

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

The Economy, Housing and the Arts Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes



Monday 27 January 2020

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Rory Vaughan (Chair), Rowan Ree, Ann Rosenberg, Helen Rowbottom and Adronie Alford

Other Councillors: Lisa Homan

Officers: Hitesh Jolapara (Strategic Director, Finance and Governance), Emily Hill (Assistant Director, Corporate Finance), Danny Rochford (Head of Finance, The Economy Department), Cliff Parker (Assistant Director, Housing Finance), Firas Al-Sheikh (Head of Housing Investment and Strategy), Mark Meehan (Chief Housing Officer), Glendine Shepherd (Assistant Director, Housing Management), Simone Melia (Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Assessment), Julia Copeland (Head of Strategic Commissioning and Rough Sleeping Lead), Gerry Crowley (Head of Allocations and Lettings), Peter Hannon (Head of Neighbourhood Services), Yvonne Stoney (Sheltered Housing Manager), Kim Smith (Chief Executive Officer) and Charles Francis (Committee Services)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were provided by Councillor Andrew Jones.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 01 October 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

4. 2020 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS)

Emily Hill (Assistant Director of Finance), provided a presentation outlining the Council's budget proposals and also set out the challenges facing local government in recent years.

It was noted that the gross General Fund budget was £525m, of which the net budget requirement of £154.3m was funded from Council resources (such as council tax and business rates) and general Government grant. It was noted the Government grant funding would increase by £3.6m from 2019/20 to 2020/21 as a result of the Government's pre-election spending round in September 2019.

Emily explained that the Council faced further pressures to manage any additional costs that might arise outside of the budget forecast. The budget recommended a 1.99% increase in Council Tax and 2% adult social care precept levy. Each would raise £4.8m over 4 years and £1.2m in the first year. This would support investment in key services for residents and improve future financial resilience. Additionally, it was noted that the business rates system was changing for a fourth successive year.

It was assumed that the budget gap would increase in each of the next three years if no action was taken to reduce overall expenditure. It was noted the Government would undertake a 'fair funding review' in 2020/21. This would reconsider how the Grant was distributed between authorities.

Concluding Corporate Finance's initial remarks, Hitesh Jolapara (Strategic Director, Finance and Governance) explained that in accordance with the administration's policy, the Authority sought to keep the council tax low while protecting and improving services.

Departmental Budget

Danny Rochford (Head of Finance, The Economy Department) provided a presentation of the Economy general fund budget for 2020/21, highlighting the following key points:

- The main challenge was the constraints on the Department's ability to collect income (pressures of Welfare reform, the Homelessness Reduction Act and the general state of the wider economy i.e. difficulties in generating Planning income)
- The proposed budget for the specific sectors within the Economy Department were Building and Property Management, Economic Development, Learning and Skills, Growth, Housing Solutions, Operations, Planning and Property Service and Compliance
- £800k savings had been identified through: Placing homeless residents in to better, longer-term private rented sector housing to reduce the use of Temporary Accommodation (£196,000), Reduction in Temporary Accommodation voids (£115,000), Improved debt management (£286,000), Consolidation of management & workforce and reduction in the use of agency staff (£100,000), Review and restructure of Economic Development (£61,000)
- An overview of the risks as set out in Appendix 2
- An overview of the Fees and Charges as set out in Appendix 4

The Chair thanked officers for the strong overview of the Corporate and Housing budgets, as well as the savings proposals. Cllr Lisa Homan was invited to speak before questions were taken from the Committee.

Cllr Lisa Homan explained that the budget had sought to avoid affecting front line services and considerable efforts had been made to find efficiencies. The Housing Solutions budget had been particularly challenging, given the Council's track record of not having any families in B&B accommodation in the last 3 years, gradually reducing the number of families in temporary accommodation.

In relation to business rates, Cllr Rowan Ree asked about the London Pool and how this differed from previous years. In response, Emily explained how the pool of London Boroughs (business rates) operated (spreading any losses or gains) and reduced volatility in the market place. The Committee noted that the agreed Pilot Pooling arrangements meant that any growth would be retained by Hammersmith and Fulham and the GLA. New regulations now meant that the government would take its share of the pool.

