

Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee

Meeting held on Tuesday, 4 February 2020 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

- Present:** Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Chair);
Councillor Richard Chatterjee (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Robert Canning, Luke Clancy, Felicity Flynn and Vidhi Mohan
- Also Present:** Councillor Andrew Pelling
Councillor Sean Fitzsimons
Councillor Alison Butler, Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services
Rose Marie Louis, Service Development and Strategic Projects Manager
John Montes, Senior Strategy Officer
Yvonne Murray, Director of Housing
Julia Pitt, Director of Gateway
Lorraine Smout, Head of Responsive Repairs
Caroline Toogood, Head of Strategic Projects and Growth
Felicia Wright, Head of Finance
Saheed Ullah, Head of Capital Delivery for Homes and Schools, Council
Homes, District and Regeneration.
- Apologies:** Councillor Sherwan Chowdhury sent his apologies, Councillor Andrew Pelling was in attendance in his absence.

PART A

1/20 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

2/20 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

3/20 Urgent Business (if any)

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair announced that the running order of business had been changed and the items would be heard in an order different to those published which would be:

1. Cabinet Member Question Time
2. Housing Revenue Account
3. Axis Responsive Contract Review
4. Brick by Brick Business Plan 2020/21

4/20

Cabinet Member Question Time: Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services, Councillor Alison Butler gave a presentation, during which the following points were noted:

- The vision for the service was that everyone deserved a decent home.
- There was ongoing work to further reduce the amount of families residing in temporary accommodation with a review of supply conducted for both the private sector and council temporary accommodation.
- As part of the reduction of use of private sector homes, the further purchase/lease of properties had been conducted in the past year in order to increase the supply of council accommodation.
- Extensive work had been carried out on fire safety, with the installation of sprinklers on all taller council blocks as well as sheltered blocks.
- The department was currently working through the implications of the 'Hackett Review', with proposals to be drawn up after consultation.
- There had been reorganisation across council departments which meant the departments now sat across divisions between Adults and Health as well as Place department.

Following the presentation the Sub-Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions on the content of the report and the information provided during the presentation.

In response to a Member question about whether the purchase of street properties would help to drive down costs associated with Temporary Accommodation (TA) housing, the Cabinet Member advised that the aim of purchasing the 100 properties was to place people who had been in temporary accommodation. The priority for the department was to increase Council owned properties which would drive down TA costs, as well as provide better security and standards for people approaching the Council as homeless.

A Member commented that there was lack of data in the report on other Local Authorities (LA) that utilised Croydon TA which would be useful for the planning of school places and increased use of amenities and health services. The Cabinet Member advised that when families were placed in Croydon, the information was passed on as a duty of care, but this was not always the case

for single homeless placements. The Council was working with London Councils to mitigate the use of cross borough placements and encourage more use of TA by host boroughs.

It was commented that there had been a significant dip in housing expenditure which had subsequently risen again and it was questioned what the movement in the graphs represented. The Cabinet Member said that the momentum in the graphs represented transfers of costs from one part of the service to another, whilst there may have been a reduction in one area of service, there had also been notable demands in others at different stages. In 2019/20 there had been an increased demand for TA properties which had resulted in the Council attempting to purchase more properties in order to offset costs that would have been spent in the private sector. Increased demand for larger homes had also added to costs.

The Impact of Universal Credit (UC) on costs for TA was questioned, as well as the increasing challenges for the department in mitigating adverse experiences for families. Officers said that there had been cost implications experienced from increased demand which was attributed to a raft of welfare reforms and not limited to UC. Preventative work was being done to target families impacted as they were more likely to require statutory services such as homelessness services.

The importance of targeted work was highlighted by officers, with steps being taken through London Councils to obtain access to data including lobbying for access to Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) held data in order to increase continued intervention work and targeting families locally.

In response to a question on the impact of Article 4 on the need for TA and whether there would be increased risk of homelessness as a result, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the Council was making sure that they reviewed and assessed the situation on an ongoing basis. Article 4 would not prevent HMO's but smaller HMO's would have to apply for permission through the planning process, with contingency within planning rules to ensure that specified standards were adhered to. The issues with HMO's were mainly in how they were managed.

