



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE  
LONDON BOROUGH OF HAVERING  
Council Chamber - Town Hall  
25 January 2017 (7.30 pm – 10.25 pm)**

**Present:** The Mayor (Councillor Philippa Crowder) in the Chair

**Councillors** Councillors June Alexander, Clarence Barrett, Robert Benham, Ray Best, Wendy Brice-Thompson, Michael Deon Burton, Joshua Chapman, John Crowder, Keith Darvill, Meg Davis, Ian de Wulverton, Osman Dervish, Nic Dodin, Alex Donald, David Durant, Brian Eagling, Gillian Ford, Jason Frost, Jody Ganly\*, John Glanville, Linda Hawthorn, David Johnson, Steven Kelly, Phil Martin, Barbara Matthews, Robby Misir, Ray Morgon, Barry Mugglestone, Stephanie Nunn, Denis O'Flynn, Ron Ower, Garry Pain, Dilip Patel, Roger Ramsey, Keith Roberts, Patricia Rumble, Carol Smith, Frederick Thompson, Linda Trew, Jeffrey Tucker, Linda Van den Hende, Melvin Wallace, Lawrence Webb, Roger Westwood, Damian White\*, Michael White, Reg Whitney, Julie Wilkes, Graham Williamson, Darren Wise and John Wood

\*Part of meeting

Approximately 40 Members' guests and members of the public and a representative of the press were also present.

The Mayor advised Members and the public of action to be taken in the event of emergency evacuation of the Town Hall becoming necessary.

Father Roderick Hingley, of the Church of St Alban, Protomartyr, Romford opened the meeting with prayers.

The meeting closed with the singing of the National Anthem.

**68 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (agenda item 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors John Mylod and Viddy Persaud. Apologies were also received for part of the meeting from Councillors Jody Ganly and Damian White.

69 **MINUTES (agenda item 3)**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 23 November 2016 were before the Council for approval.

It was **AGREED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 23 November 2016 be signed as a correct record.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 23 November 2016 be signed as a correct record.**

70 **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (agenda item 4)**

There were no disclosures of pecuniary or personal interests.

71 **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR, BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL OR BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE (agenda item 5)**

A minute's silence was held in memory of Alderman and former Leader of the Council Mr Arthur Latham who had sadly died recently. Tributes to Mr Latham were paid by all sides.

Council also noted with sadness the recent death of Mr John Symons clerk of the London Borough of Havering from its inauguration in 1964 until 1973.

The Mayor thanked all organisations involved with the Havering float which had come seventh at the recent London New Year's Parade. The Mayor also acknowledged a work of art commemorating the victims of the Holocaust that was on display in the Town Hall and had been created by Hannah Turnbull – winner of the Havering Young Artist 2016 competition.

The text of the announcements made by the Leader of the Council is attached as appendix 1 to these minutes.

72 **PETITIONS (agenda item 6)**

No petitions were presented.

73 **COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2017 (agenda item 7)**

It was noted that the report on the Council's Financial Strategy, which included the Council Tax Support Scheme 2017 had been approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January 2017.

The report of Cabinet asked Council to approve the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2017 and included, for noting, the Equalities Impact Assessments in respect of the Council Tax Support Scheme.

The report was **AGREED** by 43 voted to 5 (see division 1) and it was **RESOLVED**:

**That the Equalities Impact Assessments in respect of the Council Tax Support Scheme be noted and the Council Tax Support Scheme 2017 be approved.**

**74 NATIONAL SCHEME FOR AUDITOR APPOINTMENTS (agenda item 8)**

A report of the Audit Committee recommended that the Council join a national scheme – Public Sector Audit Appointments which would enable a sector led arrangement for the appointment of a suitable company to be the Council's auditor. This would allow compliance with contractual and independence requirements and lower overall procurement costs.

The report was **AGREED** without division and it was **RESOLVED**:

1. That the Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) invitation be accepted to 'opt in' to the sector led option for the appointment of external auditors commencing 1 April 2018, for the financial years of the contracts let in accordance with the PSAA procurement strategy; (5 years as currently proposed);
2. That authority be delegated to the Section 151 Officer to give notice to the PSSA that the invitation is accepted.

**75 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES (agenda item 9)**

A report of the Governance Committee recommended that Council approve some changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules to allow recommendations on proposals for development to be submitted directly to Cabinet or Council for consideration, without prior consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

This would ensure that Overview and Scrutiny recommendations were brought to the attention of Cabinet or Council in a timely manner.

The report was **AGREED** without division and it was **RESOLVED**:

**That the revisions to the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules as shown in appendix 2 to these minutes be approved.**

**76 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (agenda item 10)**

Fifteen questions were asked and replies given. The text of the questions, together with their answers, is shown as appendix 3 to these minutes. .

**77 MAYOR OF LONDON (agenda item 11A)**

A procedural motion that motion 11A be dealt with on a vote only basis, that all other motions be dealt with under the intermediate debate procedure and that motions be heard in the order 11A, 11B, 11D and 11C was **AGREED** by 47 votes to 5 (see division 2).

**A MAYOR OF LONDON****Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group**

When the Greater London Authority (GLA) was set-up it had more limited powers. It is presided over by an Elected Mayor. In recent years the GLA has acquired more powers including over housing prompting concerns about the democratic status of the Elected Mayor and their powers to overrule local planning decisions. Indeed how is it possible for one person elected on about 20% of the registered vote to be held accountable on the many issues that matter in a city the size of London?

Thus this Council agrees the post of Elected Mayor (Leader) of London should be abolished and replaced with the Cabinet system, in which the Elected Assembly elects the Leader as we do in Havering and calls on the Council Leader to seek support for this change from other London councils.

The motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 28 votes to 15 (see division 3).

