



REGENERATION AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting of the REGENERATION AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on OCTOBER 31 2007 at 7:00PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT: Councillor Lewis Robinson (Chair)
Councillor Mackie Sheik (Vice-chair)
Councillor Mary Foulkes
Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Paul Noblet

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Richard Thomas - Executive Member for Regeneration
Pat Hickson - Chair, Bonamy and Bramcote TRA
Sylvia Marsh - Secretary, Bonamy and Bramcote TRA
Patrick Blunt, Southwark Chamber of Commerce
Ian Fraser, Elephant and Castle Traders' Association
Valerie Stevens, Elephant and Castle Traders' Association
Shammin Uddin – Committee Manager, Black and Minority Ethnic Tenants Association

OFFICERS: Amma Boateng – principal lawyer
Graham Richards – transport planning group manager
Sally Crew - transport project officer
Stephen McDonald - Strategic Director, Major Projects
Hamish Beaton – scrutiny officer

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Martin Seaton and Councillor Paul Baichoo.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS AS URGENT

A minutes silence was held for Bernie Bartley by the Committee. The Chair made mention of his passing, referring to Bernie as a "kind, civil, excellent representative of the Elephant & Castle people".

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Councillor Noblet noted that he is currently acting as the interim member for Transport and Environment.

MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Regeneration and Resources scrutiny sub-committee meeting held on September 19 2007 be agreed as a correct record of proceedings and signed by the chair.

That the minutes of the joint Housing and Regeneration and Resources scrutiny sub-committee meeting held on October 9 2007 be agreed as a correct record of proceedings and submitted to the Housing scrutiny sub-committee for final sign off.

1. REGENERATION OF THE SOUTH BERMONDSEY TRAIN STATION

- 1.1 The chair welcomed transport project officers Sally Crew and Graham Richards and suggested that, as means of an introduction, the officers outline their report on the South Bermondsey train station development and highlight any key items from the report. The chair explained that, following the officers' introduction, members from the Bonamy and Bramcote TRA would be invited to comment on the situation before discussion was opened up to members for comments.
- 1.2 An officer reported that the South Bermondsey station regeneration is a long-term project which began in 2002. She explained that, because the project was funded incrementally through a number of a different sources, it had needed to be broken down into a number of phases. Additionally, the multi-agency involvement in the project had led to delays and hold-ups in several of the different phases. As an example, she noted that proposed work to link the CCTV back to Southwark Police Station, the train operating company and borough command had been delayed by issues relating to the data protection act and the discovery of soil contamination in the station area that had required testing from an external organisation. These delays had led to the further sub-phasing of projects and difficulties in obtaining and retaining funding.
- 1.3 A TRA member commented that she had been involved in an initial project meeting in 2002 that had outlined the development plans. The TRA member had been excited by the various opportunities for improvements to the station area. She complained, however, that the project had soon lost momentum and that communication from council officers had been disappointingly lacking. She pointed out that the Ilderton Road shop front footpaths and areas behind the shops still needed improving and that the lighting and parking in the area had also been marked for development. As a tenant in the area she felt disappointed with the council's progress, and noted her concern that the current condition created a bad impression for visitors to Bermondsey. Another TRA member questioned the level of road works required for such a seemingly simple project and wondered why they had been delayed for so long. She further questioned the seriousness of the reports of soil contamination.
- 1.4 The Chair assured the TRA members that their concerns had been received and understood. He hoped that scrutiny would be able to make recommendations, following questions to the project officers, that would be able to move the project forward.

