

APPENDIX 2

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY (ORDINARY)

WEDNESDAY 21st JULY 2004

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.10 (3)

ITEM 7.4 REPORT BACK ON CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE

Can the Leader explain why the Executive noted the Members' Motion on Planning Policy on Mobile Telecommunications Masts but failed to take any action on it?

RESPONSE

The concurrent report that accompanied the motion referred to the Executive made it clear that there are very few instances where the Council, as a planning authority, can wield influence with regard to mobile phone mast siting and sharing.

Indeed, the report stated that:

'The majority of telecommunication antenna in London is placed on buildings rather than on freestanding masts, and it is only the latter, where the mast would exceed 15 metres in height or fall within a conservation area, that requires planning permission. Whilst operators are required to notify the local planning authority the local authority is expressly disallowed from commenting on the principle of its installation.'

The report went on to say that:

'Relatively few planning applications are received each year to erect new ground based masts of over 15 metres. In each case the operator will submit a statement setting out the opportunities for mast sharing. All of the main telecommunication operators already ascribe to the industry's 'ten commitments' of good practice that include a commitment to first explore the opportunities for mast sharing....Southwark planning policy on this issue is under review but consideration will be given to requiring operators applying to erect new masts of over 15 metres to enter into a legal agreement with the Council to ensure that space is made available for other operator's equipment.' However, that additional equipment will still need to be the subject of a separate application for planning permission if it is to be positioned higher than 15 metres above ground level.'

The Executive noted the problems outlined in the report and effectively approved that consideration would be given to requiring operators to enter into a legal agreement. It was therefore deemed unnecessary to add any further comment or recommend any other action at this stage.

2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY

In the concurrent report on the Members' Motion on School Places the Strategic Director of Education stated

“some UK visitors arrive with visas which specify that there must be no call on public funds either by them or family members. The provision of education is not classed as a call on public funds. Legal advice has been sought on this matter recently and will be subject to a report to the Admissions Forum in the Summer term.”

This report has not been forthcoming. Can the Leader undertake to ensure this report is presented to the Admissions Forum at the 27th September 2004 meeting?

RESPONSE

As an active member of the Admissions Forum, Councillor Eckersley is probably aware of the volume of work this body undertook during the summer term. It is regrettable but perhaps understandable why the issue of 'Placements for Children from Overseas' was not an agenda item.

I would advise Councillor Eckersley to raise the matter with the Chair of the Admissions Forum. I believe that the Terms of Reference for this body allow any member to request agenda terms.

ITEM 8.1 PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT – AUDIT COMMISSION ACT 1998 – ON THE AWARD OF PLANNING PERMISSION AT 295-297 CAMBERWELL NEW ROAD AND 299 CAMBERWELL NEW ROAD

1. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY

Was evidence presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee about an e-mail alleged to have been sent from an officer in the Council's Transport Department to Railtrack on the 1st June 2001 which highlighted "commercial possibilities" for Railtrack arising from the redevelopment of the arches where the Imperial Gardens Nightclub was situated? Did the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider that any wider lessons could be learned by the Council in respect of how such regeneration 'marketing' may have an adverse impact upon existing small businesses in the borough where similar regeneration initiatives are being undertaken?

RESPONSE

(i) An email from Roy Turner to Railtrack dated 1 June 2001 was put before Members and circulated as part of the open Agenda papers for the 13th May 2004 OSC meeting as a background document to the review.

(ii) Indeed, the inquiry recognised that the proposed development of a Camberwell train station would have significant financial and physical impacts on businesses, and accordingly examined consultation on this proposal. In addition, the inquiry recommended that in the future the Executive maintains oversight of regeneration schemes and ensures that appropriate communications strategies are in place to manage the messages being given about developments. The inquiry's detailed recommendations are set out at paragraphs 24-31 of the scrutiny report.

In addition, paragraphs 36-41 of the report specifically address the relationship between the Council and small businesses, and includes recommendations that work be undertaken to address the way in which the authority deals with small businesses, that increased pro-active work be undertaken with SMEs in the form of assistance in preparation of planning applications and in accessing information held by the Council. The report asks officers to report to scrutiny in respect of their performance in consulting with small businesses on the Unitary Development Plan.

2. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES

Can the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee confirm whether or not the Ombudsman's Report considered the Council's failure to consult the owners of the Imperial Gardens Nightclub with regard to the development of (a) Camberwell Train Station and (b) Badsworth Road?

