

Cabinet

Meeting held on Monday, 7 June 2021 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, CR0 1NX

MINUTES

- Present:** Councillor Hamida Ali, Stuart King, Muhammad Ali, Janet Campbell, Alisa Flemming, Patricia Hay-Justice, Oliver Lewis, Manju Shahul-Hameed and Callton Young
- Also Present:** Councillor Jason Perry, Jason Cummings, Lynne Hale, Simon Hoar, Yvette Hopley, Helen Redfern, Scott Roche, Andy Stranack, Gareth Streeter, Sean Fitzsimons, Robert Ward, Pat Clouder, Jerry Fitzpatrick, Mario Creatura, Kolade, Agboola, Leila Ben-Hassel, Sue Bennett, Simon Brew, Patsy Cummings, Clive Fraser, Maddie Henson, Bernadette Khan, Shafi Khan and Louisa Woodley
- Officers:** Doutimi Aseh (Interim Director Law & Governance)
Caroline Bruce (Head of Business Intelligence, Performance & Improvement)
Chris Buss (Interim Director of Finance, Investment & Risk and Section 151 Officer)
Henry Butt (Strategic Support Officer)
Bianca Byrne (Head of Commissioning & Procurement)
Kerry Crichlow (Programme Director – Children's Improvement)
Shelley Davies (Director of Education & Youth Engagement)
Matthew Davis (Deputy Section 151 Officer)
Gavin Handford (Director of Policy & Partnership)
Sarah Hayward (Interim Executive Director Place)
Asmat Hussain (Interim Executive Director Resources)
Steve Iles (Director of Public Realm)
Elaine Jackson (Interim Assistant Chief Executive)
Debbie Jones (Interim Executive Director Children, Families & Education)
Katherine Kerswell (Interim Chief Executive)
Alison Knight (Interim Executive Director Housing)
Paul Kouassi (Head of Service)
Roisin Madden (Interim Director of Early Help and Children Social Care)
Annette McPartland (Director of Operations)
Sue Moorman (Director of Human Resources)
Kevin Oakhill (Autism Inclusion Lead)
Ian Plowright (Head of Strategic Transport)
Nish Popat (Head of Corporate Finance)
Rachel Soni (Director of Commissioning and Procurement)

PART A

80/21 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

81/21 Urgent Business (If any)

The Leader informed Cabinet that there was one item of urgent business, Determination of School Admission Arrangements, which was considered following minute number 87/21 (Autism Strategy).

Cabinet were informed that the order of the agenda would be varied with minute number 88/21 (Recommendations from the Croydon Climate Crisis Commission) taken as the first substantive followed by minute number 90/21 (Crystal Palace and South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood).

82/21 Determination of School Admission Arrangements

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Recommend to full Council that it determine the changes to Croydon's community schools' admission arrangements for the 2021/22 (at Appendix 1 of the report) and 2022/23 (at Appendix 2 of the report) academic years.
2. Note that variations will be conditional on the Code passing through its Parliamentary process (i.e. a date on or around 1 July 2021). If any variations are agreed before then, they must be expressed to be conditional on the Code passing through Parliament. All such variations should come into effect on 1 September 2021.

83/21 Financial Performance Report - Month 1 April 2021

The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Stuart King) stated the report was the first report for 2021/22 financial year and reflected the outturn for April 2021. It was noted that departments were reporting a variance of £3.4 million on the approved budget, most of which was not Covid-19 related, and that there was no indication of whether the variances were permanent or one offs which the Cabinet Member requested be added to future reports.

It was stated by the Cabinet Member that it was important that Members understood the impact of the costs of those variances and that the General Fund was projecting a net variance through the use of ring-fenced Covid-19 grant monies. It was noted that the use of reserves so early in the year could be seen as being premature.

The Cabinet Member noted that at paragraph 3.9 of the report that services had been instructed to find mitigations for all savings which could not be met and stated that he felt that this approach should be applied to all budget pressures and overspends rather than services looking to the corporate centre to meet shortfalls, for both the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

It was noted by the Cabinet Member that the report spoke of the role of the Spend Control Panel (SCP) and whether it should be applied to the HRA and Coroner Service. It was felt by the Cabinet Member that the SCP had a positive impact on spending within the council and in light of the £2 million overspend in the HRA he felt the rigours of the SCP should be applied to the HRA.

The Cabinet Member noted that at table 3 of the report that around £1 million of mitigations related to staffing and vacancies and queried why the amount was not reported as a saving but as a mitigation.

The Cabinet Member for Resources & Financial Governance (Councillor Callton Young) queried when the savings plan would be presented to Members as it was recognised that the financial year was passing.

In response to the query in relation to staffing mitigations, the Interim Director of Finance, Investment & Risk (Chris Buss) advised Members that the figures within the report were part year effects of when it was thought staff would leave as the figures were for staff who had been made redundant. Those figures would only move from being considered a risk or opportunity to the forecast once the staff members had left the organisation.

In terms of the HRA, the Interim Director advised Members that the HRA budget was set before the details of Regina Road were available and since that point a significant amount of work had been undertaken, including enhancing the staffing within Housing. Members were advised to carefully consider the possible implications before reintroducing controls on the HRA. They were further advised to wait a couple of months to understand the full picture of what spending was like as it was felt that the bulk of the overspend was a direct consequence of the conditions at Regina Road and over blocks.

In response to the query in relation to a savings plan, the Interim Director advised that a plan had been drafted and would be brought to Cabinet in due course when officers were confident that the savings identified could be delivered.

The Cabinet Member for Resources & Financial Governance queried how the SCP could be considered a hindrance to justified spending, if the Panel was working as it was intended. Furthermore, the Cabinet Member stated that it was important that Members saw the savings plan as early as possible to understand the proposals for the year ahead.

The Interim Chief Executive (Katherine Kerswell) drew Members attention to the report being for period 1 of the financial year and highlighted that such a report was unusual for a council, but was a reflection of the council's commitment to openness and transparency. Members were advised that council's often did not publish a period 1 report as so much often changed after the initial month.

Members were further advised that a written report could not convey the leadership which was taking place in the council to ensure managers were focussed on delivering the 2021/22 budget which included £44 million of savings, the budget delivery and revenue income. It was highlighted that the council had savings to deliver from 2020 to 2023 and beyond and that there was a significant amount of work still to be done. The culture of the corporate centre being available to mitigate any issues was reported to be leaving the organisation and the idea that because there was a budget it did not need to be spent was being taken on board.

The Interim Chief Executive advised Members that significant assurance work was being undertaken alongside identifying savings for coming years. Whilst it was recognised the council faced an incredibly challenging Medium Term Financial Strategy, with 2022/23 being the most difficult, Members were advised that officers were committed to achieving the budget.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) queried how the council was achieving the change in culture which was required. Furthermore, assurances were sought as to whether the council was actively working to achieve mitigations so that reserves or grant funding was not required.

