

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2022 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

**Present:** Councillor Rev. Stuart Piper (Chair); Councillors Fellows, Austin, Boyd, Currie, Keen, Leys, Pat Moore, Paul Moore, Rattigan, Tomlinson, Wing, Whitehead and Wright

**In Attendance:** Councillors Albon, Ashbee, Bailey, J Bayford, R Bayford, Everitt, L Piper, Rawf, Towning and Yates

### 412. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from the following members:

Councillor Coleman-Cooke, substituted by Councillor Wright;  
Councillor Huxley, substituted by Councillor Whitehead.

### 413. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

### 414. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Councillor Paul Moore proposed, Councillor Tomlinson seconded and the Members agreed that the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 25 October 2022 were a correct record.

### 415. A BRIEFING ON MANSTON PROCESSING CENTRE AND ITS EFFECT ON THE LOCAL AREA

The Chair invited Members who had requested to speak under 20.1. Councillors Yates, Albon and Rawf made comments as follows:

- Members thanked Thanet District Council (TDC) officers who had gone to the Manston Processing Centre and intervened regarding the infectious diseases issue at the centre;
- Members acknowledged the work done by officers to try and keep residents safe;
- One member indicated that they wanted to promote the Kent Refugee Action Network and Refugees at Home as great organisations that provided support for refugees and asylum seekers in Kent;
- The Panel was asked to note the conditions that the migrants were living at the Centre and the fact that staff were also working under those poor standard conditions;
- The Panel was asked to recognise that those conditions were a disgrace;
- The staff who worked at the Centre did an exceptional job;
- The centre was supposed to be used by about a total of 1,000 migrants and they would be moved on within 24 hours;
- However in practice this was not the case as the individuals stayed longer than the 24 hours and there were about 4,000 individuals at one point;
- The issue of immigration was a national issue. However the council should make representations to the government through the local MPs urging the government to provide safe routes for refugees to come into the country and stop human traffickers from taking advantage of the refugee situation.

The Chair requested for the details of the Kent Refugee Action Network and Refugees at Home to be shared with all Members.

Councillor Ash Ashbee gave an update as follows:

- In December 2021, the council was first informed that the processing centre for asylum seekers was going to be set up by the Home Office, at the Ministry of Defence site at Manston;
  - The understanding was to provide a temporary staging point for asylum seekers, prior to getting more permanent placings elsewhere and that no individual would stay at this centre for more than 24 hours;
  - The Leader of Council attended a meeting with the Permanent Secretary on 13 December 2021, where the plan to set up Manston as the processing centre was confirmed;
  - The Leader then convened an urgent informal cabinet meeting to discuss the council's position on this matter;
  - After this cabinet meeting the leader wrote to the then Home Secretary, Priti Patel MP on 15 December 2021 to express the council's grave concerns about the suitability of Manston site and the prospects of expanding beyond its scope;
  - No reply was received to that letter from the Home Secretary;
  - Recent reports suggested that the Home Secretary had been advised by civil servants since last December of the legal difficulties in failing to find alternative accommodation to Manston;
  - Manston site was being managed entirely by the Home Office or its agents;
- 
- The council had no role in the management of the Manston site and was therefore not always kept informed of the number of individuals at the site or how long it would continue to be a processing centre;
  - The council got to the site only when the UK Health Safety Agency (UK HSA) asked the Council's Environmental Department to conduct an inspection of the site, which was then conducted on 9 September 2022;
  - In early November reports emerged in the media indicating that the site was working beyond its planned capacity;
  - It was reported about 4,000 individuals were living at the site when the planned capacity was 1,600;
  - As a result of those reports Clearsprings, a Home Office agent were funded to look for accommodation in Kent and elsewhere in order to move the asylum seekers from Manston as rapidly as was possible;
  - TDC and other councils were not given any prior notice about this operation by the home Office not were they given any notice of any hotels or premises that were being leased for this purpose in their respective local areas;
  - The Leader and other Kent Leaders signed a letter that was sent to the Home Secretary citing the detrimental effect that these arrangements were having on the county and district services;
  - The local MPs also made clear their objections to the use of local accommodation for this purpose without prior notice;
- 
- It was believed that as a result of these objections local accommodation was stood down by Clearsprings; notably accommodation at the old Christ Church University Campus in Broadstairs;
  - In the week beginning 14 November 2022, the Immigration Minister Robert Jenrick took part in a Webinar with Kent Leaders and CExs and he acknowledged that the situation had not been well handled;
  - The Minister stressed that the Home Office was seeking to rapidly reduce the numbers at Manston to avoid the overcrowding and indicated that moving forward

councils would be given 24 hours' notice before any placements were done in their respective local areas;

