

HOUSING & COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Housing & Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Monday 26 January 2015 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Tom Flynn (Chair)
Councillor Ben Johnson (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Vijay Luthra
Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Johnson Situ
Michael Orey

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Karl Eastham

OFFICER SUPPORT: Gerri Scott – Strategic Director of Housing and Community Services
Paul Langford – Head of Operations
Jonathon Toy – Head of Community Safety and Enforcement
Shelley Burke – Head of Scrutiny
Fitzroy Williams – Scrutiny Officer

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cris Claridge, Councillor Damian O'Brien and Councillor Claire Maugham. Councillor Karl Eastham reserve member would be replacing Councillor Maugham for this meeting.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were no urgent items.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2014 and 25 November 2014 be agreed as a correct record.

5. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND NOISE TEAM - DISCUSSION

5.1 The chair invited Jonathon Toy (Head of Community Safety & Enforcement) to give a briefing on anti-social behaviour and the noise team to the sub-committee.

5.2 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that he would present the noise service and anti-social behaviour separately. Members were informed that Southwark offers a fairly comprehensive noise service, which responds to about 8,000 calls per year and operates from Monday to Thursday (8.00 – 2.30 a.m.) and at the weekend the service was extended to (4.00 - 4.30 a.m.) depending on the demand for the service.

5.3 The service was adjusted according to the season, two teams operating during the winter period, and three teams during the summer period.

5.4 Members were informed that in the past officers had tended to respond to and deal with statutory noise issues and this had been a particular issue to some residents. An example given was a qualified noise officer would need to identify noise in relation to both the source and how it was affecting the person complaining about it, often this would mean attending the home/business and making sure the noise was of such a level that it affects a reasonable person. Many residents do not want someone knocking on their door, they just wanted the noise to stop and for officers to be proactive in their approach.

5.5 During the last few months when noise officers hear about a noise nuisance they spoke to the person or address causing the nuisance and asked for something to be done about it, like reducing the level of noise. This was something officers were developing as a service and would respond to residents needs.

5.6 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated Anti-Social Behaviour officers had been looking long and hard into the

concerns of local residents. Officers had been considering how the service operates and how often issues were dealt with on a single issue basis, an example given was a licensed premise where when a nuisance was reported the licensing officer would go along and respond.

- 5.7 If the council were dealing with trading standards issues the trading standards officers would respond to those matters and the same with anti-social services. A good way to move forward would be to adopt a much more multi-agency approach. Anti-social behaviour was not isolated to estates or public realm areas, quite often it crosses over a number of issues and requires a much greater multi-faceted response, sometimes dealing with business, residential or freeholder premises and that was the kind of service the council now needs to be provide. Officers were working with the cabinet member about how the council could design the services to have a multi-agency response.
- 5.8 Members were informed that if there was one issue that still required some more work it would be the drug supply markets, not necessarily in terms of high profile business premises but particularly the open use of cannabis that was so prevalent to local residents and which officers have a lot of concerns.
- 5.9 The sub-committee were informed that last week there was a joint operation with the police and council in relation to an area around Lindsey Street that related to a number of drug related activities. There were a number of arrests, good work had taken place with community safety, housing, police and other services. Interestingly there were business premises involved in this activity and not only about residential issues and pressures, it was a mixture of things going on and the council needed to make the best use of resources as this may be the best approach for the future.
- 5.10 The chair thanked the Head of Community Safety & Enforcement for the introduction and welcomed the insight into the work going on in the department.

Noise Service

- 5.11 A member asked what can officers do if the person making the noise refuses to turn down the noise?
- 5.12 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported if the noise officer knocked on the door and believed there was an issue and asks the person to turn the noise down and they were to say no, the officer would then look at the statutory powers that they had and consider serving a notice or take further action of entering the premises and removing the equipment making the noise, which was a course of action that they had within their powers but would not wish to do in the first instance. There were prosecution powers

available but there were a number of steps that would need to be taken in advance.

