

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**RECORD OF THE DECISIONS OF THE CABINET**

**HELD AT 5.35 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2017**

**C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,  
LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Mayor John Biggs	
Councillor Sirajul Islam	(Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing)
Councillor Amina Ali	(Cabinet Member for Environment)
Councillor Rachel Blake	(Cabinet Member for Strategic Development & Waste)
Councillor Asma Begum	(Cabinet Member for Community Safety)
Councillor David Edgar	(Cabinet Member for Resources)
Councillor Abdul Mukit MBE	(Cabinet Member for Culture and Youth)
Councillor Joshua Peck	(Cabinet Member for Work & Economic Growth)
Councillor Amy Whitelock Gibbs	(Cabinet Member for Education and Children's Services)

**Other Councillors Present:**

Councillor Dave Chesterton	(Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Peter Golds	(Leader of the Conservative Group)
Councillor Andrew Wood	

**Officers Present:**

Andrew Bate	(Senior Executive, Communications)
Janice Beck	(Head of Building Development, Children & Adults Resources)
Stephen Bramah	(Deputy Head of the Mayor's office)
Emily Fieran-Reed	(Service Manager, Community Cohesion, Engagement and Commissioning, Strategy, Policy and Equality)
Jim Glover	(Revenue Services)
Sharon Godman	(Divisional Director, Strategy, Policy and Partnerships)
Afazul Hoque	(Interim Service Manager, Strategy, Policy & Performance)
Martin Ling	(Housing Strategy Manager, Place)
Niall McGowan	(Housing Regeneration Manager)
Neville Murton	(Divisional Director, Finance, Procurement & Audit)
Christabel Shawcross	(Safeguarding Adults Board Chair LBTH)
Jackie Sullivan	(Managing Director of Hospitals, Bart's Health Trust)

David Tolley	(Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards)
Abad Uddin	(Graduate Management Trainee, Human Resources)
Zena Cooke	(Corporate Director, Resources)
Asmat Hussain	(Corporate Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer)
Debbie Jones	(Corporate Director, Children's)
Denise Radley	(Corporate Director, Health, Adults & Community)
Ann Sutcliffe	(Acting Corporate Director, Place)
Will Tuckley	(Chief Executive)
Matthew Mannion	(Committee Services Manager, Democratic Services, Governance)

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Denise Jones, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.

### **3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

#### **DECISION**

1. That the unrestricted minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday 31 October 2017 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of proceedings subject to the following:
  - a. Agenda Item 5.12 – Recommendation 5 – it has been agreed that the delegation needs to be amended from the Corporate Director, Governance to the Acting Corporate Director, Place.

### **4. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

#### **4.1 Chair's Advice of Key Issues or Questions**

Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions were noted in respect of Agenda Items:

- 5.2 – Local Safeguarding Childrens Board Annual Report.
- 5.7 – Approval of the allocation of S106 and CIL funding for projects at Wood Wharf Primary School and Additional 6<sup>th</sup> Form Places at Langdon Park & George Green Schools.
- 5.10 – Disposal of Land at Ailsa Street, Lochnagar Street and Bromley Hall Road
- 5.12 – Corporate Budget Monitoring Quarter 2

Written responses would be provided.

#### **4.2 Any Unrestricted Decisions "Called in" by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

Nil items.

### **5. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **5.1 Tower Hamlets Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2016/17**

##### **DECISION**

1. To note the annual report for the Local Safeguarding Adults Board for 2016/17

##### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, HEALTH, ADULTS AND COMMUNITY (D. RADLEY)**

(Interim Strategic and Governance Manager for Adult Safeguarding (P. Swan))

##### **Reasons for the decision**

The local Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) is required to publish an annual report on the effectiveness of adult safeguarding arrangements and promoting the awareness raising, safety and wellbeing of adults in Tower Hamlets who may be at risk of harm or abuse. The annual report will be available within the Council and across partner agencies and available in the public domain. The SAB annual report, which fulfils this responsibility, is appended to this briefing paper.

