Report of the Council Meeting
Of the London Borough of Redbridge on Thursday, 19 June 2014

Thursday, 19th June, 2014 (7.15 p.m. - 11.30 p.m.)


Officials: Chief Executive, Director of Adult Social Services, Director of Finance and Resources, Director of Children’s Services, Director of Environment and Community Safety, Borough Solicitor and Secretary and Joint Heads of Constitutional Services.

Prayers were said by the Mayor’s Chaplain.

Public: 29

1. Standing Order 68: Electronic Media (COU/01/190614)

All present were reminded of Standing Order 68 which dealt with the use of electronic media tools at meetings of Council bodies. The use of such media tools was permitted unless the Chair considered that such use would adversely affect the conduct of the meeting.

2. Apologies for Absence (COU/02/190614)

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor O’Shea.

3. To approve the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20th March 2014 (COU/03/190614)

That we agree the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 20th March 2014.

4. Declarations of Interest (COU/04/190614)

Members were reminded of the requirement to consider whether they had an interest in any matter on the agenda that needed to be disclosed and, if so, to declare the interest when Council reached that item on the agenda.

5. Correspondence (COU/05/190614)
None.

6. **To receive the Mayor’s announcements (COU/06/190614)**

   (i) **Acceptance Speech**

   The Mayor addressed the Council in appreciation of the honour conferred upon him by his election.

   (ii) **Mayor’s Appeal**

   The Mayor announced upcoming Mayor’s Appeal Events.

7. **To hear questions from members of the public (COU/07/190614)**

   (i) Mr Walker asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Athwal, when will the Leader of the Council be setting up monthly monitoring of King George and Queens Hospitals on the Redbridge i site to include the bed numbers at each hospital and patient death rates along with the bed occupancy rates, staffing levels and waiting lists and so honour his pledge to residents made in his letter of 27 March to the Ilford Recorder?

   Councillor Athwal replied that he had made sure that the importance of our NHS Health Services provided to residents in Redbridge was high on the Council agenda moving forward.

   To facilitate this, the Leader had asked the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Streeting, to lead the Health and Wellbeing portfolio.

   In fulfilling this important role and portfolio the Leader had asked Councillor Streeting to ensure that working in partnership with the NHS locally and, in particular, the Redbridge Clinical Commissioning Group and the Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Trust, that we were provided with information that could be sign posted on the Council’s website regularly to demonstrate transparency in relation to their performance. This was something Mr Walker had been campaigning for a long time.

   The Leader had asked for available information produced by the NHS to be collated and posted within the next six weeks in a format that could be sustained to show trends over time.

   The Leader was also ensuring that the Health Scrutiny Committee would continue to look closely at the performance of NHS partners and scrutinise any performance improvement plans that were published and held to account the Trust Executives for service delivery and progress in relation to their improvement needs.

   It was important to note that the Council did not and should not manage the NHS, however we did have a duty to ensure that those who were accountable for the delivery of local services were held to account and the Leader would ensure that he would do that.
By way of a supplementary question Mr Walker asked, that in light of the recent temporary closure of Queens Maternity Unit and the inadequate number of child beds locally, will the Leader be part of the delegation organised by the Save King George Hospital Committee to Number 10 Downing Street, to call for funding and to remedy the problem and to seek a meeting with the Health Minister to make sure that our expectant mothers are looked after and sick children do not have to wait longer than they should in our hospitals?

Councillor Athwal replied that he thought first and foremost what we as representatives of this Borough had to do was to ensure that we followed the protocol. We do not promise what we cannot deliver. We ensured that anything we embarked upon had an end result. The Leader was all for making sure that services were delivered, but what he was not for was to go on adverts for himself or for anyone else and the Leader made that clear that if there was a way forward and we thought that something could be achieved from this, we will do so. If there was not then the Leader would certainly be taking advice from Officers, but it would be to an end but not just for personal gain.

(ii) Mr Poole asked the Cabinet Member for Resources and Finance, Councillor Zammett, can the Cabinet Member for Resources tell me how much in total, has been spent by the Council on Jacques Hall in Hainault in preparation for the lease and subsequently?

Councillor Zammett replied that Jacques Hall or 628 New North Road, was let on a 25 year lease to the Hainault and Chigwell Muslim Association.

Prior to the letting of the property, the sum of £38,000 was incurred by the Council for re-roofing works and ancillary repairs.

In addition, on site security was required following vandalism and the making of threats to cause significant damage to Jacques Hall. The cost of the on-site security was £84,000.

Since the letting of the property, the Council had not incurred expenditure on the maintenance of the property, since this was now the responsibility of the lessee.

Councillor Zammett could also advise that no Council money was provided to the lessee for the refurbishment of 628 New North Road.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Poole commented that he had received a number of complaints from both residents and community groups who have tried to book Jacques Hall for birthdays, weddings and social gatherings. They complain that the policies and practices currently in place by the current occupiers prohibit them the use of Jacques Hall for the use of community purposes. Given the public funds spent, you may also be surprised to learn that on the 16th May the local Labour party, were invited to address the gathered attendees where one candidate stated and I quote “all other parties are racist except the Labour party”. My question is this, will you give assurances to the local residents of Hainault, that everything possible will be done to ensure that the community centre that was promised and received public funding, can and will be delivered to be used by the whole community for general community use such as birthdays, weddings and social gatherings and that Jacques Hall does not and will not become used as a political base for the Labour party in Hainault or become a
place of religious worship, contrary to the lease agreed and the planning permission granted?

Councillor Zammett replied that he had been on the website to look at this particular community facility and it was very clear that it was available to all faiths, to all groups in the community. Councillor Zammett would not want to comment on what has been said in his absence, but he was absolutely certain that the Labour party would not be looking to monopolise this or to use this for a political base in Hainault and further than that Councillor Zammett could not say because as far as the letting of this particular hall was concerned, it was very clear to him and from the website that it was free and open to everyone. There may be clashes on occasions of course but it was the nature of a community facility that was being accessed by people.

(iii) Mr Moth asked the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Nijjar, what progress has been made towards the implementation of the new Public Toilets in Barkingside?

Councillor Nijjar replied that she was unsure of which particular toilets Mr Moth was referring to when he asks about the new toilets. Following the sale of land at the junction of Fencepiece Road and Fullwell Cross roundabout some years ago a feasibility study was conducted and in that feasibility study it was looked into as to whether an automated public convenience could be sited near to the top end of the High Street to replace the toilet which was shut down due to the sale of the land. There were technical issues in regard to this proposal, and it was found that there were problems with the connection of the sewage system. Therefore it was not cost effective, including the fact that the rental cost of the unit was high. An alternative option was looked into and investigated at the time. In looking at that option in 2011, the Library was being refurbished. As part of the refurbishment, the toilets, in serving the Library, were upgraded and modified so that residents and shoppers could be allowed access direct from the High Street. However, just to let Mr Moth know, Councillor Nijjar was looking into this issue and she had spoken to Officers about it and Officers were looking at potential sites where we could locate public conveniences. We will be looking at all options in addition to estimating full costs of re-opening toilets that had been previously been closed.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Moth asked that could the Cabinet Member tell me what action is going to be taken with regard to public health and no toilet provision in the town square as it is likely that public defecation and urination will take place as there are no public toilets in that area?

Councillor Nijjar replied that as you may be aware, this was included as one of our pledges during the elections, as she said before, they are looking into opening public conveniences in the near future. Councillor Nijjar had already spoken to Officers and in the next few weeks they would look at potential sites.

(iv) Mr Djitli asked the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Streeting, following the recent Sunday Times report that Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust has Government approval to use local authority funding to buy out the PFI deal for Hexham General hospital: will Redbridge Council look into buying out the Queens PFI contract?

Councillor Streeting replied that the question, which actually raised the prominence
of a really interesting case, for those who had not followed it closely was the Northumbria case where the Council lends funds to a Health Trust so that the Trust can re-finance and effectively buy out its PFI contract. In simple terms, the Council was accessing funds from the Government’s Public Works Loan Board and lending them to the Trust through the PFI deal, thus providing sizeable finance at a lower cost and saving the Trust a significant sum per year, whilst also providing the benefits of the Council in question.

As the Queens PFI contract was between the provider and Queens, any contract change or refinancing would need to be led by Queens. There were also some caveats in terms of the factors that led to the Northumbrian case being successful. Firstly there needed to be some assessment of the feasibility of refinancing and funding what could be quite extensive legal and transition costs. There would also need to be support for any such change from the Department of Health and the Treasury on what was effectively a debt swap from the private to public sector balance sheet.

The Council was always very willing to look at ways to discuss helping another local public body if that helped improve services to local residents, and it certainly would not have missed the attention of Mr Djitli and members of the Council, that both of our NHS trusts had significant financial pressures and troubles. This would of course need careful consideration not least around the legal issues and it would be necessary for Queens to fully guarantee and reimburse the Council’s costs. It was also worth bearing in mind that Queens was situated in Havering so in this case, there would need to be a discussion with that local authority and possibly this local authority as well. But Councillor Streeting could not commit to buying out the PFI contract and he thought it was fair to say that a Government of whichever shade would probably cotton on very quickly to local authorities across the Country buying out PFI’s left right and centre. Councillor Streeting thought this would be judged on a case by case basis with all of the stake holders involved.

8a Appointments of Committees and Other Bodies (COU/8a/190614)

The report before us set out the proposals for appointing Members and, where appropriate, co-opted members and independent persons, to Committees and other bodies.

The report also proposed changes to the existing titles and/or Terms of Reference/functions of the Council’s Relevant Committees (Policy & Resources Service Committee, Children’s Services, Leisure & Youth Service Committee, Adult Social Services, Housing & Health Services Committee, Environment Service Committee and Licensing Committee).

Appointment of Ordinary Committee

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-

Resolved: That (i) ordinary committees be appointed as set out in paragraph 3.2 (a) of the report before us, with the terms of reference/functions of these Committees being as set out in the Constitution and, in the case of Service Committees, attached as Appendix D to these minutes.

(ii) seats on these committees be allocated as set out in paragraph 3.2 (a) as tabled at our meeting.

(iii) the Members, co-opted members and substitutes to be appointed to serve on these committees be as shown on Appendix A to these minutes, subject to the deletion of those persons shown to be appointed as Co-opted Members on the Health Scrutiny Committee.

**Appointment of Licensing Committee**

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


**AGAINST: (0)**

**ABSTAIN: (1)** – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 2 on Appendix H

Resolved: That (i) the Licensing Committee be appointed as set out in paragraph 3.2 (b) of the report, with its terms of reference/functions being as set out in Appendix D to the report.

(ii) seats on the Licensing Committee be allocated as set out in paragraph 3.2 (b) as tabled at our meeting.

(iii) the Members appointed to serve on the Licensing Committee be as shown on Appendix B to these minutes.

**Appointment of Panels and other Bodies**
The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 3 on Appendix H

Resolved: That (i) panels and other bodies be appointed as set out in paragraph 3.2 (c) of the report, with their terms of reference/functions being as set out in the Constitution.

(ii) seats on these panels and other bodies be allocated as set out in paragraph 3.2 (c) as tabled at our meeting.

(iii) the Members, co-opted Members and substitutes to be appointed to serve on these bodies be as shown on Appendix C to these minutes.

Scrutiny Panels

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 4 on Appendix H

Resolved: That (i) the terms of reference/functions of the Education Scrutiny Panel be as set out in the Constitution and that the co-opted members be appointed to the Panel as set out in section 5.1 to the report before us.
(ii) the terms of reference/functions of the External Scrutiny Panel be as set out in section 5.1 to the report before us.

**Appointment of Area Committees**

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


**AGAINST: (0)**

**ABSTAIN: (1)** – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 5 on Appendix H

**Resolved:** That (i) Area Committees be appointed as set out in section 6 of the report before us, pending the Council’s further consideration of their future;

(ii) the membership of these committees be the Members representing the Wards forming the committees as set out in section 6 of the report of the report before us.