- 5.13 A member stated there was an example in his ward recently where bins were moved to provide access for a person with a disability, but the collection of the bins was disturbing another resident and so you have a situation of competing needs of different residents, how would such a situation be resolved?
- 5.14 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that there were processes within the council, and an issue such as that would be dealt with in a joint approach with the cleansing team and environmental enforcement team who would undertake the work in terms of actions against bins left out at the wrong times and causing other issues. Officers would work with highways as well.
- 5.15 Members were informed that there was a partnership tasking group within this borough, which was a multi-agency council lead and met fortnightly meeting, which deals with a whole range of council related and police services to look at how we can respond to issues that come within our borough over a two week period.
- 5.16 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated that often it would be a multi-agency issue that arises and officers would advise that parking should do this piece of work and get housing in to do another piece of work and perhaps get the wardens to undertake some work in this area, this work would be co-ordinated through the fortnightly meeting. Officers also rely on councillors to report any issues, a good example being the Rockingham Estate where parking, noise team, police, SASBU and a range of different services were working together. The officer agreed to the members forwarding the details of this particular case to him.
- 5.17 A member stated that people had different noise tolerance and he had thought that officers had noise equipment to measure noise levels, but now understood that noise officers just listen, how do you measure noise levels?
- 5.18 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated noise disturbance was subjective, noise officers were qualified to a certain level and had qualifications in noise acoustics. They were trained to recognise what the level of noise was and have to base it around reasonableness of the disturbance in terms of what would affect a reasonable person.
- 5.19 The member stated if the noise team were called out, sometimes people have their windows open and the noise was coming from the outside, do they ask the resident to close the window so they can measure from inside or do they measure with the window open?

- 5.20 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that they have got to base it on a level of reasonableness, there may be a number of reasons why they may feel that the noise was so loud outside, whether the windows were open or closed or whether there was a particular issue around where they may take action.
- 5.21 In the summer time people do open their windows and this could happen where noise levels outside are at an intolerable level. We do not want to say is that it is not statutory nuisance, we would want to say could you turn your music down as it was very loud at this moment in time.
- 5.22 The chair stated that both Councillor O'Brien and himself had spent time with the noise team on the night shift, and one of things that struck him was that was officers' safety was most at risk from residents who were told that noise was not a nuisance, rather than the people making the nuisance. What do we do to protect officers in those situations and to educate residents about what their job was?
- 5.23 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that there were a range of back office functions, the officers have to report where they are and where they are going and report back to the call centre or liaison points on their visits and where their going next, there was a constant checking process.
- 5.24 Members were assured that if there was an address with an issue, that gets flagged on the system and officers were alerted and warned in case there was a specific issue. Officers were trained in how to deal with particular situations and they are encouraged that if they were in confrontation they should step away, not to remain in that situation and deal with it at another time.
- 5.25 The officer stated that the point about officers being more at risk from the person reporting the nuisance and being told it was not an issue was interesting and he would be willing to explore more with the sub-committee. He further reported that officers were responding to people who genuinely believe there was a noise issue because of other health related problems that they face and that caused officers some real challenges.
- 5.26 A member asked what would you advise councillors to do with repeated reports of noise nuisance? Councillors and officers were not being believed, but if they had something in black and white based on the average noise expectation most people would respond to that positively.
- 5.27 The officer advised members to involve other health based professionals to help with some of these cases, officers were now looking to directly involve health professional services in cases to provide help and support.

- 5.28 Members were informed that officers would like to get to the point where we were very clear around the offer that officers were making, and what the expectation was at the service being providing, if there was a noise issue officers would do something about it, if other agencies are required we would involve them.
- 5.29 A member of the public stated that the noise from youths gathering in the stairwells was a real problem, they were sometimes persuaded to go away but would then return later on, it affects life on the estate especially with older people and some of them were very difficult to deal with and were very cheeky, this situation had been going on for the last 4 years.
- 5.30 The chair stated that this would be taken onboard with the anti-social behaviour discussion later on in the meeting.
- 5.31 The chair stated with regards to staff safety, the night he went out with the team he was aware of the flag system which keeps up on any dangerous situations they may come across. The team he was with were directed to a particular address, the call centre did not see a flag but one of the officers recognised the address and asked the call centre again, they reported again there was no flag. The officer then called their own team it was picked up that the address had been flagged as a problem address. The chair asked were there issues with the call centre?
- 5.32 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that officers were working very closely with the call centre to improve the level of both handover and checking of information and assured members that it was improving.
- 5.33 One of the things that officers have been working on closely with the call centre managers was that they had an officer that controls the activity of the noise service that comes through and officers have been talking about having that officer based within the noise team, so it would be easier to have that hand over. There were systems in place and officers were moving in the right direction.
- 5.34 A member asked what were the service challenges that officers were facing with regards to being pro-active to increasing noise activities?
- 5.35 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that the reason why the night time economy team was introduced to Southwark 3 years ago was recognition of the vibrant night time economy that was coming to the borough and that has been successful and developed some very good relationships with a lot of the major clubs, and we have the ability to be a lot tougher on clubs that are not managed properly.

