

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **CAMDEN TOWN DISTRICT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** held on **WEDNESDAY, 5TH DECEMBER, 2018** at 6.30 pm in the Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Crowndale Centre, 218 - 220 Eversholt Street. London, NW1 1BD

REGISTERED DMC MEMBERS PRESENT

Fran Heron (Chair)	Amphill Square TRA	Wendy Priolo	Coopers Lane TRA
David Auger	Co-optee	Isabel Sanda	Bridgeway Street TRA
Richard Caylor	Bayham Place TRA	Barbara Seckington	Agar Grove TMO
Steve Christofi	Regent's Park TA	John Seckington	Agar Grove TMO
Eileen Ennis	Crofters Way TRA	Sonia Uddin	Camden Studios TRA
Sheila James	Mayford TRA	Wolfram Westendorf	Godwin and Crowndale TMO
Stephen Kelly	Three Fields TRA	John Wood	Walker House TRA
Sherryl Murphy	Mayford TRA	Andrew Whitaker	Walker House TRA
David Perris	CASP		

OTHER RESIDENTS PRESENT

Jessica Buck	Tenant	June Williams	Mayford TRA
--------------	--------	---------------	-------------

COUNCILLOR OBSERVERS PRESENT

Councillors Meric Apak (substitute), Samata Khatoon and Paul Tomlinson

COUNCILLOR OBSERVERS ABSENT

Councillors Nasim Ali, Heather Johnson, Andrew Parkinson and Roger Robinson

OFFICERS PRESENT

Sharon Calvey	Head of Estate Services
David Clarke	Team Leader (Planned Works)
Komal Doan	Senior Tenant Participation Officer
Antony Holmes	Ward Housing Manager
Reda Khelladi	Tenant Participation Co-ordinator
Vicky Morris	Ward Housing Manager
Jeremy Shapiro	Head of Community Investment and Regeneration

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Camden Town District Management Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. REGISTRATION OF TENANT AND RESIDENT ASSOCIATIONS AND CO-OPTION OF REPRESENTATIVES

The DMC considered the list of registered tenant and resident associations (TRAs) provided by the Tenant Participation Service listed at Appendix A to the agenda and those TRAs whose registration had lapsed, which were listed at Appendix B.

It was noted that an updated Appendix A had been circulated.

RESOLVED –

THAT the list of registered Tenants and Residents Associations and their representatives as at Appendix A be noted.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Ceri Thomas, Timothy Thomas (Brook and Cranleigh TRA), Henry Leak (Phoenix Court TRA), Helia Evans (Ossulston TRA), Jeanne Thomason (Coopers Lane TRA), Pat McNicholas (Regent's Park TA) and Councillor Roger Robinson.

An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Paul Tomlinson.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Consultation on Phase 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance review

The Chair announced that the Council was currently consulting on phase 2 of its supplementary planning guidance review, which residents and TRAs may wish to contribute to. Details would be circulated.

ACTION BY: Dan Rodwell, Principal Committee Officer

Deputation to Housing Scrutiny Committee on the Community Investment Programme

The Chair requested the DMC's permission to submit a deputation request to the Housing Scrutiny Committee regarding the Community Investment Programme (CIP). She advised that the general feeling was that there had been no reduction in concerns around CIP since issues were raised in a deputation by DMC chairs to the Housing Scrutiny Committee over a year ago.

On being put to the vote, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED –

THAT the Chair be authorised to submit a deputation to the Housing Scrutiny Committee on behalf of the DMC outlining their concerns on the Community Investment Programme.

Camley Street Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Chair drew the DMC's attention to the flyers circulated on the draft Camley Street Neighbourhood Development Plan. She outlined the area covered by the draft Plan, commenting that the proposed model varied significantly from the Council's proposals, which were to use the capital receipts from the development of Camley Street for projects in Gospel Oak. The alternative land trust model would pay out more business rates to the Council through retaining and adding businesses, and be able to deliver more social housing on the site than the Council was proposing. She added that a community land trust model in Brixton was being pursued showing how viable such as model was. She encouraged the DMC to look at the pros and cons of the options, consider the risks of each, and provide comments as appropriate.

