

MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 2021, 7PM – 10.20PM

PRESENT: Councillors Peter Mitchell (Chair), Erdal Dogan (Vice-Chair), Kaushika Amin, Dawn Barnes, Patrick Berryman, Mark Blake, Mahir Demir, Joseph Ejiofor, Emine Ibrahim, and Preston Tabois.

The following councillors joined the meeting virtually: Councillors Alessandra Rossetti, Julie Davies, Noah Tucker, Zena Brabazon, Mike Hakata, and Isidoros Diakides.

This meeting took place in two parts and these minutes should be read in conjunction with the minutes of the Corporate Committee on 23 November 2021.

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alessandra Rossetti and Councillor Scott Emery. *Councillor Alessandra Rossetti joined the meeting virtually but could not be considered to be present for the purposes of the attendance record.*

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest. Councillor Joseph Ejiofor stated that, following advice from the Monitoring Officer, he did not have any interests to declare.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were no deputations, petitions, presentations, or questions.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Corporate Committee meeting held on 9 September 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7. REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS, POLLING PLACES AND DESIGNATION OF POLLING SCHEME

Under s100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair of the meeting was of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances. These circumstances were because there were some amendments where the proposals cut through parkland (specifically the border between APK-B and APK-C and between WOD-A and WODB). The polling district boundary had been moved to the perimeter of the park. The red line was the original proposal and the green was the revised. Therefore the boundaries in this whole borough map should replace those shown on the individual polling scheme maps for these districts. This was a technical change and made no alteration to the electorate for either of the areas but required approval of the committee to be included in the polling scheme (Appendix 1b), as set out in Recommendation 1.

The Assistant Director Direct Services introduced the report which set out recommendations for each polling district and the associated polling place, including where feedback was received and any changes that were made as a result of the consultation phase.

It was explained that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) concluded in December 2019 and recommended that Haringey should continue to have 57 councillors, should have 21 wards rather than 19, and that all ward boundaries should change. This was enacted by Parliament. The Electoral Services Team was responsible for developing proposals to create polling districts for these new wards and to identify polling places within each district. It was noted that there had been input from a member working group and an officer working group. It was also noted that a public consultation had commenced on 31 August 2021, including an all-member briefing, and that this had resulted in some changes which were set out in the report.

It was added that, if approved, the polling districts would be uploaded to the council's electoral register and would be operational for the council elections in 2022. It was highlighted that a full communications plan for the elections would make sure that people were informed about the location of their polling stations. It was noted that the proposals were due to be reviewed next year following the parliamentary boundary review which was due to report in 2023.

It was highlighted that a drawing which showed the new districts on a boroughwide map had been circulated as a late paper. It was noted that this drawing also showed locations where there had been minor boundary amendments to align with parkland boundaries. It was explained that this was a technical change which did not alter the electorate but that this needed to be approved by the Committee for inclusion in the polling scheme (Appendix 1b), as set out in the report recommendations.

It was noted that it was proposed to reduce the number of polling districts from 83 to 76 and it was enquired why there were some differences in the sizes of polling districts. The Assistant Director Direct Services explained that some polling districts were larger as they contained green spaces and that the review had tried to be consistent in the number of electors in each area.

It was commented that one polling station had been removed in Northumberland Park and that the electoral count would be 3,886. It was acknowledged that there had been two polling stations in this area that were very close to each other and that one polling station was being removed but it was noted that this was significantly larger than other areas. The Assistant Director Direct Services stated that the conditions had been checked to make sure that they were not excessive. It was accepted that some areas were larger but that the proposals took walking distance into account. The number of electors allocated to each polling place included those who opted for postal votes in each area. It was considered that the proposals would result in approximately even numbers across the borough.

Some members of the Committee expressed concerns about the close proximity of the polling stations in Noel Park ward, in particular St Mark's Church, Noel Park Primary School, and Wood Green Library. It was commented that the road directions may seem simple but that this would be quite a distance for some residents. The Assistant Director Direct Services explained that the arrangements in Noel Park ward and the named polling stations had been considered in detail. It was acknowledged that there may be further developments in the area in the future but that, at present, it had not been possible to identify any suitable alternatives.

