

MINUTES OF MEETING Overview and Scrutiny Committee HELD ON Monday, 29th November, 2021, 7pm.

PRESENT:

Councillors: Khaled Moyeed (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair) and Dana Carlin

ALSO ATTENDING VIRTUALLY: Cllr Gunes, Yvonne Denny, Lourdes Keever, Anita Jakhu, Kanupriya Juhunhunwala.

20. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to item 1, on the agenda and members noted the information about filming at meetings.

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Gunes could not be present 'in person' and attended the meeting virtually.

22. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair formally accepted the High Road West Scrutiny Report at item 12.2 as a late item of business. This was late due to the need to consult on factual accuracies in the report and respond to comments.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr White declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 5 and 12.2 as he was a voting member of Cabinet when decisions had been taken in March 2021 on the High Road West Scheme.

24. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

Cllr White left the meeting room, following his declaration of a personal and prejudicial interest.

The Chair had received a deputation in relation to item 12.2 - High Road West Scrutiny Review and invited Paul Burnham to put forward his representations.

Michael Hodges and Florence Allaway accompanied Mr Burnham.

The deputation spoke against the High Road West Scheme as a whole and highlighted the recent Lendlease planning application which, in their view, showed that the whole scheme was unviable and produced only half the rate of profit that

Lendlease needed to take forward the rest of the scheme as set out in previous Cabinet reports.

In the deputation's view the recent Planning application indicated that the Council would not be able to offer the single move to most residents as promised in the earlier Cabinet reports and voted on. There had been 500 Council homes promised but 300 would not be ready until 2032 and, in the view of the deputation, would mean that residents would spend longer in temporary accommodation.

Mr Burnham contended that 70% of the new homes would be offered on the open market with only 30% available on shared ownership, which was less affordable for local residents and meant less access to housing by BAME residents. Therefore, in the deputations view, the development using the £90m of GLA money would end up supporting non-Council homes and would also drive up the value of homes and rents in the area and increase in retail costs.

The deputation continued to outline their concerns on the conduct of the Love Lane Ballot, including:

- That Council officers had targeted contact with residents that were vulnerable in respect of their uncertainty on a yes or no vote for demolition.
- There was a significant number of officer contacts with Love Lane residents to ensure completion of the ballot responses.
- Concerns raised that there had been collection of ballots by officers, which the ballot registration company had advised against but had still been taken forward on 4 occasions.
- A statement read out from a resident advising repeated phone calls from an officer and door being knocked on several times. The Committee heard from the deputation that this resident had indicated that they were uncertain and did not understand the choice being given. The resident had then received follow up calls, and a visit to their home. The resident then decided their vote and was helped to complete this online. In the deputation's view, this statement was enough information to warrant a review of the conduct of the ballot process, before any further steps on the demolition were taken.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following responses were provided by the deputation party:

- The deputation contended that viability was a complex calculation and there should be a sensitivity analysis considering unexpected economic factors that could risk the scheme being repackaged in the future to the detriment of resident expectation.
- It was important to establish what had happened in the conduct of the vote and then determine the validity of the ballot outcome.

- A need for an independent review by an independent body, without an interest, who was not committed to the Council, to the GLA, to the deputation party, and prepared to independently take evidence. This body would need to consider:
 - the dynamics of the property owner /tenant relationship and the power position, taking account that 75% of the tenants in the ballot were non-secure tenants,
 - facilitating open evidence sessions,
 - providing the mechanism to get facts and information on the scheme before demolition of the estate,
 - consider what good practice is and what was not good practice to inform future ballots,
 - could also involve scrutiny contributions to the review.

- The deputation felt that the Council were being guided by the GLA deadlines and access to the GLA funding, and there was a need to pause and consider the ballot issue and examine concerns.

- There were further doubts from the deputation about Civica undertaking the independent review as it was no longer part of the electoral reform society.

- The deputation contended that the recent Lendlease Planning application was not consistent with the basis of the ballot. Therefore, concerns about the ballot would need to be responded to by the Council, at this stage before the scheme developed as this issue could not be rectified in the future.