It was noted by the Leader that within the Report in the Public Interest (RIPI) the council had been criticised for previously not accurately reporting the seriousness of the financial position to Cabinet and queried whether it was felt that the report was an optimistic assessment of the position the council was in.

In response, the Interim Chief Executive advised Members that the report was accurate and did not misrepresent the council's position. It was felt that the Interim Director had correctly, in accounting terms, presented Members with the balance of the outcome for the year as it stood at month one. Members were advised that a recommendation could be included that mitigations be found not just for savings that were not delivered, but for all overspends.

It was noted by the Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal that there was a greater level of transparency within the report, both with there being a period one report and the openness around variances, savings risks, mitigations and other risks on the General Fund. However, the Cabinet Member expressed concern that the grant funding had been used within month one when it may have needed to be used later in the year.

The Interim Director highlighted paragraph 3.11 of the report and advised Members that budget holders had been instructed to remain within budget. Furthermore, it was noted that often people were cautious in month one and did not always share the good news but did share the bad news; as such the Interim Director advised that he expected it to get better.

The Cabinet Member for Homes (Councillor Patricia Hay-Justice) stated that the HRA recording an overspend of £2 million was not a positive sign and noted that table 4 of the report listed what had made up that overspend. Cabinet were informed that she had gone through that table with officers to understand the reason for the overspend and the mitigations which had been put in place. In terms of responsive repairs, the Cabinet Member stated that this had been due to immediate repairs at Regina Road and outstanding repairs from the previous year. In light of the overspend, the Cabinet Member queried whether the account for 2020/21 had been finalised and whether an underspend from that year could be transferred to 2021/22 accounts.

In response, the Interim Director advised that the outturn from the HRA had not yet been finalised but that he was expecting the figures later that week. Members were advised that the normal process would be for an underspend to be transferred to the HRA reserves and that it was for Cabinet to decide whether to then transfer that money to the HRA account for 2021/22.

It was stated by the Shadow Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Jason Cummings) that one of the areas which had characterised financial reports in previous years was for departmental overspends to be balanced off by corporate items. Questions had previously raised on the matter and it had been found that the situation had remained the same throughout the year. Due to previous experience, the Shadow Cabinet Member stated that he was concerned that the papers reported departmental overspends being balanced by corporate items and that previous years had not seen departmental spend improving through the year, however suggested that he felt inclined to believe the answers being provided as they were being provided by officers and not politicians. In light of the concerns, the Shadow Cabinet Member queried whether the quarter one report would show a better picture in terms of departmental expenditure.

In response, the Leader noted that the report was unusual in terms of local authority reporting and was set to demonstrate the financial control

the council was seeking to establish. The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal stated that the concerns raised were sensible and valid, and were similar to the questions being asked by Cabinet in terms of departmental overspend. It was stressed, in response, that the Cabinet were determined to ensure accountability by working with officers to ensure everything was being done to deliver the budget, however it was recognised that setting a balanced budget and delivering the budget were two separate matters and there remained a number of unknowns. Such as unknown was whether the end of Covid-19 restrictions would take place on 21 June 2021 and whether actions to mitigate the impact would need to be put in place.

The Interim Chief Executive advised that there was a 100% commitment that the quarter one report would be open, honest and accurate. In terms of concerns, she advised that was anxious as to the impact of restrictions on income targets, however it was stressed that there was a culture being developed that should a department not achieve its income, or overspend then it absorb that within its budget.

The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal stated that upon reflecting on advice of the Interim Director that receiving a period one report was unusual due to volatility that can exist between months one and two, that he suggested that Cabinet review the need for the SCP for the HRA once the period two report was received. Furthermore, the Leader stated that mitigations be put in place for all budget pressures.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To note

1. The General Fund is projecting a net nil variance as at Month 1. Service departments are indicating a £3.451m overspend with this being netted off against £3.451m underspend from a one off Covid Grant confirmed to Croydon Council for 21/22 by MHCLG as part of the Local Government Finance Settlement.
2. That a further number of risks and compensating opportunities may materialise which would see the year-end variance change and these are reported within Section 3 of this report. Should these risks materialise or the mitigations not be effective the Council could overspend by £3.659m.
3. The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is projecting a £2.117m overspend for 21/22. If no further mitigations are found to reduce this overspend the HRA will need to drawdown funding from the HRA Reserve account.
4. The above figures are predicated on forecasts from Month 1 to the year end and therefore could be subject to change as forecasts are

refined and new and updated information is provided on a monthly basis. Forecasts are made based on the best available information at this time.

5. That whilst the Section 114 notice has been lifted a, the internal controls established as part of the S114, such as the Spend Control Panel remain. However, restrictions have been lifted for ring-fenced accounts such as the Pensions Fund, Housing Revenue Account and Coroner's Costs as these do not impact on the financial position of the General Fund. The Spending Control Panel which was set up at the beginning of November 2020 continues to meet on a daily basis.

84/21

Croydon Renewal and Improvement Plan - Performance Reporting Framework & Measures

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) reminded Members that one of the key actions from the Report in the Public Interest had been to develop a monthly performance, finance and risk reporting regime. A report had been considered at the April 2021 meeting of Cabinet and the report contained within the agenda provided an update of the work which had been completed since April 2021.

Members were informed that the intention was for the final version of the performance report to be received in September 2021; however it was stressed that it would remain an iterative process. Furthermore, Members were advised that the report was due to be considered by the General Purposes & Audit Committee and Scrutiny & Overview Committee to enable those committees to inform the work also.

The Leader highlighted that the report included monitoring of the delivery of projects and programmes, delivery against the Croydon Renewal Plan, risk reporting, organisational health dashboard and stress report which was hoped would facilitate discussions via an internal control board.

The Leader noted that there was a large amount of data being collected and that the volume was likely to increase as the reporting was developed further. In light of this, the Leader queried how Members and the organisation could review the data effectively. In response, the Director of Policy & Partnership (Gavin Handford) advised that the document was iterative and would continue to be developed. The report would be detailed and would support Members to undertake their roles, however dashboards would be included as introductions to different sections which would highlight specific areas.

The Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety & Business Recovery (Councillor Manju Shahul-Hameed) noted that at the previous Cabinet meeting a decision had been taken to establish a Citizen Panel and queried how this was being progressed. The Director of Policy & Partnership advised that a Key Performance Indicator would be

developed to enable Members to see the output of the decision to establish a Citizen Panel.