Councillor Paul Tomlinson outlined that the draft Plan was being consulted on and there would eventually be a public vote on the Plan for residents in the locality. He encouraged residents to visit the public display at 5 Pancras Square library and to attend one of the consultation events. It was agreed details of these could be circulated to the DMC.

ACTION BY: Dan Rodwell, Principal Committee Officer

The representative of Crofters Way TRA commented that some investment in the area would be welcome if it provided more social housing. There was potentially scope for 200 council houses where currently 40 existed.

4. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA

There were none.

5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED –

THAT the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12th September 2018 be approved and signed as a correct record.

7. CAMDEN TOWN DMC ACTION POINT UPDATE

Consideration was given to the action points arising from the previous meeting.

Council transport being hired by TRAs

The Vice-Chair commented that while he had a positive meeting with the Council's Transport Manager in August he had heard little since. The response was noted and some concern was raised that the review of the service would entail reducing the service. It was suggested that the Transport Manager meet with the Vice-Chair in early 2019 to gauge what the review of the service might entail for potential provision of transport to TRAs.

ACTION BY: Michael Lawrence, Transport Manager

Landlord review feedback

The Chair summarised the landlord review and welcomed that named Council officers would still be allocated to areas under the proposals. She however commented that the feedback from the pilot in Kentish Town was fairly meaningless.

Responsive Security Patrol motion response

The DMC noted the response to the motion and the Chair outlined the need to keep monitoring the Responsive Security Patrol, to make sure Housing Revenue Account money used for the service was used services for tenants and leaseholders. Any move to return control of the service to the Council's Community Safety service would not be welcome.

HS2

DMC members commented that the Council's response to the DMC's concerns on HS2 undertaking works while noise insulation had not been installed on the vast majority of affected homes was concerning. It was not clear how HS2 had provided assurance to the Council given that they had not published a number of reports they were supposed to and that noise monitors were sited too far from works.

8. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (CIP) UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

Jeremy Shapiro, the Head of Community Investment and Regeneration introduced the report and noted the Chair had already submitted additional queries encompassing matters such as the relationship with the housing market, progress of sales, securing receipts and penalty clauses in contracts with contractors. The Chair expressed her disappointment that responses to those questions were not ready in time for the meeting. The Head of Community Investment and Regeneration accepted that it was reasonable to expect the Council to have much of the information sought readily to hand but explained that some analysis and collation of

information was needed to respond to the queries and offered his apologies that it was not immediately available.

Responding to questions, the Head of Community Investment and Regeneration informed the DMC that the redeveloped Charlie Ratchford Centre would include a new community centre and 38 extra care homes paid for by the sale of an adjoining site.

He also outlined that the Council was procuring a development partner for redeveloping Cockpit Yard in Holborn as part of its accommodation programme. This would include new housing, updating Holborn library, re-providing depot space and having a creative incubator site for arts and crafts. The housing would be mixed tenure with roughly 35% affordable housing, being a mix of social housing and Camden Living homes. The Chair commented that the term 'affordable' needed to be avoided because of the difference in the legal and colloquial use of the word.

Answering further questions, the Head of Community Investment and Regeneration outlined that consultation on the Cockpit Yard site had taken place through the local area action group and the library user group. There was some concern from residents on the neighbouring street about the impact of construction.

The DMC was informed that the £30.8 million grant from the Mayor of London would predominantly go into the Community Investment Programme (CIP) given that the construction of housing under CIP provided the assurance to the Mayor's office that the grant would lead to homes being built. By using the grant money, £22 million of Right to Buy receipts earmarked for use in CIP could be instead be used for other projects. Concerns about Right to Buy were raised by the DMC.

A DMC member commented that as CIP works were separate from Better Homes works it was difficult to understand from just a CIP report the full breadth of improvement and redevelopment works under consideration. Combining them under one umbrella would help give a better overview to residents on what works might be happening in their areas.

The Head of Community Investment and Regeneration outlined that everything listed in the table in the report was approved by Cabinet and had planning permission. Godwin and Crowndale proposals had not been listed because consultation with residents had not occurred yet. However providing 10 new Council homes on the site was being looked at. There were other potential sites being explored but the Council was wary of listing them as CIP schemes when they had not been fully scoped or consulted on.

