

HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

11 March 2025
5.30 - 7.40 pm

Present: Councillors Griffin (Chair), Robertson (Vice-Chair),
Gawthrop Wood, Gardiner-Smith, Lee, Martinelli, Swift and Tong

Executive Councillors: Bird (Executive Councillor for Housing) and Holloway
(Executive Councillor for Community Safety, Homelessness and Wellbeing)

Tenant/Leaseholder Representatives:
Best (Leaseholder Representative), Birch (Tenant Representative), Minns
(Tenant Representative) and Powell-Hardy (Tenant Representative)

Officers present in person:

Assistant Director, Housing and Health: Samantha Shimmon
Assistant Director, Development: Ben Binns
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Meeting Producer: James Goddard

Officers present online:

Asset Manager: Will Barfield
Strategic Resettlement and Community Equity Lead: Keryn Jalli
Housing Strategy Manager: Helen Reed
Home Improvement Agency Manager: Frances Swann

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/9/HSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Thittala and Tenant Representative Justyna Ulman-Jaworska. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Lee.

25/10/HSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bird	25/15/HSC	Had received assistance from the Cambridgeshire Home Improvement Agency (CHIA) in the past.

25/11/HSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

25/12/HSC Public Questions

Question 1

We are the Save Ekin Road community group, and we are writing to you regarding Cambridge City Council's plans for Ekin Road. We are a group of council tenants and freehold residents living on Ekin Road, and we seek an update from you regarding the Ekin Road project.

We note that council tenants within the redevelopment zone received a letter last month from the Council, outlining that the Council expects all such residents to have moved out by December 2025, and that legal proceedings will commence against them if they have not moved by then. This was the first these residents had heard about such a deadline, and it was communicated to them through a complicated legal notice.

We also note that in Agenda Item 9 of this meeting, in Section 4.6.4, only 47 council-owned households of the 96 within the redevelopment zone have been relocated in the 9 months since a decision was taken to redevelop Ekin Road. This is fewer than 50%, and there remains only 9 months for the council to relocate over 50% of those households. These will undoubtedly be those who have the most complicated needs, i.e., are currently in houses rather than flats, and/or who need the largest homes.

Many of our members report to us that they are constantly looking at, and bidding on, homes on home-link, and that most weeks there are no suitable homes available. Those that do bid have, by and large, been unsuccessful as they are in need of 3 or 4 bedroom houses.

Thus, we would like to ask you the following questions today:

Question 1:

How does the Council plan to finish relocating the remaining 49 council-owned households on Ekin Road within the 9 months remaining before its self-imposed deadline of December 2025?

Question 2:

In light of the impending deadline of December 2025 for council tenants to move out, does the Council still plan to honour its commitment to tenants to provide them with “like for like” housing?

Question 3:

For those council tenants who are actively seeking homes on Home-Link, what will happen to them if they have been unable to successfully bid on a home by the December 2025 deadline?

Kind regards,
Save Ekin Road

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. The Council had relocated 47 out of 82 tenanted households, which was the position expected at the midway point in the relocation process. The Council would continue to offer support to the remaining 35 tenanted households and 11 property owners on the estate. Residents were encouraged to contact the Council should they wish to discuss their circumstances in more detail or if they had any questions regarding the relocation process.
- ii. The Council relocated tenants on a 'like for like' basis unless the needs of the household changed.
- iii. The Council would work closely with all tenants throughout this year to ensure that they could move to a home of their choosing. If a move had not been possible, the Council would make up to two direct offers of a suitable alternative property, the second of which would be reserved for the household.

Supplementary question:

- i. Asked whether the Council would comply with its promise to residents to offer 'like for like' accommodation. Believed the promise had been made from at least June 2022.
- ii. Expressed concern that the Council was not complying with its promise in the documentation that residents had received as it advised that residents needed to move by December 2025 if they had not moved before then.
- iii. Asked if residents were moved in December 2025, would accommodation be 'like for like' or classed as 'suitable' accommodation.
- iv. Believed 'like for like' accommodation was receiving the same quality of home in roughly the same area, with roughly the same amount of garden.

- v. Commented that some residents at Ekin Road were paying a price for this redevelopment as they did not want to leave and had no choice.
- vi. Expressed concern regarding the legal letter which had been received by residents, which advised that they needed to move out of their property by December 2025, which might not be 'like for like' but 'as the needs of the resident required'.

