MINUTES

Meeting: Standards Committee
Date: 9 March 2010
Time: 10am
Place: Committee Room 5, City Hall, The Queens Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at: http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/committees/standards-committee

Present

Claer Lloyd-Jones (Independent Member) (Chair)
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)
Pradeep Agrawal (Independent Member)
Victoria Borwick AM
Len Duvall AM
Sir David Durie (Independent Member)
Diane Mark (Independent Member)
Caroline Pidgeon AM
Murad Qureshi AM
Sam Younger (Independent Member)

Also Present: Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Mayor’s Chief of Staff (as observer, in the absence of the Mayor’s representative on the Committee, Richard Barnes AM, statutory Deputy Mayor).

1. Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Richard Barnes AM, Statutory Deputy Mayor. Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Mayor’s Chief of Staff, attended the meeting as an observer, in his place.

1.2 The Chair stated that she would take an urgent report at Item 18 on a Meeting of Chief Executives of London Councils with Standards for England.
2. Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 Resolved:

(a) That the relevant Members’ declarations of memberships of Functional Bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table at Item 2 on the agenda, be noted as personal interests; and

(b) That gifts and hospitality received by Members, as set out on the Authority’s gifts and hospitality register, be noted.

3. Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 The Chair stated that she had received a copy of the research of Professor Alan Lawton, University of Hull, and Dr Michael Macaulay, Teesside University, on Assessing the Impact of Standards Committees, to which Professor Lawton had referred during his presentation to the Committee on 9 December 2009. The GLA was cited as an example of notable best practice in dealing with high profile investigations. Standards for England (SfE’s) Bulletin 47 had also referred to the research in their recent bulletin, available here: http://www.standardsforengland.gov.uk/media/Bulletin47.pdf

3.2 Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 9 December 2009 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4. Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 Resolved:

That the actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted.

5. Sir Christopher Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (Item 5)

5.1 The Chair welcomed Sir Christopher Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, to the meeting. The Chair requested that Sir Christopher make some opening remarks before inviting Members to ask him questions. A copy of the transcript of the discussion is attached at Appendix 1 to these Minutes.

5.2 At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair thanked Sir Christopher Kelly for attending the meeting and stated that she looked forward to meeting him again at such time as the
Committee on Standards in Public Life’s Inquiry into Local Leadership and Public Trust was resumed.

5.3 Resolved:

That the discussion with Sir Christopher Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, be noted.

6. Seminar of London Standards Committee (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, which informed the Committee of the main points that had arisen at the Seminar of London Standards Committees held on 11 February 2010.

6.2 Diane Mark (IM) commented that the seminar had been a very interesting exercise. The feedback from the different groups had varied a great deal and demonstrated the very different levels of experience of the attendees, and the different composition of standards committees around London. It was clear that the GLA had a greater level of experience than some local authorities and she could understand why those local authorities were looking to the GLA to exercise a leadership role. Victoria Borwick AM commented on the need to ensure consistency of standards across London. Pradeep Agrawal (IM) stated that the feedback from his group were that local authorities looked to the GLA to provide support in terms of producing policy documents and research.

6.3 Caroline Pidgeon AM commented that it would have been useful to have some presentations before the workshops to set the context as the level of knowledge and experience of participants was very different. She was concerned about the financial implications to the GLA if the Standards Committee were to take on a leadership role for standards committees in London.

6.4 The Chair commented that it had been agreed at the seminar to circulate the report to participants and she proposed that the Committee did that. She envisaged that there would be economies of scale from working on a regional level for the recruitment of Independent Members, training and sharing experiences but that she did not believe that the intention was that the GLA should bear the cost. She proposed that officers look at the issues and report back to the Committee. The Deputy Chairman stated that the GLA Standards Committee should exercise caution about expanding its role as the boroughs might not welcome that approach. Other Members commented that sharing good practice through debate both in and outside London would be helpful, particularly as the GLA could learn from best practice in other authorities, but the GLA would need to ensure that its intention was not misconstrued.

