



**Brent**

**SUMMONS TO ATTEND THE  
ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING**

**Wednesday 17 May 2017 at 7.00 pm**  
Grand Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

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 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL of this Borough.

CAROLYN DOWNS  
Chief Executive

Dated: Tuesday 9 May 2017

**For further information contact:** Thomas Cattermole, Head of Executive and Member Services: 020 8937 5446, [thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.cattermole@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: [democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting.  
By entering the meeting room you will be deemed to have consented to the possibility of being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.**

# Agenda

Apologies for absence.

## **1 To elect the Mayor of the Borough for the Municipal Year 2017/2018**

For the Council to elect a Mayor for the 2017/2018 Municipal Year, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (a).

## **2 To Appoint a Councillor of the Borough to be Deputy Mayor**

An intimation will be received from the incoming Mayor regarding the appointment of a Councillor of the Borough to be Deputy Mayor, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (b).

## **3 Vote of Thanks to the Outgoing Mayor**

For the incoming Mayor to invite a vote of thanks for the outgoing Mayor, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (c).

## **4 Declarations of Interests**

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct and Standing Order 32 (e), Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests, and the nature of these, in relation to any matter to be considered at this meeting.

## **5 Minutes of the Previous Meetings** 1 - 32

To confirm as a correct record, the attached set of minutes from the meeting of the Full Council held on 27 February 2017 and the Special Full Council meeting held on 20 April 2017, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (f).

## **6 Changes to the Constitution** 33 - 52

For Full Council to agree any changes to the Constitution, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (g).

## **7 Representation of Political Groups on Committees** 53 - 62

For Full Council to review and determine, under Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 or any re-enactment or modification thereof, the allocation of seats on Council committees and other relevant bodies, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (h).

**8 Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and Appointment of Chairs/Vice-Chairs (if any) 63 - 66**

For Full Council to agree the membership of Council committees and Joint Committees and other relevant bodies, forums and panels; and to appoint the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Council Committees, forums and panels and to agree the substitutes for members, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (i). The full list of Full Council appointments will be circulated prior to the meeting. Appointments that are not constitutionally made by Full Council will also be circulated prior to the meeting.

**9 Calendar of Council Meetings for the 2017/2018 Municipal Year 67 - 84**

For Full Council to agree the calendar of Council meetings for the forthcoming 2017/2018 municipal year, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (k).

**10 Urgent Business**

At the discretion of the Mayor to consider any urgent business, in accordance with Standing Order 32 (m).



Please remember to switch your mobile phone to silent during the meeting.

- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

Minutes of the ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
held on Monday 27 February 2017 at 7.00 pm

### PRESENT:

**The Worshipful the Mayor**  
Councillor Parvez Ahmed

**The Deputy Mayor**  
Councillor Bhagwanji Chohan

### COUNCILLORS:

Aden	Agha
Allie	Bradley
Butt	Carr
Chan	S Choudhary
Colacicco	Colwill
Conneely	Crane
Daly	Davidson
Denselow	Dixon
Duffy	Eniola
Ezeajughi	Farah
Harrison	Hector
Hirani	Hylton
Jones	Kabir
Kansagra	Kelcher
Long	Mahmood
Marquis	Mashari
Maurice	McLeish
McLennan	Miller
Moher	J Mitchell Murray
W Mitchell Murray	Naheerathan
Nerva	M Patel
RS Patel	Pavey
Perrin	Pitruzzella
Shahzad	Ms Shaw
Ketan Sheth	Krupa Sheth
Southwood	Stopp
Tatler	Thomas
Van Kalwala	Warren

## 1. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors A Choudry, Collier, Hoda-Benn, Hossain and Khan.

## 2. **Procedural Motions**

**RESOLVED** that the following procedural motions moved by Councillor Kabir and which related to three items on the agenda, be agreed:

### 1. *The Budget and Council Tax 2017-18 to 2019-20*

- i) That the Leader of the Council be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes in presenting the report on the 2017-18 to 2019-20 Budget and Council Tax to the meeting, setting out the Cabinet's proposals for the Budget, after which, the following arrangements for the purpose of debating and voting upon the Budget and Council Tax 2017-18 to 2019-20 be as follows:

The Deputy Leader of the Council be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes;

The Chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes;

Councillor Davidson, on behalf of the Leader of the Conservative Group, be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes;

The Leader of the Brent Conservative Group be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes;

A general debate to follow, during which the usual rules for debate would apply, as set out in Standing Orders 46 and 47, save as set out in this procedural motion;

The Leader of the Council be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes to submit his closing remarks; and

- ii) That voting on each Group's budget proposals be taken *en bloc*.

## 2. **Motion**

That Standing Order 34(e) be suspended to allow for a cross-party motion to be considered this evening.

## 3. **Petition**

That the lead petitioner be allowed to address Full Council for a maximum of five minutes and that the relevant Lead Member be allowed to respond for a maximum of three minutes.

Furthermore, a maximum of one speaker from each Group be allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes should they wish.

### 3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 23 January 2017, be approved as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the following amendments:

(i) Present

That Councillor Warren be recorded as having been in attendance at that meeting; and

(ii) Motions

That, under Minute No.15 (Motions) and, specifically, Minute No.15 (iii) (“Planning Shambles”) it be recorded that the Mayor, Councillor Ahmed and the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Chohan, be recorded as having abstained from the voting on this matter.

#### Matters Arising

With reference to supplementary question (v), as detailed at Page 14 to the minutes, Councillor Nerva asked whether the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Hirani, was able to update Council on whether he had been successful in obtaining all party support to register Brent’s concerns about social care funding.

In response, Councillor Hirani advised Council that a joint letter had been drafted and was ready to be sent but it had still to be determined as to whether the letter was to be sent on behalf of all three Group Leaders or on behalf of the Lead Member and that this would become apparent before the next Council meeting.

***NOTE: It was noted that, as drawn to the Council’s attention by Councillor Kansagra at its January meeting, the Council received notification of nominations by the Conservative Group, including nomination of Councillor Colwill to the Senior Staff Appointments Sub-Committee. The Council made appointments to committees in accordance with those nominations. The appointment of Councillor Colwill to the Senior Staff Appointments Sub-Committee had been formally taken by the General Purposes Committee at its meeting held on 8 December 2016.***

### 4. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest received from Members.

### 5. Mayor’s Announcements (including any petitions received)

The Mayor made the following announcements:

(i) Brent Holocaust and Genocide Memorial Day

The Mayor announced that, on 26 January 2017, over 200 people had attended the Brent Holocaust and Genocide Memorial Day, which had had a full programme that included a holocaust survivor testimony from Manfred Goldberg. The Mayor said that there had also been choirs, speeches and the lighting of memorial candles, which had added to the incredibly moving programme he had been honored to be a part of.

(ii) Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender History Month

The Mayor reminded Members that Brent Council and Brent Housing Partnership would be celebrating the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) History Month with an event to be held in the Civic Centre on Tuesday 28 February 2017 from 6pm to 8pm. He said that LGBT History Month had been celebrated since 2005 and the theme of this year's event, which would be open to staff, allies and members of the public was '*Pride NOT Prejudice*'. The Mayor said that the event was also open to the public and was an ideal opportunity to learn more about relevant services provided by Brent Council, and to network with Brent residents, partners and colleagues.

(iii) International Women's Day – Wednesday 8 March 2017

The Mayor was pleased to announce that Brent would be celebrating International Women's Day with an event to be held in the Civic Centre on Wednesday 8 March 2017. He said that International Women's Day was a global event that celebrated the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women and added that the day also marked a call to action for accelerating gender parity.

The Mayor said that International Women's Day was all about celebration, reflection, advocacy, and action and that, on the day, attendees would be able to hear how to move to purposeful action - and with men and women joining forces – how, collectively women could be helped to realise the limitless potential they offered both locally and globally.

The Mayor encouraged all Members to attend these events.

(iv) Mayor's Final Fundraising Event of Municipal Year 2016-2017

The Mayor announced that he would be hosting his final fundraising event of his Mayoral year in the Civic Centre on Thursday 16 March 2017. The Mayor extended his gratitude to Members for their continued support during his year in office and hoped that Members again would support this, his final event.

(v) Petitions

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



In accordance with Standing Order 68, the Mayor drew to the attention of Members, a petition, which related to Islamia Primary School, and which had gathered over 1,200 validated signatures.

The Mayor invited the Lead Petitioner, Nur Enver, to address the Council.

Ms Enver said that she was attending the meeting on behalf of all the signatories of the petition to keep Islamia Primary School as a two-form entry. She said that the petition alone was a testament of just how important the school was. She said that in just three days, the petition had gathered 1,250 signatures. She said that Islamia Primary was a very unique school and the only voluntary aided Muslim school in Brent and which was oversubscribed. Ms Enver said that the school's latest Sats results had been amongst the top ten percent in the country. She said that the school catered for the needs of families who lived in Brent by providing equal opportunity and access to the school irrespective of families' financial backgrounds. She said that the school provided a service to parents to be able to educate their children not only through the national curriculum but simultaneously with a faith ethos and British values. The school was a flagship school which was recognised nationally and internationally. If the school resorted back to a one-form entry, the impact on the school, parents, children, the local community as well as the wider community would be devastating. She said that the school would be faced with a sibling crisis and also a staffing crisis as well as job cuts and this would put huge stress on staff there. There would also be financial implications for the school. Ms Enver said that the new funding formula was putting a lot of pressure on schools and being a one-form entry school, would find it difficult to avoid going into deficit. Also, if the school reverted to one-form entry, the catchment area would be removed, which would mean that the School would be taking on children from outside of Brent and would add to parking and congestion problems in the area. She said that it would also put additional pressure on Brent to provide primary places and that this would also have a knock-on effect on the environment and the carbon footprint. She said that she did not believe this but recently had started to think this was true and that there was an element of discrimination on the school's behalf. Ms Enver said that she noticed that many schools in Brent had become three, four or five-form entry and had been given the green light to expand, even when over 90% of residents had actually opposed it. There was, she said, a school which was on the same road as Islamia School which was in more of a congested area, had been offered four-form entry and a further school, which housed 480 boys and was within walking distance to Islamia School and this school was not even a Brent school. She said she would like to know how many schools had been reduced to one-form entry when there was such a demand for primary school places. The events that had led to the new build being stopped had emerged from an unfair cap on Islamia Girls' School, which was never part of the original agreement. Up until today, this cap had not been removed, which would hinder development at the girls' school. The GCSE results of this school had topped the league tables in West London. The Yusuf Islam Foundation had allowed the school to stay as a two-form entry and it had supported the school for ten years without asking for rent, and had provided space on the premises which belonged to the girls' school and had not charged for this. It was, she said, a kick in the teeth from Brent since the school had accommodated an additional 500 children throughout the past

10 years. Ms Enver's question to Council was "What has Brent done to resolve this?" The school would like Brent to find a permanent solution as its children deserved the same opportunities as others.

In response, Councillor Mili Patel, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, thanked Ms Enver for her petition and said that she was aware that Islamia was a very successful school which was delivering good outcomes for its pupils. She appreciated that Islamia was a popular school amongst its pupils, parents and governors. Councillor Patel said she wanted the school to thrive and to continue to deliver excellent outcomes to the community and that she would do whatever she could to help, however, she said that the Council was only one of a number of stakeholders and partners involved in this process and she pointed out that some of the concerns Ms Enver had addressed, specifically to the Council, were not solely in its gift to solve. Specifically, she said, the petition called on the Council to ensure that Islamia School remained as a two-form entry school thereby providing a viable solution to provide safe and secure premises for all 420 pupils there. Councillor Patel said that this was a positive goal, but it was not Brent Council which was consulted upon reducing its published admission number from 60 to 30 places, but Islamia Primary School's Governing Board. She said that the Board had taken this decision without the Council's knowledge and certainly without its support and hoped that parents would lobby the governing body and take part in the school's consultation. Councillor Patel wished to make it clear that the Council did not have funding to expand the current building or to build a new primary school on the Salisbury Road school site. She said that the Council wanted to work with the Yusuf Islam Foundation to achieve one of these outcomes. Unfortunately, she said, the Foundation had not been able to work with the Council to achieve this and its announcement in December of the withdrawal of the building had left the Council with an impossibly short deadline to achieve a sustainable and lasting outcome. Councillor Patel hoped that the parents and the Council could persuade the Foundation to reconsider and to work with the Council and the school on these proposals. In conclusion, Councillor Patel addressed one issue, which she felt should not have been mentioned in this discussion but as it had been raised by the petitioner she stressed that the particular religious practice at the Islamia School had no bearing whatsoever on the Council's approach to this issue and that the Council had a duty to find educational places for all young people and wanted even more children in Brent to get the good education that people of Islamia got and that's why the Council wanted to keep the school open.

**6. Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and Appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs (if any)**

There were no appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies or appointment of Chairs and Vice-Chairs.

**7. Budget and Council Tax 2017-18 and 2019-20**

The Council had before it a report by the Chief Finance Officer on the 2017-18 to 2019-20 Revenue and Capital Budgets and a proposal to increase Council Tax levels.

The Mayor announced that the DCLG had published the final local government finance settlement at 8.00pm on the evening of Monday 20 February 2017 and that it had been debated in Parliament on Wednesday 22 February 2017 and passed.

He said that the final settlement contained no changes to the figures published in the Budget Report for the Council meeting of 27 February 2017, which had been based on the draft settlement. The Mayor said that, this being the case, no amendments to that report were necessary but he thought it would be helpful to confirm with Members before the meeting that the local government settlement had now been finalised.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Butt, presented the report, which set out the Cabinet's proposals for the Budget and the setting of Council Tax for the period 2017-18 to 2019-20.

Councillor Butt said that, at an organisational level, the Council was doing well, given the near impossible circumstances the Council was having to work in. He said he wanted to draw a distinction between being immensely proud of the collective responsibility and being unhappy at what the Council was here this evening to do. He said that Brent, as a Labour authority, was once again being forced to impose austerity cuts by the Conservative Government. He said that this was a seventh year of pointless austerity and disproportionate cuts across each and every service the Council provided. He was pleased that the Administration had managed to set a deliverable budget and said that it would offer as much protection as it could to services that were most vulnerable and which were most depended upon. He added that the Administration was introducing a three-year capital investment programme.

Councillor Butt went on to say that that the Council was doing all of this with far less money. He said that, at this point, public services in Brent had lost around £850m in cumulative funding and that, by 2020, this would rise to approximately £1.2bn, or £1,700 per household. He said that this challenge had been made even greater by two factors. Firstly, he said, the Government had given the Council more responsibility but had failed to provide adequate funding needed to carry out this additional responsibility. Secondly, the Council continued to see high and rising demand both by volume and complexity for many of the essential but increasing expensive services the Council provided. With this in mind, he said, in revenue terms, the Council was just about keeping its head above water, but to do so, the Council had to compromise in almost every aspect of what it did and that the Council had to find the least worst option.

Councillor Butt said that despite setting a deliverable budget, the coming years were not without risk and that the Council owed it to its residents to be clear that while certainly achievable the Council could not be complacent about these savings being easily achieved. The Council also needed to be mindful of the fact that if it failed to deliver what it had set out, then it would have no option but to look again at those essential services that it had worked so hard to protect.

He said that the Council had one of the most ambitious capital investment programmes scheduled over the next three years with more than £0.5bn allocated.

Housing for example, was a major investment target with upgrades to Council housing, independent living and massively improving standards for residents.

Councillor Butt said that the Council faced enormous challenges across a variety of different areas such as: housing whether owned or rented; adult social care; and looked after children, who were the most vulnerable residents. He said that the Government should be putting every instrument of state at their disposal but instead had cut funding for Brent schools by £20m. Councillor Butt also expressed his concerns for the local economy and local small and medium businesses faced with tax increases.