The Assistant Director (Development) responded:

- i. Advised that tenants would be relocated to 'like for like' accommodation unless the needs of the household had changed.
- ii. Agreed that a formal legal letter had been sent to residents; it was necessary as part of the legal process.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. Tenants had been advised that they would be offered 'like for like' accommodation. Also confirmed that residents could move back to Ekin Road once the redevelopment had been completed.
- ii. Encouraged tenants to contact Officers if they had any concerns and said they could also contact her with any concerns.

Question 2. The Chair exercised discretion to accept this public question despite it being received after the deadline had passed.

I wish to ask a question in relation to agenda Item 9 para 4.6.8 Framework for Change for North Cambridge.

The crucial importance to the local community of Arbury Town Centre and Arbury Court shops, including the library and Post Office, has been recognised in the Draft North Cambridge Design Code.

As a local resident I was very disturbed to hear from some shopkeepers that their leases will not be renewed beyond 2030 because it is proposed to demolish the shopping centre and flats for redevelopment. It appears that they have been offered no further information or mitigation to support the viability of their businesses leading up to and beyond that date. I am very concerned that we will lose these family-run shops as well as Budgens and the Post Office and library.

1. To what extent is any of the above true?
2. When will councillors and/or officers be engaging directly with the shopkeepers?

3. Will you be offering them incentives to renew their leases or incentives to trade through the rebuild period so that they can occupy any new premises?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. There was a decision at Housing Scrutiny Committee (HSC) in June 2024 that negotiations on commercial leases at Arbury Court would take account of the need to consider future options for a District Centre. There was a decision at HSC in September 2024 to develop a Framework for Change for North Cambridge. This report noted the importance of Arbury Court as a centre for the area. Future options were being considered through discussions with the commercial tenants. Engagement with the commercial tenants would be an important part of the way forward.
- ii. Discussions had taken place with individual commercial leaseholders whose leases were coming to an end. It was proposed to start community consultations on a broader basis from May and, as the September report said, the commercial centre and the commercial leaseholders would have a central role in this. The Council would be offering meetings to all commercial tenants. No decision had been taken beyond creating flexibility from 2030 and any decisions would follow on from the consultation.
- iii. All the negotiations had led to new leases that extended to 2030. Understood the concerns about the impact on the centre. There was a timetable for the consultation process to end in January 2026. If there was a decision to redevelop, the Council was committed to keeping the shops open during the development period.

Supplementary question:

- i. Noted the Executive Councillor had referred to engaging with commercial tenants but commented that when he had spoken with two commercial tenants, they advised that their leases had been extended but they were 'in the dark' about the redevelopment proposals.
- ii. Asked if Officers could produce a simple one-page route map through the process for the shop keepers so that they could understand what would happen and when.

The Assistant Director Development responded:

- i. Advised that the Council would publish the key dates for the proposed consultation process and that these were already publicly available in the HSC September report.

- ii. Each commercial tenant would be invited to a meeting with Officers in the next couple of weeks so that they could discuss any concerns they had.
- iii. A consultation with residents would take place in May-June 2025.

25/13/HSC Structural repairs and associated works at Bermuda Terrace flats – 2025

Matter for Decision

The Council owns six blocks of flats at Bermuda Terrace, Histon Road. A programme of structural repairs and associated works is required to ensure the buildings are maintained in a good state of repair.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the award of a contract to Chas Berger Limited, subject to the completion of the required consultation with leaseholders. Chas Berger Ltd achieved the highest score following the tender evaluation process.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Asset Manager.

It was noted that this agenda item had not been included on the Forward Plan for the whole 28-day requirement before the meeting. This was because pre-tender estimates predicted a contract value below £1 million. Following tender clarifications, the contract value would exceed £1 million which changed the category of decision so that it was now a key decision. With the permission of the Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee the urgency procedure was invoked to suspend the 28-day requirement so that the item could be considered at Committee, so it was open to scrutiny and debate rather than a decision being made through the out of cycle process.

The Asset Manager and Assistant Director for Housing and Health said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Noted concerns about some leaseholder's ability to be able to pay for the repairs undertaken and advised that the works were not expected to be

completed until April 2026 and therefore bills were not anticipated to be sent until September 2026. Meetings would take place with leaseholders to discuss the payment timetable and options for repayment. Agreements could be made with leaseholders if they were struggling financially. Repayment would be discussed on an individual basis. Noted that a high proportion of the Council's leaseholders rented their properties out.

