low rates might make this uneconomic.

BORROWING ACTIVITY DURING 2010/11

- 3.9 The split of the council's treasury portfolio between fixed interest and variable loans and investments, as at 31 March 2010, is set out in Table 2.

Table 2 – Treasury portfolio at 31st March 2011 – loans and investments

	31.03.10 Actual £m	31.03.2011	
		Planned £m	Actual £m
Fixed rate loans – PWLB	522.0	556.5	491.0
Variable rate loans – PWLB	-	-	-
Variable rate loans – Market	85.5	85.5	95.5
Short-term loans – Market	52.0	-	69.2
Total Debt	659.5	642.0	655.7
INVESTMENTS	69.0	56.0	57.5
NET DEBT	590.5	586.0	598.2

- 3.10 The average rate of interest payable by Brent Council on its loans has fallen from 4.6% in 2009/10, to 4.37% in 2010/11. A debt restructuring was undertaken in October 2010, repaying £50m of PWLB loans and taking advantage of cheaper short term debt. The saving will be around £700,000 per annum, depending on short term interest rates. The Debt restructuring of £64.8m, undertaken in March 2009, continues to save around £1.5m per annum as rates remain low. Also in 2010/11 Brent Council took a new PWLB £20m equal instalment of principal loan at 2.94% (10 years).

- 3.11 As outlined above, the PWLB has increased the rates charged on loans to gilts plus 1%. This has increased the cost of new loans and will discourage debt restructuring activity.
- 3.12 The duration and average interest rate, of loans in the treasury portfolio at 31st March 2011 is set out in Table 3.

Table 3 – Treasury portfolio at 31st March 2011 – duration/interest rates

Maturing Within	£m		Share of total debt %	Average Interest Rate 2010/11 %
	31.03.10	31.03.11		
1 Year	52.0	71.2	10.9	0.58
1 – 5 Years	-	8.0	1.2	2.94
6 - 10 years	10.0	9.0	1.4	2.94
11 – 15 years	5.0	5.0	0.8	8.88
Over 15 years	507.0	467.0	71.2	5.08
Variable PWLB	-	-	-	-
Variable Market	85.5	95.5	14.5	4.31
TOTAL	<u>659.5</u>	<u>655.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4.37</u>

LENDING ACTIVITY DURING 2010/11

- 3.13 The council's investments averaged £78m during 2010/11 (£86m during 2009/10) and earned £0.9m in interest. Returns were assisted by the declining portfolio of long term deposits (deposited in 2007 and 2008 for up to three years), some of which continued to generate returns in excess of 5% per annum when overnight rates had fallen to 0.25%. The amount invested varied from day to day depending on cash-flow and the Council's borrowing activity. Responsibility for investing funds was split between the in-house team, which manages approximately two thirds of the investments and an external house managing approximately one third of the investments.
- 3.14 Investments by the in-house team were made primarily with the intentions of achieving security and liquidity, and were all placed with for money market funds or for periods up to one month. Rates achieved ranged between 0.25% and 0.83%, but existing long term loans raised the average rate achieved to 1.3% (2009/10 2.54%). Loans were made to high quality counterparties included on the Treasury Lending list. Appendix 1 lists the deposits outstanding at 31st March 2011.
- 3.15 The financial tsunami following the bankruptcy of Lehman brothers forced a number of banks into administration in the autumn of 2008, and the collapse of the main Icelandic banks (7th October 2008). Brent Council has two deposits outstanding with Icelandic banks, as follows:-

Heritable	£10m	5.85%	Lent 15.08.08	Due back 14.11.08
Glitnir	£5m	5.85%	Lent 15.09.08	Due back 12.12.08

- 3.16 The Council continues to work with the Local Government Association and other authorities to recover the loans. All other deposits have been repaid on time. The most recent advice from CIPFA, the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Local Government Association (LGA) states that authorities are likely to be treated as preferred creditors to Glitnir. However, the Winding Up Board (WUB) for Glitnir has proposed that local authority deposits be treated as ordinary creditors (only likely to recover around 30% of their losses), meaning that legal action will continue – our legal advisers, Bevan Brittan, believe that the deposit will be recovered. Hearings before the district court in Iceland have been successful, but the WUB has appealed to the Icelandic Supreme Court. Further hearings are expected in September. The administrators for Heritable have repaid a further £2.1m in 2010/11, a further £1,030,000 to date in 2011/12, and state that creditors should receive 80% / 85% of deposits plus interest to October 2008, by instalments to 2013.
- 3.17 External cash managers were initially appointed in 1998 to manage two portfolios with the aim of achieving an improved return at an acceptable level of risk. Aberdeen Asset Management has managed a portfolio throughout the period. The value of the Aberdeen's portfolio was £23.6m as at 31st March 2011 (£23.3m 2010). Actual performance for 2010/11 (2009/10 in brackets), and the three and five years to 2010/11 are set out in Table 4.

Table 4 - Performance of Aberdeen Asset Management and the In-House team against benchmark

	Aberdeen %		Brent in-house %	7 Day LIBID Benchmark %
2010/11	2.0 (1.9)		1.3 (2.8)	0.5 (0.4)
Three Years	3.6		3.4	1.4
Five Years	4.25		3.85	3.0

- 3.19 Aberdeen outperformed the benchmark in 2010/11 by using longer dated certificates of deposit of up to twelve months duration with financial institutions on the Brent lending list.
- 3.20 The in-house team did not have access to the same wider range of lending instruments as the managers (gilts or CDs), but was able to add value by using money market funds (pooled funds managed by city finance houses) and benefiting from previous long term deposits made in 2007 and 2008.
- 3.21 The three and five year records indicate that Aberdeen has achieved their out-performance target (+0.5% per annum). Aberdeen is among the best managers over all periods (there are around ten in the market).