Councillor Butt said that there was a gulf between a financially independent local authority to one that had been cut adrift. He said that the challenge had been made worse by the nature of what the Council did. Demand, he said, was counter cyclical and that Council Tax and business rates were as regressive as they got. He said all of this stifled enterprise and could not see what the Government was trying to achieve. He said that this was a 21st century Conservative Government, which was finishing what it had started in the 1980s and 90s. In conclusion, Councillor Butt said that Brent's residents knew that they had a Labour led Council on their side and that it remained a Brent for the future, in which, everyone had a stake.

Councillor McLennan, Deputy Leader of the Council, said that today's budget had come about following a consultation process which had taken place in supermarkets, Brent Connects and by speaking with people on the streets. She said it had been a privilege to hear people's views and concerns and what it all meant to them. Councillor McLennan said that it had been challenging and hoped that in terms of what had been presented would mitigate some of the excesses laboured on residents. Councillor McLennan said that the Budget had been cut by 60% over 4 to 5 years, which had brought about an enormous challenge. She said that the Council had to produce a balanced budget to protect its most vulnerable services. Councillor McLennan said that staffing levels were 4,425 in 2010 and was now 2,200, which meant that the Council could rent out two floors of the Civic Centre to generate income. She said that the Council would have to make further cuts in future years and would need to be aware of the impact on schools funding formula. Councillor McLennan said the Council would look at how the Government was talking about business rates. Small business, she said, were the life blood of Brent's community and that whilst this budget had been difficult and challenging, she believed that this budget had achieved what it had set out to do. In conclusion, Councillor McLennan asked that all Members recognise what the Administration had to do and to formally accept and endorse the budget as set out before them.

Councillor Kelcher, Chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee, said he was grateful to have been given the opportunity to put the views of both Scrutiny Committees and their task groups following their Budget deliberations. He said that the Committee had taken a reflective and strategic review and that the Panel that produced the report had been cross-party and cross-committee.

He said that the first thought with regard to the Budget was that there had been a significantly improved role for the scrutiny function. He said that the Committee had considered the decision to accept a four-year settlement and had agreed with that.

With regard to Council Tax he said that there had been a changing picture throughout this and that it had to be rewritten several times. Reserves, he said, were sustainable and sensible. Councillor Kelcher said that front line and back office distinction was not as clear as it had previously been and the Committee decided that this should be on the basis of impact on the people of Brent.

Councillor Kelcher believed that the scrutiny function could push civic enterprise strategy with local businesses having procurement opportunities.

Councillor Davidson, on behalf of the Leader of the Conservative Group, said that he had listened to the Administration's proposals with interest and, despite anti-government assertions, Brent Labour's first instinct was to demand that Brent residents paid more for the same mediocre service. He said that Brent residents had already been let down by the Mayor of London and that they now faced the first Council Tax rises since former Mayor, Ken Livingston, had been in office. Councillor Davidson said that the Mayor of London was raising Council Tax by 1.5% yet Brent was demanding a 4% rise in Council Tax. He said that the Budget lacked creativity to protect residents and that incomes in Brent were amongst the lowest in London. He went on to say that Brent Labour Group was taking the maximum Council Tax increase without having to have a referendum. He said that the Conservative Group had produced an alternative budget which froze Council Tax. He said that the Conservative Party was a compassionate party and that his budget was compassionate as it sought to address key concerns of residents and protected and enhanced front line services. It also included additional funding for Adult Social Care and took a radical approach to deliver a clean borough. He applauded the Council's savings made in certain areas such as sharing back office functions and piloting Fixed Penalty Notices and commended the work of Councillors McLennan and Southwood in these areas.

He went on to say that there was, however, still needless spending. Brent Conservatives would cut this immediately to deliver money to frontline services. The Council's Communications Department paid £1m to produce Brent Labour propaganda which he suggested should be funded by the Brent Labour Group. He said that the cost of this department had increased by 25% over the last decade and the Conservative Group would cut this entirely as it was unnecessary expenditure. Brent's Business Intelligence Unit was an £800k department tasked with understanding the Brent population and providing support to the organisation to deliver change. He said that the Cabinet should be undertaking this function and again that the Conservatives would scrap this department entirely. He said that £200k had been spent on trade union funding and, at a time when unions are causing misery to commuters, this should be borne by Brent Council. As a small business owner himself, he looked for efficiency. He said that this attitude to business had not been applied to this Council budget. By applying 5% savings to an annual budget of £40m the Conservative Group had identified £2m savings to back office functions. He stated that all of these savings should be returned to Brent residents. Despite endless failed schemes to tackle fly tipping Brent remained one of the dirtiest London Boroughs. He said that enough was enough and that this key priority was one that the Council failed to deliver on time and again and that the Conservative budget aimed to get a grip on this. Councillor Southwood's trial with Kingdom Security had had some success but the Conservative proposal would go further. It would mean cleaner streets and revenue raised that can be ploughed back into front line services. He outlined that the Conservatives would promote and

expand self-funded security firms to enforce fixed penalty notices for littering, predicted to raise £200k in the first year. A similar strategy was adopted by Wolverhampton Council which saw revenue from fines rise from £34k to over £200k in one year. He also explained a Conservative proposal to start charging for collection of bulky waste, forecast to raise an additional £500k. The Conservative Group proposed that these savings outlined will be put into Adult Social Care funding in addition to the 2% precept. Councillor Davidson outlined that Adult Social Care is key issue with the number of over 65s expected to grow by 8% and that strategy was essential to continue to ensure high levels of care. He stated this strategy was currently absent in Brent with residents neglected and offered a patchy standard of care. He said that the Conservatives were proposing a contract for Adult Social Care, with a minimum standard for care and compassion and additional moves to integrate Health and Social Care. This new funding, alongside enhanced Scrutiny structures, would ensure that Adult Social Care will become fit for purpose.

He concluded that this budget was about choices and the Conservatives wanted a budget to ensure the Council would work for hard pressed residents, and would rather use the savings specified to freeze Council Tax. The group also wanted to get serious about cleaning up Borough once and for all and stated that they had imagination and drive to do so. Councillor Davidson finally thanked Officers in the Finance Department for support in developing the proposals.

Councillor Warren, Leader of the Brent Conservative Group, introduced the Brent Conservative budget proposals and stated that they were putting forward a Brent Conservative budget for Adult Social Care. He outlined that the Brent Conservatives were proposing an additional £3.5m for Adult Social Care and were not asking residents to pay for this, but were instead giving them money back. He said that the move to add £3.5m to the Council's reserves was unnecessary and the Brent Conservative proposals were centred on spending this money for Adult Social Care. He noted that the Scrutiny Committee had previously concluded that the level of reserves was adequate but still went along with increase in reserves, which he didn't believe was effective. He noted that he went to Cabinet budget meeting in February and felt that the discussion had been minimal and not adequately addressed the responses of 84 residents that replied to budget consultation.

He stated the he felt that the Administration's proposed budget was cynical and again asked residents to give the Council more money despite the Council having money to spend. He stated that his headline figure was a 3% cut in Council tax and also corrected the figure on his circulated motion stating that band D would be 40p more than stated. He referenced the £110m underspend in the Council's capital budget and also the business rates revenue which would be generated from the new housing and Quintain projects around Wembley Stadium. He also pointed to the revenue generated from Section 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy. He stated that the Brent Conservative budget would ensure that more money was being given back to residents and would spent in ways that residents want to see it spent. He also discussed the New Homes Bonus and explained how the Brent Conservative budget included some of that money in the Council's revenue account, as previously it was recorded in the capital account. Councillor Warren also emphasised Brent Conservative proposals to scrap the Press and

Communications department and spend the money generated on Adult Social Care.

Councillor Warren continued and referenced the three representations requested from Councillor Shaw to include in the Brent Conservative budget. These included more lollipop people around schools in the Borough; a reversal of the increase in visitor parking permits; and the creation of a new fund for care leavers. He also mentioned proposals to scrap the green bin tax. Councillor Warren continued by again citing a failure of scrutiny in the Borough which had passed comment on the free current bulky waste service, opposing the Administration's proposal to charge for the service. He outlined that the Brent Conservatives planned to maintain the free bulky waste service in their budget and believed that the proposals to charge would see fly tipping increase as a consequence. He also noted Brent Conservative proposals for an additional £100k on CCTV cameras; a further £100k to deal with effects of fly tipping and a £350k New Carers Fund. He stated that he believed the Brent Conservative proposals equate to a fair and balanced budget, unlike the one proposed by Brent Labour. He concluded that the Council had more money than it was implying, referencing how much money had been spent on legal fees; the costs of entering into bad contracts; and how the accounts relating to an exit payment for former employee Cara Devani had not been signed off by auditors of those accounts. He noted that he had objected to these accounts, as had others. He concluded by stating that a neighbouring Borough, Hammersmith and Fulham, had not increased Council Tax and therefore proving it was not a necessity. He commended the Brent Conservative budget to Full Council.

A general debate followed with Members commenting on the proposed Budget and amendments that had been put forward by the Opposition Groups.

Councillor Agha stated that the scale of austerity from the Conservative Government left Councillors with little choice other than to accept and endorse the Administration's balanced and deliverable budget. He noted that it reflected the pressure of seven years of austerity yet the Council had still managed to protect central services. He said that the Government's approach was also causing the health service to lurch from crisis to crisis and had created an unfair sense that GPs were not pulling their weight. This was despite GPs seeing more patients than ever with 350 million consultations every year. He explained that increased demand on available appointments and a reckless approach by the Government had exposed the country to a vicious cycle and that the healthcare system was at risk of becoming a shadow of its former self in an act of shameless political sabotage.

Councillor Nerva stated that despite the amount of time devoted to the opposition groups, it remained unclear on what they were proposing. He explained that at one stage in the past the Council had been under great pressure financially. He said that this provided a clear reason for having increased monetary reserves. He referenced Councillor Warren's comment about an overspend on legal fees and stated that it would be unwise to spend reserves for the sake of it as some financial burdens on the Council remained unpredictable. He explained that 90% of Local Authorities are raising Council Tax because the Government assumed that this will happen to help address the crisis in health service and its impact on social care. He said that the Council was getting no help from the Government to address the problems within adult social care. He said he was pleased that a strategy of prevention was being pursued to address some of these problems. In addition, he

noted that proposals for bulky waste collection were interesting and hoped that it could be looked at on an all-party basis, aside from the budget process. He hoped that this would also look at how to increase recycling and all ensure that landlords took responsibility for having arrangements in place to dispose waste correctly. He noted that this was meant to be resident collection service. He concluded that he would also like to see more proposals going forward around enforcement on parking charges.

Councillor R Patel also noted the Council's difficulty in having to develop fair budget proposals in the face of Government cuts, explaining that Council Tax had previously been frozen for five years despite this. He noted the devastating effect that cuts were having on the NHS. He outlined his belief that the Council had been able to maintain good services despite cuts to funding and with Brent being one of the most deprived Boroughs which had a high level of demand on housing and social services. He referenced that Surrey County Council wanted to raise Council Tax by 15%, which only served to highlight the pressure Councils were under. He said it was widely known that Central Government offered a 'sweetheart deal' to Surrey but that Brent would not be offered that position. He concluded by commending the Administration's budget proposals.

Councillor Duffy began by highlighting the crisis in adult social care. He stated that the Council currently do a good job in providing adult social care and that should not be forgotten, however the Council do not produce value for money in all contracts and this would need to be reviewed. He stated the current contractual model employed by the Council had not been working. He also said that the parking account needed to be reviewed and that bulky waste services should have a simple split between an express service that residents pay for and free service for those who cannot pay. He also referenced the Community Infrastructure Levy in Kilburn being at a high level because of the constant noise and dirt caused by the amount of lorries in the area. He stated that any Cabinet plan to take that money away from the locality and into central Council reserves would not be popular with residents. He concluded by stating his support for the Administration's budget but reiterated that the Council could be more efficient and look for more savings by reviewing its model for entering into contracts.

Councillor Shaw spoke in support of Councillor Warren and the Brent Conservative budget and on three items which she said affected the residents of Brondesbury Park. She implored the Council to move that lollipop people in the Borough be reinstated to ensure that children are safe going to school. Secondly, she spoke against the increase of £4.50 to the daily visitors parking permit. She also spoke about proposals from the Children's Society to exempt care leavers from paying Council Tax, and argued that this would be a sign of a compassionate council. She concluded that she was pleased about the budget that the Brent Conservative Group was putting forward as it was one that residents could be proud of and support. She urged the Council to accept the Brent Conservative Group proposals.

Councillor Stopp said that the Conservatives on the Council could not claim to be a compassionate party when the Government had taken 60% out of the Council's budget in recent years. He also condemned the proposals made by Councillor Warren about spending the money that Brent Labour had earmarked for the Council's reserves. He said that he was pleased that Brent was represented by a Labour-run Council as he would have been worried about the damage that might



have been done to the Borough had the Conservative or Brent Conservative Groups been in power. Councillor Stopp went on to address the Community Infrastructure Levy in association with Councillor Duffy's remarks and said that the Council needed to look at this as a way to bring money into the building and to look at other ways in which the Council could learn from other good Labour Councils across the Country. In conclusion, Councillor Stopp said that the proposed budget was good work given the difficult spending cuts identified.

Councillor Mahmood thanked those responsible for presenting this budget. Brent, he said, had suffered more than some other local authorities and that the Labour Group's proposals represented a fair, responsible and balanced budget. He welcomed the increase in Council Tax by 4%, of which, 2% would be spent on social care and said that Brent did well with its Adult Social Care Budget. Councillor Mahmood went on to say that he was pleased that special consideration had been given to the Borough's elderly people and dementia sufferers in Brent. Dementia, he said, was on the increase and was affecting more people. He hoped that the Council would continue to help them support families and carers and to provide support equally and fairly to all residents.

Councillor Southwood recommended the Budget to Members as she believed that it was rooted in real life and wanted to keep popular and valued services sustainable. She said that the Council was in a position to make tough choices such as the generating of waste and disposal of it had a cost in terms of money and the environment. She said that Councillor Warren had reminded her about the LED lighting programme, which had resulted in the delivery of one-third of carbon savings and biodiversity in parks. Councillor Southwood said that the responsibility for the development of new services, highways enforcement and damage caused to pavements, currently lay with the Council and that the proposed Budget had set tone for work the Council wanted to undertake.

Councillor Tatler said that a Harrow resident had said to her how lucky she (Councillor Tatler) had been to be living in Brent as the Council there did its job. Councillor Tatler said that this showed that the Council listened and communicated with its residents and demonstrated how Brent's residents could only trust the Council's Labour Party. She said that difficult decisions had been taken during the budget process and that a different approach had been taken to delivery of regeneration, not only through house building but place making. Councillor tattler went on to say that the Council's Labour Group had delivered over 50% social housing and had also looked at how to help its residents gain meaningful employment. She said that Brent CIL provided better funding to help neighbourhoods and that time and space was needed to develop town centres into the hearts of local communities. In conclusion, Councillor Tatler said that the Government was looking to raise business rates and that the Council was looking to work with it in relation to this.

Councillor Kansagra agreed with the Leader of the Council that the Council had suffered cuts in the region of £850m and up to £1.2bn and that any business would have gone bankrupt if it had suffered such reductions in funding but that the Council had not. He thanked the Labour Administration and those responsible for managing those cuts. Councillor Kansagra questioned what the cuts reflected and whether the Council was over-staffed, which he felt it was and that the reduction in staff levels had identified efficiency savings and he was glad that the Administration

was using these. He said that had the Administration not identified these cuts it would have borrowed and spent. Councillor Kansagra said that Councillor Butt was looking forward to a period of post-Conservative to which he felt there was no chance of this. He commended the Conservative Group's alternative budget to Members.