- TDC had thus far not received any notifications;
- It was reported in the news as at 22 November, that the Manton site was currently empty pending any new arrivals of asylum seekers.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- The report that the Manston site is currently empty is noted, but would the centre be used in the future?
  - One of the issues that seemed to go wrong was the communication between TDC and the government. What can be done to make the communication better when this site is used again or any other local areas are used by the Home Office?
  - Twenty four hour notice was not a long time. What could TDC do if the 24 hour notice was not given to the council?
  - When TDC's environmental department carried out its inspection of Manston site, were there any issues that arose from that inspection, particularly with the rising numbers of individuals living at the site and the reports of infectious diseases?
  - There were inadequate infectious disease prevention measures at the site;
  - Would these measures be improved for the future in order to prevent any infectious disease outbreaks, which would affect individuals living and staff working at the centre and likely to affect local residents?
  - Was there any known information regarding the health status of the man who died at the Manston site before he arrived?
  - It was disappointing to hear that the Manston had not been stood down completely because it did not seem the right place to use to manage migration;
  - Was the dispersal programme meant to take place within Kent or further afield?
  - There was some scare mongering and racism on the social media platforms especially in relation to housing. The council had a public equality duty in the discharge of functions to eliminate discrimination, harassment, bullying and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act;
  - It was also the duty of the council to provide equal opportunities for those individuals who shared protected characteristic and those who do not and foster good relations between those who a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- 
- The management of the immigration at the national level was causing the delays that led to Manston Processing Centre being overcrowded;
  - To what extent were the two local MPs assisting the Leader of Council with the robust push regarding handling of incoming refugees through the district?
  - It was harrowing to see human beings travelling in such conditions to cross the channel. There was a need to look at why the centre was established at Manston. According to the government's own statistics 80% of those who claim asylum were successful;
  - It was interesting to note that there were a number of systems for processing refugees coming into the country. The Ukrainian and Hong Kong refugees were settled; their children were going to school and they were also allowed to work here too, whilst other refugees were treated under a separate system. It was interesting to note certain people were dealt with much less of an impact on local communities. This was some kind of apartheid system;
  - The council should petition the government to provide a safe route for the 81% of the refugees as described in government statistics who had a legal right to be in the UK. This was so that government could focus on eliminating the loopholes for the 19% who had no right to be in this country and the traffickers;

- Did Clearsprings still have an association with the Christ Church University Campus?
- Did the Ministry of Defence have the correct planning permission for the current use of the Manston site to house asylum seekers there?
- There had been some concern in the local area for the migrants due to misinformation which had created some bad feeling. Could the council issue a statement updating the public on what had happened and the council's concern for the effect on housing?
- The government should work with the French government to set up a processing centre in France. They should also allow migrants who had been processed to work. There were a number of job vacancies and the government was considering changing the immigration rules to allow for the recruitment of more people from outside the country and yet there were people who had come into the country and were desperate to work.
- This was because many of them go through a number of years before their asylum claims were fully processed and in the meanwhile suffered from physical and mental ill health, partly because they were not allowed to work and having to be housed in a hotel at someone's expense. The whole system needed reviewing;
- Members paid tribute to Sir Roger Gale MP and Sir Roger's Office who had been superb in dealing with the Manston issue. His had kept the council informed and his office had been taking a variety of donations for people in need not necessarily only for the people at the Manston Centre;
- Members urged the two local MPs to continue to put pressure on the government to work with Local Authorities.

