



London Borough of Hackney  
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission  
Municipal Year 2020/21  
Monday 7 November 2022

Minutes of the proceedings of  
the Living in Hackney Scrutiny  
Commission held at  
Hackney Town Hall, Mare  
Street, London E8 1EA

---

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Councillor Soraya Adejare</b>
<b>Councillors in Attendance:</b>	<b>Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Penny Wrout, Cllr Clare Joseph (Vice-Chair), Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren, Cllr Sam Pallis, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Sarah Young and Cllr Zoe Garbett</b>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<b>Cllr Ian Rathbone</b>
<b>Officers In Attendance:</b>	<b>Rob Miller (Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace)</b>
<b>Other People in Attendance:</b>	<b>Philip Glanville (Mayor of London Borough of Hackney) and Cllr Sade Etti (Mayoral Advisor of Housing Need and Homelessness)</b>
<b>Officers in Virtual Attendance:</b>	<b>Jennifer Wynter (Head of Benefits and Housing Needs), Marcia Facey (Operations Manager - Benefits and Housing Needs), Zoe Tyndall (Change Support Team Manager - Digital &amp; Data) and Andrew Croucher (Operations Manager - Benefits &amp; Housing Need)</b>
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	<b>Craig Player</b>  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 Councillor Rathbone.

### **2 Urgent Items / Order of Business**

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

### **3 Declaration of Interest**

3.1 Councillor Ogundemuren declared that he was a London Borough of Hackney resident.

#### **4 Changes to the Housing Register and Lettings Policy**

4.1 The Chair opened the item by explaining that the Commission had requested this item as it was keen to hear about how the new Lettings Policy had affected residents since its implementation.

4.2 The session would cover the advice and guidance in place for residents that no longer qualify for the housing register, and to those that face a long wait or are unlikely to get housed, and the impact of the policy on prioritising residents in the greatest need and providing more predictable outcomes.

#### **4.3 Representing London Borough of Hackney**

- Councillor Sade Etti, Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness
- Rob Miller, Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace
- Jennifer Wynter, Head of Benefits and Housing Needs
- Marcia Facey, Operations Manager - Benefits and Housing Needs
- Andrew Croucher, Operations Manager - Benefits and Housing Needs
- Zoe Tyndall, Change Support Team Manager - Digital and Data

4.4 The Chair invited the Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness to give a short verbal presentation on the context of local housing needs in Hackney. The main points are highlighted below.

4.5 In 2001, the average house price in Hackney was £139,000. This had since increased to £705,000, meaning an increase of over 407%. This represented the biggest increase across all local authorities in the UK.

4.6 For anyone to be able to buy a house in Hackney, they would need to have a household income of £140,000 and a deposit of £70,000. This did not reflect the financial circumstances of most residents in the borough.

4.6 The key support that the Council had provided over the past decade to low-income households that were renting in the private sector was the Local Housing Allowance.

4.7 Before 2013, the Local Housing Allowance was linked to the local cost of rent, meaning that it went up to reflect the rising cost of rent in the borough. However, since 2013 the legislation that provided for this increase had been removed and the allowance had been frozen.

4.8 In addition to this, in 2016/17 there were around 1229 council homes available to local residents in need. In 2019/20, this had decreased to only 409 council homes.

4.9 This had led to a variety of issues for local residents, including overcrowding and exploitation by rogue landlords. It had also meant that many families have had to leave the borough to find more affordable housing options.

4.10 The Chair then invited the Head of Benefits and Housing Needs and the Operations Managers to make any follow up points on the presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

4.11 Over the last few months the housing crisis had worsened further, with increasing volatility in the property and housing markets. This had led to an increase in families presenting to the Council as homeless, particularly those fleeing domestic abuse and gang violence.

4.12 Such families have needed to be provided with emergency temporary accommodation, at a time in which there were 30% less privately rented properties available in Hackney than before the Covid-19 pandemic.

4.13 Should a homeless family approach the Council for emergency temporary accommodation at this time, the closest location that it would be able to offer that family would be Wolverhampton, Coventry or Derby, and for a single homeless person the closest location would be Crawley.

4.14 Capital Letters, the local authority owned and funded housing company along with the Department for Levelling Up, Communities and Housing, had not provided any properties since September as it had not been in a position to do so.