Councillor M Patel said that, with regard to education, the Prime Minister's priorities had been wrong, particularly in relation to her views on grammar schools and schools funding cuts. She said that the Prime Minister had been the first since the early 1990s to have cut funding per pupil and questioned what this £26.5m reduction in spending would mean for Brent and that, despite all of this, the Council's Children and Young People Department's budget continued to focus on protecting vulnerable children and to give them the best start in life as possible.

Councillor Miller said that stronger communities had a smaller financial profile but that vulnerable Brent residents faced a further raft of damaging and centrally enforced austerity. He said that the Council's duty was to offer the greatest possible protection from cuts, innovation to get around them and political protection from them. Councillor Miller said that a vacant post within the Council's Trading Standards Team had been removed and a further £25k extra income had been secured through ring-fenced commercial building control activity over the year ahead. In addition, he said the Council would gain approved provider status to allow the Council to avoid seeking permission from other local authorities to operate in their areas with a further £35k to be generated over the year ahead. He said that all steps possible would be taken to increase the self-sufficiency of the Willesden Green Library Centre with a Café and more innovative use of the existing space for commercial rent. There were, he said, easier stories to tell than the income generation and the money that the Council would make savings in. Councillor Miller said that this was a budget for a safer Brent, that Labour made a difference in the area of policing, and the London Mayor was no exception. There would, he said, be an investment of £480k to be match funded by the Police to introduce 'Met Patrol Plus' because keeping Brent's residents safe was at the top of the Council's priorities. He said that with crime rising across London, now was the time for the Council to be ready to detect and prevent crime and, in line with a range of suggestions from the Scrutiny Committee, to make allowance for new capital investment in a modernised, digital CCTV system which would allow the Council to share its bandwidth with its local partners and reduce the cost of reallocating cameras. In both of these ways, Councillor Miller said that, despite irresponsible Conservative attempts to undermine the viability of local government as a whole the Administration was showing that it would invest in a safer Brent and stand with its residents.

Councillor Hirani thanked Members from all parties on the prominence they had given to adult social care during the budget debate. He said that the proposed Budget showed that the Council was spending more on Adult Social Care, despite the Council having £150m less to spend on adult social care due to Central Government's grant cut. He said there was increasing demand for these services with 200 more patients who had an adult social care need in relation to dementia. Councillor Hirani said that the Council had been featured recently by the Local Government Association for its innovative NAIL programme where the Council had plans to deliver 529 extra care homes by 2018 and that this scheme would save the Council £332 per week compared to a nursing and residential care home placement

and that, to date, had delivered £4.7m worth of savings and still provided better care to residents who needed it. He said that the Council was displaying ambitious plans to address the social care crisis and that the Council had a Brent Local Health and Care Plan that sat under the Health and Well-being Board and on which, Councillor Colwill was a member. Councillor Hirani confirmed that the Council already had a contract with the Carers Support Centre. Councillor Hirani spoke on Councillor Davidson's reference to the by-election held last week in Copeland, which had seen the Labour Party lose its seat there. He said that the people of Brent had voted differently and recommended that Full Council agree the proposed Budget as it showed how the Council planned to address the social care crisis in Brent.

Councillor Carr suggested that the Council might wish to consider cutting the number of elected ward Members it had from three to two as this would realise a quick saving. She said that the increase in Members' budget expenses was 25% and that Councillors should practice what they preached. Councillor Carr also believed that the Council did not require a whole department to promote the interests of the Leader of the Council.

Councillor Colwill recommended the alternative budget moved by Councillor Davidson as there were proposals to bring money back in to regenerate the Borough. He said that this had been done between all parties over the years and that the homes that were being produced would bring in much more revenue as time went on and that if the Council kept regenerating, it would end up with a vibrant Brent which required all Councillors to work together to achieve this. In conclusion, Councillor Colwill urged that the Council continue to look after its schools during these times of cuts.

Councillor Butt, in delivering his closing remarks, thanked all Members for their contributions to the debate and said it had been interesting listening to what the alternative budgets had proposed. In questioning whether the opposition groups had consulted or engaged with public prior to producing the alternative budgets and confirmed that, in the case of the Administration's proposed budget, the Labour Group had. He said that the Administration had been absolutely honest with residents in an attempt to deliver a better Brent. Councillor Butt said that Councillor Warren's alternative budget had been disappointing. He added that Councillor Warren had been afforded the option to attend Cabinet and to engage with the Administration and that what he had proposed was of little substance, few other options due to austerity and a lack of ideas or vision.

Prior to a vote being taken on the amendments put by Opposition Groups and the proposals by Cabinet, the Chief Executive confirmed that the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor would abstain from the initial vote cast in each case.

On a recorded vote being taken, the alternative budget moved as an amendment to the Cabinet's proposals for the Budget by Councillor Davidson, was declared **LOST**.

Voting was recorded as follows:

**For the Amendment (5)**

Councillors Carr, Colwill, Davidson, Kansagra and Maurice

**Against the Amendment (51)**

Councillors Aden, Agha, Allie, Bradley, Butt, Chan, S Choudhary, Colacicco, Conneely, Crane, Daly, Denselow, Dixon, Duffy, Eniola, Ezeajughi, Farah, Harrison, Hector, Hirani, Hylton, Jones, Kabir, Kelcher, Long, Mahmood, Marquis, Mashari, McLeish, McLennan, Miller, Moher, J Mitchell-Murray, W Mitchell-Murray, Naheerathan, Nerva, M Patel, R Patel, Pavey, Perrin, Pitruzzella, Shahzad, Shaw, Ketan Sheth, Krupa Sheth, Southwood, Stopp, Tatler, Thomas, Van Kalwala and Warren.

**Abstentions to the Amendment (2)**

Councillors Ahmed and Chohan

On a recorded vote being taken, the alternative budget moved as an amendment to the Cabinet's proposals for the Budget by Councillor Warren, was declared **LOST**.

Voting was recorded as follows:

**For the Amendment (2)**

Councillors Shaw and Warren

**Against the Amendment (54)**

Councillors Aden, Agha, Allie, Bradley, Butt, Carr, Chan, S Choudhary, Colacicco, Colwill, Conneely, Crane, Daly, Davidson, Denselow, Dixon, Duffy, Eniola, Ezeajughi, Farah, Harrison, Hector, Hirani, Hylton, Jones, Kabir, Kansagra, Kelcher, Long, Mahmood, Marquis, Mashari, Maurice, McLeish, McLennan, Miller, Moher, J Mitchell-Murray, W Mitchell-Murray, Naheerathan, Nerva, M Patel, R Patel, Pavey, Perrin, Pitruzzella, Shahzad, Ketan Sheth, Krupa Sheth, Southwood, Stopp, Tatler, Thomas and Van Kalwala.

**Abstentions to the Amendment (2)**

Councillors Ahmed and Chohan

On a recorded vote being taken to the Cabinet's proposals for the Budget, by Councillor Butt, the motion was declared **CARRIED**.

Voting was recorded as follows:

**For the Motion (49)**

Councillors Aden, Agha, Allie, Bradley, Butt, Chan, S Choudhary, Colacicco, Conneely, Crane, Daly, Denselow, Dixon, Duffy, Eniola, Ezeajughi, Farah, Harrison, Hector, Hirani, Hylton, Jones, Kabir, Kelcher, Long, Mahmood, Marquis, Mashari, McLeish, McLennan, Miller, Moher, J Mitchell-Murray, W Mitchell-Murray, Naheerathan, Nerva, M Patel, R Patel, Pavey, Perrin, Pitruzzella, Shahzad, Ketan Sheth, Krupa Sheth, Southwood, Stopp, Tatler, Thomas and Van Kalwala.

**Against the Motion** (7)

Councillors Carr, Colwill, Davidson, Kansagra, Maurice, Shaw and Warren

**Abstentions to the Motion** (2)

Councillors Ahmed and Chohan

Accordingly, it was **RESOLVED** that:

- (i) An overall 3.99% increase in the Council's element of Council Tax for 2017/18, with 2% as a precept for Adult Social Care and a 1.99% general increase, be agreed;
- (ii) If the 2% adult social care precept in the Council's element of Council Tax was rejected, Adult Social Care expenditure would be cut by £2.1m in 2017/18 from the levels proposed in this paper, be agreed;
- (iii) The General Fund Revenue Budget for 2017/18, as summarised in Appendix A, be agreed;
- (iv) The cost pressures, technical adjustments and savings, as detailed in Appendix B, be agreed;
- (v) The HRA Budget, as set out in Section 6, be agreed;
- (vi) The dedicated schools' grant, as set out in Section 7 be agreed;
- (vii) The pension fund contribution rates of 32.5%, 33.8% and 35.0% for 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20 respectively, be agreed;
- (viii) The report from the Budget Scrutiny Panel, as set out at Appendix C, be noted;
- (ix) The Capital Programme, as set out at Appendix D, be agreed.
- (x) The Treasury Management Strategy and the Annual Investment Strategy for 2017/18, as set out at Appendix E, be agreed;
- (xi) The Prudential Indicators measuring affordability, capital spending, external debt and treasury management, as set out at Appendix F, be agreed;
- (xii) The advice of the Chief Legal Officer, as set out at Appendix G, be noted;

- (xiii) The categorisation of Earmarked Reserves and Provisions, as set out in Appendix H, be agreed;
- (xiv) The schedules of fees and charges to be set by the Council, as set out at Appendix I, and the proposed new Fees and Charges Policy, as set out at Appendix J, including the officer delegated powers to which it referred, be agreed;
- (xv) The results of consultation, as set out in Section 9 and detailed in Appendix K, be noted;

**NOTE: These recommendations only include a provisional Council Tax level for the GLA as its final budget was not agreed when this report was despatched. This means that the statutory calculation of the total amount of Council Tax under Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 may be amended by the final Greater London Authority precept.**

- (xvi) In relation to the Council Tax for 2017/18:

The following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2017/18, in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended:

- (a) £981,517,657 being the aggregate of the amount that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- (b) £874,652,471 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) £106,865,186 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- (d) £1,145.16 being the amount at (c) above, divided by the amount for the tax base of 93,319, agreed by the General Purposes Committee on 8 Dec 2016, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.

(e) Valuation Bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
763.44	890.68	1,017.92	1,145.16	1,399.64	1,654.12	1,908.60	2,290.32

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (d) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings

listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

(xvii) It be noted that, for the year 2017/18, the proposed Greater London Authority precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, in respect of the Greater London Authority, for each of the categories of dwellings are as shown below:

Valuation Bands

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
186.68	217.79	248.91	280.02	342.25	404.47	466.70	560.04

(xviii) Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at paragraph 2.29(e) and 2.30, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2017/18 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
950.12	1,108.47	1,266.83	1,425.18	1,741.89	2,058.59	2,375.30	2,850.36

It be noted that the Chief Finance Officer has determined that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Act 1992.

- (a) The Chief Finance Officer be and is hereby authorised to give due notice of the said Council Tax in the manner provided by Section 38(2) of the 1992 Act.
- (b) The Chief Finance Officer be and is hereby authorised, when necessary, to apply for a summons against any council tax payer or non-domestic ratepayer on whom an account for the said tax or rate and any arrears has been duly served and who has failed to pay the amounts due to take all subsequent necessary action to recover them promptly.
- (c) The Chief Finance Officer be and is hereby authorised to collect revenues and distribute monies from the Collection Fund and is authorised to borrow or to lend money in accordance with the regulations to the maximum benefit of each fund.

(xix) In the event that the GLA sets a different Council Tax precept to that set out in this report (which was the published provisional amount at the date of

despatch) that authority be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer to vary the amounts at (xvi), but only insofar as to reflect the GLA decision, and to make consequential, but no other, amendments to the amounts at (xvii).

## 8. **Members' Allowance Scheme**

The Council had before it, a report by the Chief Legal Officer, which sought the Council's approval to the making of a Members' Allowance Scheme, in the proposed terms, as set out in the report, for the 2017/18 Financial Year.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (i) The Members' Allowance Scheme in the proposed terms set out in the report, for the Financial Year 2017/18, be approved; and
- (ii) The Chief Legal Officer be authorised to comply with the statutory requirements to publicise the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme.

## 9. **Changes to the Constitution**

The Council had before it, a report by the Chief Legal Officer, which sought the Council's approval to proposed changes to the rules of debate at meetings of the Full Council.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (i) With immediate effect, the changes to the Constitution proposed in the report, be agreed; and
- (ii) The Chief Legal Officer be authorised to amend the Constitution accordingly.

## 10. **Appointment of Deputy Electoral Registration Officer**

The Council had before it, a report by the Chief Executive, which sought the Council's approval to the appointment of a Deputy Electoral Registration Officer under Section 52(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1983, and that such appointed person be authorised to perform and exercise any of the duties and powers of the Electoral Registration Officer.

**RESOLVED** that the Council's Electoral Registration and Services Manager be appointed as the Deputy Electoral Registration Officer, with the full powers of the Electoral Registration Officer in her absence.

## 11. **Review of New Scrutiny Committee Structure**

Councillor Ketan Sheth, Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee, introduced a report by the Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships, which reviewed the new structure of the Council's two scrutiny committees, which had come into effect on 18 May 2016, and which examined the



impact of the dual structure on addressing the challenges and strategic issues for scrutiny at the Council.

By way of an amendment, Councillor Warren moved that the recommendation within the report be deleted and be replaced by the following:

- “1. This Council notes both the failure of its scrutiny arrangements and lack of any effective scrutiny since May 2014; and
2. This Council instructs Officers to revisit the proposals and present to Council a new scrutiny structure with a minimum of four such committees.”

On a vote being taken by a show of hands, the AMENDMENT was declared **LOST**.

Accordingly, it was **RESOLVED** that the content of the report be noted and agreed.

## 12. **Localism Act 2011 - Pay Policy Statement**

The Council had before it, a report by the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development, which, in accordance with Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 (requirement upon English and Welsh local authorities to produce a pay policy statement on an annual basis) sought the Council’s approval to the Pay Policy Statement attached to the report, as an accurate and factual representation of the Council’s pay arrangements for 2017/18.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (i) The Pay Policy Statement attached to the report be approved as an accurate and factual representation of the Council’s pay arrangements for 2017/18; and
- (ii) Any amendments required during the year be brought back to a future meeting of the Council’s General Purposes Committee and Full Council for approval.

## 13. **Motion**

In accordance with the agreed procedural motion, the following motion was debated by Council:

### Brent Council Condemns US Travel Ban

Councillor Shahzad OBE moved the motion by urging that this Council unanimously condemns recent unjustified and inhumane efforts by President Donald Trump to ban the men, women and children of predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States, and objects in the strongest terms to the principle of any nation imposing arbitrary, discriminatory travel bans.

This Council holds that racism and xenophobia, for which there can be no place in civilised society, be challenged at every turn, and that the politics of hate and fear must always be robustly confronted and comprehensively rejected.

This Council draws attention to the recent commemoration of Holocaust and Genocide Memorial Day and implores President Trump to heed urgent warnings against allowing the catastrophic mistakes of our collective past to be repeated.

This Council celebrates our borough's proud diversity and is testament to the immense and invaluable contribution afforded by the universal human right of global migration.

While recognising the need to prioritise national security, this Council calls on the UK government to continuing setting an international example of enlightened compassion, ensuring that our words are more than matched by our actions via a guarantee that this country will always be as much a place of sanctuary as it is a land of opportunity.