The Leader thanked the Head of Business Intelligence, Performance & Improvement (Caroline Bruce) and her team for all of their work in collating the report.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Note the progress that has taken place with regard to the development of a suite of reports in order to improve the corporate offer.
2. Review the corporate performance and finance report (appendix A) as at 30 April 2021 with regard to KPI's, project milestones and projected savings against target, noting that this report is still in development stage.
3. Note that this report will be reviewed at General Purposes Audit Committee on the 10 June and Scrutiny and Overview Committee on the 15 June.

85/21

Report in the Public Interest - Quarter 1 Update

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) noted that the report provided an update on work completed six months following the approval of the council's Report in the Public Interest (RIPI) action plan. It was noted that Cabinet had received an update in April 2021 and due to the report being considered that evening being more up-to-date it was recommended that the June 2021 report go to the Council meeting on 5 July 2021 instead. The previous report had advised that a third of actions had been completed and the Leader noted that this figure had increased to over half. 44 actions had been started but were still being worked through; nonetheless the Leader stated the report showed positive progress had been made within six months.

The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Stuart King) stated that he felt that the report evidenced a good degree of progress had been made but queried the progress on recommendation 20. Whilst it was noted that it was a complex and resource intensive piece of work a progress update was requested. The Interim Executive Director Resources (Asmat Hussain) assured Members that the task and finish group had been meeting regularly and were reviewing the full list of companies which were associated with the council. Members were advised that a report was due to be taken to Cabinet in July 2021 on the governance review of the companies and the current situation of those organisations.

It was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition (Councillor Jason Perry) that the pace of change within the council was not sufficient as there were a number of recommendations which had remained outstanding. In particular, concerns were raised in relation to recommendation 1.2 as it was queried how actions had been achieved if they had not been evidenced. Furthermore, he queried whether the Cabinet were providing any challenge.

In response, the Leader of the Council stated Cabinet Members were engaging with the reports, asking questions and were deliberating in public. Furthermore, it was stated they were challenging information to provide assurance to the public and communities.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Note and agree the progress the Council has made in regard to achieving the recommendations set out by external auditor in the Report in the Public Interest (appendix 1) with 55 out of 99 actions complete;
2. Note the beginning of work to properly evidence what has been achieved so far and the intention to carry out an internal audit of actions delivered to provide full assurance to members and residents on the change achieved;
3. Agree the refreshed action plan for the recommendations including actions marked complete, new actions and amended deadlines; and
4. Agree that this updated report and action plan go to Full Council in place of the previously agreed April 12th Cabinet Report as it is more up to date.

86/21

Addressing the costs of care and support for unaccompanied asylum seeking children and young people in Croydon

The Cabinet Member for Children Young People & Learning (Councillor Alisa Flemming) informed Members that the report set out the issues facing the council in terms of addressing the cost of care and support for unaccompanied asylum seeking children and young people (UASC) in Croydon.

The Cabinet Member stressed that the borough was proud of the richness in cultural diversity within Croydon. Furthermore the council was proud of the support it provided to UASC; many of whom, it was recognised, had overcome great danger and adversity to come to the country. However,

given the location of the Home Office at Lunar House there was a national point of entry for UASC within the borough. It was noted that for many years Croydon had been forced to bear an extremely large proportion of the nation's costs for caring for those children and young people.

Members were advised that there were 458 young people in care and 322 care leavers in the borough and in addition there were the USAC, of which Croydon should have around 65 but the figure stood at 205. This had created substantial financial pressures which were estimated to be worth £7.6 million in 2020/21. It was recognised that the pressures were not new but were growing year on year due to the number of care leavers.

The Report in the Public Interest (RIPI) had acknowledged that the council had lobbied the Home Office on the issue of proper financial reimbursement and that whilst financial redress had been provided, it had not been sufficient.

The Cabinet Member further highlighted that the impact of the National Transfer Scheme, which was a voluntary scheme, had left Croydon with three times the number of asylum seeking children than the scheme suggested the borough should have. Furthermore, it was highlighted that around 50% of care leavers in the borough were asylum seeking young people.

Member's attention was brought to the budget forecast estimating a gap in excess of £13m from 2021 to 2024, despite the mitigations which had already been put in place. In light of the concerns highlighted in the report the Cabinet Member requested that Scrutiny consider the report.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the report set out that the council reserved the right to take further action, should it be required, and noted that Kent County Council was challenging the Home Office on a similar matter as it was also struggling with the financial burden and to deliver services safely.

Thanks were given to the Interim Director of Improvement & Quality (Kerry Crichlow), the Interim Executive Director Children, Families & Education (Debbie Jones), the Interim Chief Executive (Katherine Kerswell) and the Improvement & Assurance Panel for all their work to try to address the budget gap. Additionally, the Cabinet Member thanked the 24 London boroughs who had agreed to relieve some of the pressure facing Croydon for a period of three months whilst a long term solution was formed.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) echoed the thanks to given to all those who had worked in the development report. The council was proud of the support it had provided but it was stressed that it was important that the authority was properly resourced. It was noted that the government's policy was underpinned by the National Transfer Scheme which was not working due to the voluntary nature. Whilst Croydon was

ready to continue to support young people; having established considerable specialism and expertise within the organisation; proper financial redress was required. The 24 London boroughs were thanked for their support, but the Leader highlighted that London was providing support disproportionately to the rest of the country and that a national solution was required.

The Cabinet Member for Resources & Financial Governance (Councillor Callton Young) stated his support for the report as it was integral that a solution was found which shared the financial burden that was experienced by the borough. Whilst the children and young people were welcomed, it was stressed that it was important that the council was able to support them properly and safely.

The work officer and the Cabinet Member were commended by the Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Stuart King) as it was noted that it was an incredibly challenging position for the council. Whilst the financial pressures were significant, the moral duties to some of the most vulnerable residents of the borough were great. The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal queried whether there was an update on the accommodation strategy mentioned at paragraph 6.5 of the report. Caution was suggested by the Cabinet Member also in terms of paragraph 9.2 as it was noted that this could be perceived to be similar to the language by the council previously which had been criticised by Grant Thornton in the RIPI which had suggested that there had been an overreliance on lobbying government rather than working to drive costs down.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Children Young People & Learning stated that part of the rapid review had looked at the average costs for accommodation. The review had found that costs were on par, particularly for those in foster placements. Whilst the review had found there was value for money, the Cabinet Member stressed that the funding gap needed to be addressed to enable the delivery of service safely.

The quality of care provided by Croydon for its UASC residents was highlighted by the Interim Executive Director as an area she had always been impressed with, even when working elsewhere. Members were advised that the council cared for around three times the number of young people it should support if the national formula of 0.07% was taken into account. It was noted that this disproportionate number had a disproportionate impact on the council which could not be absorbed.