**78 SOLAR PARKS (agenda item 11B)****Motion on behalf of the United Kingdom Independence Party Group**

This Council recommends that the Executive conducts a poll before deciding whether or not to introduce Solar Parks at both Dagnam Park and Gerpins Lane.

**Amendment by the Conservative Group**

This Council notes that the Executive will consider carefully all responses to consultation before deciding whether or not to introduce Solar Parks at both land adjacent to Dagnam Park and land at Gerpins Lane and that if the solar farm project contained in the Medium Term Financial Strategy agreed by the Council does not proceed further substantial savings will be required.

**Amendment by the Independent Residents' Group**

Many residents have no inclination to support a wind or solar farm as they are viewed as an environmental blight on the landscape and because they're promoted on the back of a fraud called "man made climate change", but council plans for a solar farm in Dagnam Park, Harold Hill and on land

off Gerpins Lane, nr Rainham are proposed to raise money to provide council services, but are they financially viable following cuts in government subsidies for ground based solar farms?

Thus this Council calls on the Executive to investigate the full environmental and amenity costs and financial viability before progressing any plans for solar farms in Havering.

### **Amendment by the Labour Group**

This Council opposes the Executive proposal to introduce a Solar Park at Dagnam Park.

Following debate, the amendment by the Conservative Group was **CARRIED** by 28 votes to 13 (see division 4); the amendment by the Independent Residents' Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 43 votes to 3 (see division 5) and the amendment by the Independent Residents' Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 29 votes to 18 (see division 6). The amendment by the Conservative Group was **AGREED** as the substantive motion by 32 votes to 12 (see division 7).

### **RESOLVED:**

**This Council notes that the Executive will consider carefully all responses to consultation before deciding whether or not to introduce Solar Parks at both land adjacent to Dagnam Park and land at Gerpins Lane and that if the solar farm project contained in the Medium Term Financial Strategy agreed by the Council does not proceed further substantial savings will be required.**

## 79 **TERMS AND CONDITIONS REVIEW (agenda item 11C)**

### **Motion on behalf of the Independent Residents' Group**

This Council agrees the way to deliver the budget strategy agreed by Council to cut the wage bill by £500,000 is by for example reducing wages by 1% across the board starting at the top and then down until the target is met. No one likes a wage cut but if unavoidable due to further cuts in government funding that is the straight forward we're all in it together and fair way to do it and vital to maintaining staff morale and jobs, whereas robbing Peter to pay Paul is simply bad politics in the present difficult circumstances.

Also Council agrees the review of terms and conditions costing £512,000 so far to conduct is a separate and secondary matter entirely as an honest review could result in an increase in the wage bill. But because it's being conducted to reduce the wage bill, it means experienced and qualified staff are failing "the interview" with many feeling a great sense of injustice, demoralised and taking redundancy (another cost) as a result. And many

lower paid staff are suffering disproportionately due to changes in allowances. Changes in terms and conditions should be oiled with a pay rise, not imposed unfairly to deliver a pay cut.

**And therefore Council calls on the Executive not to conflate the review of terms and conditions with the budget strategy to deliver a £500,000 cut in the wage bill.**

### **Amendment by the Conservative Group**

This Council notes that the two fundamental objectives of the review of employee terms & conditions of employment (T&Cs) are to: modernise our approach to working arrangements, pay structures and job evaluation, replacing existing T&Cs that are inconsistent, outdated or do not assist the delivery of services; and to create annual savings of at least £500,000 on the Council's non-schools corporate pay bill, as previously agreed as part of the Council's budget strategy. Whilst an across the board % reduction in salaries could achieve the savings target, it would not modernise our working arrangements and in particular would leave in place a range of inconsistent T&Cs that our staff and trade unions have previously identified as in need of modernisation. It is also essential that those working arrangements are modernised in order to ensure that we meet our obligations with regard to equalities and equal value.

This Council values the contribution and commitment made by all staff to the delivery of good quality public services. Whilst change proposals of this order will unfortunately lead to some staff experiencing a reduction in pay, this Council notes that the contractual impact of the Council's proposals means that more than two out of every three staff will either be unaffected or will be slightly better off. This Council also notes that a significant period of pay protection will be applied to those staff who experience a reduction in pay to help support them through the transformation

In noting these matters this Council reaffirms the decision agreed at the Full Council meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2016 that authority is delegated to the Governance Committee to approve proposals which were likely to arise from the review of T&Cs, noting the amendment to the terms of reference of the Governance Committee within the Constitution as set out at paragraph 97 on page 180C of the minutes of that meeting.

The amendment by the Conservative Group was **AGREED** by 39 votes to 4 (see division 9) and **AGREED** as the substantive motion without division.

### **RESOLVED:**

**This Council notes that the two fundamental objectives of the review of employee terms & conditions of employment (T&Cs) are to: modernise our approach to working arrangements, pay structures and job evaluation, replacing existing T&Cs that are inconsistent, outdated or do not assist the delivery of services; and to create annual savings**

of at least £500,000 on the Council's non-schools corporate pay bill, as previously agreed as part of the Council's budget strategy. Whilst an across the board % reduction in salaries could achieve the savings target, it would not modernise our working arrangements and in particular would leave in place a range of inconsistent T&Cs that our staff and trade unions have previously identified as in need of modernisation. It is also essential that those working arrangements are modernised in order to ensure that we meet our obligations with regard to equalities and equal value.

This Council values the contribution and commitment made by all staff to the delivery of good quality public services. Whilst change proposals of this order will unfortunately lead to some staff experiencing a reduction in pay, this Council notes that the contractual impact of the Council's proposals means that more than two out of every three staff will either be unaffected or will be slightly better off. This Council also notes that a significant period of pay protection will be applied to those staff who experience a reduction in pay to help support them through the transformation

In noting these matters this Council reaffirms the decision agreed at the Full Council meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2016 that authority is delegated to the Governance Committee to approve proposals which were likely to arise from the review of T&Cs, noting the amendment to the terms of reference of the Governance Committee within the Constitution as set out at paragraph 97 on page 180C of the minutes of that meeting.

