

MINUTES OF MEETING Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 12th December, 2022, 6.30 - 9.30 pm

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Dawn Barnes, Mark Blake, Harrison-Mullane, Hymas,
Khaled Moyeed, Matt White (Chair) and Adje**

86. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

87. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

88. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

90. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Panel received a public question from Alex Davies on behalf of the senior leadership and governing body of Chestnuts Primary School, in relation to the St Ann's development:

How will our pupils and their families be protected from the increase in pollution and vehicle traffic caused by the proposed permanent vehicle entrance opposite the school?

The Chair read out the following pre-prepared response to the question:

The planning application reference number HGY/2022/1833 submitted by Hill Residential, Catalyst Housing Limited and Catalyst by Design Limited for the St Ann's

Hospital site was considered by the Council's Planning Sub Committee on Tuesday 29 November 2022.

After considering a detailed [report](#) and hearing from objectors of the scheme including from the School, as well as supporters, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to various conditions and legal obligations being agreed.

The report and discussions addressed concerns from school children about the access opposite Chestnuts Primacy School being used for construction traffic. There are two proposed site access points, and the majority of the works will use an access point to the east of the school and the developers have committed to minimising traffic opposite the school. The level of traffic using this entrance once the development is complete will be low due to the low level of parking on the site and the inclusion of measures to promote the use of sustainable transport.

The Committee's resolution referred to 'heads of terms' of legal agreements including the following to help improve air quality and safety:

- **Highway Works** - Creation of 2 new pedestrian crossings on St Ann's Road (1 signalised crossing and 1 zebra crossing)
- **Traffic Management Measures** - Provide a contribution of £80,000 towards the feasibility, design and consultation relating to the implementation of traffic management measures in the area surrounding the site
- **St Ann's Cycle Lane** - Provide a contribution of £150,000 towards a study of the feasibility and design of a protected cycle track on St Ann's Road.
- **Construction Logistics and Management** - Provide a contribution of £10,000 towards the assessment and monitoring of a detailed construction logistics and management plan (secured by condition).
- **Accident Vision Zero** - Provision of a contribution of £24,000 towards reducing traffic accidents in the vicinity of the application site and supporting 'healthy streets'
- **Residents Liaison Group** - The applicant shall use reasonable endeavours to run, facilitate and organise quarterly meetings with local residents' groups, schools and businesses during the demolition and construction works relating to the whole development.

The Committee's resolution referred to conditions which also include a Demolition Logistics Plan, Demolition Environmental Management Plan, Construction Logistics Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan where approval from the Council will need to be sought in due course. Discharging these conditions will require evidence of engagement with the Liaison Group mentioned above

In relation to a follow-up question, Mr Davies thanked the Chair for the response and requested that the Council ensured that the health and safety of the children at Chestnuts school should be at the forefront of minds in relation to the new development.

The Panel also received a deputation on behalf of Haringey Defend Council Housing. The deputation was introduced by Paul Burnham and Jacob Secker. The key points raised as part of the deputation were noted as:

- The current cost of living crisis was not the time for raising rents on 870 new build homes. This would widen the gap between the rent paid on existing properties and new stock, to an average of £60 per week. This is something that the Council should avoid.
- The Cabinet report did not even offer a detailed financial business case for this increase.
- London Affordable Rent was a discredited rent model that was being withdrawn by the Mayor of London. Shelter had produced a report, which showed that London Affordable Rent was not affordable to lower income working families as it cost more than 30% of their income. This was made worse when considering the additional cost of service charges.
- Concerns were noted that LBH was making a strategic decision towards higher rents. The information contained in the budget report to Cabinet showed that there was a 13.8% increase in rental income next year, rising to a 52% increase over current levels by 2027. It was suggested that this was way above what was permitted by the government.
- The MTFS Cabinet report suggested that, as rent and service charges were fixed, there was no need to consult residents on the rent increase. It was commented that this was untrue and that residents should be consulted upon £98m of rent income and £12m in service charges.
- The detailed management reports which previously went to the HfH Management Board and were publicly available were no longer available on the internet. Haringey Defend Council Housing would like to see a housing management committee of the Council formed and all of the equivalent papers published as part of this committee.
- It was suggested that the Council should stand up to the government and lobby them for the investment that local people need.
- The deputation party highlighted the open letter from the Deputy Leader of Islington Council to the government calling for a rent freeze.

