



Brent

SUMMONS TO ATTEND COUNCIL MEETING

Monday 6 July 2026 at 6.00 pm*

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

*Please note the corrected start time listed for the meeting.

Please note that this meeting will be held as a physical meeting with all members of the Council required to attend in person.

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

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

KIM WRIGHT
Chief Executive

Dated: 26 June 2026 (republished on 29 June 2026 and 6 July 2026)

For further information contact: James Kinsella, Governance & Scrutiny Manager
Tel: 020 8937 2063; Email: james.kinsella@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes and agendas please visit:
[Council meetings and decision making | Brent Council](#)

Limited space will be available at the meeting for the press and public to attend or alternatively it will be possible to follow the meeting via the live webcast. The link to follow proceedings via the live webcast is available [here](#)

Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest** in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also a Prejudicial Interest (i.e. it affects a financial position or relates to determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission, or registration) then (unless an exception at 14(2) of the Members Code applies), after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

***Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences** - Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

****Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

- (a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:
 - To which you are appointed by the council;
 - which exercises functions of a public nature;
 - which is directed is to charitable purposes;
 - whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party of trade union).
- (b) The interests a of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting, to a greater extent than the majority of other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the electoral ward affected by the decision, the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who employs or has appointed any of these or in whom they have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000, or any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are a director
- any body of a type described in (a) above

Agenda

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

1 - 24

To confirm as a correct record, the minutes of the Annual Council Meeting held on Wednesday 20 May 2026.

(Agenda republished to include the attached minutes on 6 July 2026)

3 Declarations of Interest

Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, the nature and existence of any relevant disclosable pecuniary or personal interests in the items on this agenda and to specify the item(s) to which they relate.

4 Mayor's Announcements

To receive any announcements from the Mayor.

5 Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and Appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs

25 - 26

To agree any appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies (if any) in accordance with Standing Order 30 (g).

(Agenda republished to include the attached list of appointments on 6 July 2026)

6 Deputations (if any)

To receive any deputations requested by members of the public in accordance with Standing Order 32.

Members are asked to note that two deputations are due to be presented at the meeting, relating to the following issues:

- (a) Maintenance and upkeep of South Kilburn (to be presented by Pete Firmin)
- (b) Progress on delivery of South Kilburn redevelopment from a resident perspective including impact on Granville Recreation Ground and other green spaces and how the programme fits within Brent's wider policies in terms of the climate change emergency, air pollution and loss of biodiversity (to be presented by Leslie Benson representing Granville Community Kitchen)

7 Questions from Members of the Public & Brent Youth Parliament 27 - 32

7.1 To receive and consider the question(s) submitted by the public for response by the relevant Cabinet Member, in accordance with Standing Order 33.

Members are asked to note that two public questions have been received, which have been circulated as part of the agenda along with the written responses provided.

7.2 To receive question(s) submitted by the Brent Youth Parliament for response by the relevant Cabinet Member, in accordance with Standing Order 33(c).

Members are asked to note that one question has been received, which has been circulated as part of the agenda along with the written response provided.

8 Petitions

To consider any petitions with more than 200 signatures for which a request has been received for their presentation, in accordance with the Council's petition rules and Standing Order 66.

Members are asked to note that at the time of agenda publication there are no Petition(s) due to be presented at the meeting.

9 Motions 33 - 44

To debate the Group motions submitted in accordance with Standing Order 41.

Members are asked to note:

- The motions submitted for debate have been attached, in accordance with Standing Order 41(c).
- Where a motion concerns an executive function, nothing passed can be actioned until approved by the Executive or an officer with the relevant delegated power.

(Agenda republished to include the attached motions on 29 June 2026 along with the amendments submitted by the Liberal Democrat Group and Green Group on the Conservative Group motion (attached as 9.2 a and b) and Labour Group on the Liberal Democrat motion (attached as 9.3a) on 6 July 2026)

10 Questions from the Opposition and other Non-Cabinet Members 45 - 52

For questions to be put to members of the Cabinet by Opposition and Non-Cabinet Members in accordance with Standing Order 35.

Five advance notice questions have been received under this item, which have been attached along with the written responses provided.

Members are asked to note that this session will also include an opportunity (within the time available) for other Non-Cabinet members and the Opposition to ask questions of Cabinet Members without the need for advance notice.

11 Report from Chairs of Scrutiny Committees

To receive reports from the Chairs of the Council's Scrutiny Committees in accordance with Standing Order 36. The reports have been attached as follows:

11.1 Resources & Public Realm Scrutiny Committee 53 - 58

11.2 Community & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee 59 - 64

12 Report from the Vice Chair of the Audit & Standards Advisory Committee 65 - 76

To receive the Annual Report produced by the Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee updating on the work of both Committees, in accordance with Standing Order 37.

13 Change to the Constitution 47 - 110

To receive a report from the Corporate Director Finance & Resources detailing a number of constitutional changes to the Council's existing scrutiny arrangements (Part 4 of the Constitution), including establishing an additional scrutiny committee with a housing remit; Full Council meeting standing orders (Part 2 of the Constitution) and the Members' Allowance Scheme (Part 6 of the Constitution).

(Agenda republished to include an updated version of the report along with Appendices 1 & 3 on 6 July 2026)

Ward Affected:
All Wards

Contact Officer: Pameel Crowther Newman,
Head of Law & Litigation
020 8937 4078
Pameel.Crowther-Newman@brent.gov.uk

14 Exclusion of the Press & Public

No items have been identified in advance of the meeting that will require the exclusion of the press and public.

15 Urgent Business

At the discretion of the Mayor to consider any urgent business, in accordance with Standing Order 37(s).



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. Alternatively, it will be possible to follow proceedings via the live webcast [HERE](#)



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

Minutes of the ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
held in the Grand Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Wednesday 20 May 2026 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Amer Agha MB BS, MSc, PHCM

The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Kanta Mistry

COUNCILLORS:

Aden	Ahmadi Moghaddam
P.Ahmed	Alexandre
Amadi	Anderson
Bajwa	Blackman
Brown	Burn
M Butt	S Butt
Chadha	Chauhan
Choudry	Chowdhury
Clinton	Dar
De Souza	Dixon
Donnelly-Jackson	Do Rosario
Gallagher	Georgiou
Grahl	Hack
Ibrahim	Jansali
Johnson	Kansagra
Kelcher	Knight
Lorber	Madabhushi
Mahmood	Malonga
Maurice	McLeish
Mishra	Mitchell
Mulaisho	A.Patel
HB Patel	N.Patel
Perrin	Rubin
Ryan	Shah
Thomas	Unger
Vakani	Want
Warsame	

1. Welcoming Statement

Prior to formally opening the meeting, the outgoing Mayor Councillor Hack took the opportunity to welcome all new and returning councillors following the outcome of the recent borough election as well as guests to the Annual Council meeting. He then invited Kim Wright (as the Council's Chief Executive) to provide a brief outline of the arrangements for the conduct of the meeting and Mayor Making ceremony. Having noted the outline provided, the Mayor then formally opened the meeting.

2. **Apologies for Absence**

The Mayor advised that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors I.Ahmed and J.Patel.

3. **To elect the Mayor of the Borough for the Municipal Year 2026 - 2027**

Prior to handing over to the Chief Executive for the conduct of the election process, Councillor Hack began by asking members for nominations to the office of Mayor of the London Borough of Brent for the 2026 - 2027 Municipal Year.

Councillor Muhammed Butt proceeded to nominate Councillor Amer Agha. In moving the nomination, he firstly took the opportunity to thank Councillor Hack for his hard work and dedication whilst serving as Mayor and commitment in seeking to represent local community groups and organisations. In taking the opportunity to congratulate all members on their election (whether as new or returning councillors) the Leader then moved on to advise how pleased he was to nominate Councillor Agha for the position of Mayor, recognising the importance of the role and qualities it was felt he would demonstrate in providing strong civic leadership across the borough.

No other nominations were received with the Chief Executive therefore advising members that they would need to confirm the appointment on the basis of a vote requiring a straightforward majority to be achieved.

Prior to the vote, Councillor Georgiou (as Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group) requested (under Standing Order 43 (c)) that this be undertaken on the basis of a roll call. Having confirmed the request, the outgoing Mayor then handed over to the Chief Executive for the appointment of the Mayor to be put to the vote.

On a recorded vote being taken the appointment of Councillor Amer Agha as Mayor was declared **CARRIED**. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that Councillor Amer Agha be elected Mayor of the London Borough of Brent for the 2026 - 2027 Municipal Year.

The voting recorded on the appointment of Councillor Amer Agha as Mayor was as follows:

For (34): Councillors Aden, Agha, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Choudry, Chowdhury, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Grahl, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Madhabushi, Mahmood, Maurice, McLeish, Mishra, Mistry, A.Patel, H.Patel, Rubin and Thomas

Against: (20): Councillors Ahmadi-Moghaddam, Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Gallagher, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Malonga, Mitchell, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Shah, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Abstentions (1): Councillor Hack (Mayor).

Councillor Agha then proceeded to sign the statutory Declaration of Acceptance of Office of Mayor.

4. To appoint a Councillor of the Borough to be Deputy Mayor

Councillor Agha, taking over as Chair of the meeting, thanked members for his nomination and appointment as Mayor. Prior to the Mayor announcing the appointment of his Deputy Mayor Councillor Georgiou, in raising a point of order, felt it important to recognise that whilst the Local Government Act 1972 enabled the Mayor of a London Borough to appoint a Deputy Mayor there was no obligation on the Mayor to make such an appointment. Councillor Georgiou therefore urged the Mayor to carefully consider the basis of any appointment, especially if that involved the position being offered to a member of the Conservative Group as part of any agreement between the Groups, which it was not felt reflected the outcome of the recent borough election.

In response, Councillor Kansagra (as a Point of Order) challenged the basis of the comments made by Councillor Georgiou, reminding members that these had preceded any announcement being made by the Mayor.

Having noted the comments made, the Mayor moved on (without further comment) to announce the appointment of Councillor Kanta Mistry to serve as Deputy Mayor for the 2026 - 2027 Municipal Year

At this stage in proceedings the Mayors Chain of Office and robes were exchanged between the outgoing and newly appointed Mayor and also Deputy Mayor.

Councillor Agha then formally returned thanks for his appointment. Starting by welcoming all guests, he highlighted his pride in being nominated as Mayor and thanked all members for their trust, confidence and faith in appointing him to take on the role as first citizen of the borough.

Highlighting the privilege he felt in being appointed as Mayor, Councillor Agha began by reflecting on his personal journey which had involved his family first arriving in the United Kingdom in 2004 from Saudi Arabia, with their roots in Pakistan, where they had initially faced uncertainty before thankfully being welcomed with friendship, opportunity and a sense of belonging by the local community in Brent.

In seeking to build a future for their children, Councillor Agha recalled a formative experience which had involved the provision of support, particularly from the late Councillor Harbhajan Singh and his wife Mrs Kamal Singh (fondly referred to as Kamal Ji) in enabling his children to secure local primary school places. Councillor Agha advised it was this act of kindness which had demonstrated the value and power of public service and community spirit which had taken forward as key principles in driving and inspiring his own involvement in local politics based on a

desire to give something back to the community that had given so much to both him and his family. Councillor Agha was also proud to highlight the achievements in relation to his professional and academic path, with these identified as key in driving his passion about the importance of education, which he also hoped to be able to share during his time as Mayor given the way the way this could also create opportunities and improve life chances.

Reflecting on his time serving as a Councillor since his election in 2014, Councillor Agha outlined the privilege he felt at being able to serve the residents of Brent acknowledging those who had initially encouraged him to stand for election, including Dawn Butler MP. Noting the importance of this support and belief shown in him, he felt it was this experience which had made a real difference in helping to shape his understanding of leadership, resilience and the importance of community relationships.

Highlighting his commitment and focus on the future, Councillor Agha advised of the intention to use his role as Mayor to celebrate Brent as a welcoming borough bursting with pride and diversity with every street having its own storeys, hopes and dreams involving people from different backgrounds, faiths and cultures living side by side with respect and understanding. As a result, he felt Brent's strength lay not only in its diverse and varied communities but also in the mutual respect, acceptance and compassion shown between residents, which he advised he was committed to champion during his time as Mayor. Illustrating the opportunities provided to support this approach through anecdotal experiences during his time campaigning as a councillor, he highlighted what in his view made local government so special in terms of the close connections and relationships it was possible to build and develop in seeking to bring communities closer together. The example of his appointment as Mayor, having arrived in the country as an outsider, was cited as evidence of what could be achieved when welcomed as a neighbour, friend and eventually representative of the community.

Looking ahead, Councillor Agha then outlined the aims for his mayoralty in seeking to bring people together, support the Council's overall vision and objectives and serve all residents with fairness, dignity and respect, recognising Brent as the place that had given him and his family its chance and which he was proud to call home. At the same time, the opportunity was also taken to recognise his fellow councillors and colleagues for the work they undertook to support local residents, with particularly reference made to Councillor Muhammed Butt and Councillor Ryan Hack (as former Mayor) along with his close friend and work colleague Sindhu Balakrishnan whose dedication and friendship, he advised, had inspired him throughout his journey.

Prior to concluding, Councillor Agha took the opportunity to pay specific tribute to his wife (Sunbal) for the strength, support and encouragement she had given him throughout his journey highlighting her patience and sacrifice during his time in public office and when navigating their journey during its more difficult times. Highlighting his gratitude for her love and support, the Mayor ended by reaffirming his pride in Brent as a diverse and welcoming borough and his commitment to its future, advising that he would be announcing the organisations he intended to support through the Mayor's Charity at a future meeting.

5. Vote of thanks to the outgoing Mayor

The Mayor then invited Councillor Muhammed Butt, as Leader of the Council, to propose a vote of thanks to Councillor Hack as the outgoing Mayor along with all co-opted and other independent members serving on the Council's committees.

Councillor Muhammed Butt in once again congratulating Councillor Agha on his appointment as Mayor, began by recognising the honour in serving as First Citizen of the Borough and in being able to advocate and serve as a champion for Brent, which were roles he felt Councillor Hack had worked hard to fulfil during his time as Mayor. Recognising the energy, dignity, dedication and commitment demonstrated by Councillor Hack in serving the people of Brent during his time as Mayor, the Leader praised Councillor Hack for his warmth, good humour and the valued contribution made in representing the borough during his Mayoralty highlighting his efforts in seeking to bring all communities together as a visible and enthusiastic ambassador and in support of numerous community organisations and local causes with these efforts, he advised, being appreciated by all members. In ending therefore hoped Councillor Hack would take pride in all he achieved during his Mayoralty.

Moving on, Councillor Butt then took the opportunity to highlight the valued work of the Council's co-opted and independent committee members, given the core role they played as critical friends in the Council's democratic process and in terms of strengthening the quality, transparency and accountability of work being undertaken. In passing on his thanks, he advised how their independence and objectivity were highly valued and seen as integral to the role of the bodies on which they served including Scrutiny, Audit & Standards and the various health and education related bodies. Recognising the pressures and challenges which local government continued to face, he ended by thanking all of the co-opted and Independent members for the welcome contribution they continued to make to the good governance of Brent.

The Mayor then invited comments from other members in recognition of the role undertaken by Councillor Hack during his time as Mayor.

In response, Councillors Kansagra, Grahl, Kelcher, H.Patel, Clinton, Georgiou, Dar, P.Ahmed, Johnson, Maurice , Mahmood, Thomas and finally Councillor De Souza all spoke to congratulate the new Mayor and Deputy Mayor on their appointment and thank Councillor Hack as outgoing Mayor, recognising the commitment, leadership, service and compassion demonstrated in undertaking his civic role. Reflecting on his appointment as the youngest Mayor of Brent, members were keen to commend Councillor Hack on his enthusiasm, professionalism and dedication in seeking to represents Brent's communities and also for the fair, effective and impartial way in which he had presided over Full Council meetings with such confidence.

Reference was also made to the extensive programme of civic engagements attended by Councillor Hack during his term as Mayor across the borough, with members keen to acknowledge his visibility within local communities, willingness to engage with residents from all backgrounds and his commitment to promoting Brent both within and beyond the borough. His strong connection with the Irish community and support of the Brent Irish Advisory Service were also highlighted, with members commending the extensive efforts made in relation to his charitable

fundraising activity in support of the Brent Irish Advisory Service as his nominated charity and significant contribution this would make to the organisation and the local communities it served.

Members were also keen, in reflecting on his achievements during his year in office, to acknowledge Councillor Hack's accessibility and responsiveness to local residents and continuing commitment to local issues despite the demands of his mayoral duties, with reference made to his popularity within Brondesbury Park and surrounding wards and the high regard in which he was held by residents across the borough. Tributes were also paid to Councillor Hack's support for a wide range of community groups and organisations, which members noted had included him attending a large number of events celebrating Brent's diverse communities, including Irish, Caribbean and other cultural groups, as well as his engagement with schools, voluntary organisations and disability groups, with the approach felt to have reflected Brent's diversity and strong relationships between communities across the borough.

Reflecting on his year in officer, members were also keen to recognise Councillor Hack's positive impact as a role model for young people noting that as Brent's youngest Mayor, he had demonstrated what could be achieved through hard work, dedication and public service. The commitment demonstrated to causes including food poverty and justice, community support and youth engagement were also praised, with members welcoming his continued contribution on these issues as he returned to his role as a ward councillor.

In concluding their remarks, Members once again thanked Councillor Hack for his service as Brent's First Citizen and wished him well for the future. Appreciation was expressed for his friendship, commitment and contribution to the borough during his mayoral year with members also looking forward to his return to active participation in Council business as a ward councillor.

As part of the above contributions Councillor Clinton took the opportunity, whilst expressing his appreciation to the outgoing Mayor, to also reflect on concerns relating to public confidence in politics following the outcome of the recent local election with reference made to increasing levels of voter dissatisfaction, disengagement and a perceived loss of faith in democratic institutions which he felt also need to be considered in celebrating and welcoming the new Mayor. Citing recent local election results from a number of local authorities, these concerns were focused around the ability of the current electoral system to produce outcomes where the proportion of seats won accurately reflected the proportion of votes received, including within Brent, with this he felt highlighting questions about democratic legitimacy and representation. Whilst advocating for reform of the national electoral system, Councillor Clinton also hoped members would reflect on the level of electoral support received by individual parties now represented on the Council prior to any decision being made later in the meeting regarding council leadership and committee appointments for the forthcoming four-year term of the Administration with it hoped, given the composition of the Council, that all of the represented political groups would seek to work collaboratively on a cross party basis rather than through a minority administration relying on the support of other groups in exchange for specific concessions.

The Mayor then invited Councillor Hack to return thanks and review his time in office.

Councillor Hack, in returning thanks, began by expressing his pride at having been elected as Mayor and being able to serve the people of Brent during the previous year. Reflecting on the privilege and honour in being able to serve the borough, the opportunity was taken to thank his friend and former colleague Orleen Hylton as well as the residents of Brent for the trust placed in him during his mayoral year with the opportunities to engage with residents, communities and local organisations across Brent particularly valued.

Highlighting a number of memorable engagements during the year, Councillor Hack made specific reference to receiving warm wishes from former Irish President Michael D. Higgins as well as meeting current President Catherine Connolly and being able to welcome Their Majesties The King and Queen to Brent on a visit to Neasden Temple in addition to attending more than 400 events across the borough. These experiences were ones Councillor Hack stated he would also cherish and would remain among the most memorable aspects of his mayoralty.

Expressing his appreciation for the support and hospitality extended to both himself and his consort throughout the year, Councillor Hack was also keen to commend the warmth, compassion, kindness and generosity shown by residents, other members, community groups and volunteers and to acknowledge the significant contribution made by so many individuals and local organisations to community life in Brent.

Reflecting on the diversity of Brent and the opportunities he had been given to engage with communities from a wide range of backgrounds and faiths, Councillor Hack also highlighted his participation in various cultural and religious celebrations across the borough as well as community gatherings, which he stated had reinforced his sense of belonging within Brent and had highlighted the borough's strength as a diverse and inclusive community.

The Mayor also took the opportunity to pay specific tribute to his consort, Fernando Teles, describing his journey to the United Kingdom from Brazil and his strong affinity with Brent advising members that the warmth and hospitality received as part of their shared experience throughout his mayoral year had further strengthened their appreciation of the borough and its residents.

Turning to his fundraising activity, Councillor Hack advised he was proud to be able to confirm that the Mayoral Appeal had raised in excess of £92,000 in support of his nominated charity, the Brent Irish Advisory Service. He noted that this represented the highest amount ever raised through a Mayoral Appeal in Brent's history and was delighted at the impact this would have in supporting the continuation of welfare and advice services for members of the Irish community and other residents across north-west London, with all members thanked for their support over his mayoral year.

In concluding his remarks, Councillor Hack ended by reflecting on the challenges facing the borough but expressed confidence in the strength, resilience and community spirit of Brent's residents and the character of the borough in terms of the level of mutual support, inclusion and respect for others. In thanking Councillor

Butt for his support during his time in office, as Leader of the Council, he hoped all residents would continue working together with openness, compassion and shared purpose, emphasising that Brent's greatest strength remained its people and the collective spirit of its communities. As a final comment, he also took the opportunity to wish Councillor Agha all the best for his coming year as Mayor, which he was sure he would serve with distinction.

The Mayor thanked Councillor Hack for his comments and ended by wishing him well for the future and then advised that as this now concluded the ceremonial part of the meeting, he would move on to deal with the remainder of the agenda.

6. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared by Members at the meeting.

7. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 23 February 2026 be approved as a correct record.

8. **Appointment of the Leader of the Council**

As this was the first meeting of the new Administration following the local borough elections in May 2026 the Mayor invited nominations for the office of Leader of the Council, which members were advised would be for a term of office to expire at the Annual Council meeting following the next borough election in May 2030.

Prior to nominations being made, Councillor Georgiou advised of an amendment he was seeking to move under Standing Order 42 (a) relating to the process for appointment of the Leader and the subsequent appointments made to Cabinet positions. Referring to discussions between members and the comments made by Councillor Clinton earlier during the meeting, Councillor Georgiou reiterated what he felt to be the importance of developing a more collaborative approach towards the way in which all groups now represented on the Council sought to work with an emphasis on cooperation and partnership as the basis for the Council's future governance arrangements.