Councillor Ashbee, Penny Button Director of Safer Neighbourhoods and Colin Carmichael, CEx responded as follows:

- The council did not have any information about the health status of the man who had died at the Manston Centre;
- The reopening of the processing centre had not been confirmed nor whether it would be stood down or not. At the moment it had not been stood down;
- There were some adjustments that were being made to the site. The MP that covers Manston, Sir Roger Gale was in regular contact with the Home Office Secretary;
- This was an appalling situation and the Council had taken a robust stance on the matter. The Home Office Secretary had listened to comments from the councils so far. He had also given a pledge that no new sites would be utilised without giving councils at least 24 hours' notice before moving in;
- It was worth noting that the old Christ Church University Campus in Broadstairs was selected by a contractor employed by the Home Office to find sites. That was part of what the government called the dispersal programme which had nothing to do with the Manston Processing Centre. TDC had no knowledge of this placement;
- The council after some discussions with the Housing team had already objected to the campus being used for the dispersal programme as this would have had an adverse effect on the council's ability to find affordable accommodation for the local area's housing emergency situations. This then prompted the Kent Leaders' letter of objection to the Secretary;
- The inspection was a food and hygiene inspection which looked at the source of food. Environmental Services worked with the UK HAS on this inspection. The government agency then passed on all the results to the operators of the site including the Home Office advising them on what they needed to do to ensure that the infectious disease controls were robust enough to stop the spread of any infections;

- The 24 hours notice did not give the council the ability to refuse the use of local sites, except to point out, like with the use of the old Christ Church University Campus that this was in breach of planning policy. In this case the council would take enforcement action where there is a breach;
- There were a number of refugee programmes in the country. There were the Afghan Refugees, Syrian Refugees, Ukrainian Refugees and the broader migration programme and each of them was being organised in a different way. This was confusing for councils and the public;
- It was the organisation of the Manston Centre which appeared to be the problem. It was a combination of that the lack of resources of accommodation for people to move into;
- The council's understanding was that for the moment the Manston would continue to be used as a processing centre for new arrivals of asylum seekers;
- The council's understanding was that dispersal would be in other parts around the country, not just within Kent. For now the placements were taking place outside Kent;
- The council had taken a robust stance on this matter for the good of the district and it was not a partisan stance;
- When the Leader first took the matter up with Sir Roger Gale, the MP took the issue up in the Commons the next day;
- MP Craig Mackinlay made some robust comments as well against the use of the old Christ Church University Campus in Broadstairs and it helped the campus being dropped off the list for the dispersal programme;
- Both MPs have been very supportive of the council's position on this matter;
- The council was in contact with the current owners of the old Christ Church University Campus. The council was not clear as yet on the exact status of the agreement Clearsprings had for the university campus. It was the council's understanding that Clearsprings had no more intention of using the campus again;
- The council was not aware of any planning process that was followed regarding setting up of the processing centre at Manston. The advice council had which would be investigated further was that the Home Office would be able to use the site until next year, when they would need to obtain some kind of planning approval for their current use. However this approval did not necessarily need to come through TDC as it could be determined at the county of national level;
- The Leader was happy to work with the Council's Communications team and produce an outline of what had happened regarding this subject matter and share with the public.

The Chair thanked the Leader for the update and the Panel noted the report.

The meeting was adjourned at 20.08hrs

#### **416. DECARBONISATION OF THE COUNCIL'S HOUSING STOCK**

The meeting resumed at 20:15hrs

The Chair invited Councillor Yates to speak under Council procedure Rule 20.1 Councillor Yates thanked officers for the successful bid of £4.3 million decarbonisation fund that was made by the Housing Team.

Sally O'Sullivan, Tenant & Leaseholder Services Manager, led the discussion and made the following points:

- This was a strategy for how Tenant and Leaseholder Services (TLS) would reduce greenhouse gas emission, to ensure the Housing Revenue Account

(HRA) Housing stock supported the government's aims for decarbonisation and meeting net zero by 2050. It linked into the Council's Net Zero strategy. This strategy was especially important because of the way it would affect council tenants, many of whom were in fuel poverty. The adoption of this strategy would lead to the following:

