

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

Councillors Meehan (Chair), Rice (Vice-Chair), Khan, Waters, Wilson and Bloch

Apologies Councillor Whyte

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION
GPCO12.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY) Apologies for absence were received from the Leader and Councillor Monica Whyte, who was substituted by Councillor Jonathan Bloch. Apologies for lateness were received from Kevin Crompton (Chief Executive) and Julie Parker (Director of Resources).
GPCO13.	URGENT BUSINESS There was no urgent business.
GPCO14.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Cllr Khan declared a personal interest in Item 9 (Annual Governance Report) and Agenda Item 10 (Treasury Management 2010/11 Mid Year Activity & Performance Update) (Minute numbers 20 & 21) as a Member of the pension scheme and previous Chair of the Pensions Committee.
GPCO15.	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS The Committee received deputations from John Snelling (Employee Side Union Representative) on agenda items: 6 – Efficiency Amendment to the Redeployment Policy, 7 – Support Functions Review (SFR) – Policy and Performance and 8 – SFR – Marketing & Communications. Details of Mr Snelling’s comments are recorded under the relevant minute below.
GPCO16.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING The minutes of the meeting held on 28 th June 2010 were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.
GPCO17.	EFFICIENCY AMENDMENT TO THE REDEPLOYMENT POLICY Steve Davies, London Borough of Haringey (LBH) Head of Human Resources (HR), introduced the report which detailed amendments to the redeployment policy. The Committee noted the deputation from John Snelling, Employee Side Secretary, stating that: there had been a lack of consultation with the trade unions, dismissing staff in the short time scale proposed would be inappropriate and suggesting posts covered by agency staff could be suitable for redeployment. Mr Snelling also raised concerns about cost, voluntary redundancies, equalities in

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>relation to age and medical redeployments and how these proposals would affect women on maternity leave.</p> <p>In response to some of the concerns raised about equalities the Head of HR explained that officers were aware of the Council profile and the redeployment profile broadly matched this so age discrimination was unlikely to occur and medical and maternity redeployments would receive preferential treatment. The Head of HR stated that there would not be a general option for voluntary redundancies, however, if employees put themselves forward for voluntary redundancies they would be considered.</p> <p>Committee members suggested that running the redeployment periods concurrently with contractual notice periods should be explicitly discussed with trade unions.</p> <p>The Committee requested figures for employees currently on maternity leave and copies of officers' written answers to some of the issues raised by the Unions.</p> <p>The recommendations were agreed in principle but officers were asked to consult with the unions on the implementation of the proposals and report the outcome of the discussions to the General Purposes Committee on 28th October 2010. In the interim any redeployees will be given a separate redeployment search period that will last until 28th October 2010.</p> <p>The Chair recognised the reality of the situation; that there will be fewer vacancies in the future and highlighted that officers had already started looking for redeployment opportunities, before the redundancies process began.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) That all redeployees be offered a period of redeployment to run concurrently with their period of contractual notice and that the period be paused when a redeployee is placed in a trial job.(ii) That a range of assessment information be used to determine the interview selection of redeployees for a redeployment opportunity.(iii) That the unions be consulted on the implementation of the proposals and the outcome of discussions reported back to the General Purposes Committee on 28th October 2010. In the interim any redeployees will be given a separate redeployment search period that will last until 28th October 2010.
GPCO18.	<p>SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW (SFR) – POLICY AND PERFORMANCE FUNCTIONS</p> <p>Steve Davies, LBH Head of Human Resources (HR), introduced the Service Functions Review (SFR) of the Policy and Performance Functions and the revised service structure which would create a Council-wide centralised shared service.</p> <p>It was noted that the current formal consultation period had been extended until the middle of October; the results of which will be presented to the General</p>