Members were advised that a significant amount of work had been undertaken, including financial modelling which evidenced value for money. Whilst the council were able to demonstrate the costs of USAC was less than local young people, the Interim Executive Director advised that when a council was caring for that volume of young people additional costs were incurred elsewhere in the system, such as foster care; most

asylum seeking children were cared for through in-house foster carers but that led to other young people being placed in independent foster care.

Members were advised that whilst a lot of work was being undertaken, such as within the Medium Term Financial Strategy, it was recognised more could be done. A report was being written which set out the additional pressures being borne due to the volume of care leavers and work had been undertaken with other boroughs in relation to the commissioning of placements.

The Cabinet Member for Culture & Regeneration (Councillor Oliver Lewis) noted that the young people being discussed were some of the most vulnerable in the world and the care for them often fell to Croydon when there should have been a national solution. The Cabinet Member called for the government to take responsibility and implement a proper system which meant the spread of young people was even across the country or properly resources councils, such as Croydon, to provide the care.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Learning (Councillor Helen Redfern) stated that she had previously requested a detailed breakdown of the costs the council was requesting, which she felt were missing from the report and so questioned the value of taking the report to consider at Scrutiny. It was noted that the Chair of the Improvement & Assurance Panel, Tony McArdle, had said that the council should not do more than it needed to and to that end the Shadow Cabinet Member stated that benchmarking on a per capita basis would be beneficial.

It was suggested by the Shadow Cabinet Member that should the council make a case to the government to reimburse the costs then it was important that the council was able to demonstrate that it was not part of the problem. The offer of the Panel acting as broker was welcomed, however the Shadow Cabinet Member suggested that Kent County Council was acting to resolve its situation itself and so queried why Croydon had taken a passive approach.

The Leader stated that it was unfortunate that the Shadow Cabinet Member had departed from the cross-party position held in Croydon that a solution to the issue was required. Furthermore, the Cabinet Member advised Cabinet that the Shadow Cabinet Member had been privy to the information she requested. It was stated that the matter had been discussed at meetings of the Corporate Parenting Panel, which the Shadow Cabinet Member was a member of, at scrutiny meetings and meetings of the General Purposes & Audit Committee. The Cabinet Member stressed that the information was in the public domain, however offered that should be further information required then the Shadow Cabinet should request the information directly.

It was highlighted by the Cabinet Member that there had previously always been a cross-party consensus on the matter and queried the

Shadow Cabinet Member's assertion that the council had been passive and stated that she felt that it should be embarrassing that a conservative council was seeking legal redress from the government. She called on the Opposition Group to join with the Administration to call for a long term solution and to write to Croydon South MP, Chris Philp, who was a Home Office Minister for a solution, such as financial redress or making the transfer scheme mandatory.

The Leader noted that the report reflected an important and complex situation in terms of the support provided to the most vulnerable people in the world. Whilst the council was proud of the support it had provided, it was stressed that the situation was not sustainable.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Note the actions to secure support from central government and from London boroughs to relieve the disproportionate costs of care and support for unaccompanied children and young people incurred by the residents of Croydon.
2. Note the significant budget gap of £13.278 million forecast over 2021-24 despite the above actions.
3. Note the additional impact this will have on the council's borrowing from the government, including additional interest.
4. Recommend this report for review and challenge at the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.
5. Note that the council reserves the right to take further action to address the issues set out in the report.

87/21

Autism Strategy

Councillor Jerry Fitzpatrick noted that most people in attendance at the meeting were neuro-typical but that Croydon had a neuro-divergent community of around 10,000 residents. In development of the Strategy the council had listened to the voice of community in 2019 and undertook consultation in 2020.

It was stressed that it was extremely difficult for many within the neuro-divergent community to navigate the world created by neuro-typical people. That often led to neuro-divergent people living unnecessarily frustrated lives, suffering from unnecessary levels of physical and mental ill health and premature death. It was noted that training was an important theme within the Strategy as it was important that every neuro-typical person understood how to interact positively with neuro-divergent people.

Whilst Councillor Fitzpatrick stated that the Strategy was not world changing, he did stress that it was significant step in the upward journey of ensuring neuro-diversity in the mainstream agenda. Furthermore, it was noted that the development of the Strategy had been well received by the council's health partners and all those who had been involved in its development were thanked; including Nicky Selwyn and Kevin Oakhill.

It was highlighted that the Strategy was an all-age strategy but it was noted that there was a need for a national strategy also, which incentivised employers to hire and retain neuro-divergent workers and supported the neuro-divergent to set up businesses.

The next step, it was stated, was to develop an action plan which ensured the objectives outlined with the Strategy were taken forward by and Councillor Fitzpatrick called for the responsibility for implementing the Strategy be with the Executive Leadership team within the council to ensure change occurred.

Nicky Selwyn, Chair of the Autism Partnership Board stated that she felt the Strategy was a game changer as previously the closest Croydon had been to having any strategy had been a draft version in 2012. It was noted that Croydon were fortunate to have an Autism Inclusion Lead (Kevin Oakhill) who had supported the development of the Strategy.

It was highlighted that there were active and committed partners from health, mental health and various agencies which it was hoped would be active participants in implementing the objectives set out in the Strategy.

It was noted by Nicky Selwyn that it had been really positive that the voice of the neuro-divergent community had been integral to the development of the Strategy, with over 500 responses having been received. Members were advised that a working group had been established with the support of Councillor Fitzpatrick and the Autism Inclusion Lead which it was felt represented the community.

Nicky Selwyn stressed that it was important that the Strategy did not just get filled after approval, but was developed into an action plan and a means of monitoring progress would be established.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) highlighted Councillor Fitzpatrick's personal leadership in this area and welcomed the feedback on the partnership working which had taken place in the development of the Strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Learning (Councillor Alisa Flemming) noted that the Autism Inclusion Lead had been a breath of fresh air in advising the council on how to deliver services to residents with an autism diagnosis and for supporting the development of such an

important Strategy. It was noted that the Strategy would have far reaching impact on how the council delivered services going forward.

It was noted by the Cabinet Member that the strategy was not a statutory duty but reflected the council's focus on equality and diversity for all residents in the borough.

The Cabinet Member for Families, Health & Social Care (Councillor Janet Campbell) thanked Councillor Fitzpatrick for his tireless work in leading the development of the Strategy. It was noted by the Cabinet Member that it was important that it was not just the Autism Partnership Board which ensure the delivery of the objectives and queried how the council would ensure the objectives were rolled out across the council. In response, the Interim Chief Executive (Katherine Kerswell) praised the work which had gone into the development of the Strategy and advised Members that should the Strategy be approved it would become council policy. It was noted that she had seen a large volume of support across partnerships for the Strategy and, as such, she felt confident that it would become integral to the work of not just the council but across the borough.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Families, Health & Social Care (Councillor Yvette Hopley) thanked Councillor Fitzpatrick, Nicky Selwyn and Kevin Oakhill for their tireless work in developing the Strategy and for ensuring the neuro-divergent community were involved in its development. It was noted that the Strategy had been discussed at a number of health board meetings and had been well received by all.

