



Brent

MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES AND PUBLIC REALM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Thursday 12 September 2019 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Kansagra (Vice-Chair) and Councillors S Choudhary, Mashari, Thakkar and Stephens.

Also Present: Councillors Miller, M Patel, Southwood and Tatler.

1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Aden (substituted by Councillor Anita Thakkar) and Nerva.

2a. Declarations of interests

In relation to agenda item 8, Carlton and Granville Centre Site update report, Councillor Robert Johnson declared that he knew people on both sides of the argument and he was a member of South Kilburn Trust, therefore, he would not take part in the discussion or decision making on this item.

With regards to agenda item 9, Council Tax Support and Local Welfare Assistance, Councillors S Choudhary and Stephens declared that they were members of Council Tax Task Group.

2b. Order of Business

RESOLVED:

It was resolved that the order of the agenda be amended to take the agenda item 3, Deputations, together with item 8, Carlton and Granville Centre Site update report, as deputations and public questions under item 3 related to item 8.

3. Deputations

In relation to agenda item 8, Carlton and Granville Centre site update report, the following people made representation to the Committee under the deputation provision - Standing Orders paragraph 32:

- Mr Babikir and Mr Arai on behalf of Rumi's Cave - Mr Arai presented a joint deputation at the meeting.
- Leslie Barson presented a deputation on behalf of Granville Community Kitchen.
- David Kaye and Peter Firmin read a public question each.

The following key queries and issues were highlighted by the presenters during the aforementioned representations to the Committee.

Mr Arai (Deputation on behalf of Rumi's Cave):

Lack of Engagement - The application did not demonstrate that relevant tests had been carried out to justify why an enterprise hub/workspace was required and how older residents' needs had been addressed. It ignored what was at the heart of the community and social wellbeing which was also supported by the statement of community involvement.

Loss of Community Space - The Council's regeneration proposal for this site was a "disbenefit" to the community as the Design and Access Statement (DAS) identified that the existing floor space occupied by the temporary tenants had not been included when calculating the existing provision. When comparing the existing floor area with the proposed it would appear that there was a net increase, however, when one included the floor space occupied by the temporary tenants which was designated as D1 use class under the Town & Country Planning Act, there was a loss of c. 450m², hence, this was a major disbenefit of the proposal.

Housing Mix and Demand - Although the Council was delivering 100% affordable housing, there was neither any evidence in the supporting application or planning statement that justified that local housing needs had been considered, nor did the application encourage mobility between tenures. Brent's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) document informed the Council's position concerning housing size mix for both market and affordable dwellings whilst taking account of Brent's Core Strategy Policy CP2 of seeking 25% of new dwellings in the Borough to be 3-bed dwellings or more. The Social Economic profile data stated that South Kilburn had a higher proportion of lone parent households compared with Brent. Mr Aria claimed that, in a statement made on the 27th August by a council officer, it was suggested that this application was required to address overcrowding. However, there was no evidence in the supporting application or planning statement that justified that local housing needs had been considered, and the application did not encourage mobility between tenures as the proposed unit mix was 100% social rent. As a result, there was no justification of the proposed mix, the need for an Enterprise Hub but more importantly no compelling argument to justify the loss of community floor space.

Ms Barson (Deputation on behalf of Granville Community Kitchen):

The representation centred around the question of 'how could the Scrutiny Committee continue to support Granville Carlton development?'. Ms Barson asked the Committee to particularly monitor and further scrutinise the following aspects of the Cabinet decision:

- Family units seemed to be going from 28 to 18 with no guarantee of these being social/council housing.
- How would the Committee ensure that effective and workable safeguards were in place against noise, particularly, in hot summer when people and users would open windows and use a balcony.
- Minimum social housing provision needed clarification with specific details.

- Concerning the paragraph 3.5c of the report, the ethos was that the small businesses ‘give back’ to the community so that social enterprise was at the heart of the Granville and community engagement - this statement required clarification and specific details.
- In relation to the paragraph 3.5d of the report with regards to the democratic selection process and the role of the Stakeholders Group - Ms Barson stated that the group was not democratic and transparent and the claim that the parameters were being worked out and finalised was unfair. She added that the entire passage about this issue was misleading and the group was yet to be decided and this must be monitored very carefully.
- There needed to be effective and robust checks and balances on decisions and recommendations and the Committee must continue to monitor council performance and cabinet decisions. In that regard, a letter was written by Ms Barson to members of the Scrutiny Committee requesting them to closely look at this Cabinet decision.