It was noted that it would have been useful for polling stations to be shown on the A3 map of polling districts. It was also noted that some electors would have to walk past another polling station in order to get to their polling station and it was enquired how this would be addressed. The Assistant Director Direct Services noted that there was an aim for all polling stations to be within a walking distance of 12-15 minutes for all residents, based on information on the Transport for London website. It was acknowledged that this was sometimes challenging, particularly near ward boundaries, and that there were often limited venues that were suitable or available as polling places. It was added that the communications plan for the new polling districts and polling places would involve sending out maps and clearly informing residents of their polling places. It was added that the member working group would continue up until the pre-election period to ensure that the communications plan was as effective as possible.

Some members of the Committee noted that the recommendation in the report proposed that delegated authority be given to the Returning Officer to amend the polling scheme and it was asked whether this could be in conjunction with local councillors. The Assistant Director Direct Services explained that, if something was identified in advance, local councillors would be consulted but that there may be occasions where the Returning Officer would have to make a rapid decision and such consultation would either be impractical or inappropriate close to the election itself. It was therefore requested that the recommendation remained as proposed.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the polling scheme describing the polling districts and the polling places for the new 21 wards of Haringey as set out in Appendix 1a & b **and Appendix 4**.
2. To delegate authority to the (Acting) Returning Officer (ARO) and the Deputy (Acting) Returning Officers to amend the polling scheme where the names of buildings change and for specific elections where strictly necessary for a particular election, including changing polling places.
3. To agree that minor errors in transferring the maps in Appendix 1a & b **and Appendix 4** into the electoral registration software can be corrected with Acting Returning Officer (ARO) approval.

8. EXTERNAL AUDIT PLAN 2020/21

The Head of Finance and Chief Accountant introduced the report which presented the council's plan for the audit of the Statement of Accounts for 2020-21, which included the Housing Revenue Account and Haringey Pension Fund. It was explained that the plan had been updated and set out the approach that the auditors would be taking, including the highlights of the audit and the proposed audit fee. It had been noted that the deadline to complete the 2020-21 audit was 30 September 2021 but that only about 9% of local authorities had met this deadline.

David Eagles, the Audit Partner from BDO, noted that the materiality levels for the audit had increased slightly compared to the previous year to reflect the increased gross spend for the year and were set out on page 224 of the agenda pack. It was also noted that the timeline for the audit was set out on page 231 of the agenda pack.

It was stated that the significant risks for the purposes of the audit were identified in the report and included management override of controls, revenue recognition, expenditure cut-off, valuation of non-current assets, valuation of pension liability, reconciliation of bank accounts, allowance for non-collection of receivables, and sustainable finances (use of resources). It was commented that the risk relating to management override of controls was a standard risk in most audits and was not related to any particular concerns in Haringey and that the risk relating to related parties was not considered to be a significant risk but that there had been some issues in the past and this area remained under closer review.

It was highlighted that some issues had been identified in relation to IT general controls and that the complexity of this issue meant that specialist IT auditors were required. The specialist audit had identified areas of weakness where there was potential for manipulation and it was believed that stronger controls would be required to mitigate this risk. This required additional testing which would impact on the audit and would need to be discussed with management. It was clarified that officers would be working to complete as soon as possible but wanted to inform the Committee that there was a real risk of delays.

In response to a question from the Committee, David Eagles stated that the audit deadline was unrealistic as authorities were still catching up from the previous audit period, which had been significantly disrupted by the Covid-19 pandemic, and had therefore been given a shorter time scale for the 2020-21 audit. David Eagles was not aware of any penalties for local authorities who completed their audit after the deadline and it was noted that the regulators were being understanding in acknowledging that there was an ongoing national crisis.

Some members of the Committee noted that the outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) was a £6.8 million overspend and it was enquired whether there would be a review of the strategies to close the budget gap. David Eagles explained that the focus of the auditors was to assess the arrangements that the local authority had in place and to consider the reasonableness of any assumptions. It was noted that the auditors could identify any areas of weakness but could not provide options.

The Chair drew attention to page 249 of the agenda pack which identified a significant control deficiency in relation to the implementation of IFRS 16 (leases) and it was enquired whether this would impact the audit timeline. David Eagles explained that IFRS 16 would be implemented from 1 April 2022 and would be a significant change to the financial reporting requirements for the council. It was noted that there had been a number of deferrals for implementation but that the auditors would be looking at the council's preparations as part of the 2020-21 accounts.