The following arose as part of the discussion of the deputation:

- a. The Panel sought clarification over the assertion that the London Affordable Rent (LAR) model had been discredited. In response, the deputation party advised that the Mayor's office has initially suggested that this would be no different to social rents under the model, but that this had quickly proved to be untrue and that the average gap was around £60 per week. It was suggested that the Mayor's office were moving towards all social housing being at social rents and that the average amount of development grant would be 50% higher going forwards.
- b. The Panel sought clarification around the extent to which tenants had been consulted upon the budget proposals previously. In response, the deputation party advised that tenants used to receive an annual consultation and that every tenant in the borough was written to. Any increases in rent and services charges were published as part of the December budget papers to Cabinet.

- The failure to do this seemed to be at odds with the Council's stated goal to be open and transparent.
- c. The Panel also sought clarification about the information that was no longer available on the website. In response, it was commented that HfH used to publish a huge amount of information which was no longer available. Particular attention was drawn to the backlog of fire safety actions that were no longer visible. It was suggested that no effective method had been put in place to replace this level of transparency. The deputation party would like to see a housing committee of the Council to oversee the management of what was HfH.
 - d. The Panel asked the deputation party if they had any further comments on the housing committee and its suggested role. In response, Defend Council Housing suggested that there was a degree of oversight when the ALMO was in place. The Council should have a formal committee in place with published agendas and minutes, so that tenants could play a part in how the housing function was managed and they could put forward issues to that committee. It was suggested that at present, there was a basic lack of democratic accountability for council tenants and leaseholders.
 - e. In relation to a query about whether there were any other specific authorities that had a good model for this, the Panel was advised that Swindon and Cambridge both had an effective housing committee in the past. It was essential that this housing committee was able to be critical of the Council.
 - f. Members acknowledged the need for the voice of tenants to be part of any housing committee and it was suggested that a representation of a tenant's body could perhaps be co-opted on to this panel.
 - g. The Panel sought clarification as to whether the deputation party had spoken to the Cabinet Member about London Affordable Rent being withdrawn by the Mayor. In response, Mr Burnham advised that he had not spoken to the Cabinet Member but that they would be aware of this. Mr Burnham advised that he would be happy to speak to the Cabinet Member.

In response to the deputation, Cllr Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning set out:

- a. That the governance arrangements around the housing service were in transition, following having been brought back in-house. The future governance models were being put in place and that these would require future Cabinet decisions.
- b. There was a customer call group of residents that fed into the housing service, along with a housing resident advisory panel. The Cabinet Member also set out that she was also setting up an improvement board, that would have residents on it. The Cabinet Member suggested that this board could feed into the Panel going forwards.
- c. The Cabinet Member gave assurances that, as a housing service, it was important to everyone involved that all information was freely available to residents for scrutiny and that further governance models were being put in place to support this.

The Chair thanked the deputation party and advised them that he would provide a written response, setting out what action the Panel would take in response to the deputation. **(Action: Chair).**

91. MINUTES

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning advised that she would bring the housing repairs improvement plan to the February meeting of the Panel as an agenda item. **(Action: Cllr Carlin/David Joyce).**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of 1st November were agreed as a correct record.