6.5 The Committee agreed the recommendations of the report and the Chair, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the officers who had been involved in organising the seminar.
6.6 Resolved:

(a) That the report on the Seminar of London Standards Committees held on 11 February 2010, appended to the report, be noted;

(b) That the themes emerging from the seminar (set out at paragraph 3.3 of the report) and the possible role identified for the GLA in leading on training and recruiting Independent Members be noted, and that officers give more consideration to that suggestion and report back to the Committee; and

(c) That the report of the Seminar of London Standards Committees be sent to the organisations which were invited to send delegates to the seminar (the London Boroughs, the Corporation of London, the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA), the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA), Transport for London, Professor Alan Lawton and Alison Kelly, National Lead Governance and Accountability, Audit Commission), and to the delegates who attended the seminar.

7. Draft Annual Governance Statement (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee considered the draft Annual Governance Statement for the Authority for 2009/10. The draft Statement included an expanded section on the role of the Standards Committee and new sections on the roles of the Chief Financial Officer and Monitoring Officer.

7.2 Caroline Pidgeon AM sought assurances that substantial improvements would be realised from the SAP procurement system administered by Transport for London (TfL) for the use of consultants. The Assistant Director of Finance responded that there had been some initial problems with the SAP system but the new system gave the GLA huge opportunities to improve its procurement processes once the system had fully bedded down.

7.3 Len Duvall AM commented that the draft Annual Governance Statement did not make reference to the London Assembly’s Annual Report. In response to a query, it was indicated that paragraph 5.1 of the Annual Governance Statement related to issues surrounding Lee Jasper (former Director of Equalities and Policing for Ken Livingstone, former Mayor of London). Len Duvall AM stated that the document should also refer to the prosecution of the former Deputy Mayor, Government and External Relations, Ian Clement, and the outcome as it was a significant governance issue. This was agreed and the Finance Manager undertook to revise the document accordingly. The Finance Manager also pointed out that the Expenses and Benefits Framework had been revised as a result of the issues arising from the fraud committed by Mr Clement. The Committee agreed that a revised version of the Annual Governance Statement should be presented to it at its next meeting on 15 June 2010.

7.4 The Chair stated that it was important to find out about stakeholders’ perception of the service provided by the Standards Committee in dealing with complaints in terms of the
messages given to complainants, the way in which the complaints are dealt and whether there was a perception that poor behaviour was being dealt with in an appropriate manner. It would be useful to assess whether stakeholders’ views were reflected in the way in which the Standards Committee undertook its work. The Monitoring Officer undertook to carry out a survey of complainants, with the understanding that it would be quite a small sample and would include elected Members and external complainants. The survey would exclude complainants who had been referred to the corporate complaints process, as their complaint did not relate to the GLA’s Code of Conduct.

7.5 Sir David Durie (IM) stated that paragraph 3.29 of the draft Annual Governance Statement referred to a whistle blowing policy and he suggested that the text should include an explanation of how the policy worked, together with more information regarding the staff survey referred to in paragraph 3.31 document. The Finance Manager undertook to include further information regarding those matters.

7.6 The Chair commented that the Annual Governance Statement was very well written and would be a useful induction tool for a range of people who were unfamiliar with how systems worked in the GLA.

7.7 Len Duvall AM stated that he would write to the Chief Executive to ask why in the draft Annual Governance Statement one major governance issue from previous years had been included but why a significant governance issue that had led to a prosecution in 2009 had been omitted. He would share the response of the Chief Executive with the Standards Committee.

7.8 **Resolved:**

(a) That the draft Annual Governance Statement be amended to reflect the Committee’s comments;

(b) That the revised draft Annual Governance Statement be submitted to the Committee’s next meeting on 15 June 2010; and

(c) That the Monitoring Officer undertake a survey to ascertain complainants’ satisfaction with the way the Standards Committee has dealt with and assessed their complaints about Member conduct.