1. Reduction of fuel consumption for our residents, making their homes warmer and more comfortable using less energy;
  2. The work to be carried out would be highly disruptive and residents would have to learn how to live in a different way or use new technologies;
  3. The new build properties that would come into the social housing stock would already be high performing and council officers would need to ensure they can demonstrate to tenants how this could be achieved.
- The strategy provided information on the expectation of the performance of newbuilds but its main focus was on current stock that was poorly performing;
  - Firstly, it examined the data that the council already had and what could be done to add onto this current information about the council properties. There was a need to come up with a plan to improve on the data currently held by the council as such information underpinned the Council's efforts for prioritising the programme for retrofitting the Current council stock;
  - This strategy had three objects and these were to:
    1. Get all properties to Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) C by 2030;
    2. Reduce energy consumption for residents;
    3. Offset carbon emissions.
  - To achieve these objectives, there were three principles to work by and these were:
    1. Tackle the council's worst performing properties first;
    2. Fabric First, No Regrets - this would mean that the council would ensure that its homes were well insulated first as this had an immediate impact on the residents fuel consumption. Once this was in place would be in a better position to find a clean heat solution that compliments the building. That would mean the council would have no regrets on what would already have been done and not have to redo any previous works;
    3. And to have meaningful resident involvement.
  - It was predicted that it would cost the council £40 Million to achieve the Net Zero target;
  - A further £4 million was required for professional fees;
  - Therefore, the Council was going to try and tap into as much funding as possible. Currently officers were exploring such finding streams as Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund (SHDF), (Energy Company Obligation (ECO4), Local Authority Delivery (LAD) scheme and Home Upgrade Grant (HUG);
  - The Council also knew that it had to act now to achieve our targets and there was an opportunity to apply for funding from the social housing decarbonisation fund;
  - An application was submitted for £4 million and this would need to be match funded by the Council by a further £4 million;
  - The council also applied to carry out works to five of our six tower blocks, which were expected to achieve an EPC C & B in all properties;
  - This was a highly ambitious project that would include the replacement of the EWI, cyclical, structural and fire safety works and this was being funded by Homes England. The estimated total value of this project was about £25 million;
  - Officers had decided to start with the tower blocks for a number of reasons that included the following:

- The trajectory pledges to complete a full retrofit of the tower blocks by 2028;
- Tower blocks had suffered from a lack of investment over the last 10 years, meaning that they were the worst performing council properties, not just for EPC's but for Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) and complaints as well. They looked tired and it was hard to make them look clean;
- The council had been awarded pre tender funding for the replacement External Wall Insulation (EWI), and these should be replaced to ensure TDC remained eligible for the remainder of the funding. Homes England had been consulted and had expressed satisfaction with the council's progress to date.

Officers had elected the bid and delivery route for the following reasons:

1. No one in the team has bid writing skills or the capacity to complete the requirements of the bid;
  2. We need to deliver the project by March 2025 or we will have to pay back the awarded funding.
- Therefore the appointment of bid and deliver partner fulfilled both criteria. The Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) Committee required assurance that TDC had the capacity for the delivery and supply chain in place, because the tight turnaround time did not allow for a full procurement exercise;
  - Mears approached TDC and offered this service. The council agreed to partner with Mears for a number of reasons that included the following:
    1. There was already a good relationship between Mears and TDC;
    2. Mears had good knowledge of council stock and tenants - especially with regards to the tower blocks that were highly complex buildings;
    3. Mears were successful in securing funding in wave 1 for other local authorities. This gave the council greater confidence in Mears bid writers. The council was also pleased with progress Mears were making to deliver against their commitments;
    4. Other providers that were approached did not give the council the same level of commitment as Mears.
  - The Council had also engaged a consultant that would provide a value for money report.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- One Members said that it was good to know that the council was addressing its worst performing buildings first;
- Would owners/occupiers be levied for these improvements? The leaseholders Services team provided an exemplary service to tenants by providing all the information required by Members to deliberate on matters;
- Another member welcomed the use of apprenticeships and local contractors;
- Members also thanked officers for the work done to putting together the report with significant detail;
- Another Members asked who was responsible for conducting EPC ratings on council properties;
- They further asked why the EPC information was missing;
- They also asked what would be done to address that issue;
- EPCs had been a legal requirement since 2007. Why would the council not train its own officers to conduct such ratings?