**Regional Planning Committees**

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


**AGAINST: (0)**

**ABSTAIN: (1)** – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 6 on Appendix H

**Resolved:** That (i) Regional Planning Committees be appointed as set out in section 7 of the report before us, with their terms of reference/functions being as set out in the Constitution.
(ii) the membership of these committees be as set out in Appendix E to these minutes with the tabled correction.

8b **Members Allowances (COU/8b/190614)**

The Independent Remuneration Panel to London Councils had recently (June 2014) published a new report on the remuneration of Councillors in London. The release of this report, together with the new composition of the Council, had led to a review of the current Redbridge Members Allowances Scheme.

Details of revised proposals were set out in the report and were attached in Appendix 1 to the report before us.

**Amendment moved by Councillor Canal** and seconded by Councillor Hayes

“To apply a 20% reduction to all Special Responsibility Allowances to:-

1. Achieve further savings
2. Ensure no accusation of bias can be levied against the administration; and

To set the level of the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Leader of the Third Largest Group at the same level of a “spokesperson” on a Council Service Committee.”

Following debate the amendment was put to the vote and the result was as follows

**FOR: (24)** – Councillors Best, Blaber, Bromiley, Canal, M. Chaudhary, Cole, Cronin, Cummins, Mrs Dunn, Fairley-Churchill, Haran, Hayes, Mrs Huggett, Lambert, Mclaren, Mrs Nolan, O’Shea, Mrs Packer, Prince, Mrs Ryan, Sharpe, Stark, Turbefield and Weinberg.


**ABSTAIN: (1)** – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The amendment was declared not carried.

**See voting record 7 on Appendix H**

Following debate the recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 8 on Appendix H

Resolved: That Council adopts the revised Members Allowances Scheme and Schedule of Payments as set out in Appendix F to these minutes with the tabled correction.

8c Changes to Calendar of Meetings (COU/8c/190614)

The report before us asked us to consider changes to the agreed Calendar of Meetings for the 2014/15 municipal year.

Amendment moved by Councillor Canal and seconded by Councillor Bond

“The Council (i) agrees that the following meetings not be deleted from the Calendar of Meetings for 2014/15 municipal year:-

Area 1 Committee – 23rd June 2014
Area 5 Committee – 23rd June 2014
Area 2 Committee – 24th June 2014
Area 7 Committee – 24th June 2014
Area 3 Committee – 25th June 2014
Area 6 Committee – 25th June 2014
Area 4 Committee – 30th June 2014”

Following debate the amendment was put to the vote and the result was as follows:-

FOR: (27) – Councillors Best, Blaber, Bond, Bromiley, Canal, M. Chaudhary, Cleaver, Cole, Cronin, Cummins, Deakins, Mrs Dunn, Fairley-Churchill, Haran, Hayes, Mrs Huggett, Lambert, Mclaren, Mrs Nolan, O’Shea, Mrs Packer, Prince, Mrs Ryan, Sharpe, Stark, Turbefield and Weinberg.


ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)
The amendment was declared not carried.

See voting record 9 on Appendix H

The recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


AGAINST: (27) – Councillors Best, Blaber, Bond, Bromiley, Canal, M. Chaudhary, Cleaver, Cole, Cronin, Cummins, Deakins, Mrs Dunn, Fairley-Churchill, Haran, Hayes, Mrs Huggett, Lambert, Mclaren, Mrs Nolan, O’Shea, Mrs Packer, Prince, Mrs Ryan, Sharpe, Stark, Turbefield and Weinberg.

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 10 on Appendix H

Resolved: That Council (i) agrees that the following meetings be deleted from the Calendar of Meetings for 2014/15 municipal year:-

Area 1 Committee – 23rd June 2014
Area 5 Committee – 23rd June 2014
Area 2 Committee – 24th June 2014
Area 7 Committee – 24th June 2014
Area 3 Committee – 25th June 2014
Area 6 Committee – 25th June 2014
Health Scrutiny Committee – 26th June 2014
Area 4 Committee – 30th June 2014

(ii) agrees that meetings of Service Committees be held as follows in the 2014/15 municipal year:-

- Replace meetings of the Adult Social Service, Housing & Health Service Committee with Health, Wellbeing, Care & Older People Service Committee
- Replace meetings of the Children’s Services, Leisure & Youth Service Committee with Children & Young People Service Committee
- Replace meetings of Environment Service Committee with Neighbourhood & Communities Service Committee

9. Urgent Statements (COU/09/190614)

None.
10. **To hear questions from Members (COU/10/190614)**

(i) Councillor Deakins asked the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Javed, will the Cabinet Member for Housing review the effectiveness of Redbridge Housing’s arrangements for resident consultation and engagement?

**Councillor Javed replied that** that the consultation with the people of Redbridge for the people of Redbridge was Labour’s vision for 4 years at least and many more years to come. With regards to housing in particular, section 42 of the 1980 Housing Act conferred a duty upon local authorities to consult their tenants on a wide range of issues; management issues, rents and services, improvements, demolition, improvements within the properties and outside. Then the Cabinet itself proposed to consult, to consider proposals to strengthen that consultation. Councillor Javed could say that the Housing Service certainly was at the forefront of carrying out consultation with the residents and long may it continue and Councillor Javed believed that the tenants had the right to be consulted, and that would happen. Councillor Deakins would know, because she was the Chair of the Adult Social Services and Housing Committee, and she was part of it, very actively took a part in it, but there was something that he hoped that she could share with us, what it is was that she was not able to do during her period of office that she occupied, Council would like to hear what it was that concerned her and Councillor Javed would be happy to listen to that and put her right.

**By way of a supplementary question Councillor Deakins asked**, in view of the fact that the Cabinet Member has attended only half of the Redbridge Residents Housing Panel Meetings in the last year, and he has never been present for the whole of any of those meetings, and that he attended neither the tenants nor the leaseholders annual conferences this year, how will he establish credibility with the Council’s housing residents and their representatives?

**Councillor Javed replied that** what Councillor Deakins did not know was that who he went to see, an elderly lady a 99 year old, a pensioner, that would be much better than sitting and listening to you with respect. Councillor Javed did listen to people, did attend where it was really necessary and prioritised his work. As Cabinet Member for Housing he could assure the Council that he would be everywhere, wherever he was wanted and needed.

**By way of a second supplementary question Councillor Hayes asked**, does the Cabinet Member agree that with regards to these statutory consultations and obligations, leaseholders are often the poor relations and do not have anything like the same rights to be consulted that tenants do on a number of issues, such as, for example, small scale voluntary transfers. Will the Cabinet Member please assure Council that he will make every effort to make sure that leaseholders are always consulted fully and properly on all matters which affect them, and that every effort is made to do this even where the law does not so require it.

**Councillor Javed replied that** he was somewhat delighted by that admission by the Party opposite that for the past four years have not done so, and for the majority of time that they have been in power except 8 years, you did not do that. All you held was an Annual Conference that we should continue to do and we will do a lot more than you have all done. We will have done much more than you have ever done. All
the tenants and all leaseholder have a right to be consulted and this administration will do that.

(ii) Councillor Rai asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Athwal, what he sees as the biggest challenges facing the new administration?

Councillor Athwal replied that first and foremost we needed to look at the challenge from 4 years ago to now. Four years ago we were faced with 25 million pounds worth of cuts, which we eventually did and then we were forced into 35 million, eventually, which we managed by raiding 13 million pounds worth of reserves to balance the books. In all honesty, the Leader thought that the parties opposite, if the truth be told, did their job for 3 years and then played to the electorate in the vain hope that they would bail them out and give them 4 more years. What we are now facing as the result of that wasted year was cuts in the realm of £60 million. If it was bad then, just double it, that is what we are facing. That is the next 4 years and the Leader thought people needed to understand that this. Once all the patting each other on the back was over that the hard work of balancing those books over the next 4 years had already begun. The Leader thought that from looking at the challenging financial difficulties that we faced, we had to ensure that we embraced the change and transformation was not just more cuts, but were actually innovative imaginative ideas coming to the fore. We were determined to tackle these inequalities; there was about 8 or 9 years difference in life expectancy if you live in the North or South of the Borough. We would like to do more for our health. We would like to champion the hopes and aspirations of all. We want to deliver on the pledges that we made to the electorate. In doing so what we will be doing is restoring faith in politicians and politics when we achieve that.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Rai asked, in light of the dire financial position that you have inherited from the previous administration, some members of the public that are also known as ex-tory Councillors, might feel it is impossible to fulfil our election pledges. Can you provide the information that will reassure them?

Councillor Athwal replied that he thought the answer was really simple. Rewind back to 6th March, when this Labour Group, then the opposition, presented the budget amendments, which were fully costed, fully paid for and the Administration voted down and then decided, we have got the Leader of the opposition giving us lectures on finance. He was the same person who on March 6th voted against fully costed ideas which were then plagiarized, spelling mistakes and all. Everything, lock stock and barrel. Only in one night to add a million pounds to the deficit that this borough faces. We started off with 25 million on the 9th and we would have to make up 26. In short Councillor Rai look at the budget papers of 6th March and you will see and those of you on the opposite side who said there were some pledges that were not there. We had to keep something behind, because we knew you would copy the lot, and they were costed.

By way of a second supplementary question, Councillor Prince asked, will you give the commitment that you will indeed give the costs of those new proposals and also the timescales of all of the proposals that you have put forward during your election campaign?

Councillor Athwal replied that absolutely, we will deliver on each one, the timetabling had already started, one or two had already been delivered, others were in
the pipeline. The Leader thought the longest one to take time to build will effectively be the swimming pool. But the Leader guaranteed and assured this Chamber that it would happen before the next election. We would deliver on that in this term and we will publish all the costings that you so require.

(iii) Councillor Farah Hussain asked the Cabinet Member Health and Wellbeing, whether Valentines Park, Barley Lane Recreation Ground and South Park are still under consideration as possible sites for a new swimming pool as they were in the dying days of the last administration?

Councillor Streeting replied that as people will know before the election debate that we had we made it very clear that this administration would always, wherever it could, prioritise building and regenerating brownfield sites. Councillor Streeting thought the choice that was set forward, and he had to say in a rather untimely and hasty some might say crazy fashion, by the last administration to propose to build on Valentines Park, Barley Lane recreation ground and South Park came out of the blue with no consultation with park user groups, which, given the lectures that they like to give to our administration about public consultation, really does highlight the extent of their hypocrisy. As such it was Councillor Streeting’s intention to look at all of the appropriate sites in the south of the Borough, both in Ilford and in other town centres around. We would prioritise feasibility work to build a pool and ancillary facilities as soon as practically possible in line with our amendment to budget Council, although he was aware that other Councils had built leisure centres in parks. Councillor Streeting thought we could find a more suitable option that not only provided comprehensive swimming facilities for our residents but also gave us the opportunity to regenerate areas in the Borough that were desperately in need of regeneration, but also to look outside the auspices of our own Council to see how services to the whole of the community could be better delivered within one site. So he hoped that reassured his colleague. He knew it was an issue for some of her residents in Valentines ward and he hoped they would take some comfort in his words this evening.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Farah Hussain asked, when considering a possible site for a new pool what factors will inform the decision making process?

Councillor Streeting replied that there were a number of factors really. Firstly the land available and the cost of the land available. We also needed to look at the regeneration opportunities and there were many regeneration opportunities that would present themselves to this Borough, particularly with the advent of Crossrail. But it was also about looking beyond the provision of a simple swimming pool and thinking about wider leisure provision, cultural provision within the Borough, looking at other areas of the public sector and voluntary sector to see where there were opportunities for mutual benefit and savings. Councillor Streeting said to his colleague and to members across the chamber that it will not take us 4 years to come up with any practical ideas as indeed it did with the last administration. We will look to do this quickly to give our residents the pool that they have been waiting for, for so long but we are not going to be hasty, we are not going to be rash, we are not going to produce ideas off the back of an envelope. This will be fully considered in a joined up way across the Council. Councillor Streeting was very happy to receive representations from ward members and indeed wider community groups, the public sector, the private sector and the voluntary sector if they had particular ideas about
the nature of the facilities that could regenerate our communities and also any individual sites which could be looked at and he encouraged people to make those representations sooner rather than later.