RESPONSE

No, it did not.

3. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN HUNT

Can you confirm that the council also failed to consult on the Badsworth road development, ten metres away. Point 28 of the OSC report makes clear that they also failed to consult on the train station. Dr Roy Turner writes that they didn't have time to consult but they did have time to enlist letters of support and put together a proposal for Thameslink 2000.

Other black organisations were also not consulted on the Fairview Homes or the Badsworth Rd applications, yet were consulted on the Sainsbury's application 50metres away.

Neither the DA nor the Ombudsman mention the failure to consult on Badsworth road and the train station; why was this information not made available to either?

RESPONSE

The Badsworth Road development was not considered as part of the scrutiny inquiry, as no evidence was presented on the subject. However, I am advised by the Planning Division that it is the case that Imperial Gardens was not consulted on this application. I am further advised that it was not considered that this was necessary because from looking at the ordnance survey plan the entrance to the Imperial Gardens nightclub was 80m away on a different street on the other side of a busy railway line. The advice is that site inspection revealed that the scrapyard was opposite a redundant garage and facing a railway bridge with no openings; and that from this side there is no sign that Imperial Gardens extends to anyway near this site. I am advised that Railtrack, the body responsible for the railway and bridge, were notified and that a site notice was displayed on the Medlar Street frontage.

I am advised that the Sainsburys scheme was for a much larger application (a food store, cinema, sports centre and 50 flats) with a Camberwell wide interest, whereas The Badsworth Road proposal was for a nursery and 26 flats which would only have had an impact on the residential properties in the immediate vicinity; therefore the two applications would call for a very different level of consultation. I am advised that consultation on the Badsworth Road proposal was as follows

Site Notice: 01.02.2002

Press notice: 17.01.2002

Consultees: Traffic, Conservation, Public Protection, Railtrack, 295-297 Camberwell New Road, Fairview Homes, 1-15 consecutive Medlar Street; Club 14, 15-28 consecutive, 15A, 15B consecutive Badsworth Road; 1-13 consecutive Hodister Close.

I am advised that there was no requirement to consult on the aspiration for a Camberwell train station and therefore no procedural failure. However, the scrutiny inquiry recognised that the proposed development of a Camberwell train station would have significant financial and physical impacts on businesses, and accordingly examined consultation on this proposal. In addition, the inquiry recommended that in the future the Executive maintains oversight of regeneration schemes and ensures that appropriate communications strategies are in place to manage the messages being given about developments. The inquiry's detailed recommendations are set out at paragraphs 24-31 of the scrutiny report.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN HUNT

Given what we have just heard about the constraints that the Scrutiny Committee has had on dealing with accusations of racism in dealing with black and ethnic issues would he welcome a public inquiry conducted by the CRE or similar body as has just been outlined?

RESPONSE

My understanding is that the CRE can come into the London Borough of Southwark and conduct an inquiry at any stage that it so chooses and if it wishes to come in and conduct an inquiry it should do so.

ITEM 8.2 SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2003/04

1. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS

How many reports in the period 2003/ 2004 were simply noted by the Executive and how many formal responses were there?

RESPONSE

Scrutiny exerts its influence via a number of channels and likewise the Executive makes its response in a variety of ways.

Nationally, local authorities are grappling with the issue of how to effectively evaluate scrutiny. Southwark is currently developing proposals for evaluation measures that will be part of a pilot by the Centre for Public Scrutiny. Evaluation of scrutiny necessarily focuses on outcomes, some of which are within the control of the authority itself, and others [in the case of health scrutiny] arise from delivery by partner organisations.

Accordingly, simple counts of reports noted and formal responses received should not be taken as the sole indicators of effectiveness or influence. An appendix is attached detailing reports from Scrutiny to the Executive. This shows that, while a formal response has rarely been made, in most cases Scrutiny's recommendations have been reflected in the final decisions of the Executive.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS

How is the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny going to improve the number of formal report backs from two out of thirty-one, which I make about six percent up to closer to a hundred percent?

RESPONSE

Clearly this is something which we need to address in taking us forward that is why it is specifically listed as one of the points to address in the scrutiny report in term of keeping scrutiny going. We have concerns that basically the Executive is noting too many reports and we need to have greater clarity in terms of which of our recommendations they have taken forward, in that they have come from us and we have been shown to have a transparent role in the process, as apposed to just noting what we have to say.

2. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR MICHELLE PEARCE

What steps has the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee taken to increase the responsiveness of the Executive to the work of scrutiny?

RESPONSE

Please refer to the answer to question 3.

3. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY

Given the lack of responsiveness of the Executive to scrutiny does the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee believe that scrutiny is "truly influential" and is playing its "part in delivering better services to local people"?

RESPONSE

I have been disappointed by the lack of formal response to many of our scrutiny reports, which the Executive often simply noted, without giving detailed written or verbal responses on the recommendations. As a result it has not always been clear whether the Executive has actively agreed to our recommendations.

The Executive is asked to bear in mind that where its responses have included a detailed Action Plan [addressing both the report's detailed recommendations and the issues overall direction] this has proved invaluable to scrutiny Members, stakeholders, the public and the authority as it provides a means to monitor implementation and thus facilitate wider and more informed engagement in scrutiny and the democratic process.

Nationally, local authorities are grappling with the issue of how to effectively evaluate scrutiny. Southwark is currently developing proposals for evaluation measures that will be part of a pilot by the Centre for Public Scrutiny. Evaluation of scrutiny necessarily focuses on outcomes, some of which are within the control of the authority itself, and others [in the case of health scrutiny] arise from delivery by partner organisations.

Scrutiny exerts its influence via a number of channels and likewise the Executive makes its response in a variety of ways. Simple counts of reports noted and formal responses received should not be taken as the sole indicators of effectiveness or influence.

Scrutiny inquiries undertaken in the last year have been wide-ranging and have always sought to add value to the service, policy or function under review, through recommendations to the Executive or the relevant delivery partner. These include:

- Review of Community Councils governance arrangements
- Scrutiny of alleged fraud on major voids contracts
- Prevention of teenage pregnancy [jointly delivered service with South London & Maudsley NHS Trust and the voluntary sector], and the

level and nature of mental health services to black, male teenagers [SLAM, voluntary sector and social services]

- Community engagement on the Elephant & Castle [involving public meetings and key stakeholders]
- One-off situations including Thames Water's response to a major water burst, and scrutiny recommendations in response to a fire on East Dulwich Estate.

4. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE

Is the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee disappointed with the level of public engagement especially at the sub committee level and what steps will he be taking to improve this? Barrie Hargrove?

RESPONSE

Good public engagement is one element of a healthy scrutiny function and accordingly we continue to work hard to achieve increased community engagement. Throughout reviews, an increasing number of community representatives and groups are engaging with scrutiny as a means of influencing the council, both at OSC and its sub-Committees.

In addition to statutory co-opted voting Members for Education functions, Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee now includes co-opted non-voting members of the community.

Attendance at public scrutiny meetings is not the sole means by which the community may be involved in scrutiny, however. At all stages of our reviews there are a variety of opportunities for public engagement with input into the scrutiny process through for example site visits and invitations to give evidence.

The importance of scrutiny having access to the council's communications function so that our work can be publicised was emphasized by the IDeA's recent review of the scrutiny function. Whilst we are still climbing this particular hill, scrutiny has had some excellent support on a number of our reviews.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE

I would like to ask Councillor Humphreys where he talks about the scrutiny having access to the Council's communication function – do you think we have good access to that and if so are we using it properly?

RESPONSE

Clearly in terms of communications, this comes in two realms, first of all in terms of access for public engagement of scrutiny processes. One that we had some success or we got co-operation on was the Thames Water enquiry. We did have an interactive web site, unfortunately the number of strikes we had on that web link was one, and that was me! So it wasn't that successful, however what I would say is that we need to be more creative in how we engage out and I hope that will be discussed in more detail at the Overview &

Scrutiny Committee - how we improve our community engagement as it is very important. We have had a few other areas we have had success on community engagement. Obviously we have had a lot of community engagement, as Councillor Hargrove's knows, in terms of the enquiry at 295 – 297 Camberwell Road.

5. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLIE SMITH

Could the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee please provide a table of attendance records of all Councillors to scrutiny meetings for the period 2003/2004?

RESPONSE

Attached are tables showing Member attendance at each of the scrutiny bodies during 2003/04.