Referencing the outcome of the recent borough elections. Councillor Georgiou pointed out that this had not given any single political party a mandate to govern independently and was felt to represent a clear message from the electorate that a more collaborative and inclusive approach was required in terms of the borough's leadership. Having been requested by the Mayor to focus on the substance of amendment being proposed, Councillor Georgiou advised that he would therefore be seeking to propose the adoption of a cross party alliance as the basis for the Council's future governance arrangements involving a Cabinet comprising of nine members allocated on the basis of four Labour Group members, 2 members from the Liberal Democrats and Conservative Groups and one from the Green Group, which it was felt would better reflect the wishes expressed by the electorate at the last borough election and provide a new and more dynamic leadership and governance model for the borough.

Following the outline of the proposed amendment from Councillor Georgiou the Mayor then moved on to seek formal nominations for the position of Leader of the Council. At this stage, Councillor Grahl proceeded to move the nomination of Councillor Muhammed Butt to the office of Leader of the Council.

As a result of clarification provided at the meeting by the Chief Executive regarding the order in which any nominations received and subsequent amendments moved in relation to that process would need to be considered and voted upon, Councillor Georgiou advised that he would no longer be seeking to formally move the proposed amendment he had initially outlined.

This was instead followed by Councillor Lorber formally moving the nomination of Councillor Georgiou to the office of Leader of the Council along with an amendment to the term of office for the position, on the basis that any appointment be for a one rather than four year term of office.

As no further nominations were received the Mayor advised he would now need to move to the vote on the two nominations followed by the amendment on the term of office for Leader.

Reminding members that the appointment of the Leader would be on the basis of a vote requiring a straightforward majority to be achieved, the Mayor advised that once that process had been completed he would then put the amendment moved by Councillor Lorber (on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group) in relation to the term of office for appointment of the Leader to the vote.

Prior to the vote being taken, Councillor Georgiou (as Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group) requested (under Standing Order 43 (c)) that these be undertaken on the basis of a roll call. Having confirmed the request, the Mayor then moved to put the appointment of the Mayor to the vote, which was conducted by the Chief Executive.

On a recorded vote being taken and a straightforward majority being achieved the appointment of Councillor Muhammed Butt was declared **CARRIED** with it therefore **RESOLVED** that Councillor Muhammed Butt be elected Leader of the Council.

Given the outcome, the Mayor confirmed a vote on the nomination of Councillor Georgiou as Leader of the Council would not be required.

The voting recorded on the appointment of Councillor Muhammed Butt as Leader of the Council was as follows:

For (24): Councillors Aden, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Choudry, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kelcher, Knight, Mahmood, McLeish, Rubin and Thomas.

Against: (20): Councillors Ahmadi-Moghaddam, Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Gallagher, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Malonga, Mitchell, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Shah, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Abstentions (11): Councillors Agha (Mayor), Mistry (Deputy Mayor) Chadha, Chowdhury, Do Rosario, Kansagra, Madhabushi, Maurice, Mishra, A.Patel, H.Patel

Having confirmed the appointment of the Leader of the Council, the Mayor then moved on to put the amendment moved by Councillor Lorber (on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group) in relation to the term of office for appointment of the Leader to the vote.

On a recorded vote being taken the amendment was declared **LOST** and it was therefore **RESOLVED** that Councillor Muhammed Butt's appointment as Leader of the Council be for a term of office to expire at the Annual Council meeting in May 2030.

The voting recorded on the amendment moved to change the term of appointment for the Leader of the Council was as follows:

For: (20): Councillors Ahmadi-Moghaddam, Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Gallagher, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Malonga, Mitchell, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Shah, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Against (33): Councillors Aden, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Choudry, Chowdhury, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Madhabushi, Mahmood, Maurice, McLeish, Mishra, A.Patel, H.Patel, Rubin and Thomas.

Abstentions (2): Councillors Agha (Mayor) and Mistry (Deputy Mayor).

9. **Annual Review of Constitution**

The Mayor then moved on to invite Councillor Muhammed Butt (as Leader of the Council) to introduce the report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources detailing a number of proposed changes to the Constitution. In moving the changes outlined within the report, Councillor Muhammed Butt advised that they incorporated a necessary and targeted review of the Constitution prompted by the new political make-up of the Council following the May borough elections. Referring to the existing Standing Orders relating to the submission of advance notice written questions and Group motions at Council meetings, members were advised these had needed to be updated to reflect the new political composition of the Council with the aim to ensure the arrangements remained fair, workable and fit for purpose ahead of the first ordinary Full Council meeting in July.

Confirmation was provided that the report had not been intended to present a wider annual review of the Constitution, with the outcome of that process scheduled to be reported back to Council in July, and instead reflected a narrower and more urgent need to ensure the basic operating rules for questions and motions recognised the new political balance on the Council. Referring to the proposals relating to the allocation of motions and advance notice written questions, Councillor Muhammed Butt advised that the arrangements proposed had followed initial consultation with Group Leaders and involved an allocation reflecting the political balance between Groups on the Council. It was felt the approach outlined would not only provide a clear and fair route allowing Groups to continue to bring matters forward for debate, but would also ensure Council meetings remain manageable and focused whilst allowing members across the Council to hold the administration to account in a way

that remained proportionate, practical and reflective of the new circumstances in which the Council was operating.

In commending the recommended changes to Council, Councillor Muhammed Butt ended by assuring members that the proposals reflected a desire to ensure the Council could continue to conduct its business effectively and fairly and would not prejudge the broader review to come in July.

The Mayor then opened the debate inviting other members to speak on the report, with the following contributions made.

In opening the debate Councillor Mitchell advised of an amendment she was seeking to move at this stage of the meeting under Standing Order 42 (a) in relation to the Council's scrutiny arrangements proposing the establishment of a third Scrutiny Committee, with responsibility for housing-related matters. In moving the amendment, Councillor Mitchell began by highlighting concern at developments during the meeting relating to the appointment of the Leader and Minority Administration, facilitated through the support of the Conservative Group rather than any genuine collaboration of cross party partnership. These were, she felt indicative of wider shortcomings in the current political arrangements in failing to reflect the percentage of the popular vote achieved by each of the respective political groups and the wishes of the electorate.

In light of these concerns, Councillor Mitchell felt it important to recognise the importance of robust checks and balances within the Council's governance arrangements with particular emphasis placed on the role of scrutiny in holding executive members and council officers to account, improving transparency, and helping to secure effective outcomes for residents. As a result, she advised that the Green Group were formally moving an amendment to the report, seeking to explore the establishment (as an additional change to the Constitution) of an additional scrutiny committee with a specific focus on housing in order to strengthen accountability, improve oversight of housing services, and enhance political representation within scrutiny arrangements. In support of the amendment, Councillor Mitchell highlighted that the Council currently operated with fewer scrutiny committees than many other London boroughs, with the existing scrutiny arrangements not felt to provide sufficient capacity to examine all council functions effectively in terms of managing the volume and complexity of work and time available for detailed scrutiny. The focus on housing was highlighted as a specific area of concern in this respect, given the substantial expenditure on temporary accommodation and the calls for improved oversight made by external organisations and stakeholders.

In addition, it was felt the proposed additional scrutiny committee would also provide an opportunity for a broader political representation within the Council's governance arrangements enabling greater opportunities for representation across political groups and in relation to the chairing arrangements which would better reflect the outcome of the recent local election. Referencing comments made earlier in the meeting to collaboration and cross-party working, Councillor Mitchell hoped that all members would support the amendment given the focus on multi-party politics as an increasingly significant feature of both local and national politics and need for all political groups represented on the Council to work collaboratively,

seek compromise, and build consensus in order to achieve the best outcomes for residents.

The Mayor thanked Councillor Mitchell for moving the amendment with the Chief Executive confirming that should the establishment of an additional scrutiny committee be approved this would involve a further report being provided for the July Council meeting setting out detailed proposals in terms of remit, membership and operational arrangements.

Having noted the advice, the Mayor then opened the debate inviting other members to speak, with the following contributions received.

As an in initial contribution, Councillor Georgiou felt further clarification was required on the future arrangements proposed for motions at Full Council meetings based on the consultation undertaken with Group Leaders prior to the meeting with opposition expressed to the provision of five motions per Council meeting, which he felt to be excessive and would restrict the time available to allow sufficient debate on other important issues. Concerns were also expressed at the justification for the proposed allocation of motions between Groups, based on the Council now operating under a minority Administration, and as a result it was felt the arrangements required further reflection and consideration, including the alternative suggestions submitted by the Liberal Democrats Group prior to the meeting.

Speaking next, Councillor Lorber advised of an additional amendment he was also seeking to move at this stage of the meeting under Standing Order 42 (a) proposing a further change to the Constitution with the Council moving from an Executive style of governance and returning to a Committee system style of decision making.

In support of the amendment, members were advised of the limited timescale remaining to enable consideration of the option to return to a committee style system of governance and highlighted his experience of operating under previous committee arrangements, which he felt provided a more democratic decision-making model allowing matters to be fully debated, scrutinised, and considered before decisions were made. As examples of decisions he felt may have benefitted from these type of arrangements, reference was to the change in recycling arrangements, introduction and operation of dockless e-bikes and management of Council owned void properties provided. Referring to comments made during the meeting, Councillor Lorber felt the move to a committee style system would also allow political groups to be represented more effectively in decision-making and would be particularly appropriate in a council where no single party held overall control, enabling the views of all councillors to be heard and better reflecting democratic representation and on this basis he commended the additional amendment to members.

Speaking next, Councillor Kansagra whilst acknowledging that the outcome of the election had returned a Council with no overall control felt there was now a responsibility on all councillors to work collectively in establishing a way forward that would enable the Council to continue functioning effectively and avoid the potential for disruption at future meetings through the provision of a clear structure and process for governance. In welcoming the assurance provided that a more detailed review of constitutional changes would follow he advised the Conservative Group considered this a fair and constructive approach and way forward

highlighting the responsibility on all political groups to work together in the interests of residents. Whilst recognising the importance in ensuring that council decisions remained subject to appropriate scrutiny, it was felt the approach outlined within the proposals moved by the Leader of the Council and assurance regarding an ongoing review of the Constitution would enable an appropriate and constructive way forward which he advised the Conservative Group would support.

As a final contribution to the debate, Councillor Clinton felt it important to highlight the ability for councillors from all Groups to be able to exercise independent judgement and to disagree, where they felt it appropriate with their group leadership. On this basis it was hoped members would consider supporting the amendments outlined as a means of strengthening democratic scrutiny and accountability within the borough. Councillor Clinton advised that he also supported the concerns previously outlined in terms of the existing capacity for effective scrutiny and ended by encouraging any members who disagreed with their group position to voice those concerns in support of improved scrutiny and accountability.

As there were no further members who had indicated they wished to speak, the Mayor having thanked members for their contribution then drew the debate to a close by firstly inviting Councillor Muhammed Butt (as mover of the original report) followed by Councillor Mitchell (as mover of the first amendment) and then Councillor Lorber (as mover of the second amendment) to exercise their rights of reply.

Speaking first, Councillor Muhammed Butt once again outlined what he felt to be the balanced and proportionate basis on which the proposals presented in the report for the provision of motions and advance notice written questions had been developed. Whilst advising that the Labour Group would be willing to consider and support the amendment moved by Councillor Mitchell on the proposed establishment of an additional scrutiny committee focussed around housing, it was pointed out this would be on the basis of any final proposal being developed as part of the wider review of the constitution following the meeting with the opportunity taken, in concluding, to reiterate the commitment made to continue working with all political groups.

Following on Councillor Mitchell, in exercising her right of reply took the opportunity to thank members for the support expressed in terms of developing more effective cross partnership working and collaboration and hoped all members would be willing to support the amendment she had moved in seeking to enhance democratic scrutiny and accountability.

Councillor Lorber was then invited to speak, and in exercising his right of reply once again highlighted the importance of the timescale in support of the consideration of his amendment in advance of forthcoming legislative changes being introduced by the Government relating to local government governance arrangements, which were expected to come into force in June 2026. Referring to the ability introduced under the original localism arrangements, empowering local authorities to determine their own decision-making structures (including the option to not only adopt an Executive style system of governance but also to operate under a committee system) he felt the current Government had moved away from the principle of localism in now removing the ability for Council's to decide for themselves how decision-making should be conducted. Given the anticipated

timescale in which these changes were expected to come into effect, Councillor Lorber advised he had considered it necessary to move the amendment seeking a return to a committee style system of governance enabling its consideration in advance of the option being removed. Members were therefore urged to consider and support the amendment, as a means of promoting the wider engagement of all members in decision-making across the Council and as a means of better serving residents and leading to improved outcomes through a more inclusive decision-making structure.

Having thanked councillors for their contributions, the Mayor then moved to the vote on the proposed changes to the Constitution, which he advised would start with the amendments moved by Councillor Mitchell and then Councillor Lorber, prior a vote on the final substantive recommendations.

Prior to the vote being taken, Councillor Georgiou (as Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group) requested (under Standing Order 43 (c)) that the vote on the amendments moved by Councillor Mitchell and Councillor Lorber be undertaken on the basis of a roll call. Having confirmed the request, the Mayor then moved to put the amendments to the vote, in the order they were moved which was conducted by the Chief Executive.

On a recorded vote being taken the amendment moved by Councillor Mitchell relating to the proposed establishment of a third Scrutiny Committee, with responsibility for housing-related matters was declared **CARRIED** with it therefore **RESOLVED** that the Council (as a further change to the Constitution) explore the establishment of a third scrutiny committee, with a focus on housing related matters. Members were reminded this would be on the basis of the detailed arrangements being subject to further development following the meeting and a final proposal being presented back to the next Council meeting in July 2026.

The voting recorded on the amendment moved by Councillor Mitchell on exploring the establishment of a third scrutiny committee with a focus on housing was as follows:

For (53): Councillors Aden, Ahmadi-Moghaddam, P.Ahmed, Alexandre, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Brown, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Chauhan, Choudry, Chowdhury, Clinton, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Gallagher, Georgiou, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Jansali, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Lorber, Madhabushi, Mahmood, Malonga, Maurice, McLeish, Mishra, Mitchell, Mulaisho, A.Patel, H.Patel, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Rubin, Shah, Thomas, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Abstentions (2): Councillors Agha (Mayor) and Mistry (Deputy Mayor).

The Mayor then moved on to put the amendment moved by Councillor Lorber in relation to adoption of a committee style system of governance and decision making to the vote.

On a recorded vote being taken the amendment was declared **LOST**.

The voting recorded on the amendment moved by Councillor Lorber to adopt a committee style system of governance was as follows:

For: (20): Councillors Ahmadi-Moghaddam, Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Gallagher, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Malonga, Mitchell, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Shah, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Against (33): Councillors Aden, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Choudry, Chowdhury, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Madhabushi, Mahmood, Maurice, McLeish, Mishra, A.Patel, H.Patel, Rubin and Thomas.

Abstentions (2): Councillors Agha (Mayor) and Mistry (Deputy Mayor).

The Mayor then moved on to put the substantive recommendations relating to the constitutional changes detailed within the report (as moved by the Leader of the Council and amended to include exploring the establishment of a third scrutiny committee with a focus on housing) to a vote which was undertaken by a show of hands and unanimously declared **CARRIED**.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** to approve:

- (1) The amendments to Standing Orders 35 and 41 in Part 2 of the Constitution as detailed in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the report.
- (2) To include, as part of the ongoing review of the Constitution, the establishment of a third scrutiny committee with a focus on housing on which a further report would be provided for the Council meeting in July 2026 setting out detailed proposals.
- (3) To authorise the Director of Law to amend the Constitution, accordingly, including making any necessary incidental or consequential changes.

10. **Representation of Political Groups on Committees**

The Mayor then moved on to invite Councillor Muhammed Butt (as Leader of the Council) to introduce the report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources, which the Leader advised fulfilled the Council's duty to review and determine the representation of different political groups on certain Committees at its annual meeting and as soon as practicable following on from the local borough election held on the 7 May 2026. Members were advised the report also detailed the position regarding the appointment of Political Assistants following the outcome of the local election and designation of the Principal Opposition Group.

In moving the report, Councillor Muhammed Butt (as Leader of the Council) outlined the importance of the review in supporting establishment of the Council's new governance arrangements. Whilst acknowledging that that election result had created a more plural Council (in terms of political representation) he felt it was also important to recognise that the Labour Group still remained the largest Group on the Council. As a result, it was pointed out, the review had been designed to ensure the allocation of seats on the committees to which the political balance rules applied were applied lawfully and fairly. Members were reminded that application of the statutory requirements in this respect was not optional and designed to ensure

the allocation on seats on those committees to which they applied were, as far as reasonably practicable, designed to reflect the political composition of the Council whilst also ensuring that the Council's decision-making, scrutiny and regulatory functions were able to operate effectively.

In terms of the allocation of seats on specific committees, Councillor Muhammed Butt confirmed that he was moving the proposals as set out in Table 1 and 2 in section 3 of the report, subject to the final available ordinary seat (which would need to be on the Audit & Standards Committee and also reflected on the Audit & Standards Advisory Committee) being allocated to the Labour Group. Taken overall, it was felt that the approach outlined in the report reflected a balanced and workable arrangement which recognised the overall political composition of the Council and would enable the committees listed to be established without further uncertainty. Turning then to the designation of the Principal Opposition Group, Councillor Muhammed Butt advised that on the basis both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups had the same number of members he would be moving designation of the Conservative Group as the Principal Opposition Group, highlighting the importance in providing clarity around the arrangements for opposition representation and accountability and with the designation designed to reflect the need for a clear, effective opposition role within the Council's governance framework.

As a final issue to be addressed, the Leader also advised that he was proposing that the current allocation of seats on the Health and Wellbeing Board be carried forward (as set out in section 3,12 of the report) until the broader review of the Constitution was completed. This again was felt to represent a sensible and proportionate approach, allowing the Board to continue operating effectively while the Council completed its review of wider constitutional matters. In moving the recommendations and proposals outlined, the Councillor Muhammed Butt ended by outlining the way in which they had been designed to comply with the statutory requirements in relation to the political balance rules whilst also reflecting the recent outcome of the election and need to allow the Council's continued effective governance.

Having thanked Councillor Muhammed Butt for moving the report, the Mayor then drew members attention to an amendment to the recommended allocation of seats submitted on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

In moving the amendment, Councillor Lorber (speaking on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group) began by expressing concern at the basis on which the proposed allocation of seats set out within section 3 of the report (as moved by the Leader of the Council) had been calculated and presented, which he felt did not reconcile and were inconsistent with the total number of 38 seats available. As an alternative, the Liberal Democrats had therefore submitted an amended proposal relating to the allocation of seat between committees, which he felt not only reconciled with the overall number of seats available but would more accurately reflect the political balance of the Council. Using the proposed allocation of seats on the Planning Committee as an example, Councillor Lorber highlighted the way in which the proposed allocation within Table 1 of the report created the potential for contested decisions to be confirmed on the basis of a casting vote effectively giving a group that did not hold an overall majority on the Council control of committee

decisions. Under the Liberal Democrats amendment he advised the overall allocation would be based on a reduced total of 35 committee seats across the ordinary committees to which the political balance rules applied, which it was felt would provide a fairer and more balanced distribution as well as more closely reflecting the overall political balance of the authority, whilst ensuring that the views of all councillors could be adequately represented through committee membership and voting arrangements. In summing up, Councillor Lorber hoped all members would recognise what he felt to be the numerical inconsistency within the original allocation of seats proposed and support the Liberal Democrats amendment on the basis that it would address this position as well as providing an allocation of seats that was more reflective of political balance on the Council and avoid one political group from being able to retain control of committees despite not holding an overall majority on the authority.

The Mayor thanked Councillor Lorber for moving the amendment on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group before inviting other members to speak, with the following contributions received.

In opening the debate, Councillor Georgiou spoke in support of the amendment moved by the Liberal Democrats Group highlighting the need to ensure, that whilst reflecting the rules, the allocation of seats also reflected the outcome and wishes expressed by residents at the recent borough election. Highlighting the basis of the amendment in support of what he felt was a fairer distribution of seats, it was pointed out that approval of the proposed allocation moved by the Leader would enable the Labour Group to retain significant control over those bodies on which the seats were required to be allocated. The opportunity was also taken to challenge the proposed designation of the Conservatives as Principal Opposition Group, with reference made to the way in which the Conservative Group (despite previous criticism of the Labour Group) had acted relating to the appointment of the Leader of the Council, with their subsequent designation as Principal Opposition Group therefore felt to undermine effective opposition and scrutiny. On this basis he advised the Liberal Democrats would be supporting the amendment as moved and against the proposed allocation of seats as detailed within the report as moved by the Leader of the Council.

Speaking next, Councillor Kansagra (responding on behalf of the Conservative Group) advised of the way in which his Group based their approach towards decision making, which he pointed out had always been focussed in seeking to achieve the best outcomes for Brent residents. Examples were provided of the group previously having supported proposals from both the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups where they were considered to reflect this approach, which it was felt contrasted with the approach adopted in the past by members from other opposition groups. Councillor Kansagra also took the opportunity to reject allegations that the Conservative Group had received any form of incentive in relation to the arrangements under discussion, describing such claims as inappropriate with the basis of the approach adopted by his Group being to ensure the Council could move forward (in terms of its governance arrangements) in a way that best served residents and would enable the effective governance of the Council. In advising the Conservative Group would not therefore be supporting the amendment moved by the Liberal Democrats he assured members of his Groups intention in opposition, to continue scrutinising and holding the administration to account.

As a final contribution, Councillor Clinton felt there was a need to challenge the assertion made by Councillor Kansagra regarding the role of Liberal Democrat members in supporting proposals from other parties, with specific reference made to the support provided on the tourist levy and regulation of digital devices in schools as examples. Highlighting that a number of the committee positions under discussion, including the Leader of the Principal Opposition Group, attracted additional allowances Councillor Clinton felt it was fair to question the basis on which any potential arrangement had been reached which enabled the Labour administration to continue governing while securing specific positions for the Conservative Group on other bodies. In summing up he ended by advising that the Liberal Democrats would continue to highlight these type of issues in order to ensure that genuine independent opposition was being provided on behalf of local residents.

As no further members had indicated they wished to speak, the Mayor advised he would not invite members to exercise their right of reply before moving the vote on the amendment and recommendations which had been moved. Prior to inviting members to exercise their right of reply, Councillor Georgiou raised a Point of Order relating to the status of any agreement which may have been reached between the Conservative and Labour Groups, facilitating the continuation of the Labour Group as a minority administration and whether, if such an agreement was in place, that would prevent them being nominated and designated as the Principal Opposition Group.

