

## **LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT**

At an **ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL** of the **LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT** held at Brent Town Hall Forty Lane, Wembley, Middlesex on **Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> September 2006 at 7.00 pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**The Worshipful the Mayor**  
Councillor B Joseph

**The Deputy Mayor**  
Councillor H B Patel

### **COUNCILLORS:**

Ahmed	Jones
Allie	Kansagra
Anwar	D Long
Arnold	J Long
Mrs Bacchus	Lorber
Baker	Malik
Bessong	Matthews
Beswick	Mendoza
Blackman	Mistry
D Brown	J Moher
V Brown	R Moher
Butt	Moloney
Castle	Motley
Chavda	O'Sullivan
Clues	Pagnamenta
Colwill	CJ Patel
Coughlin	H M Patel
Crane	Powney
Detre	Shah
Dunn	Ms C Shaw
Dunwell	Singh
Eniola	Sneddon
Farrell	Steel
Mrs U Fernandes	Tancred
Fox	Thomas
Hashmi	Tullett
Hirani	Van Colle
Jackson	Wharton
John	

1. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Corcoran, Cummins and Leaman.

2. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting of Full Council held on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2006 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

3. **Declarations of Interests**

At this meeting there were none.

4. **Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor was sorry to announce the death of Mrs Alice Newland who passed away on 17th July 2006. Alice Newland had represented the Kenton Ward until 1974 and had been Mayor of Wembley in 1962/63 and Mayoress to her husband S. G. Newland in 1949/50.

The Mayor also reported with regret that the death of Harry Drury on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2006. He would have been 91 next birthday. Harry Drury was Mayor 1971/2. He served on the old Willesden Council from 1949 and on Brent Council until 1982. Drury Way at Brent Park was named in his honour.

The Mayor reported that a sponsored walk was being organised from Brent to Richmond on Sunday 29th October. The proceeds were to be evenly divided between her charities and the Paul Daisley Trust. Anyone wishing to take part should contact Richard Cotton. She urged those not able to take part to sponsor those who do.

The Mayor reminded Members that her Civic Service would take place on Saturday 30th September at the Church of the Transfiguration, Wrentham Avenue at 2.00pm.

The Mayor reported on the visit to the Borough of the Prime Minister of Dominica. She was very pleased to have been able to greet him and he had invited her to pay a return visit.

The Mayor announced that Brent had won the prestigious London in Bloom Silver Gilt award as the overall winner in their Council category, beating off competition from other boroughs such as Camden, Bexley, Islington, Richmond, Haringey and last year's winners, Kensington and Chelsea. Brent won the City category, with an electoral population of over 100,000 but less than 200,000. All 33 local authorities of Greater

London are invited to enter this annual competition and judging categories were designed to include residents, the business community, schools and London's public parks and open spaces. The Mayor added that Brent had an excellent track record for winning London in Bloom awards and in 2005 had won one of the top awards for Gladstone Park – the Best Bedding Display Trophy. London in Bloom is a London-wide campaign to create a lasting improvement to London's environment. The Silver Gilt is a coveted award and is the seal of approval from the horticultural industry. Silver Gilt Award winners go forward to be nominated as the Council to represent London in the national competition.

The Council congratulated Shaun Faulkner, Head of Parks Service, and his staff for this major achievement.

Tributes were paid to the life and work of Alice Newland and Harry Drury after which the Council stood for a minute's silence in their memory.

#### 5. **Procedural Motions**

The Council considered a procedural motion that was circulated and moved by Councillor Wharton.

RESOLVED:-

that Standing Orders be suspended insofar as necessary in order that in respect of Summons items 6 and 11(a) to 11(c) each Group shall be entitled to have up to two Members speak for a period of up to 3 minutes each, which shall include the person moving the motion.

(Councillors Ahmed, Mrs Bacchus, Beswick, Butt, Coughlin, Crane, Eniola, Farrell, Fox, John, Jones, D Long, J Long, J Moher, R Moher, Moloney, Powney, Singh and Thomas wished it recorded that they had voted against the above procedural motion).

#### 6. **Appointment to Committees etc/Appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs**

RESOLVED:

That in respect of the Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board: Councillor D Brown be replaced by Councillor Hashmi, and Councillor D Brown and Councillor C Patel be appointed as Councillor Hashmi's first and second alternates respectively.