80 **OLYMPIC AND PARLYMPIC GAMES PRECEPT (agenda item 11D)**

**Motion on behalf of the Joint Administration**

Under an agreement between the GLA and the government of the time, from 2006/07 Council Tax payers across London were required to contribute £625m towards the cost of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This was equivalent to an annual charge of £20 per household (Band D) which was collected by the GLA via an Olympic Precept included in council tax bills. In 2016/17 the final instalment of the £625m was paid and Council Tax payers saw the £20 precept reduce to £8 accordingly.

As the full £625m had been paid off, the expectation was that the remaining £8 would be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18. However, the draft 2017/18 GLA budget does not propose to return this sum.

Furthermore, while the Games were a great success and enjoyed by many, the precept meant that Havering Council Tax payers contributed some £16m towards the Games with little or no quantifiable benefit to our residents.

Our council faces significant financial pressures, such as Social Care, demographic growth and Housing which is made even more challenging when set against substantial reductions in local government funding.

As such, this Council calls upon the Mayor of London to honour the original agreement which ring-fenced the £20 precept for the Olympic and Paralympic Games and as the financial obligation has been met, the remaining £8 should be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18 to help fund council services to our residents.'

### **Amendment by the Independent Residents' Group**

(Proposed amended wording shown in bold for clarity).

Under an agreement between the GLA and the government of the time, from 2006/07 Council Tax payers across London were required to contribute £625m towards the cost of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This was equivalent to an annual charge of £20 per household (Band D) which was collected by the GLA via an Olympic Precept included in council tax bills. In 2016/17 the final instalment of the £625m was paid and Council Tax payers saw the £20 precept reduce to £8 accordingly.

As the full £625m had been paid off, the expectation was that the remaining £8 would be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18. However, the draft 2017/18 GLA budget does not propose to return this sum.

Furthermore, while the Games were a great success and enjoyed by many, the precept meant that Havering Council Tax payers contributed some £16m towards the Games with little or no quantifiable benefit to our residents.

Our council faces significant financial pressures, such as Social Care, demographic growth and Housing which is made even more challenging when set against substantial reductions in local government funding.

As such, **this Council calls on the Executive to ascertain whether withholding the return of this overpayment is lawful and if not instruct the legal department to seek the return of said monies** and calls on the Mayor of London to honour the original agreement which ring-fenced the £20 precept for the Olympic and Paralympic Games and as the financial obligation has been met, the remaining £8 should be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18 to help fund council services to our residents.'

Following debate, the amendment by the Independent Residents' Group was **NOT CARRIED** by 41 votes to 8 (see division 8) and the motion on behalf of the Joint Administration was **AGREED** as the substantive motion, without division.



**RESOLVED:**

Under an agreement between the GLA and the government of the time, from 2006/07 Council Tax payers across London were required to contribute £625m towards the cost of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This was equivalent to an annual charge of £20 per household (Band D) which was collected by the GLA via an Olympic Precept included in council tax bills. In 2016/17 the final instalment of the £625m was paid and Council Tax payers saw the £20 precept reduce to £8 accordingly.

As the full £625m had been paid off, the expectation was that the remaining £8 would be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18. However, the draft 2017/18 GLA budget does not propose to return this sum.

Furthermore, while the Games were a great success and enjoyed by many, the precept meant that Havering Council Tax payers contributed some £16m towards the Games with little or no quantifiable benefit to our residents.

Our council faces significant financial pressures, such as Social Care, demographic growth and Housing which is made even more challenging when set against substantial reductions in local government funding.

As such, this Council calls upon the Mayor of London to honour the original agreement which ring-fenced the £20 precept for the Olympic and Paralympic Games and as the financial obligation has been met, the remaining £8 should be returned to Council Tax payers in 2017/18 to help fund council services to our residents.'

81 **VOTING RECORD**

The record of voting decisions is attached as appendix 4 to these minutes.

---

**Mayor**

This page is intentionally left blank

MADAM MAYOR,

I would like to give members an update on a number of current matters and issues facing the Council.

## **TEMPORARY ICE RINK & FESTIVE EVENTS**

Firstly, I would like to thank our staff for their work in arranging Christmas events across the Borough which were attended by thousands of our residents and added to the vibrancy and enjoyment of this special time of the year. I would also like to thank *Very Nice Ice* for bringing their temporary ice rink to Romford Market over the festive period.

It served as a focal point for many families' Christmas entertainment and attracted numerous visitors to our historic market, and I congratulate everyone involved for making this attraction such a success. Romford has long been known as a town with an ice skating tradition and this temporary ice rink in Romford has given everyone a taste of the fantastic new permanent ice skating facilities that our new leisure centre in Western Road will provide from early 2018. I am pleased to say that the project is well on schedule.

Congratulations are also due to the Queens Theatre at Hornchurch where the Pantomime clocked up a record 28,000 attendances, and I congratulate and thank its board chairman Denis Rycroft who has just retired after 16 years of dedicated voluntary work there.

One that note thanks are due to the excellent local acts who performed at your Charity Concert yesterday evening including the Newtons Primary school dancers who charmed us all.

## **OFSTED CHILDRENS REPORT**

Just before Christmas we received Ofsted reports on Children's Social Services and some schools. Our Childrens' Director Tim Aldridge and his team are working to address the issues raised in both these reports. Existing plans for improvement have been acknowledged, and a plan of action is in place for both School Improvement and Social Care to ensure that both services are enhanced further in line with Ofsted's recommendations. Funding is always a problem for Councils like ours where we receive so much less government support those areas whose needs are perceived to be greater. However we are determined to drive up performance in all sections.