8. **GLA Ethical Governance Audit (Item 14)**

8.1 The Chair welcomed Alison Kelly, National Lead, Governance and Accountability, Audit Commission to the meeting. The Chair invited Ms Kelly to present her findings to the Committee and to then answer Members’ questions. A transcript of the discussion is attached at Appendix 2 to these minutes.

8.2 At the end of the discussion the Chair, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Ms Kelly for attending the Committee.
8.3 **Resolved:**

(a) That the Audit Commission’s presentation and findings, arising from its ethical governance audit of the Authority, be accepted by the Committee; and

(b) That it be noted that, following further consideration of the presentation by the Mayor and the London Assembly’s Business Management and Administration Committee and Audit Panel, and taking on board the comments made by the Committee, a draft action plan will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

9. **Independent Element (Item 8)**

9.1 The Chair invited Independent Members to update the Committee on their involvement in mayoral appointments.

9.2 Pradeep Agrawal (IM) stated that he had acted as an independent element for the appointment of a London member to the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council. The Panel had unanimously recommended a candidate for appointment to the Mayor following an interview.

9.3 Diane Mark (IM) stated that she had acted as an independent element for the appointment to the post of Mayoral Adviser for Budget and Performance. She had viewed the job description and person specification for the post before attending the final interview panel. She was able to confirm to the Mayor that, in her opinion, it would be reasonable to appoint the chosen candidate.

9.4 The Chair informed the Committee that she had received a letter from Dee Doocye AM, Chair of the London Assembly’s Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee, in respect of the role of the Independent Member in the recruitment process for the appointment of the Chair of the Arts Council in London. The letter was circulated at the meeting and is attached at Appendix 3 to the Minutes. The Chair invited the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence to give an update to the Committee.

9.5 The Deputy Chief Executive said that he was providing an update in his role as Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence and not in his capacity as Monitoring Officer. He was not acting as the Monitoring Officer for any issues arising from the matter of the appointment of the Chair of the London Arts Council to avoid potential conflicts of interest. The Monitoring Officer function in this regard would be exercised as necessary by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

9.6 The Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence stated that the Mayor and Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport were in correspondence about the selection arrangements for re-running the competitive selection process for the
appointment of the Chair of the London Arts Council. Until the correspondence was concluded he was unable to say anything further. The deadline for applications had been 29 January 2010 and applications had been received by then.

9.7 Len Duvall AM stated that he had been contacted by journalists about breaking news about the appointments process in the press. A report on Dave Hill’s blog in *The Guardian* stated that the Department for Culture, Media and Sport had rejected the Mayor’s proposed Panel and had asked him to establish an interview panel, which was credible and independent for the first stage of the process, and which would not include the Mayor or the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence. The Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence responded that it would be inappropriate for him to comment on press reports and in any event not until the Mayor and Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport had completed their discussions about the make-up of the panel.

9.8 The Chair suggested that she should reply to the Chair of the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee stating that the Committee would receive a report on the role of the independent element at its next meeting. The Head of Committee and Member Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer added that a report on the role of the independent element would be included in the action plan arising from the Audit Commission’s Ethical Governance Audit of the GLA.

9.9 Sir David Durie (IM) commented that the report should particularly look at what the role of the independent element should be in a competitive process, as from his experience it was less than satisfactory. The Chair commented that she shared some concerns about the role of the independent element. The Chair asked that officers ask all the independent Members individually about their experiences as an independent element as part of the review of that role.

9.10 Caroline Pidgeon AM expressed discomfort about the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence answering questions relating to the appointment of the Chair of the London Arts Council. The Chief Executive explained that there had been no complaint which fell within the purview of the Monitoring Officer, and so there were no questions to answer from the Monitoring Officer’s perspective. As previously stated the Deputy Monitoring Officer would deal with any questions for the Monitoring Officer. Len Duvall AM noted that the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence had rightly declared a potential conflict of interest and stepped aside from dealing with issues relating to Freedom of Information requests in relation to the appointment of the Chair of the London Arts Council. The Chair suggested that the report to the next meeting address the role of the independent element in general terms as opposed to detailing specific cases. Len Duvall AM commented that he thought it would be difficult to avoid dealing with specific cases in the report.