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>Purposes Committee with potential amendments to the proposals.</p> <p>The Committee noted the deputation of John Snelling, Employee Side Secretary, opposing the recommendation to delegate power to proceed with the proposals and emphasising the importance of the Committee being presented with the consultation results and trade unions having the opportunity to make representation on the findings.</p> <p>The Committee noted that there was a vacancy for the position of Assistant Chief Executive - Policy, Performance, Partnership and Communication, the responsibilities of which were currently being covered by the Assistant Chief Executive – People & Organisational Development until a top-tier restructure had been conducted.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That it be noted that the formal consultation on the proposed centralised model for the policy and performance function and the associated efficiencies began on 6th September 2010 and is due to run until mid-October 2010.</p> <p>(ii) That the results of the formal consultation be presented to the General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 28th October 2010 with any amendments to the proposed centralised model for the policy and performance function.</p> <p>(iii) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Chief Executive (People & Organisational Development) in consultation with the Chair of the General Purposes Committee to sign off amendments and proceed to implementation following formal consultation. This is subject to there being no significant and adverse unresolved comments or substantial deviations from the proposals.</p> <p>(iv) That the timetable for delivery be noted.</p>
<p>GPCO19.</p>	<p>SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW (SFR) - MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE RESTRUCTURING REPORT</p> <p>Steve Davies, LBH Head of Human Resources (HR), introduced the Service Functions Review (SFR) of the Marketing and Communications Functions which was undergoing formal consultation until 6th October 2010. The results of the consultation would be presented to the General Purposes Committee.</p> <p>The Committee noted the amended report, which had been circulated to members and published on the Council's website. The amended report incorporated Chief Finance Officer (CFO) comments stating that the proposed structure should enable the estimated cost saving to be realised on full implementation but that this could not be finalised until the formal consultation had been completed and any amendments to the proposals made.</p> <p>The Committee noted the deputation of John Snelling, Employee Side Secretary, opposing the recommendation to delegate power to proceed with the proposals</p>

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

and emphasising the importance of the Committee being presented with the consultation results and trade unions having the opportunity to make representation on the findings.

Members asked to be circulated copies of officers' written answers to some of the issues raised by the Unions and asked whether local residents would be consulted on the changes to the Council's communications and marketing functions. It was noted that engagement with the local community would take place after the formal consultation.

RESOLVED

- (i) That it be noted formal consultation on the proposed centralised model for the marketing and communications functions and the associated efficiencies began on 6th September 2010 and is due to run until 6th October 2010.
- (ii) That the results of the formal consultation be presented to the General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 28th October 2010 with any amendments to the proposed centralised model for the policy and performance function.
- (iii) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Chief Executive (People and Organisational Development) in consultation with the Chair of the General Purposes Committee to sign off amendments and proceed to implementation following formal consultation. This is subject to there being no significant and adverse unresolved comments or substantial deviations from the proposals.
- (iv) That the timetable for delivery be noted.

GPCO20. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE REPORT

The Grant Thornton (the Council's external auditors) Annual Governance Report on the Council's Statement of Accounts 2009/10, was introduced by Kevin Bartle, LBH Lead Finance Officer. The Statement of Accounts 2009/10 had to be signed-off by 30th September.

Paul Hughes and Paul Dossett from Grant Thornton attended the meeting to present the report. The Committee noted that data quality arrangements had improved and the number of amendments required had been reduced and Grant Thornton could now offer an unqualified view of the accounts. A number of reclassifications of fixed assets was reported and members noted that the reporting of these would become more complex in the future under new accounting regulations.

In response to the Committee's questions officers confirmed that steps were being taken to ensure errors in the accounts were minimised. Details of the action plan to avoid future errors within the draft accounts, which was included in the committee report, would be submitted to the Audit Committee for monitoring.

The Committee thanked Grant Thornton staff for their work and support to officers throughout the year and also thanked Council officers for submitting the necessary