- 1.5 A member voiced her disappointment with the project's delays. She added that she had been seeking answers regarding the phased funding levels for the past two months and wanted to know how much funding had been lost due to delays. Further, the member claimed that multi-agency involvement had not proven to be a problem with other council projects, and wondered if in fact the main problem was poor project management. She asked if there were currently any plans for implementing better project management.
- 1.6 A transport officer replied that, despite an earlier estimation that £50,000 had been lost, in fact no funding had been lost after all,. She explained that the council had been able to negotiate with the Department for Transport (DfT) so that the £50,000 funding could be moved into the next financial year. She reiterated that the funding was still in place and the development team planned to carry out as much of the work as possible with the funding available. She noted that at present the team was still working on the lighting development phase before they could proceed to upgrading the footpath. In response to the query about implementing better project management, another officer explained that the Regeneration and Resources Department was currently restructuring and setting up a specific project team which would be responsible for taking this project forward.
- 1.7 A member noted that the project had started in early 2002. He agreed that the project was not straightforward but suggested that it should not have taken this long to implement. Specifically, he asked what work had taken place between 2003-2005 as this period of time had not been covered in detail in the written officer report.
- 1.8 A transport officer replied that she had not been involved in the project at this time and that project records were lacking. She assessed, however, that since the original funding obtained had been for the Congestion Charging Scheme (CCS), the project had lost momentum once this had been spent. Another officer added that six different people had been in charge of this project at some point in time over the years, and that this would have been a problem with regards to maintaining project momentum.
- 1.9 A member inquired as to what lessons could be drawn from this project, and if there were any recommendations that the sub-committee could make to the executive committee. In particular, he noted that it would be beneficial if recommendations could be made for how future multi-agency projects could be managed.
- 1.10 A transport officer suggested that a project's size does not necessarily relate to its level of complexity. He explained that the South Bermondsey development project had needed to operate on a limited budget and work with several large agencies on several different phases. He anticipated that the project management team would be able to take this project forward and considered that if possible, the establishment of a multi-agency liaison team would be conducive to maintaining relationships with external agencies. He explained that while this project was of importance to the council, it did not necessarily hold a similar level of priority with other organisations and that maintaining stakeholder engagement could therefore be difficult.
- 1.11 A member asked if the council was making things difficult for itself and queried whether it was in fact necessary to deal with so many different agencies.
- 1.12 A transport officer replied that such interaction was a necessity. As an example she stated that the council had needed to apply through National Rail to the DfT in order to obtain DfT funding.

- 1.13 A member asked what agreements regarding development and funding were still being sought from other agencies, and how long these would potentially take to reach.
- 1.14 A transport officer was optimistic that this period would be shorter than previously thought and could potentially take six to seven weeks. She also commented that the team would look to integrate the lighting phase of the project with other lighting projects in the area and thereby fast track the completion of this phase.
- 1.15 The Chair drew attention to the appointment of an external project manager in March 2003, as noted in the written report, and asked what the project manager had achieved and whether this position had eventually ceased due to funding problems.
- 1.16 An officer replied that this had occurred before her time on the project, but from what she understood the external project manager had apparently been appointed to arrange discussions regarding the CCTV installation and the quality of lighting. She was unsure as to why the position had been revoked.
- 1.17 The chair noted that the council was still seeking additional funds for the project and inquired as to what these were and what the chances of receiving them were.
- 1.18 An transport officer explained that additional funding was being sought for the "connect two" project - the construction of a bridge over Rotherhithe New Road - and that this funding could also be put towards the shop front improvement phase of the development project. Another officer added that the project team was hoping to obtain this funding through a "lottery fund" bid that would be allocated according to a public vote on December 2. At this point, the Chair asked what the project team would do if the public did not vote in favour of funding the project. A transport officer replied that the project team would then endeavour to obtain funds through the London Cycle Network. The officer added that the nature of the development project was very piecemeal. He explained that the project team had never received a lump sum of funding for all phases of the project. Instead, they had only received "bits and pieces" of funding and had needed to make do with whatever funding they could obtain.
- 1.19 A member asked if it would be likely whether a decision regarding the funding for the environmental improvement phase could be reached by the end of 2007.
- 1.20 A transport officer replied that this looked likely and that the project team had already secured part of the funding. He expressed confidence that the project team would be able to lever funding from the London Cycle Network.
- 1.21 A TRA member requested that a council officer attend future TRA meetings.
- 1.22 A transport officer apologised for previous breakdowns in communication and assured members that an officer would attend future meetings.
- 1.23 A TRA member asked how the TRA could apply for the installation of a pedestrian crossing for the Ilderton Road area. Councillors Livingstone and Foulkes advised that they would take this issue forward in their capacity as councillors.
- 1.24 A member made the recommendation that, from a broader aspect, when planning a multi-agency project there should be service level agreements included to ensure good project management. He also recommended that this issue be submitted to the executive member to monitor and ensure that the January deadline is met.