(iv) Councillor Singh Bola asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Norman, will the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services rule out closing and/or demolishing grammar schools in the Borough?

Councillor Norman replied that she could categorically rule out closing the grammar schools in this Borough. You may be aware that Cabinet agreed to release funding for the feasibility studies needed to support the expansion of both schools. Subsequently Council, in its budget for 2014/15, made provision for that expansion. There were early indications that there would be a need to demolish some older buildings at both sites that were not fit for education in the 21st century. Still she anticipated, and would give a commitment, that these buildings would be replaced with buildings that were fit for purpose.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Singh Bola asked, can the Cabinet Member confirm that the expansion of the grammar schools will go ahead?

Councillor Norman replied that she could confirm that the expansion of the grammar schools would go ahead, they were supported by the Labour Party when the budget was placed before Council, the feasibility studies were being done as we speak and she was hopeful that planning permission would be forthcoming to allow these expansions to go forward.

(v) Councillor Bain asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement, Councillor Hatfull, what plans the new administration has to clean up our streets?

Councillor Hatfull replied that measures to improve the quality of our local environment was a very key election pledge by Labour in its election manifesto and was one that we certainly intended to deliver.

Our administration would crack down on anti-social behaviour, including litter and fly-tipping, particularly mattresses but all fly tipping and there would be tougher enforcement and penalties for all those responsible for behaviour which blights our communities.

We were already taking the positive steps of getting the appropriate Council Enforcement staff accredited under the Police’s Community Safety Accreditation Scheme. This would grant Redbridge staff more powers, limited Police powers with which they could deal more efficiently and effectively with a wide range of Environmental offences.

As part of the Scheme, staff would wear an ‘approved uniform’ while undertaking their duties, which would increase the uniformed presence on our streets, with a smartly dressed team which he hoped would also make residents feel safer.

As well as introducing a new enforcement team with accredited powers we were going to consult with the public to seek their views on the introduction of a bye-law to ban public spitting which again would provide our Enforcement Officers with the
necessary powers to take formal action against offenders.

Councillor Hatfull’s colleague, the Cabinet Member for Environment, would also be delivering Labour’s pledges to introduce weekly street sweeping, which was cut by the last administration which would have an evident impact on cleanliness and it was only when we proposed this in a budget amendment that they were embarrassed into action.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Mrs Ryan asked, will the Cabinet Member assure me that as much of the fly-tipping goes on at night, these staff will actually be working at night and going round patrolling, because that is when most mattresses are dumped?

Councillor Hatfull replied that well the simple answer to that was yes, absolutely. What we will be doing was where culprits can be identified we will take very tough action against these offenders. There was a large number of tools we had available to help with this, particularly the use of CCTV, including mobile CCTV cameras, which would be in place to catch people that fly-tip at night. Councillor Hatfull would also strongly encourage residents and Ward Councillors to report fly-tipping where it occurred, to help clean the mess up speedily and identify particular hot spots which we could then look at to take serious action. And again, if residents did see things, if they noted down the number plate, again we would use that to track down offenders. But as well as enforcement of course, prevention was better than cure, which was why we were committed to introducing free collection of bulky waste items from all residents, not just the unemployed and elderly, but all residents, so that there was no longer an incentive for them to fly-tip their mattress in the middle of the night. But the short answer was yes, we would be out at night, we would be up 24 hours a day and we would catch them if they fly-tip.

(vi) Councillor Howard asked the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Nijjar, if she will support residents campaigning for step-free access at Newbury Park underground station?

Councillor Nijjar replied that she would be pleased to add her support to the objective of securing step-free access for all users of Newbury Park Station. On the 21st of November last year a motion was carried and it was approved by the Council to call upon the Mayor of London to finish the work which was started back in 2009 to provide step-free access at Newbury Park Station. We also asked our Chief Executive to pursue this with Transport for London.

Subsequently, Councillor Nijjar was aware that Transport for London reaffirmed to the Borough in December last year their commitment to making the Tube network as accessible as possible for all customers.

Transport for London, however, had also highlighted the considerable investment required to make Tube stations step-free and that its focus was currently upon putting in lifts at busier key interchange stations which were used by significantly higher numbers of people.

While Transport for London noted that some provisional work was carried out back in 2009 at Newbury Park Station for the installation of lifts, with the current level of funding it had indicated that, unfortunately, there were currently no plans to install
lifés at the station. Also, Councillor Nijjar brought to the Council’s attention that the same thing also happened at Seven Kings station as well.

It remained the Council’s wish to see this station equipped with lifts and she would be pressing Transport for London to review afresh their priority and costings for Newbury Park as well as Seven Kings for lift provision, and also to consider other alternatives whilst that was also being considered.

**By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Howard asked**, how much would lifts at Newbury Park station cost and why were Transport for London’s previous step-free proposals abandoned?

*Councillor Nijjar replied that* Transport for London indicated last December that their revised estimate for lifts provision was £4 million which initially started off at £9 million.

The project to install lifts was cancelled in October 2009 by TfL due to a decline in revenues as a result of the economic downturn and increased costs.

This decision was then confirmed in the TfL Business Plan in 2010. At that time the former Public Transport Liaison Group (PTLG) wrote to the MP asking him to write to the Mayor of London and again this was confirmed and we will carry on pressing TfL for the lifts and Councillor Nijjar knew everybody across the Chamber was also in agreement with this.

**By way of a second supplementary question, Councillor Mrs Huggett asked**, could the Cabinet Member tell me if she is actively campaigning for step-free access for all underground stations in the Borough apart for those in the south and if so what will be the order of priority for these?

*Councillor Nijjar replied that* she was in complete agreement, she wanted CrossRail to be step-free for all of the stations in the Borough so if again the Deputy Mayor would like to invite me to any of the events then please do and she would be most happy to attend.

**(vii) Councillor K. Chowdhury asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Norman,** if she will continue to support the Youth Council and involve young people directly in decision making in the Council?

*Councillor Norman replied that* Redbridge’s Youth Councils, which included the Children in Care Council, the Junior Children in Care Council; and the Youth Council, epitomised the type of youth led structures which were ideally suited to be vehicles for the collective voices of children and young people, and people who know Councillor Norman well will know that she was particularly committed to children in care and enabling their voices to be heard by this Council.

It was through the articulation of these collective voices that elected Members, professionals in Children’s Services and members of the wider community in Redbridge were able to listen and respond to what children and young people were saying about their priorities and concerns.

As Cabinet Member for Children and Young People she was particularly keen to
ensure that children and young people were regularly consulted about their experiences of the services that they used and about how these services impacted on them. She also wanted to ensure that children and young people were involved in shaping services and making decisions. Councillor Norman would therefore, wholeheartedly, continue to support all the youth councils in Redbridge.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor K. Chowdhury asked, will the Cabinet Member continue to support the Young Cabinet?

Councillor Norman replied that she was committed to the Young Cabinet and had been particularly impressed when she attended meetings that they had had in this Chamber of how knowledgeable they were and the hard work that they did. Councillor Norman thought that it was an important part of teaching young people about democracy and she could assure Councillor Chowdhury and this Chamber that she was fully committed to ensuring that that continued.

By way of a second supplementary question Councillor Weinberg asked, would the Cabinet Member give a pledge that as she feels so strongly in support, which I know she does of the Young Council, that she will also pledge to continue up to £100,000 per year for them to be able to see through their ideas and put our money, where it should be, with the young people?

Councillor Norman replied that she knew how committed Councillor Weinberg was to the young people in this Borough and she could assure Councillor Weinberg that she would continue that commitment. The Youth Council and the Young Cabinet were in the process of putting together their plans to spend the £100,000 given to them by Cabinet for 2014/15. The Cabinet was due to receive a progress report from the Young Cabinet in December 2014 and an outcome report from them in June 2015. At this stage Councillor Norman was keen to support the Youth Council and delivering on the expenditure of the £100K they were given to spend and to see these come to fruition.

Unanswered Questions

As the time for dealing with questions expired, the remaining 9 questions would receive a written answer in accordance with Standing Order 17.15. A copy of the response was attached as Appendix G to these Minutes.

11a To receive petitions, which will stand referred to the appropriate Chief Officer in accordance with Standing Order 19. (COU/11a/190614)

(i) Councillor Cleaver presented a petition containing 244 signatures regarding fly tipping and anti-social behaviour at the rear of the shops on High Road South Woodford

(Referred to the Petitions Officer and Chief Highways and Cleansing Officer).

11b Petition for Debate: Shortage of child bed and cubicle capacity in local hospitals (COU/11b/190614)

We had before us a report seeking consideration of a petition that was received on 2nd May 2014. The petition contained 1,508 signatories which was in excess
of 1,500 signatories required for the matter to be debated at Full Council in accordance with the Council’s Petitions Scheme. The Petition stated as follows:

“We the undersigned Redbridge residents petition the Council to campaign to end the shortage of child bed and cubicle capacity in our local hospitals reported at page 59 of Barking Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals Trust Board Papers for February 2014 which causes children to wait longer to be seen by a doctor and so increases the risk of poor care by writing to the Secretary of State for Health for extra funding and seeking the support of other East London boroughs.”.

Mr Howe, lead petitioner, spoke in support of the petition.

Following debate the recommendations were put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

See voting record 11 on Appendix H

Resolved: That Council (i) notes the petition; and

(iii) refers the petition to the Health Scrutiny Committee with the request that the Committee takes appropriate scrutiny action to hold the NHS to account in respect of the matters raised.

12a Deputation relating to Children’s A&E at King George Hospital (COU/12a/190614)

We received a deputation relating to Children’s A&E at King George Hospital. The deputation was from Mr Howe, Mr Walker, Mr Archer, Mr Djitli, Mr O’Callaghan and Mr McGeary.

We noted representations made by Mr Howe, as spokesperson for the deputation, questions put by Members to the deputation and responses received.

Resolved: That Council thank the deputation for their contribution.

12b Deputation relating to the proposed ban on U-turns at Clayhall Avenue (COU/12b/190614)
We received a deputation relating to the proposed ban on U-turns at Clayhall Avenue.

The deputation was from Mr Rana, Mrs Spence, Mrs Pouros, Mr Vakharia, Mrs Wade and Mr Pascal.

We noted representations made by Mr Howe, as spokesperson for the deputation, questions put by Members to the deputation and responses received.

Resolved: That Council thank the deputation for their contribution

13a Requisitioned Decisions: Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions (COU/13a/190614)

The report before us asked us to consider:

(a) the decision of Area 3 Committee in respect of the Clayhall Avenue U-Turn restrictions; and
(b) the decision of the Lead officer for Area 4 Committee in respect of the issues relating to the Clayhall Avenue U-Turn restrictions.

Area 3 Committee, at its 19th March 2014, considered a report entitled “Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions”. Area 3 Committee resolved as follows:-

“(i) note that enforcement of Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions was included in the Council’s Forward Plan published on 27th January 2014;

(ii) note the comments of Area 2 Committee, made at its meeting on 21st January 2014, that they do not support the introduction of a further ‘U’ Turn restriction at the junction of Clayhall Avenue and Claybury Broadway;

(iii) note that Area 4 Committee at its meeting on 29th January 2014 agreed to delegate authority to its Lead Officer, in consultation with Clayhall Ward Members, to reaffirm the Committee’s previous decision to enforce U-Turn restrictions in Clayhall Avenue, after the Forward Plan notification period expires on 28th February; and

(iv) agree to the enforcement of both the existing and proposed U-Turn restrictions on Clayhall Avenue.”

The report considered by Area 3 Committee on 19th March 2014 was attached as Appendix 1 to the report before us.

“In accordance with Standing Order 54.3 (b) Councillors Bond, Cleaver, Deakins and Patel have requisitioned resolutions (i) and (iv) of the Area 3 Committee for consideration by full Council.”