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>information within the agreed timescales.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting be noted.</p> <p>(ii) That the amendments made to the Statement of Accounts 2009/10 be agreed and that the Director of Corporate Resources be delegated authority to agree any final amendments.</p> <p>(iii) That the Pension Fund governance report be noted.</p>
<p>GPCO21.</p>	<p>TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2010/11 MID YEAR ACTIVITY & PERFORMANCE UPDATE</p> <p>Nicola Webb, LBH Head of Finance, introduced the report on the Council's treasury management activities and performance in the first half of 2010/11 and the Treasury Management Practices document, as set out in the report.</p> <p>In response to the Committee's questions it was confirmed that the pension fund was managed by a similar strategy and the same financial limits applied across both the treasury and the pensions fund. The Committee was assured that the Council's Treasury Management Advisors, Arlingclose, used a range of indicators to ensure all institutions on the Council's lending list were secure and action was taken immediately if any relevant factors changed.</p> <p>The Committee noted that any fixed term investments could not be recalled if that institution was removed from the lending list.</p> <p>In response to a question concerning the country in which Nordea Bank was based, officers agreed to double check with Arlingclose that it was based in Finland. This has subsequently been confirmed.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns about investing in foreign banks and recommended only investing in their UK subsidiaries. Officers agreed to look into this.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Non-UK banks – It is proposed to bring further information back to Committee in January on this issue as part of the draft Treasury Management strategy for 2011/12.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That the Treasury Management activity undertaken during the first half of 2010/11 and the performance achieved be noted.</p> <p>(ii) That the proposed extended use of money market funds (as set out in Appendix 3 of the report) be recommended to Cabinet and Council.</p> <p>(iii) That the reinstatement of Clydesdale Bank to the lending list be agreed and the reinstatement of Santander UK Bank be noted.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>(iv) That the Treasury Management Practices document (as set out in Appendix 4 of the report) be noted.</p>
GPCO22.	<p>THE SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY</p> <p>Robin Payne, LBH Head of Enforcement, presented the report on the Policy for the Licensing of Sex Establishments, further to the Policing and Crime Act 2009 which allows for the licensing of sexual entertainment venues. Hard copies of the draft policy were tabled.</p> <p>The Committee was advised that any application for the licensing of a sexual entertainment venue would have to be judged on its own merit, however, there were grounds for refusal based on whether the venue was in (or in the line of sight of) residential and other specific areas.</p> <p>In response to the Committee's questions it was noted that: there were currently no licensed sexual establishments in Haringey although normal alcohol licensed premises were allowed to run 11 sexual entertainment operations each year; one-off theatre performances with nudity would not be classed as sexual entertainment and massage parlours were covered under separate legislation and were not supposed to provide sexual entertainment.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the draft policy going out to consultation be agreed.</p>
GPCO23.	<p>STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY</p> <p>Robin Payne, LBH Head of Enforcement, presented the report updating members further to consultation on the revised draft Statement of Licensing Policy and proposed amendments to the Policy.</p> <p>The General Purposes Committee noted that there had been limited responses to the consultation (detailed in Appendix 1 of the report), however, some responses such as that from the Greater London Authority (GLA) required amendments to the Policy.</p> <p>There were comments during consultation that the Council could consult more on licensing and the Head of Enforcement highlighted that this was not a requirement of the Act and, due to cost, consultations had been reduced. It was noted that there might be changes in the future that might mean applicants will have to pay fees towards consultations.</p> <p>Committee members highlighted that the Policy was not explicit in describing how litter dropped outside premises should be dealt with (Appendix 2 of the report, paragraph 14.7 – bullet 5). It was noted that prescriptive conditions could be attached to a licence during the application process.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That the outcomes of the consultation and proposed changes to the draft</p>

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>statement of Licensing Policy be noted.</p> <p>(ii) That the Policy, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report, be adopted by Full Council.</p>
<p>GPCO24.</p>	<p>THE REVISION OF CONDITIONS IN RELATION TO MASSAGE AND SPECIAL TREATMENT LICENCES UNDER THE LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT 1991</p> <p>Robin Payne, LBH Head of Enforcement, introduced the report detailing revisions to the Codes of Practice for Special Treatment, in relation to the London Local Authorities Act 1991.</p> <p>In response to the Committee's questions the Head of Enforcement explained that the fee structure had been varied to ensure local businesses were in the correct category of cost including arrangements for advertising costs to be covered as well as additional costs for higher risk premises.</p> <p>The Committee also noted, in response to questions, that the registration of such premises was delegated to officers as part of the application, if an application was refused the decision could be appealed and if a premises did not comply with regulations it could lose its license.</p> <p>The Committee raised concerns about under-age sales to young people and noted that the law provided for this and test purchases were conducted to ensure the ban on young people using sun-beds was being met.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That the new conditions and regulations (in the case of laser treatments) be noted.</p> <p>(ii) That the introduction of a registration scheme for all beauty therapists working in the Borough be agreed.</p> <p>(iii) That changes in the administration process which supported local businesses be agreed, this includes:</p> <p>A) simplifying the fees structure, B) removal of the requirement to place newspaper adverts for new applications.</p>
<p>GPCO25.</p>	<p>CENSUS 2011</p> <p>The Committee received the Census 2011 report introduced by Kevin Crompton (LBH Chief Executive) and George Cooper (LBH Electoral Services Manager) seeking the General Purposes Committee's support for a positive programme of liaison and assistance during the census process.</p> <p>It was noted that the Council was fully co-operating and an officer task force group had been set up and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Area Manager had made presentations to the Area Assembly meetings and many other organisations</p>

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

to highlight the forthcoming census.

The Committee noted the need to gain the trust of hard to reach community groups in dealing with their personal information during the census process and that all members could play an important role in spreading the message of how vital it was that these groups take part in the census. It was noted that the NHS were forming part of the Area Manager's liaison plans, but this was about getting an accurate picture of the community and not individual details. Members highlighted that General Practitioners should be contacted to help raise awareness and their registration lists could be used to obtain addresses that might not be known to the Council. Members recognised that there were issues surrounding privacy.

In response to the Committee's concerns that illegal residents will not want to take part in the census it was noted that ONS had detailed material and campaigns designed to target such people. Much of the ONS campaign will be based on letting people know that if they are not counted the local area will suffer as it will not receive adequate funding for services. The Chief Executive confirmed that funds will be allocated for initiatives to target hard to reach groups.

The Committee agreed to the establishment of an ad hoc Member Advisory Group and suggested that members be put forward at Full Council on 18th October to serve on this Advisory Group.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a positive programme of liaison and assistance in the Census 2011 be supported.
- (ii) That Full Council receives a presentation by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census Area Manager at it's meeting on 18th October 2010 be agreed.
- (iii) That members to serve on an ad hoc Members Advisory Group to support the Census be agreed at Council on 18th October.

GPCO26. MAY 2010 ELECTION ISSUES

The Committee received the report on the evaluation of the Parliamentary and Local Elections held on May 2010 presented by Kevin Crompton (LBH Chief Executive) and George Cooper (LBH Electoral Services Manager) capturing the administrative issues and to inform future planning of electoral services.

The Committee noted that a new bill on individual registration was being put forward by the Government which would mean one registration form would be required to be completed by each individual rather than one per household as was currently the case. The new arrangement would also allow households to decide whether to return the forms or not; currently the law states that registration forms must be returned. The Committee expressed concerns that the new arrangement would mean fewer people would register to vote.

The Committee discussed various aspects of the May 2010 elections – specifically the Haringey count; including the delivery and counting of postal votes. The Chief

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010**

	<p>Executive recognised that there were issues with postal votes, particularly the pattern in which they were returned, but to distribute ballot papers out any earlier would have meant sending the Parliamentary and Local ballot papers out separately, which would have doubled the cost of postal votes.</p> <p>The Committee recognised that more venues that could act as polling stations were required in future and that schools should be encouraged not to close for the day if polling stations were held on site and only if the paramount health and safety concerns of pupils therein could be satisfied.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>
GPCO27.	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>
GPCO28.	<p>NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no new items of exempt urgent business.</p>
GPCO29.	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of minute no. 30 as it contained exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972; namely information that was likely to reveal the identity of an individual, and information relating to any individual.</p>
GPCO30.	<p>MINUTES OF GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-BODIES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the exempt minutes be noted.</p>

The meeting ended at 21:15 hrs

Councillor GEORGE MEEHAN

Chair

Councillor

Chair

SIGNED AT MEETING.....DAY

OF.....