- ii. Advised that reference to a 'threshold' was in relation to who could make the decision to award the contract. As the contract value had exceeded £1million this meant that the decision could not be made by an officer under delegated authority and instead the decision needed to be brought through Housing Scrutiny Committee and made by the Executive Councillor.
- iii. Noted that balcony resurfacing had been undertaken about 10 years previously but there had been some movement in the buildings since. Repairs wouldn't be required to all buildings and surveys would be carried out to see which buildings needed to be repaired.
- iv. The contract was for structural repairs and not energy efficiency works, however if during the surveys it was found that there were gaps in cavity wall insulation / loft insulation then the gaps would be addressed.
- v. Noted concerns regarding the removal and replacement of trees on the site and advised that a consultation would be undertaken with residents to ensure suitable trees were provided and a robust maintenance programme was in place.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

25/14/HSC Pledge to Support the Resettlement of Refugees

Matter for Decision

In 2020 the Council made a pledge to resettle 200 refugees over 5 years. A major part of the resettlement programme is the provision of housing. In 2021, the Council agreed to provide 4 council properties per annum, outside of the current Lettings Policy, for the next five years, to help deliver the pledge. To continue the Council's resettlement work, the resettlement pledge needed to

be renewed including the allocation of housing outside of the current Lettings Policy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Agreed the pledge to:
 - a. Welcome refugees and asylum seekers to rebuild their lives in Cambridge and the surrounding areas through wraparound support under our resettlement programme.
 - b. Allocate a minimum of 4 City Council properties per annum, outside of the current Lettings Policy, for the next five years to help deliver the pledge to resettle refugees. With a proportion of these properties provided to refugees that require secure accommodation as prescribed by central Government refugee schemes.
 - c. Engage with the East of England Strategic Migration Partnership to identify suitable accommodation for refugees based on household needs.
 - d. Provide advice to refugees who are homeless to explore their housing options, including the Private Rented Sector.
 - e. Work alongside local communities, agencies, and charities to provide services that support welcoming, cohesion, and the removal of any barriers to resettlement.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategic Resettlement and Community Equity Lead.

The Strategic Resettlement and Community Equity Lead said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was difficult to comment how the Council compared to other local authorities as the needs of people seeking sanctuary varied. Some local authorities would have a higher number of people seeking asylum, whereas in Cambridge there were a higher number of people with refugee status and the challenges people faced because of their status

was different. A needs assessment with refugees had been undertaken and the data from this would inform work moving forwards. There were national challenges that people faced for example access to health care, dentistry and school places. Benchmarking against other local authorities had been undertaken in relation to grant funding. The Council had been recognised as demonstrating good practice in the region and Central Government officials had visited the Council and met with refugees the Council supported.

- ii. Advised that the Council provided Central Government with data regarding the resettlement work the Council undertook for example the number of people who had been able to access English classes, the number of people who had been supported into employment and the number of people assisted with the health care system.
- iii. The holistic support for the resettlement work was fully funded through Central Government grant funding and was based on the number of people the Council resettled in the city. With reference to the Local Authority Housing Fund, the Council had agreed to pursue this as the grant offered by Central Government through the Local Authority Housing Fund was at a better rate than the grant offered through Homes England, so it was believed to be a better decision to invest in these properties using the Local Authority Housing Fund.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

25/15/HSC Housing Adaptations, Repairs and Renewal Policy

Matter for Decision

The draft policy contained within Appendix A of the Officer's report aims to replace the existing Cambridgeshire Adaptations & Repairs Policy adopted in 2019. It proposes a continuation of the same types of financial assistance for eligible applicants on low incomes for adaptations, repairs and improvement to their homes, but with some improvements to help support positive health and wellbeing outcomes.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved the Cambridgeshire Housing Adaptations, Repairs and Renewals Policy 2025-2030 at Appendix A of the Officer's report, as it related to Cambridge City Council, to replace the existing Cambridgeshire Adaptations & Repairs Policy 2019.
- ii. Delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Housing & Health to agree, subject to sufficient funding being available from the council's ring-fenced capital allocation, and in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Housing, Chair & Vice-Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee and Opposition Spokes (or their successors):
 - a. any future changes to the maximum amounts of financial assistance payable which may be needed during the life of the policy;
 - b. capital funding of any additional partnership work or other projects which may be appropriate to meet the objectives of the policy; and
 - c. any other minor changes which may be required during the life of the policy.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Housing Strategy Manager.