- Considering the impact of what a no vote outcome would have meant which was temporary tenants on Love Lane being added to the Council Housing waiting list, and likely waiting far longer for permanent accommodation, the deputation's position was:
 - That the need for providing secure tenancies to the Love Lane residents remained an issue.
 - There would be residents living on the Love Lane Estate that pay rent and Council tax but will not have security if a secure tenancy.
 - Offering secure tenancies to the Love Lane residents was a positive thing that the Council should do - there could be a local allocations policy as a way forward?
 - This was ultimately an issue for the resident to decide in the ballot.
 - There was still a need to consider the legacy of the ballot outcome on Love Lane.

- Responding to a Committee question on whether the deputation held any compelling evidence that the ballot process was not properly run, given 70% of residents were in favour of demolition, the deputation had evidence and they wanted this considered as part of the independent review process. The deputation acknowledged that they were not a neutral body and there was a need for another body to come in and consider this information and take statements.

- The deputation considered that they had enough evidence to suggest that this was needed and referred to the information considered by the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel which noted that four postal ballots had been handled. The deputation believed that there was more than this number handled with both visits to homes and help provided to residents to use their phones to vote.
- There was acknowledgement that the Council had not run a ballot process before and the current situation indicated that the ballot process needed a review. The deputation felt that the Council should be setting the highest standards, given this was a policy taken forward by the Mayor of London in response to the local Labour party motion which was agreed by the Labour party conference.
- The deputation party had spoken with four tenants who had advised that they had their ballot paper taken away by officers. Another tenant who was voting no, had had their door knocked on 6 times and was called 7 times, and answered once. Officers said that they could come round and collect his ballot paper as they could see he had not voted.
- The deputation party respondent advised that she had seen officers knocking on doors in multiple properties and another no voter, who was blind, was also offered to take his ballot paper but the offer was not accepted. She had spoken with another temporary tenant who was happy with her flat and would prefer a permanent tenancy and did not want her block to be knocked down. She had voted yes, as this would lead to a permanent tenancy.
- A deputation party spokesperson, spoke of her contact with vulnerable people on the estate through their disability and through their circumstances who did not know the ballot was taking place. There were language barriers and she spoke to residents where English was not the first language. They spoke Portuguese, Turkish, Kurdish and Bengali and were not fully aware of the process.
- The deputation party spoke about the poor conditions of the estate, where there were areas of drug use, maintenance issues and it was felt that there was a narrative being provided that if residents voted for the demolition, this would change their situation.

The deputation was thanked for their views, independent review request was noted, and this Committee could not take this decision and would be made by the Executive [Cabinet] and the Committee would communicate this on their behalf.

25. SCRUTINY REVIEWS

High Road West Scrutiny Review

CLlr White remained absent for this item.

The Committee agreed to vary the agenda and consider the Scrutiny Review on High Road West after the deputation.

The Chair set out the 13 recommendations of the review, outlining that the Committee had not heard direct evidence on issues concerning the conduct of the Love Lane Ballot but were putting forward the recommendation for a lesson-learned review with particular focus on the experience of residents to inform any future ballot.

The Chair emphasised that this was the very first estate ballot conducted in Haringey and it was particularly important that due importance was given to the allegations and representations received on this matter.

Councillor Connor asked if recommendation 2 concerning the ballot could be strengthened to put forward an independent review. In response, the Deputy Monitoring officer advised that when compiling reviews there was a need to consider evidence from all parties. Although, the Committee had heard the representations of the deputation, the Committee had not had the benefit of hearing from the officers involved with the process and this would be needed when putting forward recommendations to any review and advised against this.

The Chair proposed, as a way forward, that the recommendation could still go forward as a separate matter referred from the Committee to the Executive, having heard from the deputation. The Committee agreed this.

Councillor Hare raised the following points, which did not affect the recommendations.

- Suggested that the Chair's forward could note the length of the review, membership changes and need to complete evidence sessions by August 2021.
- On Recommendation point 2, he explained that evidence provided was not a Council officer but one of Capita's staff carrying a ballot bag.
- On Recommendation 11, suggested that the first bullet point should not just be the price of purchasing similar premises but suggested should say *price of purchasing similar premises on similar freehold or leasehold basis* as this was a key point made by the Peacock business estate who also highlighted that some business premises included residential accommodation,
- Suggested adding some wording to recognise the high level of difficulties in business planning, investing and financing created by uncertainties, and in future, to engage with businesses that may be affected fully and at the earliest stage of considering regeneration schemes to limit the additional disruption caused by uncertainties.