92. HOUSING REPAIRS PERFORMANCE

The Panel received a report which provided an update on repairs performance in the housing service, following its transfer from the ALMO to the Council. The Report was introduced by Cllr Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning as set out in the agenda pack at pages 9 to 16. Judith Page, Assistant Director for Property Services was also present for this agenda item. The following arose as part of the discussion on this report:

- a. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that a significant level of improvement was still needed in the housing repairs service to reach the standards that the Council and residents expected. At the point of transfer to the Council in June 2022, the service had experienced significant instability both internally and externally for the previous two and a half years. The key issue was that a lot of the housing stock was old and in need of major works.
- b. In response to a request for clarification, officers acknowledged a typographical error on page one of the report and that the chart should state that restricted repairs came to an end in June 2021, rather than repairs.
- c. In response to a query about what was meant by a limited digital offer, the Panel was advised that repairs emails went into a centralised mailbox to customers services and that these had to be allocated from there.
- d. In response to a question around KPIs and the percentage of appointments made and kept, the Cabinet Member advised that that this could be impacted by differing levels of priority. It was noted that the service was looking to publish reporting standards so that people would know how long they could expect to wait for a repair.
- e. In response to a question about the timeframe for improving repairs, the Cabinet Member advised that that this would be set out as part of the improvement plan coming to the next Panel meeting. February would fit with in with the wider project planning for this as well as the recruitment of the AD for Housing Services and an AD of Housing Management in January.
- f. Members advised that the stated 2.5% of repair jobs which resulted in a complaint, did not seem to reflect the level of complaints they were seeing in their casework. In response, the Cabinet Member commented that she would like to see this figure down to under 0.5% of complaints being escalated. Officers advised that they were bringing in a complex case team to deal with cases that had more than four repair jobs scheduled. It was envisaged that

- adopting a casework management approach would help to bring down instances of complaints being escalated. Officers advised that part of the approach being adopted was to look at the wider culture of how the Council dealt with complaints.
- g. Members commented that in terms of their own experiences, even if it was just a perception, it seemed as though things only got done once a councillor had become involved. In response, the Cabinet Member commented that ultimately the problem was around not identifying service failures quickly enough.
 - h. A Panel Member commented that they would like to see a system whereby feedback was provided to the ward councillor, so they could keep track of cases where they had escalated a complaint. Rather than the ward member only knowing that something had not been done when they were chased by the original complainant. The Cabinet Member acknowledged this point and reiterated that the key problem that needed to be resolved was identifying the initial service failing.

RESOLVED

Noted

93. SCRUTINY OF THE 2023/24 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2023/24 - 2027/28)

The Panel received a covering report with a number of appendices, that set out the Council's draft budget and 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2023/2028 proposals relating to the Panel's remit. The report was introduced by John O'Keefe, Head of Finance (Capital, Place & Economy) as set out in the agenda pack at pages 17 to 92. Cllr Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning was present, along with Cllr Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development. A number of officers from the Housing and Placemaking Directorate were also present.

By way of introduction, the Panel was advised that the report contained a summary of the draft budget proposals that were submitted to Cabinet the previous week. The proposals related to the revenue and capital General Fund budget as well as the HRA revenue and capital budgets, and the HRA business plan. The report noted that at present there was a £3.1m budget gap and that this was after circa £5m of additional one off funding (reserves) had been utilised. An updated report would be presented to Cabinet in February, which would reflect the updated financial position, having taken in to account the latest government funding settlement and other sources of income, such as grants. The Panel noted that the Council continued to maintain a wide ranging capital programme, however rising interest rates had affected the ability of the Council to self-finance some of these schemes.

The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about the barriers to moving on from Temporary Accommodation (TA). The Panel also enquired whether this related to people who had been in Temporary Accommodation so long that the Council could not discharge its housing duty to them by placing them in the private rented sector. In response, the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning advised that there was around 500 families who had been in TA for a

very long time, some as long as 20 years. Many of these families were settled and had little desire to move elsewhere. The problem was that there was a cost to the Council in making up the 10% difference between the London Housing Allowance Rate and the rate for the Temporary Accommodation, and that this put additional pressure on an already very stretched budget. Saving AHC_SAV_009 related to a piece of work that was being done to work with some of these families to find permanent accommodation that they would be willing to move into. This would save the Council money as the rates for permanent Council owned accommodation were cheaper. The Cabinet Member assured Panel members that this was not about discharging families into the private sector and that for many of the families in question they would not be allowed to do so due to the fact that they had been there before the regulation change came into effect.