Mr Firmin (Personal):

The representation centred around the question of ‘*to what extent did proposals for the future of the Granville & Carlton Centre conform to what the Scrutiny Committee previously requested*’? Mr Firmin made the following points to the Committee:

- The scrutiny of the Council and its Cabinet/Executive was very important for residents. The number of units for council housing in the scheme was extremely important but in the Cabinet’s response to the Committee’s recommendations, there was no mention of it. The Committee must follow through on its initial scrutiny session and other queries raised to achieve the best possible outcomes.
- With regards to open membership and democratic process of the Stakeholders Group, a chair of tenants’ association in Kilburn never received an invitation to join and it seemed that certain individuals were invited to express interest, therefore, it was not a democratic process.

Mr Kaye (Personal):

Citing ‘*local community representation, governance and democracy*’ aspects touched upon in paragraphs 3.4d and 3.5d of the report, Mr Kaye stated that there were confusion and potential conflict of interest about the precise role of South Kilburn Trust in this scheme as they were a partner in the development. Mr Kaye was of the view that it was a real contradiction that responsibility of consultation was in the hands of a body that was a partner with the Council in the development. He asked that the Committee must investigate this close relationship which could have wider implication about the Council’s overall relationships and role.

During the discussion, Members of the Committee made the following queries and comments:

- Referencing the elderly residents' issue highlighted in the deputation, the Chair, Councillor Kelcher, asked whether the concerns and issues relating to locally disadvantaged groups were adequately considered. Councillor Tatler agreed to look further and reassured that a local hub would need to support all groups.
- Members enquired about the details of 'Social Work Space' and 'Community Floor Space' along with clarity as to which uses were included in various calculations used considering comments about the existing Net Internal Area (NIA) and the possible variance in numbers, if any. Cllr Tatler responded to this.
- The Chair asked about the noise issue. A Member also noted that 'windows to be kept shut' was a very weak response and there was a need to look beyond that. Another Member commented about the possible use of air conditioning and claims of naturally powered air conditioning should be carefully considered and tested. In response, it was noted that professionals were involved in the scheme design to minimise noise impact and comply with building regulations. Councillor Tatler indicated that she was happy to receive any recommendations from scrutiny members to consider. She assured that modern technology was being used to mitigate as best as possible and tenants would be made aware and that this matter would be considered as part of the planning consideration.
- About anti-social behaviour monitoring and environment, Councillor Tatler indicated that there would be natural surveillance as well as permanent CCTV together with the use of green technology and sustainable materials as much as possible. The safeguarding element was also being considered.

[As resolved earlier, the Committee moved on to consider the agenda item 8, Carlton and Granville Site update report at this juncture]

8. Carlton and Granville Centre Site

The report provided an update report, following the Committee's meeting on 3rd April 2019 to continue monitoring progress on the development of the scheme and how the assurances being sought had been addressed.

Previously, the Committee also referred the matter back to the Cabinet and as required by the call-in procedure, the Cabinet reconsidered its original decision on the Carlton & Granville Centres Site - South Kilburn - at the Cabinet meeting on Monday, 15 April 2019.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Tatler, Brent Council's Lead Member for Regeneration, Property & Planning, responded to various queries, deputations and updated the Committee about the Cabinet's decision about Carlton and Granville Centre Site. During her update, the following key points were noted:

- Council Housing - The unit mix had now been changed in favour of family units, which would all be council housing units (social rent). The scheme now

- being considered by planning officers was for 18 units, comprising 4 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed, 7 x 4 bed.
- Community Asset - The Council fully understood that the Carlton and Granville Site/ The Granville was an important community asset.
 - Noise - Concerns about noise had been carefully considered and would be covered in the final scheme.
 - Social Enterprise Model - There was a meeting with stakeholders, the proposal was not just for small businesses and the Council was looking more at the social enterprise model. The Council was working towards clearly defining 'social enterprise' and to do more work together with local entrepreneurs in this domain, and work with the C&G Stakeholder Group on this.
 - Engagement and local Stakeholders - The entire South Kilburn Estate was canvassed for new members to the C&G Stakeholder Group, however, there were only three expressions of interest received in return. The process of engagement would be continuing. So far, a variety of methods to engage with local residents and stakeholders were used with 40 events held and letters as well as emails sent. However, with the best will in the world, one could not force everyone to come and engage all the time and the conversation had been much broader than just emails or one particular mode of engagement.
 - The Stakeholders Group - The Stakeholders Group was about bricks and mortars as well as the community needs concerning the project - the decisions would be taken with the Stakeholder Group, not just by the Council. The formal governance of the group was scheduled to be in place by the end of this year but the final decision rested with stakeholders. Three Local Ward Councillors, elected democratically by local residents, were also part of the Stakeholders Group.
 - South Kilburn Trust - This was an independent group with the membership of their trustees open to the public. Now, there would also be two additional new positions available to residents and local stakeholders, through an open and transparent process, to join as trustees.
 - Action by the Cabinet on recommendations by the Committee – in response to previous comments made at the Resources and Public Realm Committee, clear actions had been taken as a result of recommendations. For example, council homes, ventilation, comprehensive noise assessment, a governance structure, as well as, two new vacancies open to all etc. to name some of the changes. As the relevant Lead Member, Councillor Tatler, along with residents, scrutiny and officers, would continue to work hard to make this a successful scheme that added value and benefitted the community.