In response, the Chief Executive clarified the basis on which members of the Executive were appointed and advised that provided members of the opposition group did not form part of the Executive there was nothing to prevent that group being nominated as Principal Opposition Group.

Having received this clarification and advice, the Mayor then moved on to invite Councillor Muhammed Butt (as mover of the original report) and then Councillor Lorber (as mover of the amendment) to exercise their right of reply on the debate.

Speaking first, Councillor Muhammed Butt advised that the Labour Group would not be supporting the amendment moved by the Liberal Democrats and would instead be supporting the proposed allocation of seats as moved and set out in the report, based on these representing a fair and lawful allocation designed to reflect, as far as reasonably practicable, the political composition of the Council whilst ensuring the business of the Council was able to continue being undertaken effectively moving forward.

Moving on to exercise his right of reply, Councillor Lorber once again outlined concerns relating to the basis of the calculations within the proposed allocation of seats set out in the report moved by the Leader of the Council and in ending sought clarification from the Chief Executive that the proposed allocation had been assessed as numerically correct.

Having been invited to provide clarification by the Mayor, the Chief Executive drew members attention to the note which had been included within section 3.8 and Table 1 of the report, which had made clear that based on the rounding up of seats to be allocated between the respective groups there was one final available seat

from the 38 available to which all groups could lay claim to. In order to reflect the existing membership size of the Committees to which the political balance rules applied, this would be on Audit & Standards Committee. The report had therefore been clear that it would be for Council to decide which Group received that final seat, with the Leader having moved, in introducing the report, that this be allocated to the Labour Group.

Having noted the clarification provided, the Mayor then moved on the vote on the report, which he advised would start with the amendment moved by the Councillor Lorber (on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group), prior a vote on the final substantive recommendations.

On being put to the vote (by a show of hands) the amendment moved by Councillor Lorber (on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group) in relation to the alternative allocation of seats on the ordinary committees to which the political balance rules apply was declared **LOST**.

The Mayor then moved on to put the substantive recommendations as detailed within the report moved by the Leader of the Council to a vote.

Prior to the vote being taken, Councillor Georgiou (as Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group) requested (under Standing Order 43 (c)) that the vote on the substantive recommendations in the report be undertaken on the basis of a roll call.

Having confirmed the request, the Mayor then moved to put the substantive recommendations to the vote, which was conducted by the Chief Executive.

On a recorded vote being taken the substantive recommendations as detailed within the report moved by the Leader of the Council were declared **CARRIED**.

The voting recorded on the substantive recommendations was as follows:

For (31): Councillors Aden, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Choudry, Chowdhury, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Madhabushi, Maurice, Mishra, A.Patel, H.Patel, Rubin and Thomas.

Against (22): Councillors Ahmadi-Moghaddam, Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Gallagher, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Mahmood, Malonga, McLeish, Mitchell, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Perrin, Ryan, Shah, Unger, Vakani, Want and Warsame.

Abstentions (2): Councillors Agha (Mayor) and Mistry (Deputy Mayor).

It was therefore **RESOLVED**:

- (1) To agree the size of each Committee, as detailed within the report.
- (2) To approve the allocation of seats on Committees to each of the Council's political groups (where the rules of political balance apply) as set out within the report, including the final available seat (which would be on the Audit & Standards Committee and also reflected on the Audit & Standards Advisory

Committee) being allocated to the Labour Group, and to make appointments to those committees (under agenda item 10 on the agenda) giving effect to the wishes of the political group allocated the seats.

- (3) To note that the political balance on Council Sub-Committees would be reviewed at the first meeting of the General Purposes Committee and Licensing Committee to be held following the Annual Council Meeting.
- (4) To approve the designation of the Conservative Group as the Principal Opposition Group
- (5) To agree provision for the allocation of a political assistant to eligible Groups, on the basis detailed within section 3.15 – 3.19 of the report.

11. **Appointment to Committees and Other Bodies including the appointment of Chairs & Vice-Chairs**

The Mayor then invited Councillor Muhammed Butt (as Leader of the Council) to introduce the report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources.

In introducing the item, the Leader advised that the report set out the nominations for appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and nomination for Chairs and Vice Chairs as well as co-opted members, where necessary, for the 2026 - 27 Municipal Year, with the nominations having been made (where required) in accordance with the political balance of the Council and requirements in relation to political proportionality. Members were advised that the appointments to be made formed an essential part in establishing the Council's governance arrangements for the year ahead. Referring to the alternative nominations included within Appendix 1(b) of the report submitted by the Liberal Democrats Group, Councillor Muhammed Butt advised that he would be moving the proposed appointments to committees, other bodies, Chairs and Vice-Chairs as set out in Appendix 1(a) of the report, with the chairs nominated by the Labour Group highlighted in bold.

Members were also reminded that the proposed appointments reflected the political balance arrangements agreed under the preceding item, whilst (it was felt) also recognising the need for strong and effective scrutiny in a more plural Council. As part of the approach outlined, attention was drawn to the proposed appointment of members from the Principal Opposition Group to chair each of the Council's scrutiny committees, with it pointed out that opportunities had also been made available for the other opposition groups to take up vice-chairing roles should they wish. In addition, members were advised that the Chair and Vice Chair appointments on the Kingsbury and Kenton, Wembley and Kilburn Brent Connect Forums had been offered to the respective opposition groups with the Conservative and Liberal Democrats having made nominations to those posts. Taken together it was felt this provided clear recognition of the need for good governance to involve proper challenge, rigorous scrutiny and effective accountability.

In addition, it was pointed out the report sought to provide continuity in a number of other important areas, including the ongoing appointment of the Council's Independent Persons, the independent co-opted members of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee, and the existing co-opted members of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee. In moving the proposals as

outlined, the Leader ended by once again highlighting the importance in being able to reach agreement on the appointments to be made in order to ensure the Council was able to continue functioning effectively in terms of its governance arrangements and to deliver for residents.

The Mayor then opened the debate inviting other members to speak on the report, with the following contributions made.

In opening the debate, Councillor Georgiou began by highlighting concerns about the basis on which the proposed appointment of Conservative Group members to chair both scrutiny committees had put forward given the close links demonstrated with the Labour administration during the meeting and impact this may have on the ability of scrutiny to continue holding the administration to account. Referring to the previous appointment of more experienced members as scrutiny chairs, whom he felt had been effective in carrying out their responsibilities, concerns were also expressed about the need to ensure the appointments made were also sufficiently independent and experienced rather than based on what he felt constituted a political agreement between the Labour and Conservative Groups enabling the Labour Group to retain control of the administration, despite not having an overall majority of seats. In concluding, Councillor Georgiou also referred to the offer of the Vice-Chair positions to the remaining opposition groups, which he reminded members was in direct contrast with the decision taken following the previous local election in May 2022 to remove the vice chair position as opposition appointments and advised of his intention to ensure residents were reminded of the arrangement reached between the Labour and Conservative Groups relating to formation of the Administration.

Speaking in response, Councillor Kansgara rejected the suggestion that the appointments outlined within Appendix 1(a) of the report represented any form of coalition arrangement and reminded members that opposition groups had sought positions as chairs and vice-chairs of scrutiny committees over a number of years, with the outcome of the recent borough elections having now provided the opportunity for such appointments to be made. In his view the proposals outlined in the report would also provide stability for the Council and enable it to move forward, in terms of the governance arrangements, with appropriate checks and balances. This approach was contrasted with the alternative proposals submitted by the Liberal Democrats, which Councillor Kansgara felt would only have led to further instability in the Council's governance arrangements. In concluding his comments, confirmation was provided that the selection of the nominated scrutiny chairs had been a matter for the Conservative Group to decide, with the assertion that newly elected councillors would not have the necessary experience to chair committees rejected and Councillor Kansgara noting that individuals with limited previous experience had also successfully occupied these type of roles. On this basis, he advised the Conservative Group would be supporting the proposed nominations as moved by the Leader of the Council.

As a further contribution, Councillor Mitchell then spoke to clarify the offer made in relation to the appointment of vice-chair positions on the scrutiny committees, which it was confirmed had been extended to but not accepted by the Green Group. Emphasising the importance of scrutiny in ensuring accountability and effective governance, Councillor Mitchell felt that all members who valued these principles needed to take a close interest in the scrutiny arrangements, with the example

provided of the approach taken by the previous Chair of the Resources & Public Realm Scrutiny Committee in her commitment towards championing robust scrutiny and holding members and officers to account and which it was hoped would also be principles adopted by the new Conservative members nominated to assume the scrutiny chair positions. Referring to her previous experience as a scrutiny member, it was also hoped that members would fully engage in the process, including the need for sufficient preparation and participation during meetings with it also hoped that all members would be able to move forward constructively given the importance in being able to maintain effective scrutiny and accountability within the Council's decision-making framework under the new Administration and to ensure the best outcome for residents.

Supporting the comments made by Councillor Georgiou and Mitchell, Councillor Lorber spoke next to once again highlight the increased importance of effective scrutiny within the Council's new governance arrangements, although once again highlighting his preference for a committee system style of decision making. As a result, he also supported the view that the scrutiny committees needed to be chaired by individuals possessing the necessary experience to ensure scrutiny was conducted effectively and independently and on that basis he advised he would also be nominating (as an alternative to the nominations moved by the Leader of the Council) Councillor Clinton to be appointed as Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Georgiou be appointed as Chair of the Resources & Public Realm Scrutiny Committee.

As a final contribution to the debate, Councillor Chadha spoke in order to respond to concerns raised regarding the experience of newly elected councillors, with assurance provided regarding the commitment of those members nominated within the Conservative Group towards working hard to deliver a robust, effective and independent scrutiny process.

As there were no further members who had indicated they wished to speak, the Mayor thanks members for their contribution and then drew the debate to a close by inviting Councillor Muhammed Butt (as mover of the original report) to exercise his right of reply.

In responding to the debate and alternative nominations moved on behalf of the Liberal Democrats Group in relation to the appointment of scrutiny chair positions, Councillor Muhammed Butt confirmed that the Labour Group would be supporting the proposed nominations as moved and set out in Appendix 1(a) of the report.

Prior to moving to the vote, the Chief Executive in response to clarification sought by Councillor Lorber on the process, confirmed that the alternative nominations moved by the Liberal Democrats in relation to the appointment of scrutiny chair positions would need to be treated as an amendment to the report. At the same time members were also advised of a change in the substitute members nominated by the Leader of the Council on the Barham Park Trust Cabinet Sub Committee. It was noted these appointments should only consist of Cabinet Members, with the change made to therefore be confirmed when the Sub Committee was formally appointed by Cabinet.

Having noted the advice provided, the Mayor then moved to the vote, which he advised would start with the amendment moved by the Councillor Lorber (on behalf

of the Liberal Democrats Group) regarding the nominations for scrutiny chair positions, prior a vote on the final substantive recommendations in the report.

Prior to the vote being taken on the amendment, Councillor Georgiou (as Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group) requested (under Standing Order 43 (c)) that the vote be undertaken on the basis of a roll call.

Having confirmed the request, the Mayor handed over to the Chief Executive and on a recorded vote being taken the amendment relating to the appointment of Councillor Clinton as Chair of the Community & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Georgio as Chair of the Resources & Public Realm Scrutiny Committee was declared **LOST**.

The voting recorded on the substantive recommendations was as follows:

For (12): Councillors Alexandre, Brown, Chauhan, Clinton, Georgiou, Jansali, Lorber, Mulaisho, N.Patel, Shah, Unger and Want.

Against (39): Councillors Aden, P.Ahmed, Amadi, Anderson, Bajwa, Blackman, Burn, M.Butt, S.Butt, Chadha, Choudry, Chowdhury, Dar, De Souza, Dixon, Donnelly-Jackson, Do Rosario, Gallagher, Grahl, Hack, Ibrahim, Johnson, Kansagra, Kelcher, Knight, Madhabushi, Mahmood, Malonga, Maurice, McLeish, Mishra, Mitchell, A.Patel, H.Patel, Perrin, Rubin, Ryan, Thomas and Vakani.

Abstentions: Councillor Agha (Mayor) and Mistry (Deputy Mayor).

The Mayor then moved on to put the substantive recommendations relating to the appointments detailed within Appendix 1(a) of the report, as moved by the Leader of the Council, to a vote (by show of hands) which was declared **CARRIED**.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** to:

- (1) To approve the appointments of Members, Co-Opted Members and substitutes to Council Committees and Outside Bodies as set out in Appendix 1(a) and section 3.2.4 of the report.
- (2) To approve the appointment of Chairs/Vice Chairs to Council Committees as set out in Appendix 1(a) for the 2026-2027 Municipal Year.
- (3) To note the appointments:
 - (a) To the Cabinet, Cabinet Committees and Joint Executive Committees and their respective Chairs and Vice Chairs for the 2026-2027 Municipal Year, as detailed in Appendix 1(a) of the report.
 - (b) to be confirmed by the General Purposes Committee for the 2026-2027 Municipal Year, as detailed in Appendix 1(a) of the report.
 - (c) to be confirmed by Licensing Committee for the 2026-2027 Municipal Year, as detailed in Appendix 1(a) of the report.

(The full list of appointments can be found as part of the appendices to the main report republished prior to the meeting)

12. **Calendar of Council Meetings for the 2026 -2027 Municipal Year**

The Mayor then invited Councillor Muhammed Butt (as Leader of the Council) to introduce the report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources which the Leader advised detailed the calendar of meeting dates for Full Council and other meetings during the 2026 - 27 Municipal Year.

As no members indicated that they wished to speak on the item the recommendations in the report were put straight to the vote by the Mayor and were unanimously declared **CARRIED**.

It was therefore **RESOLVED**:

- (1) To approve the dates for Full Council and other meetings to take place during the 2026-27 Municipal Year, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.
- (2) That the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance be authorised to make any alterations deemed necessary to the Municipal Calendar during the course of the year having consulted with the Leader of the Council, Leaders of the Opposition Group(s) and Chair of the affected meeting.

13. **Urgent Business**

As there was no urgent business to be transacted the Mayor declared the Annual Meeting closed and advised that he looked forward to seeing all members at the next Council meeting on Monday 6 July 2026.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm

COUNCILLOR AMER AGHA MB BS, MSC, PHCM
Mayor

Full Council – 6 November 2026

Agenda Item 5 – Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies

Standing Order 30(g) states that, if necessary, Full Council is required to agree appointments to committees and outside bodies. In addition to the changes listed Council is being asked to confirm the appointment of an Independent Person

Such appointments are set out below:

Committee Membership

- (1) Councillor Perrin to replace Councillor Mitchell as a full member of the Audit & Standards and Audit & Standards Advisory Committee.
- (2) Councillor Jayanti Patel to replace Councillor Kansagra as a full member of the Audit & Standards and Audit & Standards Advisory Committee.
- (3) Councillor Mitchell to replace Councillor Perrin as a substitute member of the Audit & Standards and Audit & Standards Advisory Committee.
- (4) Councillor Rubin to replace Councillor Thomas as Chair of the Corporate Parenting Committee.
- (5) Councillor Hack to fill vacancy as Chair and Councillor Thomas to fill vacancy as Vice Chair on Kilburn Brent Connects.
- (6) Councillor Muhammed Butt to replace Councillor Grahl as the Council's nominated representative on the London Councils Greater London Employment Forum with Councillor Grahl to replace Councillor Muhammed Butt as deputy.



Brent

Outside Bodies

- (1) Councillors Johnson, Mahmood and Rubin to fill the vacancies on the Agreed Syllabus Conference and Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE)

Please note: If required, any further membership changes to be notified at the meeting



Item 7.1: Questions from Members of the Public

Full Council – 6 July 2026

1. **Question from Chi Wong to Councillor Robert Johnson (Cabinet Member for Housing, Homelessness and Renters)**

As a tenant living in the private rented sector, can the Cabinet Member for Housing, Homelessness and Renters provide further details on the protections included within the Renters Right Act regarding the renewal of tenancy agreements and support the Council is able to provide for tenants in terms of advice and guidance relating to their rights under the Act.

Response:

The Renters' Rights Act is a transformational landmark for private renters.

Under the Renters' Rights Act, the approach to tenancy renewals has fundamentally changed.

Fixed term Assured Shorthold Tenancies have been abolished and replaced with Assured Periodic Tenancies, meaning that tenants no longer need to renew their tenancy agreement at the end of a fixed term. Instead, tenancies continue on a rolling basis until either the tenant chooses to leave or the landlord regains possession using one of the statutory grounds set out in legislation. Section 21 "no fault" evictions have also been abolished, providing tenants with greater security of tenure.

In practical terms, Private Housing Services working in partnership with Housing Needs are supporting the implementation of these protections by:

- Providing clear advice and guidance to tenants on their rights under the Act, including security of tenure, notice periods and protections from unfair eviction.
- Offering tenancy sustainment services to help prevent homelessness and support tenants to remain in their homes.
- Providing early intervention and mediation services where disputes arise between landlords and tenants.
- Assisting tenants to challenge unlawful evictions, excessive rent increases or discriminatory practices.

- Signposting tenants to specialist legal advice and advocacy services where required.
- Working proactively with landlords to encourage compliance with the new legislative framework.
- Using enforcement powers where appropriate to address breaches of housing legislation and poor management practices.

We are also making sure that information relating to the Renters' Rights Act is readily accessible through **our** website, customer contact channels and community engagement activities.

In relation to tenancy agreements specifically, tenants should be advised that landlords can no longer require them to sign a new fixed term agreement in order to remain in their home. Tenancies continue automatically unless ended by the tenant or through a lawful possession process. Rent increases are also subject to statutory controls, with landlords generally limited to one increase per year through the prescribed legal process.

By providing timely advice, effective enforcement and targeted support, we want to play an important role in ensuring tenants benefit fully from the enhanced protections introduced by the Renters' Rights Act.

The Housing Needs Service have curated a new team to help support the department's response and implementation of the new legislation, combining the new opportunities the Act brings to sustain Private Rented Sector (PRS) tenancies in the borough, and to support and work collaboratively with the Private Housing Services team under the new enforcement powers relating to Landlord compliance.

The recently formed Private Rented Sector Sustainment & Compliance Team consists of 3 specialised senior officers, who are on hand to intervene with early rent concerns, tenant and landlord disputes before the situation escalates or the Landlord is seeking to end the tenancy, as well as any scenario where there is the possibility that the tenancy can either be sustained, or, where there is evidence to suggest a breach by the Landlord under the Act.

The aim is to grasp tenancy concerns ahead of them spiralling, using early intervention and pro-active assistance to resolve the issues with the tenant and Landlord, in turn avoiding the need (where a statutory duty has not been triggered) of a homelessness application and the cost and resource associated with that, as well as the potential need to use costly temporary accommodation further down the line.

The team can be reached via their dedicated inbox which is monitored throughout the day. Incoming enquiries are received directly from residents and landlords, as well as internal referrals from colleagues in Homelessness Service, and other teams such as Brent Hubs where there is potential to sustain a tenancy and keep residents in their home.

The inbox is already proving to be busy with lots of requests for advice and assistance in relation to PRS tenancies, rent concerns, and scenarios of Landlord harassment and verbally ended tenancies.

We recognise the importance of education for residents on the vast changes that the Renters Rights Act brings. If residents are unaware of the changes, they may not be aware of their rights, and in turn could be exposed to potential unlawful action by their Landlords, or if their Landlord has committed a breach.

The PRS Sustainment & Compliance Team are responsible for contributing to the continued education of their colleagues on the Act and key legislative changes, and for helping support information sharing, and providing advice to residents on their new rights.

The team are connecting with a number of internal and external partners to ensure consistent messaging is made through means that are accessible to tenants, as well as a leaflet and pamphlet to supplement the information made available on our website relating to the changes.

For residents seeking advice on their rights under the Act, any tenancy related concerns, or any questions related to the Renters Rights Act, enquiries can be sent to the team on:

PRSSustainmentAndCompliance@brent.gov.uk

2. **Question from Ranya Dauteva to Councillor Robert Johnson (Cabinet Member for Housing, Homelessness and Renters) and Councillor Tina Amadi (Cabinet Member for Communities, Culture & Cost of Living Support)**

From my experience as a sole parent and full-time carer of my son, please could you advise why families such as mine caring for disabled children continue to face lengthy delays in housing assessments and Blue Badge applications despite providing medical evidence and supporting documents.

Families in these type of circumstances require stability, routine and appropriate housing with delays in the assessment of housing and Blue Badge applications having a direct impact on wellbeing, safety and daily life.

Can the Cabinet Members therefore explain what action is being taken to reduce waiting times for disabled families and provide clearer communication regarding these type of applications and assessments?

Response:

Response from Councillor Robert Johnson:

Any household experiencing housing need is able to apply to join the Council's housing register (the waiting list for social housing). In more urgent or serious circumstances, households may instead make an application under homelessness legislation. In both cases, the Council undertakes an assessment of the household's circumstances to determine whether the relevant statutory thresholds are met and what duties, if any, are owed.

There should not be undue delay in the assessment itself. However, where an assessment identifies that a household requires alternative suitable accommodation, it is often at this stage that delays arise. These delays are not typically due to the assessment process but rather reflect the acute shortage of affordable housing within Brent.

There is a significant lack of available accommodation across both the private rented sector and the social housing sector. This scarcity means that, even where a need is clearly established, it can take a considerable amount of time to secure suitable accommodation that meets the household's needs.

The Council recognises these challenges and is actively working to increase the supply of affordable housing. This includes delivery through the Council's New Homes Programme, the acquisition of properties via Invest for Brent, and the use of leasing schemes to expand the pool of available accommodation.

Response from Councillor Tina Amadi:

In relation to Blue Badge applications, our target for completing the assessment is 10 working days. However, where applications are more complex, or where further medical or Occupational Therapy evidence is required, assessments can take longer.

Once the application has been approved residents can expect to receive their Blue Badge within 15 working days.

Unfortunately, we experienced short-term resourcing pressures during the year-end period which contributed to delays in some cases with the longest processing time at 23 days. The service is now back at full capacity, and over 100 additional applications have been assessed in the past month. The most urgent cases, including those with terminal conditions, are being prioritised and we expect to have returned to our processing target of 10 working days for the majority of applications within the next two to three months.



Item 7.2: Questions from Brent Youth Parliament

Full Council – 6 July 2026

1. **Question from Brent Youth Parliament to Councillor Jake Rubin (Cabinet Member for Children Services, Employment & Climate Action)**

When can we expect to see progress on the Educational Maintenance Allowance being introduced for young people in the borough?