Area 4 Committee, at its meeting on 29th January 2014, considered a report a report in respect of the Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions. The Committee resolved as follows:-

“That we (i) note that any proposals concerning Clayhall Avenue are likely to be Key Decisions and therefore the rules regarding key decisions (Section 5 of the report refers) will need to be followed and. Accordingly, the Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions report has been included in the Council’s Forward Plan published on 27th
(ii) note the comments of Area 2 Committee made at its meeting on 21st January 2014;

(iii) agree to delegate authority to our Lead Officer, in consultation with Clayhall Members, to reaffirm our previous decision to enforce U-Turn restrictions in Clayhall Avenue, after the Forward Plan notification period expires on 28th February; and

(iv) note that Area 3 Committee at its next meeting on 19th March will be asked to consider/reaffirm its decisions in respect of Clayhall Avenue U-Turn Restrictions, and that if Area 3 and 4 Committees confirm their common position on this matter then the decision can be actioned, subject to the requisitioning procedure.

In accordance with resolution (iii) of Area 4 Committee set out in the paragraph above, the Lead Officer, having consulted with Clayhall Ward Members, took the following decision on 15th April 2014:-

“That (i) the U-Turn restrictions in Clayhall Avenue be enforced;

(ii) in respect of (i) above agree the making of a relevant Traffic Management Order; and

(iii) in respect of (ii) above note that the Traffic Management Order will require advertising and consideration of any objections / feedback received.”

The paper documenting the decision of the Lead Officer for Area 4 Committee is attached at Appendix 2 to the report before us.

In accordance with Standing Order 54.3(b) Councillors Bond, Cleaver, Deakins and Patel had requisitioned the decision set out in the paragraph above for consideration by full Council.

In respect of the requisitioned decisions of Area 3 Committee, Councillor Deakins moved and Councillor Bond seconded the following amendment:-

“That Council, noting that:

- U-turns have been permitted in front of the width restriction for over 40 years, with no evidence of their having led to any recorded accidents whatsoever;

- the Council has not established that a ban could avoid creating problems worse than those the Committee is trying to resolve, or would achieve any benefit to justify imposing significant inconvenience upon hundreds of residents of Roding ward and beyond and on people who work at the Roding Hospital and the Southend Road industrial estates;

- the view of Area Committee Two, where the people most significantly affected by the decision live, has been ignored;

- the Forward Plan as published did not actually specify that Area Committee Three would be the decision-making body until shortly before it met;
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accordingly refers the matter back to the Area Committee for it to reconsider”

In respect of the requisitioned decisions of Area 4 Committee Lead Officer, Councillor Deakins moved and Councillor Bond seconded the following amendment:-

“That Council, noting that:

- U-turns have been permitted in front of the width restriction for over 40 years, with no evidence of their having led to any recorded accidents whatsoever;

- the Council has not established that a ban could avoid creating problems worse than those the Committee is trying to resolve, or would achieve any benefit to justify imposing significant inconvenience upon hundreds of residents of Roding ward and beyond and on people who work at the Roding Hospital and the Southend Road industrial estates;

- any proposed Traffic Order is likely to generate large numbers of objections and involve Council highways and legal officers in unnecessary expense to progress, for no obvious benefit;

refers the matter back to the Lead Officer, and asks him, in reconsidering, to consult further with all relevant ward members as well as the new Cabinet Member.”

In accordance with paragraph 16 of the Rules of Debate, in order to facilitate the progress of business, the debate on the amendments of Area 3 Committee and the Area 4 Committee Lead Officer were taken together. The amendments once debated were separately put to the vote and the results were as follows:-

Requisitioned Decisions of the Area 3 Committee:-

FOR: (3) – Councillors Bond, Cleaver and Deakins.


ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The amendment was declared not carried.

See voting record 12 on Appendix H

Requisitioned Decisions of the Area 4 Committee Lead Officer:-

FOR: (3) – Councillors Bond, Cleaver and Deakins.

ABSTAIN: (1) — Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The amendment was declared not carried.

See voting record 13 on Appendix H

Resolved: That Council (i) note the request for these matters to be considered in accordance with Standing Order 54.7;

(ii) take no action and in accordance with Standing Order 54.9 the decision of Area 3 Committee can be implemented immediately; and

(iii) take no action and in accordance with Standing Order 54.9 the decision of Area 4 Committee Lead Officer can be implemented immediately

13b Requisitioned Decision: Area 6 Committee - Area Discretionary Budget (COU/13b/190614)

Area 6 Committee, at its 19th March 2014, considered a report entitled “Area Discretionary Budget”. Area 6 Committee resolved as follows:-

“Resolved: That (i) we note the position in respect of the 2014-15 discretionary and non-discretionary budgets;

(ii) we agree the provisional sums set aside for the maintenance of ongoing schemes;

We note the section of the report which outlines the Community Infrastructure Levy and that receipts of £5,202 are available for local infrastructure;

(iii) we agree to allocate £1,000 to the Redbridge Faith Forum in support of their workshop project for women and a conference open to both men and women to give faith communities in the borough a collective voice and to cover the wide range of challenges faced and opportunities to be explored by women in the borough, subject to confirmation by Legal and Constitutional Services that such an application is not discriminatory;

(iv) we agree to fund the actual costs of the re-calibration of a speed gun and the purchase of a bicycle for the dedicated Metropolitan Police Ward PCSO Officer, such costs not to exceed £1,000;

(v) we agree that the parking money obtained from the Ilford CPZ extension scheme be allocated to fund further improvements in Woodland Rd. and Gordon
Rd. (traversing Loxford and Clementswood wards).

(vi) we agree to fund Loxford Public Conveniences and South Park Public Conveniences for a further period of 12 months from April 2014 at a cost of £6,687.12 and £6,623.88 respectively, to be funded through use of the £5,202 of CIL money, the rest to be allocated from the discretionary budget."

The report considered by Area 6 Committee on 19th March 2014 was attached as Appendix 1 to the report before us.

In accordance with Standing Order 54.3(b) former Councillors Maravala and Tewari had requisitioned resolution (v) above of the Area 6 Committee for consideration by full Council.

The Rules of Debate for Council stated that no Motion or amendment may be debated unless it had been proposed and seconded.

As there was no mover of an amendment the decision of Area 6 Committee stood.

Resolved: That Council (i) note the request for this matter to be considered in accordance with Standing Order 54.7; and

(ii) take no action and in accordance with Standing Order 54.9 the decision of Area 6 Committee can be implemented immediately.

Change in Order of Business

It was agreed in accordance with Standing Order 22 that the order of business be changed so that the Business Motion relating to recording thanks to former Members be considered next.

14. To consider the following Business Motions (COU/14/190614)

14 (iv) Business Motion relating to recording thanks to former Members

We had before us a Motion relating to recording thanks to former Members for their valuable service.

Councillor Athwal moved and Councillor Canal seconded the following Motion:-

“This Council records its thanks to the former Members who completed their service on the Council on the 26th May 2014, or at Annual Council on 12th June 2014, for the valuable service rendered by them to the London Borough of Redbridge.”

Following debate the Motion was put to the vote and the result was as follows:-
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Hussain, Javed, Jeyaranjan, Jones, Kaur-Thiara, Lambert, Littlewood, Mclaren, Merry, Nijjar, Mrs Nolan, Norman, O’Shea, Mrs Packer, Parkash, Prince, Rai, Rashid, Mrs Ryan, Sachs, Santos, Sharma, Sharpe, Singh Bola, Stark, Streeting, Turbefield, Weinberg, White and Zammett.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The Motion was declared carried.

See voting record 14 on Appendix H

Resolved: “This Council records its thanks to the former Members who completed their service on the Council on the 26th May 2014, or at Annual Council on 12th June 2014, for the valuable service rendered by them to the London Borough of Redbridge.”

14 (i) Business Motion relating to pressure on school places

We had before us a Motion relating to pressure on school places. Councillor Norman moved and Councillor Littlewood seconded the following Motion:-

“This Council notes the acute pressure on school places in Redbridge and the on-going cross-party support for the capital programme to expand the number of places in the Borough.

This Council is concerned by reports that the Secretary of State for Education is transferring £400million from the Department for Education’s basic need budget to plug a funding shortfall in the free schools programme and believes that funding would be better directed to areas of shortage – like Redbridge – as opposed to funding new free school places in areas where the supply of places is in excess of need.

This Council further believes that the government should grant the powers and the funding necessary to allow this local authority to build new local authority maintained schools in the borough.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Education to:

   i) highlight the need for further government funding to build new school places in Redbridge

   ii) to request the freedom and the funding to build new local authority maintained schools in the borough”

Amendment moved by Councillor Weinberg and seconded by Councillor Best:-

“In the second paragraph (3rd line) delete wording “….plug a funding shortfall in”
In the second paragraph (3rd line) insert word “…to” before “…free”
In the second paragraph (5th & 6th line) delete “…as opposed to funding new free school places in areas where the supply of places is in excess of need.”

Following debate the amendment was put to the vote and the result was as follows:-

**FOR:** (24) – Councillors Best, Blaber, Bromiley, Canal, M. Chaudhary, Cole, Cronin, Cummins, Mrs Dunn, Fairley-Churchill, Haran, Hayes, Mrs Huggett, Lambert, Mclaren, Mrs Nolan, O’Shea, Mrs Packer, Prince, Mrs Ryan, Sharpe, Stark, Turbefield and Weinberg.


**ABSTAIN:** (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The amendment was declared not carried.

**See voting record 15 on Appendix H**

Following debate the Motion was put to the vote and the result was as follows:-


**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAIN:** (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The Motion was declared carried.

**See voting record 16 on Appendix H**

**Resolved:** “This Council notes the acute pressure on school places in Redbridge and the on-going cross-party support for the capital programme to expand the number of places in the Borough.

This Council is concerned by reports that the Secretary of State for Education is transferring £400million from the Department for Education’s basic need budget to plug a funding shortfall in the free schools programme and believes that funding would be better directed to areas of shortage – like Redbridge – as opposed to funding new free school places in areas where the supply of places is in excess of
This Council further believes that the government should grant the powers and the funding necessary to allow this local authority to build new local authority maintained schools in the borough.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Education to:

i) highlight the need for further government funding to build new school places in Redbridge

ii) to request the freedom and the funding to build new local authority maintained schools in the borough”

14 (ii) Business Motion relating to A & E Services at King George Hospital

We had before us a Motion relating to A & E Services at King George Hospital. Councillor Streeting moved and Councillor Athwal seconded the following Motion:-

This Council notes remarks made by the Secretary of State for Health that:

“The NHS locally has always been clear that changes to the A&E service at King George Hospital will not be made until there are further improvements in the quality of emergency care, and when more work has taken place to reduce the need for hospital attendance and give care closer to home.”

And that: “…we do not expect the Trust to be ready to make the changes for the foreseeable future.”

This Council further notes the statement made by the Chief Executive of the NHS Trust, Matthew Hopkins, who said: “Our plans have not changed, and we are still working towards the same end goal, but we will not be working towards a set deadline to close the King George emergency department at this point.”

This Council remains of the view that the Government should abandon plans to close the Accident and Emergency Department at King George Hospital and does not believe that a delay goes far enough.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to:

i) The Secretary of State to ask him to clarify the nature of the statement made just days before polling day and to reaffirm this Council’s position that the closure plans for A&E at King George Hospital should be abandoned, not just delayed;

ii) The Chief Executives of BHRUT and the NHS Trust Development Authority to ask them to revisit the reconfiguration plans with a view to maintaining
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A&E at King George Hospital and to work with this authority to develop a long-term vision for services at the hospital.

In accordance with Standing Order 24 meetings must not continue beyond four hours and fifteen minutes from the time set down for their commencement in the Summons. As that time had been reached, the Mayor asked Councillor Streeting to close the debate, the Motion was immediately put to the vote and the result was follows:-


AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The Motion was declared carried.