The Chair thanked the members of public and Councillor Tatler, Lead Member for Regeneration, Property & Planning, Lead Member for their invaluable contributions concerning the agenda item 8, Carlton and Granville Update Report.

The Committee noted that in reviewing and confirming its decision, the Cabinet supported the recommendations made by the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee, details of which were as follows:

- In terms of the recommended design option, the 23 units of housing be provided as social housing. In recognising the need to address issues in relation to viability, the Cabinet would explore a predominance of three or four bedroom 'family sized' accommodation.
- Appropriate noise-reduction safeguards be provided for tenants within the new housing units in order to manage the relationship between the mixed residential and community use on the site - such a provision was to ensure that noise concerns did not limit the use of the facility by the community.
- A minimum level of local social enterprise provision was guaranteed within the Enterprise Hub.
- Community governance options being developed in terms of future management of the site must be based around the Key Stakeholder Group and involved a range of broader local community members. Such governance options must have open membership to locals, with democratic processes for the selection of people and positions.

After careful consideration and taking into account the discussion that took place under item 3 - deputations relating to this agenda item - it was **RESOLVED**:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee:

- i. Recommends that the Council vigorously promote the fact that the units at Granville would be 'council' housing to better inform the public who had concerns about the provision of affordable housing at the site;
- ii. Recommends that the Cabinet ensured that social enterprise spaces offered business space to those groups in the area who found it hard to reach work (e.g. elderly etc.) and bring forward an action plan to achieve this objective; and
- iii. Requested the Lead Member for Regeneration, Property & Planning to bring back an update report to this Committee in early 2020 on the following aspects:
 - The plans to promote the fact new units would be council homes.
 - The final design and efficacy of noise dampening scheme.
 - The provision of social enterprise space in the new business hub.
 - The robustness of new governance structure and demonstration of local involvement at both South Kilburn Trust and in the development of the stakeholders' group for this specific development.

In addition, the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee made the following information requests:

- a. To provide information to the Committee on the definitions of "affordability" when it came to workplace space (e.g. to clarify at what percentage of the market rate they would be let at) and how much space would be given to this provision. Also, to provide specific details about social enterprise, social workspace and community floor space.

4. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the last meeting held on 3 July 2019 be approved as a correct record subject to Councillor S Choudhary's name being added under 'also present'.

5. **Matters arising (if any)**

In relation to Tottenham Hotspur Section 106 Commitments - the difference between the 'amount' and the amount 'claimed to date' in the table on the supplementary information about Wembley stadium - Councillor Kabir enquired about a significant amount of money that was outstanding and details were not available in the table/report. Amar Dave (Strategic Director Regeneration & Environment) undertook to look into this matter and send the requested information to Councillor Kabir.

Councillor Nerva had approached the Chair, prior to the meeting, to request information about tree-work. The Chair stated that it would be covered in his next Chair's report.

6. **Chair's Report**

The Committee considered the Chair's report which set out details regarding the selection of topics for the current meeting as well as work undertaken by the Committee outside of public meetings.

RESOLVED that the Chair's report be noted.

7. **Brent Statement of Licensing Policy**

The Chair welcomed Councillor Miller, Lead Member for Community Safety & Engagement, to the meeting. Councillor Miller introduced the report and highlighted that the Committee had before them a pre-scrutiny update for their perusal and feedback.

