

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING Overview and Scrutiny Committee HELD ON Thursday, 27th March, 2025, 19:00**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Matt White (Chair), Alexandra Worrell, Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes and Lester Buxton**

## **ALSO ATTENDING:**

### **22. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to Agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda front sheet, in respect of filming at meetings, and Members noted the information therein.

### **23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **24. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Connor declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 5 & 8. Cllr Connor advised that she was a signatory to an open letter published by Acorn in relation to asking the Council to end its use of private sector enforcement agents to collect Council Tax debt.

Cllr Connor advised the Committee that she was approaching the deputation and the report listed at agenda item 8 with an open mind.

### **26. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

The Panel received a deputation from Haringey Acorn in relation to the Council's use of private sector enforcement agents to collect outstanding Council Tax debt. The deputation party were Eleanor Whitlock (lead signatory), Owen Kennedy, Elizabeth Cabeza, Kyra Carty and Reuben Bard-Rosenberg. The key points of their deputation is summarised below:

- The deputation party asked the Committee to scrutinise bailiff use across the borough. Acorn believe that the Council should commit to end use of private bailiffs to collect Council Tax debt and should commit to finding a new approach.

- Acorn started campaigning in 2022 for an end to the use of private sector bailiffs and are now campaigning on the issue nationally. A number of Council's have changed their policies.
- It was suggested that there were three main issues with Haringey's approach:
  1. Using bailiffs was an aggressive and intimidating way to collect Council Tax debt. Citizens Advice Bureau estimated that one-third of people who interacted with bailiffs were subject to behaviour that broke the law. 60% of people reported intimidation or harassment. It was contended that, therefore, use of bailiffs likely increased pressures on other public bodies, such as mental health services.
  2. Using private bailiffs to collect Council Tax debt did not improve people's ability to manage their finances or help Council's maximise their Council Tax income. Bailiffs added charges, compounding residents ability to pay. Policy in Practice found no correlation between bailiff use and Council Tax collection rates across London boroughs.
  3. Private bailiff companies were not incentivised to improve payment rates in the long term. They made money from levying additional charges on residents and always paid themselves first. It was suggested that if bailiffs actually managed to get residents to better manage their debts, they would go out of business. It was claimed that the introduction of the Ethical Debt Policy reduced the use of bailiffs slightly, however it had failed to significantly lower the use of bailiffs in the borough. It was suggested that last year bailiffs received nearly 9000 Council Tax cases in Haringey and that this equated to almost one-in-ten households in the borough.
- It was asserted that the poorest, most deprived and ethnically diverse wards in the borough such as Tottenham Green and Northumberland Park were four times more likely to receive a call from a bailiff than the most affluent wards in the borough.
- Twenty community groups, trade union representatives and local councillors had signed Acorn's open letter to the Council asking it to ban the use of private debt collection agencies.
- Acorn set out that the Council did not seem to have a clear understanding of the problem and the administration did not seem to want to work with Acorn to improve the situation.
- To date, Cabinet Member responses to Acorn's questions included assertions that bailiffs were mainly used to collect debts from landlords and people living outside of the borough. It was commented that tenants, rather than landlords were liable for Council Tax.
- Acorn asserted that Haringey's own data showed that bailiffs were being mostly sent to the poorest wards.
- Acorn was advised that the Council was going to set up a working group on debt collection in 2023, but this didn't seem to have happened.
- Acorn asked the Committee to look into the issue and recommend policy changes to the Cabinet
- The examples of Southwark; who brought debt recovery in-house and; Hammersmith and Fulham, who have ended their use of private sector bailiffs were given. The Committee was encouraged to reach out to other authorities to see what could be done.