- 5.36 If the Council was to going to make the best of the services we have it has got to be with the multi-agency approach as that would be the best way forward, we have got teams of skilled people that can deal with a range of issues in a vibrant night time economy concerning pubs, restaurants, clubs and bars. There are ways of managing businesses within the nighttime economy, we want to encourage a vibrant and mixed business community.
- 5.37 A member asked can officers link particular groups of people coming from a bar or club because the council could penalise those businesses?
- 5.38 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that officers were getting better in linking some of the clubs, bars, fast food take away and taxi ranks. Officers had a good idea about what was a well run club, effectively managed with the right level of supervision, door staff and ability to support customers as they come and go from the club. Some clubs were very large and would always provide challenges but officers would always be tough with clubs that are not managed effectively.
- 5.39 A member stated that he had a few issues with noise, and officers had gone around and the noise was sporadic and officers had reported back that the noise was not there, do you have any thoughts on that?
- 5.40 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that any noise calls that come in are a priority, he would still encourage people to contact us, quite often those sporadic noise issues come back regularly, it is a matter of keep on telling us, keep a log and build up the evidence and action will be taken.
- 5.41 The chair stated that he had the Croydon application on his phone which measures and describes noise levels, is this a gimmick?
- 5.42 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated the reason why we hesitate to ask people to record the noise is that when it comes to evidence you can not honestly say as officers that noise came from that place at that time, it was often the qualified officers evidence that was required and that was the challenge for officers.
- 5.43 A member recalled discussing the call centre and integrated records in 2012, and recalled there would be flags on all records and that would take 18 months. What was causing the difficulty in integrating records of this nature, when we want to identify dwellings causing a problem? What is causing the delay and can you give us a firm time frame when the integration would take place?
- 5.44 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that he could not give a firm time frame, there were a number of systems

that needed to be looked at and they were not at the same stage in their development or quality of information. The system that the noise team used was called APP and still needs work to be done to bring it up to date then it has to be integrated. Work was being carried out through different departments.

- 5.45 It is a collective responsibility and ambition as a council that we have a good dialogue across the different departments with regards to the issues, we have to keep reviewing the information as an ongoing piece of work.

Anti-Social Behaviour

- 5.46 The chair stated that the police were stretched, how much pressure was that putting on the council in terms of the budget, are we confident of dealing with anti-social behaviour at a time when there was less police resources than in the past?
- 5.47 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that the council had to get the very best out of partnerships that we work with, the police were facing the same financial pressures as the council. Both will have to work together and share resources, the multi-agency approach had to be the way forward and we have to look at area based issues more than single item issues, what we come across was a series of different problems that revolve around the same people who move from area to area, the focus needs to be on area based action, we need to be challenging low level crimes.
- 5.48 A member stated that the Borough Commander priorities were burglary and robbery even though drug abuse was important, he recognised there were two issues of tackling cannabis usage and dealing which can be more associated with gangs, was there a difference between the council and police priorities?
- 5.49 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported the police have their priorities which would be described as the MOPAC 7, which would be burglary, robbery, commercial burglary, criminal damage etc and were measured on performance in relation to those priorities. Violence with injury was discussed.
- 5.50 The issues on the ground that were fed to the council in relation to anti-social behaviour included drugs. The officer stated that a multi-agency approach would be the best way forward, the police and council need to combine resources to deal with those areas. Those people who are smoking cannabis on the stairwells may well be the same people involved in robberies, it needs to be dealt with on an area basis.
- 5.51 A member stated that he was at a ward panel meeting recently, where there was an excellent ward policing team and the sergeant

reported that according to MOPAC 7 that the level of incidents had dropped by up to 40% in some cases. That did not match with what people were telling him that they were experiencing on the street, and the fear of crime was different to experiencing crime. He was interested that MOPAC 7 indicators were driving the police to re-priorities areas which were helping them to get good performance ratings but not necessarily delivering across the board to make sure our communities were safe and secure.