- 1.25 The deputy chair noted that the project had highlighted communication problems. He hoped that the project team would work to rebuild confidence with the TRA. The Chair also reiterated his hope that the project team would keep members updated with the project's progress. Councillor Noblet stated that in his capacity as interim executive for Environment and Transport he would monitor the situation.
- 1.26 The chair asked if there was a plan to present a report to members that explained the restructuring of the department and the structure of the project management team.
- 1.27 A transport officer replied that the restructure was still under consultation but that he would seek an update. At this point a member pointed out that the officer had previously said that the project management team was currently in place, but was now saying that it was under consultation. The officer explained that the restructuring was still ongoing and would take time.

Resolved:

- 1 The committee recommended that once officers were aware of funding availability they meet with councillors and TRA members to update them. Members and TRA members suggested meeting in either January or February 2008.
- 2 The Committee recommended that it would be appropriate that an update be obtained from the Head of Street Scene & Public Protection, Des Waters, to explain the restructuring of the public realms teams.
- 3 The committee recommended that the executive bear this issue in mind and that the restructuring process include the creation of a project management team.

2. Executive Interview: Councillor Richard Thomas [portfolio for regeneration]

- 2.1 The chair introduced this item and suggested that each member who had submitted a question should ask one supplementary question regarding their respective question, and that discussion surrounding business continuity at the Elephant and Castle be reserved until the following agenda item. The chair thanked Richard Thomas for attending and for providing an in-depth written response to questions.
- 2.2 **Question 1: What percent of staff in the Regeneration Department are classified as BME?**
- 2.3 With regards to the written answer to question one, the chair commented that the statistics provided were encouraging. Noting the competitive market nature of recruiting planners in London, the Chair asked what was being done to recruit and retain planning staff.

- 2.4 The Executive Member for Regeneration (EMR) noted two recent BME appointments at a senior level within the department. He admitted that there were problems not only in Southwark but across London in planner recruitment, but advised that the department was trying to be pro-active on this issue. He informed members that the department was currently in discussion with Southwark University about potential options for providing support for courses and students, with a view to recruit future graduates. He added that the recent move from *Chiltern* would help attract new staff as offices were now housed in a more convenient location. He also stated that the HR department was currently putting together competitive employment package to offer prospective employees.
- 2.5 A member requested a clarification of the CRE definition of BME employee. She wondered that, since this BME definition included "persons of any white background except British", (thereby including white Irish and white Commonwealth employees) this could distort figures. She wondered if there was a better means to gauge the level of non-white employment.
- 2.6 EMR replied that this were the accepted CRE definition for BME employee. He assessed that the level of white non-British employees was not high and would not distort figures greatly. **EMR pledged to determine the level of non-white figures and report back to the member.**
- 2.7 The member also requested clarification on the meaning of "director and direct reports". EMR explained that this referred to the director and staff who reported to the director.
- 2.8 **Question 2: Could you please outline progress in meeting our targets for deciding planning applications?**
- 2.9 The chair inquired as to whether the recent increase in community councils approving planning applications meant that the council was now tending to lose appeals. He further inquired whether further councillor training was being given.
- 2.10 EMR replied that he had not seen recent figures on this, but from the figures he had seen it appeared that only a small number of appeals had been lost and that this could not be blamed on community councils. He assessed instead that the 6-weekly cycle of community council meetings was often out of sync with the dates of council planning meetings and that this could lead to delays. He noted that there had been a recent increase in the level of training for councillors.
- 2.11 Councillor Noblet offered apologies and left the meeting at 8:15
- 2.12 **Question 3: What is the plan for affordable housing on the Wooddene? Southwark Council's website indicates that it there will be 'more than 100 homes to be let at an affordable rent and more than 200 homes to buy by 2009.' I have been informed by Officers that a decision has not been made. Can the Executive Member confirm the plans.**
- 2.13 A member thanked EMR for his written answer to question three, describing it as comprehensive. She noted that since it was a small project it should not be expected to take as long as the Elephant & Castle project. She asked for confirmation that people would be able to rent houses by 2009, and if this was in fact a realistic date.