Councillor Miller added that the briefing paper provided a significant update and sought views from members of the Scrutiny Committee as part of a pre-decision scrutiny consultation with regards to the proposed draft Statement of Licensing Policy. He stated that the report contained a range of vital measures, including minimum unit pricing, along with other matters, to ensure that drinking in Brent took place in a regulated environment that struck a careful balance between supporting

the night-time economy along with tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB), consideration of the welfare and safety of the community and stakeholders.

After his introduction, Councillor Miller handed over to Yogini Patel (Senior Regulatory Service Manager, Brent Council) to provide further details and the following key points were highlighted:

- Since the last review in 2015 which did not have evidence of ASB and other issues, a lot of work had been carried out in this area and it now included hot spots including areas with less housing space, consideration of 24-hour economy in the Borough particularly Wembley and Kilburn and to tackling of negative behaviour and crime.
- New off-licenses to meet stricter criteria, welcoming approach to on-licences with food and entertainment to provide a healthier mix.
- 70p unit limit price and potential restrictions options until it could be proven that an establishment/licensee was not contributing to the problem.
- Before determining the Policy, the Licensing Authority must consult the persons listed in section 5(3) of the Licensing Act 2003. As was good practice, the licensing authority would consult more widely and not only limit it to the persons listed in section 5(3) of the Act. Section 5 of the report outlined that the Licensing Authority would consult widely. Persons to be consulted include Chief Police Officer, London Fire Brigade, Director of Public Health, local premises licence holders, club premises licence certificate holders as well as bodies representative of businesses, residents, Planning, Trading Standards, Children Safeguarding, Public Safety, Noise Team, Licensing Authority and Home Office.
- Consultation would also be undertaken with members of the Licensing Subcommittee, and with members in areas where proposed cumulative impact zones were proposed.
- The consultation commenced on 23rd August 2019 and would end on 4th October 2019. Brent Forums would be consulted and their comments and views would be considered as the dates for the forums fell outside the period for on-line consultations.

The Chair thanked the Lead Member and Officers for their introduction and work and subsequently invited questions from the Committee with Members spotlighting on the following key areas:

- The role of mystery shoppers and limiting sales of alcohol in the stadium and other problematic areas should be further encouraged.
- CCTV recordings were kept for 31 days. Yogini Patel clarified that the recordings could not be watched live due to home office guidance.
- Police and the Licensing Authority visited any problem areas and the Council CCTV could also be utilised, where possible.

- The work done by the Council in Queensbury area must be praised nevertheless there were eight town centres in the borough and it would be good to know how often were these increased or decreased. In response, the Committee noted that cumulative impact zones (CIZs) were continuously reviewed, subject to consultation and regular updates from various teams were coordinated and put in the mix.
- Responding to the queries about the Council's support for the local night time economy, it was highlighted that a careful balance between effective enforcement vis-a-vis the development of night time economy needed to be struck to ensure sufficient safeguards were in place while supporting the night-time economy. Councillor Miller reassured that Brent did not have an overzealous approach in Kilburn or elsewhere in the Borough and all applications were determined by a committee according to a set criterion.
- The new stricter measures could not be applied to existing premises due to appeals and license transfers issue which had been reported to the Home Office.
- The Chair enquired if the initiatives like the Home Office's Purple Flag Scheme were being pursued. In response, it was noted that the purple flag was mentioned in the Licensing Policy but was a resource intensive route which could be an issue. Councillor Miller added that other voluntary measures could be explored and were being explored. He added that a voluntary registration scheme that would be published so that people could check information about various establishments and make their own minds.
- The new policy intended to have restrictions on miniatures and a high percentage of alcohol drinks to avoid inappropriate and dangerous top-ups.
- Concerning a query about compliance and data on 70p minimum unit price, it was clarified that this policy option was being introduced for the first time in Brent and the Council would have an idea in a year. HMRC would keep the additional money raised by the scheme and this was only at a consultation stage at the moment. It was also not blanket minimum pricing like the one adopted in Scotland.
- Licensing and public place protection orders were separate regimes.
- Resources was an issue so had to target areas based on evidence and heat maps.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee:

- i. Recommends that the Council takes action to encourage key night-time economy locations (primarily Wembley and Kilburn) to attain the appropriate status reflecting the best practice, for example, the Home Office's Purple Flag Standard.

- ii. Notes the draft Statement of Licensing Policy in Appendix A, Cumulative Impact Zones proposed in Appendix B and consultation questionnaire in Appendix C.
- iii. Further notes that once the public consultation period ended, the draft Policy might be the subject of change before it is reported to Full Council for approval on 23 November 2019.