Cllr Rowan Ree asked about the income for the Economy Department and, in particular, how much scope there was to control Planning fees or whether they were controlled centrally. In response, Danny Rochford (Head of Finance, The Economy Department) explained that planning fees could be split between statutory and non-statutory. The statutory fees were beyond the Council's control as they were set by central government who chose when and if they wished to increase them. However, the non-statutory ones could be influenced and indeed benchmarking exercises (against other London Boroughs) had been conducted. Danny confirmed that non-statutory fees would be increased by 2.8% which was in-line with the Council's expectations for all charges.

Cllr Rowan Ree asked whether there was scope to charge a higher proportion of fees for larger developments rather than household developments. In response, Danny explained that he would need to seek expert advice from the service and report back.

Action: That Danny Rochford contact the Planning Department to establish whether there was any scope to charge developers higher planning fees (than those for residential development) for large scale developments.

Cllr Adronie Alford acknowledged that as the Council had lost the fee from the temporary management fee, she asked whether this would be a substantial risk to the Council. In response, Danny explained that it had been listed on the Departments' risk schedule, but it was dependant on the decisions central government made in relation to grants. It was noted that after 20/21 there was no certainty whether it would be continued, reduced or removed.

With regards to the Homeless Reduction Act Cllr Adronie Alford asked what was meant by the previously ineligible client group. In response, Mark Meehan (Chief Housing Officer) provided details of recent legislative changes and what the implications of these were including the new prevention duty which had been placed on the Council. Mark explained that since the Homelessness Act had been

introduced in 2018, the Council had seen a 130% increase in the number of people the Council was assisting.

Cllr Ann Rosenberg asked that in those cases where a business was waiting for business rates to be clarified, were Chartered Surveyors used and what impact did this practice have. In response, Hitesh explained that the Council did receive a large number of appeals which were considered by the Valuation Agency which did result in rates fluctuating. Hitesh explained that trends data could be provided and this could be circulated by email.

Action: That trend data on business rates Appeals be circulated by email.

The Chair asked about the long-standing backlog of appeals, especially in relation to Westfield and whether these had reduced in number. In response, Hitesh explained that large appeals such as Westfield's and the BBC had been through the system but there were a number of appeals which still required action by the Valuation Office.

Residents were invited to ask questions through the Chair. Officers were asked how the Council could incentivise landlords to turn some of the empty premises surrounding the market into accommodation and perhaps transform larger retail spaces into smaller shops. In response, Mark Meehan explained that the Council had Local Plan as well as a Private Sector Housing Team that worked with Private Sector landlords to try and bring properties back into use for rented accommodation. Asking a follow up question, the resident asked whether there was scope to conduct further publicity and marketing to bring more vacant properties back into housing stock.

Mark Meehan explained how the Council used the CAPITAL Letters scheme which incentivised landlords to work with the Council to bring properties into circulation and highlighted that a new pan-London initiative was just about to be launched.

Cllr Lisa Homan also highlighted the action being taken to encourage absentee leaseholders of properties on the estates to get in contact with the Council so that further accommodation could be offered to tenants. Cllr Rowan Ree asked if the Council was also in contact with local estate agents. Mark Meehan commented that officers were in contact with a variety of housing providers and a competitive housing market was currently operating.

With regards to Council tax levies, Cllr Rowan Ree noted that 53% of dwellings were liable for 100% Council Tax, which struck him as very low. This also meant that 47% of dwellings received some form of discount. Cllr Rowan Ree asked how this compared with other areas (boroughs). In response, Emily explained that the support available was dependent on the characteristics of the local population. It was noted that the Council tax support was a local scheme. There were national requirements for the support of older people, but the provisions in relation to those of working age for those on low incomes was determined locally. The Committee noted that the Authority provided high levels of support to individuals and families on lower incomes, as agreed by Full Council.

The Chair commented that the large single cohort of people with single person discount (30%) seemed higher to him than it might be elsewhere, which he thought might reflect the housing stock in that there were far more 1- bedroom studio flats or as a reflection of the local demographics. In response, Emily explained that some level of assurance could be provided, as the Council did undertake data matching exercises to ensure those people claiming single person discount were indeed eligible for the benefit.

The Chair asked officers if they thought the savings which had been outlined could be achieved. Further questions included, how officers went about challenging the budget to deliver the savings and how this pressure / scrutiny was maintained throughout the year. Placing homeless residents in better long-term accommodation, to reduce the use of temporary accommodation was an aim the Committee supported. The issue here was, reassuring people on the housing register that if they used the private rented sector, they were not disadvantaged from their place on the social housing register.