TOTAL INTEREST PAID AND RECEIVED

- 3.22 Total interest paid and received in 2010/11 is shown in Table 5. The reduced interest paid on external debt reflects the restructuring in October 2010 and short term borrowing at lower rates. The reduced interest received on deposits reflects lower market rates and lower cash balances.

Table 5 – Overall interest paid and received in 2010/11

	Budget £m	Actual £m
Interest paid on external debt	31.0	29.7
Interest received on deposits	1.7	0.9
Debt management expenses	0.4	0.2

By way of comparison, interest received on deposits was £7.0m in 2008/09 (budget £3.5m) and £2.2m in 2009/10 (budget £3.0m).

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE END OF THE YEAR

- 3.23 Although the UK financial markets have been fairly calm since the end of the financial year, markets continue to worry about credit worthiness and debt owed by Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain. Short term interest rates remain very low, and long term rates have fallen in response to ‘flight to safety’ concerns and the growing belief that economic recovery will be very slow and monetary conditions loose. The list of loans outstanding as at 30th June 2011 is attached as Appendix 2.
- 3.24 In response to concerns about the impact of the Greek debt crisis, fears about possible contagion in Italian and Spanish markets, and proposals to change the ratings for various UK banks, Arlingclose issued advice at the end of June that local authorities should restrict lending to less than 12 months for UK banks. Although the in house team has restricted duration, Aberdeen used CDs that have duration of close to one year. As it has been anticipated that the Aberdeen mandate would be terminated in 2011 to fund capital expenditure requirements, it was felt that early termination would be appropriate to avoid any turbulence in the market.

4 ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

- 4.1 Regulations issued under the 2003 Local Government Act require that councils agree an Annual Investment Strategy (AIS) before the beginning of each year, setting out how investments will be prudently managed with close attention to security and liquidity. The AIS for 2010/11 was agreed by Full Council in March 2010. The AIS sets out the security of investments used by the authority analysed between Specified (offering high security and liquidity, with a maturity of no more than one year) and Non-Specified (entailing more risk or complexity, such as gilts, certificates of deposit or commercial paper) investments. The AIS also sets out the maximum duration of deposits.

4.2 To discourage the use of investments that may be considered speculative, the acquisition of share or loan capital in any body corporate (such as a company) is defined as capital expenditure. On this basis, the Council does not invest treasury balances in shares, corporate bonds or floating rate notes issued by companies, though there is authority to invest through pooled schemes which are not considered capital expenditure.

4.3 Treasury activity has complied with the AIS in 2010/11. The approach has been to lend for short periods to high quality counterparties, reducing risk. As loans have matured, receipts have been used to minimise borrowing.

5. PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS – 2010/11 OUTTURN

5.1 The introduction of the new prudential system of borrowing in the 2003 Local Government Act (LGA) gave new opportunities for councils to assess their requirements for capital spending, and not have them restricted by nationally set approvals to borrow money (credit approvals), as previously. The new system also brought new responsibilities on councils to ensure that:

- a) capital expenditure plans are affordable;
- b) all external borrowing and other long term liabilities are within prudent and sustainable levels;
- c) treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good professional practice.

5.2 Under regulations issued under the 2003 LGA councils are required to follow the Prudential Code issued by CIPFA which sets out how councils ensure responsible use of new freedoms. The Code details indicators that councils are required to set before the beginning of each year, to monitor during the year, and to report on at the end of each year.

5.3 The outturn for prudential indicators measuring affordability is set out in Table 6. General Fund and HRA capital financing charges as a proportion of total budget were lower than the original estimates as a result of the reduced requirement to fund expenditure from unsupported borrowing in 2010/11.

Table 6 – Prudential indicators measuring affordability

	2010/11 (estimates)	2010/11 (actual)
Capital financing charges as a proportion of net revenue stream:		
- General Fund	9.27%	7.68%
- HRA	36.4%	35.67%
Impact of unsupported borrowing on:		
- Council tax at Band D	£4.68	£2.42
- Weekly rent	-	-

- 5.4 The outturn for prudential indicators for capital spending is set out in Table 7. Movements within the capital programme, including slippage between years and resources becoming available during the year, are to be reported in the Performance and Finance Quarter 4 Outturn report to the Executive in August 2011. Capital spending is funded from a variety of resources, including government grants, capital receipts, revenue contributions, Section 106 contributions and borrowing. This means that movements in capital spending are not directly reflected in movements in the CFR, which principally reflects borrowing requirements. Total borrowing in 2010/11 was lower than anticipated which meant a reduction in the overall CFR.