9.11 The Chair responded that she considered that the Standards Committee needed to concern itself with the role of the Independent element but not with administrative issues relating to the process. She would ask the Chief Executive to deal with administrative issues if they needed to be addressed in the future. The Chief Executive added that officers were working
on a protocol in respect of Members’ rights to information, which would be reported to the Annual Meeting of the Assembly. Len Duvall AM responded that it was important to learn lessons from the past because of the reputational risk to people acting as an independent element. The Chair stated that she would ask the Chief Executive to consider very carefully how the Committee could have as full a debate as possible at its next meeting without any confusion about the roles of officers.

9.12 Resolved:

(a) That the Chair write to the Chair of the Economic and Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee to inform her that the Standards Committee will consider a report on the role of the Independent element at its next meeting on 15 June 2010; and

(b) That a report on the Independent element be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee on 15 June 2010 and that it take account of the experiences of the Independent Members who have acted as an Independent element and the Chief Executive consider how the Committee can have a full debate without any confusion about the roles of officers.

10. Monitoring of Expenses – Mayor and Elected Members – 2009/10 (Item 9) and Monitoring of Expenses – Senior Staff 2009/10 (Item 10)

10.1 The Committee considered two reports of the Executive Director of Resources, which set out the cumulative expenses of the Mayor and elected Members and senior staff for the whole of 2009/10 until 31 January 2010. The reports also set out the detailed expenses of the Mayor, Assembly Members and senior officers from 14 November 2009 to 31 January 2010. Limited comparative statistics showed that there had been a reduction in the expenses of the Mayor and elected Members and senior staff year on year from April to January.

10.2 The Chair noted that Sir Christopher Kelly had raised two important issues in relation to MPs’ expenses. The first was whether there was any confusion about reclaiming expenses which had been properly incurred in undertaking the GLA’s business and whether Members and staff considered that there was an inadequate level of remuneration and therefore they were entitled to top it up. The second issue was whether there was a culture of Members and staff doing things that were not challenged.

10.3 The Assistant Director of Finance responded that the GLA had an Expenses and Benefits Framework, and the role of officers in the Resources Directorate was to approve and pay expenses within the agreed Framework but there was also a culture of challenge around expenses.

10.4 Members questioned whether it was appropriate for senior officers to claim for very minor expenses. The Chair suggested that if people had claimed in accordance with the Expenses and Benefits Framework the only option for the Standards Committee would be to ask officers to review the policy to consider what sorts of things it would be reasonable to claim for, as
there could be a reputational risk to the GLA. The Assistant Director of Finance confirmed that all the expenses set out in the appendices to the reports had been approved and paid in accordance with the Expenses and Benefits Framework.

10.5 Resolved:

(a) That the expenses incurred by the Mayor and London Assembly Members in the period 1 April 2009 to 31 January 2010 be noted;

(b) That the expenses incurred by senior staff in the period 1 April 2009 to 31 January 2010; and

(c) That the Executive Director of Resources be requested to review the policy in respect of which items of expense it was appropriate to claim for.

11. Update on the Local Assessment of Complaints about GLA Members (Item 11)

11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Monitoring Officer updating it on the local assessment of complaints about GLA Members.

11.2 The Senior Legal Adviser informed the Committee that Richard Barnbrook AM had appealed against the decision of the Hearing Sub-Committee held on 24 September 2009 to the First Tier Tribunal (Local Government Standards in England) – formerly known as the Adjudication Panel for England - on 21 January 2010, but had subsequently withdrawn his appeal against the GLA as he accepted that he had acted in his capacity as a GLA Assembly Member and had accordingly been in breach of the GLA Code of Conduct.