In response to the challenges across the school sector, we have in conjunction with the Regional Schools Commissioner (who is responsible for academies) recruited Dame Joan McVitie to chair an Improvement Board to focus in on the key challenges facing the secondary sector.

In relation to social care service, a key area of focus is the leaving care service, which was judged to be our worst performing section. The priorities in this area are to ensure that young people Leaving Care are fully aware of their entitlements and receive the support they need to make a successful transition to adulthood. The service has also reviewed the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), with a view to strengthening the first response to safeguarding concerns.

## **HAVERING COLLEGE**

I am looking forward to Havering College taking up a £5.4 million grant from The London Economic Action Partnership, which is the new name for the Local Enterprise Partnership, to help create a Construction & Infrastructure Skills & Innovation Centre at their site in Rainham, as well as additional learning space for professional and trade skills in infrastructure and construction engineering.

The project will also see the refurbishment of the college's existing construction centre and the installation of a Virtual Reality, simulated learning environment – this will be unique for a construction further education establishment in the UK.

To enable the College to take up this grant the Council will be working with the college on financing and exploring the current use they make of their property estate across the borough.

The Principal of the College will also be giving a Members' Briefing shortly that will also encompass a scheme for a possible merger with Barking & Dagenham College.

## **MEETING WITH MINISTER TO DISCUSS SETTLEMENT**

Last week Andrew Rosindell MP, Andrew Blake-Herbert and I met with the Minister for Local Government, Marcus Jones, to renew our call for a review of the funding formula which sees our borough unfairly penalised financially, and disproportionately compared to other London councils. Although we are planning ahead and looking for ways to increase our income, we will continue to argue for a fairer deal from Central Government. On this occasion we also emphasised the inequitable way the Better Care Fund is distributed. This particularly impacts on us with the largest percentage of older people of any London borough and no less than 60 care homes within our boundary.

## **NOAK HILL SPORTS CENTRE**

On a brighter note, I am very pleased to announce that the new Noak Hill Sports Centre in Heaton Ward at Harold Hill opened this week and has already had visitors with local football clubs securing booking for the 3G football pitch. There are some small areas of work left to complete including landscaping and completing the Sports Hall floor but in all, the facilities are already very impressive with an official launch planned for the end of February or March.

## **T&C UPDATE**

The Council started its formal consultation with staff and trade unions on the Council's Terms and Conditions of Employment proposals in September 2016. As you know we launched the review to modernise and standardise our Terms and Conditions, and find yearly savings from our pay bill of £95m to protect our services and fill our budget gap. Like other councils, we had to look at all our options and it wasn't a step we took lightly. In fact it took us longer than we had planned because we wanted to make sure that it was the right thing to do and that our proposals for the annual savings of at least £500,000, were fair and measured, and applied to all Council staff from the Chief Executive down. This process is now in its final stages, with feedback from staff and Trade Unions taken into account and, where we could, acted upon. The number of staff that would see either no change in their pay - or see it increase - is slightly higher than under the original proposals. The Job Evaluation Appeals process is nearing completion, and the implementation of the proposals is expected in the summer. It has been a long hard process that isn't over yet, but we have tried to make it a

fair, open, and honest one. The process will continue to be reviewed by Governance Committee.

## **THE MARKET HOUSE**

Members will know that we want to see the historic Romford Market return to full strength in the heart of the retail community, and if I may, I'll borrow Mayor Sadiq Khan's words on visiting Gallows Corner last year when he said "the status quo is not an option." That applies to Romford Market. If we do nothing it is in danger of withering and dying. We are fortunate to have access to money from the Mayor of London to help reinvigorate the market and the firm advice that we have received is that one important element of that is the building of a new Market House.

We are looking for the new Market House to provide a quality catering offer every day of the week, and act as a focal point, to complement existing businesses and the new public space in front of St. Edward's Church. Plans for that Market House will go to our Regulatory Service Committee next month where there will be further opportunity for objections and expressions of support to be considered fully.

## **SOLAR FARM UPDATE**

Although we shall be discussing a motion and amendments on this topic later in the agenda I thought that it would be helpful as a backdrop to bring members right up to date as to the Administration's position.

The proposal for two solar parks in the borough (which was agreed as an item of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy) is part of a wider strategy to provide clean, sustainable and renewable energy and also to generate significant income to maintain vital services in the face of loss of much of government funding.

Following the outcome of an initial public consultation prior to any planning application we have been considering with officers how to proceed further. We are grateful for the interest and views on both possible sites.

I myself have had meetings with officers of the Friends of Dagnam Park and other individuals. I have also carried out inspections. On Friday the 13th January I toured the whole site with officers and on Friday last the 20th I walked through the area with the Chairman and Secretary of the Friends Group and a concerned resident. I am grateful to them for their time and courtesy.

Although work is continuing on financial and practical analysis I can say that we do not now consider that the Dagnam Park proposal should proceed in its current form.

My particular concerns include the size of the area proposed and its topography. If a smaller scheme for Dagnam Park is to be suggested the form and content of consultation will be discussed in advance with the Friends Group. If no scheme is proposed no further consultation will be needed. I hope to be able to give final confirmation on this by our next meeting.