Table 7 – Prudential indicators measuring capital spending and CFR

	2010/11 Estimates £m	2010/11 Actual £m
Planned capital spending:		
- General Fund	133.383	99.752
- HRA	20.127	14.493
- Total	153.510	114.245
Estimated capital financing requirement for ¹ :		
- General Fund	371.526	350.543
- HRA	337.724	331.264
- Total	709.250	681.807

- 5.5 The Council also sets prudential indicators for external debt as shown in Table 8. This is to ensure that the council's overall borrowing is kept within prudent limits. The authorised limit for external borrowing is set flexibly above the CFR to allow for opportunities to restructure debt or borrow early when interest rates are favourable. The Operational Boundary sets out the expected maximum borrowing during the year, allowing for cash flow, interest rate opportunities and restructuring. In 2010/11 the council undertook a debt restructuring of £50m, but did not exceed the Operational Boundary.

Table 8 – Prudential indicators for external debt

Indicator	Limit	Status
Authorised limit for external debt	£929m	Met
Operational boundary for external debt	£829m	Met
Net borrowing	Below CFR	Met

¹ The Capital Financing Requirement estimates in this table are at 31st March of each year.

5.6 The prudential indicators for treasury management, which are included in Table 9 below, were all met. These are set to ensure that interest rate exposures are managed to avoid financial difficulties if interest rates rise sharply. Although borrowing at variable rates can be advantageous if rates are falling, a sharp rise can cause budget difficulties, and force the Council to fix rates at an inopportune time. Again, managing loan durations ensures a variety of maturity dates to avoid all re-financing when rates may be high. Finally, the upper limit on investments of more than one year allows flexibility to lend for longer periods if interest rates make this advantageous, particularly by external managers investing in gilts, but also ensures that a minimum level of balances is available for cash flow purposes. Deposits have been short term, and long term loans have been run down during the year.

Table 9 – Prudential indicators for treasury management

Indicator	Limit	Outcome
Treasury Management Code		Adopted
Exposure to interest rate changes		
- fixed rate upper limit	100%	100%
- variable rate upper limit	40%	21%
Maturity of fixed interest loans		
Under 12 months		
- upper limit	40%	0%
- lower limit	0%	0%
12 months – 24 months		
- upper limit	20%	1%
- lower limit	0%	0%
24 months – 5 years		
- upper limit	20%	1%
- lower limit	0%	0%
5 years – 10 years		
- upper limit	60%	2%
- lower limit	0%	0%
Above 10 years		
- upper limit	100%	98%
- lower limit	30%	96%
Upper limit on investments of more than one year	£60m	£20m

6. MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION

6.1 The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) Regulations 2003 set out the requirement that councils set aside a minimum of 4% of their General Fund capital financing requirement to repay principal on debt, regardless of the length of life of the asset that was being financed.

6.2 Revised regulations which amend this requirement were issued in 2008.² Under the new regulations councils are required to set an amount of Minimum Revenue Provision which is 'prudent'. The definition of what counts as 'prudent' is set out in statutory guidance which has been issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and which authorities are required to 'have regard' to.

6.3 Under the guidance councils are required to prepare an annual statement of their policy on making Minimum Revenue Provision to Full Council. The purpose of this is to give Members the opportunity to scrutinise use of the additional freedoms and flexibilities under the new arrangements. This Policy Statement was submitted and approved by the Full Council at its meeting in March 2010 within section 9 of the Budget Setting report.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Financial implications are set out within the report.

8. DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and officers believe that there are no diversities implications arising from it.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Guidance has been issued under s21 (IA) of the Local Government Act 2003 (the '2003 Act') on how to determine the level of prudent provision. Authorities are required by Section 21 (B) to have regard to this guidance.

9.2 Under regulation 28 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) authorities have significant discretion in determining their Minimum Revenue Provision but, as a safeguard, the guidance issued under the 2003 Act recommends the formulation of a plan or strategy which should be considered by the whole Council. This mirrors the existing requirement to report to Council on the prudential borrowing limit and investment policy. The Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2000 have been amended to reflect that the formulation of such a plan or strategy should not be the sole responsibility of the Executive.

10. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Loans Register.
2. Logotech Loans Management System.
3. Arlingclose reports on treasury management.

² Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 – SI 2008/404

4. Aberdeen Asset Management quarterly reports.
5. 2010/11 Budget and Council Tax report – March 2010

11. CONTACT OFFICERS

1. Martin Spriggs, Head of Exchequer and Investments – 020 8937 1472
2. Paul May, Capital Accountant – 020 8937 1568

CLIVE HEAPHY
Director of Finance and
Corporate Services

Brent treasury lending list

1 The current loans outstanding **as at 31st March 2011** are:

Name	Amount £m	Yield %	Lending Date	Maturity Date
Global Treas. Fund (RBS)	9.3	Var.	Call	
Gartmore cash reserve	4.5	Var.	Call	
Northern Trust global fund	0.1	Var.	Call	
Heritable bank	5.0	5.85	15.08.08	14/11/08
Glitnir	5.0	5.85	15.09.08	12/12/08
Skipton BS	5.0	6.48	01.07.08	01/07/11
RBS	<u>5.0</u>	Var.	22.09.08	22/09/11
Total	<u>33.9</u>			

Brent has also invested £23.55m with an external manager, Aberdeen Asset Manager, which has placed the fund in a mixture of certificates of deposit (CDs) and cash. The list of investments held by Aberdeen is as follows:-