The following arose during the discussion of the deputation:

- a. The Committee queried whether Acorn could provide some examples about the impact of bailiff visits. In response, Acorn advised that there were some testimonials provided as part of the submission. Of these, the first was a member who had a bailiff turn up at his door, he did not identify himself, acted in an intimidating manner and refused to leave. The second instance related to a women who was pursued for over a year for £1k of Council Tax debt that she did not owe. This resulted in a flurry of harassment through letters, calls and texts.
- b. The Chair sought clarification about the extent to which the issue was people were unable to pay, rather than an error had been made. In response, Acorn advised that they had a lot of conversations with people on the door step about bailiff use, but not everyone necessarily wanted to put their name to a testimonial. Acorn set out that one of the things they wanted the Committee to do was to go out and talk to residents' about their experiences of being visited by bailiffs. It was suggested that the Council didn't seem to have much information on who the bailiffs working on their behalf were. Acorn commented that as a small voluntary organisation they didn't have the resources that the Council did.
- c. The Panel commented that the report at Agenda Item 8 set out that without use of enforcement agents, the Council would lose £2.5M in lost Council Tax revenue collection. In response, Acorn commented that this assumed that the Council wouldn't be able to collect any of that revenue using a different method. It was commented that Hammersmith & Fulham had some success in sending agents round who were not bailiffs and were able to secure repayment plans.
- d. The Panel queried the assertion that the Council should set-up an in-house debt recovery service, given the cost involved and the precarious financial situation that the Council found itself in. In response, Acorn commented that they were asking the Committee to speak to other Council's to see what was possible based on what happened elsewhere. As a way forward, Acorn suggested some intermediate steps such as; not sending bailiffs to homes that had families with children, introducing flexible payment plans, ensuring that residents were aware of their rights in the letters and correspondence that was sent to them and also have a section of the website with direct links of where residents could make a complaint if bailiffs had acted improperly. Acorn also commented that bailiffs added charges to debts and that money was invariably taken out of the borough.
- e. The Committee sought clarification about when Southwark and Hammersmith & Fulham brought in their revised policies. In response, Acorn advised that they were introduced in around 2017, but some of this had been done in stages.
- f. In response to a question, Acorn advised that an in-house debt recovery service would have more democratic oversight and residents could complain to local ward councillors if they had issues.
- g. The Committee commented that the Ethical Debt policy had been introduced in 2021 and this offered a range of support to residents. The Committee sought Acorn's comments on the extent to which the Ethical Debt policy had made a difference. In response, Acorn advised that they believed that the policy had been most effective in relation to provision of information in one place. It was commented that the policy resulted in fewer people being funnelled towards

- bailiffs at the start of the process. However, once they were in that funnel the amount of people who progressed up each level, to the point of having a bailiff visit, didn't really change.
- h. Acorn also commented that one of the promises made as part of the introduction of the Ethical Debt policy was that there would be special protection for vulnerable residents, effectively a triaging process to stop vulnerable people from getting into debt. When Acorn queried what the Council's definition of a vulnerable resident, they eventually received a copy of the statutory guidance around bailiff use. Acorn suggested that there didn't seem to be much of a working system in place to determine who was vulnerable.
  - i. In response to a request for clarification, Acorn advised that the 9k households figure referred specifically to cases of people being referred to enforcement agents.
  - j. In response to a further request for clarification, Acorn advised that that the assertion that bailiff usage was highest in the most deprived areas of the borough was derived from correlating the number of visits in each ward with the wards that were the most deprived.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services was asked to provide a short verbal response to the deputation. The response is set out below:

- a. The Cabinet Member thanked the deputation party for their deputation and invited them to remain in the meeting for Agenda Item 7, which was a report on Council Tax (CT) collection, support for residents and the use of enforcement agents in collecting CT debt.
- b. The Cabinet Member set out that Haringey was different, in that it had an Ethical Debt Policy. There were a number of steps taken by the Council before cases were referred to enforcement agents, as a last resort.
- c. The Cabinet Member emphasised that it had to be seen in context. Whilst it was appreciated that there were bailiffs that acted improperly, all bailiffs working for Haringey had to wear a body camera. The Cabinet Member advised that all of the complaints that had been received had been investigated and the body camera footage had been viewed. The Cabinet Member advised that on reviewing the footage, none of the cases involved the enforcement agent acting improperly. In reference to one of the specific cases referred to by the deputation party, the Cabinet Member advised that the use of an enforcement agent was appropriate, as the lead tenant had collected the money from the other tenants but had not paid the Council Tax bill and had ignored repeated warning letters.
- d. In terms of the locations of highest incidents of enforcement agents being used, the Cabinet Member advised that everyone knew that the borough was split east to west, with life expectancy varying by 8 years in the most to least affluent wards. The Cabinet Member set out that the same wards that had the highest number of visits by enforcement agents also corresponded to where the Council had given the most Council Tax reduction/exemption. It was stated that the Council was actively working to provide support to its residents in this area.
- e. The Cabinet Member advised that the most important thing was that residents got in touch with the Council if they were struggling to pay their Council Tax, as there were a number of internal Council organisations that could help them.