Response:

The Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA) was a key manifesto commitment of Brent Labour Party, and introducing it is a top priority of this administration. The Brent EMA will play a key role in providing practical cost of living support to young people in Brent schools, while helping to tackle poverty and the inequalities of outcome that affect young people in education across the borough.

We have commenced development work on the proposal to introduce an Educational Maintenance Allowance for young people studying post-16 in Brent. This involves research on current EMA systems (for example in Scotland, Wales and more locally in Tower Hamlets), analysis of Brent post-16 data and developing costed options for a Brent EMA system. The options being developed may include the pupils who would be eligible for an EMA, proposed EMA rates and monitoring processes. It is likely that eligibility for the EMA would be linked to attendance.

As part of this work, consideration will need to be given to identifying a budget as part of the budget planning process and well as consultation with stakeholders, such as the Brent Youth Parliament.

The expectation is that the EMA could be introduced from September 2027, if not sooner.



Item 9.1

Full Council – 6 July 2026

Labour Group Motion

Declaring a Gambling Harms Emergency in Brent

This Council notes:

- That gambling harm is a public health, community safety and issue of pride in Brent, with a visible concentration of betting shops and adult gaming centres in our most deprived communities.
- That Brent's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment identified the financial, health and social costs of gambling harm locally, including its links to debt, poor mental health, family breakdown, crime and inequality.
- That Brent has led a national campaign for gambling reform, working with over 40 councils, alongside Dawn Butler MP and Andy Burnham MP to call for a five-point plan for change, including stronger local licensing powers, the removal of the outdated "aim to permit" duty, greater public health oversight and tougher enforcement.
- That Brent Council sponsored the Social Market Foundation report '*High Streets at Stake*', which highlighted the growth of adult gaming centres and the weakness of the current licensing framework.
- The impact of this campaigning in securing a change in the law, with the Government legislating for Gambling Impact Assessments, so that when enacted, councils can introduce presumption against new premises licences in vulnerable areas.

This Council believes that:

- Gambling harm should be treated as a serious public health emergency.
- Residents should not have to watch their high streets permeated with gambling premises while councils are left with limited powers to act, and where residents and councils do not want gambling premises, they should have the power to say no.

- Residents and community leaders in Wembley, Willesden and Kilburn should be thanked for speaking with one voice in opposition to the further spread of gambling premises.
- With 81 licensed gambling premises in Brent, it is easier to find a betting shop or adult gaming centre than a supermarket. Any limited business activity these premises bring is far outweighed by the wider harm they cause.
- The growth of the gambling industry should not be supported in our borough and that every lawful tool available should be used to create a hostile environment to its entrenchment.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) Declare a gambling harms emergency in Brent and launch a Gambling Harms Strategy, setting out a joined-up approach across licensing, planning, public health, community safety, schools, debt advice and resident support.
- (2) Welcome the new Gambling Impact Assessment powers and urge Government to set a commencement date as soon as possible, so the new provisions can be implemented without delay and operators cannot rush applications through under the old regime before councils are equipped to act.
- (3) Write to major landowners in Wembley reiterating the Council's opposition to gambling advertising and the normalisation of gambling in public spaces.
- (4) Write to the Gambling Commission challenging its hands-off approach to local licensing, making clear that Brent believes communities and their elected representatives, not distant regulators or the courts, should have the strongest voice in deciding what venues are on their high streets.
- (5) Continue working with residents, MPs, councils and campaigners across the country to push for a new Gambling Act that puts public health first.

Councillor Jasbinder Bajwa
Kingsbury Ward

Full Council – 6 July 2026

Conservative Group Motion

Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy: Transparency, Strategic Use and Scrutiny

This Council notes:

- That Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy, known as SCIL, is a significant funding stream derived from development and is intended to support infrastructure needed to accommodate growth across Brent.
- That recent debate in Brent has highlighted legitimate questions about how SCIL schemes are identified, prioritised and brought forward for decision, and whether members and residents are given sufficient clarity in advance.
- That the Council has itself acknowledged the need for a more strategic approach to Community Infrastructure Levy funding, including clearer alignment with infrastructure planning and more robust scrutiny of proposed allocations.
- That residents are entitled to confidence that SCIL is being used transparently, strategically and for infrastructure genuinely linked to growth and development pressures.

This Council believes:

- That SCIL funding should be allocated based on clear evidence, transparency and demonstrable public value.
- That all major proposed SCIL schemes should be accompanied by clear information on cost, rationale, delivery timetable and expected outcomes.
- That the Council should show explicitly how each proposed SCIL allocation supports growth related infrastructure needs, rather than using SCIL to address long standing issues that ought to be funded through other means.
- That in a Council with no overall control, all political groups should have a meaningful opportunity to scrutinise major SCIL proposals before final decisions are taken.

As a result, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Request that Cabinet publish an annual forward pipeline of proposed SCIL schemes, including indicative costings, intended timelines and the service area or location concerned.
- (2) Request that every future report seeking approval for major SCIL allocations includes a clear written statement explaining why the proposed scheme qualifies for SCIL support and how it relates to infrastructure needed to support development and growth.
- (3) Request that, before any major new SCIL allocation is considered by Cabinet, all Group Leaders or their nominees are offered a briefing on the proposed programme and the basis on which schemes have been selected.
- (4) Request a quarterly update to all councillors setting out the SCIL balance, new receipts, allocations, expenditure and remaining available funds.
- (5) Request the provision of an annual public report setting out SCIL allocations approved, expenditure committed, progress of delivery and outcomes achieved.

Councillor Jayanti Patel
Queensbury Ward

Full Council – 6 July 2026

**Amendment submitted by the Liberal Democrats Group to the
Conservative Group Motion**

Proposed amendment – To add the wording underlined in red:

**Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy: Transparency, Strategic
Use and Scrutiny**

This Council notes:

- That Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy, known as SCIL, is a significant funding stream derived from development and is intended to support infrastructure needed to accommodate growth across Brent.
- That recent debate in Brent has highlighted legitimate questions about how SCIL schemes are identified, prioritised and brought forward for decision, and whether members and residents are given sufficient clarity in advance.
- That the Council has itself acknowledged the need for a more strategic approach to Community Infrastructure Levy funding, including clearer alignment with infrastructure planning and more robust scrutiny of proposed allocations.
- That residents are entitled to confidence that SCIL is being used transparently, strategically and for infrastructure genuinely linked to growth and development pressures.
- In February 2026 £80m of SCIL was allocated to projects not yet started, agreed by the previous administration.
- In February 2026 the projected cost to repair the backlog of highest priority roads was £44.7m. The pavements backlog would cost £310.7m.

This Council believes:

- That SCIL funding should be allocated based on clear evidence, transparency and demonstrable public value.
- That all major proposed SCIL schemes should be accompanied by clear information on cost, rationale, delivery timetable and expected outcomes.

- That the Council should show explicitly how each proposed SCIL allocation supports growth related infrastructure needs, rather than using SCIL to address long standing issues that ought to be funded through other means.
- That in a Council with no overall control, all political groups should have a meaningful opportunity to scrutinise major SCIL proposals before final decisions are taken.
- That we must prioritise a proportion of SCIL funding for repairs to roads and pavement to stop the backlog increasing further. This must be done in growth areas due to rules governing CIL but will benefit the whole borough by taking pressure off the reactive repairs team.

As a result, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Request that Cabinet publish an annual forward pipeline of proposed SCIL schemes, including indicative costings, intended timelines and the service area or location concerned.
- (2) Request that every future report seeking approval for major SCIL allocations includes a clear written statement explaining why the proposed scheme qualifies for SCIL support and how it relates to infrastructure needed to support development and growth.
- (3) Request that, before any major new SCIL allocation is considered by Cabinet, all Group Leaders or their nominees are offered a briefing on the proposed programme and the basis on which schemes have been selected.
- (4) Request a quarterly update to all councillors setting out the SCIL balance, new receipts, allocations, expenditure and remaining available funds.
- (5) Request the provision of an annual public report setting out SCIL allocations approved, expenditure committed, progress of delivery and outcomes achieved.
- (6) Ensure that planned SCIL projects not yet started are reviewed by the group leaders (or nominees) – and request cabinet have regard to their recommendations.
- (7) Request that a portion SCIL is invested in road/pavement resurfacing in growth areas.

Councillor Charlie Clinton
Alperton Ward

Full Council – 6 July 2026

Amendment submitted by the Green Group to the Conservative Group Motion

Proposed amendment – To add the wording underlined in red:

Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy: Transparency, Strategic Use and Scrutiny

This Council notes:

- That Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy, known as SCIL, is a significant funding stream derived from development and is intended to support infrastructure needed to accommodate growth across Brent.
- That recent debate in Brent has highlighted legitimate questions about how SCIL schemes are identified, prioritised and brought forward for decision, and whether members and residents are given sufficient clarity in advance.
- That the Council has itself acknowledged the need for a more strategic approach to Community Infrastructure Levy funding, including clearer alignment with infrastructure planning and more robust scrutiny of proposed allocations.
- That residents are entitled to confidence that SCIL is being used transparently, strategically and for infrastructure genuinely linked to growth and development pressures.
- That the Infrastructure Funding Statement for 2024-2025, providing a crucial view of SCIL allocation and spending, is delayed, and that Brent has not published an Infrastructure Development Plan since 2019.

This Council believes:

- That SCIL funding should be allocated based on clear evidence, transparency and demonstrable public value.
- That SCIL spending should be aligned to more a transparent, up-to-date and granular documentation of local needs, e.g. a refreshed Infrastructure Development Plan, or town plans.

- That all major proposed SCIL schemes should be accompanied by clear information on cost, rationale, delivery timetable and expected outcomes.
- That the Council should show explicitly how each proposed SCIL allocation supports growth related infrastructure needs, rather than using SCIL to address long standing issues that ought to be funded through other means.
- That in a Council with no overall control, all political groups should have a meaningful opportunity to scrutinise major SCIL proposals before final decisions are taken.

As a result, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Request that Cabinet publish an annual forward pipeline of proposed SCIL schemes, including indicative costings, intended timelines and the service area or location concerned.
- (2) Request there is no further delay with the Infrastructure Funding Statement for 24-25, on the Cabinet agenda for 27th July.
- (3) Request that decision-making for SCIL spending is based on an up-to-date, detailed documentation of local needs.
- ~~(2)~~(4) Request that every future report seeking approval for major SCIL allocations includes a clear written statement explaining why the proposed scheme qualifies for SCIL support and how it relates to infrastructure needed to support development and growth.
- ~~(3)~~ (5) Request that, before any major new SCIL allocation is considered by Cabinet, all Group Leaders or their nominees are offered a briefing on the proposed programme and the basis on which schemes have been selected.
- (6) Request that all Group Leaders or their nominees are briefed on allocated but not implemented SCIL funded projects.
- ~~(4)~~ (7) Request a quarterly update to all councillors setting out the SCIL balance, new receipts, allocations, expenditure and remaining available funds.
- ~~(5)~~ (8) Request the provision of an annual public report setting out SCIL allocations approved, expenditure committed, progress of delivery and outcomes achieved.

Councillor Mary Mitchell
Willesden Green Ward

Full Council – 6 July 2026

Liberal Democrats Group Motion

Providing Choice to Improve Recycling Rates Across Brent

This Council notes:

- Brent continues to lag behind many London boroughs on household recycling. While residents overwhelmingly support recycling and want to help tackle climate change, the Council's current system does not make recycling easy enough.
- Brent's household recycling rate remains around 30%, well below the Mayor of London's ambition of 50% municipal recycling by 2030 and behind several Liberal Democrat-run councils, including Kingston, Sutton and Richmond, which consistently exceed 45%. Their performance shows that better collection systems, clearer communication and stronger resident engagement can deliver higher recycling rates.
- Brent's blue recycling sacks have not solved this problem. Residents continue to raise concerns about split or disintegrating sacks, litter, storage difficulties and confusion over what can be recycled. Three years after the Brent Liberal Democrats first called for the sacks to be scrapped, they have failed to deliver the improvement promised.
- As Brent seeks to cut carbon emissions, reduce waste disposal costs and create cleaner neighbourhoods, improving recycling must be a key environmental priority.

This Council therefore believes that:

- Brent's recycling performance is not good enough and must improve.
- Blue recycling sacks should no longer be treated as Brent's default recycling model. Any continued use should be justified by clear evidence that sacks are wanted by residents in the relevant area, are practical for those households, and perform better than alternatives in increasing recycling, reducing contamination and keeping streets clean.
- Residents deserve a recycling service that is simple, convenient and encourages maximum participation.

- Targeted education and engagement are essential to improve recycling rates and reduce contamination.
- Brent should learn from the best-performing London boroughs and adopt approaches that work locally.

This Council therefore requests that Cabinet:

- (1) End the blanket reliance on blue recycling sacks as Brent's default collection model and carry out an urgent, evidence-led review of alternative recycling arrangements, with a presumption in favour of replacing sacks with wheelie bins where sacks are causing problems for residents, contributing to litter, reducing participation or failing to improve recycling.
- (2) Ensure any proposal to retain sacks in a particular area, housing type or circumstance is backed by published evidence, including resident feedback, recycling performance, contamination, street cleanliness, accessibility, storage and value for money.
- (3) Undertake an urgent options appraisal of the most effective recycling collection models for Brent, including additional wheelie bins, segregated containers, improved communal recycling and other best-practice systems.
- (4) Offer households who want one the option of an additional wheelie bin for segregated recycling, as first proposed by the Brent Liberal Democrat Group in 2023.
- (5) Develop targeted education and public awareness work with schools, community organisations, housing providers and residents' associations.
- (6) Improve recycling in flats and estates, where participation remains lower than elsewhere.
- (7) Present the review and new recycling strategy to the next Full Council, including a timetable for a more effective, resident-friendly collection model.
- (8) Set ambitious annual targets to increase household recycling, with regular public reporting and clear accountability.

Councillor Krishna Chauhan
Alperton Ward

Full Council – 6 July 2026

Amendment submitted by the Labour Group to the Liberal Democrats Group Motion

Proposed amendment – To add the wording underlined and delete the wording indicated:

Providing Choice to Improve Recycling Rates Across Brent

This Council notes:

- Brent continues to lag behind many London boroughs on household recycling, although evidence shows Brent is the leading the way with food waste collection with the 6th highest figures in London. While residents overwhelmingly support recycling and want to help tackle climate change, the Council's current system must continue to be made easier, clearer and more consistent for residents. ~~does not make recycling easy enough.~~
- Brent's household recycling rate remains around 30%, with the Government's Simpler Recycling reforms now requiring separation of waste streams, including paper and card by default, Brent has a responsibility and opportunity to improve its approach and deliver a recycling scheme that is legally compliant, environmentally effective and practical. ~~well below the Mayor of London's ambition of 50% municipal recycling by 2030 and behind several Liberal Democrat-run councils, including Kingston, Sutton and Richmond, which consistently exceed 45%. Their performance shows that better collection systems, clearer communication and stronger resident engagement can deliver higher recycling rates.~~
- Brent's blue recycling sacks have not on their own solved this problem. Residents continue to raise concerns about split or disintegrating sacks, litter, storage difficulties and confusion over what can be recycled. Three years after the Brent Liberal Democrats first called for the sacks to be scrapped, they the scheme has improved paper and card quality, but not yet delivered the step-change needed to meet Brent's climate ambitions. ~~failed to deliver the improvement promised.~~
- As Brent seeks to cut carbon emissions, reduce waste disposal costs and create cleaner neighbourhoods, improving recycling ~~must~~ continues to be a key environmental priority.

This Council therefore believes that:

- Brent's recycling performance is not good enough and must improve.
- Blue recycling sacks should not longer be treated as Brent's default recycling model in every circumstance. Any Ccontinued use should be justified by clear evidence that sacks are wanted by residents in the relevant area, are practical for these households, and perform better than alternatives in increasing recycling, reducing contamination and keeping streets clean.
- Residents deserve a recycling service that is simple, convenient and encourages maximum participation.
- Targeted education and engagement are essential to improve recycling rates and reduce contamination.
- Brent should will learn from the best-performing London boroughs and adopt approaches that work locally.

This Council therefore requests that Cabinet:

- (1) ~~End~~ Review the blanket current reliance use on of blue recycling sacks as Brent's default collection model and carry out an urgent, evidence-led review of alternative Brent's recycling arrangements, ~~with a presumption in favour of replacing sacks with~~ considering the case for wheelie bins where sacks are causing problems for residents, contributing to litter, reducing participation or failing to improve recycling.
- (2) Ensure any proposal to retain sacks in a particular area, housing type or circumstance is backed by published evidence, including resident feedback, recycling performance, contamination, street cleanliness, accessibility, storage and value for money.
- (3) Undertake a timely ~~n-urgent~~ options appraisal of the most effective recycling collection models for Brent, including additional wheelie bins, segregated containers, improved communal recycling and other best-practice systems.
- (4) Offer households who want one the option of an additional wheelie bin for segregated paper and card recycling, ~~as first proposed by the Brent Liberal Democrat Group in 2023.~~ where practical, subject to cost.
- (5) ~~Develop~~ Continue strengthening targeted education and public awareness work with schools, community organisations, housing providers and residents' associations.
- (6) Improve recycling in flats and estates, where participation remains lower than elsewhere.
- (7) Present the review ~~and new recycling strategy~~ to the a next future Full Council Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee, ~~including a timetable for a~~

more effective, detailing Brent's commitment to a resident-friendly collection model.

Councillor Promise Knight
Stonebridge Ward

This page is intentionally left blank



Questions from the Opposition and Other Non-Cabinet Members

Full Council – 6 July 2026

1. **Question from Councillor Samiah Anderson to Councillor Matt Kelcher (Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Planning)**

Can the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Planning update Full Council on the long-awaited roof and fascia replacement works at Donnington Primary School, and explain how this £561,000 investment will fix significant leaks, make the school building weather-tight and safe, and support our commitment to investing in Brent's next generation by giving local children the decent classrooms they need to get the best start in life?

Response:

This administration is determined to ensure that every child in Brent gets the best start in life and is able to fulfil their potential. A key part of this vision is to ensure that every one of our 36 local community schools is a safe, welcoming and supportive learning environment.

The council receives funding from the Department for Education (DfE) to support local schools via the School Condition Funding Allocation (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/school-capital-funding>). We have received an uplift of around £400,000 for the year 2026/27 compared to previous years.

To ensure that this funding is used to deliver the highest priority improvements, the council undertakes condition surveys of the schools and forms a three-year programme of improvement investment which is approved by Cabinet and Full Council.

The roof replacement project at Donnington Primary School was identified as a priority and to be completed in the summer 2026. Our investment will replace the flat roof coverings and fascias as the current roof covering and fascias have reached the end of their life. The project will provide a new, roof manufacturer backed guarantee and warranty for 20 years meaning that the roof will prevent water ingress into classrooms for many years to come.

The outcome will be a school environment which is better protected from water ingress and leaks which means there will be fewer interruptions to learning and better outcomes for local families and children for years to come.

2. Question from Ryan Hack to Councillor Jake Rubin (Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Employment & Climate Action)

Can the Cabinet Member Children's Services, Employment and Climate Action update Full Council on how Brent's landmark investment of up to £11.2 million in SCIL funding is helping to unlock the £92 million state-of-the-art College of North West London campus on Olympic Way, and set out what difference this will make for students by opening up exciting new pathways into construction, digital, green technology and future skills, while also enabling the delivery of 1,934 much-needed new homes, including affordable homes, on the existing college sites?

Response:

Thank you for your question.

Brent Council is working with the United Colleges Group, the Department for Education, and the Greater London Authority to deliver a brand-new campus for the College of North West London on Olympic Way in Wembley Park.

In 2019, the Council committed £6.5 million of Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy funding to support the project. Following a review of the latest proposals, we increased that commitment in our 2026 budget to up to £11.2 million, helping turn this long-held ambition into reality. We are pleased demolition is now underway and look forward to construction beginning on this state-of-the-art campus.

The new college will expand opportunities for Brent residents, providing high-quality post-16 and adult education that aligns with our Employment and Skills Strategy. Working with the College, we will continue developing courses that meet local employer demand in sectors such as construction, digital, AI and green industries, helping residents gain the skills needed for well-paid jobs.

The campus will also strengthen Wembley Park as a destination for learning, innovation, and investment, supporting the area's wider regeneration alongside new homes, businesses, and public spaces.

Alongside this, the Council has granted planning permission to redevelop the former College of North West London sites in Willesden and Wembley, delivering over 1,900 new homes, including at least 20% affordable housing, as well as commercial space, community facilities, and a new public park. Construction is now underway on both sites, demonstrating our commitment to delivering new homes, infrastructure, and opportunities for Brent residents.

3. Question from Councillor Michael Maurice to Councillor Promise Knight (Cabinet Member for Cleaner Streets, Transport & Public Realm)

Given the significant number of Penalty Charge Notices being issued under Brent's School Street schemes, and the repeated concerns raised by residents and motorists that signage at some locations is unclear, poorly positioned or difficult to interpret safely while driving, could the Cabinet Member for Cleaner Streets, Transport & Public Realm:

- (a) set out what review the Council has undertaken of signage, layout and public information across all School Street locations to ensure that these schemes are operating fairly and lawfully.
- (b) furthermore, can the Cabinet Member confirm how many Penalty Charge Notices have been issued under Brent's School Street schemes in the last 12 months, broken down by location, and whether the Council has identified any sites with especially high numbers of notices that may suggest motorists are being caught out by inadequate signage or poor scheme design rather than acting in deliberate breach of the rules.
- (c) Finally, given that School Street schemes are presented by the Council as measures intended to improve child safety and reduce pollution, can the Cabinet Member explain what objective test the Council applies to ensure that these schemes are delivering those aims in practice and are not operating in a manner that reasonably gives residents and visitors the impression that they are serving as revenue generating measures?

Response:

- (a) Brent Council is committed to ensuring that all School Street schemes operate fairly, lawfully and effectively. All School Street signage within the borough is compliant with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD), which sets the national legal requirements for traffic signing. In addition to meeting these statutory requirements, the Council undertook a borough-wide review of School Street signage in 2023. Following that review, advance warning signs (AWS) were installed on approaches to School Street restrictions where appropriate, despite such signage not being a legal requirement. The purpose of these additional signs was to provide motorists with greater advance notice of the restrictions before reaching the enforcement point.