- 5.52 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated that the question would be better answered by the Borough Commander than himself, but reassurance was a priority for the police without any question, the reassurance figures for Southwark were high at the present. He further reported that what residents tell officers on the ground in terms of their experience was what they experience every single day and that officers need to be working closely within a multi-agency approach in order that they get the message across that crime levels robbery or burglary were going in the right direction.
- 5.53 A member asked when will you next meet with the Borough Commander to discuss progression towards an integrated approach of detecting both low level and serious crime within the borough?
- 5.54 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement reported that he had a conversation with the Borough Commander this morning and met with the Superintendent last Friday and reached an agreement to join some services together and would hope that over the next 6 to 12 months that would be a fully integrated process.
- 5.55 A member stated that an area which had not been discussed this evening was CCTV.
- 5.56 Councillor Situ reported that last week there was a massive joint operation by the council and the police services in the Bermondsey area which resulted in 13 individuals being arrested for drugs dealing, anti-social behaviour and significant crimes which had affected the area. Without the four months of joint operation from both the council and police we would not have got to that position. The sub-committee were assured that serious drugs dealings was still on the police radar, which was an important issue which our residents were raising on estates.
- 5.57 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement stated CCTV was a very effective tool. We would want to measure the outcome in terms of the recordings and how many of those recorded crime incidents do we turn into arrests. That figure was going up all the time, officers were seeing a 20% increase and being commended by the police team in terms of the level of input we have had.

5.58 The Head of Community Safety & Enforcement welcomed members and co-opted members of the sub-committee to visit the new CCTV screens to see the effectiveness of the system.

RESOLVED: That members of the sub-committee arrange a date and time to view the CCTV system with the Head of Community Safety & Enforcement. The following councillors stated that they wished to be included on the visit, Councillors Tom Flynn, Ben Johnson, Johnson Situ and Martin Seaton

6. EVICTIONS REVIEW - OUTCOMES REPORT

- 6.1 The chair welcomed councillor Richard Livingstone (Cabinet Member for Housing), Gerri Scott (Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services) and Paul Langford (Head of Operations) to the meeting and invited them to update members on the review.
- 6.2 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported that 330 evictions had been carried out and officers looked at a sample of those cases. Members were assured that most systems were operating effectively, there were a few areas of inaccurate record keeping and members would see in the recommendations that training had been put in place for officers.
- 6.3 The sub-committee were anxious to be assured that the Mr AA case was not endemic within the department, that although there were a couple of areas where officers need to do better overall, that case was isolated in terms of customer practice.
- 6.4 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services stated there were areas for improvement and a number of recommendations that would keep officers focused. This had been a useful exercise for officers, issues were picked up during supervision and team meetings, but doing a quarterly review of a sample of cases would keep officers focused for the future.
- 6.5 The Head of Operations reported that the basis of the report was focused on the grounds for eviction, timescales in the application of any court orders, the presence of the correct orders and how officers dealt with the removal and storage of goods.
- 6.6 The key findings that came out of the review were around record keeping. Solid record keeping keeps officers honest and operating in an effective way, out of the 66 cases that were looked at which included one referral from a councillor, only one case was found that was unclear and required further investigation, officers spoke to a member of the special investigations team who recalled the eviction and clarified that nothing was left in the property, this information should have been on the system.