Name	Amount £m	Yield %	Maturity Date
Abbey National CD	3.15	1.44	18.10.11
Abbey National CD	1.2	0.00	24.11.11
Barclays Bank CD	2.7	1.45	01.08.11
Barclays Bank CD	1.5	1.42	14.10.11
Clydesdale Bank CD	3.5	0.00	24.05.11
Lloyds TSB CD	1.5	0.00	03.08.11
Lloyds TSB CD	3.0	1.48	05.12.11
Nationwide BS CD	2.25	1.5	22.02.12
RBOS CD	2.3	0.00	03.08.11
RBOS CD	2.35	1.51	06.02.12
Accrued interest	<u>0.1</u>		
Total	<u>23.55</u>		


Brent treasury lending list

2 The current loans outstanding as at 30th June 2011 are:

Name	Amount £m	Yield %	Lending Date	Maturity Date
Global Treas. Fund (RBS)	6.25		Var. Call	
Gartmore cash reserve	12.0		Var. Call	
Heritable bank	4.365	5.85	15.08.08	14/11/08
Glitnir	5.0	5.85	15.09.08	12/12/08
Northern Trust global fund	0.1	Var.	Call	
Skipton BS	5.0	6.48	01.07.08	01/07/11
RBS	5.0	Var.	22.09.08	22/09/11
Santander UK	10.0	0.81	03.06.10	01.07.10
Total	<u>47.715</u>			

Brent had also invested £23.6m with an external manager, Aberdeen Asset Manager, which had placed the fund in a mixture of certificates of deposit (CDs) and cash. However, details have not been included as the mandate was terminated on 18th July 2011.

This page is intentionally left blank

	<p style="text-align: center;">Full Council 12 September 2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Regeneration and Major Projects</p>
<p>For Action Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Proposed changes to Area Housing Boards</p>	

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The Council's Constitution currently specifies that there will be 4 Area Housing Boards ("AHBs") as part of the Council's formal consultation network. Unlike other area fora, Members may not vote or Chair the Boards. The aims of the AHBs are broadly to be a conduit for information flow to and from the Council's tenants and leaseholders, with input from other interested groups.
- 1.2 BHP, with the agreement of the Director of Regeneration & Major Projects, now propose to move from the current AHB structure to a model based on a more open style consultation approach which will continue to focus on scrutiny and monitoring by residents of housing service delivery but will aim to significantly increase the numbers of council tenants participating in such events.
- 1.3 Several London boroughs continue to operate AHB style structures having nominated resident representation similar to the current approach in Brent. Others, such as Harrow, Ealing and Hillingdon for example are reviewing their AHB structure due to low attendance by residents. Westminster and Barnet have already moved away from an AHB structure and have adopted open style forums for monitoring, debate and consultation of housing issues with council tenants. Barnet's 'hub' scheme for example draws attendance from a pool of 1600 tenants made up of residents' association members and other tenants who have expressed an interest in attending such events. BHP intend to emulate the 'hub' scheme and introduce a similar scheme with the intention of capturing a much wider audience of council tenants than those currently attending AHBs which fulfils one of the main TSA regulatory framework criteria - to empower and involve more tenants in the management of their

homes. Amendments to Article 10 of Part 2 of the Constitution need to be made to bring these proposals into effect and such amendments can only be made by Full Council.

2.0 Recommendations

That Members of Full Council approve the following recommendations in A – M inclusive as detailed below.

- A. That the 4 existing Area Housing Boards (“AHBs”) be dissolved and replaced with a new structure, outlined in the body of this report, as a forum for consultation with Council tenants.
- B. That the new open forum structure be established with no geographical boundaries within the borough of Brent.
- C. That there will be four meetings each year to be held on a rotating basis in the same geographical areas as the current AHBs e.g. Wembley at the Town Hall, Harlesden & Brentfield/St Raphael’s at Gwyneth Rickus Building, South Kilburn (new venue to be found) and North Kilburn (East Brent) at Willesden Library Centre.
- D. That the Aims of the new structure will be:
 - (a) To involve customers in the provision of housing services
 - (b) To monitor the performance of housing management and contractors of BHP/Council’s housing management service and other parts of housing services
 - (c) To develop new ideas and methods for solving Council housing problems
 - (d) To influence the practices and policies that determine the provision of housing services
 - (e) To consider the wider community problems and find solutions to them
 - (f) To advise BHP/Council’s housing management service on local priorities for the provision of housing services and the allocation of resources
 - (g) To advise BHP/Council’s housing management service in the development of its business strategy/area strategy
 - (h) To liaise with other groups and organisations
- E. That there will be open Membership to the new structure for monitoring, consultation and debate on housing issues i.e. membership will be open to all residents in tenant or leasehold properties that are managed by BHP on behalf of the Council.
- F. That Councillors will be invited to attend the open forum.
- G. That there will be no voting rights for any attendees at the open forum.

- H. That the purpose of the new structure will be to consult, inform and empower tenants and leaseholders in the management of their homes.
- I. That each year in June one representative from each registered tenants' and residents' association may be put forward to join a forum organising team established by BHP/Council's Housing Management Service to seek advice on the composition of agendas, the format of the open forums and shaping outcomes from open forum sessions. The forum organising team will meet at least eight times a year. That there will be no voting rights for any attendees.
- J. Meetings will be organised and led by officers from BHP/Council's Housing Management Service. Any person may speak during open discussions and workshops. BHP officers, BHP board members, officers from the Council's Housing Management Service and members of the forum organising team may introduce individual agenda items and may lead workshops.
- K. That invitations to attend the open forum will be publicised in the residents' quarterly newsletters 'Partnership News'; BHP's web site; flyers; at Residents Association meetings; by email; personal invitations to all councillors; and by other appropriate means of communication.
- L. That the proposed new forum structure will be called "*Talkback*".
- M. That paragraphs 10.12 to 10.20 of Article 10 of Part 2 of the Council's Constitution are amended on the terms set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The principles and framework for the establishment of Area Housing Boards, together with the rules for meetings, were agreed by the Council's Housing Committee in October 1993. In 1994 nine Area Housing Boards were established: Stonebridge, Churchend and Chalkhill Boards ceased to exist in the late 90s; the six remaining boards South Kilburn, North Kilburn, North Wembley, South Wembley, St. Raphael's and Harlesden & Brentfield were merged into four boards in 2005 due to low attendance; the remaining four boards are South Kilburn, North Kilburn, Wembley and Harlesden & Brentfield/St Raphael's. These are specified in the current version of the Council's Constitution.