Responding to the last point, Cllr Lisa Homan explained that it was important to stress that using temporary accommodation was an expensive option / less suitable and it was far more cost effective to use properties within the private rented sector (PRS) for a limited time. Mark Meehan confirmed that one of the roles of officers was to reassure tenants that they would remain on the housing register, despite using the PRS. Mark explained that temporary accommodation was somewhat of a misnomer as most of the temporary properties were in the PRS. As a final remark, he reiterated that residents place in the queue for Council housing would remain unchanged by using the PRS.

Action: that the Committee examine the operation of the Housing Register in relation to temporary accommodation at a future meeting and before changes to the Register are considered at Cabinet.

The Chair asked what monitoring was conducted on the housing budget. In response, Mark Meehan confirmed that every Housing budget manager met with his Finance counterpart on a monthly basis, so there was an ability to assess current and on target performance at every Departmental budget level.

Resolved –

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report.

That the Committee examine housing allocations and the use of temporary accommodation prior to its consideration at Cabinet.

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT AND FINANCIAL PLAN FOR COUNCIL HOMES

Danny Rochford (Head of Finance, The Economy Department), introduced the presentation that covered the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and the Financial Plan for Council Homes (including the proposal to increase rents).

Providing an overview, Danny stated that every year, the council reviewed the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget which enabled officers to draw up a fresh 40-year financial plan for the HRA to ensure that a long term, sustainable plan was in place. Details were provided on a series of challenges and pressures to the HRA which were summarised as follows:

- Loss of rent for four years
- Increased spending on Fire Safety
- Increase in accommodation costs
- Housing Development Programme
- Repairs and maintenance contract costs
- Asset Management Strategy (a considerable proportion of the housing stock was nearing the end of its life expectancy)

With these pressures in mind, Danny explained that this year's refresh sought to deliver and fund improved housing services to residents and invest for the future. However, to achieve this, a rent increase of 2.7% was necessary based on CPI (Consumer Price Index) +1%, in line with the Council's commitment made in 2015 to make rent increases affordable. It was noted that it was also necessary to make savings in ongoing costs over four years, which would lead to an annual cost saving of £4m per annum.

Danny explained that failure to take either of these actions would result in either; a reduction in essential services to residents, or significantly increasing the savings target to over £4m. He explained that in real terms, the rental increase amounted to an average rent increase of £3.12 / week.

Discussing the pressures further, Cllr Lisa Homan highlighted that the rent rise which had been considered in the past, was actually lower than what had been suggested back in 2015. The importance of the Fire Safety Plus scheme was underlined, as was the need for the Council to respond to the emerging (central government) guidance (at no additional expense to leaseholders). It was also noted that more money was being spent on repairs as this area had been previously underfunded.

Mark Meehan explained that before any recommendation to increase rents had been made, officers had surveyed all the other 32 London Boroughs. He confirmed that the Officer proposal to increase rents was identical to what all the other London Boroughs were doing. In relation to fire safety, he reiterated the need to ensure the Council was in a strong position to react and implement legislative change.

Cllr Ann Rosenberg asked who had the ultimate responsibility when a building was being constructed, to ensure they were compliant (with fire safety legislation) and residents were not left with worthless properties. She explained she was aware there were around 400 properties which had been identified where the construction materials meant that householders were unable to move or secure further funding from lenders. Mark Meehan explained this topic could be brought back as a future item or he could brief Cllr Rosenberg outside the meeting. In general terms, Mark Meehan commented that thankfully only a few properties in Hammersmith and Fulham had been identified which fell into this category.

Cllr Lisa Homan commented that the Environmental Housing Team which addressed issues in the PRS were conducting a large survey and feeding information to Government on non-Council buildings, so there were a variety of work streams also being done on non-housing stock. As a closing remark, Mark Meehan said it was only right that the free-holder of the building paid for any remedial works to rectify the building and make it compliant

The Chair confirmed that the Committee wished to re-examine the work being conducted on the Fire Safety Plus scheme within the next twelve months.

Action: That Officers provide an update on the Fire Safety Plus scheme in the next year.