- On Recommendation 13 and taking this forward, to fully cost the value (economic, social, including indirect) of the businesses as part of the public engagement and analysis.
- In the report, at 6.4, the impact on businesses of the change from the original Arup master plan suggested should be described. Option 1 was supported by the businesses because the Peacock Estate was retained and the change was significant for the Peacock business estate.

The Committee noted these points and the Chair highlighted the above points raised were already captured in the main body of the report.

Taking account of the concerns expressed on: the viability of the scheme, Council houses being built in the last stage of the scheme, and the current 6.6% profit margin, the Committee asked the Deputy Monitoring officer if there was a penalty clause, in the homes were not built. The Deputy Monitoring officer agreed to speak to legal colleagues and respond to this point.

Following a vote of members of the Committee present in the room, [Cllr Moyeed, Cllr Connor, Cllr Carlin] the High Road West Scrutiny Review and recommendations was agreed and would go forward to the January meeting of Cabinet for a response.

26. MINUTES

Councillor White returned to the meeting.

There were two outstanding actions concerning the budget which would be taken forward as part of the scrutiny budget process.

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 7th of October 2021.

27. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

Cllr Connor highlighted that the Adults and Health Panel were looking at how the Irish Centre group would be working alongside the Grace organisation.

Cllr Gunes added that the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel were in the process of evidence gathering for the Child Poverty Scrutiny review, for completion by March 2022.

The co-opted member Lourdes Keever was concerned to hear about the issues on funding and support raised by the Irish Centre at the recent Full Council meeting highlighted the need to ensure that co-production activities picked up these issues.

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of Scrutiny Panel meetings as set out at pages 9 to 50 of the agenda pack.

28. JOINT WORKING WITH AND SUPPORT FOR THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR (VCS)

Geoffrey Ocen , Chief Executive of the Bridge Renewal Trust and Poppy Thomas, VCS Co-ordinator attended online, and provided a presentation containing an update on how the Council works with the Voluntary and Community Sector. They were responding to a request from the Committee for information on:

- How the Council works with the local voluntary/community sector, is strengthening their capacity and working with them to attract external investment in the borough;
- How the Council is involving and supporting voluntary organisations to bid for services.

The Committee noted that the Bridge Renewal Trust were commissioned in 2016 to work with the Council as the voluntary sector strategic partner to essentially support and build the capacity of the voluntary sector. The aim was to work closely together with the Council to deliver support services with The Bridge Renewal Trust specific aim of developing the capacity of the VSC .

The Committee continued to consider a presentation on the projects that the: Council, The Bridge Renewal Trust and Voluntary groups have been working on together. In particular noting :

- The Council based voluntary sector team was established since summer 2020, to grow further capacity and provide direct support, providing workshops and training and building relationships.
- The Team were providing network, facilitating relationships, and resources,
- The Council and Bridge Renewal Trust , working together was not just about bringing more funding to the sector but also bringing people together in the voluntary sector and working together to address the common underlying issues affecting communities.
- The Bridge Renewal Trust were providing information through their website on issues affecting the voluntary sector.
- The Bridge Renewal Trust were ensuring the sector was resourced effectively and working together as collaboratively as possible.
- The sector was provided information on core sector funding and the understanding of the funding available related to Covid project funding and available resource costs.
- Making sure that the voluntary sector can access the available funding support.
- Working with the sector to help them attract external funding support
- Working on health inequalities and ensuring involvement of voluntary sector in co – production.

Responding to the presentation, the Committee sought clarification on the outcomes of the voluntary sector community group initiatives that had been funded by external funders and funded by the Council as part of the Covid support grant. It was understood that there were several initiatives that were coming forward, post pandemic, and it was queried how they would be assessed i.e. what had worked well and what had not? The Committee also needed further clarity about the composition of external funding and needed to understand what Council money or CCG money was.