4.0 Reasons for proposed changes

Dissolution of Area Housing Boards

- 4.1 The frequency of attendance of Residents' Association Representatives at all four Area Housing Boards during the period March 2010 to December 2010 is detailed in the following paragraphs (although the Council's Constitution provides for membership from a varied list of organisations, only Tenant and

Resident Association representatives have voting rights, so it is their attendance that has been examined).

- 4.2 North Kilburn has 13 Tenants Associations and 1 community group on their board and the average attendance by resident representatives for the period March 2010 to December 2010 has been 9 per meeting.
- 4.3 The number of Tenants Associations in the Wembley area is 12 and a further 9 community groups. The average attendance at the Wembley Area Housing Board has been 9 residents.
- 4.4 Harlesden & Brentfield/St Raphael's, have only 4 registered associations in the area but membership at this Area Housing Board has reduced over the last 12 months with the death of 2 very active members and another member being very ill. The average attendance over the 12 month period has been 6 residents.
- 4.5 South Kilburn have 10 registered associations and 2 community groups with 21 members on their area housing board. However attendance over the 12 month period March 2010 to December 2010 has been an average of 6 residents.
- 4.6 As can be seen from the above, the overall attendance at Area Housing Boards has been consistently low where BHP officers often outnumber residents at meetings. With the TSA focus on empowering and involving more tenants in the management of their homes, it was considered necessary to rethink the way in which a much larger proportion of Council tenants could be encouraged to become involved in regular consultation forums in the management of Council housing. The 'hub' style scheme for example in Barnet has been in existence for just over one year; they have 1600 residents on their database and have had 136 residents attending at least one Hub meeting. BHP will have a database of 3972 tenants who will be invited to participate in the proposed new structure and BHP anticipate a significant increase in the number of tenants attending consultation meetings than those currently reflected in the numbers attending AHB meetings.

Consultation

- 4.8 In May 2010 BHP undertook consultation with the Chairs of all four Area Housing Boards to discuss the proposed dissolution of the Area Housing Boards. Further consultation with the members of all Area Housing Boards took place in June 2010.
- 4.9 All four Chairs were unanimously in favour of the proposed change from Area Housing Boards to a more open style method for monitoring, debate and consultation of housing services and recommended full consultation with Area Housing Board (AHB) members at the June 2010 round of AHBs. Three of four Area Housing Boards voted in favour of the proposed change. BHP officers considered consulting on the name for the new forum structure and when this specific issue was discussed with the AHBs, some members of the AHBs voiced their views that the AHB structure should not be changed.

However, officers remain of the view that the current AHB structure needs to change and become more inclusive for Council tenants and leaseholders.

- 4.10 If the new structure is approved by Members, BHP will still present performance reports to tenants by setting aside allotted time for standing agenda items so that tenants will still be able to identify performance trends in their own areas.
- 4.11 BHP Officers believe that the new structure would be a sustainable way of reaching many more tenants in the consultation process and thereby give a much wider audience the chance to get involved in discussions on the management of their homes.

Aims

- 4.12 The aims of the new structure are broadly similar to the aims of the current Area Housing Boards shown at Article 10 of Part 2 of the Council's constitution. These are:

- (a) To involve customers in the provision of housing services
- (b) To monitor the performance of housing management services and contractors and other parts of housing services
- (c) To develop new ideas and methods for solving Council housing problems
- (d) To influence the practices and policies that determine the provision of housing services
- (e) To consider the wider community problems and find solutions to them
- (f) To advise the housing management service on local priorities for the provision of housing services and the allocation of resources
- (g) To advise the housing management service in the development of an area strategy
- (h) To liaise with other groups and organisations

- 4.13 BHP proposes to consult with customers at the 'hub' style meetings on the following topics over the next 18 months:

Health and Safety
Communal Areas on Housing Estates
Delivery of Repairs
Providing Services for customers with disabilities
Providing Services for the elderly
New Tenancies and the First 6 months
Communicating with Customers
Providing services for the Young
Major Works from a Customer Perspective i.e. what could be improved when a major works contractor arrives on site.
Digital TV

- 4.14 Officers from the retained Housing Service and from the Consultation Board will need to work with BHP to clarify how consultation will be undertaken in respect of non-BHP functions which are not included in the aims of the proposed new structure.
- 4.15 The meetings of the proposed new structure will be conducted more like an open forum, with presentations from staff and residents, breakout groups, question and answer sessions and general discussion. They will be facilitated and co-ordinated by the Resident Involvement Manager but there will not be formal Chair requirements. The proposed new forum will be called “Talkback”.