DMC members commented that as many local residents were generally aware of mooted schemes on their sites and that transparency was important, a table should be included in update reports on sites under consideration. Uncertainty around sites was delaying other investment, for example, through DMC bids.

In discussion, DMC members commented as follows:

- Consultation on proposed public space developments tended to be poor;
- Negative impacts such as additional density, loss of green space and loss of trees needed to be listed in reports as well as positives to give a balanced picture;
- Greater transparency was needed around the large Camden Living homes being marketed to sharers; and
- Even allowing for a 1 year set up period, it was concerning the Council was halfway into the 15 year programme but had only completed 20-25% of projects needed to meet the targets set. There may be variations across different types of tenure, but it was not clear how the Council would manage to significantly improve its completion rate.

In response to the final comment, the Head of Community Investment and Regeneration acknowledged the challenge in meeting the CIP targets for new and additional housing. However, projects amounting to 70% of the housing target had already been approved and so the overall target was considered achievable.

There followed some queries around the relationship between HS2 replacement homes and CIP homes on the Regent's Park estate. The Head of Community Investment and Regeneration outlined that 70 homes at Netley were listed in private sales. Of the 95 HS2 replacement homes, he believed that 66 were replacement social housing and 29 either shared ownership or shared leasehold. Only 6 of the 29 affected leaseholders had taken up the opportunity to move into a replacement home and the Council was considering what to do with the remaining units. He could confirm the figures and other details in due course.

ACTION BY: Jeremy Shapiro, Head of Community Investment and Regeneration

DMC members raised concerns about the density of housing on the Regent's Park estate as more housing was currently being built, albeit social housing was welcome.

The Head of Community Investment and Regeneration agreed in response to a question to provide detail on why HS2 had yet to take possession of the blocks on the Regent's Park estate earmarked for demolition.

ACTION BY: Jeremy Shapiro, Head of Community Investment and Regeneration

He further agreed to provide detail on the costs of employing five community liaison officers. DMC members asked that the details also set out why these were considered necessary, but only in Gospel Oak as they did not appear to be being used elsewhere.

ACTION BY: Jeremy Shapiro, Head of Community Investment and Regeneration

The Chair reiterated the disappointment that the information sought prior to the meeting had not been provided in time and asked that a special DMC meeting be explored to look at this as well as the additional information sought during the meeting.

ACTION BY: Komal Doan, Senior Tenant Participation Officer

9. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND SECTION 106 ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

The Chair noted the responses provided to queries submitted in advance of the meeting on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It was noted that no officers were able to attend and that the inability to ask questions of officers on CIL was frustrating. The commitment of the Cabinet Member for Investing in Communities to respond to any queries arising from the meeting was however noted.

DMC members raised concerns about the allocation of the 25% of CIL designated as local CIL by councillors and how this process was not transparent and appeared subjective and potentially open to favouritism from local councillors. DMC members remarked on the lack of engagement by ward councillors in Regent's Park over allocation of local CIL funds, but commended those in St Pancras and Somers Town for doing so.

The local CIL consultation was welcomed but it was questioned why it was not feasible to consult residents on the strategic CIL, given this was 75% of the total CIL and could impact on the borough and its residents significantly.

Considering the responses to the queries raised prior to the meeting, DMC members expressed concern that the Council did not have the figures for how much CIL was being generated from Community Investment Programme (CIP) schemes to hand. It seemed absurd that the Council was planning how to invest CIL money without knowing how much it was due to receive from each development. The DMC queried whether the Council produced quarterly inflow and outflow reports on CIL, which would be prudent.

The Chair proposed and it was agreed that the DMC's comments be forwarded to the relevant Director for them to note and respond to. It was then agreed that the proposed special DMC meeting on CIP include a discussion on CIL affording officers another chance to attend and answer the DMC's questions.

ACTION BY: David Joyce, Director of Regeneration and Planning

10. REVIEW OF THE CARETAKING SERVICE AND EXTERNAL CLEANING OF ESTATES

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Estate Services.