- f. The Cabinet Member argued that the last thing residents needed was a campaign that suggested the Council was deliberately targeting them and making them afraid to contact the Council and seek help. The Cabinet Member emphasised that the most effective thing that Acorn could do would be to encourage residents to contact the Council if they were having difficulty in paying their Council Tax.
- g. The Cabinet Member reiterated that answers to a number of the questions put forward by the deputation party would be discussed as part of the report at Agenda Item 7.

## **27. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the following meetings were agreed as an accurate record:

- 6<sup>th</sup> January 2025 – Call-in
- 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025 – Call-in
- 20<sup>th</sup> January 2025 – OSC Meeting (Budget)
- 30<sup>th</sup> January 2025 – OSC Meeting (Budget)

## **28. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panels were noted and agreed as a correct record, and any recommendations contained within were approved:

- Climate, Community Safety & Environment Panel – 17th December
- Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel – 17th December
- Children & Young People's Panel – 13th January

## **29. COUNCIL TAX COLLECTION, SUPPORT FOR RESIDENTS & THE ROLE OF ENFORCEMENT AGENTS**

The Committee received a cover report and an accompanying presentation which provided an update on how the Council dealt with Council Tax debt, including the use of Enforcement Agents, and what support the Council offered to alleviate debt. The report and presentation were set out in the additional report pack at pages 1-28. As Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services, Cllr Carlin gave a general introduction to the agenda item. The presentation was introduced by; Kari Manovitch, AD Customer Services; Andrew Mackie, Revenues Manager; and James Straw, Benefits Manager as set out in the additional report pack. Cllr Seema Chandwani, Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality was also present for this agenda item, as part of her portfolio included the Council Tax Reduction Scheme and the Ethical Debt Policy. As part of the Ethical Debt Policy, the Council had a policy position that no one who was known to the Council as; being vulnerable or having mental health concerns, or known as being in receipt of Council Tax reduction benefit would be referred to an enforcement agent. The policy also put in place a number of changes around how the Council engaged with residents to prevent payment defaults and debt, as well as offer support to those who were struggling financially.

The following arose as part of the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Chair sought clarification on slide 9, around the extent to how many of the four pathways led to a person being referred to an enforcement agent. In response, the Committee was advised that those who were in receipt of Council Tax Reduction benefit would never be referred to an enforcement agent. The same applied to those who were known to Adult Social Care as being vulnerable. In the third pathway, for those who were flagged by the Council's Pathway software as being potentially in financial hardship, they would be sent an additional letter offering dedicated help from the Council's Financial support Team and extra time to pay. Officers clarified that if that person did not engage with the Council, then ultimately a decision would have to be made as to whether to refer the case to an enforcement agent or not.
- b. The Chair commented that the deputation had put forward the argument that enforcement agent referrals were concentrated in the most deprived areas. The Chair sought clarification about whether this was reflection of the fact that the Council was failing to reach the people it need to help, or whether it was the case that the Ethical Debt Policy was aimed at helping a minority of the most vulnerable, or whether the Council was saying that Acorn's assertion was incorrect. In response, the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality acknowledged that it was a fair challenge and that the Council needed to keep using data to try and understand why referrals may be higher in a particular area. It was suggested that one possible factor may be do with population density and HMO prevalence in particular wards. The Cabinet Member advised that the starting point for the Ethical Debt Policy was to try and do a bit more to see if the organisation could connect with people and offer support before going down the enforcement route. The Cabinet Member advised that around 25k people in Haringey either didn't pay all together or received a significant discount on their Council Tax. The Council had also invested in a Financial Support Team and income maximisation officers to work with people who may be struggling but were not eligible for CTRS. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that there would still be people who were not supported under the scheme and emphasised the importance of local residents getting in touch with the Council in order that the Council could try to support them.
- c. The Committee questioned whether there was a way to exempt eligible people from going through the 65 day process at the beginning of the process, in order to avoid them receiving letters that they ultimately wouldn't have to pay. In response, officers advised that a liability order was required in order for the Council to pursue its right to recover an outstanding debt. So, removing people earlier in the process could result in people being removed who would be eligible to pay and the Council would have no legal recourse to recover it. Officers advised that they wanted to offer as much support as possible and it was acknowledged that the Council was perhaps not contacting all eligible residents at an early stage. Officers acknowledged that they would look at how the CTRS and vulnerable resident cohorts could be exempted at an early stage in the process in order to reduce the worry and anxiety caused to them.
- d. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that the slide in question related to 1464 referrals in one month, December 2024.