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY DECISIONS MONITORING
2003/2004**

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
OSC 09.06.03	Early Years Best Value Review: Implementation Progress	Executive 17.06.03	Scrutiny report noted but Scrutiny recommendations reflected in Executive decisions.	None.
OSC 09.06.03	Final Report: Draft Enterprise Strategy And Employment Strategy	Executive 17.06.03	Scrutiny report noted and recommendations incorporated in the draft Enterprise Strategy	None.
OSC 07.07.03	Individual Decision Making	Executive 29.07.04	<p>Option 3 was agreed (in line with OSC recommendation).</p> <p>OSC recommendations in respect of Best Value Reviews and dealing with petitions were endorsed.</p> <p>Para 28: recommendations of OSC agreed.</p> <p>OSC recommendation to increase the deadline of call-in from 3 to 5 days was agreed.</p> <p>Responses to OSC recommendations in respect of the forward plan were agreed.</p>	None.
E&CS 15.07.03	Fast-Track Review Of The Voluntary Sector	Executive 29.07.03	<p>Executive agreed with E&CS in supporting the adoption of Option B.</p> <p>Also agreed to recommendation of an Annual Report on Voluntary Sector funding activities and recognized E&CS concerns re emerging voluntary groups, in particular BME groups</p>	None.

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
E,Y&L 03.09.03	Draft School Organisation Plan	Executive 07.10.03	Written response to be provided to E,Y&L concerns.	None.
OSC 25.09.03	Call-In: Appropriation For Planning Purposes Of Council Owned Section Of Potter's Field Former Coach Site	07.10.03	In light of OSC recommendations Executive requested a further report as soon as possible including any necessary views from the Chief Financial Officer and assessments of any potential financial consequences of the decision to appropriate the Potter Field Land and any legal challenge to that decision.	None.
OSC 22.10.03	Call-In: Funding For Southwark Group Of Tenants Organisation (SGTO)	Executive 04.11.03	OSC's recommendations specifically taken account of in Executive decisions.	None.
E,Y&L 28.10.03	Secondary Strategy	Executive 04.11.03	Executive agreed to raise E,Y&L concerns with London Challenge. Executive noted other comments in relation to the strategy.	None.
H&SC 12.11.03	Foundation Hospitals	Executive 25.11.03	Comments of Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee received and noted.	None.
OSC 17.11.03	Call-In: Communications Strategy	Executive 25.11.04	OSC concerns accepted and Southwark's External Communications Strategy and Action Plan amended accordingly.	None.
E,Y&L 24.11.03	Long Term Review Of Education Support Services	Executive 25.11.03	Recommendations of the Education, Youth & Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee noted and agreed that a report be brought back setting out a template for consultation including how Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be involved	None.

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
			in the consultation process.	
E,Y&L 03.12.03	Education Finance Settlement 2004/2005	OSC 16.12.03	Recommendations of the Education, Youth & Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee noted.	None.
OSC 04.12.03	Call-In: Modernising Face-To-Face Services For Customers	Executive 16.12.03	<p>OSC findings noted.</p> <p>In response to OSC, Executive confirmed its position that the resolutions regarding the Best Value Review into cash management and on the proposed reform of face-to-face services do not cut across the pre-existing consultation on the findings of the Housing Management Best Value Review.</p> <p>Executive did not separate cash offices from report (as per OSC recommendation) but agreed that potential efficiency savings associated with the closure of cash offices should not be included in the forthcoming budget proposals for the year 2004/5.</p> <p>No action should be taken on the first phase of Cash Office closures until the beginning of June 2004.</p>	None.
OSC 15.12.03	Early Years Best Value Review	Executive 16.12.03	OSC recommendations to be given consideration when considering the budget for 2004/05 and the 'grants programme' in February 2004.	None.
E&CS 17.12.03	Scrutiny: Community Councils	Executive 03.02.04	Executive agreed E&CS recommendations.	None.
E,Y&L 14.01.04	Southwark Parks – Organisation, Structure And Contracts	Executive 03.02.04	<p>E,Y&L recommendations noted.</p> <p>Executive noted concerns about the adequacy</p>	None.