A further review of signage and layouts was undertaken in 2024. As additional funding became available, further advance warning signs were installed at a number of School Street locations to enhance driver awareness. All School Street schemes now include advance warning signage on the approach to every entry point, and two entry signs are provided wherever site conditions make this feasible.

The Council also keeps scheme operation under review and investigates any concerns raised regarding signage visibility or positioning.

Officers from all the relevant teams meet monthly to discuss formal appeals that have progressed to the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (London Tribunals). The cases are reviewed and actions agreed including installing additional signage, if required.

- (b) The council records the numbers of PCNs for each camera location within each school street. This is a significant amount of data and comprehensive information can be provided upon request. The last 12 months figures have been provided below:

SZ Zone	School	PCNs issued April 25 to March 26
1	Harlesden Primary	446
2	Wykeham Primary	178
3	Elsley Primary	363
4	John Keble C of E, Maple Walk & St Claudine's	12171
5 & 52	St Joseph's RC Primary	2099
6	Preston Park Primary	708
7	Mora Primary	2515
8	St Mary's CE Primary	468
10	Christchurch CE	642
11	Stonebridge and Our Lady of Lourdes	333
12	Our Lady of Grace Infants	3329
14	St Joseph's Infants and Juniors	2616
16	Convent of Jesus & Mary Infants	39
17	Northview Primary	1969
18	Princess Frederica	2251
19	Ark Franklin	3640
23	Kingsbury Green & St Robert Southwell	8337
24	Mount Stewart Inf & Jnrs	1211
25	Claremont High & Uxendon Manor	2469
26	Sudbury Primary	1678
27	Oakington Primary	1109
28	College Green School	1400
29	Gladstone Park Primary	327
30	Wembley Primary	589
32	Oliver Goldsmith	1266
33	Preston Manor	12250
34	Manor School	7484
51	Leopold Primary	719
81	Brentfield Primary	412
	Total	73018

It should be noted that there is a programme for reviewing and expanding school streets and introducing new school streets in the borough, which would result in

the appearance that there have been increases. There is also a 2 week warning notice period before PCNs are issued. Officers regularly review School Street locations, including sites with higher levels of enforcement activity, to assess whether signage, road markings, camera positioning, exemptions, and overall scheme design remain clear and effective. Where concerns are identified, the Council will consider appropriate improvements in line with Department for Transport guidance and best practice. Factors affecting the number of PCNs issues include, traffic volumes and the location of the scheme within the wider road network. Compliance generally improves as motorists become more familiar with restrictions and these schemes have proved to be effective in reducing traffic near our schools.

(c) We have recently completed a light touch review of 22 School Street schemes across Brent, assessing their impact on road safety, travel behaviour, air quality, stakeholder feedback and assessing their impact using four main measures:

- Road safety (casualties) and improved road safety

Child casualty numbers remained very low.

There were no sustained increases in road traffic casualties around most schools.

Several schools saw reductions in overall casualties by 2024.

- Travel behaviour (modal shift) reduced car travel, increase in walking, cycling, scooting, public transport

The evidence for modal shift is positive overall.

- Air quality (NO₂ concentrations)

The report concluded that annual average NO₂ concentrations decreased over the monitoring period. This suggests reduced vehicle emissions around schools and supports Brent's objective of improving local air quality.

- Stakeholder feedback

School streets have been well supported by residents and the school community and with positive feedback.

From our studies, it has been concluded School Streets appear are effective in meeting the councils transport objectives and providing a safer environment around schools, reducing traffic-related risks, improving air quality, and maintaining or increasing active travel levels.

4. Question from Councillor Paul Lorber to Councillor Promise Knight (Cabinet Member for Cleaner Streets, Transport & Public Realm)

As Wembley Stadium hosts more and more event days each year, residents and businesses are increasingly affected by Event Day parking restrictions.

Can the Cabinet Member for Cleaner Streets, Transport & Public Realm therefore explain:

- (a) why the Wembley Event Day Zone enforcement starts at 8:00am for events that may not begin until 7:00pm (many hours before the event starts). This seems disproportionate and creates unnecessary difficulties for residents, local businesses, employees, and visitors going about their normal daily activities.
- (b) whether the Council has considered introducing enforcement hours that are more closely aligned with actual event start times and attendee arrival patterns, rather than potentially beginning 11 hours before an event starts and considered if it would be more sensible and fairer for enforcement to start 3 hours before the actual event.

Response:

- (a) The event day parking restrictions were introduced to protect parking for residents and businesses in the area. Event day restrictions operate 8am to midnight on main roads to the stadium and generally 10am to midnight elsewhere in residential areas outside controlled parking zones. In recent years there have been an increase in visitors to the area well in advance of events, and visitors often take advantage of any available parking spaces they can find, which has a negative impact on parking availability for residents, resulting in increased enforcement requests. It should also be noted that, aside from the wider event-day parking controls, parking restrictions are already in place on Wembley Hill Road under the W CPZ, which operates from 08:00 to 21:00 every day. For this reason, we deploy extra enforcement patrol in the wider Wembley area to tackle all issues relating to illegal parking on event days.
- (b) These existing restrictions help manage parking demand in the area and reflect the ongoing parking pressures experienced by residents, particularly during event days and enforcement is as advertised and in accordance with Traffic Management Orders.

Introducing changes to when these restrictions are enforced would create inconsistencies, logistically would be difficult with a finite resource to cover the event zone, and it is likely would increase complaints from residents and businesses.

5. **Question from Councillor Paul Ryan to Councillor Matt Kelcher (Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Planning):**

We understand that the council is in the process of selecting a single delivery partner to complete the regeneration of South Kilburn over the next 15 years. This regeneration has historically been fraught with issues of subpar build quality and a lack of community engagement.

In light of this, can the Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Planning provide assurances that:

- (a) this contract will have enforceable guarantees of minimum build quality standards, and that the Council commits robust monitoring and enforcement;
- (b) that Social Value commitments made by the contractor will be sufficient to meet the needs of the South Kilburn community and that they are prepared to monitor and enforce these guarantees using transparent and objective metrics.

Response:

The council is currently in the process of procuring a Single delivery partner for South Kilburn. Procurement documentation issued by the Council is based on the assessment of the successes and challenges arising from the delivery of the regeneration thus far.

It identifies build quality and community engagement as a key Programme objective; and states “*delivering a thriving, distinctive neighbourhood that reflects South Kilburn’s diversity and creativity - continuing established standards for high-quality, **robustly built mixed-tenure homes including affordable homes**, alongside public spaces and a mix of uses that support civic life, enterprise, culture and wellbeing... and **Build community capacity and grow community wealth to create the conditions for active participation**, and ensure an empowered community is embedded as the lasting legacy.*”

In response to the specific questions raised:

- (a) The tender requires bidders to set out their processes and protocols for designing, commissioning, monitoring and evaluating robust and durable build quality and building performance, across each of the RIBA stages from strategic definition to in use. It further requires them to set out their understanding of some of the most common sources of resident complaints and dissatisfaction in the early years of occupation and how they will ensure these are minimised. Finally, they are required to outline their commitment to the highest level of aftercare and resident satisfaction in occupation.


The winning bidder’s responses will be enshrined in the contractual arrangements and will be closely monitored.

- (b) The tender requires bidders to set out their 10 year Social value strategy alongside a Social value action plan for the first two years addressing identified

areas of need of the South Kilburn community including Young people, Cost of living crisis, community capacity building, community voice and Climate Emergency. Against each area of need they are required to set out what they will do (i.e. activities, initiatives, events, etc.), the resources, skills and expertise they will bring and how they will work with the network of VCSE, the Council and other institutional and statutory service providers in a complementary manner to achieve objectives and add value. They are also required to set out mechanisms to measure demonstrable impact through KPIs, quantitative proxies and qualitative assessment to provide a rigorous, professional, transparent and evidence based reporting framework to measure, monitor and report delivery impact. Finally, they are required to confirm the governance structure to oversee the delivery of social value and how they will ensure a “review, refine and revise” approach to understanding local needs, designing initiatives, monitoring progress and measuring impact.

The winning bidder’s responses will be enshrined in the contractual arrangements and will be closely monitored.

The Council has received comprehensive and high-quality bids from the three shortlisted bidders including responses on Social Value, which are being carefully and rigorously assessed by an extensive panel of council officers, consultants and members of the South Kilburn Community. To allow time for full and proper consideration the Cabinet date for decision is being moved from July to 7th of September 2026.

 <p>Brent</p>	<p>Full Council 6 July 2026</p> <hr/> <p>Report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources</p>
<p>Resources and Public Realm Committee Chair’s Update</p>	

Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Council
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
List of Appendices:	None
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	<p>Jason Sigba, Strategy Lead –Democratic & Corporate Governance 020 8937 2036 Jason.Sigba@brent.gov.uk</p> <p>James Kinsella, Governance and Scrutiny Manager, Democratic and Corporate Governance 020 8937 2063 james.kinsella@brent.gov.uk</p> <p>Amira Nassr Deputy Director, Democratic and Corporate Governance 020 8937 5436 amira.nassr@brent.gov.uk</p>

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 To update Full Council on the meetings and activities of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee since the last update to Full Council on 10 November 2025.

2.0 Recommendation(s)

That Full Council

2.1 Note the report and the updates provided for the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee.

2.2 Note that the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee's work programme for the 2026/27 municipal year will be provided as part of the next update report to Full Council.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Contribution to Borough Plan Priorities & Strategic Context

3.1.1 The work of the Committee contributes to the delivery of all of the strategic priorities set out in the Borough Plan 2023-2027. It seeks to ensure Council decision-making remains transparent, accountable and open, resulting in improved policies and services.

3.2 Background

3.2.1 In advance of approval to the formal establishment of the Homes Scrutiny Committee, Brent Council currently has two scrutiny committees: the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee and the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee. The Council is also a member of the North West London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (NWL JHOSC). Councillor Anup Patel was been appointed as chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee at the Annual Council Meeting on 20 May 2026.

3.2.2 A scrutiny committee can look at anything which affects the borough or its inhabitants, subject to its remit.

3.2.3 Brent Council Standing Orders allow for the chairs of the scrutiny committees to report to ordinary Council meetings on the activities of their committees¹.

3.2.4 The current remit of the of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee is set out in the Council Constitution under the Terms of Reference for scrutiny committees². Subject to establishment of the Homes Scrutiny Committee the remit of the Committee includes:

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.

3.2.5 The Committee is also the Council's "crime and disorder committee" for the purposes of Section 19 of the Police & Justice Act 2006 and as such may review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of the crime and disorder functions by the responsible authorities (as defined by section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998) who make up the

¹ Brent Council Constitution, Part 2, paragraph 36.

<https://democracy.brent.gov.uk/documents/s123308/Part%202%20April%202022%20Procedural%20Rules.pdf>

² Brent Council Constitution Part 4.

<https://democracy.brent.gov.uk/documents/s123310/Part%204%20May%202022%20Terms%20of%20Reference%20.pdf>

Safer Brent Partnership, in order to make reports or recommendations to Full Council.

- 3.2.6 Below is an update of the work undertaken by the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee under the previous Chair and membership. The Committee met for its third meeting of the 2025/26 municipal year on 4 November 2025 where it reviewed the Council's financial position alongside wider service and policy developments. Members considered the Quarter 2 Financial Forecast, noting that while a balanced budget remained achievable, significant pressures persisted, particularly in temporary accommodation, adult social care and children's residential placements. The Committee examined delays in delivering savings, rising demand and cost pressures, and the impact of market factors such as housing supply and care provision. Members highlighted risks associated with hospital discharge, short-term placements and falling council tax collection, while also recognising improvements in financial controls, including tighter oversight of recruitment, agency spend and expenditure. The Committee emphasised the need for stronger mitigation measures, better targeting of financial support, enhanced partnership working with the NHS, and continued focus on income generation and void reduction to stabilise the Housing Revenue Account.
- 3.2.7 The Committee also scrutinised the Council's approach to supporting the voluntary and community sector (VCSE), procurement reform and the development of a new social value framework. Members welcomed efforts to strengthen the VCSE sector but raised concerns about capacity building, funding levels, affordability of council-owned spaces and the need for clearer, more transparent commissioning arrangements. The emerging Procurement Strategy and Improvement Programme were noted to be delivering early benefits, including savings and better supplier engagement, but further work was required to support local businesses and strengthen contract management. In reviewing the draft Social Value Policy, the Committee supported a shift towards a more flexible, community-led approach but stressed the importance of robust monitoring, clear performance data and accountability. Across these areas, the Committee made a number of recommendations focused on improving transparency, strengthening partnerships with local organisations, embedding social value across council activity, and ensuring that future procurement and commissioning decisions deliver measurable benefits for Brent residents.
- 3.2.8 The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee met for its fourth meeting on 21 January 2026 where it undertook detailed scrutiny of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in Brent. Members noted increased reporting and enforcement activity, reflecting both improved public engagement and the expanded use of tools such as Public Spaces Protection Orders and fixed penalty notices. The importance of a multi-agency approach was emphasised, combining enforcement with support for vulnerable individuals, while concerns were raised about uneven enforcement across the borough, gaps in data and analysis, and the need to better understand underlying causes of ASB. The Committee recommended developing a standalone ASB strategy, strengthening work on houses in multiple occupation and improving data, reporting and partnership

engagement, including greater involvement of councillors and community representatives.

- 3.2.9 The Committee also considered the findings of the Budget Scrutiny Task Group, recognising the ongoing financial pressures facing the Council despite modest improvements in funding certainty. Members highlighted significant overspends driven by temporary accommodation and adult social care, and the continued challenges of operating within constrained resources. Concerns were raised about the adequacy of information available to support effective scrutiny, particularly around expenditure decisions and savings plans, and the need for greater transparency in financial reporting. While acknowledging positive work in areas such as reducing agency spend, the Committee stressed the importance of maintaining close oversight of budget performance and its impact on residents.
- 3.2.10 The Committee met for its final meeting of the year on 24 February 2026 where it focused on environmental issues and financial performance. Members heard a deputation from a resident regarding fly tipping and littering, highlighting significant local impacts linked to commercial waste, inadequate infrastructure and increased reporting. The Committee noted that the Council had made improvements in response times and clearance rates, with over 38,000 reports recorded and almost 99% cleared within target, but emphasised that underlying causes such as waste storage, bulky waste access and behaviour change required further attention. Members called for improved coordination between services, better use of data and clearer performance reporting, alongside consideration of alternative charging models for bulky waste and enhanced user experience for reporting systems such as FixMyStreet. The importance of consistent service standards across different land types and stronger integration between housing, enforcement and public realm services was also highlighted.
- 3.2.11 The Committee also scrutinised the Quarter 3 financial forecast, which identified a £12.5m overspend driven primarily by adult social care, temporary accommodation and housing pressures. Members examined the structural drivers of overspending, including increased complexity of care needs, workforce and data challenges, and rising housing demand, while welcoming actions to strengthen prevention, improve commissioning, and enhance financial monitoring. Concerns were raised regarding the sustainability of the Housing Revenue Account, pressures from repairs, compliance and regeneration programmes, and the need to prioritise investment in existing stock.
- 3.2.12 Finally, the Committee reviewed the Annual Complaints Report, noting a high number of upheld complaints, particularly in housing and emphasised the need to strengthen learning, improve timeliness and embed complaints within contractor performance management. Across all areas, the Committee stressed the importance of stronger data, transparency and cross-service coordination to improve outcomes for residents and support more effective scrutiny.

4.0 Stakeholder and ward member consultation and engagement

4.1 Members continue to be fully engaged in the development and delivery of the scrutiny work programme, which is intended to be a flexible, living document that can adapt and change throughout the municipal year in response to the Committee's needs.

5.0 Financial Considerations

5.1 There are no financial considerations for the purposes of this report.

6.0 Legal Considerations

6.1 There are no legal considerations for the purposes of this report.

7.0 Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Considerations

7.1 There are no EDI considerations for the purposes of this report.

8.0 Climate Change and Environmental Considerations

8.1 There are no climate change and environmental considerations for the purposes of this report.

9.0 Human Resources/Property Considerations (if appropriate)

9.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

10.0 Communication Considerations


10.1 There are no communication considerations for the purposes of this report.

Report sign off:

Minesh Patel

Corporate Director, Finance & Resources

This page is intentionally left blank

	<p align="center">Full Council 6 July 2026</p>
	<p align="center">Report from the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources</p>
<p align="center">Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Chair's Update</p>	

Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Council
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
List of Appendices:	None
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	<p>Chatan Popat, Strategy Lead – Scrutiny, Democratic and Corporate Governance 020 8937 5068 chatan.popat@brent.gov.uk</p> <p>James Kinsella, Governance and Scrutiny Manager, Democratic and Corporate Governance 020 8937 2063 james.kinsella@brent.gov.uk</p> <p>Amira Nassr, Deputy Director, Democratic and Corporate Governance 020 8937 5436 amira.nassr@brent.gov.uk</p>

1.0 Executive Summary

1.0. To update Full Council on the meetings and activities of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee since the last update to Full Council on 10 November 2025.

2.0 Recommendation(s)

That Full Council

2.1 Note the report and the updates provided for the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee.

2.2 Note that the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee’s work programme for the 2026/27 municipal year will be provided as part of the next update report to Full Council.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Contribution to Borough Plan Priorities & Strategic Context

3.1.1 The work of the committee contributes to the delivery of all of the strategic priorities within the Borough Plan as it seeks to support, advise and enhance the Council’s activity. The recent activity outlined in this report contributes most specifically to the “A Healthier Brent,” “The Best Start in Life,” “Prosperity and Stability in Brent” strategic priorities within the plan.

3.2 Background

3.2.1 In advance of approval to the formal establishment of the Homes Scrutiny Committee, Brent Council currently has two scrutiny committees: the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee and the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee. The council also participates as a full voting member in the North West London Joint Health Overview Scrutiny Committee (NWL JHOSC). Councillor Sai Madabhushi was appointed as chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee at the Annual Council Meeting on 20 May 2026. Councillor Sapna Chadha has been appointed to serve as Brent’s representative at the North West London Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NWL JHOSC).

3.2.2 A scrutiny committee can review anything which affects the borough or its inhabitants, subject to its remit. The current remit of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee (subject to establishment of the Homes Scrutiny Committee) is set out in the Council’s Constitution under the Terms of Reference for Scrutiny Committees which includes:
Adult social care; Safeguarding; Children’s services; Cultural services; Education; Health; Housing; Public Health and Wellbeing.

3.2.3 As part of its remit set out in the constitution, and its role to review the provision and operation of health services within the borough, the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee can scrutinise, and make recommendations to NHS organisations or relevant health service providers.

3.2.4 The Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee’s 2026/27 work programme will be finalised during the month of July 2026. Once agreed, it will outline the policy areas and council decisions the committee plan to review during the 2026/27 municipal year. Statutory guidance on overview and scrutiny recommends that for scrutiny to be effective, scrutiny committees focus on conducting fewer in-depth reviews of highly significant topics¹.

¹ *Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local and Combined Authorities* (Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government), p21

- 3.2.5 Below is an update of the work undertaken by the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee under the previous Chair and membership. The Committee met for its third meeting of the 2025/26 municipal year on 19 November 2025 where it considered major changes to local health services and housing performance. The Committee reviewed proposals by London North West University Healthcare NHS Trust to transfer the Medical Day Care Unit from Central Middlesex Hospital to Ealing Hospital, alongside an expansion of local sickle cell services. The Trust advised the move would align day care with emergency pathways and improve patient flow, while enhancing specialist sickle cell provision at Central Middlesex Hospital. Members raised concerns about travel impacts, particularly for vulnerable patients and the risk of reduced accessibility, stressing the need for robust engagement, monitoring of patient outcomes, and clear mitigation measures. The Committee requested further detail on the future strategy for Central Middlesex Hospital and emphasised the importance of maintaining local access to services.
- 3.2.6 The Committee also scrutinised Brent Council's response to a C3 grading from the Regulator of Social Housing, which identified serious failings in housing management, particularly around compliance data and safety reporting. The department outlined significant progress, including completing high-risk fire safety actions, rebuilding compliance systems, strengthening governance, and engaging residents, though full data assurance is not expected until 2026. Members highlighted concerns about data reliability, organisational culture, tenant confidence, and the pace of improvement, calling for clearer communication with residents and accelerated survey and compliance programmes. In addition, the Housing Management Advisory Board reported on its early work to embed tenant voice and improve accountability, noting ongoing issues with estate conditions but also evidence of more responsive action by officers. The Committee made a series of recommendations focused on strengthening oversight, improving transparency, rebuilding trust with tenants, and ensuring sustained cultural and service improvement.
- 3.2.7 The Committee met for its fourth meeting on 19 January 2026 and considered a petition opposing proposed reductions to opening hours at Central Middlesex Hospital's Urgent Treatment Centre. Petitioners expressed strong concern that earlier closures would reduce access to urgent care, increase pressure on neighbouring services, and disproportionately affect a growing and ageing local population. The Committee acknowledged these concerns and confirmed it had previously scrutinised the proposals and would continue to monitor their impact.
- 3.2.8 The Committee also reviewed progress made following the Casey Review into disorder at Wembley Stadium, hearing from Council officers, the FA and partners on wide-ranging improvements to safety, security, transport coordination and crowd management. While recognising significant progress and stronger partnership working, members emphasised the need for clearer impact data, improved engagement with residents and young people, and continued focus on issues such as traffic management and communication ahead of events.
- 3.2.9 The Committee further examined Brent's approach to tackling poverty, with a particular focus on child poverty, housing pressures and support for vulnerable

families. Members noted the scale of the challenge, including high rates of child poverty and the impact of temporary accommodation, and welcomed initiatives such as Family Wellbeing Centres, free school meals, employment support and targeted financial assistance. However, concerns were raised about the long-term impact of temporary accommodation on young people, the need for more local skills and employment opportunities, and gaps in support for older teenagers. The Committee stressed the importance of using data to better target interventions and called for stronger engagement with young people in shaping policy responses. Recommendations focused on improving opportunities for employment and skills development, prioritising housing stability for families with children in key exam years and ensuring that young people's voices are embedded in the Council's ongoing work to reduce poverty.