4.15 In regard to what had been put in place to provide housing advice and guidance to residents that no longer qualify for the register, and those that faced a long wait or that were unlikely to get housed, the following points were made.

4.16 The changes to the Lettings Policy had removed 5,000 residents from the housing register, nearly 3,000 of which had been on the reserve band, with the remaining 2,000 on the general band. The reserve band was a band for residents that were housed in their assessed bedroom needs and so the Council considered them to be adequately housed.

4.17 The Council reached out to the 3,000 residents which had been on the reserve band, of which only 5% had responded with queries. Of those removed from the general band, 17% responded with inquiries, 50% of which were Hackney Housing residents.

4.18 Overall, of the 5,000 residents that were removed from the housing register, only 10 raised an inquiry as to why they were being removed. Every resident removed from the housing register had been given the opportunity to rejoin the housing register if they qualified to do so.

4.19 Dedicated, personalised housing advice and support had been provided for those residents no longer eligible for the housing register to help find suitable privately rented accommodation.

4.20 An enhanced mutual exchange offer was in place to help households already in permanent social housing to find and agree a transfer to alternative accommodation. This had included an event for residents in March 2022, and further events were planned.

4.21 Each resident no longer eligible for the housing register that had contacted the Council for support had been provided with an individual tailored plan detailing their alternative housing provision options.

4.22 An example of what had been put in place with tenants willing to consider alternative housing provision was provided.

4.23 A couple were seeking a larger premises in the N16 area so that they could apply to have their child back into their care. Due to their medical requirements, they were in need of a two-bed ground floor property with level access and a wet room.

4.24 The case was taken to court, in which an officer gave evidence of the lack of housing supply in that area and in Hackney in general. It became apparent that a property with those requirements was not available in the area, and the couple decided to seek housing provision in the private rented sector.

4.25 A named officer had been put forward to support their search for a property, and would negotiate with any landlord should they find the right property for the couple. They were also able to access financial support to assist them with a rental deposit and removal costs, and had a tailored housing plan with support from both housing and social care.

4.26 In regard to how resident voice and experience had been used to shape the service and how effective it had been at improving outcomes, the following points were made.

4.27 Whilst it was too early to demonstrate meaningful outcomes from the change to the Lettings Policy, the value of residents' experiences of service delivery was not underestimated.

4.28 For example, the new online form and application process had been developed using small groups of residents trialling iterations of the form. With a dedicated complaints team, the service had been able to monitor trends and to deliver service improvement regarding processes and messaging.

4.29 Recent presentations had also been made to advice partners, such as the Citizens Advice Bureau and Hackney Law Centre, to share resident experiences and to encourage focus on achievable outcomes with clients.

4.30 The service had also been working to further develop its support and information offering for residents, advocacy groups and colleagues in other Council services to help them understand the full range of options available to residents in need.

4.31 In regard to the impact that the policy has had on prioritising residents in need and providing more predictable outcomes, the following points were made.

4.32 Whilst early in the delivery of the new scheme it was clear that residents with similar circumstances have had the same opportunities as other residents no matter the cause of their housing need.

4.33 The new scheme delivered more predictable outcomes as the majority of residents joined the register in Band B and would always have priority over residents with similar circumstances who had joined the list at a later date.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

4.34 *A Commission Member noted that there was a national mutual exchange online service in place for social housing tenants to swap their property with another tenant. It was asked whether the Council had considered a local online service for tenants that were interested in mutual exchange.*

4.35 The Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace explained that the IT team had been working with Housing Needs to develop the mutual exchange process, making it easier for tenants to apply.

4.36 It was noted that mutual exchange cases could be complicated, citing an example of a four way swap facilitated by the Council which involved tenants moving between Hackney, Birmingham, Pontypridd and Great Yarmouth.

4.37 It was also important to note that in many cases tenants were looking to downsize within the local area, and many were looking for accessible housing options, which narrowed the number of properties available.

4.38 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that Hackney was not considering developing a local online service for tenants that were interested in mutual exchange, as the national service was supported by every registered provider and local authority and therefore had the full range of properties available on it.