- 6.7 The Head of Operations assured the sub-committee that specific fields now required specific information which has tidied up the documentation of the system.
- 6.8 The presence of officers at evictions was extremely important and immediate recommendations had been put in place regarding the named officers at evictions i.e. the RSO and income team leader, and the IT changes will be in place by the 1st February 2015.
- 6.9 A member asked with the further recommendations coming in on 1st February 2015, will the next review be reported to the Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services?
- 6.10 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services stated that the review would be reported to her and informed members that there was a performance management framework in place and senior management team that looks at performance information on a regular basis. This will be pushed into the performance management framework so the quarterly review of evictions will be reported to the senior management team.
- 6.11 Officers want the recommendations to be fully adopted and checked on a regular basis and this will go through the performance management framework including the senior management team and Councillor Livingstone as the cabinet member for Housing.
- 6.12 A member asked was there a need to look any further than the two years for cases of the officers concerned with Mr AA eviction?
- 6.13 The Head of Operations reported that these were very experienced officers, one officer had not worked again for the council since that situation and was on long term sick. The other 3 officers' cases were looked at and there were not any issues arising from the review.
- 6.14 A member asked a question in relation to recommendation 5 of the report, where in the system are the checks and balances that allow you to spot something that might go wrong before it goes wrong?
- 6.15 The Head of Operations explained that issues needed to be recorded properly and timing was key in ensuring that officers going back to court from the earliest date of which the original procession order was sorted so that the clock starts ticking right back at the start. It was noticed from the review that there were 2 cases where officers went back that they would have contravened the 6 year, had we not have gone back.
- 6.16 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services stated there were strong supervision mechanisms in place, one to one with officers, review of case load on a weekly basis, team meetings

as well as training and development. Management were looking at performance in the moment as well as looking at it retrospectively particularly around rent arrears and illegal occupancy. There is very close scrutiny on an ongoing basis of people's current case loads and what they were doing with them so officers were not looking at things after the event in those areas.

- 6.17 A member asked do officers have access to a checklist that they can go through before they get to the point of eviction?
- 6.18 The Head of Operations assured members there were checklists for every stage of the process for officers and a further point was the review proved to be extremely useful and no fundamental flaws that had been found in the procedures both in the initial review or this review. It was about ensuring the application of those procedures.
- 6.19 The chair stated the sub-committee were discussing officers covering up and welcomed the details contained in the report. One of the issues brought up in the court judgement was that 2 ward councillors had raised the issue and were worried about it. With the ongoing review and the checks that officers would be doing where would be a good place for ward councillors to feed into the system, rather than members inquiries?
- 6.20 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services stated that any ward councillor should always come straight to the head of service or strategic director if they have any serious issues at all.
- 6.21 A member stated there was 1 case that was forwarded from a councillor which all looked fine, could you tell us why the councillor forwarded a case which turned out to be of no problem, did they have concerns about the case? Could you share that with us?
- 6.22 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported that she had information on that case and it was about the eviction itself and whether the eviction should have taken place and what happen to the person subsequently. She had full details and would share them with members, outside of the meeting.
- 6.23 Councillor Livingstone stated that looking at ongoing performance management officers could send an e-mail out to all councillors asking for any cases when looking at the next quarter review. Perhaps the exercise could be repeated so that councillors know to identify those cases so we can look at them as part of the ongoing performance management.
- 6.24 A member asked who was responsible to ensure that all the necessary paperwork and procedures are followed prior to the eviction being effected, what level was that?

- 6.25 The Head of Operations reported there were different parts to the process depending on the nature of the eviction, whether it was due to illegal occupation or rent arrears.
- 6.26 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported with regards to Mr AA's case it was how the eviction was carried out, there was an issue with the 6 year window of opportunity but the other issue was the fact that when the eviction took place it did not have the relevant officers in attendance and the goods were removed and not stored in accordance with the procedure.
- 6.27 A member asked if officers do not follow the procedures, what were the sanctions and has the level of risk been raised?
- 6.28 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported the sanctions had always been the same, if people do not do their jobs they were disciplined. The recommendations specify fields must be completed by the officer attending the eviction and secondly that the manager was contacted while that eviction was taking place.
- 6.29 A member asked how do we empower tenants and councillors to provide the best service possible? And is the procedure comprehensive enough?
- 6.30 The Head of Operations reported that the procedures were on the council website and available to everyone, all procedures undertaken in any area of the directorate by officers involve tenants in reviews, there was always room for improvement but the systems were in place to evolve.
- 6.31 Councillor Livingstone stated the issue here was not so much that the tenant did not know the procedures, the tenant knew the procedure pretty well and had 3 stays of the eviction process through going through the court process and that was why it ran out of time. The difficulty was not that he did not understand the procedures the problem was officers did not follow the procedures in the correct way.
- 6.32 That was the critical error, the most serious thing that the council can do as a landlord was to evict a tenant and that had significant consequences to individuals, so if ward councillors become aware of issues in terms of evictions then let the strategic director and cabinet member know so we can look into it and make sure things are being done correctly.
- 6.33 A member asked before the case goes as far as the eviction taking place, was there some kind of checklist between the legal and the housing operations team to make sure all the necessary checks have been carried out? Do you have any early warning systems in place i.e. tenancy checks?