In response , it was clarified that the external funding outlined was money coming into the voluntary sector, including Council money. It was further explained that £2.7m had come into the borough for key projects from key external funders – [this would not include Council funding].

It was recognised that an outcome to the Council Covid grant support was that it had helped keep voluntary sector organisations keep afloat, maintaining support to communities. Some organisations were small and would likely not have the capacity to measure and demonstrate outcomes. However, the Bridge Renewal Trust was reviewing the current state of the voluntary sector and would look at supporting smaller organisations demonstrate outcomes.

The Chief Executive of the Bridge Renewal Trust continued to respond on the projects that had been funded in the last year such as supporting more stronger safer communities, building mental health support, and supporting youth projects. The Director for Adults and Health added that the Council and Bridge Renewal Trust were increasingly looking at themes of food and digital networks where organisations could work together and it was felt that this was sustainable approach.

It was noted that the Council were aiming to support grass root organisations and this would be through specific themes. These would be developed through the new Voluntary Sector Community Strategy working strategically in terms of funding deployment.

In relation to the Council funded Covid support grant, there had been ongoing engagement on the outcome of this initiative and the Council had seen an impact in terms of supporting voluntary sector groups in Haringey become sustainable. Also, during the last year, the Voluntary Sector Team had seen an increase in external funders wanting to cover core infrastructure costs of voluntary organisations and this was a welcome shift.

Responding to a further follow up query from the Committee on providing an Indication of which grassroots organisations were getting funding and then considering outcomes , in terms of the funding input, there was a more detailed finance report that could be provided and sent to the Committee in writing.

29. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE, WELFARE AND THE PUBLIC REALM

Cllr Chandwani, The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare, and the Public Realm attended the meeting to respond to questions on the Customer Service and welfare part of her portfolio. The Cabinet Member provided a brief update to provide some context and background. The following key information was noted:

- The vision for Customer Services was for the Council to be able to serve people in the way they want and way that they need. This was through effective use of resources in a multi-faceted way, ensuring accessible services for those in need and everyone else served in a different but accessible way.
- Ensuring services connect strategically which also requires getting the atomisation right so the Council can help people most in need whilst ensuring that day to day contact and interaction is as efficient as possible.
- Customer services supports 17 Council services and does not answer phone calls for all Council services.

- There were varied and complex contacts with the Council ranging from planning enquiries, Council tax enquiries and parking fines .
- The logo of the Council was important for setting out the identity of the Council. There was a need to be clear on the brand and what this means to everyone.

There had been a lot of work over the last year to create new support structure including:

- The Haringey Here To Help [welfare scheme] which was one place to find information on welfare support.
- Haringey Support Fund – which residents can get information on access to the Discretionary Housing Payments policy and Council Tax Reduction Scheme
- Debt Partnership Board – This includes several partners and stakeholders who work together to support as much as possible the residents that are likely to face severe hardship.

Committee discussion included:

The new IT system for parking permits which was useful as accessible online and worked well for people that have basic IT literacy. It was acknowledged by the Committee that new systems will have discrepancies which need to be resolved once starting to be used. There was a question on how quickly these discrepancies can be resolved with the contractor when they become apparent. In response, the Cabinet Member outlined resources to provide basic services and the previous identified need to invest the money in IT element of Parking services. In taking this service forward online, there was a good baseline of information on demand for parking permits and on this basis, the service had done well. The service had worked on the basis on 20% of customers needing assistance but this figure currently stood at 35%. The services had identified simple issues to fix which would improve this figure. There was a frustration that limit on parking permits being issued and this issue as well as others was being managed through the Customer Services Programme board as this involved four services, under different directorates. Therefore, it was important to note that an identified issue with the system could belong to a different service area or provider. For example, the number of permits being issued would be an issue to resolve with Civica.

The Cabinet Member invited Councillors to forward her issues that were being experienced with the new Parking permit system and she would pass these to the Programme board to take these forward. It was recognised that potentially more issues could have been identified by more 'working in person' with a customer to track their customer journey but this was not possible over the year with the working from home requirements of the government and safety of staff. It was noted that , prior to the implementation of the parking system, staff were manually distributing permits and this also meant that customers were queuing up for parking permits and taking up time of customer services staff who could be helping more residents in greater need. Once these issues were resolved, this system was expected to be smooth running.