4.39 *A Commission Member asked whether the Council was looking at long-term outcomes for residents who had been removed from the housing register and moved into privately rented accommodation, such as how long a tenancy was sustained for, as a measure of success.*

4.40 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that the Council did not support residents to achieve a letting or tenancy agreement that they could not afford.

4.41 It conducts an affordability assessment beforehand which advises residents on what they can afford, with some private landlords also conducting similar checks prior to a tenancy agreement. Once a tenancy was agreed, a tenancy sustainment service was provided for all residents placed in the private rented sector.

4.42 The Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness reiterated that all residents placed in the private rented sector were supported with a personal housing plan which took into account their personal circumstances and the housing options available.

4.43 *A Commission Member asked what the customer experience journey for a resident who had been removed from the housing register looked like in practice.*

4.44 The Operations Manager explained that residents were contacted and provided with a Google form which would allow them to make an inquiry about the change. Should an inquiry be made, an officer would call the resident back to discuss the alternative options available to them.

4.45 All officers had been trained to provide trauma-informed customer service to ensure that any options presented to residents are informed by a resident's individual circumstances.

4.46 Contact was also maintained should that resident move into alternative accommodation to ensure timely support should that resident experience a change in circumstances.

4.47 It was noted that the customer experience may vary from resident to resident. Some residents, especially Hackney Housing tenants, were particularly engaged with officers and as such had better experiences.

4.48 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that there was a desire to publish a Lettings Plan on an annual basis detailing how many properties the Council expected to be available throughout a year, and who it planned to let the properties to.

4.49 This was considered good practice and was routinely done by many local authorities across London. It was hoped that such an approach would help in making the process more open and transparent.

*4.50 A Commission Member asked what the outcomes of the inquiries made by residents removed from the housing register (5% of residents contacted on the reserve band and 17% of residents contacted on the general band) had been, and whether their housing needs had been met.*

4.51 The Operations Manager responded by explaining that of the 120 inquiries received from residents removed from the reserve band, 107 were sent the form to rejoin the housing register, of which 77 were returned.

4.52 Of the 391 inquiries from residents removed from the general band, 333 were sent the form to rejoin the housing register, of which 115 were returned.

4.53 The Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace explained that multi-disciplinary teams had been set up between Housing Needs and colleagues in health, adult social care and children's social care amongst others to ensure that complicated cases were progressed and outcomes were tailored to individual needs.

4.54 Residents were also being supported to ensure they were financially stable, for example ensuring that residents that qualify for benefits are in receipt of those benefits. It was hoped that such work would go some way to supporting residents into suitable accommodation and support tenancy sustainment.

4.55 The Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness added that the responses on the housing advice line had improved dramatically, with the line being separated into housing advice, homelessness and temporary housing channels.

*4.56 A Commission Member asked how the Council used landlord incentives to secure private rented accommodation for residents in need, and whether it would consider increasing the amount offered to landlords where appropriate.*

4.57 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that an interborough agreement was in place across London, which included all London Boroughs other than Chelsea & Kensington, which had agreed pan London rates for procurement including incentive rates. This ensured that any one Council did not outbid another and perversely increase rents further.

4.58 It was also explained that since the Covid-19 pandemic private landlords had been less reluctant to let to people in receipt of benefits as employment income was now viewed as less stable than benefit income.

4.59 The private rented market across London was extremely competitive, with properties often being taken off the market hours after being advertised. As such officers had to work quickly to secure rental agreements and it was not always possible.

4.60 *A Commission Member asked whether residents had been engaged in the designing process for Council communications about the housing register and the promotion of alternative housing provision.*

4.61 The Change Support Team Manager explained that a new content designer post was being funded by the Housing Needs service to review all existing website information to better inform residents on the availability of social housing and alternative options.

4.62 The post holder would work with residents in the first stages of the review to ensure their voice would be central to the process, and in the later stages take different methods of communication to resident groups to see which of them were most effective in changing behaviour.

4.63 *A Commission Member asked for more information on the aforementioned personal housing plans for those residents removed from the housing register and seeking alternative housing provision.*

4.64 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that the Council used the statutory housing plan template when assessing residents' housing needs and agreeing housing plans, and felt that Hackney's housing plans were good when compared with other boroughs.

