

Public Document Pack

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 2024** at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT

Councillors Awale Olad (Chair), Camron Aref-Adib, Nina De Ayala Parker, Matthew Kirk, Rishi Madlani and Stephen Stark

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT

Councillors Sharon Hardwick and Izzy Lenga

ALSO PRESENT

Councillors Adam Harrison (Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden).

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 Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sharon Hardwick.

2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA**

Councillor Kirk declared in relation to item 6 (Climate Action Plan) that he held some shares in Power North, the Community Energy Group based that worked with the Council to install solar panels on a number of buildings in Camden.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY)

The Chair announced that the meeting was broadcast live by the Council to the Internet and could be viewed on the website for six months after the meeting. After that time, webcasts were archived and could be made available on DVD upon

request. Those who were seated in the Council Chamber or participated via Teams were deemed to have consented to their contributions being recorded and broadcast and to the use of those sound recordings and images for webcasting and/or training purposes.

4. DEPUTATIONS (IF ANY)

The Chair informed members that three deputations had been received and accepted, copies of the deputation statements were included in the supplementary agenda.

The 3 deputations related to item 7 Camden Strategy Annual Update 2023 and were from Ben Pearson accompanied by Rachel Mawby of Save the London Motorcycling Group, John Chamberlain from Camden Cycling Campaign and David Harrison from London Living Streets. The deputations would be heard when that item was reached on the agenda.

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

There was none.

6. CLIMATE ACTION PLAN - ANNUAL REVIEW 2022/23

Consideration was given to the report of the Director of Environment and Sustainability.

Members made the following comments:

- There was lots of good stuff in the report, there were 40 actions crossed off and 6 opened in the course of the year does that reflect a reduction in the Council's ambitions.
- It was always good to receive feedback on the progress the Council had made in achieving its goals.
- It was a very good report.

In response to questions, the Head of Sustainability, Air Quality and Energy Harold Garner, Sustainability Officer Maggie Tappa and Richard Bradbury (Director of Environment and Sustainability) made the following points:

- There was work underway to decarbonise the Council's fleet of vehicles led by the Camden Accessible Travel team. They had just completed a feasibility study with the Carbon Trust Energy Saving Trust, which was looking at the

fleet as a whole and the transition that could be made within the budgets that were available to get it to zero emission by 2030.

- A lot of the actions in the Action Progress Update were continuing actions, there were a lot of actions still open indicating that there was a lot of work going on. The additions represented developments from the original action plan.
- The plan was developed through the Citizen's Assembly model with a lot of the ideas and suggestions coming from residents and what they wanted rather than what would lead to the biggest carbon savings.
- A lot of the individual actions were difficult to quantify in terms of carbon savings for instance a lot of the work the Council did with community groups was around promoting and sharing ideas around climate action and facilitating change, which was quite difficult to quantify in terms of carbon savings. However, in terms of engaging people on climate change and getting them thinking about acting against the climate crisis, was a different way of measuring it.
- What the Council had done was to introduce a number of metrics which had been developed with the Citizens Assembly Panel and which was felt to be reflective of the main pieces of work across 4 themes of which most importantly were carbon emission outcomes and borough wide emissions. There were strong outcome focussed metrics to guide the work done.
- The Council was installing air source heat pumps, but not so many ground source heat pumps due to constraints with space. The Council had delivered a few key projects across its corporate estates recently, such as Swiss Cottage Library which had a £3.7m retrofit of the whole building which included air source heat pumps and Acland Burghley School.
- The Council had secured £10m from the Government's Public Sector Carbonisation Scheme and Social Housing Retrofit Scheme, to retrofit about 350 social housing properties. Funding was also available from the Camden Climate Fund to support residents with heat pump installations. This had generated a lot of interest from residents.
- There were still a lot of Camden properties left to retrofit however this could only be carried out at the rate the funding was made available with government funding only meeting 20% of retrofit costs for social housing.
- The Council had a tree planting strategy which focussed on planting trees in the right place at the right time, ensuring that it followed the biodiversity and maintenance and management regime. The plan was to plant 600 trees each season between October and March each year.
- The Council had planted 525 trees this year, the holes and trees were in place and the Council was on track to plant 600 trees.
- With regards to the net figure of trees in the borough, the Council had to fell trees for a variety of reason including damaged trees which had died, as well as trees that grew inappropriately and damaged homes.
- The Council fell between 300 to 400 trees a year some of which were self-seeded and had grown by themselves.

Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee - Tuesday, 6th February, 2024

- The Council's website was updated every year to indicate the number of trees planted and felled yearly. There was net growth in trees in the borough every year.
- The legislation on Tree Protection Orders only applied to trees on private land that were visible from the public highway that had some public amenity, if the tree was not visible from the road it had no protection. The issue of TPO's had previously been considered by this Committee, Camden was one of the many boroughs lobbying for more protections in this space to try to ensure trees and gardens were protected.
- With regards to community engagement the Climate Action Plan came from the Citizens Assembly which was created in 2019.
- The Assembly was demographically representative of everyone living in Camden, a recommendation of the Citizens Assembly was that a Citizen's Panel should be created which still existed and met quarterly. This was also demographically representative of people living in Camden and helped guide the development of the Climate Action Plan.
- The Council also had projects and engaged with residents in Sommers Town, Future Neighbourhoods were involved in the work associated with the action plan, the Council was also hosting an event on 2nd March in Kentish Town bringing together citizens to celebrate the work being done to combat the climate crisis.
- With regards to the recommendation from the Cabinet Advisor's report on promoting green space and biodiversity, the Council was bringing all the information on green spaces and biodiversity together.
- The Council worked closely with Power North, the Community Energy Group in Camden, installed solar panels on a number of buildings including some leisure centres, St Anne's Church and also had a number of schools in the pipeline which it was hoped would progress in the next few months.
- There was a climate crisis webpage that signposted people to everything relating to the Council's policies on climate action.
- The Council was working with Agro to deliver the Metrofit Support Scheme for Camden which involved the opportunity for homeowners in Camden to receive a subsidised plan towards retrofitting their homes. The aim was to make it as fair as possible and was opened up to households across the borough.
- The Council was also working with community groups to deliver community events to explain retrofit and provide opportunities for residents to ask questions.
- The Camden Climate Fund was also available, providing £5,000 grant match funding to support the installation of energy efficient measures.
- The report described all the projects the Council had been involved in as well as some of the barriers faced, in particular the retrofit agenda and the financial restraints which was a huge challenge for the Council.
- Every major planning application in Camden was assessed against flood risk. With policies tighter in areas known as local flood risk zones. Any property in these locations was subject to enhanced planning policy in relation to flood risk.

- The Council could not control everything relating to flood risk because some of the infrastructure was maintained by other organisations such as Thames Water.
- The Council carefully monitored air quality through measures such as Healthy Street Schemes, all these monitoring reports were available on-line.
- There appeared to be an increase carbon levels post pandemic as people started to go back into the office which saw an increase in energy consumption across Camden.

Officers were thanked for their work, time taken to attend the meeting and their responses.

RESOLVED –

THAT the report be noted.

7. CAMDEN TRANSPORT STRATEGY ANNUAL UPDATE 2023

Consideration was given to the deputation statements referred to in Item 4 above.

The following responses were given by the deputies to members questions:

- Save the Motorcycle Campaign had not spammed Councillors inboxes, the Campaign group had contacted motor cyclists around Camden informing them of what the Council was planning. Motorcyclists were upset with the proposals and were informed how they could make their voices heard.
- What motor cyclist choose to do with the information that they had been provided was up to the motor cyclists. They were upset and had been emailing Councillors.
- If Councillors were asking motorcyclists to stop contacting them about what motorcyclists felt were punitive, disproportionate, irrational and unfair policies because Councillors had other matters to deal with, Save the Motor Cyclist Campaign would suggest that the Council engage with motorcyclists and address their concerns.
- With regards to those roads where there was not a safe alternative for cyclists riding in bus lanes, there had been so many different trials which had all come to the same conclusion, there was no evidence to show that the safety of cyclists were affected when motor cyclists used bus lanes.
- The Council's policy on banning motor cyclists from using bus lanes was based solely on arguments put forward from the London Cycling Campaign rather than the evidence.
- With regards to the serious injuries and fatalities figures on roads, the Camden Cycling Campaign does not know what the cause was but wanted the Council and TfL to work together to reduce the figure further, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Cyclists had a lot in common with motor cyclists suffering from similar issues, however there was a difference of opinion regarding motor cyclists use of bus lanes particularly those that were not very wide. The one place cyclists felt safe apart from a dedicated cycle lane was in bus lanes without powered two wheelers.
- The survey conducted by TfL about how cyclists felt about motor cyclists using bus lanes, found that on balance more cyclists were in favour than against it. It was found that there was no impact on the safety or the perception of safety cyclists felt.
- The Council's response had justified its current position with regards to its policy on banning motorcyclists from using bus lanes, Save the Motorcycle Campaign believed that this was a misrepresentation of some of the key points of the evidence. Either the Council had misunderstood the evidence or was biased against the motor cyclist and needed to change its policy.
- With regards to pedestrian safety, there was an obvious correlation between the amount of traffic and pedestrian and cycling casualties, so the more traffic could be taken out of an area the safer it would be for these other road users.
- The other issue related to lots of casualties occurring at junctions, therefore it was important to improve and tighten safety at junctions.
- With regards to Bedford Square, it would be good if a campaign could be started to open Bedford and Fitzroy Squares to the public as the situation had been static for a very long time.
- In relation to Bloomsbury as part of the Holborn Scheme it was hoped that Great Russell Street could be closed off to all except buses as it was disheartening that polluting traffic was outside the doors of one of the world's great institutions.
- Save the Motorcycle Campaign had noticed that when Camden was putting in schemes, powered two wheeled vehicles safety was actively de prioritised compared to the other modes of walking, cycling or public transport. This influenced all its policies when it came to powered two wheeled vehicles.
- Save the Motorcycle Campaign had not done an analysis on how Camden compared to other boroughs.
- London Living Streets were keen for people to include walking as part of their daily routine walking 20 to 30 minutes to the station on their way to work. Improving pedestrian infrastructure would encourage more people to walk as witnessed in the Seven Dials area.

Sam Margolis (Head of Transport Strategy and Projects) Brenda Busingye (Transport and Travel Planning Manager) Karl Brierley, (Safe and Healthy Streets Team Manager) and Richard Bradbury, (Director of Environment and Sustainability) made the following comments in response to the deputations and members questions:

- In relation to Road Safety in general, as part of the development of the current 3-year plan and the Transport Strategy the Council had undertaken two very detailed and thorough assessments of road safety casualties in the borough to determine the priorities.

- The Council had a clear commitment to vision zero which meant nobody killed, no serious injuries on Camden streets by 2041. As set out in the report the Council was making good progress towards this, although there was still more to be done.
- Priority analysis included problematic junctions which had been problematic for all road users over a number of years, including around Holborn referred to by one of the deputies, The Council had various forthcoming schemes around problematic junctions in the borough such as Theobald's Road and Grays Inn Road and many others in the borough.
- Some of the issues referred to related to TfL roads, the Council looked to work closely with TfL to address the issues on those areas such as for example the Kings Cross Gyratory where the Council had been pushing TfL for a number of years to make those improvements.
- Members were reminded that the Council's Transport Strategy was devised from the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy which was explicit about mode share targets for public transport, walking and cycling.
- The Council had a statutory duty to meet those targets and to produce a transport strategy which aligned with those targets which were a priority for the Council. In addition, the Council also sought to address road safety for all users in every single scheme that it delivered for example junction tightening at junctions beneficial to all road users as well as the rollout of the 20mph speed limit which had been beneficial over a number of years.
- With regards to the comments on the motorcycle parking charges, these had also been received as part of the response to the marketing charges consultation, these would be carefully considered and responded to in the report going to Cabinet at the end of the month.
- With regards to incentives for people to give up their cars, one of the schemes ran by the Council in the last few years was the permit scrappage scheme which meant if a residence parking permit were given up, the resident could access membership of the Council's car club offering in the borough.
- In relation to Camden's streets being less safe to walk on for pedestrians, the data showed that the Council was making improvements in pedestrian care with one of the Council's key achievements being a significant increase in the walking mode share which had gone up by 7% with almost one in two residents' trips now being made on foot.
- With regards to the strategic walking routes, this was briefly mentioned in Table 1 of the report. The Council was making good progress on some of the strategic walking routes such as for example from Camden Road Overground to Camden Town and Camden Market. Consultation had taken place on a crossing on Camden Street which was regarded as being beneficial, the next phase of which would be to introduce a crossing at Kentish Town Road which would complete this link. The Council was also actively working on the well-being walk south of Euston Road, which connected Euston and Kings Cross as well as a number of other schemes in the borough.
- With regards to the Camden Cycling Campaign deputation, the support was noted, it was also acknowledged that the progress might have been slower than the Campaign group might have liked particularly around the Council's

Safe and Healthy Streets Programmes. It was pointed out that a lot broader package of measures were being put in place rather than just traffic restrictions. For example, the Council consulted and officers received approval to make the Camden Square scheme permanent, to deliver an Healthy Street Scheme with traffic restrictions in the Holmes Road area as well as starting detailed engagement on the Dartmouth Park as well as plans for many other schemes.

Inviting the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden to respond to Save the Motorcycle Campaign's deputation particularly in relation to parking charges and safety, the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden commented that:

- The proposals did not treat motorcycles the same as cars. Explaining that there were no emissions set funding for motorbikes as the Council did not have the data from the DVLA, cars on the other hand had an emissions-based charging formula with a variety of bands up to 7 as well as an electric option.
- For motorcycles the Council was proposing to take the lowest emission band which was not actually treating them the same as cars. It was a flat rate charge proposed for motorcycles while there was a whole variety of rates proposed for cars.
- Bus lanes were used to facilitate travel, whenever there was more motor traffic in bus lanes it created a hostile environment for cyclists and the Council would always go for the option to create a more conducive environment for cyclists. The Council would prefer to have separate cycle infrastructure for busy bus routes such as Euston Road.
- The Council would always be led by the data which was important however lived experience was also important and as pointed out by Camden Cycling Campaign the Council's aim of facilitating more people walking and cycling was being hindered by people not feeling safe on the road particularly when for example bus lanes were used by motorcycles.
- The Council would look at the data and studies described by Save Motorcycle Campaign, however from the information provided this appeared to be cyclists that cycled on TFL managed roads that were less perturbed by large volumes of traffic.
- When the Council designed schemes, it considered all road users as well as the general principles applied to address traffic volumes, basically the less traffic, the fewer movements and the fewer opportunities for collisions.
- The changes the Council was trying to introduce with the investment was aimed to benefit all road users.
- The Council had engaged in an exchange of correspondence with Save the Motorcycle Campaign over the last two years, the issues raised were around parking charges and the removal of 2 motorcycle parking bays out of 330 in the borough, motorcyclists' safety had not been previously raised as an issue.

The Director of Environment and Sustainability and Head of Transport Strategy and Projects informed the Committee that officers were working on a new three-year delivery work programme which was part of the Transport Strategy, this was

scheduled to be presented to this Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet in the autumn/winter. Specific issues relating to motorcycle safety could be covered and included in the delivery work programme. The response to the parking charge consultation were also due to be reported to Cabinet soon.

Action By Director of Environment and Sustainability/Head of Transport Strategy and Projects

A Committee member commented that he agreed with Save the London Motorcycles basic case that the Council's current Transport Strategy failed to recognise that motorcycles were different from cars which he believed was a structural problem had a knock-on effect and underpinned all sorts of decision making. He was of the view that the Council's Transport Strategy should be revised mid scheme to recognise the basic distinction between motorcycles and cars.

The Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden disagreed with the Committee members view that the strategy had a structural problem which influenced decision making as the Council promoted safety schemes which benefitted all road users. Remarking that as officers had indicated, a response to these issues could be provided in the report going to Cabinet and coming back to this Committee later in the year.

The Transport and Travel Planning Manager also responding to Save the London Motorcycles Campaign claim that motorcycles were treated the same as cars commented, that as previously advised and accepted by Save the London Motorcycle Campaign, motorcycles were treated based on their impact and the charges proposed were based on their levels of emissions. Information could be provided to specifically show what the differences were and why the policy relating to motorcycles was being applied, which was based on impact and proportionality.

Action By Transport and Travel Planning Manager/Head of Transport Strategy and Projects

The Chair asked that officers continued to engage with Save the London Motorcycle Campaign.

The Committee endorsed the London Living Streets, and Camden Cycling Campaign suggestions, thanking all the deputies for attending the meeting and their deputations.

Consideration was given to the report of the Director of Environment and Sustainability.

In response to Committee members questions, officers advised that:

- With regards to electric vehicle (EV) charging points, the number and location of where they were installed were determined by a number of factors including requests for EV charge points, the data held on the change in electric vehicle permit owners which also determined where charge points were installed as well as points of interest.

- This was subject to change as the uptake in EV's increased.
- In terms of inter-operability most charge point providers were required to have open access; however, in practice this rarely happened for a variety of reasons. Although currently not positive, it was hoped that as the market grew the situation would change
- The Council worked with other London boroughs such as Barnet and Islington taking part in a joint procurement exercise to obtain funding from the private sector for installing EV charging points.
- With regards to residents with disabilities and complex needs, when developing and consulting on the Council's Transport Strategy. Engagement was conducted with groups including those representing the 9 protected characteristics. A comprehensive and evidence-based report was produced which looked at the proportion of trips by disabled people by different types of modes, as well as a comprehensive equalities impact assessment as the framework for the Transport Strategy.
- A detailed equalities impact assessment was conducted for each scheme individually covering the 9 protected characteristic groups as well low-income households.
- On the larger schemes, accessibility audits were conducted with the Council working closely with Camden Disability Action to identify issues that could be improved such as access for wheelchair users.
- The Council also had a borough wide stakeholder consultation list which included groups representing protected characteristics, underrepresented groups and the Disability Oversight Panel to make sure their views were represented.
- In relation to the disabled blind resident that lived in Hampstead Town Ward that made a deputation to Council a while back about clutter on Camden High Streets, the Council had requirements for safe access on any of its streets including minimum width of access. If this was impacted by advertising boards or clutter placed there by businesses or households, the Council provided education advice or took enforcement action where necessary.
- A team from the Council was currently conducting a trial focussing on a number of high streets working with businesses, residents and communities to ensure a clutter free environment.
- Officers agreed to provide information to the Committee member on what steps had been taken to resolve the issues raised by disabled resident in Hampstead Town Ward.

Action By: Director of Environment and Sustainability

- In relation to whether there were tangible health benefits derived from the Transport Strategy, in terms of the monitoring conducted on individual schemes the data had shown an improvement in air quality both within and outside the scheme area. Appendix A to the report also showed a reduction in emissions across Camden over the year. The Council was on track to meet its emissions targets by 2031 based on current projections and improvements.

- With regards to other health benefits such as decline in certain conditions such as asthma this could be referred to the Head of Sustainability, Air Quality and Energy for a response.

Action By Head of Sustainability Air Quality and Energy

- The cycling figures included e-bikes.
- With regards to issues with the implementation of the Healthy Streets Programme, the report does not talk about the specifics of the implementation of that particular scheme, but talked about the scheme generally and one of the metrics that had not progressed as much as it could have in terms of the roll out of the healthy school streets.
- The pace of implementation of the Healthy School Street programme had picked up towards the later part of 2023 with a number of schemes scheduled this year, the intention was to meet the target by 2025 as set out in the 3-year plan.
- The Council faced some challenges on the implementation of one or two of the Healthy Street Schemes, which related to changing the contractor, and issues related to construction.
- It was acknowledged that the Healthy School Streets Programme was an ambitious programme to implement there had been a resourcing issue with a key member of staff leading the scheme leaving the Council mid-way through implementation.
- Officers looked to address any mistakes made along the way. Agreeing with the Committee members comments, that delivering the programme required a significant amount of skilled resource. The service had been restructured over the past year, the resources were now in place to deliver the programme, with learning systems also in place from schemes that had not gone quite so well.

The Chair remarked that it was a good report and thanked officers for attending.

RESOLVED –

THAT the report be noted.

8. USE OF PESTICIDES IN THE PUBLIC REALM

Consideration was given to the report of the Director of Recreation.

Oliver Jones (Director of Recreation) Richard Bradbury (Director of Environment and Sustainability) and Darrell Abercrombie, (Green Spaces Operations Manager) made the following comments in response to members questions:

- With regards to whether the Council proactively encouraged residents to weed their area like other boroughs such as Lambeth, the Council engaged with local groups and those interested in Parks on how they could keep the

parks tidy, how they could plant, as well as what they could do to assist with weeding the environment.

- The Council had the infrastructure to support engagement with the local community and worked with a lot of Community Groups such as think and do the Climate Action Network. Through these various networks Streets collaborated with the Council on a whole range of issues such as the spray free approach as well as with communities that wanted to plant tree pits which attracted a lot of weeds.
- The local work done across the Council via various departments such as the Sustainability Team, Environmental Services, The Trees Team, helped the Council understand what the community wanted in the local neighbourhoods and to provide that support appropriately.
- Rather than distributing leaflets like some other Councils, Camden collaborated with the community in a more focussed way through its networks.
- Camden had a good balanced integrated weed management approach. The Council had some aspects of what other boroughs such as Hackney did in its approach.
- Camden tried to manage the risk between what was suitable and a somewhat grey area where there was no clearly defined right approach.
- Considerable research had been conducted on behalf of Cardiff City Council to determine the climate impact and the right approach. The analysis indicated that alternative approaches had considerable side effects and biodiversity impacts.
- In relation to gardens, the Council does not spray herbicide on a planted area, the only time herbicide was used was to tackle invasive species.
- Although Officers were not aware of the situation in Belgium with regards to statements about the eradication of pesticides, in France the bold statement did not quite match the reality. Organisations when making bold statements about absence of pesticides, were in reality mostly referring to a subset of an area rather than the whole area.
- In relation to use of pesticides, the Council provided an accurate depiction of what it was doing and how it was dealing with the situation and managing the risk.
- It would be ideal to have a situation where the Council did not have to use chemicals, however this was not the case and the Council continued to look at alternatives and best practise.
- The scientific report from the EU was confusing, the guidance provided was not clear.
- Managing green spaces required a wholistic approach and one aspect of this was conservation led maintenance which was introduced by the Council over 7 years ago, this was aimed at improving the soil as well as using manual techniques to improve the turf.
- The Council had trialled other different methods such as the hot foam trial which was not successful and conversations continued to be had across London about alternative options.
- The Council was carrying out a lot of planting however if selective herbicides were not used it would result in more weeds.

- Educating people by way of guidance, explaining what the Council did and why it was done. There were some elements of this in the biodiversity plan. Officers could look into providing this information on the Council's website.

ACTION BY: Director of Recreation/Green Spaces Operations Manager

- Officers agreed to provide the Committee with an update on the Biodiversity Action Plan in the new municipal year.

ACTION BY: Director of Recreation

Members made the following comments:

- The efforts being made by the Council to reduce the use of pesticides were welcomed, however there should be less herbicide use and the Council should more proactively engage with street groups on how to control weeds, as well as work closer with neighbouring boroughs and NLWA partners.
- The Council should look to raise general awareness and knowledge of why it was using pesticides in the public realm.

Officers were thanked for their report.

RESOLVED –

THAT the report be noted.

9. WORK PROGRAMME

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

RESOLVED –

THAT the Work Programme be noted.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was none.

The meeting ended at 9.08 pm.

Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee - Tuesday, 6th February, 2024

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Sola Odusina

Telephone No: 0207 974 6884

E-Mail: sola.odusina@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END