Membership

- 4.16 The number of residents currently represented by a residents’ association or community group is 5348. There are 3972 tenants and 1376 leaseholders represented by 39 associations and 12 community groups. The area breakdown is as follows:

Wembley		North Kilburn		South Kilburn		Harlesden & Brentfield/St Raphs	
Tenants	L/holders	Tenants	L/holders	Tenants	L/holders	Tenants	L/holders
1012	593	749	346	1308	254	903	183

Wembley		North Kilburn		South Kilburn		Harlesden & Brentfield/St Raphs	
Resident Assocs.	Comm Groups	Resident Assocs	Comm Groups	Resident Assocs	Comm Groups	Resident Assocs	Comm Groups
12	9	13	1	10	2	4	0

- 4.17 In addition there are 407 residents represented by 2 Tenant Management Organisations in Kilburn. The total number of residents represented by a residents’ association, community group or TMO is 42% of all council tenants and leaseholders.
- 4.18 The membership of the proposed new structure will be 3972 tenants and leaseholders but over time as other tenants who are not currently represented by a community group or residents’ association express an interest to attend this database will grow.
- 4.19 The meetings will be facilitated by the Resident Involvement Manager and these meetings will not have formal chair or quorum requirements.
- 4.20 At present, these arrangements only involve Council tenants and leaseholders of properties that are managed on behalf of the Council by BHP. These arrangements do not involve the tenants of Council properties on the Stonebridge estate that are managed by Hillside Housing Trust and which used to be owned by Stonebridge Housing Action Trust.

The role of Councillors

- 4.21 Ward Councillors often attend their local AHBs and it is not proposed to change Councillor's role.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 BHP estimates that the new structure will result in a saving of approximately £1000 per annum on officer time and overheads associated with servicing the current 16 Area Housing Board meetings which take place each year.

6.0 Legal Implications

- 6.1 The Council is obliged by section 105(1) of the Housing Act 1985 to put in place such arrangements as it considers appropriate for consultation on housing management matters for its secure tenants – the proposed new structure will be one current method of discharging that duty. The duty will still be capable of being discharged should Members agree to the proposed changes.

- 6.2 A review has been carried out by Navigant Consulting on behalf of the Council regarding the future of BHP and the Council's relationship with BHP. A review is currently taking place of the governance arrangements of BHP. Following the decision of the Council's Executive meeting of 18 July 2011 regarding the future arrangements for ownership, investment and management of the Council's housing stock, consultation will take place regarding the preferred option of Brent Housing Partnership managing the Council's housing stock as an optimised Arms Length Management Organisation focusing strongly on housing management.

7.0 Diversity Implications

- 7.1 It is anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of tenants and leaseholders attending the new style meetings and therefore a subsequent increased number of residents from BME and ethnic minority groups who have the opportunity to get involved in the management of their homes.
- 7.2 A copy of the Equalities Impact Assessment regarding the proposed changes is attached to this report and this has been considered by the Council's Diversity Team.

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

- 8.1 None

Background Papers

Minutes of Harlesden/Brentfield and St Raphaels AHB Meeting of 10 June 2010;
Minutes of East Brent AHB Meeting of 15 June 2010;
Minutes of South Kilburn AHB Meeting of 17 June 2010;

Minutes of Wembley AHB Meeting of 21 June 2010;

Contact Officers

Linda Footer
Head of Corporate Services
Brent Housing Partnership

linda.footer@bhphousing.co.uk
020 8937 2356

ANDY DONALD
DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION & MAJOR PROJECTS

APPENDIX 1

Talkback - AREA HOUSING BOARD FORUM

Area Housing Board Forum Structure

10.12 The Council's Area Housing Board Forum, *Talkback*, has been established with the aims and roles set out below.

Areas covered

10.13 The boundaries of the Council's Area Housing Board Forum, *Talkback*, will be those of the landlord service area.

Aims of the Forum

- 10.14
- (a) to involve customers in the provision of housing services.
 - (b) to monitor the performance of housing management and contractors of the housing management service and other parts of the housing services.
 - (c) To develop new ideas and methods for solving Council housing problems.
 - (d) To influence practices and policies that determines the provision of housing services.
 - (e) To influence the practices and policies that determine the provision of housing services.
 - (f) To advise the housing management service on local priorities for the provision of housing services and the allocation of resources
 - (g) To advise the housing management service in the development of an area strategy/business strategy;
 - (h) To liaise with other groups and other organisations.

Membership of the Forum

10.15 Membership of the Council's Area Housing Board Forum, *Talkback*, will be open to all residents in tenant and leasehold properties that are managed on behalf of the Council by the housing management service.

10.16 There will be no voting rights for any attendees at the Council's Area Housing Board Forum.

10.17 Members of the Council will be eligible to attend meetings of the Area Housing Board Forum.

Meetings of the Forum

- 10.18
- (a) Meetings of the Council's Area Housing Board Forum, *Talkback*, will be open to the public and to the press, and at the discretion of the person facilitating / co-ordinating / chairing the meetings, any person may speak.
 - (b) The Council's Area Housing Board Forum shall meet at least four times a year and once in every quarter and the meetings will be held on a rotational basis in the following geographical areas: Wembley; East Brent (formerly North Kilburn); South Kilburn; and Harlesden, Brentfield and St Raphaels.
 - (c) There will be no formal chair or quorum requirements or restrictions.
 - (d) In June each year, one representative from each registered tenants' and residents' association may be put forward to join a forum organising team to seek advise on the composition of agendas, the format of the Council's Area Housing Board Forum meetings and shaping outcomes from sessions of the Forum. This Forum organising team will meet at least eight times a year.
 - (e) Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with any rules agreed in respect of the conduct of those meetings.