The Chair welcomed officers going back through previous DMC meeting minutes to look for views on the caretaking service.

Responding to a question on having a demand-based service, Sharon Calvey, the Head of Estate Services, advised that the wider contract with Veolia was not being looked at as part of the review. It was accepted that the division of responsibilities for external areas between Veolia and caretakers was causing issues and needed to be resolved. The Cabinet Member for Better Homes outlined that a response could be provided on how the waste management contract was more demand-based. He was aware that bin-sensors had been previously mooted so that Veolia would be alerted when they were becoming full.

ACTION BY: Richard Bradbury, Head of Environment Services

DMC members commented that it would be easier to keep estates cleaner with easy access to things like clothing banks and oil banks. The Head of Estate Services commented that oil banks had been looked into previously but contractors were not willing to provide them.

Regarding cover for caretaking staff, the DMC set out the current arrangements for cover when regular caretakers were away were poor. Officers outlined that the arrangements for caretaking cover were a key area being explored. One option being looked at was a bespoke reserve team of caretakers.

DMC members remarked that many caretakers spent time logging and photographing issues. Actioning those issues quicker would reduce the time taken by caretakers on following them up. The Head of Estate Services agreed this was important, and would also encourage caretakers to keep being proactive.

Regarding consultation, the Head of Estate Services outlined that groups of caretakers had already been met with to discuss the review and there would be further meetings in the next couple of months to discuss ideas. A supervisors' away day to discuss the service had also taken place. In effect, consultation with residents and caretakers on the service was happening in parallel and details of the forthcoming workshops would go out in due course.

Answering additional questions, the Head of Estate Services outlined that the review was not a cost saving exercise and the proportion of the Veolia contract that was for external estate cleaning would be returned to the Council to be used on the service. Once the contract issues were resolved, the Council would understand exactly how much it could spend on the new service. A cost-neutral approach was sought so residents did not have to pay more. The proposals would go to Cabinet in April, and reported to DMCs in June 2019.

It was suggested by DMC members that the review needed to look at how cleaning after anti-social behaviour or rough sleeping on estates would take place, perhaps through an emergency response mechanism. Investing in gating would also help keep estates cleaner through limiting access, though displacement was accepted as a potential problem. The Chair commented that the Responsive Security Patrol also had a role to play in remaining pro-active and preventing issues from ASB or rough sleeping. The Head of Estate Services commented that this would have to be explored in detail so that it was not simply a case of expecting caretakers to deal with the worst issues, which in some cases was unreasonable.

DMC members proposed that HS2 Ltd could be asked to contribute to dealing with cleanliness issues caused either directly or indirectly through displacement due to HS2 works. It was noted officers were in discussion with HS2 Ltd over issues caused by displacement arising from HS2. DMC members remarked that such discussions needed to manifest themselves in meaningful action. The erection of hoardings and removal of recycling bins by HS2 were also cited as hampering efforts to keep Camden tidier. Construction in general was causing cleanliness issues for the borough.

In discussion, DMC members made the following further comments:

- Having properly locking bin stores would help keep estates cleaner;
- Vermin, particularly rats, had to be more effectively dealt with;
- The quality of service had declined under Veolia and so it was welcome that it was moving back in-house. Veolia had frequently ignored issues when reported, such as a recent example of littering of CO₂ canisters on estates;
- Caretaking reporting was welcome but could be improved. A B rating may be regarded as adequate but may represent a good level of cleaning depending on the state the area had been in before the caretaker started;
- Many caretakers were having to clear up after Veolia still. While the CCTV on Veolia vehicles to monitor their work was noted, this needed to be rigorously enforced;
- Increase leaf sweeping was needed in the autumn; and
- Leaseholders who were sub-letting could be recharged when caretakers were needed to clean up after those they were letting to, often students, moved out and left mess.

Officers agreed to advise Crofters Way TRA where their nearest recycling bins were located.

ACTION BY: Gary Borg, Senior Area Monitoring Officer

The Chair summarised the discussion and highlighted that many caretakers did an excellent job for low pay, and should be praised accordingly. It was important the good caretakers were rewarded so they were retained and poor quality ones not kept on unnecessarily.