##### **Alternative options**

There are no alternative options, as it is a statutory requirement for this report to be reported to the Mayor.

#### **5.2 Tower Hamlets Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2016-17**

##### **DECISION**

1. To note the annual report from the Local Safeguarding Children Board for 2016-17

##### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S SERVICES (D. JONES)**

(Safeguarding Children Strategy and Governance Manager (M. Bakht))

##### **Reasons for the decision**

The Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) is required to publish an annual report on the effectiveness of child safeguarding arrangements and promoting the welfare of children in its locality, ensure the annual report is

available within the professional and public domain. The LSCB annual report, which fulfils this responsibility, is appended to this paper.

### **Alternative options**

There are no alternative options. It is a statutory requirement for the LSCB to report to the leader of the council (Mayor) along with the Chief Executive, the Borough Commander, the Crime and Policing Commissioner and Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board on an annual basis.

## **5.3 Re-ablement Service Scrutiny Report & Action Plan**

### **DECISION**

1. To note the report of the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee and agree the action plan in response to the report recommendations.

### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, HEALTH, ADULTS AND COMMUNITY (D. RADLEY)**

(Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer (D. Kerr))

### **Reasons for the decision**

During the 2016/17 Municipal Year the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee is taking a thematic approach to its work programme and is looking at access to health and social care services in Tower Hamlets. As part of this, the Sub-Committee has identified the performance of the Council's 'Reablement' service as the subject for a Scrutiny Review.

The Reablement service offers support to residents aged 18+ when they are discharged from hospital and/or are already at home and starting to struggle with activities of daily living. The main focus is to support residents to regain or improve their independence and functioning.

National evidence suggests that supporting early and safe discharge from hospital into a reablement-type service delivers better outcomes for individuals when compared to longer periods of hospitalisation or immediate transfer into domiciliary care. It is also cost effective for health and adult social care services, by reducing the pressure on bed-capacity in the acute sector and the need for large packages of ongoing care in the community.

Due to the rising population of residents who are aged 65+ and on-going pressure on health and adult social care budgets, the performance of the 'Reablement' service is an issue which is of major significance to the Tower Hamlets population. Currently, Tower Hamlets benchmarks less well in terms of the number of residents discharged from hospital who receive the service and also the effectiveness of interventions (when measured by the number of people who receive the service and do not require further care).

This report seeks the endorsement of the Mayor in Cabinet of the Sub-Committee's review and its related Action Plan. Through the implementation

of the Action Plan many of the issues identified in the review will be targeted and improved.

#### **Alternative options**

To take no action. This is not recommended as the scrutiny review provides an evidence base for improving Reablement services in Tower Hamlets.

To agree some, but not all recommendations. All of the recommendations are achievable within existing resources as outlined in the Action Plan.

#### **5.4 Universal Credit and Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme - Support for Residents**

The recommendations were amended and then agreed.

#### **DECISION**

1. To approve the creation of an internal advice and support service for residents affected by the roll out of Universal Credit and self-employed residents in receipt of Local Council Tax Reduction.
2. To agree that specialist services should be commissioned as set out at paragraph 1.2 of the report from a range of independent agencies.
3. To delegate authority to the Corporate Director of Resources, after consultation with Corporate Director of Governance, to enter into any necessary agreements following a procurement exercise for the specialist services
4. To note the budget from which staffing requirements were to be funded from the Tackling Poverty Fund.
5. That a meeting be arranged with the Tower Hamlets Community Advice Network and the Mayor.
6. That the proposed review of the in house advice team be undertaken within the first year of service.

#### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES (Z. COOKE)**  
(Tackling Poverty Programme Manager (E. Kershaw))

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The creation of an in house advice and support team would allow the Council to keep an ongoing record of advice and support offered, ensuring that referrals are made as required to, for example, debt advice, employment support and for Discretionary Housing Payment.

However, in order for customers to access the best quality and range of provision, specialist services would be better commissioned from other organisations with specialist knowledge of key areas of provision, such as advice in community languages, support for those with mental health conditions and those affected by domestic abuse.

### **Alternative options**

The Council could choose not to provide or fund advice to residents on the basis that Universal Credit is the responsibility of the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and not the Council. This option is not recommended as it would leave residents with little or no support, will impact on recipients of the Council's Local Council Tax Reduction scheme, significantly increasing the risk of poverty and homelessness.

The Council could offer its own internal advice and not fund any other providers. This option is not recommended as it removes the option to commission specialist services that may be required.

The Council could choose to commission external advice only. This option is not recommended as the Council would lose a number of opportunities to record advice and map customer progress, leading to the ability to undertake proactive and informed support work with residents.

## **5.5 Tower Hamlets Resident Support Scheme**

### **DECISION**

1. To approve the Residents Support Scheme policy, as attached to the report, to go out to consultation.
2. To agree the commissioning of a short term pilot to provide support immediately pending the outcome of the consultation.

### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES (Z. COOKE)**

(Tackling Poverty Programme Manager (E. Kershaw))

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposed Scheme provides for advice and support to help residents improve their future financial circumstances, by tackling the causes, rather than just meeting an immediate need.

Offering goods and services would allow the Council to track any trends in the type of goods and required. This would allow for further proactive work to be undertaken: for example, if high numbers of people are requesting energy top ups, the Fuel Poverty Team could be utilised in helping residents to switch to more cost effective tariffs or providing measures such as property insulation to ensure that residents are assisted in the long term.

The Council's current Welfare Assistance Policy makes it hard to prove value for money. A goods based service would allow the Council to reclaim VAT, meaning that the same budget allocation would provide for more awards.

The proposed scheme would allow the Council to make efficiencies in staff time as currently awards are distributed from cash offices which is time and cost intensive.

#### **Alternative options**

The Council could continue with the current cash policy.

The Council could choose not to offer any form of support.

The Council could offer a service that provides only for immediate need and does not take into account other forms of support to assist residents in the long term.

## **5.6 Local Business Rates Relief Scheme**

### **DECISION**

1. To agree the proposed scheme in Appendix A to the report, which is to award a total of £4,654,709 to 2,616 local business ratepayers. This represent 80% of the increase experienced by ratepayers as a result of the 2017 Revaluation.
2. To commence rebilling immediately to all qualifying local businesses.

#### **Action by:**

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES (Z. COOKE)**  
(Head of Revenue Services (R. Jones))

#### **Reasons for the decision**

Designing the scheme in this way means that the maximum number of local small to medium businesses are awarded the relief but also takes into account the feedback from the consultation on the types of business to be excluded. These include the following –

To be excluded from the scheme -  
Payday lenders  
Betting Shops  
Public Sector and Local Government buildings  
Housing Association Properties  
Unoccupied Properties

Excluding the properties identified under the categories above, and those cases that have an overall increase of £100 or less, has resulted in the identification of 2,616 ratepayers that will receive the relief in the first year.

**Alternative options**

The simplest option would be to allocate a flat rate percentage to all ratepayers but this would not target small to medium sized businesses and would not reflect the size of the increase in rates payable as a result of the revaluation, or give the ability to exclude specific types of business.

**5.7 IDF: Approval of the allocation of S106 funding and approval for the adoption of a capital budget in respect of the following projects: 1. Wood Wharf Primary School PID; 2. Additional 6th Form places - Langdon Park and George Green's School PID****DECISION**

1. To approve the allocation of £3m in Section 106 (S106) funding to the proposals set out in the "Wood Wharf Primary School" Project Initiation Document (PID), which was attached to the Cabinet report at Appendix A and Table 1.
2. To approve the allocation of £7.5m in Section 106 (S106) funding to the proposals set out in the "Additional 6th Form places - Langdon Park and George Green's Schools" Project Initiation Document (PID), which was attached to the Cabinet report at Appendix B and Table 1.

**Action by:**

**ACTING CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE (A. SUTCLIFFE)**

(Head of Building Development, Children's Services (J. Beck))

**Reasons for the decision**

Approval is sought to deliver these projects for the following reasons:

1. They help contribute to the delivery of positive improvements to people's lives that will underpin the Community Plan themes of:
  - A Great Place to Live;
  - A Fair and Prosperous Community;
  - A Safe and Cohesive Community;
  - A Healthy and Supportive Community.
2. The Infrastructure Delivery Framework: Evidence Base identifies a need to increase the capacity of the education offer across the borough. These projects will result in an increase in primary and 6<sup>th</sup> form education spaces.

Please refer to the following associated documents/appendices for more information about the projects:

- Appendix A to the report: Wood Wharf Primary School Project PID
- Appendix B to the report: Additional 6th Form places - Langdon Park and George Green's Schools PID



**Alternative options**

The projects within the attached PIDs can be individually or collectively approved. The only alternative option is to not allocate the funding to some or any of these projects.

It should be noted that the use of S106 funding proposed for allocation in this report is restricted, as it must be spent in accordance with the terms and conditions of its expenditure pertaining to a specific S106 agreement related to the development from which it originates. Further details of the specific restrictions attached to each S106 agreement can be found in the attached PIDs. Any alternative spend of this funding would have to be on the projects that would meet the requirements of the relevant S106 agreement.

**5.8 Amendment to Private Sector Renewal Policy 2016 - 2018****DECISION**

1. To make the following amendment to the Private Sector Renewal Policy 2016-2018

**Clause 4.1:****Change**

Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants will continue to be available to eligible owner-occupiers, and private sector tenants and the maximum mandatory Disabled Facilities Grant is £30,000.

These grants are means tested except for the benefit for a disabled child under the age of 18.

Applications for discretionary Disabled Facilities Grant cannot be considered due to budget restrictions

**To:**

Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants will continue to be available to eligible owner-occupiers and private sector tenants and the maximum mandatory Disabled Facilities Grant is £30,000.

These grants are means tested except for the benefit for a disabled child under the age of 18.

Applications for Discretionary Disabled Facilities Grant above the maximum mandatory £30k limit will be considered on a case by case basis by the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) Grants Panel. Approval will be subject to it being identified that the client would not be able raise the necessary funds to complete the works which would then result in the adaptation not being carried out.

**Action by:****ACTING CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE (A. SUTCLIFFE)**

(Housing Strategy Manager (M. Ling))

**Reasons for the decision**

The introduction of discretionary Disabled Facilities Grants in a small number of cases where it is verified that the client is unable to make a financial contribution will enable the Council to achieve the objective of the Disabled Facilities Grant which is to assist people with disabilities to live independently in their own homes.

**Alternative options**

The Mayor could choose not to introduce discretionary Disabled Facilities Grants above the maximum mandatory £30k limit.

**5.9 Cohesion Scrutiny Challenge Report Action Plan****DECISION**

1. To note the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and agree to the action plan in response to the report's recommendations.

**Action by:****DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR, STRATEGY, POLICY AND PERFORMANCE (S. GODMAN)**

(Interim Service Manager, Strategy, Policy and Performance (A. Hoque))

(Service Manager, Community Engagement, Cohesion and Commissioning)

**Reasons for the decision**

The Council's constitution requires the Executive to respond to recommendations from the OSC. The action plan within this report outlines the Executive response to the six recommendations arising from the review.

**Alternative options**

Cabinet may decide not to agree the action plan. This is not recommended as the report outlines work undertaken by Councillors, officers and external partners to identify areas of improvement and the Council's response which identifies actions it will take to implement these recommendations.

### **5.10 Disposal of Land at Ailsa Street, Lochnagar Street and Bromley Hall Road E14**

The recommendations were amended and then agreed.

#### **DECISION**

1. To agree that the land and buildings at Ailsa Street, Lochnagar Street and Bromley Hall Road E14, as shown on the plan at Appendix A to the report, are surplus to the Council's requirements.
2. Having noted the valuation information set out in the exempt Appendix C to the report, agree to the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in the land to Ailsa Wharf Development Ltd on the terms set out in the report and exempt Appendix B to the report.
3. To authorise the Acting Corporate Director, Place, to agree to any non-material variations to the terms and the precise boundaries of the land to be sold in order to implement the recommendations above.
4. To authorise the Corporate Director, Governance, following consultation with the Acting Corporate Director, Place, to enter into the necessary legal agreements required to implement the recommendations above.

#### **Action by:**

#### **ACTING CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE (A. SUTCLIFFE)**

(Acting Divisional Director, Property and Major Programmes (R Chilcott))

#### **Reasons for the decision**

It is important at a time of reducing funding and budgets in the public sector to ensure that efficiencies are driven through the running and/or disposals of the Council's assets to reduce revenue costs and/or generate capital receipts.

The decisions in this report will contribute to the continual review and rationalisation of the Council's assets, and help reduce the operational portfolio to the optimum required. The disposal will generate a capital receipt for the Council, which can be reinvested and directed to its principal expenditure priorities. It will also reduce revenue expenditure on upkeep, maintenance and security.

The proposed redevelopment of the land as part of a wider Housing Zone regeneration project will bring disused and environmentally poor sites in a prominent location into productive use. By taking constructive action in this way the Council is meeting its strategic enabling role in promoting regeneration. The redevelopment will have a potentially transformative effect on this area of the borough. The provision of a significant amount of

affordable housing will help the Council to meet its targets and support people on lower incomes into quality accommodation.

The Poplar Riverside Housing Zone was established in 2016. The Housing Zone contains 10 potential development sites the majority of which occupy former industrial lands nearby or bound by the A12, A13 and River Lea. The Council is focussed on ensuring a significant quantum and mix of affordable homes is delivered in the Housing Zone, alongside high quality and affordable workspace, open space, cultural facilities and community infrastructure. Poplar Riverside has the potential to emerge as London's new affordable district in which to both live and work. Utilising the rich asset that is the River Lea will be crucial to the regeneration of the Housing Zone, as well as the delivery of key infrastructure to significantly improve connectivity across the A12, A13 and River Lea, creating a network of walking and cycling routes and opening up Poplar Riverside to the rest of the Tower Hamlets and East London.

GLA funding for the housing zone has been split across two phases. The GLA has allocated £52m for the first phase (a mixture of grant and loans), which could rise to £78m in the second phase. Some of this funding will be used in support of delivery of the Ailsa Wharf scheme, notably to fund the potential pedestrian and cycle bridge and to support the potential acquisition of workspace, should this be necessary.

Key sites in the housing zone include Leamouth North (developed by Ballymore as City Island), Leamouth South (Ballymore), Leven Road (St William) Gillender Street (Peabody) and Ailsa Wharf. There are also two estate renewal schemes at Chrisp Street and Aberfeldy Estate (Poplar HARCA).

Over 15,000 homes are likely to be built in Poplar Riverside over the next 10 to 15 years, with the majority scheduled for delivery by the early 2020s. The development of Poplar Riverside will also provide up to 3,000 new jobs, a new 1 hectare local park, improvements to the wider Lea River Park and two new primary schools. The current regeneration of the Aberfeldy Estate is an example of the improvements to be delivered.

### **Alternative options**

The Council has the option of developing the land itself but the land consists of discrete areas, and the benefits of a comprehensive development within the Housing Zone framework would not be delivered through a piecemeal approach. In isolation the Council's land would deliver a restricted number of units compared to the contribution it would make to a wider scheme and the quality of the immediate environment would in any event make this an unattractive alternative. The ability to produce a significant income from the

land from a commercial letting is also affected by the environment. The likely interest would be from low value uses such as the vehicle salvage or waste processing operations that currently dominate the area.

In terms of the approach to the disposal, the land could be sold in the open market following a marketing programme. However the adjoining land making up the Ailsa Street scheme is being assembled by the developer. This puts the developer in the position of a special purchaser. Such a purchaser would be expected to offer terms to the Council more beneficial than those that other parties would be able to. The purchaser, by virtue of its site assembly, is in a position to take forward the wider development, which brings other benefits to the Council.

In line with the Council's Disposal Policy, agreed by Cabinet in April 2015, the Acting Corporate Director, Place has agreed that sale by negotiation is the most appropriate method of sale, for the reasons set out above.

#### **5.11 Update of the Strategy for the Identification of Contaminated Land 2017**

##### **DECISION**

1. To approve the Tower Hamlets Strategy for the Identification of Contaminated Land 2017.
2. To delegate to the Acting Corporate Director, Place authority to make any amendments to the policy deemed necessary following consultation with the Corporate Director, Governance.

##### **Action by:**

**ACTING CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE (A. SUTCLIFFE)**

(Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards (D. Tolley))

##### **Reasons for the decision**

Local Authorities are designated appropriate Agencies under Part 2a of the Environmental Protection Act (1990) who are responsible for identifying and determining contaminated land within their jurisdiction. From time to time Local Authorities are required by the aforementioned Act to review the inspection of land within their area.

##### **Alternative options**

If the Council takes no action they would be neglecting their duty to review the already adopted plan.

## 5.12 Corporate Budget Monitoring Report Quarter 2

### DECISION

1. To note the Council's forecast outturn position against Revenue and HRA budgets agreed for 2017-18, based on information as at the end of September as detailed in Sections 3-7 of the report.
2. To note the summary savings position.
3. To endorse management action to achieve savings.
4. To note the position on the Mayoral Priority Budget

### Action by:

**CORPORATE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES (Z. COOKE)**

(Chief Accountant (K. Miles))

### Reasons for the decision

The Council could choose to monitor its budgetary performance against an alternative timeframe but it is considered that the reporting schedule provides the appropriate balance to allow strategic oversight of the budget by members and to manage the Council's exposure to financial risk. More frequent monitoring is undertaken by officers and considered by individual service Directors and the Council's Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) including approval of management action.

To the extent that there are options for managing the issues identified these are highlighted in the report in order to ensure that members have a full picture of the issues and proposed solutions as part of their decision making.

### Alternative options

The regular reporting of Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring information provides detailed financial information to members, senior officers and other interested parties on the financial performance of the Council. It sets out the key variances being reported by budget holders and the management action being implemented to address the identified issues.

Further information across the Council's key financial activities is also included to ensure that CLT and Members have a full picture to inform their consideration of any financial decisions set out in this report and also their broader understanding of the Council's financial context when considering reports at the various Council Committees.

Set alongside relevant performance information it also informs decision making to ensure that Members' priorities are delivered within the agreed budget provision.

It is important that issues are addressed to remain within the approved budget provision or where they cannot be contained by individual service management action, alternative proposals are developed and solutions

proposed which address the financial impact; CLT and Members have a key role in approving such actions as they represent changes to the budget originally set and approved by them.

### **5.13 Mayor's Individual Executive Decisions - List of Recently Published Decisions**

#### **DECISION**

1. To note the Individual Mayoral Decisions set out in the Appendices to the report.

#### **Action by:**

**COMMITTEE SERVICES MANAGER (M. MANNION)**

#### **Reasons for the decision**

This is a noting report to aid transparency.

The reasons each decision were taken are set out in their specific reports.

#### **Alternative options**

The alternative option would be to not produce this report, but that would not aid transparency of decision making.

### **6. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT**

Nil items.

### **7. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

#### **DECISION**

1. That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act, 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985, the Press and Public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting for the consideration of the Section Two business on the grounds that it contains information defined as Exempt in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government, Act 1972.

### **8. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

Nil items.

**9. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**9.1 Chair's Advice of Key Issues or Questions in Relation to Exempt / Confidential Business**

Nil items.

**9.2 Any Exempt / Confidential Decisions "Called in" by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

Nil items.

**10. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

Nil items.

**10.1 Ocean Site H - Revised Capital Estimate**

The recommendations were agreed as set out in the report.

**Reasons for the decision**

As set out in the Exempt/Restricted Decision Sheet.

**Alternative options**

As set out in the Exempt/Restricted Decision Sheet.

**11. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT**

Nil items.

The meeting ended at 7.37 p.m.

Mayor John Biggs