The Housing Strategy Manager and the Home Improvement Agency Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. A Project Officer had been employed specifically to increase awareness of the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFGs) within the Council's administrative area and to network with communities as there had been an underspend in the DFGs over recent years. Other work to promote DFGs included reaching out to over 1000 residents through 15 public facing events, 30 professional organisations across health and social care, and targeted leaflet drops to 1400 properties.
- ii. In the past additional DFG funding had been allocated to all local authorities. Due to Cambridge City Council's underspend, the Council passed their additional allocation to Huntingdonshire District Council as part of the shared Home Improvement Agency service as their demand

- for DFG funding was higher and it served to support the Cambridgeshire areas social care needs as a whole.
- iii. Approximately 80 DFG adaptations were undertaken in Cambridge per annum at a cost of around £540,000 against a budget of £827,000. Agreed to provide data and demography about the grant recipients outside of the meeting.
 - iv. In terms of forecasting DFG need year on year it wasn't just about demographic need but also the life of adaptations and potential need for replacement which needed to be taken into account.
 - v. Cambridge City tended to have a younger population compared with neighbouring authorities and there are also some affluent areas within the City which means some applicants are not eligible for the means tested grants.
 - vi. Noted reference to a 'savings cap'; £6000 savings would be disregarded as part of the means test for grant funding.
 - vii. The 'means test' is outdated; many people are not eligible for the grant funding due to their income / occupational pensions which are all considered as part of the application process.
 - viii. The increased DFG top up grant funding will particularly help with children's cases where disabled needs could not be met, as construction costs have increased. Five years ago an extension would have cost in the region of £40,000, which now costs £60,000; without top up funding the works could not be funded.
 - ix. A team of Caseworkers are employed to help applicants complete their application forms. They also support applicants through the planning and building regulation process and liaise with builders.
 - x. Officers had explored whether the application process could be digitalised but this tended to make the process more complicated.
 - xi. The law requires consultation with social services and most referrals to the Cambridgeshire Home Improvement Agency (CHIA) came in following occupational therapy assessments.
 - xii. CHIA offers a self-funding service to people who are not eligible for a grant.
 - xiii. In response to a query about whether CHIA explored why people didn't use the service following an expression of interest - advised that if people weren't eligible for grant funding, they would either fund the adaptations themselves, they may move or they may choose not to have the adaptations done which could put them at risk.
 - xiv. Noted that Huntingdonshire District Council did not have their own council housing stock. Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council spent approximately £1.6 million in addition to the DFG budget on adapting council homes.

- xv. Partners of applicants are also means tested for DFGs as this is a legislative requirement. Officers do identify and challenge situations where financial / coercive control is suspected.
- xvi. DFG funding cannot be used to fund mobility scooters, officers are not aware if other grant funding is available.
- xvii. Where a contractor delayed the delivery of adaptations there would be flexibility with regards to the requirement for the works to be delivered within 12 months of the grant approval.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

25/16/HSC City Centre Regeneration Sites

Councillor Lee joined the meeting from this agenda item.

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the report is to provide an update on city centre sites: Stanton House, East Road and Hanover and Princess Court. The report also sought approval to proceed with the demolition of Stanton House and redevelopment of the site through the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) to provide 29 new highly sustainable affordable homes.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Approved that the Stanton House scheme be brought forward as an affordable housing development and included in the Housing Capital Programme, with an indicative capital budget of £9,808,469 for the construction costs, professional fees and further associated fees.
- ii. Authorised the Director of Economy & Place in consultation with the Executive Councillor to deliver 100% affordable housing (29 units), with It is proposed that the affordable homes will be let in line with the Councils Housing Strategy, i.e. inclusive of a mix of social rent, 60% market rent and 80% market rent.
- iii. Authorised the Director of Economy & Place in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Housing to approve variations to the scheme

including the number of units and mix of property types, sizes, tenure, rent and the nature and level of the provision of special needs as outlined in this report.

- iv. Approved that delegated authority be given to the Executive Councillor for Housing conjunction with the Director of Economy & Place to enable the site to be developed through Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) subject to a value for money assessment to be carried out on behalf of the Council.
- v. Delegated authority to the Director of Economy & Place to instruct the demolition of the existing building at Stanton House.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Development).