11. CHANGES TO WATER CHARGES

The DMC noted the update and agreed that any queries or concerns be referred to the Vice-Chair, who could liaise with officers on behalf of the DMC. His details would be circulated accordingly.

ACTION BY: Dan Rodwell, Principal Committee Officer

12. RESIDENT PARTICIPATION

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Tenant Participation and Sheltered Housing.

The Chair noted the DMC's special meeting the week previously, drew the DMC's attention to the notes from the meeting in the tabled papers and outlined the key points arising as follows:

- Ensuring that the Tenant Participation team were empowered to take action and be pro-active;
- Looking at using an arbiter who was independent of Tenant Participation to deal with conflict resolution, to avoid Tenant Participation, who had to support all tenants, being put into conflict of interest type situations and using up large swathes of their time;
- Improving accountability and transparency in the service. The figures in the survey and housing annual report were not clear on how and where improvement had occurred;
- Providing greater clarity on the Tenant Participation budget and how it was spent;
- Having a bottom-up rather than a top-down approach to Tenant Participation; and
- Improving how residents were able to feed into the resident participation strategy on an ongoing basis.

The DMC praised the work of Tenant Participation officers over a number of years.

Reda Khelladi, Tenant Participation Co-ordinator, commented that the aim was to have the strategy ready to present to March DMCs, building on the surveys and discussions already held. It was acknowledged that more residents wanted to be more involved and a menu of options for residents in terms of engagement was being developed. Greater involvement of younger people and those of black and minority ethnic backgrounds was also needed and officers were working on this as part of the strategy. More consultation would be undertaken in January 2019. It was agreed that the reports could be improved through including data from previous years for comparison.

DMC members noted that conversations over resident participation needed to be ongoing. Liaising with DMCs and TRAs was welcome but better engagement with street properties was needed, as many residents in street properties had little awareness of their options for getting involved.

Websites for TRAs were mooted as one option to improve engagement, and officers outlined potential support to help set up websites through an arrangement made with schools' IT.

The Chair then drew the DMC's attention to the motion that had been laid round regarding the Camden Food Box scheme. She outlined the purpose of the scheme and the work put in by a number of volunteers to establish a scheme providing food and other household essentials as well as advice and support that while not as open as allowing people access to the scheme coming in off the street, was not as restrictive as the Food Bank scheme. The DMC was advised that just prior to the launch of the scheme there had been an intervention to prevent the launch and the motion deplored this and sought an investigation on why it had happened.

Komal Doan, Senior Tenant Participation Officer, outlined how the scheme had come about and how the key part of the scheme was to provide or signpost to advice so that people did not need immediate food provision on an ongoing basis. The Tenant Participation Co-ordinator outlined that the issue for the launch was securing appropriate premises from which to be based. The large number of residents supporting the scheme was noted and officers were keen to see it progress – with the support of the DMCs – despite the setback.

DMC members commented that it was important to recognise the time given by volunteers for such a scheme by being transparent over why it had been prevented from launching when planned. A review would also provide learning points for future projects.

On being put to the vote it was, with 8 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions:

RESOLVED –

THAT the DMC pass the following motion:

“This DMC deplores the cancellation of the launch of the vitally needed Camden Food Box scheme on Tuesday, 27th November at the Crowndale Centre. This project attracted support from corporate sponsors set to donate a sizeable cheque to support its charitable aims of supplying not only healthy nutritious food and necessary supplies to vulnerable and needy families but also providing or signposting them to range of support services as part of a package targeting those in most need.

Individual volunteers who have worked hard to set up and support this project on a purely voluntary basis are devastated it is not now live as planned. Instead it has

been pulled at the eleventh hour just as their efforts were about to come to fruition and everything was in place to provide for the needy in the very near future. Rather than bringing joy and warmth during the cold harsh winter months, vulnerable, poverty-stricken families will be deprived of food, supplies and support that would otherwise have been provided to them via the Food Box project.