The motion was put to the vote and was declared **CARRIED**.

14. **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

The meeting was declared closed at 9.35pm.

COUNCILLOR PARVEZ AHMED  
Mayor

# Public Document Pack



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

Minutes of the ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
held on Thursday 20 April 2017 at 7.00 pm

### PRESENT:

**The Worshipful the Mayor**  
Councillor Parvez Ahmed

**The Deputy Mayor**  
Councillor Bhagwanji Chohan

### COUNCILLORS:

Aden	Agha
Allie	Bradley
Butt	Carr
S Choudhary	Colacicco
Collier	Colwill
Conneely	Crane
Daly	Davidson
Dixon	Eniola
Ezeajughi	Farah
Harrison	Hector
Hirani	Hossain
Jones	Kabir
Kansagra	Kelcher
Long	Mahmood
Mashari	Maurice
McLeish	McLennan
Miller	Moher
J Mitchell Murray	W Mitchell Murray
Naheerathan	M Patel
RS Patel	Perrin
Pitruzzella	Shahzad
Ketan Sheth	Krupa Sheth
Southwood	Stopp
Tatler	Van Kalwala

#### 1. **Apologies for Absence**

The Mayor stated that direct apologies for absence had been received from: Councillors Chan, A Choudry, Denselow, Duffy, Hoda-Benn, Marquis, Nerva, Pavey and Thomas.

## 2. **Declarations of Interest**

- (i) Councillor Harrison declared a personal interest in respect of Agenda Item No.6 (Housing Management Options Review – Outcome of Formal Consultation) in that she was a current member of the Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) Member and Resident Panel Board.
- (ii) Councillor Collier declared, in respect of Agenda Item No.6 (Housing Management Options Review – Outcome of Formal Consultation), that he had previously been a member of the BHP Member and Resident Panel Board, but had informed the Chair of his resignation on 3 January 2017.

*Councillors Colwill, Davidson, Kansagra, Maurice and Mashari joined the meeting at 7.03pm.*

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

The Mayor made the following announcements:

### ***(i) Service of Hope and Reconciliation following the Westminster terror attack***

The Mayor reflected that everyone was shocked and saddened by the terrorist attack on Westminster on 22 March. He informed Full Council that on 5 April 2017 he had represented Brent at the Service of Hope and Reconciliation which followed the attack. He said that it was a humbling and moving event which had showed the solidarity and resilience of the people of London. The occasion had made him feel extremely proud at the defiance shown in the face of adversity. He continued that thoughts were with everyone who had been involved in the attack and that the Brent Civic Centre flag had been flown at half-mast to show solidarity and unity with those affected.

*A minutes silence then proceeded to take place in the Council Chamber.*

### ***(ii) March Fundraising Event at the Grand Hall***

The Mayor announced that on 16 March he had hosted another successful fundraising evening in the Council's Grand Hall. He thanked all of those who attended and those who had supported him during his mayoral year.

### ***(iii) Wembley National Stadium Trust Reception***

The Mayor stated that he had been delighted to attend the Wembley National Stadium Trust Reception recently. The reception had celebrated the work that local organisations had been doing to engage local residents in sport and physical recreation activities. He said that it had been a pleasure to meet such a wide cross-section of Brent residents.

### ***(iv) Romanian Ambassador for London at the Civic Centre***

The Mayor announced that on 19 April 2017 he, alongside the Leader of the Council, Deputy Leader of the Council and Council's Chief Executive, had had the

pleasure of welcoming His Excellency, Dan Mihalache, the Romanian Ambassador for London to the Civic Centre. He noted that it had been interesting to discuss the integration process of the large Romanian community Brent and the different ways to work together.

#### 4. **Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and Appointment of Chairs and Vice Chairs (if any)**

It was **RESOLVED that**, the following appointments to Committees be ratified by Full Council:

- (i) Resignation of Councillor Mili Patel, as full Member, from the Council's Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Roxanne Mashari to fill the vacancy, as full Member.
- (ii) Resignation of Siddika Gulamhusen, as non-statutory co-opted Member, from the Council's Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee – Sayed Jaffar Milani (Al-Khoei Foundation) to fill the vacancy, as non-statutory co-opted Member.

#### 5. **Deputations (if any)**

The Mayor noted that the Council had received a combined deputation from residents of Harlesden Gardens in Kensal Green Ward and that the deputation related to traffic issues and road rage. He asked Councillor Kelcher (Kensal Green Ward) to introduce the residents.

Councillor Kelcher began by placing on record his thanks to the Mayor for all his work during his mayoral year. He stated that the residents would speak on the issue in further detail but mentioned that he, Councillor McLeish and Councillor Hector had all visited the roads in question and that they were fully supportive of the initiative being proposed by residents. It was felt that this would help to aid the traffic problems which were prevalent in Harlesden.

Nancy Strang (resident of Harlesden Gardens) began by stating that she had been a resident of the Harlesden Gardens area for 14 years. She outlined that in the last couple of years the traffic on Park Parade (the local high street) had worsened significantly. She felt that the problems arose in part from the two way traffic systems on three of the roads adjoining Park Parade (Harlesden Gardens, Sellons Avenue and Springwell Avenue), which frequently caused 'bottlenecks' of road traffic. She put forward that some of the reasons which contributed to this included: not being able to turn onto the road when another car is coming in the opposite direction; double parking on the road; and cars on the high street using the three roads as a cut through. She also mentioned that there were two bus stops which created a traffic backlog and three schools in the Harlesden Gardens area which contributed to the severe disruption at pick-up times. She also drew Members' attention to the rise of anti-social behaviour in the form of road rage and that her children had witnessed violent and expletive confrontations between drivers. She concluded that this was an issue affecting all of the residents in this area, and that only one person she had spoken to had refused to sign her petition on this issue.

Amanda McKenzie (resident of Harlesden Gardens) noted that she had lived in Harlesden for 16 years and had been a resident of the Harlesden Gardens area for nine years. She said that the traffic problems were intolerable on the three roads in question, but that they wanted to offer a solution to the Council. She directed Members to a map of the roads, which had been circulated within the Chamber, which identified the possibility of creating a 'natural loop' of access to the three roads. She felt that this would assist in easing the traffic flow on these three roads, and have a beneficial effect for residents in the area. She explained her proposals in more detail according to the map, specifying which sections of the roads would be one way and which would be proposed to remain two way. She also mentioned that a similar system had been introduced on Buckingham Road and Wendover Roads in the past, and it was known to be working well. She concluded by asking the Council to consider their proposal find a solution to the problems raised.

Councillor Southwood (Lead Member for Environment) thanked the residents for their deputation and Ward Councillors for visiting the roads in question. She stated that she felt that Council could, and should, do something to address this. She noted that the narrowness of the roads compounded the issue and the presence of the schools in the vicinity caused concern. She raised that she had also been receiving an increasing volume of emails on concerns about anti-social behaviour occurring at school pick-up times. Members heard that the issue raised in the deputation was timely as Council Officers were due to be meet Transport for London (TfL) on the impact of the Harlesden Town Centre Scheme and that there was a perception at this stage that the scheme may have had a negative knock-on effect on traffic around Harlesden. She advised Members that the speed limit for the area was already 20 miles-per-hour but there were other potential things that could be instigated by the Highways department to stop cars parking on double yellow lines. Although it was also noted that any short term measures would require funding and would need to consider any others which might have an effect on the area. She acknowledged the positive impact of the aforementioned systems introduced on Buckingham Road and Wendover Roads and proposed that Councillors, Officers and residents all work together in the short term to develop a sustainable long-term solution to these issues.

## **6. Housing Management Options Review - Outcome of Formal Consultation**

The Mayor outlined that the procedure for this item had been agreed with all three group leaders and the Council's Chief Executive. He outlined that Councillor Farah (Lead Member for Housing and Welfare Reform) would introduce the item; followed by a speech from the Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee; which would be followed by a general debate which would be open to all Members. The item would conclude with a summary from the Lead Member.

Councillor Farah introduced the report which set out the outcomes from the formal consultation undertaken with tenants and leaseholders on the Council's future housing management service provision. Councillor Farah began by thanking the BHP Board and staff for their support during a difficult period over the last two years. He gave some background to Full Council on the reasons that the review had come about, citing significant concerns about BHP's performance which began towards the end of 2015. He noted that review formally started in June 2016 and Cabinet heard the three identified options for housing management services going forward at its meeting in November 2017. These were:

- (i) To continue with BHP on a reformed basis;
- (ii) To bring the service back in-house; or
- (iii) To enter into partnership with another organisation to provide the service.

Councillor Farah outlined that Cabinet had rejected the partnership option as it was deemed to have had too many risks and rejected the option to reform BHP as Cabinet did not have confidence in BHP to make the necessary improvements or savings that needed to be achieved. He specified that Cabinet had chosen its preferred option to bring the housing management service back in-house as it was expected to be easier to achieve savings and would also give the Council direct control to be able to drive up standards. This would in turn deliver better services for tenants and leaseholders. He noted the consultation which had been undertaken with residents since November 2016 and the different aspects of this which included: newsletters; information on the Council's website; a dedicated hotline; a dedicated freepost address; drop-in events; and an independent survey which had a 26% response rate. He drew Members' attention to the fact the survey's key finding was that 49% of BHP respondents support, or tended to support, the Council's proposal and only 8% preferred the reformed BHP option.

He set out the additional reasons for the in-house option being considered preferable, such as: there no longer being a financial advantage to having an arm's length management organisation (ALMO); a single leadership team would provide clarity of accountability and reduce costs; opportunities to bring Council expertise to addressing BHP challenges whether on the frontline or in back off functions; and opportunities to join up services and remove an unnecessary divides which currently existed between Council and BHP services. He noted that it was for these reasons that ALMOs in London had reduced from 20 in 2009 to eight in 2017. He added that most ALMO arrangements were not always clear and that there was not always much to distinguish between what could be run operationally by the Council's Housing Department. He concluded that his main focus was for residents' voices to be heard in shaping housing management services and asked for Members to support the proposals put forward in the report - of which Cabinet would make the final decision on.

Councillor Ketan Sheth (Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee) began by stating that housing was a huge challenge within the borough. He said that Members knew this, not just because of the stats on homelessness and temporary accommodation, but also from the housing issues that residents frequently tell them that they face. He mentioned that the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee convened for a special meeting in October 2016 to discuss the review of the different options for the Council's housing management services. He was pleased that the recommendations made at that meeting were taken forward and had been contained within the report before Full Council. He also outlined that members of the Committee had undertaken 'walkabouts' in BHP estates across the borough, including Wembley, Kilburn and Cricklewood and that it had been valuable for the Committee to be able to see services for themselves. Members' heard that a resident had approached the Committee Members and voiced their frustrations. Returning to the special Scrutiny Committee meeting in October, Councillor Ketan Sheth outlined how satisfying it was that so many BHP residents were in attendance and that the Council should be proud that it was able to engage with so many of them.

He continued by specifying the three recommendations that the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee had set out for Cabinet (contained under paragraph 15 of the report) and the reasoning. He re-iterated that it was pleasing that these had been taken into account and it also highlighted the role that the Scrutiny Committees had in teasing out problems before important key decisions are taken. He concluded that Councillor Farah had made it clear at the special Scrutiny meeting back in October that he wanted resident engagement to be at the core of the new housing management arrangements and that he hoped that this would definitively happen.

The Mayor then opened the debate up to Members.

Councillor Kansagra (Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group) began by recalling that Full Council had welcomed the original decision to create BHP as an ALMO to deliver the Council's housing management services (in 2002) and often applauded BHP's work at Council meetings. He stated that it was important to assess what had gone wrong since then. He said that when the Council established BHP it was hoped that a private business culture would be established to drive the management of the service forward, and it was unfortunate that this ultimately never happened. He felt that this was because the Council's internal work practices and culture had been incorporated within the creation of the ALMO. He also felt that strategic direction from the Council had been lacking at that time which had contributed in a number of ways to the current problems. He stated that, in his opinion, the option in the report for pursuing a reformed BHP was the preferable route for Cabinet to take. He noted that this reform should also encompass more involvement for the relevant Scrutiny Committee and more Councillors on the BHP Board with additional powers to assist with oversight of the ALMO.

Councillor Shahzad stated that there had been a high level of concern about BHP from both its tenants and leaseholders in Cricklewood. He stated that the high number of complaints about the service had not been acceptable and that the proposal to bring the management of the service back in-house provided a way of addressing this. He said that when the management of housing had been provided in-house, before BHP had been created, it had been a superior service. He concluded that it was beneficial for the Council that the proposed option would save money and that he was certain this option would provide a better service for residents.

Councillor Collier outlined that he was concerned about the proposed decision to bring the housing management service back in-house. He said that he could not remember a time of such unanimity of agreement between Councillors and Officers for a key decision affecting the Council. He emphasised that the decision to enter into a repairs and maintenance contract with Wates had contributed to BHP's problems as Wates had not had the supply chain or staffing levels to deliver the key elements to the contract. He felt that the BHP Board had been inhibited by this contract in what had, in effect, been a political decision taken by the Council. He also raised concerns about a lack of strategic direction within the Council, stating that it had been a significant error not to utilise BHP for new builds and questioned why filling voids (unoccupied properties) and undertaking repair work to properties had not been addressed more quickly. He re-iterated that this was linked to the failure of the contract with Wates. He concluded that he felt the proposed decision



would take away both the expertise of its members and the community voice if the BHP Board was disbanded. He also raised that the problems would only continue if it was largely the same people involved in delivering housing management services.

Councillor Long began by declaring that she was a previous BHP Board Member. She also noted her concerns for how the housing management service would function if it was brought back in-house. She questioned how the future decisions relating to the service would be made, stating that having it within the portfolio of one Lead Member and having decisions come through Cabinet could cause delays which might affect the service. She said that it was also possible that decisions would be delegated to Council Officers which would mean less transparency for residents. She highlighted that the in-house option would still incur transfer costs and that it would be difficult for the Cabinet to manage expectations of what can be achieved under the proposed new arrangements. She mentioned that the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee had considered the three different options and offered recommendations but questioned why BHP's problems had not been scrutinised more regularly and addressed before reaching this point.

Councillor Jones emphasised the amount of casework she had had to deal with from BHP leaseholders in recent years. She noted that this had centred on inadequate information from BHP when work was proposed and the length of time it took to address any problems. She said that she hoped that proposals would work in addressing the issues facing residents.

Councillor Colacicco raised points to Council on the link between poorly insulated homes and mental health problems. She noted that the UK's housing stock had the lowest level of energy efficiency in Europe. She added that cold homes and poverty went hand in hand and that the Council should take control and make warm housing a priority for its Council housing stock.

Councillor Kabir stated that in principle she was in agreement with the proposal to bring the housing management service back in-house but would have preferred a greater level of detail on the logistics of where this would be placed within the Council's structure. She raised that, going forward, it was very important for Members to have channels for referrals of housing-related casework to social services, children and young people services, environmental services, the police, relevant voluntary sector organisations and others. She also stated that any future contracts should be value for money and ensure that tenant and leaseholder interests are taken into account. She continued that the relevant Scrutiny Committee should have a more prominent role in overseeing the management of the Council's housing stock, with arrangements to ensure tenants and leaseholders are involved alongside frequent Committee recommendations to Cabinet. She also implored that it was essential that the Council took into consideration the need to adapt houses for those children and adults with special needs.