It was highlighted by the Shadow Cabinet Member that it would be extremely important that the objectives within the action plan were part of the responsibility of the Executive Leadership to ensure that it succeeded. Furthermore, it was noted that others within the disability communities were envious of such a Strategy and the Shadow Cabinet Member sought assurances that further strategies would be developed to support them also. In response, the Leader suggested that such assurance could be provided at a future Council meeting due to the pressures of time and ensuring all items on the agenda were considered before the meeting guillotine.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Endorse and approve for publication the Autism Strategy.
2. Note the approvals either received, or pending, from other partner organisations in the strategy.

3. Agree that minor future amendments to the strategy can be made by the Director of Commissioning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Families, Health and Social Care.

88/21

Recommendations from the Croydon Climate Crisis Commission

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) noted that the Council had declared a Climate Change and Ecological Emergency in July 2019. All involved with the Croydon Climate Crisis Commission; including the New Economics Foundation (NEF) and Commission Members were thanked for their work in developing the report and recommendations.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon (Councillor Muhammad Ali) began by thanking the Chair of the Commission (Miatta Fahnbulleh) and all at the NEF for their work. It was stated that the council was committed to taking action on climate change and welcomed the Croydon Climate Crisis Commission (CCCC) report, and it was further noted by the Cabinet Member that the council's commitment to tackling climate change was not new as many initiatives had been in place for some time.

It was stated by the Cabinet Member that the council were committed to producing a costed delivery plan and to start working on recommendations within the report through existing funding sources. It was noted that the Commission had been established prior to the start of the pandemic and CCCC had been required to work during challenging to develop its report.

The recommendations in the report, the Cabinet Member informed Members would be integrated into all of the work of the council and the council would seek to call upon partners to intensify their work also to deliver tangible mitigations to tackle climate change.

The Chair of the CCCC thanked all of the Commissioners for the huge amount of time and effort which was put into developing the report. It was reported that everyone involved understood their task was to develop practical recommendations for delivering a step change transition to net zero which built upon the work which had already been undertaken by the council and borough.

It was stated that it was felt that it was clear that simply transitioning to net zero was not enough and that a pathway to a green economy which created jobs and improved living standards was required. To that end, the Chair of the Commission advised Members that the report sought to provide practical steps which were felt to be deliverable, ambitious and tangible.

Three core areas had been identified; the first of which was ensuring understanding of the baseline in place so the council could track the trajectory of change. It was noted that this work was not just for the council to undertake but would require large levels of engagement across

the borough and with partners to develop a clear picture of the challenge and shared endeavour. Furthermore, it was highlighted that there was the need to ensure there was clear accountability, responsibility and oversight of the work.

It was noted that there was clear action in terms of the green recovery as the previous 18 months had a dramatic impact on the local economy. It was reported that the CCCC felt that there was an opportunity to think about a medium term plan to identify green jobs which were aligned with upskilling and training local people and develop low carbon jobs.

The third area identified was in relation to greening neighbourhoods, including low traffic neighbourhoods and renewable energy and ensuring all partners and local businesses were engaged to ensure the work was a shared endeavour. It was stated that there was huge piece of work in relation to public engagement in terms of ensuring people understood the scale of the challenge and their role in making a change.

The Chair of the Commission highlighted that it was important to achieve the scale of change required. It was noted that the change required was a challenging task for the council to deliver and that there was need for action both regionally and nationally; whether through funding or investment in affordable public transport.

It was recognised that there was no solution which would solve the issue, but that it was hoped that the report provided some tangible first steps for the council to consider and implement to transition to net zero.

Ian Morris, a Commissioner from the CCCC thanked the council for declaring a climate and ecological emergency in 2019 and for setting up a Citizens Assembly and the Commission. It was noted that Covid-19 had impacted the work of the Commission in terms of timing but also in terms of engagement as the engagement work undertaken was limited due to the pandemic.

It was highlighted by Mr Morris that the council could not tackle the crisis along and it would require a collective act across all sector, stakeholders and would require lobbying at both a regional and national level, but that it did have a unique role in both reducing its emissions and influencing partners to reduce theirs.

It was suggested the council look at organisations like Ashden, which had a sustainable towns and cities programme which supported local authorities. Furthermore, Friends of the Earth and the Grantham Institute were highlighted as organisations the council could engage with.

The need for accurate and comprehensive measurements of emissions to produce a baseline to understand the trajectory of emissions. It was noted consumption based emissions were often three times higher than

production based emissions and that it was important that this was recorded also.

Mr Morris stated that he felt that it was important that the council did not just consult but engaged with people so that solutions could be developed rather than initiatives being imposed which were top down. It was stressed that any action needed to be done in partnership with all stakeholders.

It was stressed that the climate and ecological crisis was happening at an accelerated rate and Mr Morris noted that it had been described as the greatest challenge faced by humanity and the biggest threat to humanity's continued existence. It was stated that it had been almost two years since the Emergency had been declared, but Mr Morris felt that the council had not taken enough action to deal with the crisis and compared it to the action to tackle Covid-19. Concern was raised that there had not been sufficient engagement from Members from either party in the work of the Commission and concluded that it was integral that there was leadership both centrally and locally to tackle the crisis facing the planet.

The Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety & Business Recovery (Councillor Shahul-Hameed) thanked the NEF and all the Commissioners for their work and continued support. It was noted by the Cabinet Member that the council had some ambitious plans, including creating green jobs and upskilling local residents. Croydon had previously hosted an Innovation Network conference to discuss giving priority to community wealth building, however the Cabinet Member noted that there were challenges in terms of financial circumstances and staffing which meant developing partnerships would be integral to the success of any plan going forward. As such, the Cabinet Member queried how the Commission could support the council to identify the right partners who could bring in external funding to delivery some of the recommendations which had been identified by the CCCC.

In response, the Chair of the Commission suggested the council should not underestimate what it and other anchor institutions could achieve if all worked towards a green economy. It was stated that mapping the flow of resources would be a first step to understanding how to prioritise areas such as the creation of green job, upskilling or greening the economy. Once that had been undertaken, the Chair of the Commission suggested that the council could look to build a partnership which would require leadership to begin the conversations, develop processes and deliver collective outcomes. Furthermore, it was stated that the council would need to begin working with businesses to coordinate and pull together resources. Mr Morris added that it was critical for the council to network, research and learn from other authorities.