Commenting on the ongoing nature of fire investigations, Cllr Helen Rowbottom asked about the budget implications of these works and how officers were about able to predict what funds were needed. In response, Mark Meehan explained that officers were not able to predict and did not know what the specific funding requirements would be until events transpired. This was where the use of reserves came into play. As Cllr Rowbottom was a nearly elected Member, he offered to provide her with a separate briefing on the Fire Safety scheme so she conversant with the specific projects were operating in her ward.

Cllr Adronie Alford asked whether the Officers had discovered any significant issues with other building/s during the course of implementing the fire safety plus changes. In response, Mark Meehan explained that they had not.

Residents were invited to ask questions through the Chair. A resident asked if it was possible for Officers to provide a breakdown of how (after the rent increase had been agreed by Cabinet in April) the rent was allocated and what services were being paid for. Danny explained that the Council would be sending a letter to all tenants at the end of February 2020 in advance of the budget consideration in April. He confirmed that the letter would contain a table itemising all the elements that formed the overall rent charge (including basic rent as well as the separate service charges). The resident explained that some London Boroughs were producing a booklet which provided details of how the rent was calculated. Mark Meehan stated that the Housing Department would be unable to issue a booklet before 6 April 2020, as the Authority was duty bound to give a specific notice period before the rent increase came into effect, however, a booklet was something that the Authority might issue in the future.

Cllr Rowan Ree asked whether the Authority had seen any cost savings arising from the Fire Safety Plus scheme such as insurance or repairs. Mark Meehan noted the question and explained he would respond outside the meeting.

Action: Mark Meehan to contact Cllr Rowan Ree outside the meeting with further information regarding cost savings and the Fire Safety Plus scheme.

A resident asked whether the recently replaced fire-doors as part of the Decent Homes Programme, could be retro-fitted elsewhere to speed up the implementation of the Fire Safety Plus scheme. He also expressed concern at the £500k savings

which needed to be found annually (to achieve the £4million saving within 4 years). In response, Cllr Lisa Homan explained that while there was additional money in the Maintenance Budget at present, the Council was actively looking to find efficiencies as well. Mark Meehan reiterated this point and confirmed that the Housing Department was currently reviewing agency posts, vacancies, collection rates and the voids process as part of an overall drive to achieve further savings.

A resident asked about the £600k the Council received for water rates and whether this would continue. In response, Danny confirmed that the billing process would be handed back and so the contractual relationship would return to being between residents and Thames Water. Essentially, the HRA would lose £600k income per annum.

A resident expressed concern about the Council's complaints procedure and was informed that the Council had a robust complaints procedure in place, and should they have further concerns, these could be discussed separately outside the meeting. The resident also raised concerns about the breakdown of the rents charges they had received. The Chair confirmed it would be beneficial for the Committee to have a better understanding of these and asked officers to provide information outside the meeting of how these were calculated.

Action: That officers provided a breakdown of the rent charges to the Committee outside the meeting.

A resident asked if it was common practice to have a 40-year business plan. Cliff Parker (Assistant Director, Housing Finance) confirmed this was usual practice as properties had a 100-year lifespan. In relation to the development of new properties, officers needed to work out the costs and income streams associated with the properties and these only became apparent after at least 40 years had elapsed.

Concluding the item, the Chair confirmed that while potential rent increases were not welcome news for tenants, the pressure and difficulties facing the Council had been well made by Officers in the presentations which had been provided. The Chair confirmed it would be good for the Committee to receive the breakdown of rent charges so these were clear to the committee and also so it could have an understanding of what might be developed in future years.

RESOLVED

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report.

5. ROUGH SLEEPING, HOMELESSNESS AND SHELTERED HOUSING UPDATES

Glendine Shepherd (Assistant Director, Housing Management) gave an overview of the report which provided updates on Rough Sleeping, Implementing the Homelessness Reduction Act 2018, Temporary Accommodation and Sheltered Housing. The individual report authors then provided a brief summary of the reports and the following points were noted:

Rough Sleeping

Julia Copeland, Head of Strategic Commissioning and Rough Sleeping Lead explained that rough sleeping was the most visible and extreme form of homelessness. Details were provided on the causes and scale of the problem, as well as what steps the Council was currently taking to address the issue.