4.65 Personal housing plans were produced with residents, and residents agree to the steps set out within the personal housing plan. The aim was to assist residents to take actions that work for them and their personal circumstances, rather than make decisions for them.

4.66 When producing a personal housing plan, an officer would have an initial conversation with the resident to ascertain what outcomes they wish to achieve in regard to housing, and look to put in place measures to help them achieve those outcomes.

4.67 In regard to wider support included within the personal housing plan, such as employment support or training when a resident wants to increase their income and as such the affordability of a property, officers would signpost to relevant services such as Hackney Works.

4.68 *A Commission Member asked what the impact of the new Lettings Policy had been on officers' workloads.*

4.69 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that officers were still having to manually support those residents who had had a change in circumstances due to the ongoing impact of the cyber attack.

4.70 As such, officers supporting the housing register were not in a position to be released into other parts of the service until the transition to the new software was complete. However, once the transition was complete (by December 2022) it was expected that these officers would be released into the wider housing advice service, leading to quicker and more receptive housing advice and guidance for residents.

*4.71 A Commission Member asked for clarification on the Council's nominations process and how residents were matched with the appropriate number of beds in a prospective property.*

4.72 The Operations Manager explained that Hackney Housing was the only landlord in the borough that accepted overcrowding by one. The nomination process was based on the number of rooms in a property, as well as the size of the rooms.

4.73 Taking the example of a three bed property, should there be two or three double bedrooms the lettings officer would consider nominating a family of six for that property. However, if there were three single rooms, that family would not be put forward.

4.74 For Housing Association properties the process varied. Each Housing Association in the borough had its own allocations policy, so when a lettings officer nominates a household for a Housing Association property the decision would ultimately lie with them.

*4.75 A Commission Member asked whether there was a review process within the team for instances in which residents were wrongly taken off the housing register.*

4.76 The Operations Manager explained that whilst mistakes do happen, the most common reason for a resident being wrongly taken off the housing register was that the resident had not updated their details following a change in circumstances. Any such instances were being dealt with by officers and where appropriate residents were being put back on the register.

4.77 The Head of Housing Needs and Benefits added that the service was ultimately audited by the Local Government Ombudsman, through which residents could make complaints if they felt it necessary.

*4.78 A Commission Member asked for further information on the role of advice partners in providing support and guidance to residents that had been removed from the housing register.*

4.79 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that grant funded advice partners supported residents with housing advice and guidance regardless of where they were on the housing register. There was also a floating housing support officer that was commissioned to work across the Council.

4.80 The majority of residents on the housing register were residents already in social housing and as such would already have dedicated housing officers and support networks in place should any issues arise.

*4.81 A Commission Member asked whether there were any plans to engage advice partners to understand some of the issues that residents had been facing as a result*



*of the new Lettings Policy, and whether this would form part of the evaluation process once the transition to the new system was completed.*

4.82 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that officers met regularly with advice partners to understand the experiences of residents. These discussions were often open and constructive and centred on how the Council and its advice partners could give residents the best possible advice and guidance reflective of their personal circumstances.

4.83 The Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness added that training was provided for advice partners, as well as ongoing conversations regarding housing support and guidance.

## **5 Impact of the Cyber Attack on the Housing Register**

5.1 The Chair opened the item by explaining that the Commission had requested this item as it was keen to hear about how the cyber attack had affected residents on the housing register and whether the service had returned to business as usual.

### 5.2 Representing London Borough of Hackney

- Mayor Philip Glanville, Cabinet Member for Digital and ICT
- Councillor Sade Etti, Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness
- Rob Miller, Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace
- Jennifer Wynter, Head of Benefits and Housing Needs
- Marcia Facey, Operations Manager - Benefits and Housing Needs
- Andrew Croucher, Operations Manager - Benefits and Housing Needs
- Zoe Tyndall, Change Support Team Manager - Digital and Data

5.3 The Chair invited the Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace to give a short verbal presentation. The main points are highlighted below.

5.4 The cyber attack in October 2020 affected all systems hosted on the Council's servers. Many of these systems had already been transferred to a Cloud based service and, whilst the cyber attack was hugely impactful, this therefore meant that some vital systems such as the Council's website, emails and telephone system were not affected.