Sally O'Sullivan and Bob Porter responded to comments from Members as follows:

- This report would also be going to cabinet for decision on 15 December 2022;
- A detailed scope of work for the tower blocks particularly the heating system was currently not available. However once that information had been made available a report would be taken to cabinet for decision at a later stage;
- Officers were confident that leaseholders would not be levied for works on the external wall insulation. However they would be charged for the works on the internal walls insulation;
- The council would assist households by looking for finance for these internal walls insulation works;
- A new grant scheme for households struggling with energy costs went to cabinet. This is one source that could be used for internal walls insulation works;
- The missing EPC information was a legacy from the East Kent Housing. £60K had been allocated for the improvement of data in this area;
- A data asset officer was currently working on inputting data into the system;
- Officers carried out an analysis about having an in-house EPC service and concluded that that it was better to have it as an externally sourced service as it took a while to conduct EPCs.

Councillor Jill Bayford, Cabinet Member for Housing thanked officers for work, particularly for the successful submission of bids.

Members noted the report.

#### **417. QUARTER 1 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2022/23**

Matt Sanham, Acting Director of Operations introduced the report and made the following comments:

- This report had already been taken to cabinet on 13 October 2022;
- A forecast overspend had been made of just under £1.8 million against the General Fund revenue budget;
- One of the main reasons for the overspend was the additional demand in the housing service with more homelessness placements;
- In response to this the council had revised and was delivering on the new Homelessness Strategy Action Plan. Officer were regularly monitoring the levels of homelessness, recruiting new staff and commissioning new services to address the increasing need for support;
- Additionally agency staff had been brought in by the waste and recycle service;
- Gas and electricity cost increases had also affected the budget performance;
- The General Fund Capital Programme reflected substantial underspend. This was due to the phasing and timing of grant funded projects some of which were recommended to be slipped into the later years of the capital programme;
- In the HRA there was marginal cost overspend of £119k against the General Fund budget. On the other hand with the Capital Programme there proposals for the variations of a number of budgets so that the budget profile was closer matched to the revised expectations for the time and future spending

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- Waste and Recycling: The Council relies heavily on agency staff. Was the council trying to investigate possible alternatives around growing staff in the service without relying more on agency staff?
- The crematorium income: Increasing cost of gas would seriously affect cremation costs. Would these costs be passed on to families or would government assist councils?
- The Coastal Project income from Southern Water: Some of the money had been offered to town councils to refurbish the lifts;

- Ramsgate Town Council had been waiting for some feedback from TDC regarding this fund.

Matt Sanham responded to Member comments and questions as follows:

- The council had always relied on agency staff for the waste and recycling service because on the nature of the business. If for example was unable to turn up to work, the council would be forced to resort to agency staff to ensure that the service was not disrupted;
- Covid affected the service to an extent as crew staff work in close quarters. That meant that if one member of staff got covid, a number of the staff working in the same crew would most likely be affected. During covid there was an average of fifteen staff who would be off sick due to covid at any one time, forcing the council to resort to agency staff;
- There was generally a shortage of HGV driver across the country and as a result costs or drivers were going up. In other sectors some HGV drivers were paid as much as £60k per year which the council could not afford;
- Council was working on coming up with a training programme to train up new drivers, whilst retaining the current ones;
- The crematorium cost: Officers were building into the 2023/24 budget strategy, the capacity to deal with the uncertainties of fuel costs. The overspend showing in the report was a demonstration of the fact the council had absorbed the additional costs that came in as a results of the increases in inflationary increases. Fees and charges were also being reviewed;
- Southern Water Coastal Project fund: There was an original proposal when the money was received for town and parish councils but no council had come forward to accept the proposals. Matt Sanham was going to check on whether there were any submissions that had been made to TDC by the parishes.

Members noted the report.

#### **418. HOUSING ESTATE; STRATEGY, POLICY AND STANDARDS**

Sally O'Sullivan, Tenant and Leaseholder Services Manager introduced the report and made the following comments:

- Service standards were a set of commitments to council residents. They provided information about the level of service they could expect from the council. These standards also provided guidance to officers to the level of service they should be providing;
- Residents were involved in the development of these standards to varying degrees;
- Repairs service standard - This standard described the service that was delivered by the council's partnering contractors, Mears and Gas Call. It also provided information to Council tenants about what to expect from the repairs service, that included on the following issue:
  - The different ways in which they can report a repair;
  - How long different categories of repairs will take to be carried out;
  - How an appointment will be made;
  - What to expect from a contractor when they come to their home;
  - How we monitor the service.
- Much of this standard was dictated by the contracts the council had in place. However, Council had consulted the Thanet Tenant & Leaseholder Group (TTLG) on the Mears customer pledge. This document set out standards of behaviour for

the operatives and call centre staff and as a result of the feedback from the TTLG, further training was put in place for the call centre staff;