- 2.14 EMR agreed that this would be a tight timetable. He suggested that he would investigate potential ways to shorten the process of choosing a development partner. He added, however, that this process would likely be governed by EU regulations.
- 2.15 **Question 4: SMEs in the Elephant and Castle are concerned with the lack of consultation over the past eight months, and one of the many questions that has yet to be answered is whether the council will provide compensation for the lost of earnings to the SMEs dating back to when the regeneration of the area was announced which including the demolition of the shopping centre.**
- 2.12 Referring to question four, a member stated that this had been answered well. She noted, however, that there were slight differences in the two charters brought in by the Elephant & Castle traders and also by the council. She explained that the traders had emphasised the issue of blight, and asked that the council be flexible and try to include this in its charter. Further, she pointed out that since Lend Lease's involvement in July, there had been no formal meeting with the traders and that rents had increased. She emphasised that these delays in holding meetings were causing concern.
- 2.17 EMR assured members that he was aware of the issue and fully appreciated that people wanted certainty. He hoped that Lend Lease's involvement in the project would be able to provide some of this certainty. He pointed out, however, that until Lend Lease became the legal land lord then they would be unable to begin negotiations with traders.
- 2.18 **Question 5: How are the Council going to address the concerns of the Leaseholders on Heygate Estate about the valuation of their homes. They have been devalued due to the neglect of the council. Will this be factored in when considering the market value for their homes.**
No supplemental questions were asked.
- Question 6: Following the survey of residents in the area surrounding Burgess Park the main findings included a demand for better facilities, there is a fear of crime but despite this the park seemed highly valued by the respondents. Can the executive member's vision for Burgess Park, in light of this feedback and also in relation to the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate.**
No supplemental questions were asked.
- Question 7: At your meeting last year with this scrutiny committee, you expressed your disappointment regarding the borough's unsuccessful round 2 LEGI bid, but undertook to seek other ways of delivering parts of that proposal through other routes.**
- a. **Could you update the committee on the progress of that work?**
- b. **What progress has been made in preparing a round 3 submission?**
- 2.19 With regards to question seven, a member commented that the answers provided were very good. He noted the six streams of secured investments and commented that there was nothing outside of youth around business development. He asked if there were any other avenues that EMR was involved in.
- 2.20 EMR replied that he was also involved in 'business start-up'. He added that the council was holding discussions with Lambeth and investigating the possibility of joint structures.

- 2.21 The member asked if there were any of the 15 schemes that EMR would like to prioritise. EMR replied that he did not wish to pick one to prioritise.
- 2.22 At this point Councillor Livingstone declared an interest in that he was an employee of the Learning and Skills Council.
- 2.23 **Question 8: Could you outline your strategy for the continuation of the work carried out by Southwark Works once its agreed funding ceases?**
- 2.24 A member sought to clarify the written response to question eight, and inquired as to whether the three funding solutions (listed as bullet points) were stand-alone solutions or if all three solutions were required for the project to work.
- 2.25 EMR replied that he was unsure, but doubted that they were sole solutions. He estimated that once funding was obtained, more clients could be sought which would lead to more advertising. He noted that officers were confident that the working neighbourhoods scheme would meet the criteria.
- 2.26 **Question 9: At the joint meeting of the Housing and Regeneration & Resources scrutiny committees on 9 October, the Deputy Leader of the Council explained that the plans to rehouse Heygate tenants locally have had to be changed due to delays in developing early housing sites.**
- a In your view, is this a fair assessment?
 - b What are the reasons for these delays?
 - c What action have you taken to quicken the pace for these developments?
 - d. Will sufficient housing capacity be developed through early housing sites to meet the need created through the Elephant and Castle regeneration project?
- 2.27 With regards to question nine, a member voiced concerns on behalf of Heygate tenants that the majority of tenants would need to either make two relocations or one delayed relocation because of delays at the housing sites. The member asked why these delays had taken so long and had not been factored in to the development plans.
- 2.28 EMR replied that he did not accept the premise of this question. The option to move twice was given because people wanted to "get away" from Heygate as soon as possible. Also, the demolition date had been brought forward. He added that one reason for delays had been the development of *Dickies Square* on the *Harper Road site*. Another reason was the standards of development the council was seeking. Previously the council had made do with standard designs and architects. Now, however, the council was insisting on better designs and up & coming architects.
- 2.29 The member contested that these sites had been identified in 2002 and that this was a long time ago.
- 2.30 EMR explained that the council was working with two consortiums of housing associations, therefore a single problem could lead to subsequent delays at six or seven development sites. He noted though that an agreement with one of the consortiums had been reached and an agreement with the other consortium should be reached soon. EMR concluded by highlighting the fact that the Regeneration department has made good progress throughout the year with regards to planning and performance, and pointed out that "something physical" was taking shape on all four of the department's major projects.