5.5 However, the attack did lead to the loss of the Universal Housing system. This removed the ability to process new applications to the housing register and changes of circumstances for existing applicants.

5.6 The bidding system was not affected. However, without access to the Universal Housing system, it had meant that officers had to make manual changes to allow residents to bid for appropriately sized properties.

5.7 The service had been developing an in-house IT system prior to the cyber attack to manage the housing register and replace the Universal Housing system, which included a front facing online form and back office processing and administration.

5.8 The online application form sought to make the process easy to understand and complete for residents, reduce the number of questions and make applications aware

upfront of expected waiting times and other housing options. The administration tool would make it easier for officers to view, assign and manage applications.

5.9 There had understandably been delays in replacing Universal Housing due to the cyber attack. The service was prioritising those households that had been negatively impacted, for example those where a change in circumstances would shorten their waiting time or they were close to successfully bidding for a property.

5.10 The Chair then invited the Mayor of London Borough of Hackney to make any additional comments.

5.11 The Mayor, as Cabinet Member for Digital and ICT, had attended weekly meetings as the Council responded to the initial cyber attack, followed by bi-weekly and monthly meetings during the recovery phase. Individual Cabinet Members also attended to respond to issues that affected their service areas.

5.12 This aimed to bring a level of political oversight and sometimes critical challenge to the recovery process. The Audit Committee also had oversight of the recovery process, and Member briefing sessions were also used to keep councillors updated and share experiences.

5.13 It was noted that the cyber attack was a criminal act that had been investigated by the relevant agencies. Many other organisations, both public and private, had been affected by similar attacks, and the Council was in dialogue with many of these organisations to share best practice.

5.14 The Chair then invited the Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness to make any final remarks.

5.15 There had been an understandable sense of frustration for residents waiting to have applications and changes progressed. The absence of an IT system had resulted in a backlog of applications, assessments and changes to process. Progress was being made, with households negatively impacted being prioritised.

#### Questions, Answers and Discussion

5.16 *A Commission Member asked for an update on the progress of reducing the backlog of applications, assessments and changes to process on the housing register.*

5.17 The Operations Manager explained that all residents removed from the housing register had been contacted. All residents that had applied for reconsideration and qualified for the register were being processed to rejoin.

5.18 1024 households had been accepted as homeless since October 2020 and were therefore eligible to join the register. Of those, 673 remain to be processed. This was expected to be completed by the end of the calendar year.

5.19 Residents were being prioritised in relation to when they applied to join the register so that none would be negatively impacted, for example if they were very close to successfully bidding for a property.

5.20 *A Commission Member asked whether a high proportion of homelessness cases were of households that had been supported into private sector housing by the Council, and were unable to maintain their tenancy.*

5.21 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that the biggest reason for residents approaching homelessness in Hackney was eviction from family and friends, many of which were living in overcrowded social housing.

5.22 *A Commission Member asked how the Council had engaged with affected residents both at the time of the attack and throughout the recovery process, and what had been learned about how residents access council services.*

5.23 The Operations Manager explained that each resident that had contacted the team had been called back by a dedicated officer who would be on hand to assist them with their request, whether that be an application, change of circumstances or other issue.

5.24 Speaking more widely, the Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace explained that the engagement methods used depended on the service and where it was at in the recovery process.

5.25 *A Commission Member asked for further information on the impact of the increased number of calls into the Council's contact centre as a result of the cyber attack, and the mitigations in place to reduce waiting times for residents in need of housing advice.*

5.26 The Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace explained that additional staff had been employed and trained to provide the best possible service to residents needing housing support and advice. Officers within customer contact teams were also being cross trained to ensure they were in a position to provide the correct advice and signpost.

5.27 The Council's housing advice contact number had been split into separate queues to minimise waiting times for residents with the most urgent cases, namely homelessness, temporary accommodation, choice based lettings and housing advice queues with the homelessness queue prioritised.

5.28 The average waiting time in the previous week was just over two minutes, with the longest waiting time being 29 minutes, and out of 799 calls 88% had been answered.

5.29 The Mayoral Advisor for Housing Needs and Homelessness added that call handling rates had dramatically improved since July. It was important to note that from April to July, the housing advice contact number was receiving around 5,000 calls per month.