In line with the Council's commitment to do things with residents, rather than to them, Officers interviewed 108 rough sleepers. This data was used to inform the Council's response, and stemming from the Rough Sleeping Commissions' 29 recommendations, it was noted that the Council's strategy would focus on improving prevention and early intervention through better information, signposting and partnership working. Details were provided on several of the new initiatives for rough sleepers. Actions included:

- The expansion of Housing First;
- Emergency night support service;
- Rough sleeper navigator posts;
- Homeless hospital discharge co-ordinator;
- Cold Weather Fund;
- More joined up services;
- Alternative Giving Scheme campaign; and
- Small Tap Big Change (with nearly £5K raised so far).

Concluding her remarks, Julia explained that in 2020/21 the majority of rough sleeper services (accommodation and out-reach services), would be recommissioned and Officers would continue to deliver better value for money, better outcomes and improved services to residents.

Homelessness

Simone Melia, Head of Homelessness Prevention and Assessment, provided details on the Council's statutory duties to help residents before they became homeless i.e. they had nowhere to live, but were not rough sleeping.

The Committee heard The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 ('The Act') which came into force in April 2018, had made significant changes to the way in which local authorities delivered homelessness services and put a greater emphasis on providing advice and guidance to those persons living with the threat of homelessness.

Details were provided on the number of people seeking homelessness assistance, the preventative work which officers were doing, as well as the new *duty to refer* (which put the onus on public sector organisations to let the Local Authority know if anyone was at risk of becoming homeless.)

Officers explained that the Economy Department had been recently restructured which had influenced how homeless services were delivered. Simone also highlighted the improvements which had been brought about by the new customer

contact centre based at 145 King Street, the introduction of a new online self-assessment tool, upskilling and an improved customer service experience.

Temporary Accommodation

Gerry Crowley, Head of Allocations and Lettings explained the Council provided temporary accommodation as it had a legal duty to do so to those households which were homeless or threatened with homelessness. Setting the national context, it was noted that since 2010, there had been a 77% increase the number of families in temporary accommodation and a 250% increase in the number of families in bed and breakfast accommodation.

The Committee were pleased to learn that the Council had been able to reduce the number of families using temporary accommodation by 15% since April 2018, which bucked the pan-London trend. As such Hammersmith and Fulham was deemed to be a beacon Authority for its work in this area.

Details were provided on the Temporary Accommodation Delivery Board and also TA Reduction Working Group which had been established in 2018/19. It was noted that the key to the delivery of savings was through tenancy sustainment once a household had accepted an offer of housing in the private rented sector.

Sheltered Housing

Yvonne Stoney – Sheltered Housing Manager explained that Sheltered Housing Service comprised of 970 units across 22 schemes. Schemes varied in size and design but were all one-bedroom self-contained units for independent living, clustered around a shared communal lounge. Details were provided on the resources and the numbers of Officers involved in delivering the service.

It was noted that a significant amount of resident engagement work had been conducted and these details were set out in the report.

The Committee heard an active Residents Sheltered Housing Forum met every 2 months. To establish what residents wanted from the Service going forwards, a series of workshops were held and using this feedback, 3 options were developed. Of these, the residents agreed to implement option 1 for the new service structure.

In relation to the Homelessness Reduction Act, Cllr Rowan Ree asked how much additional funding this gave Local Authorities on a long-term basis. In response, Yvonne confirmed that no further funding was available. In the short term, *new burdens funding* was available for the first few years. Cllr Lisa Homan confirmed that after 2020/21 it was uncertain what would happen.

Cllr Rowan Ree asked in terms of fund raising for homelessness, whether Officers had done any direct fund raising with businesses in the Borough. In response, Julia

confirmed that Hammersmith Bid had been actively involved and the borough was at the start of charitable giving through initiatives like Small Tap, Big Change. Businesses also had their Corporate, Social Responsibility arms and there was an element of public giving.

Cllr Rowan Ree commented how effective the Small, Tap, Big Change initiative was and Mark Meehan explained this had been launched at the Council's Business Awards. Mark explained that further information on the Small Tap, Big Change scheme and Beam would be circulated to Members outside the meeting.

Action: That Officers provide the Committee with further information on the Small Tap, Big Change scheme and Beam.