The Cabinet Member was asked to define affordable housing to which she responded that 80% of market rate was a government definition and not what Croydon would define as affordable. Through the housing strategy the Council had been working to identify what this meant in Croydon as it was clear that affordable housing should be relative to people's incomes and not market rent. It was envisaged that some properties from the Brick by Brick development, especially those that came through in the first instance and any that sat within the Croydon affordable homes scheme would be priced within 65% of market rate to enable those on benefits to access them without exceeding the local housing allowance.

A further question was raised on the delivery of Brick by Brick homes, specifically how many had been delivered and if the schemes were on target.

The Cabinet Member advised that the projects were on target despite challenges with the economy which had been problematic for private developers. The company was set up in 2016 and had gone through the natural process of setting up, looking for sites and commencing building and had now delivered its first cohort of homes in what was determined to be reasonable timescales.

It was asked what was being done to capture the profile of housing requirements of those in greatest need in light of a situation where the mix of builds on 1/2/3 bedroom properties which were currently in demand. Officers confirmed that a general housing needs dashboard was produced on a regular basis which highlighted current housing needs. One of the work streams identified as part of the Housing Strategy was to work with the Adult and Children's departments on the housing element of their services in order to pull together an overall picture of circumstances. This would better enable predictions and analysis of trends in future housing need, allowing services to better prepare and respond to the changing needs of the borough.

It was asked whether the Council had considered becoming a registered provider in light of Section 106, the Cabinet member informed the Sub-Committee that the Council had and continued to consider this but mainly for supported accommodation and in order to be in a position to secure more appropriate funding for supported accommodation services.

A Member asked what the key risks associated with the Localities model were and if there had been a communications programme to raise awareness. Officers said that the delivery of the service presented the most risk. The first pilot of the scheme was in New Addington and the success of that scheme was the basis of the extension of the model to other parts of the borough. The service had to be mindful to deliver services appropriately by targeting people/families that had been identified through other services as being in greatest or priority need. Additionally input from the local community and voluntary sector was vital to the success of the scheme and both sectors were keen to work with the Council to improve outcomes for local residents.

A Member asked what was being done to improve instances of missed bin collection for Council blocks. The Cabinet Member agreed that that level of missed bin collection for tower blocks had been unsatisfactory and the Head of Tenancy was working extensively with Veolia on immediate improvement measures by reviewing and assessing current practice and processes.

A Member asked what contingency plan was in place in the event that the Council was unable to secure permission from the Secretary of State on the renewal and extension of the Selective Licensing Scheme. The Cabinet Member said that it was hoped that the application would be acceptable and resolved ahead of the expiration of the current scheme. If permission was not granted, the Council would still have responsibility for private rented and could continue with the resources in place, whilst resubmitting an application to the Secretary of State to get the scheme approved.

A Member asked what the Council's response was to the growing list of materials identified as risks and the quality of buildings coming forward. Officers said that extensive work was being carried out and followed up on developments across the borough, with risk assessments carried out on over 50 blocks to date. When conducting risk assessments, the department had to consider the whole construction of the block, not just the list of identified materials that posed a risk but any other contributing factors and hazards.

In response to a further question about the impact of the cost for installing sprinklers in middle housing blocks on the budget would be, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the Council would want to have sprinklers in middle and lower blocks and have campaigned and lobbied alongside other LA's for funding from the government.

At the conclusion of this item the Chair thanked the Cabinet Member and Officers for their attendance at the meeting and their engagement with the Sub-Committee's questions.

In reaching its recommendations, the Sub-Committee came to the following **conclusions**:

1. The Sub-Committee commended the report, particularly the level of detail provided on all the services under the Cabinet Members' portfolio.
2. The Sub-Committee praised the extensive level of evidence gathered on the Council's Landlord Licensing scheme by the Housing Service in developing its submission to the Secretary of State and recognised that there were significant risks should there be a negative outcome of the review.
3. The Sub-Committee endorsed the engagement of the Housing Service with the voluntary sector on the Localities Programme pilots. The support shown from various partners for the Localities Model was also welcomed, with it recognised that there was a strong commitment to successfully work together for the benefit of the most vulnerable residents in the borough.
4. The Sub-Committee warmly welcomed the work by the Housing Service in lobbying the Department of Works and Pensions for access to their data in order to enable the Council to identify vulnerable residents at an early stage and agreed that there was scope for elected Members to add their voices to the lobbying.
5. The department to have sight of the impact to temporary housing stock if there was a sudden increase of street properties purchased under Right to Buy scheme

The Sub-Committee resolved to **recommend** to the Cabinet Member for

Homes and Gateway Services that:-

1. In the event that the Secretary of State refused to extend the Council's Landlord Licencing scheme or decided to reduce the scope of the existing scheme, the Sub-Committee recommends that a contingency plan is prepared for use during the re-submission period to ensure minimal disruption.
2. That the approach used by the Housing Service in engaging with the voluntary and community sector be developed and used as the Localities Programme expands to other areas of the borough.
3. That Cabinet Members lobby the Department of Work and Pensions to provide the Council with access to their data, to support the Council's work with vulnerable residents.

5/20 Axis Responsive Repairs Contract Review

The Head of Responsive Repairs introduced the report and the following was noted:

- The contract with Axis Europe PLC commenced in April 2014 and was current in the sixth year of an initial seven year term.
- As part of the contract review process, performance, costs, resident feedback, service delivery and risks were all being evaluated. Additionally an ongoing joint review of any housing related contracts that were due for extension or re-procurement was taking place.
- Contractor reviews took place on a monthly basis with performance reported on a quarterly basis to the Cabinet Member for Homes & Gateway Services.
- The providers KPI performance was benchmarked against other providers and reviewed on an annual basis.
- Customer satisfaction with the repairs service had improved.
- There had been some increase in complaints over the last two years of the contract, but performance on complaints throughout the contract period had been below the challenging targets.
- Missed appointments had been identified as an area of improvement as part of the review process that was taking place.

The Sub-Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions on the content of the report.

A Member commented that the 10% figure for follow up inspections appeared to be low and questioned whether this was typical in comparison to other local authorities and whether the information gathered was reliably provided a true reflection of the service. The officer confirmed that to conduct inspections on more than 10% of the 65,000 repairs carried out each year was not feasible with the available resources. The focus of follow up inspections was on

chargeable works and larger repairs. 100% of void properties and roofing works were also inspected. It was noted that the 10% of follow up inspections was an increase on previous years.

In response to a comment that the figure of 65,000 repairs per year appeared to be high, it was highlighted that this figure had decreased from approximately 72000 in previous years. The focus for contractors was to ensure that works were completed to high standards as it was costly for them to conduct repeat visits.

In response to questions on how easily it was for residents to report repairs and waiting times for the completion of works, it was advised that residents were able to log repairs online, via email and also by telephoning the contact centre. There was also an app available which allowed for pictures to be uploaded. The average wait for the completion of a repair was 6 days and for complex work it could be up to 6 weeks. Feedback from residents was that it was important that jobs are not closed out until fully completed and this was continuously fed back to the contractor.

A Member commented on the KPI comparison methods used and asked why client by client comparison was used with specific local authorities and housing associations rather than a cross London approach. The officer advised that this method was preferable as they were able to gain access to a range of social housing data following visits with the LA's mentioned who had similar stock to Croydon. They attended quarterly meetings which allowed for conversations and discussions to take place. They were also trying to align with London Councils to provide further opportunities for more in-depth benchmarking to take place.

It was expressed that the detail contained in the report was very encouraging, with fewer complaints regarding the contractor.

Questions were raised on the extent of sub-contracting by Axis and the extent of monitoring conducted to ensure high standards and good performance. Additionally, whether this was to local businesses and if there was a requirement for the sub-contractors to pay the London Living Wage. The officer confirmed that Axis sub-contracted a small percentage of its work to local small businesses which were employed due to the level of expertise needed to complete certain jobs. Sub-contractors were routinely monitored and removed from jobs as needed in accordance to complaints received. Axis did expect and require sub-contractors to pay the London Living Wage.

In response to a Member comment that Appendix 4 of the complaints summary showed a reduction in the number of jobs completed but complaints as a percentage of jobs completed had increased, the officer advised that the number of jobs completed fluctuated seasonally and the end of year report did not reflect this. There had been a slight increase in complaints due to gas jobs, which was unusual and as a result a full review had been conducted which highlighted that the complaints were as a result of repeat jobs. The Council had reviewed the service to ensure that all necessary equipment was now in

stock.

At the conclusion of this item the Chair thanked the officers for their attendance at the meeting and their engagement with the Sub-Committee and questions.

In reaching its recommendations, the Sub-Committee came to the following **conclusions**:

1. The information and data provided in the report was very encouraging, with reassurance taken from the reduction in the number of complaints received from some wards in the borough.
2. The Sub-Committee commended the work of officers in analysing the complaints received to identify trends and their work with partners and the contractor to develop and implement solutions to these trends.
3. The Sub-Committee concluded that the contract management of Axis by officers was good. In particular the benchmarking of contractual performance data with that of other local authorities and the well informed analysis provided from this was welcomed.
4. The Sub-Committee hoped to continue to see the service improvement outlined above, when it next reviewed the Responsive Repairs contract.
5. The Sub-Committee agreed that it would be beneficial to be consulted on the procurement options at the review point of Responsive Repairs contract.

The Sub-Committee resolved to **recommend** to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services that consultation with the Sub-Committee be built into the procurement process when the contract was next reviewed.

6/20 Brick by Brick Business Plan 2020/21

The Chief Executive of Brick by Brick presented their business plan, with a summary of the report given, during which the following was noted:

- A working draft of the paper was presented to the Sub-Committee with a number of figures including market analysis which impacted upon forecasting due to be updated prior to presentation of the report at Cabinet.
- Brick by Brick, had been set up to deliver new homes across variety of tenures with a view to returning a profit from development activity which would be returned to the Council on a 100% basis and used to fund other activities in the borough as needed.

- Achievements in 2019/20 included completion of 90 homes across five different sites, 62 of which were reserved for private sales and would achieve a good return despite the current economic climate. There were also 290 homes across 11 sites envisaged to be completed within the next four to six months.
- There were 33 more proposed sites which would deliver between 600-800 homes depending on planning permission.
- The company focus for the 2020/21 business plan was on sustainability, which was different from previous business plans. The company strived to be a leader of the 'one planet living action plan' by adopting its principles as well as working to complete and be audited on set priorities.

The Sub-Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions on the content of the report.

A Member enquired about the financial relationship between the Council and Brick by Brick as the Council was a sole lender with an agreement on borrowing which was made up of 75% debt and 25% equity. The officer explained that the Council was a sole lender to Brick by Brick which was deliberate as it enabled all monies generated to be spent solely in the borough. Brick by Brick would pay a high rate on its debt, the equity element would go into shared capital.

It was asked what had prevented the completion of the 414 homes for 2020 as proposed in the 2019/2020 business plan. The officer stated that it had been anticipated that more homes would have been delivered as projected but there had been difficulties with some sites not coming forward as quickly as expected, as a result 90 homes had been delivered with 240 further homes set to complete within the next 4 months.

Clarity was sought on how decisions were made to develop one site over another. The officer said that each site went through a decision making process, with detailed site analysis and access taken into consideration.

It was further asked what community based consultation and engagement was undertaken following site identification, prior to development. Officers said that public consultation was undertaken where appropriate, individual dialogue took place with the community including discussions with Councillors and Ward Members. The board had evaluated suggested sites for possible development, highlighting any identifiable issues many years prior to the commencement of work.

There was concern that often, residents only awareness of development of a site was when they received a letter and it was suggested that Brick by Brick should explore other avenues of engagement. Additionally their approach to consultation and engagement needed to be clear, with feedback from residents carefully considered. Officers said they were open to and always

exploring different ways to improve engagement and that public events as well as the use of social media were utilised to inform the public of site development ahead of letters being sent to residents.

It was asked if details on value for money and individual projects costs could be shared or made public. Officers advised the Sub-Committee that this could not be made public due to the commercially sensitive nature of the information. Information related to the costs of every scheme was provided to the Council in its position as a full shareholder. Information could not be shared beyond this remit as it could impact the Council's business of commercial confidentiality,

Whilst the Sub-Committee acknowledged that information related to costs could not be made public due to the confidential and commercially sensitive nature of the request, Members were not convinced that the information could not be provided to the Sub-Committee. The Chair and the Sub-Committee agreed to explore how this information could be made available to Scrutiny.

A Member questioned how independent in its operations Brick by Brick was from the Council and how much oversight the Council had on procurement and contracts. The officer confirmed that the Council was not involved in the operations of Brick by Brick and the procurement of contracts took place in accordance to Brick by Brick's internal processes which was reported in the business plan.

There was concern highlighted at the level of missing information in the report presented for Scrutiny and that this draft could have included information that would have been available at the time the report was produced.

It was suggested that the Council explore the possibility of publishing the overall RAG monitoring report discussed at monitoring meetings. The Cabinet Member agreed to take the suggestion on board for further discussion with officers.

A Member asked what was being done to build more family houses as market analysis indicated there was significant need. Officers said that they were currently looking at the viability of delivering larger units as part of future programmes. It was further questioned if there was a disparity between what was being built and housing requirements, officers said there was not, as they ensured a mix of units within each development.

It was suggested that officers include in future reports information on programme sales as well as information on the profile of costs to ensure value for money as an assurance that a rigorous quality assurance process took place throughout a scheme. It was agreed that the restoration of public confidence in the benefits of Brick by Brick to the borough was vital.

At the conclusion of this item the Chair thanked the officers for their attendance at the meeting and their engagement with the Sub-Committee and questions.

In reaching its recommendations, the Sub-Committee came to the following **conclusions**:

1. The Sub-Committee was disappointed with the level of information provided in the report and agreed that the Chair would work with officers when Brick by Brick was next reviewed in 2021 to refine the report.
2. As Brick by Brick was only set-up in 2016 the Sub-Committee concluded that it was too early to draw any conclusions on its success in terms of the delivery of new affordable housing or whether it had an effective financial model.
3. The tenure blind design approach was welcomed by a Committee for its promotion of community cohesion.
4. Given the significant number of Brick by Brick properties planned to be acquired by the Housing Revenue Account, the Sub-Committee agreed that an item would be added to its work programme in 2020-21 to assess the effectiveness of the Housing Revenue Account's client role.
5. The Sub-Committee recognised that as Brick by Brick was a commercial organisation, with the Council as its sole shareholder, it was reasonable to expect a high level of public interest and agreed that a greater level of communication and transparency was needed to improve the public's understanding of the relationship between the two organisations.
6. The Sub-Committee welcomed the confirmation that Brick by Brick used feedback from previous developments to refine and improve its approach to community engagement, but reflected that some of the issues incurred previously had impacted upon the public perception of Brick by Brick.
7. The Sub-Committee agreed that a review of Brick by Brick and the Council's engagement strategy for the development of sites would be included in its work programme for 2020-21.
8. The Sub-Committee agreed that further explanation was needed on Brick by Brick's financial model, including the cross-subsidisation between schemes within its development portfolio and as such an item on this would be included in its work programme for 2020-21.
9. The Sub-Committee noted that the lending issues faced by some prospective buyers were a result of the Government's housing regulator issuing new guidance on "housing provider" registration. Considering the potential impact upon prospective purchasers, the Sub-Committee welcomed the swift action taken to finalise the registration process and

requested confirmation once this had been fully resolved.

The Sub-Committee resolved to **recommend** to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services that:

1. In the preparation of the report for the next review of Brick by Brick in 2021 that earlier engagement in the report writing process be undertaken with the Chair of the Sub-Committee to refine the report to the Sub-Committee's specifications.
2. Consideration be given to how to improve public understanding of the relationship between the Council and Brick by Brick, and an update provided on the work undertaken in this area when Brick by Brick was next reviewed by the Sub-Committee in 2021.
3. An update be provided for the Sub-Committee by Brick by Brick once the registration issue had been resolved.
4. The Council develop a 'RAG' monitoring approach for its housing developments, including both pipeline and on site projects and publish the report quarterly in order to further enhance transparency on housing delivery.