It was noted that the additional audit fees appeared to be very round numbers and it was enquired how these were calculated. David Eagles explained that the scale fees were based on a position dating back to 2010 and that the fees had not changed but that any additional costs related to different levels of work that were required. David Eagles believed that the fee was a round number as it had been negotiated to a lower cost. It was noted that the exact costs for this year were not known yet and that there may be some adjustments based on additional controls work.

RESOLVED

To note the contents of the report and to note the further oral updates provided by BDO LLP.

9. AUDIT & RISK SERVICE UPDATE - QUARTER 2 (JULY - SEPTEMBER 2021)

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report which detailed the work undertaken by the in-house Audit and Risk Team, as well as our outsourced partner Mazars, for the quarter ending 30 September 2021. It was noted that the service had received fewer fraud referrals during the Covid-19 pandemic but that this was now increasing to more normal levels.

It was noted that Early Help Care Plans had been removed from the audit plan but the Committee queried whether this issue had been resolved. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that the EY audit had been delayed by six months to allow the findings from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to be embedded before an evaluation. It was added that this area would be reviewed as part of the internal audit

plan in 2022-23. It was confirmed that Commercial Land and Property had been added to the audit plan in response to a request from management. The rationale for this was to ensure that there was a robust arrangement for the management of the portfolio.

It was noted that Park View School had been subject to cyber fraud and it was enquired whether there was evidence of similar issues elsewhere. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that this was the only known case at present. It was highlighted that cyber fraud was increasingly common and that a cyber audit was being conducted which would be shared with the Committee.

Some members asked whether it would be possible to provide comparative data and learning points over the previous two years in each quarterly report. The Head of Audit and Risk Management noted that there was an annual report which set out in detail the work relating to anti-fraud and any lessons learned, including the numbers of cases.

The Committee noted that there were currently 230 potential tenancy fraud cases outstanding and it was enquired whether there were a large number of older cases or whether this represented mainly new cases. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that there were 230 ongoing cases but that a number of these were older cases that required some physical visits and had been delayed by the Covid-19 pandemic. The Committee noted that it would be helpful to have further information on the average timescales for processing cases.

The Committee noted that the audits on Purchasing Cycle and Management of Contracts Register had been removed. It was enquired why these audits had been removed given the Committee's previous questions and concerns about whether there were satisfactory assurances. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that the audits had been delayed pending the outcome of an organisational review about procurement related activities, including contract management. It was noted that the audit of Contract Management was currently at the fieldwork stage and it was enquired whether this would be deferred pending the outcome of the organisational review. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that this related to the follow up of a previous audit to review whether the recommendations had been implemented after six months.

Some members of the Committee commented that there was a significant number of cases relating to Homes for Haringey and asked whether this suggested that there were deficiencies in tenancy management or processes and whether the council should recuperate some costs from Homes for Haringey. The Head of Audit and Risk Management did not believe that there were particular issues with tenancies compared to other boroughs. It was explained that Homes for Haringey funded a Tenancy Fraud Officer who acted as a conduit between the two organisations.

It was enquired whether the Committee could be updated on the 11 cases of people who had No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF). The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that he would provide an update to the Committee outside of the meeting. In response to a question about audits being added and removed, the Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that the audit plan set out the areas that

were due to be reviewed and why. It was noted that the audit plan was driven by the key areas of risk and that this was reviewed periodically and/ or when new information was available.

RESOLVED

To note the activities of the Audit and Risk Service during quarter two of 2021/22.

10. TREASURY MANAGEMENT UPDATE MID-YEAR REPORT 2021/22

The Head of Pensions and Treasury introduced the report which provided an update on the council's treasury management activities and performance in the first half of the financial year to 30 September 2021 in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Treasury Management Code of Practice. It was explained that the report was for the Committee to note and that it would be presented to Full Council as required by the Code of Practice.

It was highlighted that there had been additional borrowing of £41 million, £11 million of long term borrowing and £30 million of short term borrowing, which aimed to incorporate the council's strategy to strike a balance between securing low financing costs and achieving long term cost certainty. It was anticipated that there would be additional long term borrowing later in the year. It was also noted that all activity had been in line with the approved Treasury Management Strategy so far this year.