3. Business continuity at the Elephant and Castle

- 3.1 Members received a verbal update on this issue from the Strategic Director for Major Projects. The Director informed members that, in the period of time since his appointment and the Elephant Director Chris Horn's departure, he had initiated a review on the issues affecting Elephant & Castle traders. A senior project officer had been charged with interviewing senior players in the issue and trying to find a way forward in the situation. The review interviews had concluded on 31 October that evening and a report was due the following week. The Director hoped to be able to "draw a line in the sand" and take stock of the current situation. As further background to the business continuity issue, the Director reported that in July 2007 the council had announced its preferred development partner, Lend Lease. The council was now progressing towards a contract sign-off with Lend Lease, but negotiations were proving to be protracted. He noted that Lend Lease and the council were already behaving like partners, but were not yet partners by law as Lend Lease was still in negotiation regarding its plans for the Elephant and Castle shopping centre. Until these negotiations are completed, Lend Lease would be unable to begin individual discussions with the traders. The Director further noted that the council was also trying to build up a relationship with St Modwens. He assured members that he understood the issues of concern for traders. The Director pointed out that a site on New Kent Road would be made available to traders for business continuity. He admitted that this was not a long term solution, but hoped that it could be an option to move the situation forward in the mean time.
- 3.2 Patrick Blunt commented that there is a history to this issue which could not be swept aside by drawing a line in the sand. He pointed out that previous scrutiny meeting minutes provided a good record of discussions. He stated that the situation was unfortunate and that small businesses were suffering, especially stand-alone businesses which had nowhere else to go. He believed that existing businesses at the Elephant and Castle centre could make a good claim for compensation due to blight. But the question for these businesses was where would they go as they did not want to leave the centre, and were holding out with the hope that the situation could be resolved. He reported that comparison shopping results had shown that lunchtime shopping levels had all but dried up, and the main periods of trade were after school hours, or in weekends. Also, the average spend of shoppers had decreased. Patrick Blunt noted that one trader had been forced to shut down recently due to lack of footfall, and that this trader had not received any compensation. Patrick Blunt reported that the issue had been raised with the LDA at a recent public meeting and questions had been asked as to why delays were occurring. He believed that this was because priority was being given to East London developments ahead of the Olympics. Also, the Elephant & Castle scheme was on hold pending an impact assessment on the southern and northern motorways and that a report was not due out until March 2009. Lastly, Patrick Blunt noted the problems that had occurred on the South Bermondsey development [item 1], due to multi-agency involvement and suggested that the council look to strengthen its relationship and involvement with the LDA so that similar problems would not befall the Elephant & Castle project.
- 3.3 A member noted his agreement with this, and reiterated the importance of the LDA's involvement.