See voting record 17 on Appendix H

Resolved: This Council notes remarks made by the Secretary of State for Health that:

“The NHS locally has always been clear that changes to the A&E service at King George Hospital will not be made until there are further improvements in the quality of emergency care, and when more work has taken place to reduce the need for hospital attendance and give care closer to home.”

And that: “…we do not expect the Trust to be ready to make the changes for the foreseeable future.”

This Council further notes the statement made by the Chief Executive of the NHS Trust, Matthew Hopkins, who said: “Our plans have not changed, and we are still working towards the same end goal, but we will not be working towards a set deadline to close the King George emergency department at this point.”

This Council remains of the view that the Government should abandon plans to close the Accident and Emergency Department at King George Hospital and does not believe that a delay goes far enough.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to:

i) The Secretary of State to ask him to clarify the nature of the statement made just days before polling day and to reaffirm this Council’s position that the closure plans for A&E at King George Hospital should be abandoned, not
just delayed;

ii) The Chief Executives of BHRUT and the NHS Trust Development Authority to ask them to revisit the reconfiguration plans with a view to maintaining A&E at King George Hospital and to work with this authority to develop a long-term vision for services at the hospital.

14 (iii) Business Motion relating to Area Committees

We had before us a Motion relating to Area Committees. Councillor Canal moved and Councillor Cole seconded the following Motion:-

“Council notes the responsibilities delegated to our seven area committees and notes they include, amongst others,

1. Encouraging and promoting local representation
2. Delegated decision making in areas such as highways schemes, parks and leisure issues, transport matters and environmental matters
3. The allocation of funds from local area Cll budgets
4. To act as a formal consultation mechanism on council wide policies and strategies

Council agrees that any proposal to abolish the area committees can only proceed if alternative arrangements to fulfil the function of area committees have been properly submitted, scrutinised and debated, in accordance with the constitution.

Accordingly Council agrees that any changes to the current committee structure, including Area and Regional Planning Committees, must be carried out in a way that fully engages with and consults with relevant stakeholders.

Council further agrees that such changes should be carefully considered and debated by the appropriate service committees dealing with matters where area committees currently take decisions eg highways etc.

Council also agrees that any proposed changes should involve consultation with the public.

Council therefore resolves that before any proposed changes to the committee structures are proposed or implemented,

(A) A working group is established to recommend the best way to efficiently and effectively carry out the functions of the committees subject to change

(B) The working group is instructed to report back to the relevant service committees within an agreed timescale

(C) The service committees forward recommendations to Cabinet

(D) Cabinet in turn puts its recommendations to Full Council decision.”

In accordance with Standing Order 24 meetings must not continue beyond four
hours and fifteen minutes from the time set down for their commencement in
the Summons. As that time had been reached, the Mayor asked that any
remaining business on the Agenda be put to the vote without discussion. The
Motion was immediately put to the vote and the result was follows:-

FOR: (27) – Councillors Best, Blaber, Bond, Bromiley, Canal, M. Chaudhary, Cleaver,
Cole, Cronin, Cummins, Deakins, Mrs Dunn, Fairley-Churchill, Haran, Hayes, Mrs
Huggett, Lambert, Mclaren, Mrs Nolan, O'Shea, Mrs Packer, Prince, Mrs Ryan, Sharpe,
Stark, Turbefield and Weinberg.

AGAINST: (35) – Councillors S. Ahmad, Mohammad Ahmed, Mushtaq Ahmed, Athwal,
Bain, Bellwood, Bhamra, A. Choudhury, K. Chowdhury, Coomb, Emmett, Flint, Hatfull,
Hehir, Howard, F. Hussain, Z. Hussain, Javed, Jeyaranjan, Jones, Kaur-Thiara,
Littlewood, Merry, Nijjar, Norman, Parkash, Rai, Rashid, Sachs, Santos, Sharma, Singh
Bola, Streeting, White and Zammett.

ABSTAIN: (1) – Councillor Kissin (Mayor)

The amendment was declared not carried.

See voting record 18 on Appendix H

Resolved: That the Motion be not agreed.

Any Urgent Business (COU/15/190614)

None.

App A - C

Mayor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinary Committees</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
<th>Conservative Group (4)</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Group (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Resources Service Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Canal</td>
<td>1. Cllr Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Mohammad Ahmed</td>
<td>2. Cllr Cronin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Hehir</td>
<td>3. Cllr McLaren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Howard</td>
<td>4. Cllr Prince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cllr Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr Rai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr Sachs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Young People Service Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Mushtaq Ahmed</td>
<td>2. Cllr Packer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr K. Chowdhury</td>
<td>3. Cllr Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr Kaur-Thiara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr Littlewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods and Communities Service Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Bromiley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr S. Ahmad</td>
<td>2. Cllr Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Bain</td>
<td>3. Cllr Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Singh Bola</td>
<td>4. Cllr Mrs Huggett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cllr Z. Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr Jeyaranjan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr Merry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Wellbeing, Care and Older People Service Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Blaber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Bellwood</td>
<td>2. Cllr Mrs Nolan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Bhamra</td>
<td>3. Cllr Mrs Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cllr Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr F. Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr Rashid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Mushtaq Ahmed</td>
<td>2. Cllr Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr A. Choudhury</td>
<td>3. Cllr Mrs Dunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cllr Hehir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr F. Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Labour Group (6)</td>
<td>Conservative Group (5)</td>
<td>Liberal Democrat Group (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ordinary Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensing</th>
<th>Labour Group (8)</th>
<th>Conservative Group (6)</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Group (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Mohammad Ahmed</td>
<td>2. Cllr Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Bain</td>
<td>3. Cllr Cummins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr Flint</td>
<td>5. Cllr O’Shea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cllr Rashid</td>
<td>6. Cllr Turbefield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Cllr Sachs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Cllr White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appointment of Members to Panels and Other Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Committees, panels and Other Bodies</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
<th>Conservative Group (3)</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Group (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards Committee 2012</strong></td>
<td>Labour Group (5)</td>
<td>Conservative Group (3)</td>
<td>Liberal Democrat Group (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Emmett</td>
<td>1. Cllr Mrs Huggett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Flint</td>
<td>2. Cllr Packer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Jeyaranjan</td>
<td>3. Cllr Prince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cllr Kaur-Thiara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cllr Parkash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted members: Mrs Shirley Barrow and Mr Mark Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pension Fund Investment Panel</th>
<th>Labour Group (3)</th>
<th>Conservative Group (2)</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Group (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cllr Merry</td>
<td>1. Cllr O'Shea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Norman</td>
<td>2. Cllr Mrs Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Sachs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs: (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr F. Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr K. Chowdhury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs: (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr McLaren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs: (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Committee</th>
<th>Labour Group (3)</th>
<th>Conservative Group (2)</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Group (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Rai</td>
<td>2. Cllr Huggett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cllr Santos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted members: Sue Sanders and Jasbir Sandhu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 7 – RESPONSIBILITIES OF SERVICE COMMITTEES

POLICY AND RESOURCES SERVICE COMMITTEE

Status: committee appointed by Council under section 101(1) and section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to take non-executive decisions and to advise the executive and the Council as required on matters within the following Cabinet Portfolios:

Leader

Finance and Resources

1. In respect of functions or matters which, but for their classification under executive arrangements as non-executive matters, would fall within the remit of the Leader and Finance and Resources Portfolios, to perform or consider any such functions or matters, save for the following:
   (i) those that by law have to be performed or considered by full Council
   (ii) those that are reserved to Council pursuant to the Constitution
   (iii) those that are delegated to any other Committee of the Council
   (iv) those that are delegated to officers

2. To give detailed consideration to, and to make recommendations to the Council in respect of, proposed changes to the Constitution which form part of a general review of the Constitution.

3. To advise the Council as required on any non-executive functions or matters within paragraph 1 (i) and (ii) above.

4. To advise the executive on the following matters within and concerning the Leader and Finance and Resources Portfolios:
   
   (a) any matters that are referred to in Forward Plan executive reports that relate specifically to these Portfolios, including the Cabinet’s initial budget proposals and proposed revenue and capital budget and Council Tax reports, and Budgetary Control reports, so far as they affect them, and which are due for executive decision before or at the next due meeting of the Cabinet
   (b) any matters in respect of which medium to long term policy development work is required that are referred to the committee by the executive, including, where relevant, matters that have already been included in the Forward Plan for future executive decision making

5. To establish a panel, working group or other body (hereafter a “subsidiary body”) to consider and report back with recommendations on any matters within the committee’s executive advisory terms of reference referred to in paragraph 4 (b) above. Such a subsidiary body will not have power to make any advisory decisions
itself. Any subsidiary body must be established for a specified period, after which any decision to extend the body’s life must be made by the Committee. The membership of a subsidiary body will normally be in accordance with proportionality principles and, beyond Members of the Committee, may include other elected Members and co-opted Members of the Council. Papers of subsidiary bodies will not be published. Their meetings will be open to Councillors but not normally to the public unless the relevant subsidiary body so decides.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SERVICE COMMITTEE

Status: committee appointed by Council under section 101(1) and section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to take non-executive decisions and to advise the executive and the Council as required on matters within the following Cabinet Portfolios:

Children and Young People

1. In respect of matters which, but for their classification under executive arrangements as non-executive matters, would fall within the remit of the Children and Young People Portfolio to perform or consider any such functions or matters save for the following:
   (i) those that by law have to be performed or considered by full Council
   (ii) those that are reserved to Council pursuant to the Constitution
   (iii) those that are delegated to any other Committee of the Council
   (iv) those that are delegated to officers

2. To advise the Council as required on any non-executive decisions within paragraph 1 (i) and (ii) above.

3. To advise the executive on the following matters within and concerning the Children and Young People Portfolio:
   (a) any matters that are referred to in Forward Plan executive reports that relate specifically to this Portfolio, including the Cabinet’s initial budget proposals and proposed revenue and capital budget and Council Tax reports, and Budgetary Control reports, so far as they affect it, and which are due for executive decision before or at the next due meeting of the Cabinet
   (b) any matters in respect of which medium to long term policy development work is required that are referred to the committee by the executive, including, where relevant, matters that have already been included in the Forward Plan for future executive decision making

4. To establish a panel, working group or other body (hereafter a “subsidiary body”) to consider and report back with recommendations on any matters within the committee’s executive advisory terms of reference referred to in paragraph 3(b) above. Such a subsidiary body will not have power to make any advisory decisions itself. Any subsidiary body must be established for a specified period, after which any decision to extend the body’s life must be made by the Committee. The
memberships of a subsidiary body will normally be in accordance with proportionality principles and, beyond Members of the Committee, may include other elected Members and co-opted Members of the Council. Papers of subsidiary bodies will not be published. Their meetings will be open to Councillors but not normally to the public unless the relevant subsidiary body so decides.

HEALTH, WELLBEING, CARE AND OLDER PEOPLE SERVICE COMMITTEE

Status: committee appointed by Council under s section 101(1) and section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to take non-executive decisions and to advise the executive and the Council as required on matters within the following Cabinet Portfolios:

Deputy Leader, Health and Wellbeing
Care and Older People

1. In respect of matters which, but for their classification under executive arrangements as non-executive matters, would fall within the remit of the Deputy Leader, Health and Wellbeing and Care and Older People and Portfolios, to perform or consider any such functions or matters save for the following:-

(i) those that by law have to be performed or considered by full Council
(ii) those that are reserved to Council pursuant to the Constitution
(iii) those that are delegated to any other Committee of the Council
(iv) those that are delegated to officers

2. To advise the Council as required on any non-executive decisions within paragraph 1 (i) and (ii) above.

3. To advise the executive on the following matters within and concerning the Deputy Leader, Health and Wellbeing and Care and Older People Portfolios:
   (a) any matters that are referred to in Forward Plan executive reports that relate specifically to these Portfolios, including the Cabinet’s initial budget proposals and proposed revenue and capital budget and Council Tax reports, and Budgetary Control reports, so far as they affect them, and which are due for executive decision before or at the next due meeting of the Cabinet
   (b) any matters in respect of which medium to long term policy development work is required that are referred to the committee by the executive, including, where relevant, matters that have already been included in the Forward Plan for future executive decision making

4. To establish a panel, working group or other body (hereafter a “subsidiary body”) to consider and report back with recommendations on any matters within the committee’s executive advisory terms of reference referred to in paragraph 3 (b) above. Such a subsidiary body will not have power to make any advisory decisions itself. Any subsidiary body must be established for a specified period, after which
any decision to extend the body’s life must be made by the Committee. The membership of a subsidiary body will normally be in accordance with proportionality principles and, beyond Members of the Committee, may include other elected Members and co-opted Members of the Council. Papers of subsidiary bodies will not be published. Their meetings will be open to Councillors but not normally to the public unless the relevant subsidiary body so decides.

**NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES SERVICE COMMITTEE**

Status: committee appointed by Council under s section 101(1) and section102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to take non-executive decisions and to advise the executive and the Council as required on matters within the following Cabinet Portfolios:

Environment
Community Safety and Enforcement (but excluding licensing matters)
Planning and Regeneration
Housing

1. In respect of matters which, but for their classification under executive arrangements as non-executive matters, would fall within the remit of the Environment Community Safety and Enforcement (but excluding licensing matters) Planning and Regeneration and Housing Portfolios, to perform or consider any such functions or matters save for the following:

   (i) those that by law have to be performed or considered by full Council
   (ii) those that are reserved to Council pursuant to the Constitution
   (iii) those that are delegated to any other Committee of the Council
   (iv) those that are delegated to officers

2. To advise the Council as required on any non-executive decisions within paragraph 1 (i) and (ii) above.

3. To advise the executive on the following matters within the Environment, Community Safety and Enforcement (but excluding licensing matters) and Planning and Regeneration and Housing Portfolios:

   (a) any matters that are referred to in Forward Plan executive reports that relate specifically to these Portfolios, including the Cabinet’s initial budget proposals and proposed revenue and capital budget and Council Tax reports, and Budgetary Control reports, so far as they affect them, and which are due for executive decision before or at the next due meeting of the Cabinet

   (b) any matters in respect of which medium to long term policy development work is required that are referred to the committee by the executive, including, where relevant, matters that have already been included in the Forward Plan for future executive decision making
4. To establish a panel, working group or other body (hereafter a “subsidiary body”) to consider and report back with recommendations on any matters within the committee’s executive advisory terms of reference referred to in paragraph 3 (b) above. Such a subsidiary body will not have power to make any advisory decisions itself. Any subsidiary body must be established for a specified period, after which any decision to extend the body’s life must be made by the Committee. The membership of a subsidiary body will normally be in accordance with proportionality principles and, beyond Members of the Committee, may include other elected Members and co-opted Members of the Council. Papers of subsidiary bodies will not be published. Their meetings will be open to Councillors but not normally to the public unless the relevant subsidiary body so decides.

SECTION 9 - RESPONSIBILITIES OF LICENSING COMMITTEE

(a) To discharge all the Council’s licensing functions, as defined by Section 4 of the Licensing Act 2003, to the extent permitted by the terms of that Act and any other functions which are by law the responsibility of the committee appointed under that Act.

(b) To discharge the Council’s licensing functions arising under Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982.

(c) To discharge all other licensing functions of the Council not falling within the remit of the Regulatory Committee, including considering and determining applications for licences or registrations, imposing conditions and limitations, making variations and carrying out enforcement. The licences and registrations include, but are not limited to, those in respect of the following:
   - Animal trainers and exhibitors
   - Breeding of dogs
   - Camping sites
   - Caravan sites
   - Charitable collections
   - Dangerous wild animals
   - Explosives
   - Fire certificates
   - Guard dog kennels
   - Knackers’ yards
   - Market and street trading
   - Performances of hypnotism
   - Pet shops
   - Pleasure boats and pleasure vehicles
   - Poisons
   - Premises for acupuncture, tattooing, ear-piercing and electrolysis
   - Safety at sports grounds
   - Scrap yards
   - Solemnisation of marriages
   - Zoos
(d) To consider representations received in respect of proposed Orders to be made pursuant to Section 13 of the Criminal Justice & Police Act 2001 (controlled drinking zones).

(e) To establish one or more sub-committees consisting of three members of the Licensing Committee to perform the above functions. Such sub-committees should be wherever possible, but are not required to be, politically proportionate.

(f) To monitor and control the above functions.

(g) In respect of matters which, but for their classification under executive arrangements as non-executive matters, would fall within the remit of the licensing aspects of the Planning and Public Protection Portfolio to perform or consider any such functions or matters save for the following:-

   (i) those that by law have to be performed or considered by full Council
   (ii) those that are reserved to Council pursuant to the Constitution
   (iii) those that are delegated to any other Committee of the Council
   (iv) those that are delegated to officers

(h) To advise the Council as required on any non-executive decisions within paragraph (g) (i) and (ii) above.

(i) To advise the executive on the following matters within the licensing aspects of the Community Safety and Enforcement Portfolio:

   (a) any matters that are referred to in Forward Plan executive reports that relate specifically to this Portfolio, including the Cabinet’s initial budget proposals and proposed revenue and capital budget and Council Tax reports, and Budgetary Control reports, so far as they affect it, and which are due for executive decision before or at the next due meeting of the Cabinet

   (b) any matters in respect of which medium to long term policy development work is required that are referred to the committee by the executive, including, where relevant, matters that have already been included in the Forward Plan for future executive decision making

(j) To establish a panel, working group or other body (hereafter a “subsidiary body”) to consider and report back with recommendations on any matters within the committee’s executive advisory terms of reference referred to in sub-paragraph (i) (b) above. Such a subsidiary body will not have power to make any advisory decisions itself. Any subsidiary body must be established for a specified period, after which any decision to extend the body’s life must be made by the Committee. The membership of a subsidiary body will normally be in accordance with proportionality principles and, beyond Members of the Committee, may include other elected Members and co-opted Members of the Council. Papers of subsidiary bodies will not be published. Their meetings will be open to Councillors but not normally to the public unless the relevant subsidiary body so decides.
## Appointment of Members to Regional Planning Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Planning Committees</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Planning Committee (West)</strong></td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bridge, Church End, Monkhams, Roding, Snaresbrook and Wanstead Wards)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Merry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Bain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitutes</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Bain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Planning Committee (North)</strong></td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aldborough, Barkingside, Clayhall, Fairlop, Fullwell and Hainault Wards)</td>
<td>1. Cllr Bhamra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cllr Emmett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitutes</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Hehir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Kaur-Thiara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Santos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Streeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regional Planning Committee (South) (Chadwell, Clementswood, Cranbrook, Goodmayes, Loxford, Mayfield, Newbury, Seven Kings and Valentines Wards) | Labour COLL | 1. Cllr Mushtaq Ahmed  
2. Cllr Mohammad Ahmed  
3. Cllr Singh Bola  
4. Cllr Z. Hussain  
5. Cllr Jeyaranjan  
6. Cllr Parkash  
7. Cllr Rai  
8. Cllr Sachs  
9. Cllr White |
| | Conservative COLL | Substitute COLL | Cllr M. Chaudhary |
| Substitutes COLL | Cllr S. Ahmad  
Cllr Athwal  
Cllr Bellwood  
Cllr A. Choudhury  
Cllr K. Chowdhury  
Cllr Coomb  
Cllr Flint  
Cllr Hatfull  
Cllr F. Hussain  
Cllr Javed  
Cllr Jones  
Cllr Littlewood  
Cllr Nijjar  
Cllr Norman  
Cllr Rashid  
Cllr Sharma  
Cllr Zammett |
PART 5

MEMBERS’ ALLOWANCES SCHEME

The London Borough of Redbridge in exercise of the powers conferred by the Local Authorities (Members’ Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, and having had regard to the recommendations of the Independent Panel convened by the London Councils (“The Remuneration of Councillors in London 2010) hereby makes the following scheme:

1. **Outline of Scheme**

   (a) This Scheme may be cited as the “Members’ Allowances Scheme for the London Borough of Redbridge (2011) and comes into effect on 18th November 2011, except that the Allowances included in the Schedule to this scheme are effective from the respective dates of appointment to the Special Responsibility roles.

   (b) In this Scheme, “Member” means an elected Member of the London Borough of Redbridge.

   (c) The Scheme makes provision for the payment of a basic allowance for all Members and Special Responsibility Allowances for Members appointed to certain positions of responsibility, together with the reimbursement of the reasonable out of Borough travelling and subsistence expenses and, where appropriate, carers’ expenses incurred by Members.

   (d) A Member or any other person entitled to any allowance under this Scheme may by notice in writing to the Borough Solicitor and Secretary elect to forego any part of his or her entitlement to an allowance under this Scheme. A Member or such other person may also revoke such notice, in writing, to the Borough Solicitor and Secretary.

2. **Basic Allowance**

   Subject to paragraph 5 and 6(d) below, a basic allowance set out in the schedule to this Scheme shall be paid to each Member.
3. **Special Responsibility Allowances**

   (a) For each year a Special Responsibility Allowance shall be paid to those Members who have the special responsibilities, deemed to require a significant time commitment and level of responsibility from those generally expected of a member, as specified in the schedule to this Scheme;

   (b) Subject to paragraph 5, the amount of each such allowance shall be the amount specified against that special responsibility in the schedule;

   (c) When a Member would otherwise be entitled under the Scheme to more than one Special Responsibility Allowance, then the entitlement shall instead be only to one of them, being the one attracting the higher rate;

   (d) In the event that the Leader of the Opposition does not hold the post of Chair of the Overview Committee then the applicable proportions set out at the end of the attached schedule shall apply pro-rata.

4. **Co-optees' Allowances**

   (a) For each year a co-optees' allowance shall be paid to those co-opted members who have the special responsibilities that are specified in the schedule to this Scheme;

   (b) Subject to paragraph 5, the amount of each such allowance shall be the amount specified against that special responsibility in the schedule.

5. **Scheme and Entitlement change**

   (a) Where, in the course of a year, this Scheme is amended and the resolution effecting that amendment so provides, the effect of the resolution may be backdated to the beginning of the municipal year.

   (b) Where, in the course of a year, this Scheme is amended and paragraph (a) above does not apply, or where a Member’s or other person’s entitlement changes, the relevant basic allowance, Special Responsibility Allowance, or co-optees' allowance will be calculated and paid pro-rata during the particular month in which the Scheme amendment or entitlement change occurs.

6. **Travelling and Subsistence Expenses**

   (a) Members and co-opted members may submit claims for the reimbursement of their reasonable expenses for travelling to and from “approved duties” at the rates set out in paragraph (c) and (d) below. Subject to paragraph (b) below, Members, but not co-opted members, may only submit claims in respect of those duties which are undertaken outside the Borough. Members, but not co-opted members, may submit claims for the reimbursement of their reasonable subsistence expenses incurred in connection with approved duties at the rates set out in paragraph (e) below.

   “Approved duties” are defined as follows:-
i) attendance at meetings of any body to which the Council makes appointments or nominations, or of any committee or sub-committee of such a body; subject to any limitations in the approved Scheme;

ii) attendance at any other meetings, the holding of which is authorised by the Council and to which Members from at least two political groups have been invited;

iii) attendance at any meeting of any association of local authorities of which the Council is a member;

iv) the performance of any duties undertaken in connection with the discharge of any function of the Council conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the Council to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises, but only where those premises are outside the Borough;

(v) attendance at any conference or training seminar where the relevant Director or the Borough Solicitor and Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member/Scrutiny Chair, authorises such attendance;

(vi) participation in any official or courtesy visits on behalf of the Council (whether inside or outside the United Kingdom) where the relevant Director or the Borough Solicitor and Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member/Scrutiny Chair, authorises such participation;

(vii) the carrying out of any other duty or class of duty approved by the Council for the purpose of or in connection with the discharge of the Council's functions or those of its committees.