## 7. **Interim Report of the Constitutional Working Group**

The Borough Solicitor introduced the report which set out the discussions and recommendations of the Constitutional Working Group (CWG) in relation to the operation and structure of Overview and Scrutiny for 2006-2010.

Councillor Castle moved the recommendations in the report subject to the chair of the Budget Panel being from one of the Administration parties.

Councillor John spoke against the amendment on the basis that the report clearly reflected the views of the CWG and she was of the understanding that recommendations from the CWG would be accepted without amendment. Councillor John also expressed the view that scrutiny of the budget was an inherent part of the scrutiny function and as such the chair of the panel should be more properly be drawn from the Opposition. Councillor J Moher emphasised the belief that the views of CWG represented a consensual view and that it was regrettable that an amendment was being put forward without prior consultation.

Councillor Blackman stated that the report represented the outcome of very detailed discussions centring on the operation of overview and scrutiny which was crucial to the running of the Council. He acknowledged that the proposals were the result of compromise between the three political parties but expressed surprise at the recommendation that the Budget Panel should be chaired by a member of the opposition as he did not recall this being agreed. His belief was that the Panel should be chaired by a member of the Administration. It was a new development that would be reviewed after the first year of operation to see how effective it had been.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that Members and officers of the Constitutional Working Group be thanked for their hard work and recommendations to date regarding the proposed Overview and Scrutiny structure;
- (ii) that the establishment of a Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee, select committees and a Budget Panel as outlined in section 3 and detailed in appendix 2 of the report be agreed, namely:
  - a Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee in addition to the main Overview & Scrutiny Committee,
  - four sub-committees of the main Overview & Scrutiny Committee, namely a Forward Plan Select Committee, a

Performance and Finance Select Committee, a Health Select Committee and a Budget Panel,

- the Budget Panel's role is to assist in the budget process by providing detailed input during the Executive's development of its budget proposals,
  - each of the two Overview & Scrutiny Committees and the three Select Committees consist of eight members (plus an additional six co-opted members in the case of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee) and that the Budget Panel consist of six members,
  - the Chairs of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Forward Plan Select Committee be opposition members, and
  - the terms of reference of the various Overview & Scrutiny Committees and sub-committees be modified to reflect the new roles and structure;
- (ii) that the Council agrees the proposed changes to the threshold for call in of Executive decisions from the previous restrictive threshold of 40% of non Executive members to any 5 non-Executive members;
- (iii) That the Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny committees and sub-committees each receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of £4,492 with effect from 15<sup>th</sup> September 2006 and to note that this amount will be reviewed by the CWG and that any increase subsequently agreed by the Council may be backdated to that date;
- (iv) that the Borough Solicitor be authorised to make such consequential changes to the Constitution as may be necessary to give effect to the changes agreed by Council.

#### **8. Councillor Gupta – Absence from meetings**

Councillor Gupta has not attended any meetings of the Council since he was elected because his position on the Council has been legally challenged by way of an election petition. The report before Council explained that unless the Council approves the reason for his non-attendance, he faces ceasing to be a member of the Council on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2006 due to failure to attend any meeting of the Council for a 6 month period.

**RESOLVED:**

that the reasons for Councillor Gupta's ongoing failure to attend any meetings of the Council as set out in the report be noted and approved.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders the voting on the above decision was recorded as follows:

For:	The Deputy Mayor, Allie, Anwar, Baker, Bessong, Blackman, Brown, Brown, Castle, Chavda, Clues, Colwill, Detre, Dunn, Dunwell, Mrs Fernandes, Hashmi, Hirani, Jackson, Kansagra, Lorber, Malik, Matthews, Mendoza, Mistry, Motley, O'Sullivan, Pagnamenta, C J Patel, HB Patel, HM Patel, Shah, Ms Shaw, Sneddon, Steel, Tancred, Tullett, Van Colle, Wharton (38)
Against:	Nil
Abstentions:	The Mayor, Ahmed, Arnold, Mrs Bacchus, Beswick, Butt, Coughlin, Crane, Eniola, Farrell, Fox, John, Jones, D Long, J Long, J Moher, R Moher, Moloney, Powney, Singh, Thomas (21)

## 9. Items Selected by Non-Executive Members

### (i) *Recycling plastics*

Councillor Pagnamenta introduced the item he had raised by referring to the waste of energy and resources by not recycling plastics. He referred to the higher rate of recycling achieved by some other boroughs and felt this should be an essential service and not one only the car user could access. He called on the Council to show leadership in introducing a kerbside collection service.

In welcoming discussion of the item it was mentioned that some analysis should be undertaken to evaluate the environmental cost of collection compared to the environmental benefit in recycling plastics. The request was also made that the service should allow for all recyclable items to be left out for collection on the same day rather than different items on different days.

Councillor Van Colle (Lead Member for Environment, Planning and Culture) replied that there were six recycling sites in the borough that accepted plastics. The intention was for the new waste collection contract to include kerb side collection across the borough with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007. He noted the other points that had been made and pointed out that this would be a matter that would be reported to Members again.

*(ii) Executive Decision – making*

Councillor Crane asked that decisions be taken with accountability referring to the decision to suspend ward based newsletters. The ward-based newsletters did not contain extreme political material and were a source of useful information for residents. He sought re-assurances that decisions on Council matters in future would be taken through the normal decision making processes.

A point was made that the Executive decision making arrangements allowed for a small group of members to take many decisions and it was important that the voice of the backbencher was heard. It was submitted that whilst the decision to introduce ward working had been taken by the Council the decision to wind it down had been taken by administrative action. A contrary view was expressed that no decision had been taken by the Council to circulate ward newsletters and this did not represent a good use of resources. The issue of ward working/area committees was to be considered by the Constitutional Working Group. The importance of communication and the part email played in this was acknowledged.

Councillor Lorber (Leader) responded by saying that thousands of decisions that needed to be taken were taken by officers across the Authority and this was how it had to be in such a large organisation. The production of glossy leaflets was not the best use of resources nor the best way of communicating with residents. Local events were best promoted locally by the people running them. However, Councillor Lorber indicated he would accept further discussion on the item of communication within the Council.

*(iii) National Baseball/Softball Centre – Northwick Park*

Councillor Detre stated that an application by developers had been submitted to the Lottery Commission some four months ago without the support of the Council, despite officers having been in discussions about this since 2002. The Council promoted the playing of baseball and in information it put out made reference to the facilities at Northwick Park. Councillor Detre read from the lottery submission which set out detailed proposals and yet there had been nothing put before Members on what the proposals were. He urged the Executive to review the Council's playing field and sports strategies with a view to making it clear that the Council did not want a national baseball centre at Northwick Park.

Councillor Van Colle (Lead Member for Environment, Planning and Culture) replied that the existing sports strategy had been inherited from the previous Administration. It concentrated on 8 principal sports of which baseball was not one so there was no reason to

support this proposal. He understood a planning application had been submitted and that this was under discussion with officers. Councillor Van Colle stated that the Executive would bring forward a revised sports strategy in due course.

#### RESOLVED

- (i) that the response from the Executive on recycling plastics be accepted;
- (ii) that the item on Executive decision-making be the subject of further discussion between members in so far as communication with Members is concerned;
- (iii) that the undertaking by the Executive to review the sports strategy be supported.

#### 10. **Report from the Executive**

(i) *Treasury Management Annual Report 2004/05*

Councillor Blackman (Deputy Leader) introduced the Treasury Management Annual Report and drew attention to the effect borrowing capital in the past had had on increasing the level of debt. He praised officers for their work in restructuring the debt to take account of low interest rates but stated that the Council's long term financial strategy would have to take account of the high level of debt the Council had.

(ii) *Casino/Wembley Regeneration*

Councillor Lorber (Leader) thanked the 3,600 people that had responded to the consultation on the borough hosting a regional casino in the Wembley area. He reported that 1 in 3 people had objected to the proposal. He acknowledged the need to regenerate the area and discussions on alternative ways to do this were already taking place with the developer. Councillor Lorber was keen to see improved shopping, better housing and leisure facilities all of which were what local people were saying they wanted.

(iii) *School places and support for expansion*

Councillor Wharton (Lead Member for Children and Families) reported that the Audit Commission recommended that local authorities should maintain a 5% surplus of school places but that by January 2006 this had fallen in Brent to 3.5%. Children moving from primary school to secondary school



had all been found places. By the end of August there were 92 year 7s that did not have places and these were largely made up of people moving into the borough. This figure had already dropped to 72. Councillor Wharton stated that overall there was a sufficient number of primary school places but provision was not evenly balanced across the borough.

Councillor Wharton reported on expansion plans for Preston Manor High School and the rebuilding of the John Kelly Schools.

(iv) *Away days at Bridge Park*

Councillor Lorber (Leader) reported on the use of Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre for the holding of a strategy session between members of the Executive and the Central Management Team and that future away days would take place there. He was pleased to promote the borough's own facilities and urged others to use Bridge Park facilities.

(v) *Budget Position and Population Shortfall*

Councillor Blackman (Deputy Leader) submitted that the previous administration had failed to deal with spending pressures within Children & Families and Housing & Community Care. He stated that urgent action taken by officers had reigned in the overspends but there remained a shortfall of nearly £5M. He added that the use of managed debt could not be sustained and so the Administration would be looking to continue to fund high priority services for people who needing them by identifying economies at the centre. He applauded the efforts of officers so far in this process.

(vi) *Queens Park Station Car Park Development Brief*

Councillor Van Colle (Lead Member for Environment, Planning & Culture) reported that following the highly contentious proposals put forward earlier in the year the opportunity had been taken to change the development brief to reflect a desire for no more than 12 storeys. He added there would be ample consultation following which the Council would agree the most appropriate proposal.

(vii) *Edward Harvist Trust*

Councillor Blackman (Deputy Leader) reported that action was being taken to change how the trust operated to enable

a greater number of organisations to make use of grants from the trust.

(viii) *Empty Property Review*

Councillor Allie (Lead Member for Housing and Customer Services) reported on the administration's intention to tackle this difficult issue. He referred to the recent decision to dispose of three former caretaker's houses as evidence of quick action by the administration to bring empty property back into use.

**11. General Debate**

Members debated the items included under the report from the Executive.

It was argued that the previous Administration had put in place the means by which to deal with the overspends by budgeting for balances of £10M. This had been opposed at the time but now showed how prudent it had been. In addition, reference was made to the under-estimation of the population used to calculate the grant to the Council. The case for this had been made with some success and it was agreed should continue to be made. Dealing with such issues was part of running the Council and it was submitted that by pledging not to raise Council Tax either services would have to be cut or eligibility criteria tightened. The question was asked how the overspends were going to be dealt with. The past success of lobbying the government over the population figures was questioned. It was also claimed that the previous administration only managed its budget by increasing the Council Tax. Despite such increases it was claimed the Council did not have enough school places. This was made worse by huge developments across the borough which were not supported by the local people. Existing schools needed improving first before any new school was built.

It was put that the provision of school places was more urgent than suggested by some. The previous strategy had embraced both the short and long term needs by committing to a new all through school and expanding existing schools. Any delay in accepting the need for a new school would increase the problem.

The view was put that the decision on the regional casino was a bad one. Between 2,500 and 4,000 new jobs would have been created and new conferencing facilities provided and it was questioned how this would be replaced. It was suggested that despite some opposition the Council should have taken a lead in pursuing such a facility for the good of the borough. Reference was

made to visiting events in the past within the Wembley area when there were no other people around. It was stated that the area desperately needed new developments. Reference was made to the views of local residents who clearly did not want a casino in their area. It was now a matter of looking at what other businesses could be attracted to the area and what parking provision was made. It also opened the possibility of better quality jobs being created. The opportunity existed to build a quality shopping centre.

The commitment to reducing the number of empty properties was welcomed but it was suggested that a lot more would need to be done. Under the previous Administration a scrutiny task group had looked at this issue. There were estimated to be 3,500 empty properties in the borough all requiring money so it was asked how this would be dealt with. It was stated that under an existing strategy £5M was spent on empty properties and it was questioned what empty property review had taken place.

It was noted that the new Executive had now taken on the idea of awaydays despite earlier opposition to these meetings. In response it was stated that the Executive was glad to be able to use facilities within Brent for such events.

Councillor Lorber responded to the general debate. He confirmed the importance of leading members and officers meeting but saw the difference in not spending money to go out of the borough. His view was that the most telling impact of a casino in the borough would be on young vulnerable people. He did not feel it was a priority to attract such a facility into the area and it was now time to move on. His prediction was that wherever the first regional casino was located would lead to problems for that area and local residents would be clear about the position of the joint Administration on this matter.

**RESOLVED**

that the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2005/06 be approved.

## **11. Motions Selected by the Group Leaders**

### **(i) *Proposed new powers for the Mayor of London***

On behalf of the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Allie introduced the motion. He stated that the proposed new powers for the Mayor of London was an attempt to override local accountability. The Executive decision making structure had already reduced the role of backbenchers and this proposal compounded it. Councillor Allie gave examples of

where local people had been able to successfully oppose certain developments in the borough and asked how this could happen under these new powers. The Mayor of London would hold powers over the use of housing resources and planning and this amounted to centralisation of powers. He stressed his party's commitment to local democracy.

Councillor J Moher moved an amendment to the motion. He stated that the Council should adopt a more measured approach to this matter and the amendment sought to do this. He asserted that many of the proposals were uncontroversial but some were important and of some concern. The motion if amended could then be supported by all sides on the Council.

In support of the amendment it was argued that a number of plans were already submitted by the Council towards London wide strategies. It was pointed out that the London Housing Board was currently a quango and so it was proper that the Mayor should have more democratic strategic powers over this. However there needed to be checks and balances in the relationship between London boroughs and the Mayor of London. Brent would want to ensure that resources were not disproportionately allocated to the East of London. In opposition to the amendment it was argued that local councillors should be allowed to carry out the functions for which they were elected. The view was expressed that more open space would be built on and resources taken from the Council if these proposals went through. It was questioned whether the proposals would be supported in the way the amendment sought to achieve if the Mayor was from the Conservative Party. Since the creation of the Greater London Council the size of the Government Office for London had trebled which showed there was something wrong with the balance of power. More powers were being removed from local councils and given to the Mayor and it was clear he intended to use them to force council's into a position on strategic planning. It was suggested that it was the intention of the Mayor to develop open land in outer London and take the planning benefits to use as he chose. It was asked whether the Mayor had consulted local councillors on the proposals.

The amendment to the motion moved by Councillor J Moher was put to the vote and declared LOST. The motion in the name of Councillor Lorber was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

## RESOLVED

that Council notes with dismay proposals by the Labour Government to further increase the powers of the Mayor of London at the expense of local authorities;

that Council notes the negative impact of the London Mayor's interference in local matters, such as the increase in height of the proposed tower at Copland School to 28 storeys - well above the locally agreed brief. We regret the lack of resistance by the former Labour administration to such interference;

Brent Council expresses concern at plans to allow the Mayor to decide densities, numbers and types of houses in each area ; where Housing Corporation investment will go ; and determine Planning applications and negotiate Section 106 agreements himself. We firmly believe that planning matters are best decided by councils, who have most knowledge of local need;

"Double devolution" should not mean stripping powers from both Government and councils and putting them in the hands of one person. The Government is asked to devolve more power currently held at London and Government level, as a step to empowering residents;

that the Chief Executive be instructed to convey the Council's view to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, all Brent Members of Parliament, the ALG, LGA and other stakeholders and partners;

that this resolution be used to inform any responses to consultation on the proposed new powers and their use, and be reflected in the Council's submissions and public comments on draft London-wide plans. The Executive and Planning Committee are asked to take full account of the Council's view when considering and developing policy on related issues.

### (ii) *School places*

Councillor John introduced her motion which sought to note the projected shortfall in school places and the refusal of the Administration to take a decision on a second City Academy and expressing the belief that this would lead to overcrowded classrooms, falling standards and reduced parental choice. Councillor John stated that the Council's prime consideration should be the provision of first class education for children in the borough. The Council did not have the resources to build a new school and yet the Administration was delaying proceeding with taking a decision to harness resources to provide a new school.

She detailed the pressure on school places and how the situation was worsening.

Councillor Wharton (Lead Member for Children and Families) responded that the current position had been inherited by the present Administration and had been caused by central government undermining local responsibility for providing school places. He submitted that the Council had previously worked on erroneous forecasts provided by the Greater London Council and the situation had been worsened by the Council approving massive housing developments with no consequent action to provide more school places. Efforts were underway to see if it would be possible to provide additional school places in the Stonebridge area. The proposed site for a second City Academy was not suitable and this was being reviewed in order that the best decision for all could be taken.

It was suggested that the previous Administration had ignored advice in the past to provide additional school places and that the forward planning on this issue had been poor. It was stated that the proposed location in Wembley of a new school was inappropriate because the need for extra school places was in the areas of Harlesden and Stonebridge. The failure to provide adequate school places in those areas meant pupils had to be bussed into the Wembley area. It was submitted that the Government had not supported the borough in providing a new school nor provided the resources necessary to meet the demands caused by new arrivals into the borough. The quickest way to provide additional school places was to expand existing schools. It was pointed out that in 2005 a scrutiny panel had asked the Executive to reconsider its plans for a second City Academy and that the Guinness site had been identified as a possible site for a new school. It was also stated that delay in decision making on this matter not only had implications arising from failure to provide adequate school places but also had consequences for existing schools, put additional pressures on teachers and education managers, placed more demand on social care, put additional pressures on families and led to a further shortage of provision in areas where new housing was planned.

The motion submitted by Councillor John was put to the vote and declared LOST.

(iii) *Defend our hospitals*

Councillor Blackman introduced his motion by referring to the press and media coverage of the threats to hospitals. He referred to the funding crisis within the NHS, the long waiting

times at the Accident and Emergency unit at Northwick Park hospital, vague proposals for 'super hospitals' operating on a regional basis with a threat to the future of local hospitals. He felt it was time for the Council to state that it would not accept these threats to local health care provision.

In response the view was submitted that the motion dwelt on unspecified developments that may not happen. In the circumstances the wording of the motion was too extreme. However it was stated that councillors were elected on promises to save services and there was concern over the poor record of Northwick Park maternity unit and the age of the buildings at Central Middlesex hospital which might threaten their future. Concern was expressed that the government was imposing regimes to deal with the budget deficits within the health sector which led local people to fear for the future of these services.

Councillor Powney moved an amendment to the motion calling on the Council to join with Dawn Butler, MP, Unison and other trade unions in their campaign to protect services, particularly the Accident and Emergency unit at Central Middlesex hospital.

It was submitted that the local Primary Care Trust was being unfairly asked to find savings in order to meet the shortfalls experienced in other PCTs and that the government should be told to put money where it was needed.

The amendment to the motion submitted by Councillor Powney was put to the vote and declared LOST.

The motion submitted by Councillor Blackman was put to the vote and declared CARRIED

**RESOLVED:**

that this Council is horrified at the possible plans to downgrade or even to close Northwick Park Hospital as part of a major Governmental review of the NHS. This Council accuses the Government of jeopardising people's lives in Brent in an attempt to balance their books.

This Council resolves to campaign against the plans, recently revealed by the BBC, to downgrade five of London's best known hospitals, Northwick Park Hospital being just one of them. This Council further notes that talks are to take place to discuss the possibility of stripping down emergency services at the Hospital as well as limiting some of the other services provided. The site could then face possible closure or be limited to providing basic care such as non-emergency surgery, diagnostic and

physiotherapy. Critical emergency care could be transferred to regional 'super hospitals', without the details being made clear on where such a regional "super hospital" would be sited.

This Council believes that increasing the distance between patients and hospital facilities can only increase travelling times and therefore place lives at greater risk as a result.

This Council also notes that there is a threat to facilities at Central Middlesex Hospital, which is equally unacceptable.

This Council places on record its opposition to continual reorganisations which are nothing more than a clumsy attempt to cover-up the failure to provide an effective service. Those responsible, at the highest levels, need to be aware of the grave repercussions of this proposal and reconsider it immediately.

This Council understands that the residents of Brent are not prepared to accept a substandard third world health service in a first world city.

The meeting ended at 10:08pm

**B JOSEPH**  
Mayor