- 3.4 Ian Fraser commented that a report on the background of the traders' situation and an attempt to find a way forward were very welcome. He pointed out, however, that the traders and the council had already spent many years looking at plans and proposals and that he therefore doubted that any new report would produce anything different than what had been produced in the past. He added that the two charters had areas of overlap, but also many differences. He stated that until these differences were brought into agreement, the situation could not move forward. He noted that airing advantages of different plans was helpful, but ultimately the demolition of the Elephant and Castle centre would still take place.
- 3.5 Valerie Stevens sought confirmation that, because the Lend Lease and St Modwens negotiations were still ongoing, traders would be unable to meet with the developer until these negotiations were resolved.
- 3.6 The Director confirmed that Lend Lease could not attend meetings with traders as they were yet to sign the contract. Once Lend Lease officially became the landlord, however, then they would be able to become involved in discussions.
- 3.7 Valerie Stevens remarked that the traders could not afford ongoing delays with the negotiations. She stated that traders needed help, certainty and dates. She stated that discussions had been going on for too long.
- 3.8 The Director assured Valerie Stevens that he understood her concerns, but remarked that the legal situation was beyond his control and he did not want to make false promises. He was, in the meantime, trying to find a way of working with the current circumstances.
- 3.9 Shammim Uddin asked whether the developer had indicated interest in working with the traders prior to entering the development deal. He pointed out that, before putting the project to tender, the council had apparently promised that the future developer would "take care" of the traders. Shammim Uddin reminded members that unless relevant clauses were included in the development contract, the developer would be under no legal obligation to work with the traders and that the council would not be able to control a private company. He commented that the chosen developer needed to sign an agreement with the traders, otherwise nothing would happen. Furthermore, Shammim Uddin commented that the 15 New Kent Road site was not a viable option for business continuity. He reported that no planning application has been submitted for the adjacent site, and the council's application for a car park space next to the 15 New Kent Road site had only submitted in late 2007. Shammim Uddin assessed that it was Lend Lease's interest to delay negotiations and that only the traders would stand to lose, not the developer or the council.
- 3.10 A member voiced concern over the length of negotiations with St Modwens and asked if there was any indication as to when these would conclude.
- 3.11 The Director estimated that negotiations between the council and Lend Lease would close in March/April 2008. The date of conclusion for negotiations between Lend Lease and St Modwens, however, was unknown. He added that Lend Lease were doing their best to bring the matter to a close.
- 3.12 A member asked if the council should buy the land and pass it to Lend Lease. The Director explained that Lend Lease was starting the negotiations now as they assume they will become the landlord. To this, the member asked if St Modwens could still become the landlord or still feature in the development partnership.

- 3.13 Shammim Uddin asked why the Compulsary Purchase Order (CPO) powers had still not been transferred. He asked why the council had not implemented these before the developer was chosen.
- 3.14 A member requested that the Director return to future scrutiny meetings to present the current report and the review. He noted that this issue would be a standing item for the Regeneration and Resources Scrutiny Sub-Committee and added that people were asking for updates at every meeting. He asked when the next step forward would be. The Director replied that he wanted to find a solution within the council's powers and hoped that the upcoming report would give a way forward.
- 3.15 Patrick Blunt believed that a solution had been reached two years ago in scrutiny. The previous Regeneration & Resources Scrutiny Sub-Committee chair, Toby Eckersley, had reportedly advised that the council must not make the mistake of finding a developer and then attempt to negotiate a contract. Instead the council should work out the terms of the contract and then tender the project to two or three developers. Patrick Blunt asked why this had not happened. He reiterated that by the time the developer had been chosen, the contract should have been finalised with clauses to protect the traders. He noted that this issue had been going on for four and a half years.
- 3.16 Shammim Uddin repeated his query as to when the council would use its CPO powers and if there was a cut off date to do this by. He claimed that this was a public process and the council had a legal right to use its CPO powers. The Director replied that there was not a date set.
- 3.17 Valerie Stevens noted that a previous idea of implementing well-being powers seemed to have disappeared. She understood that the council was reluctant to pay compensation and that there was no statutory requirement to do so.
- 3.18 Shammim Uddin believed that the council would be reluctant to help the traders pay rent, as this money would ultimately be paid back to St Modwens.
- 3.19 The chair suggested that the Sub-Committee wait for the outcome of the current review and requested that the Director and EMR bring the report to a future scrutiny meeting. He commented that it had been a good idea to conduct the review and talk to people involved and hoped that a way forward could be found.
- 3.20 A member advised that the report should address the points raised by the traders.
- 3.21 Shammim Uddin asked how the report would differ to previous scrutiny reviews and wondered what would ensure Lend Lease protected the tenants..
- 3.22 The vice-chair commented that this was a complex issue which the council was working to scrutinise. He hoped that the Director could be given a chance to examine the situation properly.
- 3.23 Shammim Uddin opined that the council's work must be for the benefit of the community and reiterated previous concerns about the length of negotiations and lack of protection for traders.

- 3.24 The chair advised that the sub-committee would examine this item again in future meetings. He thanked all for attending and reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for 5 December. He noted that the executive interview for Councillor Eckersley should be postponed until the January meeting and that the allotments charge increase would be an agenda item for the December meeting. A member referred to the September CRE regeneration report and asked that it be brought to scrutiny.

The meeting closed at 9:35 pm.

CHAIR:

DATE: