


Chair:	Councillor Soraya Adejare
Councillors in Attendance:	Cllr Clare Joseph (Vice-Chair), Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren, Cllr Zoe Garbett, and Cllr Yvonne Maxwell
Councillors in Virtual Attendance:	Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone and Cllr Caroline Selman
Apologies:	Cllr Sam Pallis and Cllr Ali Sadek
Officers In Attendance:	Helena Stephenson (Assistant Director Tenancy Services), Wayne Hylton (Head of Anti-Social Behaviour & Estate Safety), Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Director Environment and Climate Change), Gerry McCarthy (Assistant Director Community Safety, Enforcement & Business Regulations), Maurice Mason (Community Safety Manager), Steven Davison (Enforcement Manager) and Jacqueline Fearon (Operations Director Tenancy and Home Ownership)
Other People in Attendance:	Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas (Community Safety and Regulatory Services) and Detective Chief Superintendent James Conway (Borough Commander, Met Police Central East Borough Command Unit)
Other People in Virtual Attendance:	Steve Waddington (Strategic Director Housing Services), Steve Webster (Resident Liaison Group Co-Chair) and Zahra Shoorvazi (Resident Liaison Group Co-Chair)
Officer Contact:	Craig Player  020 8356 4316  craig.player@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Soraya Adejare in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 The Chair updated those in attendance on the meeting etiquette and that the meeting was being recorded and livestreamed.

1.2 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Pallis and Cllr Sadek.

1.3 Cllr Selma, Cllr Rathbone and Cllr Oszen were in online attendance.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

2.2 There were no urgent items, and the order of business was as set out in the agenda.

3 Declaration of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4 Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Managed Estates & Blocks

4.1 The Chair opened the item by explaining that the Commission was keen to hear about how the Council works with partner agencies and communities to ensure multi-agency responses and support in order to prevent, reduce and if necessary enforce against anti-social behaviour on council managed estates and blocks.

4.2 The Commission saw this discussion as timely given the recent refresh of the Community Safety Partnership Plan, and the Government's recently published Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan which promised new measures to support relevant agencies.

4.3 Anti-social behaviour on council managed estates and blocks was also identified as a concern for residents in the Overview & Scrutiny annual work programme consultation 2023/24.

4.4 As part of the scrutiny process, the Resident Liaison Group carried out a survey to understand the experiences of residents living in council-managed homes in reporting, being kept-up to-date on and resolving anti-social behaviour issues.

4.5 Representing London Borough of Hackney

- Councillor Susan Fajana-Thomas, Community Safety and Regulatory Services
- Steve Waddington, Strategic Director Housing Services
- Helena Stephenson, Assistant Director Tenancy Services
- Jacqueline Fearon, Operations Director Tenancy and Home Ownership
- Wayne Hylton, Head of Anti-Social Behaviour & Estate Safety
- Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney, Director Environment and Climate Change,
- Gerry McCarthy, Assistant Director Community Safety, Enforcement & Business Regulations
- Maurice Mason, Community Safety Manager
- Steven Davison, Enforcement Manager

4.6 External Guests

- Detective Chief Superintendent James Conway, Borough Commander, Met Police Central East Borough Command Unit
- Steve Webster and Zahra Shoorvazi, Resident Liaison Group Co-Chairs

4.7 The Chair then invited the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services and Council officers to give a verbal presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

4.8 Anti-social behaviour (ASB) plays a major part in whether residents felt happy and safe in their homes, as well as how satisfied they were with the Council as a landlord. This could be true whether the issues were serious, high level crimes or related to issues such as noise, fly-tipping and other nuisance behaviours.

4.9 Housing Services was committed to working with reporters and alleged perpetrators in a holistic way, working towards prevention and behaviour change wherever possible. This was in recognition of the social determinants of ASB, and that many reporters and alleged perpetrators of ASB were vulnerable.

4.10 This involved working in partnership with other teams and partner agencies to tackle the root causes of ASB while providing clear boundaries and expectations around behaviour as required. This included diversionary programmes and community activities, CCTV, property adjustments, mediation and referrals for support.

4.11 This also provided a firm basis for robust enforcement action where efforts to change behaviour did not work, recognising that enforcement was a key tool in a victim-centred approach. This included warning letters, additional patrols and enforcement powers such as Community Protection Warnings, civil injunctions, full or partial closure orders or criminal charges.

4.12 All new tenants were required to sign a Tenancy Agreement which set out the behaviours expected of all tenants. New tenancies would be introductory tenancies unless the person had previously held a secure/assured tenancy for 12 months prior to signing up.

4.13 The tenancy would become a 'secure' tenancy if the resident did not break any of the tenancy conditions during the introductory period of 12 months. The tenancy may be 'demoted' (giving the resident fewer rights) if the Council had to take them to court because of ASB.

4.14 The approach to resolving ASB in Housing Services included the ASB Team, Resident Sustainment Team, Housing Management Team and TMOs. The wider partnership also included the Police, Community Safety & Enforcement, Gangs Team, legal services, TRAs, social care and health, employment support and other landlords in the locality.

4.15 There were a number of pressures, drivers and opportunities within the social housing sector which impacted on Housing Services' approach to ASB. This included the introduction of new Social Housing Regulation, where ASB and promoting good neighbourhood relations featured heavily.

4.16 One of four of the new Consumer Standards focused on neighbourhoods and communities, outlining requirements on working cooperatively to contribute to the upkeep and safety of shared spaces, cooperating with partners to promote social, environmental and economic wellbeing, working with the Police and other relevant organisations to deter and tackle ASB, and working with other agencies tackling domestic abuse and tenants to access support and advice.

4.17 Working alongside this regulation was the Housing Ombudsman, which looked at complaints about social housing providers and evaluated housing policies and practice. It produced Spotlight reports on key issues with recommendations for improvement, with recent reports focusing on noise complaints and knowledge and information management.

4.18 To prepare for Social Housing Regulation inspection and ensure compliance with Housing Ombudsman directions and guidance, Housing Services had initiated a deep dive service review to consider how the ASB and Estate Safety Team could be modernised and improved.

4.19 The local Community Safety Partnership approach was driven by the Community Safety Strategic Assessment, which informed the priorities of the Community Safety Plan 2023/26 (of which ASB was identified as a key priority). At a local level, strategic and tactical ASB information and analysis was utilised, including community complaints and feedback.

4.20 It was also influenced by the new national ASB Action Plan which gave agencies and landlords additional powers to be able to deal with ASB, although work would need to be undertaken at a local level to understand how these additional powers could best be utilised to reflect local circumstances.

4.21 In terms of delivery, partnership monthly tasking meetings, attended by key internal stakeholders, were used to allocate resources to community and ASB problems. The style of partnership interventions used here ranged across prevention, diversion and enforcement activities.

4.22 Partnership weekly tasking meetings were used to focus on estate based ASB and were attended by the Metropolitan Police, Housing Services, Turning Point, Operation ADDER and Support When It Matters outreach teams. An audit trail was retained of all interventions undertaken by the partnership including hours patrolled and other ASB related interventions.

4.23 ASB Action Panels were also utilised, which allowed stakeholders to focus on the granular details of a particular problem. This may involve sharing data and analysis between relevant agencies to understand an issue in more detail which may inform subsequent actions.

4.24 Residents were able to report ASB issues via email, telephone, online through the "Report a Problem" website or through the noise works process which covered the out of office noise process together with gaps in service provision.

4.25 Between January 2022 and December 2023 there were 11,093 noise calls linked to Council-managed estates, which equated to almost a third (31.3%) of all noise calls. There were 2,213 victimised households on estates. The percentage of repeat victims on estates was 80%, so the majority were repeat callers.

4.26 The ASB Case Review was available to support victims of ASB (formerly known as the Community Trigger). The ASB Case Review was published on the community safety website. Last year, there were 34 reports of which just four met the threshold for intervention.

4.27 In recognition of the difficulty some residents faced in reporting and being kept-up-to-date on ASB issues, the Community Safety team would shortly be implementing an integrated ASB reporting and case management system. This would provide for anonymous reporting and risk management of ASB cases, a single point of contact for victims and better management information.

4.28 In terms of how community engagement was undertaken to identify community concern and support residents to understand what constitutes ASB and the range of options available to them, stakeholders attended ward panels, undertook community surveys and made use of social media.

4.29 Enforcement powers were utilised where necessary, including Fixed Penalty Notices, ASB Warning, Community Protection Notices and Warnings and Closure Orders. The case study "E5" was referenced to highlight how the full extent of these powers might be used to address a complex ASB issue.

4.30 In May 2023, the Police executed a drugs search warrant and on entry found Class A drugs with an estimated street value consistent with drug supply. The tenant and another two individuals were arrested for possession with intent to supply a class A drug.

4.31 Residents reported to the Council that they felt intimidated by the tenant and the number of unknown people frequenting the building at all times of day and night. The tenant was threatening and violent toward them, visitors were frequently found taking drugs inside the building and urinating or loitering outside, and the tenant played loud music, hosted loud parties, and disturbed the peace constantly. Women were also often heard screaming in pain from the tenant's property.

4.32 The tenant was therefore invited to an interview with an ASB Officer in June 2023. Allegations of ASB, disorderly behaviour, drug dealing, and drug-related activities were presented to him, which were denied.

4.33 A referral was made to the Resident Sustainment Team, which informed the tenant his tenancy was at risk and a Notice Of Seeking Possession would be issued. As the activities did not stop, the Community Safety & Enforcement Team applied for a Closure Order under as the most effective way to provide respite to the residents by temporarily closing the address.

4.34 Anonymised impact statements from residents were compiled by the ASB Officer, and the Police also provided statements on their visits and the illegal activities associated with the address. A legal file was compiled reflecting this information.

4.35 In August 2023, the Closure Order was granted for three months. The property was secured and Sitex security screens were installed the following day with the three key stakeholders present on site (ASB Housing, Police and Enforcement).

4.36 The case was monitored and in October 2023, the Principal Enforcement Officer, in conjunction with colleagues in Housing Services and the Police, agreed to apply for an extension application of the order for the maximum period of a further three months.

4.37 In November 2023, the extension was granted for a maximum period of three months. The ASB officer had served him a Notice Seeking Possession on Absolute

Grounds, to terminate the tenancy. The Closure Order would be monitored in the ASB Action Panel.

4.38 The Chair then invited the Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police Central East Borough Command Unit (CE BCU) to give a verbal presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

4.39 The partnership approach was important in addressing ASB issues locally, allowing the Metropolitan Police to understand ASB more holistically before taking action where necessary. What begins as an initial report of ASB may lead to further investigations of criminality such as drug dealing and organised crime, and similarly what begins as a report of criminality may not result in criminal charges but more preventative action or support measures by Housing Services.

4.40 The CE BCU received 7,350 999 or 111 calls between October 2022 and December 2023 relating to ASB in Hackney. This placed Hackney 12th out of all 32 boroughs, slightly above Waltham Forest, similar to Haringey and notably below neighbouring Tower Hamlets.

4.41 In terms of how things had changed over time, there had been 19.2% fewer ASB calls between October 2022 and December 2023. However, this data was based on calls into 999 or 111 and should be treated with caution, as many reports of ASB came through other routes.

4.42 There had also been notable spikes in March and October 2023, but this was thought to be due to data recording issues rather than any notable spike in ASB issues. Overall, ASB related calls had slightly decreased year on year over the previous three-year period, but had remained relatively.

4.43 Between October and November 2023 there had been notable reductions in calls relating to ASB in hotspots such as Hoxton East & Shoreditch (-29%) and Hoxton West (-45%). However, the data was treated with caution because most ASB calls tended to be received in the summer months.

4.44 In terms of the types of ASB calls received, 75.3% were related to nuisance, with much smaller numbers coming in for personal issues (5.1%), suspicious circumstances (3.6%), civil disputes (2.9%) and environmental issues (2.1%). Nuisance encompassed a wide range of activities, each of which may or may not become a criminal investigation.

4.45 Around 58% of calls were made for rowdy behaviour, 11% for rowdy and inconsiderate neighbours, around 7% for vehicle nuisance, around 6% for noise and lower numbers for issues such as begging and highway incidents. Calls for drug offences were low, but it was important to note that many of these calls would initially relate to rowdy behaviour.

4.46 The geographic spread of calls was to be expected, with more calls being made relating to ASB in areas such as Hoxton East & Shoreditch (125 calls), Homerton (114 calls) and Hackney Central (109 calls) than areas such as Cazenove (62 calls), King's Park (59 calls) and Stamford Hill West (48 calls).

4.47 Responses to ASB from CE BCU varied from de-escalation, advice and referrals, to the use of enforcement powers and criminal interventions. The ASB Early

Intervention Scheme (EIS) was a stepped approach used across London to deal with people coming to police notice through their ASB which used increased intelligence, highlighting of safeguarding issues and diversionary opportunities prior to any enforcement action. Hackney ranked 3rd across all 32 boroughs for the use of EIS interventions in 2023 (1079).

4.48 Compliance in terms of CE BCU response to 999 or 111 calls relating to ASB was monitored centrally, with CE BCU responding to just over 90% of all calls received. This was a relatively high compliance rate, especially when considering the total volume of calls received and the fact that most ASB issues reported did not relate to crime related aspects.

4.49 In terms of resident engagement, community contact sessions were utilised to enable residents to receive ASB and crime prevention advice, report ASB and crime or talk to officers about issues of local concern.

4.50 Additionally, the neighbourhood policing model was currently being reviewed by CE BCU, which had begun with the appointment of a dedicated Superintendent to oversee neighbourhood policing. The amount of dedicated ward officers and community support officers were also set to increase, and inspectors would oversee neighbourhood policing across ward clusters.

4.51 Officers from across the Metropolitan Police, British Transport Police and City of London Police also worked together to police the local transport network to tackle crime and ASB, focusing on the bus and road networks, as well as the rail and Tube networks.

4.52 The Chair then invited the Resident Liaison Group (RLG) Co-Chairs to give a verbal presentation on the survey undertaken to understand the experiences of residents in reporting, being kept-up to-date on and resolving ASB issues. The summary overview of the responses received were shared with those in attendance, as included within the agenda papers.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

4.53 *A Commission Member asked for further information on the most common types of ASB, and how community safety partners used intelligence to direct ASB resources appropriately.*

4.54 The Community Safety Manager explained that the Community Safety Intelligence Hub provided the performance data, analysis and intelligence to services and agencies upon which resources were directed and decisions were made.

4.55 53% of all ASB on estates related to noise. This could be related to loud music, parties, multiple visits at a property and banging to name a few. Rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour was also a common ASB issue on estates, which related to general nuisance behaviour such as people drinking or taking drugs in communal spaces or young people loitering.

4.56 *A Commission Member asked for further information on how CCTV was used across estates to stop ASB before it happened.*

4.57 The Community Safety Manager explained that CCTV was used across estates to reduce a range of anti-social behaviour. They played an important role in reassuring residents that action was being taken in regards to ASB issues, discouraging anti-social behaviour and gathering evidence to support enforcement action.

4.58 A Commission Member asked how the Council and its partners supported residents to understand what constitutes ASB, the range of options available to them and how to access them.

4.59 The Assistant Director Tenancy Services explained that Housing Services was working on ensuring effective communication of key messages around ASB and service developments to the wider resident base. This included regular updates through Love Hackney, leaflets, the website, social media and estate posters. The service was also looking to be more proactive in terms of translating materials into languages spoken by residents and providing translation services.

4.60 A Commission Member asked for further information about how the integrated ASB reporting and case management system would work in practice and its implementation timelines.

4.61 The Community Safety Manager explained that the integrated reporting and case management system would be a single point of contact for ASB victims, and provide information to ensure that victims were provided with regular updates and were involved in the problem-solving process. This system would be implemented by the end of January or in early February 2024.

4.62 The Assistant Director Tenancy Services clarified that the new integrated system was not a system in which Housing Services could manage its own casework. This would instead be managed by the team through the new integrated housing IT system which was going out to tender imminently. Both systems would have application programming interface (API) software which would allow for Housing Services and Community Safety to easily share information across them.

4.63 A Commission Member asked about what the Council understood about repeat victims on estates, and how it supported them to address their ASB issues.

4.64 The Community Safety Manager began by highlighting an error in the written submission and presentation, which stated that 80% of residents who reported ASB on estates were repeat victims. 25% of residents who reported ASB on estates were repeat victims, which was still high.

4.65 In practice, repeat reports of ASB would be picked up by Housing Services and referred to the Principal Enforcement Officer. The issues would be raised at a subsequent weekly tasking meeting which was attended by Community Safety, the Police, Housing Services and other relevant agencies.

4.66 A Commission Member asked about how good liaison and proactive working amongst relevant agencies was promoted, particularly in relation to more complex cases of ASB.

4.67 The Community Safety Manager explained that weekly meetings were attended by the Police, Housing Services, Public Health, Turning Point, and Support When It Matters outreach teams to ensure multi-agency, holistic responses to ASB issues.

4.68 The aim was to provide support for perpetrators which had complex needs, such as responsive advice and referrals. However, enforcement action was also needed in some cases where this did not work.

4.69 An audit trail was retained of all interventions undertaken by the partnership including hours patrolled and other ASB related interventions. It was expected that the introduction of the integrated reporting and case management system would allow for this information to be shared more easily with residents too.

4.70 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services added that the Adult Safeguarding team did a piece of work in the previous year around ASB and mental health, which could be shared after the meeting.

4.71 A Commission Member asked whether the location and suitability of social housing was considered when allocating homes to households which may have more complex needs as a means of preventing ASB.

4.72 The Assistant Director Community Safety, Enforcement & Business Regulations explained that the Council were compelled to investigate issues that could be deemed as 'statutory nuisance'. Whilst this related to noise nuisance from a property, enforcement action could not be taken when it related to domestic activity such as someone walking around their flat. In these cases property-related adjustments may be encouraged such as carpets or noise reducing pads.

4.73 The Assistant Director Tenancy Services explained that the demand for housing significantly exceeded supply and in reality it was difficult to always place households in the most appropriate way. Having said this, would be making changes in response to the Housing Ombudsman recommendations around ensuring that information shared relating to an applicant's suitability for a home was substantial enough to support any requirements relating to sensitive lettings.

4.74 The Head of Anti-Social Behaviour & Estate Safety added that this may include mediation and enhanced information sharing with residents, as well as property related enhancements such as fitting carpets, removing hard flooring, ensuring adequate insulation and fitting anti-vibration mats into washing machine space. It was important to consider the impact of the cost of living crisis on households, and look to work with them sensitively when encouraging property related adjustments to be made.

4.75 The Assistant Director Tenancy Services went on to explain that Housing First was delivered locally to provide permanent housing and support for individuals with complex needs. Tenancy and housing management was sometimes challenging for these properties, but it was not always easy to predict and was not necessarily related to where households were placed.

4.76 A Commission Member asked whether the Council had considered reopening area housing offices so that residents could access face-to-face support on ASB issues more easily.

4.77 The Strategic Director Housing Services explained that the decision to close area housing offices in 2020 because footfall was low and they were not providing value for

money. Local housing surgeries were set up to ensure residents could still receive in-person help and advice on housing issues across various locations.

4.78 The Resident Liaison Group Co-Chair added that TRAs worked closely with Housing Services to find solutions to ASB issues where necessary, and to provide information to residents about local issues and concerns.

4.79 *A Commission Member asked about how CE BCU sought to prioritise prevention, support and behaviour change rather than enforcement and criminalisation in cases of ASB.*

4.80 The Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police CE BCU recognised that the BCU was not where it wanted to be in terms of working with local communities to tackle anti-social behaviour in a more preventative manner.

4.81 The neighbourhood policing model was currently being reviewed to ensure the BCU and partner agencies could work more closely together with local communities to identify and tackle issues of local concern in a more holistic way. A dedicated Superintendent to oversee neighbourhood policing had been appointed, and increased numbers of dedicated ward officers and community support officers were expected to support this work.

4.82 The BCU was involved in partnership tasking to ensure multi-agency responses to ASB issues, and partnership interventions here ranged from prevention, diversion and enforcement. In reality, police powers were weighted towards enforcement action and criminal prosecution, but it did work with relevant agencies on preventative and diversionary activities.

4.83 The BCU was looking to prioritise a more diversionary approach going forward, ensuring coordinated action was provided with partners to ensure that individuals were directed into support rather than further or disproportionate criminalisation.

4.84 *The Resident Liaison Group Co-Chair asked whether CE BCU valued the contributions of local Neighbourhood Watch schemes in identifying and providing solutions to local community safety concerns.*

4.85 The Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police CE BCU explained that watch schemes and initiatives were a good way for local people to be actively involved in keeping their neighbourhoods safe. It was hoped that the review of the local neighbourhood policing model would provide a clearer interface between local policing and watch schemes which perhaps had not been there before.

4.86 In addition, the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime had been progressing work to overhaul community engagement and scrutiny mechanisms in Hackney to ensure they were more accountable, transparent and representative. It was hoped that as these developed it would become easier for watch schemes to actively engage with the local BCU.

4.87 One example of best practice was the Stamford Hill Shomrim, which had its roots as a Neighbourhood Watch group. It now set up reassurance patrols and community engagement activities, and in particular contributed to working towards achieving a reduction in hate crime towards the Jewish community.

4.88 The Assistant Director Community Safety, Enforcement & Business Regulations added that the Council valued the work of Neighbourhood Watch schemes, and worked closely with them particularly in youth crime and anti-social behaviour hotspots.

4.89 A Commission Member asked for further information on the case study "E5" referenced, particularly around the involvement of partner agencies and services in preventative and diversionary measures.

4.90 The Enforcement Manager explained that the case study was referenced to demonstrate the full range of enforcement measures the Council might have needed to take in order to resolve a complex ASB issue.

4.91 Before getting to a stage where enforcement action was necessary, Housing Services would have worked closely with the individual in question to provide dedicated support and signpost to relevant services before escalating.

4.92 A Commission Member asked about the training local police officers got to equip them to provide trauma informed responses to ASB issues.

4.93 The Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police CE BCU explained that trauma informed practices informed part of the basic officer training, but recognised that this was an area that needed to be built upon at a local level.

4.94 There was a desire to ensure that once an officer arrived at the BCU they would also get further, more localised trauma informed training. The Superintendent responsible for neighbourhood policing in Tower Hamlets was overseeing a taskforce to revisit the local training offer with this in mind.

4.95 A Commission Member asked how the Council used Ombudsman reports and decisions to develop its policy and practice.

4.96 The Assistant Director for Tenancy Services explained that the ASB service improvement plan had been initiatives in response to recent Housing Ombudsman Spotlight reports, and to ensure compliance with directions and guidance.

4.97 This would include a review of ASB-related policies and procedures, including the introduction of a new neighbourhood management policy and vulnerable resident policy and procedure, as well a new staff training and development programme.

4.98 A Commission Member asked how the Council prioritised reports of ASB.

4.99 The Assistant Director Community Safety, Enforcement & Business Regulations explained that on receiving a report of ASB an assessment was undertaken by an officer to determine whether it was a high or low risk report. If deemed to be higher risk, an investigation would begin immediately by ward-based enforcement officers.

4.100 One challenge it did face was in getting registered social landlords operating in Hackney to take action in cases of ASB, which may lead to prolonged investigations and repeated reports. One reason for this, as highlighted in the Housing Ombudsman Spotlight report on noise complaints, was that the member of staff responsible for handling ASB reports was often the same as for collecting rent which may give rise to a conflict of interest.

Summing Up

4.101 The Chair thanked Commission Members for their questions and all witnesses for their responses and engagement with the scrutiny process.

4.102 It was explained that, after the meeting, the Commission would reflect on the evidence heard and may make suggestions or recommendations for consideration.

5 Minutes of the Meeting

5.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 22nd November 2023 were agreed as an accurate record.

5.2 The draft minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th December 2023 would follow in the next meeting agenda.

6 Living in Hackney Work Programme 2023/24

6.1 The Chair referred to the Commission's work programme and highlighted the discussion items planned for the remainder of the municipal year.

6.2 It was explained that, following a request from officers, the community halls discussion which was scheduled for February had been postponed. This would now likely take place early in the new municipal year, although would need to be agreed as part of the 2024/25 work planning process.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00pm – 9.05pm