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee made the following information requests:

- a. Data on consultation feedback around minimal unit pricing be shared with the Committee by email once consultation came to an end.
- b. To simplify the language in the penultimate paragraph on page 3 of the policy document about timing variance.

9. Council Tax Support and Local Welfare Assistance

Councillor Southwood (Lead Member for Housing & Welfare Reform, Brent Council) and David Oates (Head of Customer Services Operations) introduced the report. Councillor Southwood highlighted that the key focus of the policy was on the ability to pay and the scheme was cost neutral.

Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee was asked to provide feedback and comments on the proposals to feed into the wider public and stakeholder consultation before the final scheme was agreed.

In considering the report, the following key points and comments were highlighted:

- A number of factors that drove the proposal to review the CTS scheme for 2020/21 were: to design a scheme which was fit for future needs - in particular how residents in receipt of Universal Credit (UC) were treated; to address any elements of the current scheme which were unsustainable or undesirable in the long-term (primarily these related to the assessment of claimants on UC and the criteria for exemption), to streamline administrative processes and reduce complexity for claimants; the Council was committed to maintaining the current level of funding for CTS, so any changes to the scheme must be cost neutral to Brent; and to ensure that the financial support available was going to those residents who were at least able to pay council tax because they were struggling with poverty, and reviewing the scheme provides an opportunity to evaluate this and recalibrate specific levels of support if appropriate.
- The proposed scheme had two key elements - a banded discount element based on the claimant's net earned income (with DWP and HMRC benefits disregarded) and revised deductions to entitlement in respect of other adults (non-dependants) living in the claimant's property (particularly those non-dependants with significant earnings). Proposing to simplify and streamline the charges based on income - appendix c.

- Over recent months, the Council's Local Council Tax Support¹ (CTS) scheme had been reviewed, by officers working in conjunction with a Member Working Group, and a new draft scheme developed, intended to take effect from 1 April 2020. The proposed change required public consultation.
- This report summarised the proposed scheme which had been developed and which was currently subject to public and stakeholder consultation until 10 October 2019.
- In legislation, the scheme was referred to as a Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS). Council Tax Support (CTS) was the name given to Brent's current local scheme.
- The proposed scheme also contained a number of other features and rules which were outlined in the report and its appendices.

The Chair thanked the Lead Member and Officers for the introduction to the report and subsequently invited questions from the Committee - Members raised the following queries and comments:

- Referring to Appendix A, what other schemes were considered as there was not enough details.
- About charging non-dependents, the calculation was based on gross figures for non-dependents whereas it was based on the net figures for actual applicants - this needed to be reviewed.
- Percentage of total income should be carefully considered and the impact on weekly take-home pay analysed and case studies be made available to the Committee.
- To take into account any stakeholders' concerns including zero hour contracts.
- A range of publicity and engagement sessions were being carried out including an event on 2 October, as well as, all those people affected directly by the scheme were being written to.
- Inflation/deflation would continue to be reviewed each year.
- A good report and a reasonably fair draft scheme, except a few minor tweaks/concerns highlighted above.

The Chair thanked the Lead Member and officers for their work and contribution.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee:

- i. Notes that the proposed Council Tax Support scheme which was subject to public and stakeholder consultation until 10 October 2019.
- ii. Recommends that the Cabinet look into the gross/net disparity based on legacy about income thresholds and report back on the resolution.

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee made the following information requests:

- a. To receive a report on local welfare assistance for pre scrutiny, as soon as possible, when ready.
- b. To receive more detailed case studies and information on costs as a percentage of weekly income and impact on weekly take-home pay rather than raw figures.

10. **Knife Crime Scrutiny Task Group Report**

Councillor Sandra Kabir (Char of the Knife Crime Scrutiny Task Group) introduced the final report which set out the findings and recommendations of the Knife Crime Task Group.

In considering the report, the Committee noted that through its work, the Knife Crime Scrutiny Task Group (the Task Group) sought to gain a better understanding of knife crime in Brent, how appropriate interventions could reduce it and which interventions might work locally. In particular, the Task Group looked at partnership working arrangements and reviewed what could be done to complement the wider public health approach and held a series of evidence-gathering sessions with internal and external partners and experts.

The Task Group had made 13 recommendations which it would put to the Cabinet and the Safer Brent Partnership to affect change. Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee had considered a draft report from the Task Group on 3 July 2019 and provided its comments - the final draft report was now being presented to the Committee to review and to agree the final recommendations as set out on page 4 of the report.