- e. The Committee requested the data for bailiff visits broken down by ward, and any additional information that could be provide such as broken down by the types of case or types of households visited. **(Action: Andrew Mackie).**
- f. The Committee queried what support was on offer to the presumably significant numbers of people who were not eligible for help but were still struggling to pay. The Committee sought clarification about what would happen in this situation on the whole and whether the Council would proceed to prosecution in this circumstance. In response, the Cabinet Member for Residents Services & Tackling Inequality reiterated that because of the checks that had been brought in as part of the Ethical Debt Policy, 25k residents would never receive a visit from an enforcement agent. The Cabinet Member set out that this was an iterative process and that the next step was to look at what our definition of vulnerability should be in this context. The Council was using technology to try and give it some insight into who may need help, but the Cabinet Member acknowledged that the Council needed to be able to improve the amount of data it had on its residents in order to plug the gap, in terms of people that were undoubtedly vulnerable but were not know to us. It was commented that only information on Haringey residents who were known to Haringey Adults Social Services would be held. By way of an example, it was suggested that vulnerable adults placed in Haringey from another authority could conceivably still be referred to an enforcement agent. In relation to those who could not afford to pay, the Committee was advised that the previous government had brought in a piece of legislation that allowed qualified legal advisors to formally request breathing space from debts for the people they were advocating on behalf of. This breathing space was unlimited for those suffering with mental health issues and for six months for those that did not. It was noted that the Council had received a number of these applications and had no choice but to accept them.
- g. The Committee sought assurances around the process for residents to get in touch if an error had been made and the extent to which these channels were properly monitored. In response, officers advised that there was a backlog in Council Tax over January and February, with additional temporary resources brought in to resolve it. Officers advised that cases that had outstanding correspondence wouldn't get issued a summons, because there was something in the software that stopped it. There was also a further check for a liability order, where a case wouldn't go to an enforcement agent if there was outstanding correspondence that the council had not dealt with.
- h. The Committee sought clarification around what the process was when the bailiff was at someone's door and what safeguards were in place for residents. In response, officers advised that the enforcement agent would knock on the door and identify themselves. They were not allowed to force entry at all. Enforcement agents abided by a set of standards set by the Enforcement Conduct Board, as well as the specification laid down by the Council, which included behaviours and when they should return cases to us. They were contracted to go by these standards. Officers set out that the Enforcement Conduct Board would investigate all complaints.
- i. In response, the Committee queried how would a resident know how to complain and whether the organisation advertised this appropriately. In

response officers advised that the process for complaining should be on the paperwork that was handed over to the resident. The Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality acknowledged the point and commented that she was happy to accede to the deputation request that information about how to complain should be put on the website. Cllr Chandwani also agreed to look at the letters that were sent out in order to make sure the process for making a complaint was really clear. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani).**