- 6.34 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported it was very hard to get approval to evict a tenant, the burden of proof was on the evidence presented to the judge in order to get an agreement to evict was significant and our legal colleagues were very cautious and made sure we had water tight cases when going to court.
- 6.35 In this case there was a stay, so effectively the judge was not satisfied and said he was going to give the tenant another opportunity, and this can go on for some time, so the evidence you present had to be very thorough to get to evict in the first place.
- 6.36 In response to early warning systems, officers carry out 50% tenancy checks of all tenants on an annual basis, last year officers completed 100% tenancy checks. The council was probably in the best position it has been in for many years in terms of knowing who is living in our housing stock. We were also the best in the country on acting against illegal tenants.
- 6.37 A member asked if the tenant was allowed to re-enter the property to collect their goods, they may not want to leave the property and you may need to go to court to get them back out? In terms of storage of evicted tenants goods for 28 days, where was the cost implication after 28 days?
- 6.38 The Head of Operations reported that with regards to re-entry, this was managed by officers working with the tenant before the eviction, tenants were always given the opportunity to take their goods out of the property and officers would provide help or support if required.
- 6.39 There were many cases where goods had been stored, and after 28 days the goods had not been collected, these were dealt with on a case by case basis. Officers on many occasions had to work with families and make arrangements for the goods to be cleared. There was a point where the council had to take a harder line but officers do try to be supportive, the cost of storage was minimised to the council.
- 6.40 A member stated the AA case was a matter of officers covering up, the recommendations contained in the report were focused on tightening up procedures which was not the problem. Would it be possible to have an independent person present at evictions to verify that council officers had followed the procedures correctly?
- 6.41 The Strategic Director of Housing & Community Services reported if the review had revealed half of the cases were wrongly recorded or that there were issues, she would have agreed with the members and looked at how officers carry out evictions, whether we needed to have some independence in terms of witnessing

what went on, but we did not find that for the vast majority of cases.

- 6.42 The evictions were carried out properly and in a very small minority of those cases the administration was poor, the recommendations contained in the report would tighten that up. Most of the staff do a very good job, this case was reported at the last meeting and was a clear example of staff not doing a good job and covering up and they have been dealt with through procedures.
- 6.43 Councillor Livingstone stated there were a number of things that went wrong in this case, the issue of timing, proper documentation and sign off none of which were present. The issue of the resident services officer not being present at the eviction and after the event the collusion of 3 officers to jointly agree statements covering each others back. They did not change the records they colluded on the statement, the record was absent and that was clear that things had not been done properly.
- 6.44 A member asked about IT hardware, some boroughs equipped their housing officers with tablets, so when they were out they could update records instantly, was that something we did as a authority?
- 6.45 The Head of Operations reported that the project that was passed to him recently and on the 29th April 2015 we should go live with the first two applications. The process of the tenancy visit, reporting repairs and following through the repairs progress. He and the Head of Maintenance and Compliance had been sponsoring this project, working with Northgate and others to try and get something in place.
- 6.46 A member asked could officers give an update on those officers that were found guilty of gross misconduct and what was their current employment status?
- 6.47 The chair stated that if it was possible for officers to answer the question from councillor Ben Johnson outside of this meeting.

Meeting ended at 9.00 p.m.

CHAIR:

DATED:

[EXEC ONLY]

DEADLINE FOR NOTIFICATION OF CALL-IN UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES IS MIDNIGHT, [DATE].

THE ABOVE DECISIONS WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTABLE UNTIL AFTER THAT DATE. SHOULD A DECISION OF THE EXECUTIVE BE CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY, THEN THE RELEVANT DECISION WILL BE HELD IN ABEYANCE PENDING THE OUTCOME OF SCRUTINY CONSIDERATION.