Councillor Mili Patel, Lead Member for Children's Safeguarding, Early Help and Social Care, welcomed the report on an important issue and thanked the Task Group for their hard work, particularly contextual safeguarding and important messaging backed up with a good set of recommendations.

During the discussion, Members praised all 13 recommendations of the Task Group and particularly spotlighted on the following recommendations as being very useful:

Recommendation 7 (Youth)

The council to support and encourage schools and other community organisations to make their facilities available for youth-focused activities after school hours and during holidays, to keep young people engaged in positive activities and deterred from crime.

Recommendation 8 (Education and Schools)

The council to work with Brent primary and secondary schools, the Brent School Partnership (BSP) and the Safer Brent Partnership, to develop and implement a Schools Safety Charter.

Recommendation 9 (Rehabilitation and Support)

The council must enhance the way it works with Brent youth offending services, London CRC and the National Probation Service in order to support offenders who can be rehabilitated, and continue to manage and assess risk.

Recommendation 10 (Collaborative working | Faith and VCS Groups)

The council to facilitate more collaborative working between the voluntary and community sector (VCS) and religious organisations, to raise funds for projects and training to prevent knife crime.

Recommendation 11 (Housing support and Government)

The council to make representations to Government to put guidance in place on the handling of housing needs cases for those at risk of violence (through gangs/ county lines) and reconsider the threshold at which someone who is deemed to be at sufficient risk gets re-housing support.

Recommendation 12 (GLA/MOPAC funding)

The council to make representations to the GLA/ Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime/ Violence Reduction Unit advising that the county lines programme is running at full capacity with an increasing unmet need. More intensive, longer-term funding needs to be provided.

Councillor Miller, Lead Member for Community Safety & Engagement, observed that this was a more positive story and it was worth remembering that psychological trauma of knife crime could not be ignored. In praising the work, he stated that this was one of the best pieces of work coming out of scrutiny that helped with contextual policy making and was a testament to the hard work of the Task Group.

Councillor Kabir thanked her colleagues on the Task Group for their great work and support from the officers. She highlighted that the Task Group had interviewed 43 people which provided invaluable insight and helped develop the recommendations. Councillor Kabir informed the Group that she intended to be the champion of reduction in knife crime and would do her best to make a difference and push for the implementation of the recommendations.

The Chair thanked the Task Group for their work particularly for its approach based on social justice backed up by evidence.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee:

- i. Requests that the scrutiny report be sent to Safer Neighbourhood Board and to Safer Neighbourhood Teams and responses sought.
- ii. Agrees the report and recommendations of the Knife Crime Scrutiny Task Group and that the report now be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

11. **Budget Scrutiny Task Group**

The Committee was invited to consider the establishment of a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group to review the Budget Outturn Performance for 2019/20; to review the implementation of the 2019 Budget Scrutiny recommendations (as agreed by the Council/Executive); and to review the Brent Council Budget Proposals for 2020/21, in accordance with Part 4 paragraph 5 of the Council Constitution.

It was anticipated that the Task and Finish Group would convene between October 2019 to January 2020 to receive oral and written evidence and report back to the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on Wednesday 29 January 2020 with a view to receive a report and make recommendations to the Council and Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee agreed:

- i. That the Budget Scrutiny Task Group be established with the following members:
 - Cllr Matt Kelcher, Chair
 - Cllr Ketan Sheth
 - Cllr Neil Nerva
 - Cllr Anita Thakkar
 - Cllr Reg Colwill
- ii. That the Budget Scrutiny Task Group have the following terms of reference:
 - a. To consider the in-year budget performance of the Council against outturn expenditure for 2019- 2020.
 - b. To identify and consider the key budget pressures and strategic financial issues for the Council and how these are being managed.
 - c. To consider the draft budget proposals for 2020- 2021, including the main areas of proposed growth and savings, key budgetary risks and the extent to which the budget proposals reflect the Council's priorities outlined in the Borough Plan".

12. **Recommendations Tracker**

The Chair introduced the Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker table (Appendix 1 of the report), which tracked the progress of recommendations made by the Committee.

RESOLVED:

- a. The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee notes the progress of the previous recommendations of the Committee.

- b. That, on 14 October, Councillor Kabir, attend the Cabinet on behalf of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee, to present the Knife Crime Scrutiny Task Group report with its recommendations. She would also present other scrutiny recommendations from the Committee and requests an executive response and decisions on these scrutiny recommendations.

13. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 8.09 pm

M KELCHER
Chair

.