The Cabinet Member for Culture & Regeneration (Councillor Oliver Lewis) queried how residents could help shape the implementation of the

recommendations and how the council intended to work with communities to achieve the borough's green objectives.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon noted that the report not only looked at making the borough greener but also sought to tackle poor health quality due to pollution, address poverty and ensure all residents experienced the health and economic benefits from tackling climate change. It was recognised that building trust with residents was central to the success of tackling climate change and the Cabinet Member stated the council would work with and communicate with residents to build a coalition to implement the recommendations collectively. It was noted that funding for tackling the climate crisis would be a challenge as there was limited local funding available, as such the Cabinet Member suggested that they would be called on the government and the GLA (Greater London Authority) to ensure appropriate funding was made available.

It was noted by the Cabinet Member for Homes (Councillor Patricia Hay-Justice) that it was important that everyone ensured that they lived sustainable lives for future generations. 17 millions homes were identified as living in fuel poverty which was a significant issue, some of whom were living in social housing. The Cabinet Member stated that it was important that the council sought to encourage residents to take on initiatives, such as ground source heat pumps to support them. In terms of private homes, the Cabinet Member queried whether the council would lobby the government for an initiative that would support homeowners to implement green technologies in their homes.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon stated that Croydon was part of an effort to address fuel poverty and had written to 7,000 homeowners to inform them of the grant funding which was available to improve energy efficiency in their homes. More information on the grant funding for insulation and greener forms of heating was available would be shared as it was available, not just for social housing but for private homes also. In terms of ground source heat pumps, the Cabinet Member highlighted that this was not only reducing the carbon footprint but also saved residents £400 a year on heating bills.

The Chair of the Commission highlighted that the government had ended the Green Homes Grant as it did not work as intended. The element of the scheme which had worked would likely be transferred to local government to deliver. It was felt that this was an opportunity for the council to retrofit homes which would support delivering recommendations

The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Stuart King) noted that carbon emissions could be reduced and tangible benefits, such as warmer homes and tackling fuel poverty, could be realised by reducing fuel costs. The Cabinet Member welcomed recommendations from the Commission informing plans in areas such as economic renewal, housing and transport as he felt that they should inform all areas of council work. It

was further stated that Members would be looking for examples and evidence that sustainability had been at the heart of the council.

Paragraph 12.5 was noted by the Cabinet Member as it stated that the council would not make any further reductions to car parking spaces, whereas he felt there would be but that the council would need to be mindful of how it implemented change. It was highlighted that government funding had been received for the introduction of a segregated cycle lane on London Road, additionally cycle facilities had been introduced across the borough. It was felt that it was reasonable trade to provide parking for six bikes for one car parking space. The Cabinet Member concluded by suggesting that a timetable of activities be developed by autumn 2021 to be considered by Cabinet in November 2021.

The Cabinet Member for Resources & Financial Governance (Councillor Callton Young) stated that he had previously worked on a sustainability plan for the food and drink industry and the means of its success had been the wins for the businesses. With this in mind, he queried whether the report looked at the “win win” opportunities which didn’t require any expenditure but required behavioural change. In response, the Chair of the Commission stated that she didn’t feel enough had been made of those opportunities. Some of the work would be about utilising resources in a slightly different way and shifting behaviours which would be a “win win”. It was felt that this should be front and centre when launching the campaign, furthermore it was suggested that it should be framing it as an opportunity as opposed to a challenge.

The Deputy Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon, Culture & Regeneration (Councillor Patsy Cummings) queried how the council planned to engage with the Citizens Assembly to gather feedback and to help shape the action plan. Furthermore, it was highlighted that all communities needed to be engaged with as it was noted that it was often the poorest communities who were most impacted by climate change and it was vital that their voices were heard.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon recognised the Citizen Assembly had been representative, however it was felt that after meeting with the Chair and CCCC there was a need for the discussions to continue and for them to be open and honest. It was further felt that there was an opportunity to engage with the younger population of the borough and to build upon the engagement which was already taking place. Mr Morris added that ideally there would be citizen assemblies across the borough to engage with people and have people which reflected the whole borough involved in developing plans.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon (Councillor Scott Roche) thanked the Chair of CCCC and Commissioners for producing the report under difficult circumstances. He stated that it was right that the council needed to take a more serious approach to improving the local environment and air quality, and that he agreed with the suggestion for a

high profile campaign with schools to change the attitudes of younger generations for a long term shift in attitude.

It was noted by the Shadow Cabinet Member that the council had committed to plant 3,500 trees before 2023 but due to the council's financial situation the tree planting capital programme had been withdrawn. It was understood the council was relying on external funding to continue the programme. Questions were asked as to how many trees has been planted before the capital programme had been stopped.

The Shadow Cabinet Member further asked what the Cabinet's position was in relation recommendation 23 of the Commission's report and whether it was committed to adopt such a scheme as it was suggested that the council's approach to improving air quality had been what he referred to as a stealth tax on local communities.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon confirmed that it remained a commitment of the council to plant trees and where there was a deficit in funding then the council sought external funding. He stated that he was confident that external funding would make up the loss in capital monies. In terms of the number of trees planted, the Cabinet Member committed to provide those figures to the Deputy Cabinet Member, but stated that he understood that there was not a huge gap between the number planted and the target.

In terms of recommendation 23 from the Commissioner's, the Cabinet Member stated that the recommendations had been from an independent body and the council would review all recommendations. It was stressed that it was important to engage with residents to support creating solutions and to ensure they understood the benefits of some of the changes being asked of them.

The Cabinet Member concluded by stating that he hoped that this work would be supported on a cross-party basis.

The Leader of the Council thanked the NEF and CCCC for all their work and for joining them at the meeting and suggested a further report be taken to the November 2021 meeting of Cabinet.

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Welcome the report and recommendations of Croydon Climate Crisis Commission and record the Council's thanks to the Commission and the New Economics Foundation for their thorough and committed work in challenging circumstances.

2. Note the actions the Council has already taken to combat climate change.
3. Note that a detailed, costed delivery plan will be developed in autumn 2021 to implement the Commission's recommendations, provided that this can be done within the Council's existing budget or utilising external funding resources.
4. Note that a copy of the Climate Crisis Commission report will be shared with the Chairs of relevant Council Committees to consider how their committee work can support the Climate Crisis work undertaken by the Council.

89/21

YourCare (Croydon) Options Appraisal

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

The Cabinet (acting, where relevant, on behalf of the Council exercising its functions as sole shareholder of YourCare (Croydon) Ltd) **RESOLVED:**
To

1. Note the Shareholder review reports of YourCare (Croydon) Limited included in the background documents to the report.
2. Agree to closing down the activities of YourCare (Croydon) Limited. The company will cease trading and all assets to be settled in accordance with the liquidation process.
3. Agree to the appointment of an authorised insolvency practitioner as liquidator to take charge of liquidating the company.
4. To note as a result of the closing down of YourCare (Croydon) Ltd, the Council, as the company's only creditor, will write off the accumulated trade debts of £189k and the loan of £81k including interest (total £11k) to the extent that these debts are not recovered as part of the liquidation process (as further explained in paragraph 6 of the report).
5. Delegate authority to the Interim Executive Director of Resources, in consultation with the Interim Director of Finance, Investment and Risk, and Interim Director of Law & Governance, to do all things necessary for the purpose of giving effect to the above recommendations, including acting as shareholder to complete relevant shareholder resolutions and give direction to the company.