Councillor Mashari began by congratulating Councillor Farah and Phil Porter (the Council's Strategic Director of Community Wellbeing) for the undertaking the review and formal consultation. She emphasised that it was important for Members not to glaze over the issues which had contributed in getting to this point. She said that all Members had horror stories on the quality of BHP service from residents and that it was very important that those responsible for delivering housing management

services both in the past and moving forward were accountable. She noted that she did not necessarily believe bringing the service back in-house would be a silver bullet to solve the problems which had occurred. She made clear that governance; transparency; quality of service; and resident collaboration would be the key in ensuring the in-housing option was successful. She agreed with other Members that scrutiny arrangements would also be crucial, and that there should be a detailed change management plan with a definitive timetable reporting to the relevant Scrutiny Committee on a regular basis. She concluded that it was important that the Cabinet got this decision right and that she did not want to see the Council having to go back to an ALMO model in another ten years' time.

Councillor S Choudhary welcomed the plan to bring housing management services back in-house. He noted that he was an ex-BHP trustee and had experienced the problems which had led to the review. He said that Brent's BHP residents were fed up with the level of service from BHP, largely caused by the lack of repairs, and that Members heard the complaints constantly through emails and at Councillors' Surgeries. He stated that all Members should want to make a success of the proposal. He added that arrangements for genuine resident engagement would be crucial. He concluded that it was also essential that the Council now ensured that it had a proper standard of mechanics and electricians to be able to carry out repairs on the properties quickly and effectively.

Councillor Carr stated she was largely in agreement with the earlier points made by Councillors Collier and Long and she was not convinced that bringing the housing management service back in-house was the best way forward. She questioned whether the proposed reforms would improve the service and also raised concerns about the practical management arrangements.

Councillor Mahmood said that whilst he had found BHP had been viewed favourably by residents in the past, in the last few years it was clear that problems had arisen which had affected this view. He stated he supported Cabinet's proposal in principle, but that if the Council did not perform well under the new arrangements then it would be letting residents down. He recorded his hope that things could improve. He concluded by thanking BHP staff for their services and thanked Officers for undertaking the review work.

With no other Member indicating that they wished to speak, the Mayor invited Councillor Farah to conclude.

Councillor Farah thanked Members for their contributions in the debate and acknowledged that he had listened to the concerns and issues raised. He stated that past experience should not paralyse the Council and emphasised that it should continue to always be forward looking. He said it would be possible to learn from past experiences and believed that the proposal would allow the organisation to do a better job with limited resources. He outlined that Cabinet would assess the concerns raised and that he, as Lead Member, would respond in due course. He assured Members that the views of tenants and leaseholders would be at the heart of the housing management service arrangements. He welcomed Members' support and said that he would welcome ideas and engagement with Members over the next 12 months. He concluded that he was confident that a better service could be delivered for residents and asked Members to support the recommendations within the report.

Councillor Kansagra raised a final point, on behalf of the Conservative Group, which asked that Cabinet re-consider the 'Reformed BHP' option (as specified under paragraph 4.7 (i) within the report) when it took its decision.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (i) The outcome of the formal consultation regarding the proposal that the housing management functions and other delegated roles exercised by Brent Housing Partnership Ltd. be exercised by the Council thus requiring termination of the management agreement, be noted;
- (ii) New arrangements for scrutiny for this function which will constructively engage residents, be noted;
- (iii) The main points of the Council's discussion of the report be referred to Cabinet when it meets to consider the consultation responses and make the final decision on the Council's housing management service options.


**7. Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business to be transacted.

The meeting closed at 7.58 pm

COUNCILLOR PARVEZ AHMED  
Mayor

**This page is intentionally left blank**

 <b>Brent</b>	<b>Annual Meeting of the Council</b>  17 May 2017  <b>Report from the Chief Legal Officer</b>
For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</span>	
<b>Changes to the Constitution</b>	

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report proposes a number of changes to the council's Constitution, in particular in relation to the process for call-in of decisions to scrutiny committees, the arrangements for the council's Audit Committee, the establishing of a new Housing Scrutiny Committee and amendment of the Members' Allowance Scheme.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Council approves the changes to the Constitution proposed in this report and authorises the Chief Legal Officer to amend the Constitution accordingly.
- 2.2 That Council approves the proposed amendments to the Members' Allowance Scheme and authorises the Chief Legal Officer to fulfil the publicity requirements.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 A number of changes are proposed to the council's constitution to improve governance and procedures. The proposed amendments are shown in the appendices to the report. Additions to the existing text are underlined and deletions are indicated by crossing through. The main changes are described below and in footnotes in the appendices.
- 3.2 Call-in of decisions to scrutiny committees

Changes are proposed to the arrangements for call in of decisions to scrutiny committees. Currently the provisions in the constitution are located in two separate places in the Constitution and the relationship between the provisions in Standing Orders and in the Call-In Protocol, are unclear. Some aspects of the procedure need to be clarified. In addition, following consideration of procedures elsewhere, it is proposed that scope be created for members who submit a call in request to seek reassurance or clarification from members or officers and to withdraw their call-in request if they are then satisfied. It is proposed that the 15 working days within which the scrutiny meeting must normally take place should be measured from the date of the successful call in rather than from the date of the decision.

### 3.3 The proposed amendments to the Constitution are as follows:

- (i) Attached in Appendix 1 are proposed changes to Standing Orders to :
  - a. Bring the relevant provisions into one location (Standing Orders 20 and 21) and set out more clearly the requirements for a valid call-in request;
  - b. Provide in Standing Order 20(c) the opportunity for informal resolution of member concerns referred to above
  - c. Make clear that a decision cannot normally be implemented during the 5 day call-in period and provide for urgency arrangements, in exceptional circumstances, where immediate implementation is necessary.
  
- (ii) Attached in Appendix 2 are proposed changes to the Call-in Protocol to:
  - a. Make the wording a bit clearer in some places;
  - b. Link more clearly to the relevant standing orders;
  - c. Be clearer about the information required to be included in a call-in request;
  - d. Clarify the process for determining whether the criteria to be met before a call-in can proceed are met;
  - e. Set out in more detail; the process to be followed at the call-in meeting;

### 3.4 Proposed changes to the Audit Committee

Changes are proposed in respect of the council's Audit Committee to include a specific reference to fraud and corruption and to reflect a recommendation made by the Audit Committee that there be an annual report from the Committee to full Council. It is also proposed that to strengthen the governance role of the Audit Committee by reconstituting it as an Audit Advisory Committee under section 102(4) Local Government Act 1972. This will enable the independent members of the committee (including the chair) to vote on matters before the committee, giving them equal status with councillor members. The councillor members of the new Audit Advisory Committee will meet as a decision-making Audit Committee when necessary (probably concurrently with or at the end of an Audit Advisory Committee meeting) to

take the formal decision to approve the council's accounts and any other decisions that may become necessary.

3.5 The proposed terms of reference of the Audit Advisory Committee are contained on Appendix 3, along with the terms of reference for meetings of the Audit Committee to take technical decisions when required.

3.6 Establishment of a Housing Scrutiny Committee

On 24 April 2017, Cabinet decided that in the future housing management services to the council's tenants and leaseholders will be provided by the council itself. The decision was made subsequent to a special meeting of Full Council on 20 April 2017 called to give all Members the opportunity to consider the outcome of the formal consultation undertaken by the council and to express their views.

3.7 Informed by recommendations made by the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on what should happen in the event of Cabinet deciding to pursue the in-house option, the Constitutional Working Group agreed proposals for a new scrutiny committee to be established dedicated to exercising the council's overview and scrutiny functions in relation to housing matters.

3.8 If established by Full Council, Members are asked to note that the Housing Scrutiny Committee will be advised to explore and, if appropriate, to make arrangements to extend its membership to a number of co-opted members. The final decision, however, on any proposed appointments will be for Full Council to make.

3.9 The proposed remit of the Housing Scrutiny Committee and the consequential change to the remit of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee are tracked in Appendix 4.

3.10 Amendment of the Members' Allowance Scheme

If the proposal to reconstitute the Audit Committee as an Audit Advisory Committee is approved, the Members' Allowance Scheme will be amended to record that the co-opted member allowance payable to the independent members is referable to their new role.

3.11 If a Housing Scrutiny Committee is established by Full Council, it is further proposed that the Members' Allowance Scheme is amended to make provision for the payment of special responsibility allowances to the Chair (£14,281) and Vice-Chair (£5,101) of the Housing Scrutiny Committee as well as the six other Members of that Committee (£3,234). These allowances match the allowances payable to Members of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee and Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee.

3.12 Given the possibility of the appointment of co-opted members to the Housing Scrutiny Committee, it is also proposed that provision be made for co-opted

member allowances of £226 (which is what the education co-opted members on the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee receive).

- 3.13 Before amending its Members' Allowance Scheme, the council has to have regard to the recommendations set out in the independent remuneration panel's report. The Remuneration of Councillors in London 2014 – Report of the Independent Panel, so far as relevant, proposed the following: the role of committee member and vice-chair of a scrutiny committee receive a special responsibility allowance of between 20-30% of the remuneration package for the Leader (i.e. £2,392 to £8,941). The role of chair of a scrutiny committee receive a special responsibility allowance of between 40-60% (i.e. £15,486 to £28,581) of the remuneration package for the Leader.
- 3.14 It is worth noting, however, that since 2014 members allowances have been set at a reduced, or much reduced, level than the amount recommended by the independent panel.
- 3.15 If approved, Full Council is requested to authorise the Chief Legal Officer to fulfil the usual publicity requirements.
- 3.16 It is also proposed that another amendment is made to the Members' Allowance Scheme in response to the following issue. The 2014 Report of the Independent Panel recommended that:

*“councils should make arrangements in their members' allowances schemes to allow the continuance of special responsibility allowances in the case of sickness, maternity and paternity leave in the same terms that the council's employees enjoy such benefits (that is to say, they follow the same policies).”*

- 3.17 Thus far no such provision has been made by the council in its Scheme.
- 3.18 It is proposed therefore that the following amendment be made to the scheme:

***“Maternity, Paternity and Sickness Pay***

13. (1) *A Councillor shall continue to receive in full a basic allowance as set out in Schedule 1 of this Scheme during any period of maternity, paternity and sickness leave.*
- (2) *A Councillor entitled to a Special Responsibility Allowance shall continue to receive their allowance during any period of maternity, paternity and sickness leave in the same way that the Council's employees enjoy such benefits.*
- (3) *If another Councillor is appointed to cover the period of absence, the replacement will be entitled to receive the same allowance.”*

- 3.19 For the avoidance of doubt, if Full Council were to agree the above amendment, it would be without prejudice to the council's legal powers to amend (at any time) or even revoke its Members' Allowance Scheme.



## **4.0 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 The additional cost of the housing scrutiny amendment to the Members' Allowance Scheme at any given time will depend on the allocation of special responsibilities, as a Member is entitled to a single special responsibility allowance only irrespective of the number of special roles that Member has been allocated, and any vacancies.
- 4.2 The actual additional costs of a Member receiving a special responsibility allowance to cover a period of absence will entirely depend on the circumstances and will therefore vary from year to year. The maximum cost of these amendments is not estimated to exceed £50,000 and can be contained within the existing budget envelope.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 These are addressed in the body of the report.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the council has a duty when exercising its functions to have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act and advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not. This is the public sector equality duty. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.
- 6.2 Due regard is the regard that is appropriate in all the circumstances. The weight to be attached to the effects is a matter for the council. As long as the council is properly aware of the effects and have taken them into account, the duty is discharged. Depending on the circumstances, regard should be had to the following.
- 6.3 The need to enquire into whether and how a proposed decision disproportionately affects people with a protected characteristic. In other words, the indirect discriminatory effects of a proposed decision.
- 6.4 The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.
- 6.5 The need to take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it. This includes taking account of disabled persons' disabilities. There can be a positive duty to take action to help a disabled person. What matters is how they are affected, whatever proportion of the relevant group of people they might be.

- 6.6 The need to encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life (or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low).
- 6.7 The need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.
- 6.8 The proposal to make provision for maternity, paternity and sickness pay for Members entitled to a special responsibility allowance will ensure that councillors are not adversely and disproportionately affected by any period of leave related to pregnancy, maternity/paternity or a disability. It will also advance equality of opportunity by removing or minimising the financial disadvantage that a councillor with a relevant protected characteristic would otherwise suffer and encourage full participation in public life.

### **Background Papers**

None

### **Contact Officers**

Debra Norman, Interim Chief Legal Officer, Resources Department, Brent Council, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley HA9 0FJ

Tel: 020 8937 1578

## APPENDIX 1

### Proposed amendments to Standing Orders 20 and 21

#### 20. Call in of Cabinet, Cabinet Committees and Officer decisions

- (a) If:-
- (i) the relevant Scrutiny Committee decides; or
  - (ii) five non-cabinet members of the Council (for the avoidance of doubt excluding voting and non-voting co-opted and independent members) submit a valid request

that any Key Decision (irrespective of the decision maker) and other decisions made by the Cabinet or by Cabinet Committees be called in for scrutiny then the relevant Scrutiny Committee shall consider that decision at its next meeting which, unless otherwise determined by the Leader, shall in the case of a decision made by the Cabinet or by Cabinet Committees take place within 15 days of the date on which the call-in is accepted as valid under paragraph (b) below. ~~the relevant decision was made or in the case of an officer decision take place within 15 days of the date on which the record of the decision is made publicly available in accordance with the Access to Information Rules.~~ This period will be extended by the Head of Executive and Member Services as appropriate to take account of any public or religious holidays identified in the Municipal Calendar.

- (b) Any such decisions by the relevant scrutiny committee or requests to call in a decision shall be made within 5 days of the date on which the relevant decision was made or in the case of a decision made by officers within 5 days of the date on which the record of the decision is made publicly available in accordance with the Access to Information Rules. A request shall be valid if it:
- (i) Is .The request for call in must be received by the Head of Executive and Member Services by 6 pm on the 5<sup>th</sup> day;
  - (ii) Is in writing and submitted in person, by letter signed by the member or from the member's individual email address and not from that member's group office.
  - (iii) includes the reason(s) for the request being made. For the avoidance of doubt, there is no requirement that the same reason be given in respect of each request when calculating whether the threshold specified in paragraph (a) above has been reached.
  - (iv) is made on the Call-in form available from [LINK] or includes all the information required by the form.
  - (v) Includes the member's suggested alternative proposals, action, or resolution of the matter; and
  - (i) meets the requirements of section 3.2 of the call in protocol included in Part 7 of this Constitution.
- (c) A non-cabinet member who has notified a request to the Head of Executive and Member Services under 20(a)(ii) may withdraw their request within 72 hours of 6 pm on the 5<sup>th</sup> day in which case the Head of Executive and Member Services will

recalculate whether the threshold in paragraph (a)(ii) is met and if it is not the call-in shall not proceed.