11.3 The Chair noted that, in respect of Richard Barnbrook AM’s appeal concerning the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham, the Tribunal had decided to rehear the case. On rehearing the case, the Tribunal had considered that the complaint was outside the scope of Barking and Dagenham’s Code of Conduct, in that Richard Barnbrook AM was not acting in his capacity as a Barking and Dagenham councillor, and was not therefore in breach of its Code.

11.4 The Chair expressed concern that the approach of rehearing cases in full, rather than simply addressing the particular grounds of the appeal, potentially undermined the role of local Standards Committees. She informed the Committee that the Tribunal sometimes heard complaints in the first instance because they had been referred to it and sometimes it heard complaints on appeal. She considered that there was therefore confusion about its role.

11.5 The Committee discussed with whom they could raise the issue and it was agreed that the Chair would write to David Laverick, former President of the former Adjudication Panel for England.
11.6 **Resolved:**

(a) That the report be noted;

(b) That minutes of the Assessment Sub-Committee meetings of 22 December 2009 and 2 February 2010 be noted and approved by the relevant Members of the Assessment Sub-Committee and that the minutes of those meetings, and the Decision Notices of the meeting on 2 February 2010 be noted by the Standards Committee (attached at Appendix 1 to the report);

(c) That the minutes of the Review Sub-Committee meeting of 9 December 2009 be noted and approved by the relevant Members of the Review Sub-Committee, and that the Decision Notices and minutes of that meeting be noted by the Standards Committee (attached at Appendix 2 to the report);

(d) That Appendix 3 to the report, which is the GLA’s “Guidance on Making a Complaint about a GLA Members Conduct” be approved; and

(e) That the Chair write to David Laverick, former President of the former Adjudication Panel for England expressing the Committee’s concern that the First Tier Tribunal (Local Government Standards in England) may choose to rehear a case, rather than addressing grounds of appeal, and so undermine the process of an authority’s hearing sub-committee.

12. **Guidance on Politically Restricted Posts (Item 12)**

12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Monitoring Officer, which explained that the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (“The Local Democracy Act”) had made changes to the designation of politically restricted posts in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 by removing the requirement for the Authority to maintain a list of posts above the nominated salary. It therefore removed the requirement to designate posts to be politically restricted due to salary, regardless of the post-holders’ duties.

12.2 **Resolved:**

(a) That the contents of the report be noted; and

(b) That the amended guidance attached at Appendix 1 of the report be approved.
13. **Standards Committee Annual Report and Annual Return to Standards for England (Item 13)**

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, which appended the Committee’s Annual Report for comment and the Annual Return, which it was required to complete for Standards for England (SfE).

13.2 The Committee agreed that the Annual Return would be completed by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, and submitted to SfE, but it would be circulated to the Committee for information.

13.3 The Chair commented that there were still some drafting changes to be made to the Annual Report so that it would be a completely freestanding report. She asked that the statistical information submitted to the meeting of the Committee on 9 December 2009 (appendices 6.1 to 6.4 of report on the Update on Local Assessment of Complaints about GLA Members) be appended to the Annual Report.

13.4 Len Duvall AM stated that in relation to paragraph 1.20 of the Annual Report, the Committee had raised concerns about the role of the independent element on 8 July 2008 when Tony Travers, Director of the Greater London Group, London School of Economics, had attended a meeting of the Committee. He suggested that reference be made to that meeting, in order to give context as to why the Committee had raised the issue.

13.5 Len Duvall AM also referred to an instance where a particular decision reached by the Assessment Sub-Committee had been removed from the initial version of the draft minutes without reference back to the Members who had been present at the meeting. He noted that the minutes had then subsequently been amended to accurately reflect the decision of the meeting, but considered that it had played an important part in the development of the Sub-Committee’s procedures and should be reflected in the Annual Report. The Chair concurred that the Committee had learnt lessons and amended its procedures accordingly to improve them. Len Duvall AM requested that he be consulted on the wording in respect of that matter to be included in the Annual Report.