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
			<p>of consultation with stakeholders with regard to decisions made by the Executive.</p> <p>Requested OSC to investigate the consultation processes and factors surrounding Executive reports.</p>	
H&SC 21.01.04	Progress On The Implementation Of The Review Of Day Care Services For People With Community Care Needs	03.02.04 Executive	Executive noted recommendations.	None.
H&SC 21.01.04	Prevention Of Teenage Pregnancy – Consideration Of Draft Report	Executive 02.03.04	<p>H&SC recommendations agreed.</p> <p>Officers asked to report back to the Scrutiny Sub-Committee with an action plan.</p> <p>Officers action plan and response to be presented to the next joint meeting of the Executive and Primary Care Trust.</p>	H&SC received joint response from Executive and PCT on 29.04.04 and agreed to revisit in 6 months' time.
E,Y&L 29.01.04	Long Term Review Of Education Support Services: Outcomes Of Consultation And Way Forward	Executive 03.02.04	<p>E,Y&L decisions noted.</p> <p>E,Y&L concerns re engagement of parents in process and clarification re roles of Improvement Project Board and a Strategic Education Alliance reflected in other Executive decisions.</p>	None.
E,Y&L 29.01.04	Consultation On Local Management Of Schools And The Fair Funding Scheme	Executive 03.02.04	<p>E,Y&L decisions noted.</p> <p>Executive took account of E,Y&L concern re delegation of Schools Library Service.</p>	None.

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
E,Y&L 29.01.04	Education Performance Report	Executive 03.02.04	E,Y&L report noted.	None.
H&SC 02.02.04	Modernising Day Care Review Process – Comments From Health And Social Care Scrutiny Sub – Committee	Executive 03.02.04	Noted OSC recommendations.	None.
02.02.04 OSC	Scrutiny: Thames Water	Executive 02.03.04	Agreed OSC recommendations.	None.
Hsg 30.03.04	Housing Allocation Review Policy	Executive 13.04.04	Executive considered and agreed Housing recommendations.	None.
F&ED 05.04.04	Alleged Fraud On Major Voids Contracts: Final Report From Finance & Regeneration Scrutiny Sub-Committee	18.05.04	This report was deferred until the June meeting of Executive as the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was not present to introduce the report.	None.
E&CS 21.04.04	Quarter 3 Performance Report – Community Safety	Executive 04.05.200 4	Executive noted E&CS comments and confirmed action plan to address issues raised relating to violent crime, street crime and rape/sexual assault.	Reported back 12.05.04.
OSC 26.04.04	Call-In: Executive Decision [Item 13, 13/094/04 “Area Housing Forum Consultation And Changes To Tenant And Leaseholder Council Constitutions”]	Executive 04.05.04	Executive noted OSC recommendations and, in response to concerns raised, agreed to a temporary suspension of the remaining Neighbourhood Forum dissolution meetings and to temporarily rescind the dissolution of those Neighbourhood Forums already dissolved.	None.
E,Y&L 04.05.04	Long Term Review Of Education Support Services	Executive 04.05.04	Executive noted E,Y&L report and reflected recommendations in terms of clarifying position of Youth and Connexions Business Unit, emphasis of contract on school improvement and placing as much	None.

Meeting (date)	Title	Referred to (date)	Decisions	Formal report back (date)
			detail as possible in public domain.	
F&ED 07.04.04	Quarter 3 Performance Report	Executive 13.04.04	Received.	None.
E,Y&L 11.05.04	Proposals For Developing Primary Schools In Southwark	Executive 18.05.04	Agreed medium to long term strategy for improving primary schools in the Borough and the provision of additional places for pupils of primary school age, subject to the inclusion of criteria identified by the Education, Youth and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee.	None.
E,Y&L 11.05.04	Collaboration And Dissemination Of Good Practice Across The Educational Service: The Establishment Of School Communities		(Executive had already given approval to the setting up of Communities of Schools through their approval of the OPM report. Report back on progress in the Autumn.)	

Neil Watson	*	*	*	*	AP	*	AP	*	*	*	*	AP	AP	AP	*	*	*	AP	*	*
Anne Yates	*	*	AP	*	*	*	*	*	A	A		-	*	*		AP	*	*	*	A
Gavin O'Brien												AP	AP		AP	*	*	*	*	*
RESERVES																				
Lisa Rajan																				
Stephen Flannery					*	*	*	*								*	*			
Ian Wingfield													*			AP	AP	-	-	-
Billy Kayada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*			
Dora Dixon-Fyle						*	*													
William Rowe																				
LD vacancy																				
Co-opted Voting Members																				
The Ven erable Douglas Bartles-Smith	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A					
Reverend Canon Graham Shaw	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	AP			

Mrs Josie Spanswick	A	AP	A	*	A	AP	A													
Ms Sheila Simpson	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A					
Mr Godson Agomuo	A	*	A	A	A	A	A	A	*	A	*	A	A	A	A					

**SPECIAL SCRUTINY SUB - COMMITTEE to complete inquiry into AWARD OF PLANNING PERMISSION AT 295-297
CAMBERWELL NEW ROAD**

* = Present
 A = Absent
 AP = Apologies

MEMBERS	29.04.2004	13.05.2004	20.05.2004	2.07.2004	12.07.2004	13.07.2004
Kim Humphreys	*	*	*	*	*	*
Linda Manchester	*	*	*	*	*	*
Barrie Hargrove	AP	A	A	*	*	*
Eliza Mann	A	AP	A	A	A	*
Andy Simmons	*	*	*	*	*	*
Gavin O'Brien	*	*	A	AP	A	A
Lisa Rajan	*	*	*	*	AP	A
Billy Kayada	*	*	*	*	*	*
RESERVES						
Stephen Flannery		*	*	AP		
Anne Yates		AP				
William Rowe						

**ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE LIST 2003/2004**

* = Present
A = Absent
AP = Apologies
- = Not a Member at the time

MEMBERS	18.06.03	15.07.03	24.09.03	04.11.03	19.11.03	17.12.03	21.01.04 cancelled	25.02.04	24.03.04	21.04.04	12.05.04
Barrie Hargrove (Ch)	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	AP	*	*
Gavin O'Brien (V-Ch)	AP	*	AP	AP	*	AP		A	*	AP	AP
Alfred Banya	*	*	*	*	*	AP		*	*	*	*
Alison Moise	*	*	A	*	AP	AP		*	*	*	A
Lisa Rajan	AP	*	*	AP	*	*		AP	*	AP	AP
William Rowe	A	AP	*	AP	AP	*		AP	A	AP	A
Anne Yates	A	A	A	A	AP	A		AP	AP	AP	A
RESERVES											
Maggie Ambrose							-	-	-	-	-
Toby Eckersley					*						
Alun Hayes											
Graham Neale											
Robert Smeath						*			*		

**HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE LIST 2003/2004**

* = Present
A = Absent
AP = Apologies
 - = Not a Member at the time

MEMBERS	17.06. 03	30.07. 03	24.09. 03	22.10. 03	03.11. 03	12.11. 03	17.12. 03	21.01. 04	25.02. 04	15.03. 04	21.04. 04	18.05. 04
Eliza Mann	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dominic Thorncroft	AP	*	*	*	*	AP	*	*	AP	*	*	*
Dora Dixon-Fyle	*	*	*	*	AP	*	*	*	AP	AP	AP	A
Vicky Naish	*	*	AP	*	AP	*	A	AP	AP	AP	A	A
Gavin O'Brien	AP	*	*	*	*	AP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denise Capstick	*	AP	AP	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lib Dem Vacancy												
Daniel McCarthy	-	-	-	-	-	*	AP	AP	*	*	*	AP
Mark Pursey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	AP	AP	-	-	-
Jane Salmon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	AP	*
RESERVES												
Lorraine Lauder		*						*	*	*		
Veronica Ward	*		*	*	*	*			*	*		*
Linda Manchester	-				*		-	-	-	-	-	-
Lib Dem Vacancy												
Mark Pursey	-	-	-	-	-	AP	AP	-	-			
Stephen Flannery	-	-	-	-	-	-						

**HOUSING SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE LIST 2003/2004**

* = Present
A = Absent
AP = Apologies
- = Not a Member at the time

MEMBERS	02.07.03	28.07.03	02.09.03	07.10.03	03.11.03	01.12.03	20.01.04	09.02.04	08.03.04	30.03.04	26.04.04	11.05.04
Gavin O'Brien	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	AP	*	*	*	*
Anne Yates	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fiona Colley	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	AP	*
Jonathan Hunt	AP	A	*	*	AP	AP	AP	*	*	AP	*	AP
Dr Abdur-Rahman Olayiwola	AP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Charlie Smith	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Abdul Mohamed	AP	*	AP	AP	*	*	A	AP	*	AP	*	AP
RESERVES												
Tony Ritchie												
Mick Barnard												
Linda Manchester	*											
Mark Pursey	*											
Anne Yates	-	-	-	-	-	*				AP		