- (d) Any No decision covered by the Standing Order which has been called in pursuant to paragraph (a) above which has not been shall be implemented before the expiry of the 5 day period provided for in paragraph (b) above has expired and no decision which has been called in in accordance with this Standing Order may be implemented prior to the date on which the decision maker receives notification of the call in from the Head of Executive and Member Services shall not be implemented until the relevant Scrutiny Committee has met to consider the decision in accordance with paragraph (a) unless the decision is urgent and the process in paragraph (e) below has been complied with.
- (e) Where a decision covered by this Standing Order is urgent the following shall apply:
- (i) A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the Council's or public interest and it would not be practicable for a quorate meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Committee to be convened and for any necessary reconsideration by the decision maker to take place in compliance with the Access to Information rules if the matter were called in.
  - (ii) The Chief Executive shall determine whether the matter is urgent on the basis of the definition in (a) above and that any decision on that matter cannot be called-in.
  - (iii) The Chief Executive shall obtain the consent of the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Committee (or in their absence the vice-chair) to the matter being treated as urgent and call-in not applying.
  - (iv) The published notice of the decision shall include the reasons why the decision may not be called-in prior to implementation.
  - (v) If the process in (b) and (c) has been completed prior to the publication of the report seeking the decision concerned, the report shall clearly state that the matter has been agreed as urgent and that call-in will not apply and, where applicable, this will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting that considers the matter.
  - (vi) Where (ii) – (iii) take place after the decision has been taken, the fact that a matter had been determined as urgent and that call-in did not apply, shall be notified to all members of the relevant scrutiny committee.
- (f) The Cabinet or Cabinet Committee shall report to the next ordinary meeting of Full Council details of any such urgent decisions and the reasons why the decision needed to be implemented as a matter of urgency.
- (g) In considering the call in the relevant Scrutiny Committee shall have regard to the call in protocol and determine whether it accepts any response which may have been given to it by the relevant decision maker and if it does not accept their response it can, in respect of that decision, agree recommendations to be given to the decision maker.
- (he) If the relevant Scrutiny Committee recommends to the decision maker that it should reconsider the decision or matter then
- (i) in the case of a decision made by the Cabinet/the Cabinet Committee, the Cabinet/Cabinet Committee (as appropriate) shall meet and shall take into account the views expressed or recommendations made to it and may then proceed to implement or change the decision as it sees fit, whether or not the

matter is referred to Full Council for further consideration under Standing Order 21; or

- (ii) in the case of a Key Decision made by an officer, the officer who made the Key Decision shall take into account the views expressed or recommendations made to him or her and may then proceed to implement or change the decision as he or she sees fit, whether or not the decision is referred to Full Council for further consideration under Standing Order 21.

## **21. Referral of Called in Decisions to Full Council**

- (a) If, following consideration by the relevant Scrutiny Committee of a called in decision, at least 10 members of the Council (not including the independent or co-opted members) so request the decision the subject of the call in shall be referred to a meeting of Full Council for further consideration.
- (b) Any request to refer such a decision to Full Council, in accordance with paragraph (a) above, shall be made in writing, together with the reasons for the referral and may include details of any suggested alternative proposal, action, or resolution (standard forms are available from members' group offices), to the Head of Executive and Member Services within 5 days of the date on which the relevant Scrutiny Committee met in accordance with Standing Order ~~18(a)~~20(a) or the date on which the decision maker reconsidered their decision in accordance with Standing Order ~~20~~18(~~he~~) if later. The Head of Executive and Member Services shall forthwith copy the request and the reasons to the Leader.
- (c) The Leader shall include in his or her report to Full Council any comments of the Cabinet or Cabinet Committee (as appropriate) on the referral and the reasons given therefore.
- (d) Full Council may make such recommendations to the Cabinet or Cabinet Committee (as appropriate) as it sees fit and the Cabinet or Cabinet Committee shall, if the recommendations relate to a function which is properly exercisable by it-, take into account but shall not be obliged to accept those recommendations.

## **Related amendment to Standing Order 6**

### **6. Form of Notice**

- (a) Subject to paragraph (b) below, any notice or request or motion required to be signed by members shall be submitted to the Head of Executive and Member Services and shall be signed by the required number of such members at the offices of the Head of Executive and Member Services. The Head of Executive and Member Services shall have delegated authority to take such action as is necessary to respond to any such notice, request or motion signed by the requisite number of members.
- (b) Any request under Standing Order 20 shall be made in accordance with that Standing Order.

~~writing and submitted in person, by letter or by email and:~~

~~In the case of a request submitted in person or by letter shall be signed and the signature(s) shall be the original signature of the member(s).~~

~~In the case of a request submitted by email, the email shall be from a member's individual address and not from that member's group office.~~

~~Shall include the reason(s) for the request being made. For the avoidance of doubt, there is no requirement that the same reason be given in respect of each request when calculating whether the threshold specified in Standing Order 20 has been reached.~~

~~Maybe made on the Call-in form available from member's group offices, and may include members' suggested alternative proposals, action, or resolution.~~

## Appendix 2

### PROTOCOL ON CALL-IN

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The basic premise of call-in is that it is a failsafe mechanism enabling non executive Councillors to make the Cabinet, Cabinet Committee, Cabinet Member or an officer making a key decision, re-consider a particular decision if it is of major concern or in Members' eyes profoundly flawed.
- 1.2 The statutory guidance on call-in states that there needs to be an appropriate balance between effectively holding the executive to account, being able to question decisions prior to them being implemented and allowing effective, efficient decision making. It also balances the need to make the process accessible and the need to ensure that call-in procedures are not abused or used to delay or slow down the decision making process.
- 1.3 As call-in can inevitably result in a delay to the implementation of decisions it should not be used for party political purposes to seek to further discuss a decision that some members do not agree with. Equally, the rights of non executive members to call-in a decision and exercise their right to question the decision, the decision maker and consider alternative options needs to be respected.
- 1.4 This protocol is designed to provide a locally agreed framework within which call-in can operate, a clear set of criteria against which an otherwise valid call-in request can be judged and a format for the effective conduct of the meeting considering the call in.

#### 2. What is a call-in?

- 2.1 A decision made by the council's Cabinet or a Cabinet committee, or a key decision by an officer, can be called in for review before it is implemented. Decisions can be called in by five non-executive members or by the relevant Scrutiny Committee. If a decision is called-in, that decision ~~should cannot normally~~ be implemented until it has been considered by the relevant scrutiny committee. ~~Called in decisions are considered by the Scrutiny Committee.~~ An urgency procedure is in place in Standing Orders for any decision that cannot afford to be delayed.
- 2.2 The relevant Scrutiny Committee ~~will meet~~ is required to meet within 15 working days of the date on which a call-in is accepted as valid decision being made. ~~If the~~ Committee ~~agrees with the reasons for the call in, the decision is may~~ decide to refer ~~the matter~~ back to the Cabinet or other decision maker, along with the reasons why the Committee thinks it should be reconsidered. The Cabinet or other decision maker will then decide whether to implement the original decision or review the decision based on the views of the relevant Scrutiny Committee. ~~Alternatively if the Committee does not agree with the reasons for call in then the matter is can~~ decide that the matter should not be referred back to the Cabinet or other decision maker ~~and in which case~~ the original decision will be implemented.

#### 3. The call-in process

- 3.1 A call in request must be submitted in accordance with the requirements of Standing Order 20 within 5 days of the relevant decision being made or in the case of a key decision made by officers within 5 days of the date on which the record of the decision is made publicly available in accordance with the Access to Information Rules. When submitting the call in request members must either

~~complete the set out the following call-in form available [LINK]) or include in their written request all the information required by the form. In particular this includes:~~

- an explanation as to why they are calling in the decision and if they are calling in all or part of the decision(s).
- an outline of the suggested alternative course of action.

~~3.2 The call-in request form or a similar format should be used to ensure full information is provided.~~

~~3.3~~—When a call-in request is submitted the Head of Executive and Member Services Which meets the requirements of Standing Order 20(b)((i) – iv) the Head of Executive and Member Services will refer it to the Chief Executive, who, in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer and the Head of Strategy and Partnerships (the council's designated Scrutiny Officer) ~~who will decide and the Chief Legal Officer, will decide~~ whether or not an otherwise valid the call-in conforms with the following requirements of this protocol. The call-in request will be assessed against the following criteria:

- Is the call-in process being used as a means of gaining information / understanding or discussing general concerns with Members and officers? If this could be achieved through the general overview and scrutiny process or by talking to the relevant officer or lead member informally the call-in will not be valid,
- Does the call-in duplicate a recent call-in on the same issue? If the call-in duplicates another call-in made within the previous 6 months it will not be valid,
- Have the reasons for calling in the decision already been discussed by the relevant Scrutiny Committee? If the reasons for calling in the decision have been discussed by the relevant Scrutiny Committee prior to the decision being made the call-in will not be valid,
- Call-in of a decision of the Cabinet referring a matter to Full Council for consideration will not be valid,
- Call in of operational management decisions taken by officers will not be valid
- If the call in request is considered by the Chief Executive to be frivolous, vexatious or clearly outside the call-in provisions it may be deemed invalid.

Prior to deciding the validity the Chief Legal Officer and the Head of Strategy and Partnerships may seek clarification from the members concerned.

#### **4. The Conduct of the call-in Meeting**

~~4.1 The Scrutiny Committees are is an official committees of the council and its meeting are held~~ in public.

4.2 The purpose of a call-in meeting is for non executive members to examine and consider the decision made by the Cabinet, Cabinet Committee, or officers (in respect of key decisions) and for members of the committee to make suggestions and recommendations they consider appropriate to the decision maker. The



Scrutiny Committee meeting provides an opportunity for members to seek clarification of the methodology used in enabling a decision to be made, as well as explore work undertaken by officers culminating in the matter coming before the Cabinet decision maker.

4.3 The relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holder and chief officer (or his/her representative) will be invited to attend the ~~Call-in~~ relevant scrutiny cCommittee meeting to explain the reasons for the decision, respond to the issues raised in the call-in request and answer questions at the meeting.

4.4 It is the chair of the relevant sScrutiny cCommittee's responsibility to manage the meeting effectively by applying standing orders, maintaining good discipline and fostering a culture of respect. All contributions to the meeting should go through the chair and the chair should ensure that no purely personal disagreements or comments are allowed to continue.

4.5 To ensure that the meeting is effective the procedure at the meeting (subject to the Chair's discretion) shall be as follows~~chair will:~~

(a) ~~Start each call-in agenda item by~~The chair will asking a representative of the members ~~that who~~ called in the decision to set out the reasons for the call in for up to 5 minutes. In the event that different members have identified different reasons the chair may in their discretion as more than one member to speak in which case the available time under (b) below shall be shared equally between the members.

(b) ~~The chair will consider whether to permit any~~ If a member of the public who has made a request to address the meeting to do so, the rules relating to members of the public addressing a meeting as set out in Standing Orders apply. Members of the public can be allowed to speak for 2 minutes ~~or 3 minutes in exceptional circumstances~~. If a number of requests to speak have been received then the chair should seek to limit the number of contributions to avoid hearing the same points repeated and should seek advice from the Head of Executive and Member Services about how this should be managed.

(c) ~~Ensure that a~~All of the members of the public who it has been agreed will address the meeting are will be heard prior to the lead member and any relevant officers being asked to respond to the issues raised by the call-in.

(d) The lead member shall then be invited to respond to the issues raised in the call in.

(e) The chair will then ~~!~~invite members of the committee to question the lead member and officers and discuss the issues. Members who are not members of the committee but wish to ask a question can be invited to do so.

(f) Having considered the call-in invite members of the committee are required to ~~to~~ come to one of the following conclusions:

- That the matter should be referred back to the decision maker for reconsideration with reasons for its request~~grounds for the call-in are upheld. In these circumstances and what~~ the committee must set out what it wants the decision maker~~Cabinet~~ to do.
- That it does not object to the decision~~the grounds for the call-in are rejected~~ and the decision can be implemented.

4.6 — Ensure that any member wishing to make a recommendation to the Cabinet clearly states what course of action they are proposing.

## Appendix 3

### AUDIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### Membership

- The committee comprises 5 non-executive councillors and 2 non voting co-opted members, one of whom will be the Chair of the committee.

#### Terms of Reference

To consider the following matters and to make recommendations concerning them to the relevant Council bodies or to officers

#### *Audit Activity*

1. The Head of Internal Audit's annual report and opinion, and a summary of internal audit activity (actual and proposed), and the strategic and annual audit plans, and consider the level of assurance these can give over the council's corporate governance arrangements.
2. Summaries of specific internal audit reports as appropriate.
3. The annual review of the effectiveness of internal audit.
4. Reports from internal audit on agreed audit recommendations not implemented within a reasonable timescale.
5. Specific reports as agreed with the external auditor.
6. The scope and depth of external audit work and to ensure it gives value for money.

#### *Regulatory Framework*

7. The Council's constitution in respect of Contract Standing Orders and financial regulations.
8. Any issue referred to it by the chief executive or a director, or any council body.
9. Effective development and operation of risk management and corporate governance in the Council.
10. Council policies to facilitate confidential reporting by employees of suspected fraud, corruption or any other wrongdoing and the Council's anti-fraud and anti-corruption policies.
11. The production of the Council's Statement on Corporate Governance and Internal Control.

12. The Council's arrangements for corporate governance and actions to ensure compliance with best practice.
13. The Council's compliance with its own and other published standards and controls.
14. The handling of any reports from the Local Government Ombudsman.

#### *Accounts*

15. The external auditor's report to those charged with governance on issues arising from the audit of the accounts.
16. The statement of accounts and any issues from the financial statements or from the audit that need to be brought to the attention of the Council.

### **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

#### **Membership**

- The committee comprises The 5 non-executive councillor members of the Audit Advisory Committee.

#### **Terms of Reference**

- 1 To review and approve the annual statement of accounts and consider whether there are any issues from the financial statements or from the audit that need to be brought to the attention of the Council.
- 2 To adopt the Council's Annual Governance Statement.

## **APPENDIX 4**

### **Scrutiny Committees**

#### **General**

The general membership rules and terms of reference of the Council's scrutiny committees are set out below. Each scrutiny committee may exercise any of the functions set out in the general terms of reference only in respect of those functions which are relevant to the remit of the committee. Any additional functions which are specific to individual committees are set out separately.

The terms of reference of the scrutiny committees reflect the functions the Council must ensure its scrutiny committees can exercise as well as those functions which the Council has decided to delegate to its scrutiny committees. Scrutiny committees are unable to exercise any other functions.

#### **General Membership rules**

Each committee shall comprise of 8 councillors in total. None of the councillors shall be members of the Cabinet or the Health and Wellbeing Board.

#### **General Terms of Reference**

Meet six times each municipal year and as and when required to consider any matter 'called-in' in accordance with standing orders.

Review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive.

Make reports or recommendations to Full Council or the Cabinet with respect to the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive.

Review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive.

Make reports or recommendations to Full Council or the Cabinet with respect to the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive.

Make reports or recommendations to Full Council or the Cabinet on matters which affect the borough or its inhabitants.

Decide, in accordance with standing orders, whether a decision made but not implemented in connection with the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive should be reconsidered or to arrange for Full Council to decide whether the decision should be reconsidered (i.e. to exercise 'call-in' powers).

Review or scrutinise the performance of any body carrying out any function on behalf of or in partnership with the Council.

Commission in depth evidence based reviews.

Consider requests for reviews on the handling of petitions in accordance with standing orders.

Produce and publish an annual report.

Co-ordinate the activities of the Committee with scrutiny undertaken by the voluntary sector and other bodies.

### **General Limitations**

The terms of reference of the scrutiny committees exclude matters concerning individual applications for consent, permission, approval, registration or grants. Examples include but are not limited to individual planning and licensing decisions.

### **Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee**

#### **Specific Membership Rules**

In addition to the 8 councillors, the membership of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee shall comprise of 4 voting education co-opted members (who may vote on matters relating to school education only) and 2 non-voting education co-opted members (who may not vote on any matter).

#### **Remit**

Adult social care; Safeguarding; Children's services; Cultural services; Education; Health; **Housing**; Public Health and Wellbeing.

#### **Specific Terms of Reference**

Discharge the functions of the Council under Part 4 of the Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013 in respect of the review and scrutiny of relevant NHS bodies or relevant health service providers including:

- reviewing or scrutinising any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of the health service in the borough; and
- making reports or recommendations to the relevant NHS bodies or relevant health service providers or Full Council on any matter reviewed or scrutinised; however
- in response to any consultation by the relevant NHS bodies or relevant health service providers in respect of any proposal for a substantial development of the health service in the borough or for a substantial variation in the provision of such service, to make recommendations to Full Council only.

### **Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee**

#### **Remit**

Corporate policy, partnerships and resources; Budget; Customer services; Commercial services; Planning policy; Environmental policy; Public realm; Employment and skills; IT; Recycling; Regeneration; Transport and highways; Community safety; Property; Emergency planning and business continuity.

#### **Specific Terms of Reference**

Review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities (as defined by section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998) of their crime and disorder functions and to make reports or recommendations to Full Council with respect to the discharge of those functions. This committee is therefore the "crime and disorder committee" for the purposes of section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.

Review or scrutinise the exercise by risk management authorities (including the Council, the Environment Agency and water companies) of flood risk management functions which may affect the borough for the purposes of Part 1 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

### **Housing Scrutiny Committee**

#### **Remit**

Housing functions within the Community Wellbeing Department\* and Supported housing and floating support and Home adaptations.

\* Housing functions include Transfer of Brent Housing Partnership Ltd; Housing supply; Housing growth numbers; Temporary accommodation; Landlord licensing; Private rented sector; Housing policy; Homelessness and Registered providers.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



 <b>Brent</b>	<b>Annual Meeting of the Council</b>  17 May 2017  <b>Report from the Chief Legal Officer</b>
For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</span>	
<b>Representation of Political Groups on Committees</b>	

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report fulfils the Council's duty to review and determine the representation of different political groups on certain committees at its annual meeting or as soon as practicable thereafter. Subsequently, the Council has a duty to make appointments to those committees giving effect to the wishes of the political group allocated the seats.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Full Council:
- (i) agree the size of each committee;
  - (ii) agree (where the rules of political balance apply) the allocation of seats on committees to each of the Council's political groups as set out in the report; and
  - (iii) note that the political balance on sub-committees will be reviewed at the first meeting of the General Purposes Committee.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The Council is required to **review** the representation of different political groups on certain committees at, or as soon as practicable after, its annual meeting. As soon as practicable after the review, the Council has a duty to **determine the allocation** to the different political groups all the seats on the relevant committees. The allocation is determined by applying the "political balance rules" prescribed by the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and supplemented by the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990. These rules are set out in Appendix 1 to this report and are designed to ensure that the political composition of the

Council's decision making and deliberative committees, as far as possible, replicates the political composition of Full Council. Subsequently, the Council has a duty to make **appointments** to those committees giving effect to the wishes of the political group allocated the seats.

- 3.2 The Committees that the political balance rules apply to have similar duties in relation to any sub-committees they may have.
- 3.3 The current membership of the Council is 63 members and there are three different political groups. The composition of the Council is as follows: 56 Labour Group councillors (i.e. 88.88%); 4 Conservative Group councillors (6.35%) and 2 Brent Conservative Group councillors (3.17%). According to the political balance rules a political group for this purpose is a group of two or more members. Councillor Carr is the only councillor who is not a member of a political group.
- 3.4 The table below sets out the 6 ordinary committees of the Council which the political balance rules apply to; the size of each committee (excluding any non-voting co-opted committee members in accordance with the political balance rules); the total number of seats required to be allocated; the number of seats each political group is strictly entitled to based on the number of group members and any adjustments required by the political balance rules.
- 3.5 For example, there are a total of 36 ordinary committee seats. As the 56 members of the Labour Group constitute 88.88% of the total membership of the Council, the proportion of seats the group is strictly entitled to is 32. However, as the political balance rules do not allow all the seats on a committee to be allocated to the same political group, at least 6 seats have to be allocated to the other political groups. Resulting in a final allocation of 30 seats to the Labour Group.
- 3.6 Conversely, as the Conservative Group has 4 members (i.e. 6.35% of the total membership of the Council), the group is the Principal Opposition Group for the purposes of the Members' Allowance Scheme and is strictly entitled to an allocation of 2 seats (rounded down from 2.29). Similarly, as the Brent Conservative Group has 2 members (i.e. 3.17% of the total membership of the Council), the group is strictly entitled to 1 seat (rounded down from 1.14). However, as the Labour Group can only be allocated 30 and not 32 seats, the three remaining seats also have to be allocated to the opposition groups. An allocation of two further seats to the Conservative Group, and the remaining seat to the Brent Conservative Group, would result in a proportionate allocation (based on the number of members in each group) of the available seats to the opposition groups.

<b>Ordinary Committees</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Labour Group</b>	<b>Conservative Group</b>	<b>Brent Conservative Group</b>	<b>Independent Member</b>
		<b>56 88.88%</b>	<b>4 6.35%</b>	<b>2 3.17%</b>	<b>1 1.59%</b>
General Purposes Committee	8	7			0
Planning Committee	8	7			0
Audit Committee	5	4			0
Standards Committee	5	4			0
Corporate Parenting Committee	5	4			0
Equalities Committee	5	4			0
<b>Total seats</b>	<b>36</b>				
<b>Strict Entitlement (based on a proportion of total members)</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Final Allocation (based on the political balance rules)</b>		<b>30 (-2)</b>	<b>4 (+2)</b>	<b>2 (+1)</b>	<b>0</b>

- 3.7 There are other committees which the political balance rules apply to but only principles (a), (b) and (d) (see Appendix 1, paragraph 3). Namely, the existing Scrutiny Committees and the new Housing Scrutiny Committee and Audit Advisory Committee (if established – see separate agenda item and report on ‘Changes to the Constitution’ to be considered at the meeting).

3.8 The table below confirms the size and make-up of the Committees. With double the number of members, compared with the Brent Conservative Group, the Conservative Group is entitled to be allocated the single opposite group seat on all four Committees.

<b>Other Committees</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Labour Group</b>	<b>Conservative Group</b>	<b>Brent Conservative Group</b>	<b>Independent Member</b>
		<b>56 88.88%</b>	<b>4 6.35%</b>	<b>2 3.17%</b>	<b>1 1.59%</b>
Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	8 (plus 4 voting co-opted members and 2 non-voting co-opted members)	7	1	0	0
Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	8	7	1	0	0
Housing Scrutiny Committee	8	7	1	0	0
Audit Advisory Committee	5	4	1	0	0

3.9 Subsequent to allocating seats, the Council has a duty to make appointments to the specified committees giving effect to the wishes of the political group allocated the seats (see separate agenda item and report on appointments and in particular Appendix A).

3.10 The political balance rules do not apply to the Health and Wellbeing Board but it has been previously agreed that this Board comprise 4 Cabinet Members and one opposition Member. Members are asked to make the appointments to the Health and Wellbeing Board too.

3.11 Nor do the political balance rules formally apply to the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee but are applied as a matter of policy (not

law). The proportionate entitlement to the available seats is set out below and Members are asked to make the appointments.

<b>Committees</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Labour Group</b>	<b>Conservative Group</b>	<b>Brent Conservative Group</b>	<b>Independent Member</b>
		<b>56 88.88%</b>	<b>4 6.35%</b>	<b>2 3.17%</b>	<b>1 1.59%</b>
<i>Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee</i>	15	13	1	1	0

#### **4.0 Financial Implications**

4.1 None.

#### **5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 These are addressed in the body of the report.

#### **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 None.

#### **Background Papers**

None

#### **Contact Officers**

Debra Norman, Interim Chief Legal Officer, Resources Department, Brent Council, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley HA9 0FTJ Tel: 020 8937 1578

Looqman Desai, Senior Solicitor (Governance), Resources Department, Brent Council, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley HA9 0FTJ Tel: 020 8937 1366

## Appendix 1

### The political balance rules prescribed by the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 ('the Act') and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 ('the 1990 Regulations')

1. The rules are that seats on relevant committees must be allocated to different political groups so far as reasonably practicable in accordance with the following four principles:
  - (a) that not all the seats on the body are allocated to the same political group;
  - (b) that the majority of the seats on the body is allocated to a particular political group if the number of persons belonging to that group is a majority of the Council's membership;
  - (c) subject to paragraphs (a) and (b) above, that each political group is allocated the same proportion of the total seats across all the ordinary committees of the Council as the proportion of the members of the Council that belong to that group; and
  - (d) subject to paragraphs (a) to (c) above, that each political group is allocated the same proportion of the seats on each relevant body as the proportion of the members of the Council that belong to that group.
2. Principle (c) refers to "ordinary committees" which under the Act means those appointed under section 102(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, namely General Purposes Committee, Audit Committee, Standards Committee, Corporate Parenting Committee, Planning Committee and the Equalities Committee.
3. Principle (d) applies to a "body" to which the Council makes appointments. The Act provides that the bodies to which this principle applies include ordinary committees (as defined above) and ordinary sub committees, advisory committees and sub-committees, and joint committees where at least 3 seats are filled by appointments made by the Council. By virtue of the Local Government Act 2000, principles (a), (b) and (d) also apply to the Scrutiny Committees. Those same principles also apply to the Audit Advisory Committee (if established).
4. Accordingly under principle (c) above, the General Purposes Committee, Audit Committee, Standards Committee, Corporate Parenting Committee, Planning Committee and the Equalities Committee first have to be taken together to determine the *number* of seats that should be allocated to each group. Then, in accordance with paragraph (d) above, the number of seats each political group is entitled to has to be allocated proportionately to individual committees so far as possible.

5. The political balance principles do not apply to the London Councils' Joint Committees or the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee because only one appointment on each Committee is made by the Council.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Appendix 1

### The political balance rules prescribed by the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 ('the Act') and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 ('the 1990 Regulations')

1. The rules are that seats on relevant committees must be allocated to different political groups so far as reasonably practicable in accordance with the following four principles:
  - (a) that not all the seats on the body are allocated to the same political group;
  - (b) that the majority of the seats on the body is allocated to a particular political group if the number of persons belonging to that group is a majority of the Council's membership;
  - (c) subject to paragraphs (a) and (b) above, that each political group is allocated the same proportion of the total seats across all the ordinary committees of the Council as the proportion of the members of the Council that belong to that group; and
  - (d) subject to paragraphs (a) to (c) above, that each political group is allocated the same proportion of the seats on each relevant body as the proportion of the members of the Council that belong to that group.
2. Principle (c) refers to "ordinary committees" which under the Act means those appointed under section 102(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, namely General Purposes Committee, Audit Committee, Standards Committee, Corporate Parenting Committee, Planning Committee and the Equalities Committee.
3. Principle (d) applies to a "body" to which the Council makes appointments. The Act provides that the bodies to which this principle applies include ordinary committees (as defined above) and ordinary sub-committees, advisory committees and sub-committees, and joint committees where at least 3 seats are filled by appointments made by the Council. By virtue of the Local Government Act 2000, principles (a), (b) and (d) also apply to the Scrutiny Committees. Those same principles also apply to the Audit Advisory Committee (if established).
4. Accordingly under principle (c) above, the General Purposes Committee, Audit Committee, Standards Committee, Corporate Parenting Committee, Planning Committee and the Equalities Committee first have to be taken together to determine the *number* of seats that should be allocated to each group. Then, in accordance with paragraph (d) above, the number of seats each political group is entitled to has to be allocated proportionately to individual committees so far as possible.

5. The political balance principles do not apply to the London Councils' Joint Committees or the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee because only one appointment on each Committee is made by the Council.

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p><b>Annual Meeting of the Council</b> 17 May 2017</p> <p><b>Report from the Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships</b></p>
<p>Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p><b>Appointments to Council Committees, Joint Committees, Panels, Forums and Outside Bodies; and Appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs</b></p>	

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline the proposed appointment of members and co-opted members to allocated positions on the Council's Committees, Joint Committees, Panels, Forums and Outside Bodies for the 2017-2018 municipal year. The positions are allocated according to the current political balance of the Council and in accordance with proportionality rules which is the subject of a separate report to Full Council under agenda item 7 of this meeting.
- 1.2 The recommendations below set out where, in line with the Council's Constitution, Full Council approval for an appointment is needed, and which appointments are just to be noted for information purposes.
- 1.3 It also sets out the proposed appointments of Chairs/Vice Chairs for these bodies for the 2017-2018 municipal year, including the appointment of independent chairs where necessary.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 For Full Council to agree, or confirm (as appropriate) the proposed appointments of Members, Co-Opted Members and substitutes to Council Committees, Joint Committees, Panels, Forums and Outside Bodies as set out in Appendix A (which will be circulated prior to the meeting).
- 2.2 For Full Council to agree the proposed appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs for these Committees, Joint Committees, Panels, Forums and Outside Bodies (where necessary) as set out in Appendix A (which will be circulated prior to the meeting) for the 2017/2018 municipal year.
- 2.3 For Full Council to note the appointments of the Cabinet and Cabinet Committees and their respective Chairs/Vice Chairs, as set out in Appendix A

(which will be circulated prior to the meeting) for the 2017/2018 municipal year).

### **3.0 Detail**

- 3.1 In accordance with Standing Order 32 (i) of the Council's Constitution, the membership of Council Committees, Joint Committees and other relevant bodies, forums and panels plus the appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs and substitute Members for these will be appointed at the Annual Meeting of the Council for the upcoming municipal year.
- 3.2 The appointments to Council Committees are to be made in line with the provisions of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 ('the Act') and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 ('the 1990 Regulations') which set out how Committees must be constituted when a Council is divided into one or more political groups. Further details on the political balance of the Council on Committees to meet these provisions are detailed in the report 'Representation of Political Groups on Committees' which constitutes item no.7 of this agenda.
- 3.3 The proposed appointments of Councillors to relevant Committees, Joint Committees, Panels, Forums and Outside Bodies will be received from the Labour Group, Conservative Group and Brent Conservative Group respectively. Once nominations have been received from the political groups the proposed appointments will be set out in Appendix A and circulated prior to the meeting.
- 3.4 As per Standing Order 55 (a) the Council may also appoint a pool of substitute members from which a member may be selected to speak and vote in the absence of a member of the Committee provided that the substitute member is not already a member of the Committee. This standing order states that each pool shall number up to the number of members comprising membership of the Committee and be divided according to the political balance on the Committee, save that where a group has only one member on the Committee up to two members may be appointed to the pool.
- 3.5 For information purposes only, the appointments by the Leader to the Cabinet and Cabinet Committees; are included as an additional appendix which will be circulated prior to the meeting.

### **4.0 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 The financial implications of the creation of a new Scrutiny Committee are covered within the report for agenda item 6 'Changes to the Constitution'.
- 4.2 The financial implications of the creation of a new Audit Advisory Committee are covered within the report for agenda item 6 'Changes to the Constitution'.
- 4.3 All other financial implications associated with these appointments can be met within existing budgets.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 As aforementioned, the appointments are due to be made in line with the provisions of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 as detailed in the body of the report for item no.7 of this agenda 'Representations of Political Groups on Committees'.

## **6.0 Equality Implications**

6.1 There are no equality implications to report.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications**

7.1 There are no staffing or accommodation implications to report.

## **Background Papers**

None.


## **Contact Officers**

Thomas Cattermole  
Head of Executive and Member Services  
0208 937 5446  
[thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk)

Tom Welsh  
Governance Officer  
0208 937 6607  
[tom.welsh@brent.gov.uk](mailto:tom.welsh@brent.gov.uk)

*PETER GADSDON*  
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships

**This page is intentionally left blank**

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p><b>Annual Meeting of the Council</b> 17 May 2016</p> <p><b>Report from the Director of Performance, Policy and Partnerships</b></p>
For decision	Wards Affected: All
<p><b>Municipal Calendar of Meetings 2017/2018</b></p>	

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report presents a calendar of meetings for the 2017/18 Municipal Year (Appendix 1).