There was a question on support to residents that have had a cuts to their Universal Credit payment. In response, it was noted that there were large group of people, a

majority who were disabled residents, that did not receive the previous £20 increase and this was currently being challenged in a High Court case. The Cabinet Member underlined that the previously provided £20 increase was not a bonus, as badged by the government, but a necessary increase which should have been given to respond to inflation and previous year's standstill in increase of benefit. Noted that there were 41000 residents in Haringey claiming Universal Credit and each had lost £1000 over the year. It was noted that there were 17000 residents eligible for the Universal Credit earnings taper. The Cabinet Member advised that those residents eligible for an earnings taper payment would have likely only received £2 to £3 a week. She advised that the Council were always clear that the most damaging effect, going forward in the coming years for residents would be the cost of living. In readiness, the Council had instigated the Haringey Support Fund where residents can apply for one off emergencies. So far since this scheme had been in place from 1st of April, there have been 800 applications. The applications had been for help to purchase necessary white goods and buying cooker to help with daily living requirements. The Council were exploring how to ensure that young parents are aware of this scheme and can apply to the Council for support. Noted that there had been requests for help with fuel costs and food costs.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Council Tax Reduction Scheme improvements had allowed 6000 families to access the scheme. The proposed updated scheme was currently being consulted on. Improvements aimed for were making it an automatic right for a resident on the right level of universal credit to be exempt from Council tax payment requirements. This was in line with the priority of making the Council tax scheme more accessible. The Council also now have information from DWP where a resident is exempt from Council tax and are applying for this rather than awaiting the resident complete the application form.

Further information was provided on the Discretionary Housing Payment scheme [DHP] which helps people with rent arrears or helps them to move to a cheaper rented property. There were now a financial support team of 4 officers who will support the residents accessing this scheme and may have debt problems. They will help with relevant applications for benefits that are needed.

The Committee noted that there are two benefit maximisation officers that residents can access and talk through what they are eligible for. The Council was not relying on marketing and looking closely and policy and practice data, to see the income of households and completing targeted work with people that we find on the data base to ensure that they know and understand the benefits to apply for or help them do this.

There was a question about the 'Digital Together' programme and including voluntary groups in this data sharing work in the community. In response, it was noted that there was a need to explore and discuss with officers the wider reach of this programme. There was also a need to understand and investigate partners use of technology or interface with this.

In response to a question on the Debt Management team working with law centres in the area and getting financial assistance, the Debt Partnership Board included Haringey Law Centre, Citizen's Advice Bureau, and Housing Associations. The aim of

this Board was: ensuring partners and stakeholders work together , are not working in silos but in a team mentality, acting as critical friends, with the overall aim of protecting residents and building resilience. Board Members were accepting working together to meets the needs of residents.

There was a question about directing money raised from CPZ's for street safety. In response noted that there were several ring- fenced funding pots for highways and road safety. The funding for road safety and CPZ's was from different budgets. The Committee noted that the parking income was protected by the Road Traffic Act 1974 and could only be used for infrastructure. Noted that the first tier of priority of spend was concessionary travel and most of the parking income funded Freedom passes with the Council paying for any shortfall.

The Cabinet Member continued to respond outlining that the Mayor of London has a Vision Zero , which will mean a zero-accident rate in London by 2040. The Council had received some LIP money from TfL for this. Noted that TfL had structured the funding and would only give money for serious accidents or death caused by an accident. The Cabinet Member spoke about a road in her ward, Belmont road, which had 17 near misses and had had road humps added. She was not content with the funding situation and had proposed a £8m capital bid for this area be included in the budget for consideration at the full Council in March. In the meantime, the Council' Transport engineers were compiling information on accident hotspots as where an accident takes place is loaded to the Met database which is accessed by the Council. Consideration would also be given to specific areas that needed to be as safe as possible such as roads near schools, doctors' surgeries and where there was a high footfall. Also including roads that need to be safe for walking and cycling too.

The Cabinet Member for Customer Services, Welfare and Public Realm was thanked for her attendance and information shared.

30. COMPLAINTS ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee considered this annual report which summarised Member Enquiries, complaints, Ombudsman caseload and FOI activity alongside performance from the 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021.

The following information was noted in the discussion of the report.

The Council had the most complaints to be upheld by the Local Government Ombudsman in comparison to neighbouring boroughs. Understanding was sought on the potential reasons for this and queries about whether this was a failure to properly address the complaint, initially, leading to an escalation to the Local Government Ombudsman. Understanding was further sought on the actions being taken to improve this situation.

In response, The Customer Experience Manager outlined the experience he was bringing to the organisation , since his recent move to the Council. This included: the complaints team now looking at the initial response ahead of the deadline and so that

they can liaise with the staff and offer a different point of view, providing training to staff responding to complaints, on the basics and responses .

The Customer Experience Manager had reviewed some initial responses to complaints and in some responses, officers were using very technical jargon and not responding to the heart of the matter in the complaint and was tailoring his advice to respond to this need. He was also considering stage 2 complaints and noted that some were not treating the individual's concern and would provide guidance on this.

The Committee noted that the Customer Experience Manager was encouraging officers to use Complaints team as an advisory service. He was also encouraging peer reading so some stage one responses could be more accurate, addressing the crux of the complaint. At stage two complaints he was asking officers to speak more to the customer, pick up the phone and clarify the issues and consider a resolution over the phone.

The Customer Experience Manager was reaching out to all directorates to discuss the number of complaints that they were receiving and helping to identify any trends. He expressed that complaints which were not upheld provided valuable information for the Council on improving the customer experience where needed.

Further improvements outlined, were a new corporate email inbox for Local Government Ombudsman correspondence, ensuring the Council will respond on time to requests for information.

With regards to senior officer oversight of complaint responses, there were 6 investigation officers for level 2 complaints and they liaised heavily with senior team leaders of the services being complained about.

The Committee referred to the public interest report at page 72 and questioned if training of staff would have the required impact and whether an independent review was needed. In response, the Head of Customer Experience and Operations advised that previous training was adhoc and rudimentary. The current training was targeting every responding officer in the Council ,regardless of their level of seniority with a real emphasis on the quality and a resolution. The customer experience team would continue to monitor responses and raise with directors any issues also monitoring lessons learned from ombudsman reviews. It was hoped that the new interventions would show positive outcomes.

There were also comments made on tackling complaints that were spanning a longer period for response and the Cabinet Member for Customer services, Welfare and Public realm briefly remarked that the Complaints team were setting out how they are trying to improve the process for complaints but ultimately the Council needed to be collectively striving to reach a situation where there were no complaints. She highlighted that questions should be directed on how to deliver good services to avoid complaints. This needed to be a collective whole Council approach and was not reliant on one team in charge of processing complaints. The direction of questions should be to the service heads of the 27 complaints that have reached the Local Government ombudsman stage and actions put in place to avoid the situation occurring. She

recommended that the focus should not be on the admin of complaints but focus on service quality.

Chair took on board the comments and agreed thinking creatively about consideration of the report in future years to ensure focus on this.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

31. PERFORMANCE UPDATE - Q2

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the high-level progress made against the delivery of the strategic priorities and targets in the Borough Plan as at the end of September 2021 detailed in the report.

Agreed that any further queries on the performance information be sent to the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager for distribution to services for a response.

32. SCRUTINY REVIEW - HARINGEY FAMILY OF SCHOOLS

The Committee noted that the Scrutiny review of the Haringey Family of Schools considered the relationship between the school and academies and sought approval to the Scrutiny Review and the recommendations set out.

RESOLVED

To approve the report and its recommendations and that it be submitted to Cabinet for response.

33. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

1. To note the current work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels set out at Appendix A, noting that consideration will be given to moving the items listed for the budget scrutiny meetings in January.
2. To agree the Committee and Panels' proposed Scrutiny Review Projects set out at Appendix B, C ,D and E and the submission timescales required in order to finish the reviews by the end of the municipal year.

34. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

35. FUTURE MEETINGS

13th Jan 2022

20th Jan 2022
10th March 2022

CHAIR: Councillor Khaled Moyeed

Signed by Chair

Date