The Committee noted that the council had held some Lender's Option Borrower's Option (LOBO) loans for a number of years and enquired about the process for repaying these loans. The Head of Pensions and Treasury explained that LOBO loans provided the lender with the option to propose an increase in the interest rate payable on a loan at pre-specified dates. It was stated that, if a lender proposed to raise its interest rate, the council could decide to repay the loan rather than accept a new, higher rate. It was noted that the likelihood of a lender deciding to exercise this option remained low. The Head of Pensions and Treasury stated that the council periodically reviewed opportunities to repay LOBOs with the treasury advisor but that these opportunities had not yet materialised.

Some Committee members suggested that interest rates were expected to rise and suggested that this would necessitate a review of how the council refinanced ongoing borrowing. The Head of Pensions and Treasury explained that restructuring a LOBO loan typically involved the council paying a premium to the lender which would most likely be expensive, given the length of time before the loans reached maturity. It was noted that officers were conscious that interest rates were likely to increase and were seeking to secure longer term interest rates for the Housing Revenue Account and the General Fund by taking out long term Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing. It was stated that, if any good opportunities to exit LOBO loans were identified, they would be investigated.

RESOLVED

1. To note the Treasury Management activity undertaken during the first half of the financial year to 30 September 2021 and the performance achieved which is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
2. To note that all treasury activities were undertaken in line with the approved Treasury Management Strategy.

11. BUILDING, PLACE AND STREET NAME REVIEW

The Assistant Director for Commissioning introduced the report which responded to the Committee's request for further consultation on the proposals for renaming Black Boy Lane before moving forward. In this context, the report detailed the council's proposed approach to working with residents and communities on improving the diversity and representation in Haringey's public realm. This report covered the range of issues where there were plans to engage with residents in relation to the public realm, the approach to co-production to be adopted, and a summary of work to date.

It was noted that a number of residents would be affected by street renaming and that the report considered the council's approach to reviewing the council's public realm and wider conversations. It was envisaged that the approach would be community led and would address systemic inequalities in the borough.

Cllr Ejiofor expressed his disappointment with the content of the report. He commented that the Committee had undertaken a long discussion at its meeting in March 2021 and that a number of recommendations had been made which were due to be implemented between March and October 2021. He stated that Black Boy Lane was offensive and that the report presented to the Committee appeared to delay the renaming of this street. He asked that the renaming of Black Boy Lane was separated from the broader review on street renaming across the borough. He added that the costs of renaming this street would be notional and would be met from existing budgets. Cllr Ejiofor expressed concerns that no action had been taken regarding the renaming of this street and stated that councils should lead change in relation to challenging racism.

Cllr Ejiofor moved the following motion:

This Corporate Committee has decided to separate the process for a broader buildings review from the process for moving forward with the renaming of Black Boy Lane.

The Committee recalls the comments made by the Corporate Committee at their meeting of 17 March 2021 and notes that the Committee has already agreed the following:

- (i) Considered the feedback from the Second Statutory Consultation 'Notice of Intention' on the renaming of Black Boy Lane to La Rose Lane, in particular, the Corporate Committee had noted the objections from residents and organisations directly affected by the proposed renaming;

- (ii) Considered and took into account the Equalities Impact Assessment of the proposed change on protected groups and the actions proposed to mitigate the impact including a commitment to provide support, a dedicated staff resource and resident/organisation payments; and

Furthermore, using the authority granted to this committee under the London Building Act (Amendment) 1939 Section 6(1) now agrees to the making of an Order to rename Black Boy Lane to La Rose Lane to take effect on 1 February 2022 and concurs that officers should now provide the necessary assurances to residents of Black Boy Lane for the change of this street name. The Committee also instructs officers that the support package offered to the residents be further explained and clarified.

Cllr Amin seconded the motion. She noted that the majority of residents were in favour of the renaming of Black Boy Lane and that the response rate from residents on Black Boy Lane had been low. She commented that the pub nearby had undergone a name change previously to remove the offensive name, following a campaign. She added that, following the Committee's discussions and decisions at the meeting in March 2021, it was expected that the name change could be progressed today.

The Chair noted that this was a lengthy amendment and that the Committee would need some time to consider it. It was explained that the report aimed to bring communities together; it was acknowledged that residents in the immediate area had voted three to one against the name change and that work was required to respond to this. The report sought an approach that would include residents in the immediate area and involve them in the work to tackle racism across the borough.