- b. Members asked whether, in making them a direct offer, the families in question would be jumping up the priority list. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that these families were already very high up on the allocations list, due to the length of time they had spent in Temporary Accommodation, the issue was that they were not bidding on permanent accommodation.
- c. In response to a question around what happened when offers were refused, the Cabinet Member advised that the administration needed to develop a proper policy that set out how many offers a person or family was allowed to decline. Ultimately, the Council needed to reduce the temporary accommodation bill as it ran into millions of pounds, which came out of the housing budget. The Director of Placemaking and Housing added that the situation was not helped by the government's repeated failure to offer local government a longer term grant settlement, rather than the yearly grant that it had received for several years. This made medium term financial planning very difficult.
- d. In relation to the £80k saving identified, the Panel sought clarification as to how this figure was arrived at, given it seemed quite ambitious. In response, the Cabinet Member emphasised that this was not a lot of money in the context of the circa £10m the authority spent on Temporary Accommodation each year. The Cabinet Member highlighted serious concerns with the fact the government was expected to reduce the amount of homelessness discretionary grant that the authority received and the impact this would have on the housing budget. Finance officers advised that the saving was based on a modest assumption of 180 families being relocated a year, multiplied by the average per household spend on TA.
- e. The Panel requested a written breakdown of the £10m spend on Temporary Accommodation and how many families were expected to be moved on as part of the £80k saving. **(Action: Kaycee/David Joyce).**
- f. The Panel sought assurances about how robust the financial assumptions made about P&H_SAV_001 were, and in particular, whether the £100k increase in planning fee income was achievable. In response, officers advised that Covid had seen a significant increase in applications given that a lot of people were home-based. This demand had not tailed off as yet. The projection was based on an expected national increase in fees by the government and based on current application levels.
- g. In relation to additional income from the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) and a question about proactive work in this area, officers advised that they worked proactively with fraud colleagues on this to see where additional income could

- be raised. The Planning Enforcement team had recently been active during a recent Week of Action in Wood Green. The Cabinet Member assured the Panel that she was looking to adopt a robust approach to Planning Enforcement.
- h. In relation to A&H_SAV_007, the Panel sought assurances around proposals to use more one bed social housing properties for temporary accommodation and how the Council would prevent overcrowding given the propensity for families to grow over time. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that the authority was re-designing its allocations policy to allow it to map individual need and to fine tune the process of prioritising households who needed to move. It was commented that officers were look at undertaking loft extensions and extensions to the rear of properties to increase the size of the housing stock. The Cabinet Member also identified that the Council was looking at an offer to provide accommodation to adult children living with their family in Council accommodation, as well as building more family sized Council homes. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that Haringey has historically had an oversupply of one-bed properties and that there were also problems with overcrowding and associated damp problems as a result.
 - i. The Panel raised concerns about placing a family with a young child or children in a one bed property as those children would grow up and it would inevitably be overcrowded. The Cabinet Member advised that the properties being referred to were proper one bedroom units, rather than bed-sits. The Cabinet Member also set out that the Council had a legal duty to provide suitable accommodation and not place people in an overcrowded home, there was also recent case-law to back this up. The reality, it was suggested, was that the Council could not place people in overcrowded accommodation, however it was difficult due to the critical shortage of housing in the borough. The Council needed to secure as much property that it controlled as possible to ensure that people were being housed within the borough. The shortage of housing was exacerbated by a shortage of private rented sector accommodation. The Cabinet Member relayed an example of a family being place in emergency accommodation in a hotel in Ilford due to the shortage of available housing stock in the borough.
 - j. Panel Members sought clarification about the circumstances that families would be placed in hotels and whether this was only on an emergency basis and pre-assessment. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that this related to emergency accommodation. However, due to the shortage of housing stock even the in-borough emergency accommodation was full, and some people were being placed out of borough. It was noted that this was a London-wide issue. It was stated that using one bed housing stock for temporary accommodation would free up emergency accommodation the borough and that all elements of the housing portfolio were linked. In that sense it was not possible to compartmentalise pressures on emergency accommodation from other aspects of the Council's portfolio of housing.
 - k. The Panel reiterated its point about the fact that, given people were staying in Temporary Accommodation for a long time, families with young children would inevitably grow and that ideally there should be a dedicated bedroom for the child, with the obvious caveat that it depended on the age of the child. The Panel put forward a recommendation that that the suitability of accommodation used for Temporary Accommodation should be reviewed annually on family by family basis. In response the Cabinet Member advised that placing families in

Council housing stock with one bedroom, was no different to what would happen when placing people in TA into say the private sector. The Cabinet Member agreed to ask homelessness officers to feedback on whether a review of TA suitability was done annually and that if it wasn't then this should be the case. **(Action: Cllr Carlin/Gill Taylor).**

- l. The Panel also sought clarity about whether the proposal related to one child or two babies or even two children. In response, the Cabinet Member clarified that it was not limited to one child families and that it was intended for small households with small children and that it would only be offered if it was considered suitable and it did not meet the statutory definition of overcrowding. The Panel requested a written clarification on the maximum number of adults and the maximum number of children, and the ages of the children, that would be placed in a one bedroom property. **(Action: Cllr Carlin/Gill Taylor).**
- m. The Panel agreed to a recommendation around conducting an annual review on the suitability of all temporary accommodation for the families that live there. The Panel also agreed to make a recommendation to Cabinet that the suitability of placing families in one bedroom temporary accommodation should be limited to one child. **(Action: Philip).**
- n. The Panel sought clarification in relation to saving AHC_SAV_008 and a seeming discrepancy in the figures of the 103 people in TA who required one-bedroom properties, the breakdown of the figures only added up to 100. Written clarification requested from officers. **(Action: Finance/Adults).**
- o. In relation to new capital proposals the Chair noted a discrepancy in the figures for the schemes at Wards Corner, Gourlay Triangle, and Selby Urban Village in Appendix 2 compared to Appendix 5 of the pack. In response, officers advised that this was a profiling issue, as items in the capital programme were presented over a five year period and the higher figures represented anticipated spend in 2028/2029 and beyond.
- p. The Panel sought clarification about school streets and whether this would be impacted by PCN income. In response, officers advised that PCN income came into the Environment & Neighbourhoods revenue budget and was entirely separate from the School Streets capital budget.
- q. In response to a query around Wards Corner, Gourlay Triangle, and Selby Urban Village, officers advised that these schemes contained a number of different developments within the revenue budget and that any houses built on these sites would subsequently be transferred to the HRA, subject to the relevant business case for that scheme.
- r. The Panel sought clarification about some of the points raised during the deputation in relation to London Affordable Rent (LAR) being withdrawn as a model. In response, the Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development advised that LAR was only available until March and so it could only be used for houses in the 2016-2023 Programme. Once it was withdrawn the Council would use formula rents or whatever future model might be brought in to replace LAR.
- s. In response to a question about why the Council was using LAR if there was a lower grant level attached to it, the Panel was advised that the homes in questions were always in the initial programme and the Council needed to get the spend for those homes out of the door or the funding would have to be returned to the GLA. It was also crucial to ensure that the GLA continued to invest in future programmes. The Cabinet Member advised that the grant

funding for the 2016-2023 programme was £120.2m and £127.5m for the 2021-2026 round of funding. This grant funding was essential to the viability of these schemes.