3.2.10 The Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee met for its final meeting on 4 March 2026 where it focused further on recent changes to health services and key housing performance issues. The Committee considered the reduction in operating hours of the Urgent Treatment Centre at Central Middlesex Hospital, with residents raising concerns about poor communication, limited consultation and reduced access to evening care. The NHS Trust advised that the change was based on low late-evening demand and had improved efficiency and patient flow, with performance targets now being met. However, members expressed concern regarding engagement levels and the wider impact on access to services and recommended that the decision be reconsidered following more comprehensive public engagement and supported by clearer analysis of population growth and service demand. The Committee also received updates on improvements to sickle cell services, including a dedicated day service at Central Middlesex Hospital and enhanced specialist provision across hospital sites.

3.2.11 The Committee also undertook extensive scrutiny of housing management, focusing on tenant satisfaction, service performance and the rollout of the Area Tenancy Management model. Members noted ongoing improvements in repairs, compliance and void reduction, supported by new governance arrangements and increased contractor capacity, but highlighted continued issues with data quality, complaints handling and tenant satisfaction. The Committee emphasised the need for stronger system integration, proactive repairs strategies and clearer performance benchmarking. Detailed case studies demonstrated the benefits of the new tenancy model in providing more consistent, resident-focused support, although concerns remained about communication and accountability in some schemes.

3.2.12 Finally, the Committee reviewed rising pressures in homelessness and temporary accommodation, noting a significant increase in demand and the financial and social challenges involved. Members stressed the importance of providing suitable accommodation, particularly for families and young people, improving data on impacts, and expanding longer-term housing supply, while continuing to strengthen support for residents placed both within and outside the borough.

4.0 Stakeholder and ward member consultation and engagement

4.1 Members continue to be fully engaged in the development and delivery of the scrutiny work programme, which is intended to be a flexible, living document that can adapt and change throughout the municipal year in response to the Committee's needs.

5.0 Financial Considerations

5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

6.0 Legal Considerations

6.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

7.0 Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Considerations

7.1 There are no equity, diversity or inclusion implications arising from this report.

8.0 Climate Change and Environmental Considerations

8.1 There are no climate change or environmental implications arising from this report.

9.0 Human Resources/Property Considerations (if appropriate)

9.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

10.0 Communication Considerations


10.1 There are no communication implications arising from this report.

Report sign off:

Minesh Patel

Corporate Director, Finance and Resources

This page is intentionally left blank

	<p align="center">Audit and Standards Advisory Committee 16 June 2026</p> <p align="center">Full Council 6 July 2026</p>
	<p align="center">Report from the Chair of the Audit & Standards Advisory Committee</p>
<p align="center">Annual Report of the Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee</p>	

Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Not Applicable
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
No. of Appendices:	None
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Minesh Patel, Corporate Director of Finance and Resources Tel: 020 8937 4043 Email: minesh.patel@brent.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This is the fourth annual report of the Audit and Standards (A&S), and the Audit and Standards Advisory (A&SA) Committees, on this occasion solely written by the Chair of the ASAC.
- 1.2 This report seeks to meet the requirements and principles as set out within CIPFA's Position Statement regarding Audit Committees ('Practical Guidance for Local Authorities and Police).
- 1.3 This report covers the work of the two Committees for the Municipal Year 2025-26 with the aim in drawing attention to some key areas and helping to focus consideration for the 2026-27 Municipal year.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. Full Council is asked to note the contents of the report.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Contribution to Borough Plan Priorities & Strategic Context

3.1.1 The Council's Audit and Standards Advisory Committee (ASAC) and the Audit and Standards Committee (ASC) play an important role in ensuring the good governance of the Council. The committees are a key component of the Council's governance framework. They contribute to the overall success of the Council by providing an independent and high-level focus on the adequacy of governance, risk and control arrangements to provide assurance and confidence to those charged with governance.

3.1.2 The ASAC is responsible for considering and advising the relevant council bodies on various governance matters relating to audit activity, the council's regulatory framework, and members' standards of conduct. The ASC is responsible for various governance matters including reviewing and approving the Annual Statement of Accounts, adopting the council's Annual Governance Statement and promoting high standards of conduct by members and co-opted members.

3.2 Introduction

3.2.1 I should like to begin but putting on record my thanks to the members of both Committees during the 2025-26 Municipal Year, particularly those who are no longer members of the Council. I should particularly like to place record my thanks to the Vice Chair of the ASAC and Chair of the ASC, Councillor Chan for all his help and support.

3.2.2 The Audit and Standards Advisory Committee met six times during the Municipal Year with the Audit and Standards Committee meeting on two occasions. During the year the Committees covered an increasing amount of work, unfortunately often at short notice which in view of some members has been in excess of the time available. Much of the work undertaken by the Committees has again highlighted the high and ever increasing (if generally well-managed), level of risk being faced by the Council.

3.2.3 As stated last year the importance of the work of both Committees continues to grow. With pressures on local authority finances, as highlighted in the failures of governance and financial control at other authorities, focussing our attention on the fundamental problems with the current local government funding and audit systems.

3.3 Overview

3.3.1 2025-26 continued to be a very active year, and one which it is again difficult to summarise; however, the key points that have come through from the matters consider by the Committees are as follows:

- a. Brent is still in a relatively good, if deteriorating, position, with regard to financial sustainability, with still adequate (if reducing) levels of reserves,

but again did not bring in expenditure within the budget for 2024-25. Brent was, however, one of the authorities to have the external audit of its accounts signed off before the backstop date.

- b. Further, a number of issues were also identified which may lead to future problems for the Council:
 - i. Due to the pressures on Council services the level of expenditure has and is likely to continue to rise above the base line, as pointed out Grant Thornton's Annual (Value for Money) Report for 2024/25 with its two key recommendations for action in the medium term; and
 - ii. The level of external debt and hence the interest payments due to the level of capital expenditure rising, which may be becoming an issue with higher interest rates looking like they will remain for some time.
- c. In terms of Governance, Brent also has generally sound arrangements in place, as confirmed by both the External Auditor's Value for Money report for 2024-25, (with the exception of the findings concerning improvement in the Housing service, which has led to a third Key Recommendation and a reduction in the rating for improving economy efficiency and effectiveness to having a significant weakness) and Head of Internal Auditor's (HIA) report and opinion issued in June 2025. However, there are a number of areas requiring attention, particularly:
 - i. Implementation of internal audit recommendations/actions. In 2022-23 the HIA opinion first identified an area for improvement in relation to the implementation of audit actions, to ensure that the risks identified from internal audit work were appropriately mitigated. The rate of implementation of audit actions had improved in 2024-25 from 46% in 2023/24 to 67%, however this is still an area which clearly needs to be addressed.
 - ii. Despite some improvement, there is a continuing need to address the 'second line' of defence (i.e. the monitoring and reporting of information and data, by management, in respect of the effectiveness of the 'first line' of defence), which although some improvement has been noted still requires additional improvement.
 - iii. The need to address the management of Housing Compliance, following the Council's self-referral to the Housing Regulator. This is covered in more detail later in this report.
 - iv. As stated above the Council's External Auditors, identified a significant weakness in their Annual Report for 2023-24, relating to the Council's financial sustainability. This concern stemmed from the use of £13.5 million in reserves to balance the 2023-24 budget, alongside a projected overspend of approximately £14 million for 2024-25.

3.3.2 In addition, the Corporate Peer Challenge made several recommendations to strengthen the Council's financial management:

- Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS): The Council should develop a five-year MTFS aligned with its corporate priorities and transformation programme.
- Reserves: The Council must prioritise restoring General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) reserves to sustainable levels.
- Financial Processes and Organisational Grip: The Council should enhance its financial processes to improve income generation, productivity, and efficiency. This includes strengthening debt recovery, council tax collection, procurement, and business case development, as well as undertaking cost benchmarking.

3.4 Standards Matters

3.4.1 Although, as has been stated in previous years, Standards matters are not covered by the CIPFA Statement this is one of the Committees' key roles, and one which is taken very seriously.

3.4.2 During the year the ASAC considered a number Standards issues including:

- Complaints against Members.
- Oversight of Gifts and Hospitality; and
- Member Training and attendance.

The ASC also oversees the Member's Code of Contact, subject to final consideration by Full Council, and would consider complains against members that need a Full hearing. (There were none in 2025/26).

3.5 Audit Matters

3.5.1 The ASAC continues to be well served by the Internal Audit and Investigation staff and has received regular updates on the progress of risk-based audits being undertaken during 2025-26.

3.5.2 The audits planned for delivery during 2025-26 included the following, all of which were risk based and linked to the Council's risks and priorities:

- Five key financial systems audits (with proposals for all key systems to be audited in three years).
- Three IT/cyber security related audits.
- Four audits based on a risk assessment.

- Four Grant/ Certification audits/assessments.
- Seven Schools audits.

3.5.3 The plan also made provision for advisory work and follow up activities on previous recommendations as well as certification work.

(The above is as reported in the Internal Audit Interim Report for 2025-26 considered by the A&SA Committee in December 2025.)

3.5.4 The Annual Counter Fraud Plan for 2025-26 was considered at the June 2025 meeting with the Committee updated by an interim progress report in December 2025.

The Committees also considered a large number of other items with the most significant being as follows:

- a. In June, the Head of Internal Audit's Annual Report for 2024-25.

(It should be noted that the ASAC will be considering the Head of Internal Audit's Annual Report for 2025-26 at its June 2026 meeting which renders the following somewhat historic in nature but it is included for the record, particular as we believe a number of the same issues are likely to be raised again.)

The 2024-25 report concluded that:

The Head of Internal Audit (HIA) is required to provide an annual opinion and report that can be used by the Council to inform its governance statement. The relevant standards require that the annual opinion must conclude on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the Council's framework of governance, risk management and control. In addition, CIPFA's guidance on the 'Role of the Head of Internal Audit in Public Service Organisations' requires that the Head of Internal Audit's overall opinion is objective and supported by sufficient, reliable, relevant, and useful information and evidence.

The HIA opinion in relation to the financial year 2024-25 was Reasonable Assurance:

"The adequacy and effectiveness of the overall arrangements for the Council's systems of internal control, risk management and governance are adequate, with some improvement required."

This is the second highest rating on a scale of one to four with one being no assurance and four substantial assurance.

In addition, the following observations were noted:

“In determining the opinion, the HIA has considered any key themes or issues emanating from audit work undertaken in 2024-25, and/or any areas where enhancements can be made to the Council’s governance, risk management and internal control frameworks.”

The key points raised in the report are covered in the Section 3.3 above.

- b. A report covering the Draft Internal Audit Strategy for 2024-27 and Plan for 2025-26, although this report was considered in March 2025, it relates to 2025-26, the key details of which are set out below.

The report identified the available resource for the Internal Audit function for 2025-25 comprises an estimate of **700 days**, which is anticipated to be spread across the following areas:

Area	Days (approx.)	%
Core assurance	200	28%
Agile, risk-based Work	320	46%
Consultancy and advice	50	7%
Follow-up	130	19%

The Internal Audit function continues to operate a co-sourced model, with a portion of the plan (approx. 200 days) delivered by our co-sourced partner, PwC (in 2025/26). The co-sourced model continues to operate effectively and provides a number of benefits, including:

- an in-depth understanding of the Council, its strategies and objectives, and it’s governance, risk management and control processes via the in-house team.
- increased flexibility and resilience in the resourcing of the function.
- access to specialist resource, such as IT/Cyber specialisms.
- increased benchmarking opportunities with other Councils who call off the same framework; and
- Training events and conferences hosted by PwC.

An update on the use of resources is covered above.

- c. The ASAC continued to receive updates on the work of the Council’s external auditors Grant Thornton, (the audit of the 2024-25 accounts is considered in the Accounts section below). The key item considered was the Annual Value for Money report, which gave an independent review of

the state of the Council's governance. The report was also considered at the Full Council meeting in February 2026.

The report was markedly less positive than in 2023-24, with the overall finding being that only one area (Governance) was reviewed as: *"No significant weaknesses in arrangements identified, but improvement recommendation made."* with the direction of travel found to be stable, but not improving.

In terms of the other two areas - Financial Sustainability & Improving Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness the findings were of *"significant weakness in arrangements"* with key recommendations made. The weakness identified were as follows:

(a) Financial Sustainability:

The report stated that in the prior year, a significant weakness had been identified in the Council's financial sustainability arrangements with the need highlighted to set a realistic budget for 2026-27 and into the medium-term without relying on reserves. The report concluded that insufficient progress has been made with the matter being re-raised as a key recommendation. Their evidence was:

- That in 2023-24 the £13.5 million overspend was covered by the Future Funding Risk reserve. In 2024-25, service overspends of £15.5 million were covered using earmarked reserves, released after an exercise to re-purpose reserves to support the revenue budget and enhance financial resilience. At 31 March 2025 useable reserves (non-ring fenced) were £27.1 million. Whilst the Council planned to increase its useable reserves by £5.4 million (21%) to £30.6 million by March 2026 no increase in planned reserves had been built into future years in the current MTFS.
- Overall, the Council's budget growth was forecast to increase by 52% from the 2022-23 position, an increase of £161.6 million, forecasting net expenditure of £473.6 million by 2028-29. This is a considerable rate of growth, driven by both increasing costs and demand for services.
- Rising demand pressures, particularly in temporary accommodation and social care, has made delivering balanced budgets increasingly challenging. In 2025-26, the average number of homeless households living in emergency type accommodation is expected to increase to 1,643.
- Grant Thornton's view was that the Council must urgently take additional difficult decisions to ensure that a realistic budget could be set for next year and in the medium-term, so this could be delivered without the need to further draw on reserves nor Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) from central government.

A second issue raised was that the Council had fully developed the pipeline of savings to close the projected budget gap of £28 million in the MTFS until 2028-29. Progress was being made with savings plans for 2026-27 identified as part of the budget setting process but a budget gap remained and on this basis, they have identified a further significant weakness in arrangements.

The report concluded while the Council successfully delivered targeted £8 million in savings for 2024-25 and was on track for 2025-26 targets, the arrangements in 2024-25 were insufficient to ensure long-term financial sustainability.

Grant Thornton recommended the Embrace Change Transformation programme must therefore reflect large-scale transformational savings, with greater collaboration and business transformation, underpinned by business plans and incorporated into a revised MTFS.

They concluded overall that the lack of adequate saving plans and failure to deliver recurrent planned savings places delivery of the Council's MTFS and overall financial sustainability at significant risk.

These weakness led to the two Key Recommendations being identified:

(b) Improving Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness:

A significant risk was raised in the report concerning the Council's performance in managing Housing Compliance, following the Regulator of Social Housing (RSH) awarding the Council a 'C3 grading' for serious failings in meeting quality and safety consumer standards in May 2025, identifying serious failings by the Council as a landlord in meeting the outcomes of the Quality and Safety consumer standards. The Council had made a self-referral in April 2025 concerning the quality and accuracy of its fire safety data.

RSH's engagement with the Council also identified that data for fire safety, smoke and carbon monoxide safety, asbestos management and water safety could not be reconciled; concerns about the data validation process that took place prior to the Council implementing its new asset management system; and although the Council reported that it has 95% of its stock condition data, almost half of homes had not had a recorded survey.

The Council has estimated it will take 12 to 18 months, from May 2025, to resolve compliance issues across the 'Big 8' areas of compliance: fire safety, gas safety, electrical safety, water safety, asbestos management, mechanical and engineering (lifts), damp and mould, and smoke and carbon monoxide detectors.

This has led to a **third Key Recommendations**, and is an area the ASAC has been receiving regular monitoring update reports on

3.6 Regulatory Framework

- 3.6.1 The Committees continues to oversee a number of areas concerning the regulatory framework. These have included the following areas:
- 3.6.2 Reviewing the use of RIPA powers by the Council.
- 3.6.3 The Council's Risk Management Structure and the Strategic Risk Management process. There have been major improvements in the strategic process over the last couple of years, which is now clearly linked to the Council's priorities, and considers a wider range of risks. However, concerns still remain over the risk management at departmental level with the Audit Chairs having continued to liaise with the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees over how to improve oversight of this area where there is overlap in roles. An area of particular concern during the year was cyber security.
- 3.6.4 The Council's Emergency Planning & Resilience arrangements, following an external review of this function undertaken in October 2023. The committee reviewed the action plan for improvements following this review and will be monitoring progress in this key area of the Council's duties.
- 3.6.5 The Annual Governance Statement, which is an important document as it set out the views of the Council's leadership and senior management on the state of the Council's governances. The final part of the statement covers significant governance issues relating to 2024/25. It concluded that there were no such issues identified that arose this reporting year although attention was drawn to the Corporate Peer Challenge, the Procurement Peer Review, and the referral to the housing regulator. It also made a number of recommendations for improvements. As the 2025/26 report will be considered at the June meeting this is mainly historic information.
- 3.6.6 An area which now takes up significantly less of the Committee's time is the oversight of i4B and First Wave Housing with the overlap of responsibilities between the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee and the Scrutiny Committees having been resolved and ASAC now concentrating on the council's overview, supervision and overall governance of Companies, which has both reduced workload and clarified roles.
- 3.6.7 The Audit and Standards Advisory Committee also considered a number of reports most of which were also considered by Full Council on the Council's Treasury Management. The very detailed reports show the clear and careful planning and execution of the Council's Capital and Treasury Management function. However, the Committee did again raise concerns about the level of borrowing being planned by the Council, particularly in view of the continuing high level of interest rates. Although there is nothing to suggest this will be a problem in the short term, it is something the Council should keep under review.

- 3.6.8 The Committees considered a number of reports on Cyber Security and Artificial intelligence in view of the rising level of risk identified to the Council and the experience of some other authorities.
- 3.6.9 The Committee also considered the progress of and the outcome of the Procurement Review, particularly in the light of the potential savings, and a significant interest from a number of members.
- 3.6.10 The ASAC also received a number of reports on the Council's performance in managing Housing Compliance function detailed above.

3.7 Statement of Accounts

- 3.7.1 The oversight of the Council's accounts is one of the key functions of both Committees. Brent has a proud record of having its accounts fully audited and signed off by the statutory publication date.
- 3.7.2 The statutory publication for the 2024-25 un-audited account was the 30th June 2025 and although substantially ready by that date, the draft accounts were not published until 18th August. This was as a result of a number of issues being identified primarily concerning the valuation of Council's assets. Despite considerable work by Brent staff and the external auditors, this resulted in the audit not being signed off until the 25th February 2026, two days before the 27th February 2025 Backstop date. This meant, however, that the Council's accounts were not disclaimed by the auditors as happened with some other authorities. (It should be noted that the Pension Fund accounts could properly have been signed by 30th September).
- 3.7.3 The Committee has noted the work being undertaken to try and improve the performance in this area as the Backstop date for the 2025-26 accounts is being brought forward to 31st January 2027. It is understood the target date is 30th November 2026.
- 3.7.4 Members may be aware that earlier this year, the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government confirmed a significant overhaul of the local audit system, introducing 16 measures designed to tackle the ongoing backlog and restore accountability across the sector. These changes are ongoing and the Committees will be carefully monitoring these changes.

3.8 Review of the effectiveness of the Committees

- 3.8.1 ASAC remains well placed in being independently chaired, and having the support of two independent, Standards-focused co-opted members, both of whom bring considerable experience along with the support of a highly experienced audit focuses independent co-opted member.
- 3.8.2 ASAC has again been required to consider a large number of issues over the last year. This has resulted with some agendas being packed, and some members feeling strongly that they are overloaded. Furthermore, the need for additional training for members has been identified and is being planned.

- 3.8.3 To help overcome this and generally improve the performance of the work of the Committees, members were asked to submit their views and whilst only receiving a low level of response, some key comments are set out below:

Core Strengths & Successes

Deep-Dive Scrutiny.
Financial Resilience Oversight.
Mainly non-political debate
Strong audit input
Independent Leadership.

Critical Gaps & Challenges

The Implementation Gap: A recurring theme is the delay in management implementing internal audit recommendations.
Internal Audit Capacity: Internal Audit resources are stretched.
Late and often long paperwork and reports.

Strengthening Accountability

The committee should move beyond just hearing from the Finance Director.

Closing the Follow-up Loop

Instead of just noting that recommendations are in progress, the committee should implement a RAG rated Escalation Framework.

- 3.8.4 The Committee will be considering further ways of improving their performance during 2026/27.

3.9 Conclusion

- 3.9.1 I should like to thank the members of both Committees, and the Independent Co-opted Members and Independent Persons for all their support and assistance during the year.
- 3.9.2 I should also like to express our gratitude to all the Council officers who have so diligently supported the Committees. These include particularly the Governance Officers who have supported us with the very heavy workload, the Deputy Director Organisational Assurance and Resilience (Head of Internal Audit) and Audit and Investigation staff as well as the Corporate Director and Deputy Directors of Finance, as well as all the finance staff who have supported the Committees. I should also like to thank the Director of Law and the Senior Governance Lawyer for their support.
- 3.9.3 I would also like to thank the Grant Thornton Partners and auditors for their input.

4.0 Stakeholder and ward member consultation and engagement

- 4.1 None.

5.0 Financial Considerations

5.1 The report is for noting and so there are no direct financial implications.

6.0 Legal Considerations

6.1 The report is for noting and there are no direct legal implications.

7.0 Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Considerations


7.1 None.

8.0 Climate Change and Environmental Considerations

8.1 None.

9.0 Communication Considerations

9.1 None.

 Brent	Full Council 6 July 2026
	Report from the Corporate Director of Finance & Resources
Changes to the Constitution (<i>updated on 6 July 2026</i>)	

Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Council
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
List of Appendices:	Three Appendix 1: Proposed amendments to Scrutiny Function (<i>updated and republished on 6 July 2026</i>) Appendix 2: Proposed amendments to Full Council Meeting Standing Orders Appendix 3: Proposed amendments to Members Allowance Scheme (<i>updated and republished on 6 July 2026</i>)
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Pameel Crowther- Newman, Head of Law & Litigation 020 8937 4102 Pameel.Crowther-Newman@brent.gov.uk

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1. This report proposes constitutional changes to the Council’s existing scrutiny arrangements (Part 4 of the Constitution), including establishing an additional scrutiny committee with a housing remit; Full Council meeting standing orders (Part 2 of the Constitution) and the Members’ Allowance Scheme (Part 6 of the Constitution).
- 1.2 Subject to paragraph 1.3, is proposed that the changes come into effect immediately so that the procedural changes can be applied to the conduct of the remaining proceedings of this meeting.

1.3 The reduction in the sizes of the existing Scrutiny Committees will take effect after the next Full Council meeting on 14 September 2026 following appointments to the Scrutiny Committees.

2.0 Recommendation(s)

2.1 To review and agree the changes to the Constitution set out in this report and the appendices.

2.2 To authorise the Monitoring Officer/Director of Law to amend the Constitution accordingly, including making any necessary incidental or consequential changes.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Contribution to the Borough Plan and Strategic Priorities

3.1.1 Ensuring the Constitution is kept up to date and supportive of good governance contributes to the delivery of all the strategic priorities within the Borough Plan by supporting and enhancing the Council's activity.

4.0 Background

4.1 A general review of the provisions of the Constitution and its operation is being undertaken on an on-going basis to not only ensure it remains up to date and fit for purpose but also to secure improvements and deliver the objectives of the Council.

4.2 The proposals set out in this report have been informed by cross-party discussion at the Constitution Oversight Group (COG). COG is an informal officer/member working group. The political membership of the COG is balanced and it has met four times since the Annual Council Meeting.

4.3 In the time available between the Annual Council Meeting and this meeting it was only possible to review and consider a limited number of issues but outstanding matters will be addressed in the coming months and will next be reported to Full Council at its meeting in September 2026.

5.0 Proposals

Housing Scrutiny Committee

5.1 At the Annual Council Meeting on 20 May 2026, members agreed to establish a dedicated Housing Scrutiny Committee, subject to officers reporting back to members at this meeting on the terms of reference and related changes to the Constitution.

5.2 Attached at **Appendix 1** are the tracked changes to the scrutiny section of the Constitution for approval. In summary, it is proposed that:

- A third scrutiny committee styled the 'Housing Scrutiny Committee' be established comprising of 9 councillors and 4 non-voting co-opted members. A 9 member scrutiny committee would mean the following split/allocation of seats: Labour x4 seats; Conservative x2 seats; Liberal Democrats x2 seats and Green x1 seat. Establishing a new scrutiny committee and reducing the size of the other two scrutiny committees has no broader political balance implications because scrutiny committees are not so-called 'ordinary committees'.
- The Housing Scrutiny Committee will be responsible for the statutory scrutiny function of all the Council's housing functions.
- The Housing Scrutiny Committee will meet 5 times in each municipal year but without the ability to establish task groups etc. unless agreed by Full Council.
- The 4 non-voting co-opted members will comprise of: an independent member of the Housing Management Advisory Board; a council housing tenant representative; a leaseholder representative and a registered provider representative.
- The tenant/leaseholder representatives will be appointed by Full Council following a competitive recruitment process overseen by a panel comprising of the members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee and officers.
- The chair/vice-chair of the Housing Scrutiny Committee appointments, as well as all other scrutiny committee member appointments, will be made at the Full Council meeting on 14 September 2026.
- All 3 scrutiny committees be put on an even footing regarding the number councillors on the committees, number of meetings etc.

Full Council meeting standing orders

5.3 Proposed changes to Full Council meeting standing orders are attached at **Appendix 2**. A number of aspects of the operation of Full Council meetings are yet to be reviewed but for the purposes of this meeting members are asked to approve the tracked changes at **Appendix 2** which can be summarised as follows:

- Proposals that will free up time such as deleting standing orders 31 (Report from the Leader or Members of the Cabinet); 34 (Non Cabinet Members' Debate) and 38 (Annual Report on the Borough) as well as amending standing order 36 (Reports from the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees) by removing the right to speak and ask questions.
- A new arrangement for the allocation of political group motions at standing order 41 which will mean 3 motions per council meeting and that each motion can be debated for up to 20 minutes and with an overall time allocation of 60 minutes.

- Unless a different rule applies and with the exception of procedural motions, a requirement for advance written notice of motions and amendments to motions consistent with the practices of most other councils and good governance. To ensure flexibility however the Mayor will have the discretion to allow motions and amendments even if the notice requirements have not or cannot be complied with.

Members' Allowance Scheme

- 5.4 Brent Members' Allowance Scheme (the Scheme) is set out in Part 6 of the Constitution. The current Scheme was approved by Full Council on 23 February 2026 and is effective from 1 April 2026 until 31 March 2027. The allowances payable to members are listed in Schedule 1 to the Scheme.
- 5.5 The payment of allowances is informed by [The Remuneration of Councillors in London 2023 – Report of the Independent Panel](#).
- 5.6 The tracked changes to the Members' Allowance Scheme at **Appendix 3** relate to the following:
- **Pensions.** Following enactment of the Local Government Pension Scheme (Amendment) (Elected Member Pensions) Regulations 2026 (the 2026 Regs), access to the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) has been reinstated for councillors in England on an opt-in basis since 11 May 2026. The recent legislative changes were introduced to support recruitment and promote diversity in public service. Regulation 8 of the 2026 Regs amends the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 to require schemes for allowances to specify that basic and special responsibility allowances are pensionable, and require authorities to record employer pension contributions in allowance registers.
 - **Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Committee.** It is proposed that the new Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Committee should receive the same allowance as the other two scrutiny Chairs.
 - **Group Leaders.** The allowance for the Leader of the Second Opposition Group has been increased to reflect the current size of that group whilst acknowledging the constitutional significance of the Principal Opposition Group designation. Further, an allowance for the Leader of the Third Opposition Group has been introduced to reflect the political make-up of the Council since the local elections.
 - **Whips/Business managers.** In recognition of the demands and importance of the role of the political group whips/business managers, it is proposed that all whips/business managers of all political groups receive an allowance. The Scheme remains within the budget set for allowances by combining the savings achieved by the Leader appointing 7 (and not 9) other members to the Cabinet and the allowance allocated to the 'Group

Whip for the majority group whip'. The funds available have been allocated to the 4 political group on a political balance basis.

5.7 Full Council can make in year changes to the Scheme and, it is proposed that the changes be backdated.

5.8 COG will be undertaking a more comprehensive review of the Scheme in this Scheme year and the findings and proposals will be reported to Full Council.

6.0 Stakeholder and ward member consultation and engagement

6.1 The proposed changes have been considered by the Constitution Oversight Group.

7 Financial Considerations

7.1 The financial issues are addressed in the body of the report. The proposed changes to allowances remain within the budget set. The full cost impact of pension contributions for members can only be fully assessed in 2027/28.

8 Legal Considerations

8.1 The legal issues are addressed in the body of the report.

9.0 Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Considerations

9.1. 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 or civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

9.2 “Due regard” is the regard that is appropriate in all the circumstances. The weight to be attached to the effect is a matter for the council. As long as the council is properly aware of the effects and has taken them into account, the duty is discharged. Depending on the circumstances, regard should be had to the following:

- 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;
- the need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- 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;

- 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); and
- the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

9.3 No equalities implications arise directly from this report but the recent legislative changes to members' access to the LGPS are intended to support recruitment and promote diversity in public service.

10.0 Climate Change and Environmental Considerations

10.1 None

11.0 Human Resources/Property Considerations (if appropriate)

11.1 None

12.0 Communication Considerations

12.1 None

Report sign off:

Minesh Patel
Corporate Director, Finance & Resources

Appendix 1

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.

From time to time an issue may arise which fall within the terms of reference of ~~more than one~~ both ~~Scrutiny committees~~. On these occasions, it may be convenient for the ~~two~~ committees to meet together to consider an item relating to that matter. Should this occur, as the committees remain separately constituted, each committee will continue to be required to meet its own quorum requirements, vote on recommendations at the end of the item (if a vote is required) and be chaired by its own chair.

In order to facilitate an orderly discussion of the item by members of the ~~two~~ committees, the committee chairs will seek to agree between them which of them will co-ordinate proceedings at the joint meeting. In the event that agreement is not reached, agreement will be sought at an informal pre-meeting of ~~the~~ both committees involved.

General Membership rules

Each committee shall comprise of ~~4~~ 49 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~~ five 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 ~~149~~ 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.

*Excluding housing related functions which fall within the remit of the Housing Scrutiny Committee.

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

Specific Membership Rules

In addition to the 9 councillors, the membership of the Housing Scrutiny Committee shall comprise of 4 non-voting co-opted members as follows: an independent member of the Housing Management Advisory Board; a council housing tenant representative; a leaseholder representative and a registered provider representative.

Remit

Housing needs and support; Homelessness and rough sleeping; Temporary Accommodation; Tenancy sustainment and compliance; Tenant and leaseholder engagement; Homes Adaptation Service; Fire safety in housing; Private Rented Sector support; Landlord licensing and forum; Renters' Rights Bill enforcement; New Council Housing delivery; Affordable Homes Programme; Housing compact with registered providers; i4B and First Wave Housing; HRA and Housing spend.

Specific Terms of Reference

The objectives of the Committee are to:

- Scrutinise the development and implementation of housing and homelessness strategies, policies, and action plans.
- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of housing and homelessness services.
- Review the Council's compliance with relevant legislation, statutory guidance, and regulatory requirements.
- Examine outcomes for residents, tenants, leaseholders, rough sleepers, and vulnerable households.

- Ensure the voices and experiences of residents and service users inform policy development and service delivery.

Other substantive changes

Part 4 – Terms of Reference for Council Committees and Sub-Committees Membership and Terms of Reference of Council Committees and Sub-Committees

Task Groups, Panels and Commissions

5. Other than the Budget Scrutiny Task Group, the Scrutiny Committees may not establish Task Groups, Panels or Commissions unless agreed by Full Council.

Appendix 2

30. Ordinary Meetings

Unless otherwise provided in these Standing Orders the order of business at ordinary meetings of Full Council except those concerning the Council tax setting shall be:-

(a)* **Absence of Mayor:**

To choose a person to preside if the Mayor or Deputy Mayor is absent.

(b)* **Business required to be dealt with first:**

If necessary, to deal with any business required by statute to be done before any other business.

(c) **Minutes:**

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes of the last meeting or meetings of Full Council.

(d) **Declarations:**

Declaration by members of any personal and prejudicial interests and disclosable pecuniary interests in any matter to be considered at the meeting.

(e) **Mayor's announcements (including petitions received)**

(f) **Business from previous meetings:**

If necessary, to dispose of any business remaining from the last meeting of Full Council.

(g) **Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies and Appointments of Chairs/Vice Chairs**

If necessary, to agree appointments to committees and outside bodies and to agree the appointment or replacement of Chairs and/or Vice Chairs of committees.

(h) **Deputations**

To enable deputations by Members of the public in accordance with Standing Order 32.

(i) **Questions from members of the public**

To enable questions from members of the public to be put to members of the Cabinet in accordance with Standing Order 33.

(j) **Petitions**

To enable members to reference petitions received and for there to be a debate on a petition which attracts more than 200 signatures in accordance with the Council's petition rules and Standing Order 66.

(k) Motions

To debate Motions selected by the groups in accordance with Standing Order 41

(l) ~~Annual report on the borough under Standing Order 38 (if applicable)~~

~~To receive an annual report on the borough from the Leader in accordance with Standing Order 38. [This paragraph is not currently in use]~~

(m) ~~Reports from the Leader or members of the Cabinet~~

~~To receive reports from the Leader or Cabinet in accordance with Standing Order 34. [This paragraph is not currently in use]~~

(n) Questions from the Opposition and other Non Cabinet Members

To enable questions to be put to the Cabinet in accordance with Standing Order 35.

(o) Reports from the Chair of the Scrutiny Committees

To receive reports from the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees in accordance with Standing Order 36.

(p) Report from the Vice-Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee

To receive a report from the Vice-Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee in accordance with Standing Order 37.

(q) ~~Non-Cabinet members' debate~~

~~To enable non-Cabinet members to debate an issue of relevance to Brent in accordance with Standing Order 34. [This paragraph is not currently in use]~~

- (r) Other Business required to be dealt with:
Including, by way of example but not limitation, election results, review of political balance, changes to the Constitution, recommendations from committees, and any other business required to be dealt with.

(s) *Urgent business:

If the Mayor so agrees, to consider any urgent business.

Business falling under (a) to (f) shall not be displaced, but subject thereto the foregoing order of business may be varied by the Mayor at his/her discretion.

Where the Council is to set the Council Tax items (h) to (p) will be replaced by the other items set out in Standing Order 28.

~~31. [This paragraph is not currently in use] **Report from Leader or Members of the Cabinet**~~

~~32. —~~

~~33. The Cabinet shall be allowed to submit a written report in advance of the meeting setting out key or significant issues arising from any matter which is the responsibility of the Cabinet. At the meeting up to 3 minutes will be set aside for the Leader or other member(s) of the Cabinet to present those issues. The report shall include (if relevant) all or any of the following matters:-~~

~~34. —~~

~~35. (i) **Policy proposals referred to Full Council for approval:**~~

~~36. —~~

~~37. A proposed plan, policy or strategy forming part of the Policy Framework or the Budget which is being presented by the Cabinet to Full Council for approval, the views (if any) of the relevant Scrutiny Committee and the way in which those views were taken into account by the Cabinet;~~

~~38. —~~

~~39. (ii) **Approval to depart from Policy Framework or Budget:**~~

~~40. —~~

~~41. Any decisions which the Cabinet has purported to take or is minded to take which, in the reasonable opinion of the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer or the Corporate Director, Finance and Resources are, or would be, contrary to the Policy Framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget approved by Full Council and in respect of which decision is sought from Full Council in accordance with Standing Order 21.~~

~~42. —~~

~~43. (iii) **Urgent decisions outside the Policy Framework and the Budget:**~~

~~44. —~~

~~45. Any decisions which the Cabinet has taken and which were contrary to the Council's Policy Framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget but which were taken in accordance with the urgency provisions in Standing Order 21 (to include the reasons for urgency);~~

~~46. —~~

~~47. (iv) **Urgent decisions not included in the Forward Plan:**~~

~~48. —~~

~~49. Any key decisions which were not included in the Forward Plan but were taken by the Cabinet, a Cabinet Committee, a Cabinet Member or an officer under the urgency provisions in Access to Information Rule 38 and the reasons for such urgency;~~

~~50. —~~

~~51. (v) **Urgent decisions called in:**~~

~~52. —~~

~~53. Any decisions which were called in for scrutiny and which were implemented under the urgency provisions in Standing Order 14 prior to consideration of the decision by the relevant Scrutiny Committee and the reasons for urgency;~~

~~54. —~~

~~55. —~~

~~56. (vi) **Non-compliance with Access to Information Rules:**~~

~~57. —~~

~~58. Any decisions which the Cabinet have taken in respect of which the Cabinet should have but did not comply with those parts of the Access to Information Rules relating to such decisions and any decisions which the relevant Scrutiny Committee has required the Cabinet to report to Full Council under the Access to Information Rules~~

~~because it considers that the Cabinet did not comply with the Access to Information Rules relating to the decision;~~

~~59. —~~

~~60. (vii) — The response of the Cabinet to comments received:~~

~~61. —~~

~~62. — The response of the Cabinet to any other comments or recommendations received from, or being presented by, the relevant Scrutiny Committee or Full Council;~~

~~63. —~~

~~64. (viii) — Any recommendations to Full Council.~~

~~65. —~~

~~66-31. (ix) — Any other matters the Cabinet or a Cabinet members is required to report to Council at the meeting.~~

67-32. Deputations

- (a) Deputations may be made by members of the public. Each deputation shall last not more than 5 minutes and there shall be a maximum of 3 deputations at any one council meeting on different subject matters. There shall be no more than one deputation made by the same person or organisation in a 6 month period and no repetition of the subject.
- (a) Any deputation must directly concern a matter affecting the borough and relate to a Council function. Deputations shall not relate to legal proceedings or be a matter which is or has been the subject of a complaint under the Council's complaints processes. Nor should a deputation be frivolous, vexatious, or defamatory. A deputation may be rejected if it names, or clearly identifies, a member of staff or any other individual. The Chief Executive with advice from the Monitoring Officer shall have discretion to decide whether the deputation is for any other reason inappropriate and cannot proceed.
- (b) Any person wishing to make a deputation shall give written notice to the Monitoring Officer of the title and summary of the content of the deputation not less than 5 days before the date of the meeting.
- (c) If more than three deputations are received a ballot will take place three days before the Council meeting to select the deputations to be presented before the Council.

68-33. Questions from members of the public

- (a) Subject to para (b) members of the public or those employed by or owning a business based in Brent may ask a member of the Cabinet questions on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties affecting the borough.
- (b) Questions shall be submitted fifteen clear working days in advance to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance and written copies of questions will be provided at meetings.
- (c) The time set aside for questions shall be 15 minutes.

- (d) At the Ordinary meeting following the Annual Meeting and at alternate Ordinary meetings for the rest of the municipal year, an additional 15 minutes shall be set aside for questions from members of the Youth Parliament.
- (e) No member of the public may submit more than one question at a council meeting.
- (f) The Chief Executive or his/her nominee shall have the power to edit or amend written questions to make them concise but without affecting the substance, following consultation with the questioner.
- (g) The Mayor may rule that questions which are on the same or closely related subjects are taken together.
- (h) An answer may take the form of a written answer provided by close of business the previous working day and which will be available at the meeting.
- (i) Questions shall be asked in the order determined by the Mayor.
- (j) A person asking a question under para (a) may ask one oral supplementary question, without notice, of the member who supplied the written answer. The supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- (k) Replies to supplementary questions shall not exceed 2 minutes.
- (l) Questions not answered at a meeting may, at the request of the questioner, be withdrawn and resubmitted to the next or future meeting of the Council, provided that answer has not already been supplied.
- (m) The Chief Executive, with the benefit of advice from the Monitoring Officer, may reject a question if it:
- (i) Is not about a matter for which the Council has a responsibility or which affects the area;
 - (ii) Is defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
 - (iii) Is substantially the same as a question asked within the last six months;
 - (iv) Requests the disclosure of information which is confidential or exempt; or
 - (v) Names, or clearly identifies, a member of staff or any other individual.

34. ~~[This paragraph is not currently in use] Non-Cabinet Members' Debate~~

~~Non-Cabinet members will be permitted to propose a motion for debate. The motion will be confirmed by the Chief Executive.
The debate will be for up to 25 minutes.
The Lead Member shall be permitted to speak for up to two minutes.
Non-Cabinet members are permitted to speak for up to two minutes.
The Lead Member will report to the next meeting of Full Council on any action which follows on from the previous non-Cabinet members' debate.~~

69-35. Questions from the Opposition and Non Cabinet Members

- I. Non-Cabinet members (except the Mayor and Deputy Mayor) will be permitted to put a maximum of 5 written questions to the Cabinet on any matter which is the responsibility of the Cabinet. Each non-Cabinet member

may only put one written question to the Cabinet in any one question time session. The 5 written questions are to be divided as follows: 1 from each of the opposition group, and 2 from the administration group.

Such questions must be provided in writing to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance not less than 10 clear working days before the date of the meeting and the answers published with the meeting summons.

- II. The party groups shall decide which of their members shall put the questions to the Cabinet.
- III. Each non Cabinet member shall have up to 1 minute within which to put their supplementary question.
- IV. A member of the Cabinet shall have up to 2 minutes to respond to the supplementary question.
- V. 30 minutes shall be set aside for this item.
- VI. Following (a) to (d) above, for the remainder of the time available, other non Cabinet members may put one question orally each to the relevant Cabinet member. If the Cabinet member is unable to provide a response at the meeting, a written response shall be provided within a period of 10 working days.
- VII. The Chief Executive, with the benefit of advice from the Monitoring Officer, may reject a question if it:
 - (i) is not about a matter for which the Council has a responsibility or which affects the area;
 - (ii) is defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
 - (iii) is substantially the same as a question asked within the last six months;
 - (iv) requests the disclosure of information which is confidential or exempt; or
 - (v) names, or clearly identifies, a member of staff or any other individual.

70-36. Reports from the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees

- (a) The Chairs of Scrutiny Committees may submit written reports in advance of the meeting on any matter in respect of which the committee has been consulted or which it has ~~been reviewing or considering and shall be permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes to highlight significant issues to Council. Thereafter, for the remainder of the 12 minutes set aside for this item, non Cabinet members can ask questions of the Chairs.~~
- ~~(b) In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair of the Committee may speak or, in the absence of the Vice Chair, another member of the Committee selected for that purpose by the Chair or, if no person has been selected by the Chair, a person selected for that purpose by the Mayor or other person presiding at the meeting of Full Council.~~
- (be) The Chair ~~or other person nominated to speak~~ shall where appropriate include in his or her report:-
 - (i) details of the decisions or proposals of the Cabinet, which have been called in for scrutiny and are being referred to Full Council in accordance with Standing Order 14;

- (ii) details of decisions or proposals of the Cabinet, other than those permitted to be made by the Cabinet under Access to Information Rule 38 (urgency) or 20(n) (in year changes to policy), which the relevant Scrutiny Committee considers are or, if made, would be contrary to the Policy Framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the Council's budget and the recommendations to Full Council thereon;
- (iii) details of the decisions of the Cabinet which the relevant Scrutiny Committee considers were made by the Cabinet other than in accordance with those parts of the Access to Information Rules applicable to such decisions.

71.37. Report from the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee

- (a) The Vice-Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee may present reports on any matter reported to the Committee or in respect of which the Committee has reviewed or considered and shall be permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes thereon.
- (b) In the absence of the Vice-Chair, the report may be presented by another member of the Committee selected for that purpose by the Vice-Chair or, if no person has been selected by the Vice-Chair, a person selected for that purpose by the Mayor or other person presiding at the meeting of Full Council.

~~72.38.~~ [This paragraph is not currently in use] Annual Report on the Borough

~~The Leader will present an annual report on the work of the Council to an Ordinary Meeting of Full Council. The time allowed for the Leader to speak on this item will be 5 minutes. The total time allowed for other members to debate the Leader's report will be 20 minutes. Each Group Leader will be allowed to speak for up to 2 minutes and then any other member will be allowed to speak for up to 2 minutes until the allotted time is used up.~~

73.39. Debate on key issues affecting the Borough

- (a) With agreement of all Group Leaders a speaker shall be invited to attend and speak on an issue pertinent to the London Borough of Brent. The speech shall not exceed 10 minutes.
- (b) The Lead Member will be permitted to speak for 5 minutes on the topic addressed by the speaker within which time they will propose a motion for debate which has been delivered to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance by close of business the previous day and circulated in advance.
- (c) The debate by members will not exceed 45 minutes. Questions or comments by members shall not exceed 2 minutes.

74.40. Vote of No Confidence

The Leader shall cease to hold office following a vote of no confidence in him/her. A motion in respect of the vote of no confidence shall be debated by Full Council if, at least 10 clear working days before the meeting at which the motion is to be considered, it has been signed in accordance with Standing Orders 5 and 6 by at least 40% of the members of the Council and the motion proposes an alternative

Leader. If such a motion is passed the new Leader shall hold office for the remainder of the previous Leader's term of office.

75-41. Motions

(a) Members may put motions to council. No motion may exceed 500 words in length.

~~(b)~~ A maximum of 35 motions will be ~~put to Council debated~~ at any one meeting ~~(two by the administration group and one by each of the opposition group) which will be debated in accordance with the following political group allocations in each municipal year:~~

Meeting 1 (usually in June/July)

- a. Labour x 1
- b. Conservative x 1
- c. Liberal Democrats x 1

Meeting 2 (usually in September/October)

- d. Labour x 1
- e. Conservative x 1
- f. Green x 1

Meeting 3 (usually in November/December)

- g. Labour x 1
- h. Liberal Democrats x 1
- i. Green x 1

~~(b)~~.

~~(e)~~.

~~(e)~~(c) Each group must give notice in writing of their motion to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance not less than 5 days before the date of the meeting. This shall include a copy of the Motion they are intending to move at the meeting. A copy of the motion shall be circulated to all members at least 2 days before the date of the meeting.

~~(e)~~(d) Any amendments to the motions can be accepted provided they are set out in writing to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance by 5.00pm on the previous working day.

~~(f)~~(e) The debate shall commence with the proposer being invited to speak for up to 2 minutes during which time they shall move the Motion notified to the Deputy Director of Democratic Services.

~~(g)~~(f) The proposer of an amendment will then be invited to speak for up to 2 minutes during which time they shall move the Amendment notified to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance.

~~(h)~~(g) Further speakers shall then be called by the Mayor, each limited to 2 minutes.

~~(i)~~(h) The mover of the motion shall then have a right of reply for up to 1 minute. If one or more amendments have been moved, the mover of each

amendment shall also have a right of reply for up to 1 minute in the order in which the amendments were moved.

~~(j)~~(i) The matter shall be put to the vote at the end of the debate. Where one or more amendments have been moved the voting process in Standing Order 43(a) and (b) shall apply.

~~(k)~~(i) Up to 240 minutes shall be set aside for each motion. ~~—Any time not utilised in respect of a motion shall be carried forward to be available in the debate on the following motion.~~

~~(j)~~(k) Up to 650 minutes shall be set aside for this item.

~~(m)~~(l) The Chief Executive, with the benefit of advice from the Monitoring Officer, may reject a Motion if it:

- (i) is not about a matter for which the Council has a responsibility or which affects the area;
- (ii) is defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
- (iii) is substantially the same as a Motion asked within the last six months;
- (iv) requests the disclosure of information which is confidential or exempt; or
- (vi) names, or clearly identifies, a member of staff or any other individual.

76-42. Rules Of Debate For Meetings of Full Council

(a)* *Any motion or amendment to a motion must relate to an item of business specified in the summons for the meeting and may be moved without notice only if notice in writing by 12noon two working days before the date of the meeting is given to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance:*

~~(i) (except as provided in Standing Order 28, Standing Order 40 and Standing Order 41) but must relate to an item of business specified in the summons for the meeting; or~~

~~(i) —.~~

~~(ii) —except for motions which may be moved without notice as set out in paragraph (aa) of this Standing Order; or~~

~~(iii) —except with the consent of the Mayor.~~

(aa) The following motions may be moved without notice:

(i) A procedural motion which includes but is not limited to appointing a chair of the meeting at which the motion is moved; that the minutes be amended before approved as a correct record; changing the order of business in the agenda; suspending or waiving a standing order relating to the conduct of the meeting; excluding the press and public in accordance with the Access to Information Rules; if moved, that a motion or amendment to a motion be withdrawn or altered by the proposer of the motion or amendment; that only a specified number of members from each of the political groups shall be permitted to speak; that the question be now put; that the debate be adjourned; that the meeting is adjourned; that a member not be heard and that a member leave the meeting.

(ii) An urgent motion where the Mayor has given consent.

- (b) Each amendment shall relate to the subject matter of the motion and shall not have the effect of negating the motion.
- (c) Motions or amendments to motions shall not be open to debate until formally moved.
- (d) Procedural motions shall be put to the vote without discussion, provided that the Mayor may, in his or her absolute discretion, allow or require the proposer to give (for such brief period as the Mayor may allow) reasons for proposing the motion.
- (e) A member shall stand when speaking (if able to do so) and shall address the Mayor. If two or more members rise to speak the Mayor shall call on one to speak.
- (f) Speeches shall be directed to the matter under discussion or to a personal explanation or to a point of order.
- (g) No speech shall exceed three minutes except where otherwise provided in these Standing Orders or by the consent of Full Council and except for a Chair or the Leader replying to a debate whose speech shall not exceed five minutes. Any motion or amendment to a motion shall be put within the time allowed for the speeches.
- (h) With the exception of a Cabinet Member responding to a question put to the Cabinet by a non-Cabinet member, or a Chair of a committee or sub-committee replying to a debate on a report referred from the committee or sub-committee or where otherwise provided in these Standing Orders, a member shall not speak more than once on any item of business except on rising to a point of order or in personal explanation.
- (i) A member may rise to raise a point of order or make a personal explanation. A point of order shall be confined to an assertion that a breach of these Standing Orders or of the law has occurred, A personal explanation shall be confined to some material part of a former speech by the member at the same meeting, which may have been misunderstood. A member so rising shall be entitled to be heard forthwith.
- (j) Subject to the provisions of Standing Order 6(b) the ruling of the Mayor on a point of order or on the admissibility of a personal explanation shall not be open to discussion.
- (k) Whenever the Mayor rises during a debate, all those present then speaking or standing shall resume their seat and Full Council shall be silent.
- (l) A motion or amendment to a motion which has not been moved may be withdrawn by the proposer of the motion or amendment, a motion or amendment to a motion which has been moved may be withdrawn or altered by the proposer of the motion or amendment with the consent of Full Council, which shall be signified without discussion by a show of hands and/or by a roll call. Where a motion is withdrawn there shall thereafter be no further debate on the item.
- (m) At the commencement of a debate, any member may move that only a specified number of members from each of the political groups shall be permitted to speak before a vote is taken or at the commencement of any meeting of Full Council or during the course thereof any member may move that only a specified number of

members of each political group shall be permitted to speak on each motion or amendment thereto.

- (n) The mover of the motion shall then have a right of reply. If one or more amendments have been moved, the mover of each shall also have a right of reply in the order in which the amendments were moved.
- (o) A member may move without comment at the conclusion of another member's speech: "*That the question be now put*", "*That the debate be adjourned (to some stated time)*" or "*That the Council do now adjourn (to some stated time)*" on which the Mayor shall proceed as follows:-
 - (i) on a motion that the question be now put, the Mayor shall first put that motion to the vote without further discussion; if it is passed the motion(s) and/or amendment(s) relating to the subject of the debate will then also be put to the vote;
 - (ii) on a motion to adjourn the debate or the meeting, the Mayor shall put that motion to the vote without further discussion; if it is passed the debate or meeting shall stand adjourned to the time stated; if the debate is adjourned the Council will proceed to the next item of business; if the meeting is adjourned no further business will be transacted until the adjourned meeting

AND no second motion that the question be now put or that the debate or meeting be adjourned shall be made during the consideration of the same business unless it shall be proposed by the Mayor.

- (p) The Mayor may at any time invite an officer to respond to any issue raised or question asked.

This page is intentionally left blank

The London Borough of Brent, in exercise of the powers conferred by the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003; the Local Government and Housing Act 1989; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 1972 hereby makes the following Scheme.

Introduction

1. This is Brent Council's Members' Allowance Scheme. The allowances in Schedule 1 shall become effective from 1 April 2026. The Scheme was made on 23 February 2026.

Interpretation

In this Scheme:

"Councillor" means a member of the London Borough of Brent who is a Councillor.

"Year" means a period of 12 months ending 31 March.

Basic Allowance

2. For each year a basic allowance as set out in Schedule 1 of this Scheme shall be paid to each Councillor.

Special Responsibility Allowances

3. (1) For each year, a Special Responsibility Allowance shall be paid to those Councillors who have the Special Responsibilities in relation to the authority that are specified in Schedule 1 of this Scheme.
(2) The amount of each such Allowance shall be the amount specified against that Special Responsibility in Schedule 1.
(3) No member shall receive more than one Special Responsibility Allowance.
(4) No member of the Planning Committee, Licensing Committee, Adoption and Permanency Panel and Fostering Panel shall receive a Special Responsibility Allowance unless the member has attended or completed the mandatory training sessions for that body. The reference to mandatory training sessions are to such sessions as determined by the Council from time to time.

Allowances for the education co-opted members and the independent members on Audit and Standards Advisory Committee

4. For each year an allowance as set out in Schedule 1 of this Scheme shall be paid to the education co-opted members and the independent members on the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee. The allowance will be paid in two instalments during the municipal year. For terms of office commencing from or after 18 May 2023 the allowance will only be paid where the co-opted/independent member has not been absent for a majority of meetings over the previous 6 months.

Dependants' Carers' Allowance

- 5 (1) A dependants' carers' allowance may be claimed by a councillor in respect of such expenses of arranging for the care of their children or dependants as are necessarily incurred in the attendance at meetings or the performance of

functions of a type specified in Schedule 2.

- (2) For the purposes of 5(1) above:
 - A Councillor's dependants are defined as children aged 15 or under, elderly, disabled or unwell relatives who cannot be left alone (either temporarily or permanently).
 - Payments will not normally be made to carers who are family members or person's resident at the Councillor's home.
 - Carers must be aged 18 or over.
- (3) The Carers' Allowance can also cover costs associated with Councillors who themselves need the help of a carer in order for them to fulfil their duties as a Councillor.
- (4) The maximum rate for this allowance is based on the Living Wage Foundation's 'real living wage' (unless specialist care is required and approved) to meet, or contribute towards, the actual costs incurred in arranging care. The maximum period from which any one claim can be made is the duration of the meeting/duty plus 'reasonable' travel time to and from meetings up to the maximum of an hour each way. What equates to reasonable travel time will be agreed with the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance.
- (5) Payments will only be made where:
 - a. receipts are produced for any claim; and
 - b. written/email approval of the claim has been obtained from the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance prior to the meeting.
- (6) Any queries on expenses or claims should be referred to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance.
- (7) For the purposes of regulation 7(1)(h) of the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (see Schedule 2), the following are approved duties in respect of which councillors are entitled to claim a dependants' carers' allowance:
 - i) all approved internal and external learning and development sessions as part of the Council Member Learning and Development programme;
 - ii) meetings with government departments and other official bodies;
 - iii) meetings and/or briefings convened or authorised by Chief Officers provided that councillors of at least two political groups have been invited;
 - iv) Cabinet member/officer meetings;
 - v) formal inspections and site visits authorised by the Council;
 - vi) conferences that a councillor is appointed to attend;
 - vii) formal joint meetings with members of other authorities; and
 - viii) meetings of all other bodies to which councillors are appointed as a representative of the Council or a Committee. These include:
 - a. joint committees with staff;
 - b. working panels;
 - c. steering groups; and
 - d. advisory groups and outside bodies (appointed to by the Council).

- ix) the carrying out of any other duty approved by the authority, or any duty of a class so approved, for the purpose of, or in connection with, the discharge of the functions of the authority or any of its committees or subcommittees.

Summary: Care costs can be claimed for all formal Council work including attending Council meetings, committees and sub-committees, meetings for other bodies for which councillors have been appointed by the council, as well as attending internal and external learning and development sessions.

Care costs cannot be claimed for ward work, constituency meetings, meeting preparation or travel time as these are covered by the Basic Allowance.

Civic dignitaries

6. In accordance with the necessary tax dispensation, for each year the allowances set out in schedule 1 shall be paid to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to meet the expenses of their office.

Travelling and subsistence allowances

7. (1) Subject to the conditions set out in this paragraph, reasonable travelling and subsistence expenses may be claimed by councillors (or co-opted or independent members) in respect of the attendance at conferences outside of the borough of Brent.
- (2) Subject to the conditions set out in this paragraph, reasonable expenses may be claimed for travel by councillors (or co-opted or independent members) with disabilities.
- (3) The expenses shall be for the purpose of, or in connection with, the discharge of the functions of the Council.
- (5) The prior written approval of the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance or the Director Performance, Policy and Partnerships shall be obtained in respect of both the incurring of the expenses and the amount of the expenses.
- (6) Claims shall be reimbursed at the same rate as the Council reimburses expenses claimed by officers. Subject to any maximum limits which may apply, the amount of the claim shall be limited to the expense actually incurred.
- (7) Receipts shall be produced in respect of all claims.

Renunciation

8. A Councillor (or co-opted or independent member) may, by notice in writing given to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance, elect to forego any part of their entitlement to an allowance under this Scheme.

Part-year Entitlements

9. In so far as this scheme has effect for only part of a year or where, in the course of a year, this Scheme is amended or a Councillor or co-opted or independent member becomes or ceases to be a Councillor or co-opted or independent member, or accepts or relinquishes a special responsibility in respect of which a Special Responsibility Allowance is payable, the entitlement to such an allowance shall be to such part of the allowance as bears to the whole in the same proportion as the number of days during which their term of office subsists bears to the number of days in that year.

Claims and Payments

10. (1) A dependents' carers' allowance, travelling and subsistence allowances or education co-opted or independent members' allowance under this Scheme shall be made in writing within two months of the date on which the duty in respect of which the entitlement to the allowance arises.
- (2) Payments shall be made:
- (a) in respect of Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances, subject to Sub-Paragraph (4) below, in instalments of one-twelfth of the amount specified in this Scheme on a day each month as determined by the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance.
 - (b) in respect of Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral allowances, in accordance with a scheme for which a tax dispensation has been given.
 - (c) in respect of dependents' carers' allowances, on the day as determined by the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance in respect of claims received up to the last day of the preceding month.
- (3) Where a payment of one-twelfth of the amount specified in this Scheme in respect of a Basic Allowance or a Special Responsibility Allowance would result in the Councillor receiving more or less than the amount to which, by virtue of Paragraph 8, he or she is entitled, the payment shall be such amount as will ensure that no more or no less is paid than the amount to which he or she is entitled.
- (4) A record of all payments made under this Scheme showing recipient, nature and amount shall be maintained and made available for public inspection.
- (5) No member may claim an allowance under this Scheme if he or she is already claiming an allowance from another authority in respect of the same duties.
- (6) Where an allowance has already been paid in respect any period during which the person claiming the allowance was not entitled to so claim the Council may recover the amount paid.

Annual Uplift

11. Basic, special and civic allowances payable under this Scheme shall be increased with effect from each April by a percentage equal to the inflation pay award agreed as part of the Local Government Pay Settlement in the previous financial year, unless otherwise determined by the Council.

Pensions

~~12. (a) The following members of the Council are entitled to pensions in accordance with a members pension scheme:~~

~~13. [none]~~

~~14. —~~

~~15. (b) The following allowances shall be treated as amounts in respect of which such pensions are payable:~~

~~16. [none]~~

~~12. —~~

(1) The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended) (LGPS Regulations) provide that Councillors may elect to become members of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) in respect of their duties as members of the authority.

(2) Membership of the LGPS is not automatic and Councillors must opt to join the Scheme in accordance with the applicable Regulations.

(3) Eligibility to join the LGPS is determined by statutory provisions and is not dependent on any determination made under this Scheme.

(4) Where a Councillor has elected to join the LGPS, pensionable pay shall comprise those allowances payable under this Scheme which are designated as pensionable in accordance with the LGPS Regulations.

(5) For the avoidance of doubt a:

(a) Basic Allowance; and

(b) Special Responsibility Allowance.

may be pensionable, subject to the LGPS Regulations.

(6) Travelling and subsistence expenses, a dependants' carers' allowance, and any other payments by way of reimbursement of expenses shall not be pensionable.

Maternity, Paternity, Adoption and Sickness Pay

17.13. (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, adoption and sickness leave.

(2) Councillors giving birth are entitled to up to six months maternity leave with the option to extend up to 52 weeks with the approval of the Chief Executive following consultation with the Chief Whip/Business Manager, where applicable. Maternity leave can begin:

(a) When the councillor chooses but no earlier than 11 weeks before the expected week of childbirth, or

(b) from the day following childbirth if the baby is born earlier

(3) A Councillor entitled to a Special Responsibility Allowance shall continue to receive their allowance during any period of maternity, paternity, adoption and sickness leave in the same way that the Council's employees enjoy such benefits.

- (4) If another Councillor is appointed to cover the period of absence, the replacement will be entitled to receive the same allowance. In accordance with paragraph 3.3 of this scheme, no Councillor shall receive more than one Special Responsibility Allowance.
- (5) Councillors wanting to take paternity leave must offer a declaration in writing that specifies the start day or date of the period of leave and its duration. If the child(ren) is born on a different date, the Council must be given notice of the changed period of parental leave as soon as possible.
- (6) Councillors shall be entitled to take up to 2 weeks paternity leave if they are the biological father or nominated carer of their partner/spouse following the birth or adoption of their child(ren).
- (7) Paternity leave can be taken as either:
 - (a) a single period of leave of either one week or two weeks, or
 - (b) two non-consecutive periods of leave of a week each
- (8) Councillors can take their paternity leave any time in the 52 weeks after the birth or adoption of their child(ren).

- (9) A Councillor who has made Shared Parental Leave arrangements is requested to advise the Council of these at the earliest possible opportunity. Every effort will be made to replicate the Council's staff policy in terms of leave as far as practicable with the approval of the Chief Executive following consultation with the Chief Whip/[Business Manager](#), where applicable.
- (10) Where both parents are Councillors, leave may be shared up to a maximum of 24 weeks for the first six months and 26 weeks for any leave agreed thereafter, up to a maximum of 50 weeks. Special and exceptional arrangements may be made in cases of prematurity with the approval of the Chief Executive following consultation with the Chief Whip/[Business Manager](#), where applicable.
- (11) If an election is held during the Member's maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave and they are not re-elected, or decide not to stand for re-election, their basic allowance and SRA if appropriate will cease from the Monday after the election date when they would technically leave office.

*Where adoption has taken place through an approved (domestic or overseas) adoption agency.

SCHEDULE 1

**BASIC, SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CO-OPTED MEMBER
ALLOWANCES WITH EFFECT FROM 1 APRIL 2025 (AS REVIEWED
ON 29 FEBRUARY 2025)**

Basic Allowance

Payable to all councillors = £ 13,978

Special Responsibility Allowances
(No more than one allowance per member)

1. Leader of the Council = £ 42,388
2. Deputy Leader of the Council = £ 30,891
3. Other Cabinet Members = £ 20,354
4. Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee = £ 15,229
5. Chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee =
£ 15,229
6. Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Committee = £15,229
- ~~6-7.~~ Chair of the Planning Committee = £ 15,229
- ~~7-8.~~ Members of the Planning Committee = £ 2,322
- ~~8-9.~~ Chair of the Audit and Standards Committee (Vice-Chair of the Audit
and Standards Advisory Committee) = £ 5,332
- ~~9-10.~~ Chairs of the Brent Connects Area Consultative Forums = £ 2,120
- ~~10-11.~~ Chair of the Licensing Committee = £ 3,449
- ~~11-12.~~ Members of the Licensing Committee = £ 2,120
- ~~12-13.~~ Member of the Adoption and Permanency Panel = £ 3,438
- ~~13-14.~~ Member of the Fostering Panel = £ 3,438
- ~~14-15.~~ Leader of the Principal Opposition Group* = £ 8,531
16. Leader of the Second Opposition Group** = £ 4,100,000
- 15-17. Leader of the Third Opposition Group*** = £7,500
- ~~16.~~ Group Whip/Business Manager for the majority Administration Group with
over 50% of councillors =
18. £ 4,265,875
19. Group Whip/Business Manager for the Principal Opposition Group* =
£3,332
20. Group Whip/Business Manager for the Second Opposition Group** =
£3,332
- ~~17-21.~~ Group Whip/Business Manager for the Third Opposition Group*** =
£2,726
- ~~18-22.~~ Mayor = £ 7,615
- ~~19-23.~~ Deputy Mayor = £ 3,449

*For the purposes of this Scheme this is the second largest group of the Council. If there are two or more opposition groups of the same size, it is such group as the Council shall decide.

**For the purposes of this Scheme this is the third largest group of the Council. If there are two or more opposition groups of the same size, it is such group as the Council shall decide.

*** For the purposes of this Scheme this is the fourth largest group of the Council. If there are two or more opposition groups of the same size, it is such group as the Council shall decide.

Co-opted Member Allowances

1. Chair of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee (voting) = £1,561
2. Independent members of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee (voting) = £444

3. Education voting and non-voting co-opted members of the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee £226.

SCHEDULE 2**Extract from The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003****Dependants' carers' allowance**

7. (1) A scheme may provide for the payment to members of an authority of an allowance ("dependants' carers' allowance") in respect of such expenses of arranging for the care of their children or dependants as are necessarily incurred in—

- (a) the attendance at a meeting of the authority or of any committee or sub-committee of the authority, or of any other body to which the authority makes appointments or nominations, or of any committee or sub-committee of such a body;
- (b) the attendance at any other meeting, the holding of which is authorised by the authority, or a committee or sub-committee of the authority, or a joint committee of the authority and at least one other local authority within the meaning of section 270(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, or a sub-committee of such a joint committee, provided that—
 - (i) where the authority is divided into two or more political groups it is a meeting to which members of at least two such groups have been invited; or
 - (ii) if the authority is not so divided, it is a meeting to which at least two members of the authority have been invited;
- (c) the attendance at a meeting of any association of authorities of which the authority is a member;
- (d) the attendance at a meeting of the executive or a meeting of any of its committees, where the authority is operating executive arrangements;
- (e) the performance of any duty in pursuance of any standing order made under section 135 of the Local Government Act 1972 requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened;
- (f) the performance of any duty in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises;
- (g) the performance of any duty in connection with arrangements made by the authority for the attendance of pupils at any school approved for the purposes of section 342 of the Education Act 1996 (approval of non-maintained special schools)(1); and
- (h) the carrying out of any other duty approved by the authority, or any duty of a class so approved, for the purpose of, or in connection with, the discharge of the functions of the authority or any of its committees or sub-committees.

This page is intentionally left blank