(b) In cases where a Member or co-opted member is away on business (from their usual place of work) and has to make a journey from that location in order to attend a meeting of the Council, Cabinet or any Committee or Sub-Committee of the Authority and then has to return to that business location following the meeting, the Borough Solicitor and Secretary is authorised to approve payment of travel expenses only.

(c) **Travel Expenses - Rates**

Actual expenses incurred by Members or co-opted members in connection with approved duties for which a claim may be made under paragraph (a) and for travelling expenses payable under paragraph (b) will be fully reimbursed up to amounts of allowances as directed from time to time by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government as follows:

For travel by public transport –

The actual fare paid not exceeding the ordinary fare (or any available cheap fare) and where there is more than one class of fare available, second-class fare.

For travel by private transport –
For use of a private car for attendance at approved duties mileage will be paid to Members at the flat rate of 40p per mile.

The rate may be increased in respect of the carriage of one or more passengers to whom a travelling allowance would otherwise be payable, of not more than 3p a mile for the first passenger and 2p a mile for the second and subsequent passengers.

The full amount of any expenditure incurred on tolls, ferries or parking fees, including overnight garaging.

The following rate will be paid for use of motorcycle for attendance at approved duties –
• Any motorcycle – 11.76p per mile; and

A rate of 26p per day for the use of a pedal cycle for attendance at approved duties.

The rate for travel by taxi-cab or cab shall not exceed:-
(i) In cases of urgency or where no public transport is reasonably available, the amount of the actual fare and any reasonable gratuity paid, and
(ii) In any other case, the amount of the fare for travel by appropriate public transport.

(d) Members with Special Travel Needs

The Scheme also includes a provision for the reimbursement of the reasonable travelling costs for those Members or co-opted members with special travel needs, whether those needs are permanent or temporary, to the extent that they are unable to walk, drive, cycle or use public transport to attend Council duties. A reduction of 2% shall be made in respect of the basic allowance for Members with permanent special travel needs (in lieu of the travelling element contained in the basic allowance). The duties for which reimbursement will apply are set out below:-

i) the carrying out of any of the approved duties specified in paragraph 6(a) above;

ii) the performance of any duties undertaken in pursuance of any Standing Order requiring a Member or Members to be present when tender documents are opened;

iii) attendance at any meetings with officers (at the officer’s request), to discuss a matter relating to the terms of reference or functions of any committee on which the Member sits;

iv) attendance at any meetings with officers on the content of a committee agenda (allowances can be claimed by a Chair, Vice-Chair or Spokesperson of the relevant committee only);

v) attendance at any ward surgery; and

vi) attendance at any formal opening ceremonies, either organised by the Council, or of Council premises/facilities, to which a Member or Members have been invited.
(e) **Out of Borough Subsistence Allowances**

The rate of subsistence allowance shall not exceed:

In the case of an absence outside the Borough where a Member incurs additional expenditure for meals and/or absence overnight in order to undertake an approved duty as set out in 6a (i) – (vii) above, the Member shall be reimbursed the actual amount of expenditure incurred, subject to the submission of receipts to substantiate any such claims. Prior approval should be sought by the Member from the relevant Director or the Borough Solicitor and Secretary on the maximum costs to be incurred in each case.

7. **Carers’ Allowances**

The Scheme shall include a provision for the payment of expenses for childcare and dependent care and the duties for which reimbursement will apply are the same as those set out in paragraph 6(d)(i) to (vi) above.

(i) A maximum rate will be £5.50 per hour;

(ii) Payments should be subject to a maximum weekly payment of £40, or seven and a half hours of care per week, whichever is the lower figure;

(iii) Payment should be claimable in respect of children aged 15 or under in respect of other dependants where there is medical or social work evidence that care is required;

(iv) One weekly payment should be claimable in respect of the household of each Member;

(v) The allowance should be paid as a reimbursement of incurred expenditure against receipts;

(vi) The allowance should not be payable to a member of the claimant’s own household.

8. **Claims and Payments**

(a) Basic Special Responsibility, and co-optees’ allowances are paid via the Council's payroll system, in instalments of one twelfth of the amounts specified in the Scheme, on approximately the 15th day of the month following the month to which payment relates.

(b) Claims for travelling, subsistence and carers’ allowances should be made on the appropriate claim form, supplemented by receipts where possible, and submitted to the Borough Solicitor and Secretary, no later than the end of the month. Payments will be made via the Council's payroll system, on approximately the 15th day of the month following the month to which the expenses relate.

(c) At the beginning of each municipal year, the Borough Solicitor and Secretary will advise all Members and co-opted members of the precise dates for the payment of Members’ Allowances in each month.
9. **Annual Uprating of Allowances**

The Borough Solicitor and Secretary shall, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council and the Director of Finance and Resources, apply increases to all those allowances set out in the schedule to this Scheme and the carers’ allowances set out in paragraph 7 of this Scheme in 2015/16 and 2016/17 capped at the level of the annual local government pay settlement when known, subject to any advice to the contrary being received from the Independent Remuneration Panel.

10. **Record Keeping and Publication**

   (a) The Council is required to keep a record of the payments made by it in accordance with this Scheme and of any payments made by it by virtue of section 174 to 176 of the Local Government Act 1972 (travel and subsistence), specifying the name of the recipient and the nature and amount of the payment;

   (b) The record is required to be available for inspection at all reasonable times free of charge by any local government elector for the Borough who may make a copy of any part of it;

   (c) The Council is also required to arrange publication (in a local newspaper) of the total sums paid in each year to each Member in respect of basic and Special Responsibility Allowances.

11. **Withdrawal of Allowances**

The Standards Committee may withdraw allowances in whole or in part in the event of a Member or co-opted member being suspended or partially suspended.

12. **Sickness and Maternity and Paternity Leave**

Special Responsibility Allowances payable under paragraph 3 of this Scheme will remain payable in cases of sickness or maternity and paternity leave on the same terms and to the same extent (so far as possible) as if the Member were a Council employee entitled to sickness, maternity or paternity benefits.
## Proposed Category of Allowance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Category of Allowance</th>
<th>Amount per Member 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic allowance (63 Members)</td>
<td>£10,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Responsibility Allowances – Leaders and Deputy Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Council</td>
<td>£32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Council</td>
<td>£19,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Opposition &amp; Chair of Overview Committee*</td>
<td>£14,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Leader of the Opposition</td>
<td>£6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the third largest Group</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Responsibility Allowances – Cabinet Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Members (7 Members)</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Responsibility Allowances – Committee Chairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Resources Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, and Young People Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Well-Being, Care and Older People Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood and Communities Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Committees (7 Members)</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Committee (3 Members)</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Responsibility Allowances - Spokespersons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview Spokesperson</td>
<td>£2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Resources Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, and Young People Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Well-Being, Care and Older People Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood and Communities Service Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Independent Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards Committee - Independent Chair</td>
<td>£685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee - Independent Chair</td>
<td>£1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee - Independent Vice-Chair</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Positions of Leader of the Opposition and Chair of Overview proposed to be held by the same Member.*

As stated in 3(d) of the Scheme, in the event that the role of Leader of the Opposition is no longer held by the Chair of Overview, then the proportionate allowances set out below will apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Amount Per Member 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Opposition</td>
<td>£8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Overview Committee</td>
<td>£5,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unanswered Council Questions

(i) **Question from Councillor Mrs Nolan Stark to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Norman**

“In the Wanstead and Snaresbrook area there are a shortage of school places for reception level children, with many children not having been allocated a local school reception place for September 2014, despite living within yards of the their local school.

Will the Cabinet Member honour the Labour Party’s manifesto promise of local places for local children and provide additional classrooms for reception children at Nightingale and Snaresbrook school’s to meet the high demand for September 2014”

**Answer from Cabinet Member**

“As Cllr Mrs Nolan will know, the current situation in the Wanstead and Snaresbrook areas is as a result of a very sudden surge in demand. I understand that 22 children have currently not been allocated a place in a local school. Therefore, Officers have been in contact with the Nightingale School and the Chair of Governors about the possibility of a temporary expansion. As a result of these discussions an extraordinary meeting of the Nightingale Primary governing body has been called for the 24th June 2014. I am very grateful to the chair and his colleagues for agreeing to this meeting and the proposal to create a temporary class for the coming academic year. Thus providing local places for local children.”

(ii) **Question from Councillor Cleaver to the Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Older People, Councillor Sharma**

“In view of the report of the Local Government Ombudsman regarding social care complaints which showed Redbridge as having the second highest figure per 100,000 of population, would the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown by category of complaint?”

**Answer from Cabinet Member**

“The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) published a report on 28 May 2014 which detailed all the complaints and enquiries it received in the 2013 calendar year relating to Adult Social Services functions in most Local Authorities.

To date the LGO has not provided a breakdown of categories despite a request from the Council for such a breakdown. However the Service is aware that there are some areas which could have been included for example dissatisfaction of some applicants when deemed not to meet the criteria for a blue badge.”
The Redbridge number of complaints and enquiries, amounted to 29 for the whole year.

The LGO made it clear in the report that a high number of complaints and enquiries do not necessarily suggest poorer services.

The LGO highlighted that sometimes higher numbers of complaints reflect organisations with an open and mature approach to the concerns of their service users, where feedback is encouraged and actively sought out.

Similarly, the LGO stated that lower numbers of complaints can indicate a need to focus upon the accessibility of the Complaints Process.

The council agrees with the LGO and believes that a higher number of complaints do not indicate the provision of poor services; to the contrary, Redbridge Council recognises the rights of individuals to raise complaints.

To facilitate this, the council has made its complaints leaflet accessible to all members of the public by ensuring the leaflet is available at numerous service points, on the internet and is routinely handed to service users.

The complaints leaflet can be translated in over 20 languages if required and is available in large print, easy read and braille versions.

The council encourages a culture of transparency in dealing with complaints and has therefore provided the details of the Local Government Ombudsman in its complaints leaflet and all publications to inform individuals of their right to recourse to the LGO.

It is appreciated that the report states within Redbridge, care services satisfaction rates are high and so having an open transparent approach to complaints supports the openness and learning that a high performing Adult Social Services such as Redbridge aspires to.

The Council will continue to be proactive in its complaints management in order to serve its local population with the best possible services.”

(iii) **Question from Councillor Prince to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Athwal**

“Would the Leader please give the time frames and costs for his manifesto pledges. Namely how many extra schools places will be provided in addition to those already planned to enable reduction of the number of children travelling long distances to school every day, the cost of extra resources for tackling beds in sheds, the cost of free swimming for under 16s and over 60s, the cost of the indicated increase funding for crime prevention, the cost of increasing the number of public toilets and their locations, the cost of lifting bank holiday parking restrictions. Could I have all these costs and time frames so that the people of Redbridge can measure this Administration’s performance against its manifesto commitments?”
Answer from the Leader

School Places
As I have been Leader for only a few days the detailed plans for providing local school places will take a little longer to be ready to put into the public domain. As you will know that there are statutory processes that need to be followed to increase capacity and where school expansions are involved these include appropriate consultations with schools and their governing bodies. That said, we are responding to the pressing issue of school places in the Wanstead area through having discussions with a local school in that area (Nightingale) with a view to providing additional local places for the next academic year. Overall I anticipate that we will be creating at least 5,200 additional school places over the next four years.

The majority of additional school places already created have been in the south and eastern areas of the borough, especially for primary aged children. We are clear that there are pressures in other areas of the borough and my plan is that an increasingly sophisticated approach to place planning will enable supply to be more closely matched to changing local need. I am pleased that my officers are already in discussion with the Greater London Authority to be an early implementer of a methodology to produce ward level place planning data which will inform the next rounds of school place creation. As you will know [from your previous good record in creating school places] the costs of additional places is highly scheme specific but I am advised that there will not be any greater average cost arising from any expansions in the north or western parts of the borough than the average costs of earlier expansions.

Detailed plans for additional school places will be brought to Cabinet in October. In the meantime I am aware that officers are in early discussion about several potential new schemes.