Cllr Ibrahim expressed disappointment that the renaming was not being moved forward and stated that the name of the road was offensive and was a reputational issue for the council. She added that there were other road names that required review and change and that this name change should be undertaken as soon as possible with a distinct timeframe.

Cllr Tabois commented that a number of local people were offended by this street name and had asked him to change it. He believed that racism, in particular Black racism, should be tackled effectively rather than with ineffectual actions. He asked that this issue was resolved immediately rather than deferred.

Cllr Barnes suggested that this street was renamed imminently whilst the wider street naming review was undertaken. It was considered that explaining the implications for the renaming clearly might assist in gaining local support for the renaming.

Cllr Berryman stated that a statutory consultation had been undertaken which showed the residents in the immediate vicinity to be against the name change and he enquired whether the Committee had the power to make this change at the meeting. The Deputy Monitoring Officer noted that, following questions from the Committee, it would be helpful to have a short adjournment for him to review and consider the proposed motion.

Cllr Ejiofor highlighted that the statutory consultation was not against the proposal to rename the street but that the majority of respondents from Black Boy Lane had been

against the renaming. It was added that the consultation had been boroughwide rather than specific to the street and he believed that it was within the power of the Committee to balance the views expressed. He noted his concerns that the previous decision of the Committee had not been implemented and stated that it was within the power of the Committee to amend the motion to separate the renaming of Black Boy Lane from the wider street naming review.

The Chair clarified that there had been delays in undertaking the period of consultation that was previously agreed by the Committee. This had been due to a number of factors, including Covid restrictions, the pre-election period, and the resource implications as the Committee had asked for face to face consultations and for the review of the support package.

With the consent of the Chair, Cllr Hakata spoke as ward councillor. He stated that the proposals in the report would deliver a strategic approach to reviewing the council's public realm and he believed that this was the correct course of action. He explained that there were a number of streets which showcased the names of people whose actions were now considered to be concerning but that this would need to be addressed strategically. Cllr Hakata commented that he believed that Black Boy Lane should be renamed but that there would need to be a decision on the new street name. He noted that there had been several proposals and that La Rose Lane had been the most popular in the consultation but that the Trustees of the George Padmore Institute, which had strong connections to John La Rose, had written to the council to state that the renaming arrangements would not have been supported by John La Rose. Cllr Hakata felt that the process for choosing a new street name was an important element of the process and should be carefully and strategically decided.

With the consent of the Chair, Cllr Tucker spoke as ward councillor. He commented that, when he had first moved to the area, he had been shocked that there was a street named Black Boy Lane and that many other people felt this way. He stated that this was a racist street name and that it should be changed. He noted it had been possible to change the name of the local pub, which had been similar, following a campaign and that the street name should be changed as soon as possible. Cllr Tucker explained that the consultation had included some options for an alternative street name and that La Rose Lane had been the most popular option. He stated that this would be an excellent alternative that would commemorate the work of John La Rose. He felt that a proposal to delay a decision was a proposal to never change the street name.

Cllr Ejiofor noted that a proposed package of financial support for residents affected by the street renaming for Black Boy Lane had been through consultation and was considered to be reasonable and appropriate. It was stated that the Committee had the legal authority to take decisions on street renaming and that the amendment proposed asked the Committee to make this decision.

The Chair noted that a significant amendment had been proposed and explained that he would provide an opportunity for officers to respond and that it might then be necessary to request comments from Legal and Finance. The Assistant Director for Commissioning explained that the report proposed an approach which centred around engaging with the community, contextualising the proposals for street renaming, and

addressing inequalities alongside street names. It was highlighted that the approach was not to delay decisions but to have a process which aimed to tackle racism.

The Chair asked whether Cllr Ejiofor could clarify any comments on the financial support package. Cllr Ejiofor noted that the support package had been through consultation with officers, members, and wider consultees to determine what was appropriate. It was acknowledged that, in March 2021, the Committee had been open to further changes to the support package and this could still happen but the outline arrangements had been set out. Cllr Ejiofor commented that, although the members of the George Padmore Institute had expressed concerns with the proposed name, the family of John La Rose supported the proposal.