- j. The Committee also sought assurances around contacting the financial support team, given wider concerns about it being difficult to contact the Council and the length of call waiting times. In response, the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality advised that the financial support team were separate to Council Tax queries and they had separate telephone lines. The Cabinet Member advised that to her knowledge there weren't a lot of complaints about call response times to this line and the calls were generally answered pretty quickly. The Cabinet Member acknowledged concerns about call waiting times for other services in the Council and offered to come back and discuss how to improve these more generally.
- k. The Committee sought an example of a typical case where someone would legitimately receive a visit from an enforcement agent. In response, the Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services referred to one of the examples put forward as part of the deputation. It was explained that in this case there was a shared household with a joint tenancy, the tenants were paying the Council Tax to a nominated lead tenant. That lead tenant failed to pay Council Tax and ignored all of the letters that were sent to them. This resulted in the case being referred to an enforcement agency. The Cabinet Member advised that following an exercise of using Pathway to undertake data checks, 17% of visits by an enforcement agent were found to be households who were in financial difficulty, but that had not been picked up by any of the other previous checks. In contrast, around 40% of households were found to be financially stable.
- l. In reference to a point made by the deputation party, The Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services advised that a landlord was responsible for paying the Council Tax in an HMO where the rooms were let individually.
- m. In response to a question about the case study in the papers, the Committee was advised that the household had a member of the family who was identified as being vulnerable by Adult Social Services and so they were never going to receive an enforcement visit. However, the salient point was around the fact that they had received a number of confusing letters, stating that they had a differing levels of entitlement.
- n. The Committee queried whether support to residents from the Household Support Fund was still available and for how long it would be available. In response, the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality advised that all of the support mechanisms set out in the agenda papers were still available to residents, including the Household Support Fund, and would be for 2025-26. It was noted that the government had recently made an announcement about planning to reform the Household Support Fund, but that no further details had been made available at this stage.



- o. The Committee requested a written response to in relation to further information on why the costs of bringing enforcement of Council Tax debt in-house were prohibitively high. **(Action: Kari Manovitch/Cllr Carlin).**
- p. The Committee agreed to give some further consideration around further scrutiny of this issue, once it had received the further information it had requested in relation to a ward-by-ward breakdown and the financial case for saying that an in-house model was too expensive.
- q. Officers advised that in relation to Hammersmith & Fulham, they did cease use of enforcement agents but that this resulted in a backlog of Council Tax arrears. Hammersmith and Fulham were now using private enforcement agents to collect outstanding Council Tax arrears from non-vulnerable residents. In relation to Southwark, officers advised that they had an in-house team that collected Council Tax arrears. These officers operated to the same standard as private companies. Southwark also used external enforcement agents to complement their in-house service, due to cost pressures on the in-house service.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Committee noted the information contained in the cover report and presentation.

## **30. MARKETS STRATEGY**

The Committee received a report on the Haringey Markets Strategy and Action Plan, along with a copy of the Haringey Markets Strategy attached as an appendix to the report. A set of presentation slides was also presented, these are set out in the tabled papers pack. The report and presentation was introduced by Pippa Gueterbock, Head of Placemaking and Keith Trotter, Interim Lead – Local Economy, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 65-168, and in the tabled papers pack. Also present for this item was Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Committee queried what prompted the Council to develop a market strategy in the first place, and what additional resources would be required to implement the strategy. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that it was driven by a manifesto commitment and the Cabinet Member's enjoyment of walking around a market. The Cabinet Member welcomed the fact that there were different types of markets across Haringey. The Cabinet Member commented that the Latin market at Seven Sisters should be reopening soon. In terms of resources, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that the Council was in a difficult financial position. It was commented that the role of the Council was to act as a curator, and to leverage different business networks together. The Council worked closely with Wood Green BID, and was developing a wider business forum network, which among other things would provide a degree of mentorship.
- b. In relation to concerns around the types of markets and ensuring they appealed to the local area, the Cabinet Member echoed comments made in relation to the success of Holcombe Road market and acknowledged the challenges with

Tottenham Green market. The Cabinet Member suggested it was partially about engagement and understanding what worked in a particular area, as well as the regularity and wider variety of stalls encouraging more traders to the market. Officers added that there was always a balance required between the overall viability of the market and ensuring it offered the right products at the right price point.

- c. The Chair queried whether the option of effectively providing land to external market operators limited the Council's ability to ensure that the right type of markets were happening in the right locations. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was difficult to give a definitive answer, but ultimately the Council did not have the resources or expertise to run markets in-house. It was commented that in order to do this, the Council would have to build up a team over a period of time.
- d. The Committee referred to Alexandra Palace farmer's market as an example of a successful market in the borough that was away from a town centre location and sought the comments from officers about why the strategy was focused on town centre locations. In response, officers commented that the market was very well established and people knew when it was on for example. It would be difficult to replicate the market at Alexandra Palace, not least given its prominent location and history. It was commented that the strategy focused on high footfall areas and town centres, but the team were open to exploring opportunities elsewhere, particularly if there was a good viability case.
- e. The Committee queried what checks were being done around fair pay and working conditions for the markets we interacted with. In response, officers commented that the markets were subject to a licensing process and that the inclusive economy team were part of the Market Strategy, working with business to provide support. Officers commented that fair pay was something they could look at pushing as part of the engagement with businesses. The Cabinet Member commented that a lot of smaller businesses tended to be sole traders and there was also some work to be done around facilitating mentoring by more established businesses.
- f. The Committee welcomed the return of the Latin market at Severn Sisters.
- g. A Committee Member welcomed the fact that Muswell Hill had been nominated as one of the town centres. The Committee asked about opportunities for ward councillor engagement with the Town Centre team going forward, given recent changes within that team. In response, officers advised that the team had recently been through a restructure and those roles were now called Business Engagement Officers, these officers still covered specific geographic areas and lead on market development on the ground. The Committee was advised that the team would be engaging with Ward Councillors and Members were able to contact them as and when they wanted to.
- h. In response to a question about likely contractual arrangements for market operators, officers advised that at Tottenham Green an initial 12 month contract was offered, followed by a three year contract. It was envisaged that something similar would be offered to other markets. Officers provided assurances that operators would have performance targets and that the fact they were taking place on Council land gave the authority a degree of control.
- i. The Chair queried the feasibility of Option D, a new council-operated market, in light of the responses given by officers at the meeting and questioned whether it was possible that there would be a council-operated markets in the future. In

response, officers advised that they did not want to rule it out definitively and the option would be kept under review. The advice from the retail group, who carried out some of the work on the strategy, was that Haringey didn't have access to the larger markets necessary to subsidise the smaller markets. Instead, it was recommended that Haringey should retain its current route of street trading licences, rather than becoming a market borough. It was acknowledged that a council-operated market would be unlikely without significant growth in markets in Haringey. However, this was something that the administration wanted to keep under review.

- j. The Committee agreed to recommend that the decision to operate an in-house market service was kept under review, as the strategy developed and markets expanded, in line with the wider policy position around in-sourcing of services.
- k. The Committee requested that a communication was send round to ward councillors and grouped into town centre areas, that set out what the next steps were for the strategy, along with engagement opportunities for ward councillors and the Business Engagement Officers. In response, the Cabinet Member agreed to write to all Councillors, as well as contacting councillors in groups corresponding to wards with town centre sites, such as Muswell Hill and Crouch End, to provide a point of contact and give summary of the strategy so far, and to attach the slides presented to the Committee. **(Action: Cllr Gordon).**

## **RESOLVED**

- I. That the progress made regarding delivery of the Markets Strategy Action Plan was noted.
- II. That the Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy provide a further update on the Markets Strategy in future, and that a decision to operate an in-house market service in future was kept under review, as the Markets Strategy developed and markets expanded, in line with the wider policy position around in-sourcing of services.

## **31. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

### **RESOLVED**

- I. That the current work programme for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee was noted and any amendments were agreed as appropriate.
- II. That the Committee gave consideration to possible agenda items and reports required for its meetings in 2025/26.
- III. That the Committee approved the draft scope and terms of reference for a Scrutiny Review by the Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel on TA Allocations and PRS Discharge Policies.

## **32. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**33. FUTURE MEETINGS**

8<sup>th</sup> April 2025

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....