90/21

Crystal Palace and South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood

The Chair of Scrutiny & Overview Committee (SOC) (Councillor Sean Fitzsimons) introduced the call-in referral report at agenda item 11a of the

agenda. It was noted that the report set out the original reason for the call-in. Members were informed that the Committee had reviewed all of the information presented to the Cabinet Member when the original decision had been made and had raised a number of concerns in relation to the proposal, but had not objected to the proposal.

The Chair of SOC stressed that Members of both political parties had raised concerns during the meeting which had enabled robust discussion of the decision made by the Cabinet Member. It was felt that the Committee had weighed up the evidence, listed to the concerns and evidence of residents who were both for and against the scheme, and considered evidence from councillors and an officer from Bromley Council when reaching its conclusion in referring the concerns to Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon (Councillor Muhammad Ali) introduced the report at agenda item 11b and noted that it was complicated and sensitive scheme. Members were informed that the original key decision had been taken in February 2020 following consultation with the Traffic Management Advisory Committee (TMAC) and was then considered by SOC in March 2021 when the decision was called-in. The Cabinet Member reported that the decision of SOC was to refer the matter to Cabinet to decide whether to amend the decision before the final decision was made.

Members were advised that all the documentation required to make a final decision was included within the agenda pack, however the Cabinet Member drew Members attention in particular to the report at 11b of the agenda and paragraph 2 which contained additional information which was provided to TMAC in February 2021; which the original decision was based on. It was noted that since then both the Department for Transport and Transport for London (TfL) had updated their guidance, as at paragraph 2.1 and 2.5. Additionally, the Cabinet Member highlighted that research had been published by NHS Digital in May 2021 and University College London on air pollution, which was set out at paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4.

The report at 11b of the agenda it was noted contained the concerns raised by SOC and the department's detailed responses to those concerns which the Cabinet Member felt allayed the concerns raised. It was further stressed by the Cabinet Member that the decision before Cabinet related to an Experimental Traffic Order and not a permanent one which would be a future decision.

It was emphasised that the decision before Cabinet was a very contentious matter which was finely balanced. The Cabinet Member noted that there were individuals were in support of the proposals and others who were against. It was stressed that it was important that all views were listened to and Members recognised the far reaching implications for many people. Members were advised that a public consultation had taken place in 2019; the results of which were presented to TMAC. Furthermore,

there were opportunities for members of the public to present their views, both for and against, at TMAC and SOC meetings.

It was noted that no additional submissions had been received as a result of the publication of reports in the Cabinet agenda, however an email had been received by the Cabinet Member from Ellie Reeves MP. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that prior to the meeting of TMAC in January 2021 letters had been received from both Steve Reid MP and Ellie Reeves MP calling for the Temporary Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) to be removed and for the council to not proceed with the recommended Experimental LTN. Members were informed that the content of the letters had been outlined with officer verbal introduction to the report at the meeting and that both letters were considered as part of the Cabinet Member's decision and were appended to the key decision notice in February 2021. These letters were available at appendix 3 of item 11a of the agenda. Members were advised that Ellie Reed MP had written to the Cabinet Member, Chief Executive and Leader of the Council the prior week to reiterate her points made in January 2021 and to call for the removal of the Temporary LTN.

Additionally, the Cabinet Member advised Members that he had received a further submission from Open Our Roads. This submission, it was stated, provided a snap shot analysis of bus journey times on the Route 75 in one direction. In response, the Cabinet Member suggested Cabinet should rely on the fully analysis of the iBus data undertaken by TfL which was appended to the January 2021 TMAC report.

The Cabinet Member concluded by stated the proposed Experimental LTN was a trial implementation of the Mayor of London's Healthy Streets Approach was being implemented across the Capital which was an approach to making quieter, calmer space in which people could choose to travel actively for their own health, that of their community and that of the planet.

The Cabinet Member for Homes (Councillor Patricia Hay-Justice) noted that it was a sensitive and contentious issue which balanced environmental benefits and grievances with some parts of the community. To that end, the Cabinet Member queried whether it was felt that consultation had been adequate. In response, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon stated that had the council been permitted to continue the process of developing health school streets, as outlined within the Local Implementation Plan, a similar experiment may have been proposed following a long period of consultation. However, Covid-19 had impacted that work. It was highlighted that in May 2020, the Secretary of State for Transport had called on local authorities to create spaces which allowed social distancing exercise and enable people to avoid public transport and reduce car usage but utilising Temporary Traffic Orders which did not require consultation. The Cabinet Member highlighted that the proposed scheme responded to many of the concerns raised by residents; including improved access for residents of the area

and to Auckland surgery. It was stated that the recommended proposal would enable the council to undertake focused research. As such, the Cabinet Member felt that an Experimental Traffic Order would enable greater engagement with the local population.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Hamida Ali) queried how the council would learn from the experience of taking the scheme from a Temporary to Experimental LTN which would inform other schemes within the borough. The Cabinet Member confirmed the council were learning from the implementation of the schemes. It was stressed that the scheme considered had been implemented during a pandemic based on legal advice at the time, but that the council had learnt from that and the need to engage with people. It was stressed that schemes were developed in accordance with legal advice and legislative requirements, but anything above those requirements which would support building trust within communities would be implemented in future schemes.

It was noted by the Cabinet Member for Families, Health & Social Care (Councillor Janet Campbell) that the first concern of SOC related to the baseline information; however the technical responses suggested that the ending of Covid-19 restrictions would enable monitoring to be undertaken prior to the implementation of an Experimental LTN, which would provide a new baseline. Given the potential delay for the end of restrictions, the Cabinet Member queried the delay would be problematic for the development of the baseline data.

In response, the Cabinet Member stated that should the decision be taken to proceed to an Experimental LTN then there was substantial work to be undertaken; not least with Bromley Council. It remained the hope of the council that Bromley would work with Croydon and TfL to monitor the implementation of the scheme and mitigate any impact of their residents. Furthermore, it was noted that it would take time for people's behaviours to settle down once more post lifting of restrictions. As such, the Cabinet Member did not feel that an extension of restrictions would impact the scheme and development of baseline data.