7/20 Housing Revenue Account

The Head of Finance (Finance, Investment and Risk) introduced the report and the following was noted:

- The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) operated as a single entity managed through various divisions. Primarily, Repairs & Maintenance, Financial Planning & Monitoring as well as Tenancy & Caretaking Services.
- Following a four year rent level reduction that was implemented by Central Government policy, as of 1st April this cap was being lifted and LA's would be able to increase rent levels by CPI plus 1%.
- In 2012, a retention agreement was signed which enabled two thirds of receipt of sales from right to buy schemes to be retained. As a result of the borrowing cap being lifted, the Council had more opportunities to invest in Council homes, which had been included in the Housing Strategy.
- The department operated a 40 year business plan on the budget which was reviewed and updated each year to establish continued financial viability of the ring fenced budget.
- GLA funding was received which was partly utilised on the purchasing of Brick by Brick properties.

- As part of the affordable housing programme, the department explored how to fund additional street property acquisitions. This may be through available right to buy receipts and a proposal would be submitted to Cabinet on options later this year.

The Sub-Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions on the content of the report.

In response to a Member question on whether Council officers offered help to residents in securing mortgages to purchase their properties, officers said that residents were encouraged to seek independent advice on obtaining a mortgage. The extent of the information given was purely on the right to buy process as the loss of Council homes through right to buy was detrimental to social housing stock.

A Member commented on a letter that was sent to the Secretary of State which made allegations on the inappropriate use of the funds received from the GLA. The officer made clear that some of the funding received from the GLA was used to part purchase Brick by Brick properties and the remainder of purchases were through HRA borrowing.

It was further asked what was being done to ensure that value for money was received to ensure that the HRA was not overpaying for properties bought. The officer said that as part of their business plan, the asset acquisition team explore all avenues to ensure that purchases were affordable as well as providing value for money. The price agreed for affordable homes was one set price regardless of the size and mix of the property. The officer also agreed to provide a detailed briefing on the impact on HRA of purchasing Brick by Brick properties.

It was asked whether the Council could have taken any other steps to improve the process of the transition to paying water rates directly to Thames Water for its tenants. Officers said that the decision around the change was made by Thames Water and not the Housing service. The department conducted publicity, sent out letter well in advance of the changes with contact details of officers for further information, ran surgeries in sheltered accommodation blocks and supported tenants as best as possible. It was further commented by a Member that there were issues in communication with vulnerable residents that their rent bill was being reduced as a result of the changes.

A Member asked how the Council prioritised property maintenance against the money placed in reserves for fire safety. Officers said that stock condition surveys were conducted and reviewed regularly as well as repairs data which enable prioritisation. It was highlighted that Council's homes continued to meet the decent homes standards.

At the conclusion of this item the Chair thanked the officers for their attendance at the meeting and their engagement with the Sub - Committee and questions.

Information request by the Sub-Committee

- Impact of HRA on purchasing of Brick by Brick properties.
- Provide financial information to reassure the committee HRA getting VfM for the properties it purchases

In reaching its recommendations, the Sub-Committee came to the following **Conclusions**:

1. The Sub-Committee recognised that Housing Grants provided by the Government to the Mayor of London for purchases was cost effective and provided good value for money for the Housing Revenue Account. As such the continued lobbying of the Government to increase the housing grant by the Administration was both welcomed and supported.
2. The Sub-Committee was concerned about the level of transparency on acquisitions of housing stock funded by the Housing Revenue Account and agreed that improvement was needed in this area.
3. The Sub-Committee acknowledged that the provision of temporary accommodation was a significant challenge for the Housing Service, both in terms of resources and the number of households affected.
4. In light of the impact upon the general Council budget the various initiatives undertaken to reduce the cost of temporary housing provision was welcomed.
5. The Sub-Committee agreed that a review of temporary accommodation would be included on its work programme for 2020-21

The Sub-Committee resolved to **recommend** to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Gateway Services that:

1. That the administration continues to lobby Government to increase housing grants to the Mayor of London.
2. That quarterly reports be published by the Housing Service on transactions relating to the acquisition of housing stock funded by the Housing Revenue Account.

8/20 Work Programme

The Chair confirmed that 17 March 2020 meeting would comprise of two items:

- Cabinet Member Question Time: Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment & Regeneration – Cllrs Scott and King (1 x report & 1 x

- presentation)
• Place Plan

The Sub-Committee **NOTED** the work programme for the remainder of 2019/2020 municipal year.

9/20 Exclusion of the Press and Public

This was not required

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....

This page is intentionally left blank