The Gerpins Lane scheme is still being examined. Planning approval and ministerial consent would be needed for any proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 2

## SUBJECT: AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION

Date: 25 January 2017

Part and article/ section	Page ref	Substance of amendment / amended wording	Reason for amendment
Part 4, Rules of Procedure. Overview & Scrutiny Rule 11		<p><b>Reports to Council &amp; Cabinet</b> Amend wording as follows:</p> <p>(a) Once it has formed recommendations on proposals for development, the Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committees will prepare a report and submit it to <del>(the Overview and Scrutiny Board who will then submit it to)</del> the proper officer for consideration by the Council or by the Cabinet as appropriate.</p> <p>(b) If an Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee cannot agree on one single final report to the Council or Cabinet as appropriate, then up to one minority report may be prepared and submitted for consideration by the Council or Cabinet with the majority report.</p> <p>(c) As soon as possible after the <b>Sub-Committee</b> <del>Overview and Scrutiny Board</del> has prepared the report, the proper officer shall serve a copy of it upon the relevant Cabinet Member.</p> <p>(d) The Council or Cabinet must consider the report of the Overview and Scrutiny <b>Sub-Committee</b> <del>Board</del> within two months of it being submitted to the proper officer.</p> <p>(e) Reports of Overview and Scrutiny <b>Sub-Committees</b> <del>Board</del> referred to the Cabinet shall be considered by the Cabinet within two months of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee at which its report and recommendations are agreed.</p>	Need to revise process to ensure Overview & Scrutiny decisions are brought to the Executive in a timely manner

This page is intentionally left blank





## APPENDIX 3

**FULL COUNCIL, Wednesday 25 January 2017**

### **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

#### **Air Pollution**

**1) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor Reg Whitney**

Would the Cabinet Member confirm that Havering is not breaching legal limits on air pollution and how it ranks against other London Boroughs

**Response:**

Havering is not breaching legal limits on air pollution for either the annual or hourly levels set within the National Air Quality Standards (England).

Havering has better air quality overall than many other London Boroughs coming within the top 5-6 for good air quality.

#### **Litter Thrown from Cars**

**2) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor John Glanville**

Given that English councils are to be given the legal power to punish car owners who let litter be thrown from their cars and some London boroughs already have this power, will Havering Council be using this power?

**Response:**

Power to serve a Penalty Charge Notice on those who litter from cars exists under the London Local Authorities Act 2007.

Littering is very bad behaviour and we support any increase in powers that allows us to target the problem. A more simplified procedure for dealing with car litterers is proposed as part of the Anti-Social Behaviour 2014 Crime and Policing Act. The enabling legislation to introduce this isn't yet in place but once it is we will monitor those new powers and decide whether they should be introduced here.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member indicated that he would be happy to consider how this power could be enforced as part of the general enforcement strategy.

## **The Local Plan and Parking Provision**

### **3) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

#### **From Councillor David Durant**

Due to Government/GLA policy of “housing targets” developers are submitting plans “within the rules” that provide not enough resident and almost no visitor parking and clearly this policy relies on adjoining roads providing the overspill parking. In view of this will the Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services recommend a change to the Local Plan and require highway contributions from developers to assist with the provision of more parking to help replace the national policy of “housing targets” with a local policy of “sustainable housing”.

#### **Response :**

The level of parking required on any particular new development is currently set out within the London Plan. The forthcoming Local Plan will set local parking requirements. A Residential Car Parking Standards Study is being prepared as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and will be used to inform the proposed parking standards.

As part of any planning application, the impact of the development on the surrounding area is a material consideration. Where it can be clearly demonstrated that surrounding streets already suffer significant parking stress or would do as a result of the development, mitigation measures, including possible developer contributions would be considered

We are encouraging prospective developers to engage earlier in the process, long before the planning application process to ensure that they understand the needs of the community. Working more proactively with developers will allow the council to increase influence over the specification of large scale developments going forward.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the Local Plan would set local parking levels and this would be presented to Members later in the year.

## **The Future of the Harold Hill Crown Post Office**

### **4) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish) From Councillor Keith Darvill**

What representations have been made to Post Office Limited and the Minister for Postal Affairs about the proposal to close the Harold Hill Crown Post Office in Farnham Road?

#### **Response:**

While we have not made any specific representation, we have contacted the post office to find out further information. However, it is likely that the Post Office is exploring opportunities to seek a franchisee, which is the Post Office current business model. Usually, franchise branches offer the same services for customers as well as sometimes longer hours and on some occasions opening on a Sunday. A call has been logged with the Post Office HR and consultation team to find out further information.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member conformed he was happy to meet with local ward Councillors about this issue and make representations accordingly.

## **Under Occupation of Council Properties**

### **5) To the Cabinet Member for Housing (Councillor Damian White) From Councillor June Alexander**

Would the Cabinet Member confirm what proactive steps are being taken to encourage the near 400 single council tenants living in 3 plus bedrooms to downsize.

#### **Response:**

While council tenants have the right to live in a property even if it is too large for them, the Council takes proactive steps to encourage them to downsize.

(a) In July 2016, the Council revised its Housing Allocation Policy, to reward tenants that do downsize with a community contribution reward (CCR 1 and 2) which is a high housing priority to support tenants to move into alternative smaller accommodation.

(b) Community events are also held to provide information on the housing options available to tenants to encourage them to downsize. On 19 October 2016, a Mobility Open Day was held for tenants who were under-occupying their homes or were overcrowded with the aim of bringing them together to find a swap. The event was also attended by other housing providers including Home-swapper, Seaside & Country

**Council, 25 January 2017**

Homes and the GLA's Housing Moves. We will be organising another event in March 2017.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member confirmed that tenants would be assessed for emergency rehousing if a health issue had been identified. A total of 67 people had attended the recent housing swaps with 11 swaps being progressed as a result of this.

**RIPA Powers**

**6) To the Leader of the Council**

**From Councillor Ian de Wulverton**

Has Havering used the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) powers, to gather information on the residents of Havering? If so when and what where they used for?