This DMC seeks a full enquiry into the astonishing decision made by LBC to cancel the launch of such a worthy project just days before it was to have gone live delivering a range of benefits to families in extreme poverty needing continual help and support, but no more than ever during the dark cold winter months. This heartless decision means that the needs of many families in dire need will not benefit as planned with the launch of the project being kicked down the road until some vague amorphous future date. Without a very credible explanation as to the delay, this decision is indefensible.”

13. UPDATE FROM THE CABINET MEMBER FOR BETTER HOMES

Consideration was given to the report of the Cabinet Member for Better Homes, who in his introduction emphasised that the landlord review was about addressing the currently siloed approach on service delivery and instead moving to a neighbourhood management model.

Responding to questions, the Cabinet Member outlined that the cladding and window replacement works on the Chalcots estate would cost around £80 million. However the Council had secured a Government grant to pay for this. However the costs of the evacuation were not covered. He would ask officers to confirm the total spend on the Chalcots evacuation and works, including having security and fire warden staff on site, and where the funding had come from to pay for those.

ACTION BY: Gavin Haynes, Director of Property Management

He also outlined that any urgent fire safety works would be escalated in the programme of works and some funding was being drawn from Housing Revenue Account reserves to pay for those.

Returning to the landlord review, the Cabinet Member remarked that the idea of the review was to ensure that rather than being passed between lots of different officers to fix a problem, residents could go to a single officer, who would be able to assist them with a wide range of issues and not simply forward the issue onto someone else to deal with.

The DMC thanked the Cabinet Member for his update.

14. HIGH SPEED 2 (HS2)

The DMC noted the update and thanked the Vice-Chair for providing it.

15. CAMDEN TOWN DMC BUDGET

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Tenancy Services.

Representatives of Mayford TRA introduced their bid and outlined that the lighting on the estate had been a long-term issue and the bid would lead to significantly improved lighting on all sides, making it safer for residents. It was confirmed that it was estate lighting being sought, rather than street lighting.

DMC members queried whether the Council was obliged to provide sufficient lighting as might be stipulated in leaseholders' contracts. Vicky Morris, Ward Housing Manager, outlined that relevant officers had been down to assess the position and deemed the lighting sufficient, with the Council unable to fund additional lighting. DMC members commented that lack of funds was not an acceptable reason to not install additional lighting if the Council was obliged to provide it. Officers were asked to provide information on how assessments of whether there was adequate lighting on estates were made, with reference to measurements taken and any thresholds for adequate lighting.

ACTION BY: Michael Layhe, Team Manager, Capital Works

The Chair welcomed the improvements to the presentation of the DMC's budget and thanked those DMC members and officers involved. She commented there was still more to do, but the DMC agreed it was a significant improvement. It was suggested that a table of affiliated TRAs that had not made bids during the year should be included for ease of reference, the width of bars varied to reflect the size of the TRA and the chart for overall spend per TRA and spend per resident be next to one another. The Chair advised she would be meeting relevant officers in due course and would circulate further revisions for comments in due course.

The representative of Walker House outlined the issues around their bids for noticeboards and the amount of money to be refunded to the DMC's budget. Details on how this refund would affect leaseholder recharges was sought.

ACTION BY: Jason Blackhurst, HRA and Capital Projects

On being put to the vote it was, with 10 votes unanimously in favour:

RESOLVED –

THAT the following bid be approved:

TRA	Bid Request	Requested
Mayford TRA	Additional lighting to prevent anti-social behaviour	£11,266.76

16. CAMDEN SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD (CSNB)

The DMC noted the update from the representative to the Camden Safer Neighbourhood Board and thanked her for her work.

17. RESPONDING TO THE HACKITT REVIEW

The report was noted for information.

18. ENGAGEMENT REPORT

The report was noted for information.

19. SERVICES UPDATE REPORT

The report was noted for information.

20. MINUTES FOR REFERENCE

The minutes for reference were noted.

21. TOPICS FOR FUTURE DMC MEETINGS

The topics for future meetings were noted.

22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was none.

Having adjourned between 20:20 and 20:30, the meeting ended at 21:30.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Dan Rodwell

Telephone No: 020 7974 5678

E-Mail: dan.rodwell@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END