The Assistant Director (Development) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Planning Officers had been very clear that a community room would need to be provided as part of the redevelopment of Hanover and Princess Court. The Housing Development Team would work closely with the Communities Team to agree how this would be delivered.
- ii. Noted concerns raised about the loss of specialist housing with regards to the redevelopment of Stanton House but advised that the Housing Development Team had to respond to the current housing need, which was for general housing stock. There was specialist housing within the existing housing stock and unfortunately due to the nature of the occupants although there was a waiting list for the accommodation, people were able to access the specialist housing relatively quickly. Officers would reflect upon comments made at previous meetings about housing provision for older persons accommodation.
- iii. Advised that a higher proportion of the residents within Stanton House were older homeless people as the accommodation wasn't generally desirable as the studio flats were quite small. As part of the redevelopment relocation process, residents who continued to need sheltered accommodation were accommodated in other sheltered

- housing schemes and other residents had been relocated to 'Long Drift Place'.
- iv. With the decant process, Officers worked with residents to find alternative accommodation which fitted their individual needs. Some residents had moved into general housing stock and other resident's needs had increased and therefore some were accommodated in Ditchburn Place. If residents wanted to stay in a city centre location, Officers would try to accommodate this where possible.
 - v. Acknowledged the proposed Stanton House redevelopment scheme would provide less units than was there previously but advised that the units would be much larger. A consultation would take place with Housing Officers to determine the appropriate level of rent for the area. If the Council was awarded Homes England grant funding this may also dictate housing tenure / rent levels.
 - vi. With reference to the Hanover and Princess Court redevelopment, paragraph 4.1 of the officer's report summarised the starting point for redevelopment which included a percentage range of affordable housing provision of 40-60% of 138 properties. Officers were hopeful that the total number of homes that may be able to be delivered will be higher, but it may be towards the lower range of the affordable housing provision. If viability suggested that total numbers were lower than 138 or that a lower percentage (below 40%) of affordable housing would be delivered, then a further Executive Councillor decision would be required.
 - vii. Biodiversity would be improved as part of the Hanover and Princess Court redevelopment and the community would be involved in developing ideas for this.
 - viii. There was currently no date for the demolition of Hanover and Princess Court but once the planning application had been submitted Officers would meet with residents to advise them about the redevelopment timeline.
 - ix. Officers would check the information contained within paragraph 5.9.1 'Physical Disability'. Post meeting note responding to the query raised. The needs analysis was carried out by the County Council. The County Council analysis seeks to identify the need for specialist accommodation; it is not identifying all people who have the specialist needs in question. Some people may have their needs met in other ways - for example by adaptations to their present homes or because in addition to their physical disability they have other needs which are a priority. The Committee Report is correct that the County Council analysis data does project that demand for supported living will reduce to 0 by 2026. As noted in the Committee Report the County Council analysis does also state that this may reflect a weakness in the available source data which

may be unduly affected by an anomalous fluctuation in demand for the period 2020-2022. There will be further discussions with the County Council about the best way to address specialist housing needs in the new development at Stanton House.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

25/17/HSC Update on New Build Council Housing Delivery

Matter for Decision

This was a regular quarterly report showing progress on the City Council's new housing delivery and development programme.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing

- i. Noted the continued progress on the delivery of the approved housing programme as outlined in Appendix 1 and 2 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted the issues encountered with Heating Systems at a number of new build schemes as identified in Para 4.11, and the Council adoption of an (MEP) Guardian/Consultancy route toward full system health checks, ensuring readiness for 2025 Heat Network Regulation implementation.
- iii. Noted that Funding of £4,577,000 has now been allocated to the council for the first phase of development at East Barnwell through Homes England's 21-26 AHP.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Development).

The Assistant Director (Development) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Noted concerns raised regarding the Ekin Road redevelopment. The Council had an excellent record of finding the right home for people according to their needs. The letter which had recently been sent to residents was a technical letter and was something the Council had to do as part of the legal process. This was the period as part of a redevelopment process where officers could spend more time working with vulnerable residents. A meeting with residents would be organised in the summer so tenants could talk through their concerns and officers could advise them about choices available to them.
- ii. In response to a question about Ekin Road, referred to paragraph 4.6.4 of the officer's report which stated that '1 out of 3 freehold properties had been purchased, 3 out of 9 leasehold properties had started the legal process of selling and 47 out of 82 tenanted households had moved'.
- iii. The East Barnwell redevelopment was proposed to start on the 17 March 2025. It was a 2-year development programme, and it was hoped that the first apartments would be handed over in 2 years' time.
- iv. Confidential discussions were taking place with shop keepers at East Barnwell. One retail unit would be delivered in phase one of the development.
- v. Advised that the local housing allowance rent was set by Central Government; it wasn't set by the Council.
- vi. Noted reference to 'commonhold housing'; the Council would comply with any new legislative requirements as part of its redevelopment programme. It wasn't clear at the moment whether this legislation would apply retrospectively or not.

The Committee resolved by 6 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.40 pm

CHAIR