**Response :**

The legislation provides Local Authorities with statutory powers to use covert intelligence operations in very limited circumstances where it is investigating serious criminal offences. It is not used to gather information on residents. These restricted legal powers are rarely used – there have been 2 occasions in the last 4 years. The powers cannot be used by the Council without an application to Magistrates Court which considers the circumstances and decides whether the action is justified. The Council is also inspected by the Office of Surveillance Commissioners every two or three years to ensure its policies and use of the legislation is appropriate. The Council was last inspected in December 2016 and a positive report was received.

The most recent orders for surveillance were in respect of allegations of repeated sales of cigarettes and alcohol to children and, secondly, commercial-scale fly tipping.

**Conservation Areas**

**7) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor Keith Roberts**

Due to the growth in 'try on' applications to build in our Conservation Areas can the Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services assure Council that Conservation Area rules will be applied and if necessary strengthened to ensure only schemes that enhance rather than undermine our Conservation Areas will be recommended for approval?

**Response:**

All applications for development within our Conservation Areas are assessed against our Local Development Framework (LDF), the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Council has a duty to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets when reaching decisions on planning applications. The Council is now using Place Services, Essex County Council's traded services arm as this gives us a good resource for specialist advice on applications concerning heritage assets. This adds value to the assessment process each application is subject to.

Looking forward, as part of the Local Plan preparation work, our existing heritage policies, including our Heritage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), are being reviewed to ensure that they reflect the approach adopted by the NPPF.

**Blue Badge Fraud**

**8) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor Barbara Matthews**

In order that genuine users of Blue Badges can use them and to protect council revenue, would the Cabinet Member confirm over the past three years how many exercises have been carried out to catch those misusing Blue Badges and how many Blue Badges have been confiscated and/or users prosecuted?

**Response:**

Since January 2014 we have carried out two blue badge operations, both in Romford Market Place, on 21 August 2014 and 19 February 2015, where 16 blue badges were confiscated. Since then our records show 10 further badges have been confiscated as part of the Civil Enforcement Officers normal duty.

There have been no convictions for blue badge misuse. However, a prosecution is not an indicator of the work our officers do to minimise misuse wherever possible. Blue Badge anti-fraud operations, involving Audit, Traffic & Parking Control and the Police, have taken place, and more routinely, Civil Enforcement Officers undertaking their daily enforcement patrols inspect Blue Badges and speak to users to determine correct use.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member confirmed he was happy to review how wardens carried out their work and to ensure that Blue Badge abuse was prosecuted where possible.

**Orchard Village**

**9) To the Cabinet Member for Housing (Councillor Damian White)**

**From Councillor Phil Martin**

At the last Full Council there was motion put before the council to ensure that measures were adopted to deal with the repeated failure of the Orchard Village developers to put right their many failures which have been publicised in the Local and National Press, and on prime time television and shows no sign of abating.

What steps, if any, has the Administration taken to assist the residents of this appalling development whose lives have been blighted by the sub- standard building work that has taken place there.

**Response:**

In line with the legal advice obtained, an inspection of one of the properties in Phase 3 of the development is to be undertaken to ascertain the extent of the problems in relation to the Building Regulations. Legal advice has confirmed that due to the length of time since the development has been completed, no action can be taken in respect of Phases 1 or 2. Depending on the outcome of the inspection, further investigation and/or legal action will be considered.

The Council is working strenuously to facilitate improvements with the owners of the site, Clarion Housing and will continue to work them to seek early redress of these issues. The Director of Housing Services has recently met with the Chief Executive of the Housing Association and the local MP in order to view the site.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member emphasised that work was in progress to support remedial works to be undertaken and to enable the correct provision of the right type of accommodation. Work on these areas would continue in conjunction with the Chief Executive of the Housing Association.

**GLA Precept and Police Budget**

**10) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor Graham Williamson**

According to BBC News and reports in the Evening Standard the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan will increase the GLA precept on council tax bills by 1.99% to meet a shortfall in police budget of £17.4m which he claims has been imposed by the Government. If so will the Cabinet Member for Public Safety make representations to the Mayor seeking the withdrawal of the short-sighted proposals to save money by merging/reducing the Police Borough Commanders of Havering, Redbridge and Barking and Dagenham from 3 to 1?

**Response:**

I recognise the concerns that reducing from 3 Borough Commanders to 1 may appear to present. However, these plans are part of a wider review to reduce the total number of Borough Commanders across the Metropolitan Police Service. This wider package of proposals includes the pilot of a tri-borough model of policing. Whilst clearly this new approach presents opportunities for savings, it also, more importantly, responds to concerns raised during a recent HMIC inspection of the MPS. Indeed the Council's own OFSTED inspection raised concerns in relation to the MPS's current arrangements around safeguarding and child protection.

The new tri-borough policing model seeks to strengthen the police's offer in this regard by creating a single safeguarding hub, enabling all concerns relating to vulnerable people to be referred through one point of access. The proposal is to locate the referral desk for such concerns within the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in each borough. This fits well with the Council's own approach of being the first borough in London – and indeed one of the first in the country – to implement an all-age MASH, thus enabling the multi-agency partnership to take a “whole family” approach to issues that affect a family system. This represents a more joined-up approach and should allow us to work more efficiently and effectively with our police colleagues in these particular areas of work, as well as giving us the opportunity to exercise greater influence over the allocation of police resources.

At this early stage, the Council therefore welcomes the MPS pilot model and very much hopes that it will achieve its aims and objectives – especially regarding a better approach to safeguarding and child protection. However, if the pilot does not deliver a better operational model, the Mayor of London and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime have been clear that the new ways of working should be fully reversible. The Leader of the Council and senior officers are well represented on the governance and oversight bodies for the new “pathfinder”. As such, the Council will be well positioned to evaluate the impact of the pilot and will of course be taking a particular interest in the capacity of the new model to meet the policing needs of Havering. Should the pathfinder not have the desired effects in terms of addressing areas of concern for the borough, we will of course make representations that the model should be amended accordingly.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member explained that agreement to the new police model was a Cabinet function. Members would however be kept fully informed and a Member briefing on this issue would take place shortly.

## **Harrow Lodge Park**

### **11)To the Cabinet Member for Culture & Community Engagement (Councillor Melvin Wallace)**

#### **From Councillor Jody Ganly**

Would the Cabinet Member confirm what steps he has taken to ensure that the council and Thames Water have carried out their promises at Harrow Lodge Park, and in particular, the de-silting of the main sewer.

#### **Response**

A Parks Development Officer recently met with Thames Water and their contractors who confirmed that they will be cleaning out the sewerage pipe that runs through the park by the end of the month. Works will take approximately 4 weeks. They have said that this will be carried out every six months after completion.

Officers will monitor the situation to ensure that Thames Water meet this undertaking

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member confirmed that this work would be monitored to ensure that it was carried out every six months.

## **Tribunal Cases Affecting the Council**

### **12)To the Leader of the Council (Councillor Roger Ramsey)**

#### **From Councillor Lawrence Webb**

In the last eighteen months how many non-housing related court and tribunal cases has the Council been involved in?

Please provide the details of those initiated by the Council itself and those that the Council were defending, how many were won and lost and the cost both in fees and compensation.

#### **Response**

Due to the wide range of court proceedings there is no central figure available for fees or compensation paid or awarded. However, if specific information about particular cases, or types of cases, is required those details can be requested via the Deputy Director of Legal and Governance.

In response to a supplementary question, the Leader of the Council confirmed that it was not possible to produce a general register of the cost of court cases the Council was involved in. There were a very wide variety of cases ranging from trading standards matters where the Council could sometimes recover considerable sums via the Proceeds of Crime Act to cases related to children where costs were not recoverable.



## **Council House Repairs**

### **13)To the Cabinet Member for Housing (Councillor Damian White)** **From Councillor Stephanie Nunn**

Given that the overwhelming majority of council properties have now reached the Decent Homes standards, would the Cabinet Member explain why with less than 10,000 council properties, they generate 40,000 plus repair requests in a year?

#### **Response**

The Council has a statutory obligation to provide a repairs service to tenants and these activities not only meet these requirements but help to keep the housing stock in good order. The investment programme completed via the Decent Homes programme was to address long standing major issues with large building elements, such as roofs, windows, kitchen and bathrooms. The backlog Havering had was significant with 56% of the stock being classified as non-decent. This figure is now less than 2% and 98.72% of the Council's housing stock is now at a decent level. The average number of repair-related requests undertaken each year, including building services is 31,375. This has reduced from around 42,000 two years ago as part of the Council's demand management strategy.

The current types of works principally relate to minor items resulting from

- Drain Blockages
- Gutter blockages
- Minor Leaks to plumbing and heating
- Broken window catches and sticking doors
- Minor electrical issues with broken sockets and light fittings
- Repairs to estate environments (not part of the decent homes programme funding regime)

We are working, with support of the Chartered Institute of Housing, and as part of an overall demand management strategy to reduce the numbers of works requests processed without any detriment to service quality.

Of the 31,375 repairs, some 9,000 of these are gas safety checks and 1,100 are repairs to vis properties, both of which are statutory obligations on the Council.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member emphasised that the 40,000 repair requests figure had not come from himself, nor from Council officers, and asked for an apology for the suggestion that he had misled anyone.

Repair costs were borne by the contractor (Breyer Group) not the Council and the Cabinet Member was meeting regularly with the Chief Executive of Breyer Group to go through all missed appointments and incidences of repairs not being put right first time.

## **Academic Performance in the Borough**

### **14)To the Cabinet Member for Children & Learning (Councillor Robert Benham)**

#### **From Councillor Julie Wilkes**

The London Borough of Havering always had an excellent reputation in terms of educational performance, so would the Cabinet Member explain why Havering has been allowed to fall in the OFSTED league tables in both primary and secondary education and was also forced by Central Government to convert the Pupil Referral Unit into an academy because of its failings?

## **Response**

The Ofsted measures referred to in the recent Ofsted annual report are relatively new, particularly in the secondary sector, where Attainment 8 and Progress 8 measures are being reported on for the first time. These measures replace the previous measure of five A\*- C grades at GCSE. There are complex calculations which result in the final outcome for these new measures and further information on how these work can be found via the OFSTED website.

It is important to note that GCSE performance in the secondary sector in Havering has been good and above the national average for some years. Even with the new Attainment 8 measure, this is in line with the national average this year. That said, we need to focus on improving attainment in certain curriculum areas such as maths and science. We have a significant task ahead to improve the rates of progress made by specific groups of pupils in secondary schools and are working with schools and partners, including the Regional Schools' Commissioner, on an improvement strategy.

Attainment in our primary schools continues to be strong, with outcomes for pupils in reading, writing and maths combined at the end of Key Stage 2 (age 11) in the top five per cent in the country in 2016. Pupils also make positive progress in the primary sector.

The league tables included in the information for London in the annual report refer to the measure of the percentage of pupils attending good or outstanding schools in the area. The figures for Havering are undeniably disappointing and we are focusing our attention on improving these ratings across both the primary and secondary sectors. There are a number of variables which can influence the movement up or down this particular set of league tables: the numbers of school inspections in an area in any given period, for example. In 2015 there were only seven primary inspections in Havering compared to significantly higher levels in other London boroughs. The impact of this is that schools which might have a less than good judgement do not have the opportunity to have improvement ratified until the next inspection, thus an authority's ability to change its ranking in the league table is also dependent on this contextual factor.

## **What are we doing?**

Clearly the Education landscape has changed dramatically over the last few years. With more schools now academies, the Local Authority has fewer statutory powers – we are now engaged with the education community as a system leader – influencing and supporting improvement across the sector.