Paragraph numbers 10.19 and 10.20 are not used.

Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment Completion Form

Department: Brent Housing Partnership	Person Responsible: Linda Footer
Service Area: Regeneration and Major Projects	Timescale for Equality Impact Assessment :
Date: 19 th August 2011	Completion date: 24th August 2011
Name of service/policy/procedure/project etc: Proposed Changes to Area Housing Boards	Is the service/policy/procedure/project etc: New <input type="checkbox"/> Old <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Predictive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Retrospective <input type="checkbox"/>	Adverse impact <input type="checkbox"/> Not found <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Found <input type="checkbox"/> Service/policy/procedure/project etc, amended to stop or reduce adverse impact Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there likely to be a differential impact on any group? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please state below:
1. Grounds of race: Ethnicity, nationality or national origin e.g. people of different ethnic backgrounds including Gypsies and Travellers and Refugees/ Asylum Seekers Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Grounds of gender: Sex, marital status, transgendered people and people with caring responsibilities Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Grounds of disability: Physical or sensory impairment, mental disability or learning disability Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. Grounds of faith or belief: Religion/faith including people who do not have a religion Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Grounds of sexual orientation: Lesbian, Gay and bisexual Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. Grounds of age: Older people, children and young People Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Consultation conducted Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Consultation carried out with Chairs of AHB May 10 and members of all Area Housing Boards verbally June 10 via a report dated December 2010.
Person responsible for arranging the review: Andrew Donald	Person responsible for publishing results of Equality Impact Assessment: Linda Footer
Person responsible for monitoring: Linda Footer	Date results due to be published and where: 12 th September, Council website and BHP website and BHP Newsletter to residents in October 2011.
Signed:	Date:

Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment Completion Form

Please note that you must complete this form if you are undertaking a formal Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment. You may also wish to use this form for guidance to undertake an initial assessment, please indicate.

1. What is the service/policy/procedure/project etc to be assessed?

Area Housing Boards

2. Briefly describe the aim of the service/policy etc? What needs or duties is it designed to meet? How does it differ from any existing services/ policies etc in this area

The aims above relate to the old and proposed new structure of Area Housing Boards. There has been no change to the overall aims.

The aim in changing the current structure is to attempt to increase the number of council tenants and leaseholders who participate in Area Housing Boards. The new structure will be called 'Talkback' instead of 'Area Housing Board'. Currently only two nominated resident representatives from each residents association (37 associations) are eligible to attend Area Housing Boards. The proposed change removes this restriction on those able to attend and participate. In future it is proposed that any Brent council tenant will be able to attend and will be actively encouraged to attend through personal letters of invitation, publicity via posters in communal areas of blocks of flats and advertising in 'Partnership News' the quarterly newsletter sent to all council tenants and leaseholders.

The geographical location of the proposed 'Talkback' forums will be in the same areas as the current AHBs although new venues will need to be found to accommodate anticipated increased numbers attending. The venues to be found will have accessibility for disabled residents as they have now.

- a. To involve customers in provision of housing services
- b. To monitor performance of housing management services and contractors and other parts of housing services
- c. To develop new ideas and methods of solving council housing problems
- d. To influence the practices and policies that determine the provision of housing services
- e. To consider the wider community problems and find solutions to them
- f. To advise the housing management service on local priorities for the provision of housing services and the allocation of resources
- g. To advise the housing management service in the development of an area strategy
- h. To liaise with other groups and organisations

3. Are the aims consistent with the council's Comprehensive Equality Policy?

Brent Housing Partnership and Brent Council is committed to ensuring that the services we provide are relevant to the needs of all sections of the community and that our workforce represents the people we serve.

We aim to ensure that our services meet the varied individual needs and expectations of local people and that everyone has equal access to services, regardless of their race, heritage, gender, religious or non-religious belief, nationality, family background, age, disability or sexuality. We recognise that services must be relevant, responsive and sensitive, and that the Council must be perceived as fair and equitable in its provision of services by our service users, by our partners and the wider community. We aim to ensure that our contractors and others who deliver our services also share our vision and values.

4. Is there any evidence to suggest that this could affect some groups of people? Is there an adverse impact around race/gender/disability/faith/sexual orientation/health etc? What are the reasons for this adverse impact?

There is no evidence to suggest the proposed change from AHB to new Talkback Forums will adversely affect any group of people. On the contrary, the fact that we are opening up the consultation process to all residents should have a positive effect, allowing all council tenants and leaseholders the opportunity to participate. BHP intend to monitor the take up of residents with protected characteristics by handing out a questionnaire during each 'Talkback Forum'. This will enable us to ensure that the attendance in terms of residents with protected characteristics at Talkback forums is representative of council residents as a whole.

5. Please describe the evidence you have used to make your judgement. What existing data for example (qualitative or quantitative) have you used to form your judgement? Please supply us with the evidence you used to make your judgement separately (by race, gender and disability etc).

Visits to the Barnet Homes Hub Scheme where they have done exactly what we are proposing to do for the same reasons. It works exceptionally well and the numbers of residents participating has increased from a handful at their previous area housing meetings to between 60-100 residents now.

Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment Completion Form

6. Are there any unmet needs/requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups? (Please refer to provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act and the regulations on sexual orientation and faith, Age regulations/legislation if applicable)

All current venues for AHB's are suitable in terms of access for disabled residents. BHP will ensure that the venues (yet to be sourced) for the new Forums have disabled access and are suitable to cope with an expected turnout of around 100 residents at each meeting. We are basing the expected turnout on our many years of experience of organising resident meetings where the turnout is very much driven by the number of people invited as well as the subject matters for discussion and publicity advertising the event.

7. Have you consulted externally as part of your assessment? Who have you consulted with? What methods did you use? What have you done with the results i.e. how do you intend to use the information gathered as part of the consultation?

Yes via Chairs of Area Housing Boards at a special meeting to initially discuss the proposal – all were in favour of the proposed change. Then via reports from the Head of Corporate Services in BHP to Area Housing Boards in June 2010, and March 11. The majority were in favour of the proposed changes.

8. Have you published the results of the consultation, if so where?

Through minutes of AHB meetings which are available on the council's website and BHP's website. Hard copies of the minutes of AHB meetings available on request to BHP's Resident Involvement Officer on 020 8937 2943.

9. Is there a public concern (in the media etc) that this function or policy is being operated in a discriminatory manner?

There is no known public concern.

10. If in your judgement, the proposed service/policy etc does have an adverse impact, can that impact be justified? You need to think about whether the proposed service/policy etc will have a positive or negative effect on the promotion of equality of opportunity, if it will help eliminate discrimination in any way, or encourage or hinder community relations.

This proposed change will enable BHP and the Council to gain meaningful engagement with tenants and leaseholders from different protected characteristics, by implementing a forum which will empower them to highlight any issues they may have with the services which are provided by this council and will also encourage people from hard to reach groups such as travellers to become involved in shaping their future housing. It will have a positive effect on the promotion of equality of opportunity and encourage community relations due to the fact that all council tenants and leaseholders will have the opportunity to attend rather than a just a handful who are not representative of the community as a whole.

11. If the impact cannot be justified, how do you intend to deal with it?

N/A

12. What can be done to improve access to/take up of services?

The current AHB system restricts participation by residents to a handful who have been nominated by their Residents Associations. However, residents associations only represent a third of all council tenants and leaseholders. We are proposing to change the structure of AHBs to the new Talkback Forums to improve access and participation in service delivery in housing to all council tenants and leaseholders. BHP are committed to philosophy that residents should be at the heart of influencing and decision making within their organisation. All council residents will be informed of the Talkback Forums through advertisements in 'Partnership News' which is BHP's residents' newsletter delivered each quarter to all council tenants and leaseholders. In addition posters advertising the Talkback Forums will be placed on Notice Boards in communal areas of blocks of flats.

13. What is the justification for taking these measures?

To increase the number of residents actively engaging and participating in decision making about services which directly affect them as described in sections. It will positively benefit all council tenants and leaseholders who will, if the proposed change is agreed by the Council, have the opportunity for greater participation in housing related service delivery.

14. Please provide us with separate evidence of how you intend to monitor in the future. Please give the name of the person who will be responsible for this on the front page.

Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment Completion Form

- a) Those attending the Forums will be asked to sign in as they enter to keep a record of the number attending.
- b) Satisfaction surveys about the meetings will be distributed to all attending including the quality and content of the Forums, and the ease of accessibility.
- c) Information will be collected via diversity monitoring forms handed out at the Talkback Forums which will include all protected characteristics: Age, Disability, Gender reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnerships, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion and belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.

The results from a-c above will be collated into reports to be discussed at BHP's Senior Management team meetings each quarter who will oversee the effectiveness of the new system.

15. What are your recommendations based on the conclusions and comments of this assessment?

This proposed change will enable the Area Housing Board to better meet the needs of the tenants and leaseholders by encouraging participation from people of different protected characteristics.

By opening up the membership all tenants and leaseholders the council will be fostering good relations between people from different groups because they will be attending the meetings to discuss common themes and experiences.

This in turn will inevitably bring about a more cohesive community by breaking down barriers which can bring about discrimination.

From the point of view of equality of opportunity and to encourage community relations, it is recommended that the proposed change to Area Housing Boards should be approved.

Should you:

1. Take any immediate action?
2. Develop equality objectives and targets based on the conclusions? ✓
3. Carry out further research?

16. If equality objectives and targets need to be developed, please list them here.

- A. Profile of those attending to include protected characteristics as part of the satisfaction survey process
- B. Publicity regarding the theme for every forum to be promoted in each edition of quarterly residents magazine
- C. Themes for Forums to include issues on Equalities

17. What will your resource allocation for action comprise of?

- A. To be met from existing AHB budget since number of AHB meetings now 16 per annum and will reduce to 4 per annum under the proposed Talkback scheme.

If you need more space for any of your answers please continue on a separate sheet

Signed by the manager undertaking the assessment:

Full name (in capitals please): **Linda Footer**

Date: **24th August 2011**

Service Area and position in the council: **Head of Corporate Services – Brent Housing Partnership**

Details of others involved in the assessment - auditing team/peer review:

Once you have completed this form, please take a copy and send it to: **The Corporate Diversity Team, Room 5 Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, Middlesex HA9 9HD**

Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment Completion Form

This page is intentionally left blank