- t. The Chair queried whether in order to receive this funding, the various schemes needed to start on site by March. The Cabinet Member confirmed that this was the case and there were different categorisations of what starting on site meant, including having received Planning Permission.
- u. Officers agreed to provide a written response to whether any of the 840 homes in question had not yet received Planning Permission. **(Action: David Joyce).**
- v. The Panel questioned why the rent levels for a bedsit and a one bedroom flat were the same, as suggested in the report. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that the Council was not building any bedsits as part of its housebuilding programme, and this was just how the rent rates were broken down in the report. Officers advised that there may be some historical bedsit properties in the borough, but not many.
- w. The Panel sought assurances about a proposed reduction in funding available for the bad debt for tenants provision, and how sustainable that was given the cost of living crisis. In response the Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development advised that the London Affordable Rent rates were below the London Housing Allowance rates, so anyone on benefits would be fine. It was estimated that there might be a very small number of tenants who may be subject to the benefit cap and this provision could be utilised to support them. The Cabinet Member for Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning emphasised that the LAR rate was lower than the LHA rate, which itself was sitting at one third of market rates.
- x. The Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development set out that, given the interest rate spike and the increased construction costs, the Council has looked at all other means of delivering its housing programme and could, for example, increase the number of properties for private sale. The Cabinet Member advised that using London Affordable Rent was seen as the best option as it offered secure tenancies at council rents and those homes were going to people on the housing register.
- y. The Panel sought clarification about the extent to which the administration was planning on undertaking consultation with tenants, given the Council was committed to co-production. In response, the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning set out that the 7% rent increase would be part of the statutory consultation that was carried out as part of the wider budget. The Housing service would be looking at ways to add in additional ways to engage with residents going forwards.
- z. The Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development set out that LAR was a council rent by any meaningful definition, as it involved building homes with a secure council tenancy for those on the housing register. Most other boroughs did not differentiate between different forms of council rents. LAR was considered a council rent in planning policy terms and it was also included in the definition of a council rent within the London Plan. Both LAR and formula rents were considered to be low rent housing products.
- aa. In response to the assertion by the deputation party that the decision to remove LAR was done on the grounds of affordability, officers commented that they did not believe this to be the case as they were both considered to be low

- cost affordable rent products in the London Plan. The LAR was being withdrawn as part of the negotiations between the GLA and government about the new iteration of its Affordable Homes Programme and the rent model calculations therein.
- bb. The Panel suggested that there need to be clarity about what the administration had taken this change of approach, given the manifesto commitment. In response, the Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Development advised that in an ideal scenario her political preference would have been to continue using formula rents. However, in light of the economic crisis and the increase in costs of construction, the Council had no other option. Charging London Affordable Rent was seen as the least bad option in the circumstances.
 - cc. The Chair advised that he would like to make a recommendation around the Council being clear when it talked about rent levels about exactly what it was referring to. The term formula rent should be used when formula rents were meant and similarly London Affordable Rent should be used when that was meant. The Council should also be clear that if a proposal was slightly more vague on what model should be used, then it should be clear about this. Rather than using terms like social rents or council rents seemingly interchangeably. **(Action: Philip)**
 - dd. The Chair also suggested that the gap in affordability to the cap from LAR to formula rent seemed to be slightly larger than was presented in the report. The Chair requested some more clarity and reassurance of the relative affordability of LAR against formula rent, based on the actual formula rather than their relative proximity to the cap. **(Action: David Joyce)**.
 - ee. The Chair also commented that there seemed to be an implication that everyone in social housing was in receipt of benefits. The Chair requested clarity on the number of people in Council and Temporary accommodation who were working and not in receipt of benefits. **(Action: David Joyce)**.
 - ff. The Panel sought assurances about the borrowing costs involved in the capital programme and how sustainable these were. In response, officers advised that these were higher than they would like them to be and that by February the Council would have finalised the MTFs and should have a HRA business plan that was balanced and generated enough revenue to pay off the debts in the HRA.
 - gg. In relation to heating service charges, the Cabinet Member advised that there were no plans increase energy costs through service charges in the budget. The four week consultation period was a statutory notice period used for all sorts of changes to housing management and was considered appropriate in that context.
 - hh. The Panel commented that the above comments and recommendations notwithstanding, they were generally happy with the budget proposals as set out.

RESOLVED

That the Panel considered and provided recommendations to Overview & Scrutiny Committee, on the Council's 2023/24 Draft Budget and 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/2028 proposals relating to the Panel's remit.

94. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

The work programme was noted.

95. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

96. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

27 February 2023

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair

Date