The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal (Councillor Stuart King) noted that it was intended there would be an exemption of licensed taxis and queried whether this would be for black cabs only, or all licensed vehicles. Furthermore, he queried how the valid exemption permit would be reviewed and assessed to ensure the right vehicles were given exemptions. It was noted that at paragraph 2.24 that further equalities analysis was required, and the Cabinet Member queried with who and how the focused engagement would take place. The Cabinet Member for Croydon Renewal further stated that an area that he had reflected on had been in terms of displacement and noted that mitigations were to be put in place.

The Head of Strategic Transport (Ian Plowright) confirmed the matter of exemptions for taxis had been picked up at the TMAC meeting in

February 2021. Members were advised that exemptions for black cabs were fairly straightforward but that private hire vehicles were more difficult. Officers would look to work with TfL and across London to identify those vehicles. In terms of the equality analysis, the Head of Strategic Transport advised that it was an iterative piece of work and that it was hoped that with the lifting of restrictions further analysis could be undertaken to truly understand the issues in relation to air quality and equality.

Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel noted at the SOC meeting the matter of liaising with companies such as Google Maps was raised as it was noted that it was important that software was updated to reflect temporary road closures. Furthermore, the importance of signage was raised. In response, the Head of Strategic Transport advised that the local authority informed owners of the underlying master maps of any changes which was then reflected in apps. The issue it was noted was that apps may redirect drivers down inappropriate roads, which was one officers alone could not tackle but would require work across London to find solutions.

In terms of signage, Members were advised that the council was required to follow regulations in the implementation of signage to warn drivers of restrictions ahead but that it was kept under review and the council listed to public feedback. However, the Head of Strategic Transport advised that for the scheme to be truly effective that signage would also be implemented in roads in Bromley also.

In response to queries in relation to exemptions for blue badge holders, the Head of Strategic Transport advised that the report to February 2021 TMAC meeting had included the proposal for a scheme which mirrored the Congestion Charge scheme which enabled an application for up to two exemption permits.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon (Councillor Scott Roche) raised concerns in terms of the data used within the report as the car traffic survey data had been collected between May and August 2020; during the pandemic when car usage, it was stated, irregular due to national restrictions which were in place. Furthermore, it was queried where the evidence and baseline data was which showed improve air quality rather than traffic dispersal only. Queries were further asked by the Shadow Cabinet Member in terms of how the concerns of dispersal was being mitigated.

Concerns were raised by the Shadow Cabinet Member that the business responses were low as only 47 of 330 businesses had responded to the consultation and some responses had been rejected due to an incorrect code. Additionally, it was queried how many of the businesses were truly open to respond due to the lockdown restrictions. It was highlighted that businesses needed the support of the council, especially at that time, when the country remained under restrictions and was recovering from the pandemic.

It was felt by the Shadow Cabinet Member that the report was disingenuous to suggest that a 25% response rate was not representative enough of the community when often that was the rate that local councillors were elected on. It was further noted that the local MP had raised a similar point. It was felt that there was clear opposition to the scheme and a lack of evidence of sustainability; as such the Shadow Cabinet Member queried why the Cabinet was pursuing the implementation of an Experimental LTN.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon noted that that Shadow Cabinet Member had recently been appointed to his post and urged him to read all of the papers and watch the webcasts of the TMAC and SOC meetings to answer the questions posed. It was felt by the Cabinet Member that all of the questions had previously been answered in detail and had been given full consideration.

It was stressed by the Cabinet Member that the Department for Transport had encouraged the implementation of schemes. Additionally it was stated that it was important to hear from all in the community, including those who had not engaged with the consultation process; as such it was not a referendum but a consultation.

The Leader of the Opposition (Councillor Jason Perry) expressed concern that it felt that the Cabinet Member was patronising Members who had read all of the papers. Concerns were raised that it appeared the council's approach was that residents must understand an approach rather than encourage engagement with the community. It was stated that there was a balance to be made between the socio-economic impacts and the environmental benefits of schemes, and the Leader of the Opposition queried how the council was assuring residents and businesses that the balance between the two was being assessed.

In response, the Cabinet Member stressed that it was the council's commitment to work with residents to ensure schemes were implemented in consultation and full cooperation of the residents of the borough. The Cabinet Member noted that the scheme had been considered by TMAC twice, SOC and was being considered by Cabinet; which it was felt was evidence that the council was ensuring that every element was being considered before a final decision was made.

The Leader of the Council endorsed the Cabinet Member's comments in terms of the level of deliberation that had taken place in relation to the scheme.

Cabinet confirmed that it did not wish to amend the decision that had been taken by the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon in February 2021, and that the final decision remained unchanged from the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon in February 2021.

91/21

Call-in Referral to Cabinet: Crystal Palace & South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To

1. Receive the referral made by the Scrutiny & Overview Committee following its consideration of a call-in request made on the key decision on the Crystal Palace and South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood;
2. Reconsider the Original Decision taken by the Cabinet Member Sustainable Croydon (see paragraph 2.2 of the report for details), in light of the concerns raised by the Scrutiny & Overview Committee and other relevant information listed at paragraph 3.2 of the report; and
3. Confirm that the final decision remain unchanged from the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon on 23 February 2021 (decision can be viewed at Appendix 3 of item 11a of the agenda).

92/21

Response to Call-In Report: Crystal Palace & South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood Response to Concerns of the Scrutiny & Overview Committee

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To consider the report in light of the decision at minute number 90/21 and the concerns of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee set out within the report at agenda item 11a.

93/21

Investing in our Borough

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To note

1. The request for approval of the Best Start Suite of Contracts extension period of 4 months as set out at agenda item 12a and section 5.1.1 of the report.
2. The contracts between £500,000 and £5,000,000 anticipated to be awarded under delegated authority from the Leader by the nominated Cabinet Member, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Financial Governance and with the

Leader in certain circumstances, before the next meeting of Cabinet, as set out in section 5.2.1 of the report.

3. The list of delegated award decisions made by the Director of Commissioning and Procurement, between 07/04/2021 – 27/05/2021, as set out in section 5.2.2 of the report.

94/21

Variation to extend Best Start contracts

The Leader of the Council delegated authority to the Cabinet to make the following decisions:

RESOLVED: To approve the variation of the Best Start contracts by up to a further 4 months (1st September to 31st December 2021) in accordance with Regulation 30 of the Council's Contracts and Tenders Regulations for an overall maximum contracts value of £589,000, made up of:

- Eight, Best Start Children's Centres with contracts/SLAs to four academies and five maintained schools. Four month extension value £445,000
- Five, Community, Parenting Aspirations and Parenting Skills contracts (covering 6 Lots). Four month extension value £123,000
- One, Parent Infant Partnership contract. Four month extension value £21,000

95/21

Exclusion of the Press and Public

This item was not required.

The meeting ended at 9.32 pm