13.6 The Chair commented that the draft work programme for 2010/2011 needed to include a report on joint working with the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) and London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) to the meeting on 14 September 2010. She also suggested that the Committee receive a report on whether the GLA would be able to host the World Cities Conference to its meeting on 14 September. She noted that the Annual Governance Statement had flagged up that it would be beneficial for the Standards Committee to meet concurrently with the Audit Panel to discuss issues of common interest and suggested that the concurrent meeting could be held at the beginning or end of one of the already scheduled meetings of the Standards Committee. Finally, she thought that the guest speakers in the past year had been very useful and asked Members to inform the Committee Co-ordinator of any guest speakers they wished to be invited to future meetings.
13.7 Resolved:
(a) That the Committee’s Annual Report (attached at Appendix 1 to the report), including the work programme for 2010/2011 be updated to take account of the Committee’s comments and that Len Duvall AM be consulted about the wording; and
(b) That Standards for England’s Annual Return (attached at Appendix 2 to the report), which has yet to be completed and is due to be submitted in late March or early April 2010 be noted; and that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to complete and submit the Annual Return, after consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

14. Action Taken by the Chair Under Delegated Authority (Item 15)

14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Secretariat in respect of the action taken by the Chair under delegated authority.

14.2 Resolved:

That the Committee notes the action taken by the Chair, under delegated authority, to designate herself and Sam Younger (Independent Member of the Standards Committee) to participate in the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) Panel set up to determine, before the next Assembly election, whether it remains appropriate for Assembly Members also to hold any public sector position, e.g. a position of special responsibility on a council, requiring their attention during the Assembly’s usual business hours.

15. The Use of Resources and Conduct in the Run-up to the London Local Authority and General Elections in 2010 (Item 16)

15.1 The Chief Executive stated that the guidance on Conduct of the Greater London Authority in the Run-Up to the London Local Authority and General Elections in 2010 (set out at Item 16 of the agenda) had been issued by the GLA’s three statutory officers (the Head of Paid Service, Chief Financial Officer and Monitoring Officer) to all staff. It applied to all Members, including Independent Members, and staff of the Authority.

15.2 In response to a question about training for staff in the Mayor’s Office, the Chief Executive stated that he would discuss providing training to those staff with the Mayor’s Chief of Staff.

15.3 Resolved:

That the Chief Executive’s overview of the guidance be noted.
16. **Date of Next Meeting (Item 17)**

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on 15 June 2010 at 10am, subject to confirmation of the timetable by the Annual Meeting of the Assembly on 13 May 2010.

17. **Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 18)**

**Urgent Report – Meeting of Chief Executives of London Councils with Standards for England**

17.1 The Chair stated that she had agreed that the Committee should consider a report on the meeting of Chief Executives with London Councils with Standards for England as a matter of urgency, the special circumstances being that the issues contained in the report needed to be discussed at the earliest opportunity (and the next meeting of the Committee would not be until 15 June 2010).

17.2 The Chair stated that she was concerned that the SfE appeared to be about to make a regulatory assessment of the GLA without consulting the GLA about the regulatory regime. She thought it was an unusual situation and that Standards Committee Members would want to be aware of it. The Deputy Chairman commented that he was extremely unhappy to see the proposal and that it would have been more appropriate for the SfE to raise the issue after the General Election. He felt that it would be inappropriate for the Committee to comment on the proposal at this stage.

17.3 The Chair proposed that the Committee note the information and that officers update the Committee on any developments.

17.4 **Resolved:**

That the urgent report on the Meeting of Chief Executives of London Councils with Standards for England be noted and that officers update the Committee on any developments.

18. **Close of Meeting**

18.1 The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

__________________________   ________________________
Chair                        Date

**Contact Officer:** Teresa Young, Committee Co-ordinator  
Email: teresa.young@london.gov.uk  
Telephone: 020 7983 6559
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