Cllr Rowan Ree asked whether the 3-month post at Charing Cross Hospital had started. In response, Julia confirmed that St Mungo's would be seconding one its workers and it was hoped this work would start in the next 2 to 3 weeks. The savings arising from delayed discharges would be fed into the NHS.

Cllr Adronie Alford asked about the Emergency Night Support Service and how it worked. In response, Julia explained that it was located in Market Lane Day Centre in Shepherds Bush. The provision was very basic and comprised of camp beds for up to 8 people in a room and this was supervised by 2 staff. It opened from 9 pm to 8 am and it was the Street Outreach Team at St Mungo's which brought the clients to the facility. Julia confirmed the centre had been a contributory factor in reducing the numbers sleeping on the streets at night. Officers confirmed they had approached Central Government for funding in the hope that this could evolve into a 24-hour service.

Asking a supplementary question, Cllr Adronie Alford asked if homeless attendees (of The Emergency Night Service) would be advised when they attended. In response, Officers confirmed that they would be advised to refer themselves to Housing Solutions.

Cllr Adronie Alford noted that there had been a dramatic rise in the number of homelessness housing applications and if there were checks being done to ensure an applicant was genuinely homeless. In response, Yvonne explained there was a correlation between these and the increased number of single people making applications. Officers confirmed that a series of checks were made to verify if the person was genuinely homeless.

Cllr Helen Rowbottom explained that hospitals were not allowed to discharge persons without a fixed address onto the street and asked Officers to comment on this. Officers confirmed this was correct and hospitals should not be discharging to the street. It was noted that this was where the 3-month secondment to Charing Cross hospital should be beneficial.

Cllr Ann Rosenberg asked about Glass Door. In response, Officers explained that Glass Door was a Homeless Charity and London's largest open-access network of emergency winter shelters and support services for men and women affected by homelessness. Beyond that, there were a variety of drop in centres such as Queen

Caroline or libraries. Mark Meehan also explained that most Officers had mobile phones and so they had on-line mobile access.

Cllr Ann Rosenberg asked how a homeless person went about completing on-line forms. Officers explained that there were PCs in 145 King Street and Officers were on hand to provide face to face assistance.

Residents were invited to ask questions through the Chair. A resident asked if outreach (to homeless people) had been conducted in libraries as they had noticed that rough sleepers tended to congregate in them. Rough sleepers had also been known to sleep in rooms on the estates and residents expressed concern about this development. Officers asked residents to report any incidents of rough sleeping to the Council and organisations such as Street Link would be in a position to help.

Concluding the item, the Chair stated that it was good to hear about the progress which had been made on the Rough Sleeping initiative since the recommendations from the Rough Sleeping Commission and thanked Officers for the updates and the extra work they had taken to action the Homelessness Reduction Act. In relation to the use of Temporary Accommodation, he noted that there had been more referrals, but less people using temporary accommodation which underlined the good work which was being done in this area. Sheltered Housing was also cited as a good example of doing things with residents rather than to them.

The Chair asked Officers what actions they thought had made a significant difference to bring about positive change. In response, Julia Copeland explained the Commission had focused on and given officers the incentive to join up a number of work streams to really make a difference. Julia highlighted that the Borough had a number of excellent voluntary services, strong partnerships and a good track record of working with the council's voluntary organisations and providers. Officers had ensured they had listened to homeless peoples' views and used the Council's money wisely with evidence based commissioning. Glendine Shepherd highlighted that in addition, the Council now had dedicated officers working in the area of rough sleeping which had made a real difference.

Concluding the item, Cllr Lisa Homan explained this was an area she shared with Cllr Sue Fennimore, Deputy Leader, which illustrated the degree of political commitment to tackle the problem of homelessness. She highlighted the Council had a committed staff body dedicated to addressing the issue. In relation to the Sheltered Housing work, Cllr Lisa Homan stated that she had attended a number of meetings where the Sheltered Housing initiative was discussed and there had been high levels of engagement.

The Chair said the report illustrated the large amount of positive work which was being done and the Committee looked forward to revisiting and scrutinising the work which had been done in the future.

RESOLVED

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report.

5. WORK PROGRAMMING

The Chair introduced the item and requested that the Committee be provided with an update on the work of the Arts Commission and Upstart to the next meeting.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm

Meeting ended: 9.55 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Charles Francis
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 020 8753 2062
E-mail: charles.francis@lbhf.gov.uk