Beds in Sheds
Since April 2012 the Council have received £271,368 extra funding from Department for Communities and Local Government to tackle the issue of beds in sheds. This funding has helped to establish a housing and planning beds in sheds enforcement team and is supporting effective multi-agency enforcement action across the borough.

Free Swimming for under 16’s and over 60’s
We have made a firm commitment to provide free swimming for under 16’s and over 60’s. Vision Managers are currently working on full costings for a range of options to ensure we deliver our manifesto pledge. We will of course also be providing a new pool to enable us to offer and open up swimming facilities to all ages of our community, particularly in the South.

Increase Funding for Crime Prevention
As stated in our manifesto, we particularly want to fund crime prevention initiatives that include help to tackle burglary, harassment and other types of anti-social behaviour. We also intend to provide additional support to Neighbourhood Watch. At this early stage we are entering into discussions with officers to determine which initiatives would be most effective and where data and intelligence suggest they are most needed.
Increasing the Number of Public Toilets
I have asked Officers to prepare estimates of cost to return public toilets currently shut and moth balled back to operational condition. This information together with their location will provide the basis for how we move forward.

Cost of Lifting Bank Holiday Parking Restrictions
Similarly, the cost (i.e. loss of income) and the provision of new time plates is currently being established showing the suspension on Bank Holidays. We are establishing whether a Traffic Order needs to be introduced.

As far as timescales it is not yet possible to provide an estimate on reopening public toilets as this will very much depend on the physical condition of each one when they are assessed and the restorative work required.

If a Traffic Order is to be introduced to suspend Bank Holiday enforcement then it may not be possible to achieve the Legal change by the August Bank Holiday. If simply we can chose (within the Regulations) not to enforce then we would be able to suspend enforcement from the August Bank Holiday. That clarification is being sought.”

(iv) Question from Councillor Hayes to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Finance, Councillor Zammett

“To the Cabinet Member for Resources and Finance: how the incoming administration intends to balance the continuing and widely shared wish for a continuation of civic theatre in the borough with the likely costs of maintaining and improving the existing KMT building so as to make the building fit for purpose and financially viable?”

Answer from Cabinet Member

“The Deputy Leader and I in the fullness of time will be looking at the financial viability of the KMT. Therefore, it is far too early to be making statements about its future but it is fair to say we will comprehensively review the KMT and its relevance and all elements of operational and financial viability.

As Councillor Hayes will know, the Council has spent some money on building maintenance in recent years. These include replacement of air conditioning units and electrical rewiring works. In addition a condition survey has been undertaken in 2012 to provide a 10 year planned maintenance programme. Subject to the Council as landlord carrying out planned maintenance work and the Theatre carrying out day to day repairs and routine servicing/maintenance, the building will continue to be serviceable.”

(v) Question from Councillor Mrs Nolan to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Norman

“Will the Cabinet Member and Council join with me in congratulating the pupils staff and parents and governors of Snaresbrook Primary on the recent Ofsted report and the hard work shown in turning the school round in short period of time?”
"I am delighted to join with Cllr. Mrs. Nolan in congratulating all involved on the school’s recent Ofsted Report and I’m sure Council will join me in this. This report has vindicated the faith this Council had in the ability of staff, pupils, parents and governors to achieve improvements in the school and maintain it in Local Authority control."

**Question from Councillor Cleaver to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Nijjar**

“In the last financial year how much money was spent by Area Committees on street cleaning, environmental services, grants to local amenity groups and highway works?”

**Answer from Cabinet Member**

“In the last financial year, 2013/14, the following amounts were spent under these headings:

- Street cleaning £67,544
- Environmental services £67,461
- Grants to local amenity groups £70,827
- Highway works £135,219
- TOTAL £341,051”

**Question from Councillor Prince to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Javed**

“On his recent visit to the Borough the Leader of the Opposition, Edward Miliband, gave a commitment to build 200,000 new homes across Britain. Can the Cabinet Member confirm how many of these he has managed to secure for the London Borough of Redbridge?”

**Answer from Cabinet Member**

“I am very pleased that the Leader of the opposition, Edward Miliband gave this public commitment in response to growing housing problems both in Redbridge and elsewhere.

You held three different senior positions including housing, regeneration and of course the Leader of the council and therefore, no doubt you would be aware of the following:-

In the last five year period up to 2012/13 there were 2,637 housing completions in Redbridge, of these only 452 were affordable. If we look at the longer period say
from 2002 there were just over seven thousand new homes built, of which just over fourteen hundred were affordable.

Over the same period, council waiting list has continued to grow-average wait is 6 to 7 years for a family house. The numbers of households in temporary accommodation have consistently been over 2,000 and as you are well aware families have had to be placed in unsuitable bed and breakfast accommodation.

Finally, I hope you will join me in welcoming the clear commitment made by the Leader of the opposition.”

(viii) Question from Councillor Hayes to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement, Councillor Hatfull

“To the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement: whether he supports the Mayor of London’s provision of ‘Selecta DNA’ property marking kits to victims of domestic burglary?”

Answer from Cabinet Member

“I support the provision of forensic property marking kits (traceable liquids) to local victims of domestic burglary and am pleased that this Council is already financially supporting two existing projects in the borough. The first project provides these kits free of charge to the victims of burglary along with their immediate neighbours. A second initiative provides these kits, once again free of charge, to properties in burglary hot spot locations.

Research carried out recently in London, and historically in other locations nationally, highlights that forensic property marking does substantially contribute to reductions in burglary. I believe that initiatives involving traceable marking kits will have an impact on reducing burglaries particularly in local hot spots across the borough, including Chadwell Heath where residents have suffered too many burglaries in recent years.

However forensic property marking is only one tool in fighting residential burglary, and does little to compensate for cuts in police numbers across London, or the closure of local police stations during the Mayor of London term in office.

I would therefore urge the Mayor of London to act to increase the number of Police in Redbridge and across London, and to keep his promises to ensure that more police are out on the streets in Local neighbourhoods.

Personally I will also be making sure that the Council continues to roll out alleygating projects, supports Neighbourhood Watches, builds on its work in the Bogus Caller Partnership to prevent artifice (distraction) burglaries, and uses its various channels to increase awareness of crime prevention actions that residents can take. I will also be meeting shortly with the Police Borough Commander to discuss what the Police intend to do, not only maintain, but further reduce burglary across this Borough, and how we can best support them. I will also ensure that the Council puts further financial resource into crime prevention measures, to reduce actual and fear of crime.
We all know that burglary is a very personal crime that has a particularly high impact on victims. I intend to keep a very close eye on this to ensure that the Safer Communities Partnership in Redbridge does everything it can to tackle this.”

(ix) **Question from Councillor Hayes to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration, Councillor Coomb**

“To the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration: Could the cabinet member explain to the Council the consequences of failing to maintain an up-to-date adopted local plan which demonstrates the availability of a 5 year housing land supply?”

**Answer from Cabinet Member**

“The requirement for the Council to maintain an up-to-date adopted Local Plan is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (published March 2012).

In the context of housing supply policies, our Local Plan is not considered up-to-date if it cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites against the borough’s housing target in the London Plan.

If the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, then the National Planning Policy Framework requires planning applications to be decided against the Framework (and its default presumption in favour of sustainable development) rather than the policies in the Council’s Local Plan. This could mean that sites that the Council has not specifically allocated for housing may have to be approved, either by the Council or by a Planning Inspector.

Essentially, if the Council doesn’t proactively allocate enough housing sites in order to demonstrate a five year supply, applications for housing on unallocated sites within the borough are more likely to be approved by Inspectors, notwithstanding whether or not such proposals are supported locally.

The London Plan currently sets a target of 760 homes per year for Redbridge. The borough is currently able to demonstrate a sufficient five-year supply of allocated or approved housing sites to meet its obligations under the National Planning Policy Framework in the short-to-medium term.

The Mayor is proposing to increase Redbridge’s housing target (and that of most boroughs). If the Mayor does this, the London Plan target for Redbridge will increase from the 760 homes per year to 1,123 per year. In the short-term, the borough should be able to demonstrate sufficient deliverable housing sites to meet the increased London Plan target. However, in the medium-term, the Council’s currently allocated housing sites will run out and any proposals for housing on un-allocated sites would be considered against the National Planning Policy Framework and it’s presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The Local Plan review currently being undertaken by the Council seeks to ensure that the Council can proactively allocate sufficient housing land to meet both the current and proposed (increased) London Plan Housing target in the longer-term. The draft Local Plan is due to be submitted to Government for independent
examination mid-2015 and if found sound by the Planning Inspectorate, the revised Local Plan should be adopted by the end of 2015.

Deliverable housing sites are those that are considered suitable for housing and are likely to be available for redevelopment within the next five years. The strongest local and proactive indication of whether a site is considered to be suitable for housing is through its formal allocation as a housing opportunity site in the Local Plan.

Not allocating enough land for housing potentially removes the Council’s ability to direct housing to areas it considers most suitable for housing. This is due to the National Planning Policy Framework requiring that in such circumstances decision making on planning applications defaults to a general presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Housing need within the borough is currently estimated at 2,000 homes per year; this need is strongly driven by an increased birth-rate over the past decade.

Future housing supply within the borough is currently 760 homes per year, a reflection of the current London Plan target for Redbridge. This target is expected to be increased by the Mayor to 1,123 homes per year. The increased target takes into account historic rates of windfall (unallocated) sites coming forward. It however still falls short of overall housing need.

The economic downturn since 2008 has resulted in a decline in housing completions in Redbridge and London generally and this has contributed to growing housing need. In the five years from 2008/09 to 2012/13, 2,637 new homes were completed in Redbridge, representing an annual average of 528 homes compared to the current London Plan target of 760 homes per year."
## Voting Record - Council, 19th June 2014

### LABOUR GROUP

**Leader of the Labour Group:**
- Cllr Athwal
- Cllr S. Ahmad
- Cllr Muhammad Ahmed
- Cllr Mushtaq Ahmed
- Cllr Bain
- Cllr Bellwood
- Cllr Bhamra
- Cllr K. Chowdhury
- Cllr K. Chowdhury
- Cllr Coomb
- Cllr Emmett
- Cllr Flint
- Cllr Hatfull
- Cllr Healy
- Cllr Howard
- Cllr Mohammad Ahmed
- Cllr S. Ahmad
- Cllr Merry
- Cllr Littlewood
- Cllr Farah Hussain
- Cllr Zulfi Hussain
- Cllr Javed
- Cllr Jeyarajan
- Cllr Jones
- Cllr Kaur-Thiara
- Cllr Littlewood
- Cllr Nijjar
- Cllr Norman
- Cllr Parkash
- Cllr Rai
- Cllr Rashid
- Cllr Sachs
- Cllr Santos
- Cllr Sharma
- Cllr Singh Bola
- Cllr Streeting
- Cllr White
- Cllr Zammett

### CONSERVATIVE GROUP

**Leader of the Conservative Group:**
- Cllr Canal
- Cllr Best
- Cllr Blaber
- Cllr Bromley
- Cllr M. Chaudhury
- Cllr Cole
- Cllr Cronin
- Cllr Cunningham
- Cllr Mrs Dunn
- Cllr Fairley-Churchill
- Cllr Hanan
- Cllr Hayes
- Depute Mayor (Cllr Mrs Huggett)
- Cllr Lambert
- Cllr McLaren
- Cllr Mrs Nolan
- Cllr O’Shea
- Cllr Packer
- Cllr Prince
- Cllr Mrs Ryan
- Cllr Sharpe
- Cllr Stark
- Cllr Turbefield
- Cllr Weinberg

### LIBERAL DEMOCRATS GROUP

**Leader of the Liberal Democrats:**
- Cllr Bond
- Cllr Cleaver
- Cllr DeasKin

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE NUMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor (Councillor Kissin)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX H**

- No: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 38, 0, 35, 27, 0, 59, 39, 0, 38, 0, 0, 35
- Abstained: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
- Declaration of Interest: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- Absent from meeting: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- Apologies: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0