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members agree, in principle, the dates for Full Council and other meetings to take place during the municipal year 2017/2018, as attached in Appendix 1.
- 2.2 That Members agree that the Head of Executive and Member Services be authorised to make any alterations deemed necessary to the Municipal Calendar during the course of the municipal year having consulted the Leader of the Council; the Leader of the Principal Opposition Group and the Chair of the affected meeting.

## 3. Detail

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree the dates in the calendar of meetings for the 2017/2018 municipal year, on which the council, and its committee/sub-committee meetings, meetings of the Cabinet and other bodies should be held.
- 3.2 In general, meetings of Full Council and the Cabinet take place on Mondays whilst most other meetings take place on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. With the exception of the Fostering Panel, Fridays are avoided entirely.

- 3.3 As a basis for compiling the calendar, an attempt has been made to avoid clashes of appointments for Members on the basis of memberships of committees in 2016/2017. However, where memberships change it may be necessary to review the frequency of any clashes.
- 3.4 Religious holidays have been included on the calendar and meetings have not been arranged on evenings where it has been deemed inappropriate to hold meetings because of the importance associated with any particular religious holiday.
- 3.5 For information purposes, the calendar now lists principal civic events.
- 3.6 The dates of the meetings proposed for Full Council are as follows:  
(17 May 2017 – Annual Meeting of Council and Mayor Making)  
10 July 2017  
18 September 2017  
22 January 2018  
26 February 2018 (Council Tax and Budget Setting)  
14 May 2018 (Annual Meeting of Council and Mayor Making)
- 3.7 The meetings of Full Council, the Planning Committee, the Scrutiny Committees and Brent Connects meets will continue to take place at 7:00 pm, unless otherwise indicated. Cabinet will meet at 6:00 pm as well as General Purposes, Highways, Equalities and the Barham Park Trust Committee.
- 3.8 As previously, all Members will receive Outlook diary invitations once the Calendar of Meetings and committee appointments are agreed.
- 3.9 Tentative provision has been made for Member Learning and Development sessions throughout the municipal year.
- 3.10 Meetings of the Welsh Harp Joint Consultative Committee have been agreed by Barnet Council.
- 3.11 The Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board meetings have been agreed with three meetings scheduled for the year.
- 3.12 The dates of the five Brent Connects Forums are included. Each Forum will meet four times during the year.
- 3.13 Following the decision taken by Full Council at its meeting held on 11 July 2016, each Member is responsible for submitting his or her apologies for absence from meetings for Full Council. Such notifications shall be in writing and sent to the Head of Executive and Member Services, at [thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk) in good time and in any event, before the commencement of the meeting in question. If such notification is not received, the Member(s) concerned will not be recorded as absent in the resulting minutes of the meeting.



#### **4. Financial Implications**

4.1 There are none specific to this report.

#### **5. Legal Implications**

5.1 There are none specific to this report.

#### **6. Diversity Implications**

6.1 As outlined above, religious holidays have been included on the calendar and meetings have not been arranged on evenings where it has been deemed inappropriate to hold meetings because of the importance associated with any particular religious holiday.

#### **7. Background Information**

7.1 London Borough of Brent Municipal Calendar 2016/17  
Municipal Calendar of Meetings 2016 report  
BBC and other time and date websites

Nikolay Manov  
Governance Officer  
[nikolay.manov@brent.gov.uk](mailto:nikolay.manov@brent.gov.uk)  
020 8937 1348

Thomas Cattermole  
Head of Executive and Member Services  
[thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk)  
020 8937 5446

**This page is intentionally left blank**

<b>MAY 2017</b>			
<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Committee Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
WED	17	Annual Council Meeting	7.00 pm
THUR	18		
FRI	19		
SAT	20		
SUN	21		
MON	22	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	23	Mandatory Committee Member Learning and Development Session – Panning Committee Members and Substitutes	7:00 pm
WED	24	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee (FULL)	6.30 pm
		Mandatory Committee Member Learning and Development Session - Alcohol and Entertainment Committee Members	7.00 pm
THUR	25	Mandatory Committee Member Learning and Development Session – All Scrutiny Committee Members	7:00 pm
FRI	26		
SAT	27	Ramadan Starts	
SUN	28		
MON	29	Spring Bank Holiday / Sumer half term starts	
TUE	30	Shavuot / General Purposes Committee	6.00 pm
WED	31	Shavuot	

JUNE 2017			
Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
THUR	1	Shavuot	
FRI	2		
SAT	3		
SUN	4		
MON	5		
TUE	6		
WED	7		
THUR	8	GENERAL ELECTION 2017	
FRI	9		
SAT	10		
SUN	11		
MON	12	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		Highways Committee	5.30 pm *
TUE	13	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
WED	14	Health and Wellbeing Board	7.00 pm
		Brent Connects – Kilburn	7.00 pm
THUR	15		
FRI	16		
SAT	17		
SUN	18		
MON	19	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	20	Brent Connects – Willesden	7.00 pm
WED	21	Brent Connects - Kingsbury and Kerton	7.00 pm
THUR	22	West London Economic Prosperity Board	10.00 am
		Brent Pension Fund Sub-Committee	7.00 pm
		Joint Committee of the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Brent	6.30 pm
		Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	23		
SAT	24	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	25	Ramadan Ends / Eid-al-Fitr	
MON	26	Audit Committee	6.30 pm
		Brent Connects - Wembley	
TUE	27		
WED	28	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	2.00 pm
		Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	29	Standards Committee	6.00 pm
		Brent Connects – Harlesden	7.00 pm
FRI	30		

**JULY 2017**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Committee Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
SAT	1		
SUN	2		
MON	3		
TUE	4	Barham Park Trust	6.00 pm
WED	5	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	6		
FRI	7	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
SAT	8		
SUN	9		
MON	10	Full Council	7.00 pm
TUE	11	Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	12	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
		Teachers' Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	13	Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	14		
SAT	15		
SUN	16		
MON	17	Brent Pension Fund Sub-Committee	7.00 pm
TUE	18	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		Welsh Harp Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
WED	19	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	20		
FRI	21	Term ends	
SAT	22		
SUN	23		
MON	24	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	25		
WED	26	Pension Board	7.00 pm
THUR	27	Corporate Parenting Committee	5.00 pm
		Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
FRI	28		
SAT	29	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	30		
MON	31		

AUGUST 2017

Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
TUE	1		
WED	2		
THUR	3		
FRI	4		
SAT	5		
SUN	6		
MON	7		
TUE	8		
WED	9	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	10		
FRI	11	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
SAT	12		
SUN	13		
MON	14	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	15	Janmashtami	
WED	16		
THUR	17		
FRI	18		
SAT	19		
SUN	20		
MON	21		
TUE	22		
WED	23		
THUR	24		
FRI	25		
SAT	26	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	27		
MON	28	Summer Bank Holiday	
TUE	29		
WED	30		
THUR	31	Eid-al-Adha	

SEPTEMBER 2017

Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
FRI	1	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (A) / Eid al-Adha	10.30 am
SAT	2		
SUN	3		
MON	4	Autumn term starts / Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee	6.00 pm
TUE	5	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (B)	7.00 pm
		Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	6		
THUR	7		
FRI	8		
SAT	9		
SUN	10		
MON	11	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	12	Equalities Committee	6.00 pm
WED	13	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	14	Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
FRI	15		
SAT	16		
SUN	17		
MON	18	Full Council	7.00 pm
TUE	19	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	20	West London Economic Prosperity Board	10:00 am
		Audit Committee	6.30 pm
THUR	21	Jewish New Year / Navratri Starts	
FRI	22	Jewish New Year / Muslim New Year	
SAT	23		
SUN	24	National Labour Party Conference	
MON	25	National Labour Party Conference	
TUE	26	National Labour Party Conference	
WED	27	National Labour Party Conference	
THUR	28	Standards Committee	6.00 pm
		Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	29	Yom Kippur / Navratri Ends	
SAT	30	Yom Kippur / Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	

OCTOBER 2017			
Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
SUN	1	National Conservative Party Conference	
MON	2	National Conservative Party Conference	
TUE	3	National Conservative Party Conference	
WED	4	Tabernacles / National Conservative Party Conference	
		Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	5	Tabernacles / Health and Wellbeing Board	7.00 pm
FRI	6	Tabernacles	
SAT	7	Tabernacles	
SUN	8	Tabernacles	
MON	9	Tabernacles Brent Connects – Kilburn	7.00 pm
TUE	10	Tabernacles Brent Connects –Wembley	7.00 pm
WED	11	Tabernacles / Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (B)	5.00 pm
THUR	12	Tabernacles	
FRI	13		
SAT	14		
SUN	15		
MON	16	Highways Committee	6.00 pm
TUE	17	Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	18	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	19	Diwali	
FRI	20		
SAT	21		
SUN	22		
MON	23	Autumn half term starts / Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	24	Corporate Parenting Committee	5.00 pm
WED	25	Brent Connects - Harlesden	7.00 pm
THUR	26	Joint Committee of the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Brent	6.30 pm
FRI	27	Autumn half term ends	
SAT	28	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	29		
MON	30		
TUE	31	Member Learning and Development Session	



**NOVEMBER 2017**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Committee Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
WED	1	Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	2		
FRI	3		
SAT	4	Birthday of Guru Nanak	
SUN	5		
MON	6		
TUE	7	Brent Pension Fund Sub-Committee	7.00 pm
		Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	8	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (B)	6.00 pm
THUR	9	Brent Connects – Willesden	7.00 pm
FRI	10		
SAT	11		
SUN	12	Remembrance Sunday Event – St. John’s Church	
		Remembrance Sunday Service – Barham Park	
MON	13	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	14	Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	15	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
		Brent Connects - Kingsbury and Kenton	7.00 pm
THUR	16	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
FRI	17		
SAT	18		
SUN	19		
MON	20		
TUE	21	West London Economic Prosperity Board	10:30 am
		Pension Board	7.00 pm
WED	22	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	23	Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board	7.00 pm
		Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (B)	6.00 pm
FRI	24		
SAT	25	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	26		
MON	27	Standards Committee	6.00 pm
TUE	28	Welsh Harp Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
WED	29	Teacher’s Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	30	St. Andrew’s Day / Member Learning and Development Session	

DECEMBER 2017			
Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
FRI	1		
SAT	2		
SUN	3		
MON	4	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee	TBC
TUE	5	Equalities Committee	6.00 pm
WED	6	General Purposes Committee	6.00 pm
THUR	7	Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	8		
SAT	9		
SUN	10		
MON	11	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	12	Hanukkah starts / Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		Barham Park Trust	6.00 pm
WED	13	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	14		
FRI	15		
SAT	16		
SUN	17		
MON	18		
TUE	19	Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	20	Hanukkah ends / School Christmas holiday starts	
THUR	21	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (A)	10.00 am
FRI	22		
SAT	23		
SUN	24		
MON	25	Christmas Day	
TUE	26	Boxing Day	
WED	27	No Meetings	
THUR	28		
FRI	29		
SAT	30		
SUN	31		

JANUARY 2018			
Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
MON	1	New Year's Day	
TUE	2		
WED	3	Spring Term starts	
THUR	4		
FRI	5		
SAT	6		
SUN	7		
MON	8		
TUE	9	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	10	Audit Committee	6.30 pm
		Brent Connects - Wembley	7.00 pm
THUR	11	Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	12		
SAT	13		
SUN	14		
MON	15	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	16	Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
WED	17	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	18	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
FRI	19		
SAT	20		
SUN	21		
MON	22	Full Council	7.00 pm
TUE	23	Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	24	Health and Wellbeing Board	7.00 pm
		Highways Committee	6.00 pm
THUR	25	Brent Connects - Harlesden	7.00 pm
FRI	26		
SAT	27	Holocaust Memorial Day / Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	28		
MON	29	Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Sub-Committee (C)	10.00 am
		General Purposes Committee	6.00 pm
TUE	30	Brent Connects – Kilburn	7.00 pm
WED	31	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
		Planning Committee	7.00 pm

FEBRUARY 2018

Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
THUR	1		
FRI	2		
SAT	3		
SUN	4		
MON	5		
TUE	6	Brent Connects – Willesden	7.00 pm
		Pension Board	7.00 pm
WED	7	Corporate Parenting Committee	5.00 pm
		Member Learning and Development Session	
THUR	8	Brent Connects - Kingsbury and Kenton	7.00 pm
FRI	9		
SAT	10		
SUN	11		
MON	12	Spring half term starts / Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	13	Brent Pension Fund Sub-Committee	7.00 pm
WED	14	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	15		
FRI	16	Spring half term ends	
SAT	17		
SUN	18		
MON	19	Equalities Committee	6.00 pm
TUE	20	Joint Committee of the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Brent	6.30 pm
		Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	21	West London Economic Prosperity Board	10.00 am
		Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	22	Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
FRI	23		
SAT	24	Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	
SUN	25		
MON	26	Full Council	7.00 pm
TUE	27	Teachers' Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
WED	28	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm

**MARCH 2018**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Committee Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
THUR	1	St David's Day	
FRI	2		
SAT	3		
SUN	4		
MON	5		
TUE	6	Member Learning and Development Session	
WED	7	Barham Park Trust	6.00 pm
THUR	8	Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board	7.00 pm
FRI	9		
SAT	10		
SUN	11		
MON	12	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	13	Member Learning and Development Session / Welsh Harp Joint Consultative Committee	7.00 pm
WED	14	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	15		
FRI	16		
SAT	17	St. Patrick's Day	
SUN	18		
MON	19		
TUE	20	Audit Committee	6.30 pm
WED	21	Housing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	22	Member Learning and Development Session	
FRI	23		
SAT	24		
SUN	25		
MON	26	Highways Committee	6.00 pm
		Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
TUE	27	Health and Wellbeing Board	7.00 pm
		Standards Committee	6.00 pm
WED	28	Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	29	Spring term ends	
FRI	30	Good Friday	
SAT	31	Passover Starts / Brent Youth Parliament Meeting	

APRIL 2018

Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
SUN	1		
MON	2	Easter Monday	
TUE	3	Brent Connects – Kilburn	7.00 pm
		Equalities Committee	6.00 pm
WED	4	Brent Pension Fund Sub-Committee	7.00 pm
		Brent Connects - Kingsbury and Kenton	7.00 pm
THUR	5		
FRI	6		
SAT	7	Passover Ends	
SUN	8		
MON	9	Cabinet	6.00 pm
TUE	10	Brent Connects – Harlesden	7.00 pm
WED	11	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	12	Brent Connects - Willesden	7.00 pm
FRI	13	Spring holiday ends	
SAT	14		
SUN	15		
MON	16	Spring Term Starts / Brent Connects - Wembley	7.00 pm
TUE	17		
WED	18		
THUR	19		
FRI	20		
SAT	21		
SUN	22		
MON	23	St. George's Day	
TUE	24		
WED	25	Planning Committee	7.00 pm
THUR	26	Corporate Parenting Committee	5.00 pm
FRI	27		
SAT	28		
SUN	29		
MON	30		

MAY 2018			
Day	Date	Committee Meeting	Time
TUE	1		
WED	2		
THUR	3	LOCAL ELECTIONS 2018	
FRI	4		
SAT	5		
SUN	6		
MON	7	Early May Bank holiday	
TUE	8		
WED	9		
THUR	10		
FRI	11		
SAT	12		
SUN	13		
MON	14	Annual Council Meeting	7.00 pm
TUE	15		
WED	16	Ramadan Starts	
THUR	17		
FRI	18		
SAT	19	Shavuot	
SUN	20	Shavuot	
MON	21	Shavuot	
TUE	22		
WED	23		
THUR	24		
FRI	25		
SAT	26		
SUN	27		
MON	28	Spring Bank holiday / Spring half term starts	
TUE	29		
WED	30		
THUR	31		

**This page is intentionally left blank**