We are working closely with secondary schools and the Regional Schools Commissioner and we will be launching an Improvement Board to specifically focus on performance across this sector. The Board will be chaired by Dame Joan McVitie who has an excellent track record in driving improvement in schools. Part of the work of the Improvement Board is to look at what has worked in other areas, and to prioritise the key areas that need attention in Havering. These include strengthening Leadership and Governance, and supporting schools to improve performance in key subject areas including Maths, Science and Modern Languages.

Through this process the aim is to foster a more collaborative partnership between Havering Schools in order to support sustainable sector- led improvement. We will look to local Schools to lead specific strands of this work and commit to contributing to achieving better outcomes for Havering Children.

The Local Authority does retain a statutory role in overseeing improvement in local state maintained schools. Our position is to provide schools with the necessary guidance and support, whilst taking decisive and robust action to address schools with serious or systemic failings.

## **Pupil Referral Service**

With reference to the Pupil Referral Service (PRS), the authority had been finding it difficult to secure permanent leadership for the provision for a considerable time. Pressures on the service were significant and the quality of the provision suffered as a result of these two factors. The authority had already started discussions about possible academisation of the secondary element of the service prior to the judgement of special measures. Following the provision being placed into special measures by OFSTED, the only available option open to the council was to convert this provision to an academy. As this is a specialised provision, it took a significant amount of time for the DfE to identify a suitable sponsor.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member reported that he was working with the Schools Commissioner to set up a School Improvement Board.

**Transport for London Proposals in the Local Implementation Plan**

**15) To the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety (Councillor Osman Dervish)**

**From Councillor Ray Morgon**

At the July 2016 Cabinet meeting, the Leader of the Opposition received assurance that before any proposal was submitted to TfL under the Local Implementation Plan that any proposed submission would be discussed with the appropriate wards Councillors. Would the Cabinet Member explain why this did not happen?

**Response:**

The 2017/18 Annual Spending Submission was formally signed off by myself through an Executive Decision in October 2016.

Members had the opportunity to engage in the LIP submission process through the Cabinet report in July and the supporting documents for the submission being placed in the Members' Resource Room.

In addition, ward Members had the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission before it was submitted when the Executive Decision report was published on the Calendar Brief and could have asked for the matter to be 'called in' (as with the usual arrangements).

The extensive and wide-ranging content of the LIP submission, and the imperative of meeting TfL's tight timetable, meant that it wasn't possible for the Council to engage with Ward Members on each individual proposal in the submission.

No comments were received at this point from any Ward Member and the approved submission was subsequently sent to TfL so that it met their deadline for submission of this important matter.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member clarified that funding for schemes such as these was from Transport for London rather than the council but he was happy to meet with ward Councillors to discuss these issues where possible.

VOTING RECORD

<i>DIVISION NUMBER:</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>The Mayor [Cllr. Philippa Crowder]</b>	✓	✓	O	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
The Deputy Mayor [Cllr. Linda Van den Hende]	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
<b><u>CONSERVATIVE GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Roger Ramsey	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Robert Benham	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Ray Best	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Wendy Brice-Thompson	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Joshua Chapman	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr John Crowder	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Meg Davis	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Osman Dervish	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Jason Frost	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Steven Kelly	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Robby Misir	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Garry Pain	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Dilip Patel	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Viddy Persaud	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Cllr Carol Smith	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Frederick Thompson	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Linda Trew	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Melvin Wallace	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Roger Westwood	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Damian White	✓	✓	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Cllr Michael White	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
<b><u>RESIDENTS' GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Ray Morgon	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr June Alexander	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr Nic Dodin	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr Jody Ganly	✓	✓	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Cllr Barbara Matthews	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr Barry Mugglestone	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr John Mylod	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Cllr Stephanie Nunn	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr Reg Whitney	✓	✓	✓	O	O	✓	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Julie Wilkes	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Cllr John Wood	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
<b><u>EAST HAVERING RESIDENTS' GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Clarence Barrett	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Alex Donald	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Brian Eagling	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Gillian Ford	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Linda Hawthorn	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Ron Ower	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Cllr Darren Wise	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
<b><u>UK INDEPENDENCE PARTY GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Lawrence Webb	O	✓	O	✗	✗	✓	✗	O	O
Cllr Ian De Wulverton	O	✓	O	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	O
Cllr John Glanville	O	✓	O	O	✗	✓	O	✗	O
Cllr David Johnson	✓	✓	O	O	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cllr Phil Martin	✓	✓	O	O	O	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cllr Patricia Rumble	O	✓	O	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	O
<b><u>INDEPENDENT LOCAL RESIDENTS' GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Jeffrey Tucker	✗	✗	✓	O	✓	O	O	✓	✗
Cllr Michael Deon Burton	✗	✗	✓	O	✓	✗	O	✓	✗
Cllr David Durant	✗	✗	✓	O	✓	O	O	✓	✗
Cllr Keith Roberts	✗	✗	✓	O	O	O	O	✓	O
Cllr Graham Williamson	✗	✗	✓	O	O	✓	O	✓	✗
<b><u>LABOUR GROUP</u></b>									
Cllr Keith Darvill	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	O
Cllr Denis O'Flynn	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	O
<b><i>TOTALS</i></b>									
<b>✓ = YES</b>	43	47	15	28	3	18	32	8	39
<b>✗ = NO</b>	5	5	28	13	43	29	12	41	4
<b><i>O = ABSTAIN/NO VOTE</i></b>	4	0	7	9	4	3	6	1	7
<b><i>ID =INTEREST DISCLOSED/NO VOTE</i></b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b><i>A = ABSENT FROM MEETING</i></b>	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>

This page is intentionally left blank