- The Lettings standard informed residents on what they could expect when they move into one of the council homes. The standard provided them with information on what would happen when they sign a tenancy agreement, what information they would receive and what standard to expect their new home to be in when they move in;
- To inform this standard, officers surveyed all new tenants from the previous six months. The purpose of this exercise was to learn from residents' experience and find out what was important to them when moving in;
- A message that came through this survey was the concern about the quality of the information given to new tenants and this feedback prompted the development of a new resident handbook.

Members made comments as follows:

- Members fully supported the new proposals as contained in the officer report;
- Tenants Groups were a useful platform for creating wider consultation with residents on any new changes;
- Some residents had been asked by the council to remove wall gardens in communal areas in tower blocks without prior explanation;
- This had caused some distress to residents;
- It was important that on implementation of any new policies that resident's involvement and consent was considered.

Sally O'Sullivan and Bob Porter, Corporate Director of Place responded to comments from Members as follows:

- It was unfortunate that residents were asked to remove their wall gardens from communal areas;
- However this had been done as a result of the feedback from the Fire Risk Assessors;
- A fire risk assessment was carried out and required that the wall gardens be removed from communal areas in tower blocks;
- The fire risk assessment came up with a position of zero tolerance wall gardens in communal areas;
- Officers had provided information through newsletters and TOT Notices explaining the fire risk assessment requirements to remove wall gardens;
- The council had also a telephone number that residents could call for an explanation;
- Officers were aware of storage shortage in tower blocks and were proposing new purpose built storage.

Members noted the report.

#### **419. HOUSING SERVICES STANDARDS; REPAIRS AND LETTINGS**

Sally O'Sullivan and Bob Porter, Corporate Director of Place responded to comments from Members as follows:

- The strategy was the vision the council had for its estates. It described four main objectives that were believed would enhance the estates as a place to live and these were as follows:
  1. Promote Community;
  2. Improve estate appearance;
  3. Better vehicle management;

#### 4. Safe place to live.

- The strategy also described:
  - How we will approach our estates to achieve our objectives;
  - How we will prioritise our estates for review and improvement works.
- Having an estate policy was a regulatory requirement. This estate policy applied the rules around how the strategy objectives would be delivered. It also described residents and Council responsibilities in achieving those objectives;
- The estate standard lets council tenants know what work council did to maintain and take care of the communal areas in and around its blocks of flats;
- This included communal cleaning, how the communal repairs, grounds maintenance and car parks were dealt with;
- The policy lets residents know what they were responsible for, which included the storage of belongings in communal areas and the disposal of refuse and how the council monitored the standard in partnership with residents;
- Residents were highly involved in the development of these documents. Information gathered from the estate inspections was used as well as information collected from two resident focus groups.

Members made comments as follows:

- Members supported the policies which were comprehensive and had been well written;
- The removal of carpets would counteract the insulation efforts being made to these properties by the council. If there was already a decent carpet in the property, why would such a carpet not be left in that home, after it had been deep cleaned?

Sally O'Sullivan and Bob Porter, Corporate Director of Place responded to comments from Members as follows:

- Carpets were in most cases not in a good condition to be left in the properties that were being repaired;
- These old carpets often carried parasites and it was good practice to remove and replace them;
- Assistance would be provided to those households that would struggle to buy new carpets.

Members noted the report.

#### **420. REVIEW OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2022/23**

The Chair confirmed that the presentation by the Leader on the efficacy of using cabinet advisory groups in decision making would now be coming to the Panel meeting on 17 January 2023.

Councillor Leys requested and Members agreed that Councillor Kup, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Youth Engagement be invited to a future Panel meeting to make a presentation the council's Toilet Management Strategy.

Councillor Wing also requested and Members agreed that the Panel be given an update on the Parking Review and Enforcement Strategy.

Members noted the report

**421. FORWARD PLAN & EXEMPT CABINET REPORT LIST**

Members noted the report.

Meeting concluded: 9.03 pm