5.30 *A Commission Member asked what the timeframe was for a resident who makes a new application to the housing register, through to that application being accepted and that resident being able to bid on eligible properties.*

5.31 The Operations Manager explained that the timeframe varied from resident to resident. Once an application was received, it may be that supporting evidence was

required such as medical history. In many cases it took some time for a resident to provide the necessary evidence.

5.32 Having said this, officers had to complete the registration process in 20 days and in the vast majority of cases this timeframe was being met.

*5.33 A Commission Member asked how the Council had engaged with the Haredi community in Hackney both at the time of the attack and throughout the recovery process.*

5.34 The Operations Manager explained that the majority of Haredi households were not removed from the housing register as they were in the urgent band. Those that had received personalised, dedicated housing advice and support from officers.

5.35 The most common contact officers had with the community was in regard to changes of circumstances, and those who were urgent or at risk of being disadvantaged had been prioritised.

5.36 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs added that the Council also engaged with Agudas Israel Community Services who provided advice on a range of issues to the Orthodox Jewish community.

5.37 The Haredi community was densely populated in the N16 area in close proximity to their synagogue. This, coupled with particular concerns around planning and property standards in that area, limited the community's housing options.

5.37 The Mayor of London Borough of Hackney added that the Council was engaging with community representatives, members of local organisations and developers on how new developments and changes to local spaces can be made, reflecting the unique circumstances of Stamford Hill.

*5.38 A Commission Member asked for further information on the Council's relationship with registered social housing providers in Hackney, and on the nominations process in particular.*

5.39 The Head of Benefits and Housing Needs explained that a nominations agreement was in place across East London which dictated how many units registered social housing providers should give to the Council.

5.40 The number of units depended on whether those units were new build or existing, and the size of the unit. The nominations process was managed by Housing Strategy on a quarterly basis, and any deficit was discussed between them and the social housing providers.

5.41 Registered social housing providers did hold back a percentage of their units for high profile emergency rehousing cases, particularly domestic abuse and gang violence. Having said this, many of those cases were being referred to the Council despite it not having the housing stock to meet this need.

5.42 The Mayor of London Borough of Hackney added that Housing Strategy were working on updating its dataset on housing needs in Hackney. This data would then feed into key pieces of work across the Council such as the Housing Strategy and planning policy.

5.43 The Council was also working to develop a Housing Compact that would ensure that there is a strategic and coordinated approach to meeting the housing needs of residents across the borough and bring greater transparency and accountability for the provision and delivery of housing support and accommodation.

5.44 *A Commission Member asked when the Council expected the housing register to return to business as usual, and what this may look like.*

5.45 The Strategic Director of Customer and Workplace explained that the road to recovery was complicated due to the interlinkedness of the range of services across the Council and the differing stages at which these services were at in the recovery process.

5.46 The work plan for the housing register was outlined in the written materials provided in the agenda pack. It highlighted three phases of the work plan, with a view to further review and business as usual.

## **6 Minutes of the Meeting**

6.1 The draft minutes of the previous meetings held on 17th January, 7th March and 13th July 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **7 Living in Hackney Work Programme 2022/23**

7.1 The Chair explained that this item was to consider and agree the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission work programme for the 2022/23 municipal year.

7.2 The draft work programme had been drafted by the Chair and Vice-Chair taking into consideration the suggestions made by Commission Members, as well as suggestions made in the public survey, by officers and by Cabinet Members.

7.3 The Chair then invited Commission Members to make any comments on the draft 2022/23 work programme.

7.4 A Commission Member suggested additional work programme items on the effect of the cyber attack on housing benefits and the Council's approach to tackling homelessness.

7.5 A Commission Member suggested that a written update be provided to the Commission on the progress of retrofitting since the last discussion held on 8th December 2021.

7.6 A Commission Member suggested that a written update be provided to the Commission on the progress of the programme of weekly housing surgeries across the Council's housing estates.

7.7 A Commission Member suggested that the Commission explored a potential joint piece of work with the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission on the policing of drugs in Hackney.

7.8 The draft work programme for 2022/23 municipal year, as included in the agenda papers, was agreed by Commission Members.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.20pm