At 9.25pm, the Committee agreed an adjournment to allow for the consideration of the proposed motion and amendment by the Deputy Monitoring Officer. Cllr Ejiofor supplied a copy of the written motion for consideration. The meeting resumed at 9.55pm.

The Chair proposed to invoke Standing Order 63 to suspend Standing Order 18 so that the meeting could continue after 10pm; this was agreed by the Committee.

At 9.58pm, the Committee agreed a short adjournment to allow the further consideration of the proposed motion and amendments by the Deputy Monitoring Officer. *Cllr Berryman left the meeting at this point.* The meeting resumed at 10pm.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer provided advice to the Committee. He advised that the meeting be adjourned to 23 November 2021 as the motion and amendment put forward contained material that required additional information and officer consideration, specifically financial considerations, to ensure that the proposed option was still possible. It was explained that the motion and amendment proposed an action that was significantly different from the published intention in the report and that, from a governance perspective, it would be proper to consider this issue at a reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021 with more appropriate information and public awareness.

Cllr Ejiofor highlighted that the proposed amendment asked for the street renaming to take effect from 1 February 2022 and it was enquired whether the Committee would be able to make a decision at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021. The Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that additional information and consideration was required to determine whether the Committee could take this decision on 23 November 2021. He highlighted that it would be contrary to the legal advice to take a decision at this meeting. The Chair clarified that the proposal was not to delay a decision but to adjourn the meeting for one week in order to obtain the advice that would normally be available to the Committee when considering this type of issue.

Cllr Ibrahim stated that the Committee should receive the relevant advice, including the financial implications but that it was possible to question any advice that was provided. She added that she would like advice on whether the Committee could pass a motion to say that it supported Cllr Ejiofor's motion in principle. The Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that any decision would need to be taken on its merits but that it would be possible for the Committee to provide direction to officers on the

information and proposals that were requested. In response to a question about why the Committee could not make a decision now, the Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that it was uncertain whether any legal, financial, or other matters had changed since the advice that was provided to the Committee in March 2021. It was noted that no prior warning had been provided about the significant amendment to the proposals set out in the report and it was advised that it was prudent for the Committee to wait one week for additional information to be provided.

Cllr Ibrahim accepted that additional information was required but suggested that the Committee could support Cllr Ejiofor's motion in principle whilst being clear that this did not amount to pre-determination on any future decision which would be considered based on the information provided at the time.

Cllr Ibrahim moved that the Committee agreed in principle to support the proposal made by Cllr Ejiofor and seconded by Cllr Amin (which was set out below) and asked officers to provide additional information on 23 November 2021, including financial information and a potential timeline for implementation, which would allow the Committee to make an informed decision on the way forward. It was also noted that any decision would be made based on the information that had been requested.

This Corporate Committee has decided to separate the route forward for moving forward with the building and street names review and has decided to move forward with the process of renaming Black Boy Lane.

The Committee recalls the comments made by the Corporate Committee at their meeting of 17 of March 2021, and notes that the committee has already agreed the following:

- (i) Considered the feedback from the Consultation #2 (Statutory) 'Notice of Intention' on the renaming of Black Boy Lane to La Rose Lane, in particular, the objections from residents and organisations directly affected by the proposed renaming;*
- (ii) Considered and took into account the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqiA, Appendix 6 of the report) of the proposed change on protected groups and the actions proposed to mitigate the impact including a commitment to provide support, a dedicated staff resource and resident/organisation payments; and*
- (iii) "...requested that a further period of consultation should be carried out in order to provide further assurances to residents of Black Boy Lane and elicit their support for the change of street name. The support package offered to the residents be reviewed as part of the further consultation work".*

Following a vote with 7 votes for and 2 abstentions, the motion was agreed. Each Committee member asked for their vote to be recorded.

Votes for: Cllrs Amin, Barnes, Blake, Demir, Ejiofor, Ibrahim, and Tabois.
Abstentions: Cllrs Mitchell and Dogan.

At 10.20pm, the Committee agreed to adjourn the meeting to 23 November 2021. It was noted that this would be confirmed in writing.

12. DECISION MAKING FOR THE ACQUISITION OF ALEXANDRA HOUSE

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

16. DECISION MAKING FOR THE ACQUISITION OF ALEXANDRA HOUSE - EXEMPT

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

17. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

To be considered at the reconvened meeting on 23 November 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Peter Mitchell

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank