COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 June 2026

Minutes of the meeting of the Community & Children's Services Committee held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 30 June 2026 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP (Chair)
Steve Goodman OBE (Deputy Chair)
Joanna Tufuo Abeyie
Munsur Ali
Matthew Bell
Simon Burrows
Deputy Anne Corbett
Aaron Anthony Jose Hasan D'Souza
Deputy John Fletcher
Dawn Frampton
Sarah Gillinson
John Griffiths
Mercy Haggerty
Adam Hogg
Sandra Jenner
Laura Jørgensen
Helen Ladele
Tim McNally
Leyla Ostovar
Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Beverley Ryan
Stuart Thompson
Deputy James Thomson CBE
William Upton KC
Deputy Ceri Wilkins
David Williams
Philip Woodhouse

Observing virtually:

Mark Wheatley

In Attendance:

Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jason Pritchard
Gaby Robertshaw

Officers:

Sheena Etches	-	City Bridge Foundation
Jack Joslin	-	City Bridge Foundation
Judith Finlay	-	Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Beverley Andrews	-	Community and Children's Services Department
John Barker	-	Community and Children's Service Department
Paul Barton	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Deborah Bell	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Peta Caine	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Helen Chantry	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Himmang Chemjong	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Simon Cribbens	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Hannah Dobbin	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Zoe Gayle	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Michael Gwyther-Jones	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Kirstie Hilton	-	Community and Children's Services Department

Chris Lovitt	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Rachel Talmage	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Ian Tweedie	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Greg Wade	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Ellie Ward	-	Community and Children's Services Department
Lisa Ward	-	Communications and External Affairs Department
Frank Marchione	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Phil Black	-	Chamberlain's Department
Mark Jarvis	-	Chamberlain's Department
Jacqui Mckeating	-	Chamberlain's Department
Simon Molden	-	Director, The Sports Consultancy
Amelia Christopher	-	Town Clerk's Department
Scott Myers	-	Town Clerk's Department
Emily Slatter	-	Town Clerk's Department

The Chairman welcomed new committee members: John Griffiths, Adam Hogg, Tim McNally; and thanked departing member Alderman Sushil Saluja.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Anthony David Fitzpatrick, Shravan Joshi MBE, Sophia Mooney, Mark Wheatley (observed virtually) and Alderman Kawsar Zaman.

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Deputy Anne Corbett declared that she was a leaseholder living on the Golden Lane Estate.

Laura Jørgensen declared that she was a governor at The Aldgate School.

Tim McNally declared that he had been newly appointed as a governor of The Aldgate School.

Beverley Ryan declared that she was Co-Chair of Governors at The Aldgate School.

Deputy Ceri Wilkins declared that she was in receipt of the City's Childcare Accessibility Scheme funding.

David Williams declared that his children were at The Aldgate School.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the public minutes and non-public summary of the previous meetings held on 22 April 2026 and 5 May 2026 be approved as an accurate record.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received the public outstanding actions report.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

5. **APPOINTMENTS TO SUB-COMMITTEES**

The Committee received the report of the Town Clerk. Officers explained that the vacant Allocated Member positions to the City's Housing Estates would be determined at July's Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee, to return to the Committee for approval. The Chairman asked that the new Members elected to that sub-committee consider whether they have capacity to take a lead role where required.

Regarding the Integrated Care Sub-Committee, the Chairman noted that once clarity had been sought on the NHS reforms, the Committee would appoint the three deputies at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. Agreed the addition of one extra Member, appointing three Members to the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee from the Committee:
    - Adam Hogg
    - Tim McNally
    - John Griffiths
2. Agreed the appointment of three Members to the Safeguarding and Special Educational Needs Sub-Committee:
    - Shravan Joshi MBE
    - Tim McNally
    - David Williams
3. Elected the Chair of the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee: David Williams.

6. **0-2 CHILDCARE PROVISION AT THE ALDGATE SCHOOL**

NOTE: It was agreed that this item be taken before the item on Golden Lane Leisure Centre: Preferred Design Option and Establishment of a Community Steering Group.

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

The Chairman proposed a deferral of the report to September, which was seconded by Deputy Anne Corbett, and sought the Committee's views on a deferral. The reasons for a deferral were for the revised report to include further information, such as on sufficiency, and to provide assurance on the financial modelling, for all efforts to be made by officers and the school to consider any other opportunity for the school to cover the costs. September would still allow a full academic year for parents to seek alternative provision should the Committee decide not to continue with the financial support.

Members against the deferral noted the following points:

- That the situation had been going on for too long, a deferral would not be fair on the school, parents, or Portsoken residents. The report contained lots of information, no further information would change anyone's mind.

- The report should not have been received by the Committee if it was not ready; information would always be in flux.
- Was concerned by a delay in making the decision, noting that the reason for setting the timetable was that if a child was put in a baby room that would be for two academic years. For many people the provision was an important step in returning to work, it was difficult for the school to sell those places as long-term places.
- That the Committee made the same decision to defer a report on the matter around one year ago for more information to be provided, families would be let down by another delay; and had a lot riding on the decision.
- That some staff members had pay scales linked to the City Corporation's pay scales as it was a commissioned service and they needed certainty.

Members supportive of the deferral noted the following points:

- That the report was confusing, they welcomed time for Members to raise questions at the meeting and via email to the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services over the next week or so to obtain as much information as possible.
- That the focus must be on impact and equity. What would be the best use of £174,000 for the greatest impact for those families in most need, they were not confident that the report answered those questions.
- That there were many questions they did not know the answer to (which had been shared amongst Members not officers); further information was required so as not to make the wrong decision.
- That once that further information and assurance have been provided to Members, there was a sound case to fund the provision.
- The Deputy Chair noted that he had received some information that was not in the report that would be useful for the Committee to have in a revised report to make an informed decision.

Members asked:

- That should the report be deferred, a consideration be given to the school term times, noting the upcoming summer holidays; and an executive head would be covering maternity leave.
- Whether the current position could be summarised and what the previous position was, as that was where there was miscommunication and uncertainty.
- For clarity, noting that the current subsidy was up to £174,000 per year, however the proposal in the report was for £60,000. The Chairman clarified that the report asked whether the Committee was willing to fund £60,000 or to maintain its original decision.
- That should the report be deferred, there were some items that could be added into the report, having spoken to other Members and having been newly appointed as a governor there was additional information that was not reflected in the report.
- That should the report be deferred, for it to be titled 0 to 3 provision as that more accurately reflected the age of children concerned.

- That regarding the further information spoken about by other Committee members not included in the report, noted uncertainty whether that provided a material impact to the recommendations.
- That any additional information that other Committee members possessed should be discussed in the meeting to inform the decision. In response, the Chairman highlighted that the additional information required officers to do further work.
- That should the report be deferred, a Member Briefing be provided in advance of September's Committee meeting. For that to include information on subsidy-type provision in neighbouring London boroughs, how the provision was connected to the Government's approach around school-based nursery provision and the Best Start in Life approach.

A vote was taken on the proposal by the Chairman to defer the report, seconded by Deputy Anne Corbett, with 12 Members voting For the deferral, 12 Members voting Against the deferral, and no Abstentions. Under Standing Order 28 1.(c), as there was an equality of votes, the Chairman used her casting vote For the deferral.

RESOLVED: That the report be deferred to September's Committee meeting.

7. **GOLDEN LANE LEISURE CENTRE: PREFERRED DESIGN OPTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMUNITY STEERING GROUP**

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services. Officers explained that following a resolution made by the Committee at its May 2026 meeting, a period of further public engagement had been undertaken to explore and develop the design options. The report sets out the outcomes and findings of the engagement, reflected in a recommended new option: Option 1 enhanced. That option would keep the sports hall with an expanded health and fitness offer which has the potential to secure a financially viable operation over a ten-year contract. The option also retains a dedicated spectator seating area at the swimming pool. Appendix 3 of the report sets out a Business Planning Report in which the 'Option 1 enhanced' design was described as 'Option 3'. The Community Steering Group - Chair to be appointed - was proposed, and if agreed would meet monthly during the RIBA Stage 3 design period to discuss design issues in detail.

The public engagement undertaken to explore potential design options demonstrated overwhelming support for an option that retained the sports hall.

Members supported Option 1 enhanced, noting that it covers its own costs, and it was what people wanted as it retains the sports hall; they thanked officers for their hard work at pace, listening to Members and the community.

Regarding the financial sustainability, a Member asked what could be done between now and opening to give it the best chance of success such as growing engagement and membership. The Member welcomed the establishment of the Community Steering Group and stressed that user voice must be included in the governance before the delivery of the refurbishment.

A Member suggested more development work on the ten-year plan of the leisure centre, linked to the sports offered in open spaces, generating income through wider sports development. There was a need to reach out to groups that do not engage in sports, such as the elderly with health issues. There was also a need to look at what other local authorities were doing regarding a pricing model that would attract new members and increase income.

A Member thanked the Save Golden Lane Leisure Centre campaign group for ensuring that community needs were at the heart of the design. The Member asked for the Golden Lane Leisure Centre (GLLC) Independent User Group to continue to be engaged with the specificity of the design.

The Deputy Chair highlighted that it was an example of learning for the City Corporation, with the Committee revisiting its decision and the community engagement, which had enabled the Committee to rethink the direction taken, providing a better result. He thanked officers for their fast work and stressed the need to ensure that the energy continues, working more closely with the community to ensure its success.

A Member highlighted residents' concerns around the privacy screen and sought assurance that was fully private, enabling women only swimming. The Member noted that other neighbouring local authorities offered free swimming for women and people over sixty years old. The Member stressed the need for transport to be provided to those with mobility issues and noted that a local school had to travel a long way to Poplar to go to swimming.

A Member hoped that facilities for bigger groups in the changing rooms would be provided in the design, the Equity, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee had asked for clarity on the guidance for changing facilities to be adopted in the design strategy to ensure inclusivity. The Member noted that the sports hall must be a vibrant space that people would be prepared to pay for. A Member pressed for the changing rooms to be reviewed, ensuring that those would not solely be shared open spaces.

A Member sought assurance of how the running of and management of the facilities would be monitored once the leisure centre reopens.

The Chairman was pleased to arrive at a point where the best design options were being considered, it had been clear from the outset that people wanted the sports hall to be retained; and to increase the gym space. The Chairman noted the need to understand what form the Community Steering Group and the (GLLC) Independent User Group would take once the leisure centre reopens, so those groups could continue to play a key oversight role. There was a need to encourage people to come back to the leisure centre once it reopens, demonstrating its excellent provision. There was also a need to build on the resident voice. The Chairman thanked officers for their hard work at pace and thanked the Committee for considering the enhanced option.

Officers noted that the questions around the future operation of the leisure centre were beyond the design consideration and confirmed that the Committee

would receive an update at a future meeting on the procurement of a provider and to discuss the future operation and delivery. The monthly meeting of the Community Steering Group would discuss the complexities in detail, for example regarding the changing rooms, seating and transport. The request around the privacy screen would be considered.

RESOLVED:

1. Noted the outcome of the recent engagement process.
2. Noted the design options discussed.
3. Noted the updated financial modelling.
4. Agreed the preferred design option: Option 1 enhanced.
5. Approved establishment of a Community Steering Group for the project.

8. **A REVIEW OF THE CITY CHILDCARE ACCESSIBILITY SCHEME**

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services. Officers explained that the Committee was asked to decide whether to retain the scheme or implement an enhanced scheme from September 2026, which includes additional support for families already receiving the 30-hour entitlement, where there was more than one pre-school child in the family. Officers recommended option 2 as it widens access and eases childcare costs, especially for low-income families. There was funding available through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), an additional funding source might need to be identified should there be an increase in demand. The service would promote the scheme to maximise awareness.

The Chairman noted that the scheme was relevant to all families across the City and the aim was to be as supportive as possible, last year the Committee agreed to change the entry criteria.

The Deputy Chair sought clarity on the Government's provision of thirty hours of free childcare, believing that did not cover those that were unemployed compared to the City Corporation's scheme. Officers clarified that the Government's provision was for eligible families for children over nine months old, for single parent families or families with an income of less than £100,000, for thirty-eight weeks of the year. Regarding the City Corporation's scheme, there were three criteria for accessing it: two criteria were referrals by professionals for families receiving support from social care or other services, and referrals for children with additional needs that do not qualify for an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP); the third criterion related to financial hardship, that covered those unemployed.

A Member believed that the City Corporation's scheme enabled families that already receive the 30 hours of free childcare and meet the criteria, could also receive 15 hours of free childcare during term time. That enabled families to work longer hours. Responding to the Chairman, officers clarified that the scheme was being extended to those unemployed and noted that applications were assessed on a case-by-case basis.

A Member asked how long people would be supported under the scheme in terms of getting back to work. Officers explained that support was not time

limited so as not to create a barrier, the only time limited factor to consider was the age of the child.

A Member asked how many respondents there were to the Spring/Summer 2026 Sufficiency Assessment, and how the City Corporation was speaking to local parents, asking whether their needs were being met. Officers explained that they would find out the number of respondents and explained that sufficiency assessments must be conducted twice a year. A Member requested that the percentages for respondents continue to be included going forward.

A Member asked whether the referral pathways were obstructing parents, the 2021 census data noted that there were up to 60 births per year, whereas the applications varied from one to seven. The Member asked whether the scheme was publicised. Officers explained that new birth visits were conducted, the service was mindful of the scheme and its benefits and that would be promoted with health visiting colleagues and a campaign would be undertaken.

RESOLVED: Reviewed the Childcare Policy agreed in June 2025 and approved Option 2: Universal Needs for a revised and enhanced Childcare Accessibility Scheme from September 2026. The proposed change is the introduction of additional support for families already receiving the 30-hour entitlement, where there is more than one pre-school child in the family.

9. **STRONGER COMMUNITIES FUND ANALYSIS AND FUNDING POLICY UPDATE**

The Committee received the report of the Interim Managing Director, City Bridge Foundation. Officers explained that the Stronger Communities Fund (SCF) was a small grants programme with an annual budget of just over £73,000. In 2025/26, there were 13 grants awarded. The team worked closely with the Community and Children's Services Department (DCCS) to identify gaps in provision that could be met through grant funding from the CIL Neighbourhood Fund. Members were asked to amend the policy to reduce the maximum Stronger Communities Fund to £10,000.

A Member highlighted that Portsoken had benefitted from the SCF, funding a coach trip from the estates to the seaside in summer. The Member thanked the officers for being helpful in providing support for people to apply for the grant. The application process had been streamlined and the reporting process was simpler; the Member encouraged people to apply as it provided a huge benefit.

A Member asked whether the management cost of such funds was kept in proportion, as there was a danger of an imbalance of spending too much time on administration. Alongside the larger CIL Neighbourhood Fund, there was an opportunity to have efficiencies and cross-subsidy in managing smaller grants.

A Member had reviewed the last six years and believed the average spend of the SCF was £33,000 per year, and as only half of the available fund was spent every year, the Member questioned the reduction of the maximum grant. A Member welcomed the flexibility in the current approach, enabling a higher amount of funding for an exceptional case, so questioned the reduction. A

Member noted that due to inflation and other costs increases, urged caution in removing the cap on the SCF. Officers explained the rationale for the reduction of the maximum grant to £10,000 was that the fund was oversubscribed, for example with repeat applicants and large applicants there was no space for new organisations to apply. That reduction would enable a stepping stones approach between the funds. That rationale was welcomed by Members. Officers clarified that in the last six years, most of the budget had been spent at around £73,000 for the SCF. Officers explained that this year, the number of applications had increased by 41% which was challenging, there were issues around ineligible applications, the use of Artificial Intelligence and the Greater London Authority had a similarly named programme.

A Member noted that Fusion Lifestyle no longer existed and asked where that grant currently sat and how was the City Corporation providing for those Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) children for sport and physical activity sessions. Officers explained that Fusion Lifestyle had fully delivered its fund, currently there was funding for SEND sports provision at the City of London School for Girls. The Member also asked about the grant for community cricket provision for children and asked how communities were aware of that and whether providing outreach was part of receiving the SCF. Officers explained that during the application process there would be a telephone interview with applicants talk to them about the project and outreach plans to communities. The panel of expert officers from DCCS provided that scrutiny and were in communication with the communities.

A Member noted that they were a trustee to the charity Positive Action Through Creativity and thanked officers for their support in the application process which had been simplified. The Member welcomed the grant awards for sports and youth provision; and asked for workshops to promote the funds. The team undertook outreach work and was happy to present to communities.

Officers explained that one of the bids funded through the CIL Neighbourhood Fund was for Hackney CVS to do work called VCSquared to support the voluntary and community sector to grow its capacity. There was a strong link with grants team who could inform organisations of grant opportunities.

RESOLVED:

1. Noted the recent grants awarded from the Stronger Communities Fund 2025/26 (Appendix 2).
2. Noted the analysis of the Stronger Communities Fund over the last six years, and its impact for City of London communities (Appendix 3).
3. Approved a reduction in the maximum SCF grant available from £15,000 to £10,000.
4. Approved the updated Stronger Communities Fund Policy (Appendix 4) and the SCF Officer Panel Terms of Reference (Appendix 5).

10. **ISSUE REPORT (WITH CHANGE REQUEST) - FIRE SAFETY PLANNED MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME 2028-31**

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services. Officers explained that the report related to essential fire

safety works required to all the residential housing estates and the additional expenditure requested was for critical surveys, exploratory works and investigations to inform the development of the programme. The multi-disciplinary consultant undertook a gap analysis of fire safety related documents, that revealed the absence of documents such as fire strategies.

A Member asked whether it was separate to the ongoing major works projects, as those included some fire safety work. Officers explained that it was part of the Housing Major Works Programme and was specific to fire safety related work across the portfolio. There was fire safety work included in Golden Lane Estate packages, elsewhere that was not the case. There was an uplift requested of £450,000 from within the £211 million budget.

The Deputy Chair sought assurance from officers that going forward they would do all they could to work within the existing envelope and not seek additional money. Officers explained that being at the outset for design development there was potential for costs to increase, however cost consultants were in place to manage that; there was contingency in the programme.

A Member referred to the RAG rating and asked whether the risk status was in relation to the programme or the risk of actual fires. Officers explained that it concerned project related risks, regarding overspend or programme extension.

A Member welcomed the additional funding for surveys as a lack of information had formed a lot of the work the housing team had been doing to fix the problems over many years. The Member noted that it would be good to think about when those surveys might need to be redone, building those costs in the budget going forward. The Member presumed that the new staff being recruited regarding the specialist regulatory knowledge would be in a position going forward to know the liability and ensure the works were up to standard. Officers explained that work was underway with colleagues from health and safety.

A Member queried when the missing documentation would be supplied as a matter of high priority. The Member asked what the Clerk of Works would oversee and when the role would be filled. Officers explained that the survey programme was scheduled for completion by October 2026. The Clerk of Works role would be filled in-house during the delivery phase, supported by external consultancy as the programme develops.

RESOLVED:

1. Approved an additional fees budget of £1,250,000 for preliminary surveys, Fire Strategies, reports and exploratory works.
2. Noted the revised total project budget of £12,450,000 (excluding risk).
3. Noted that this represents an uplift of £450,000 in the total fees, surveys and exploratory works budget from the Gateway 1 Report of May 2026.

11. ***DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMISSIONING AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children’s Services.

A Member submitted the following question in advance: Please could we have a focused information session for Members about the Community and Children's Services Committee (CCS) commissioning arrangements? Given the range, number and complexity of contracts managed by the CCS Committee Commissioning team, it would be helpful to know in more detail how the Commissioning team works with the Finance team in relation to procurement rules and value for money. In addition, how the 'health' of contracts is monitored and when contingency plans are created. Case studies would be helpful.

Officers explained that would be provided in the autumn.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

12. ***CITY OF LONDON STREET HOMELESSNESS OUTREACH AND SUPPORT SERVICE – STAGE 1 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY REPORT**
The Committee received the joint report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services; and the Commercial Director - Director of Commercial Change & Portfolio Delivery.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

13. ***CARERS STRATEGY 2023-27 UPDATE**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

14. ***REPLACING THE EMERGENCY SUPPORT SCHEME WITH THE CRISIS RESILIENCE FUND**
The Committee received the report of the Assistant Director, Financial Shared Services.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

15. ***DCCS HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING CHARTER (THE DCCS CHARTER)**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services.

RESOLVED: Noted the draft DCCS Health, Safety and Wellbeing Charter for information prior to implementation.

16. ***WARDMOTE UPDATES**
NOTE: Refer to the resolution concerning the item: 0-2 Childcare Provision at the Aldgate School which states that the report was deferred.

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

17. ***SCHOOL ADMISSIONS UPDATE**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

A Member highlighted that there was no clarity where the local authority responsibility was, as The Aldgate School was the only school in the local authority and City of London Primary Academy Islington (CoLPAI) was not.

The Chairman clarified that CoLPAI formed part of the City of London Academies Trust.

RESOLVED: That the report be received, and its contents noted.

18. ***REVENUE OUTTURN 2025/26 - CITY FUND - COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE (CITY FUND) EXCLUDING HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA)**
The Committee received the joint report of the Chamberlain; and the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

RESOLVED: Noted this revenue outturn report for 2025/26.

19. ***HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2024/25**
The Committee received the joint report of the Chamberlain; and the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

RESOLVED: Noted this outturn report for 2025/26.

20. **UPDATES FROM SUB COMMITTEES AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**
There were no updates received.

21. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no public questions.

22. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no public items of urgent business.

23. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED: That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

24. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED: That the non-public minutes of the previous meetings held on 22 April 2026 and 5 May 2026 be approved as an accurate record.

25. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
The Committee received the non-public outstanding actions report.

26. **LEASEHOLDER LOAN SCHEMES - MAJOR WORKS**
NOTE: It was agreed that this item be taken before the item on Golden Lane Estate Major Works Renewal Programme - Phase 1: Crescent House Leaseholder Recovery and Discretionary Discount.

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

27. **GOLDEN LANE ESTATE MAJOR WORKS RENEWAL PROGRAMME - PHASE 1: CRESCENT HOUSE LEASEHOLDER RECOVERY AND DISCRETIONARY DISCOUNT**
NOTE: During this item, the Sub-Committee agreed to extend the meeting by approximately twenty minutes, in accordance with Standing Order 39.

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

28. **ISSUE REPORT (WITH CHANGE REQUEST) - GOLDEN LANE ESTATE MAJOR WORKS RENEWAL PROGRAMME - PHASE 1: CRESCENT HOUSE**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

29. **ISSUE REPORT (WITH CHANGE REQUEST) - GOLDEN LANE ESTATE MAJOR WORKS RENEWAL PROGRAMME - PHASE 2: ALL BLOCKS EXCLUDING CRESCENT HOUSE AND GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

30. **BLACK RAVEN COURT - CITY OF LONDON PRIMARY ACADEMY ISLINGTON (COLPAI)**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

31. **BLACK RAVEN COURT (COLPAI)**
The Committee received the report of the Head of New Developments and Special Projects.

32. **WAIVER REPORT**
The Committee received the report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

33. ***NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX - SCHOOL ADMISSIONS UPDATE**
The Committee received the non-public appendix.

34. ***HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT 10 YEAR MAJOR REPAIRS PLAN REVISED FORECAST**
The Committee received the joint report of the Chamberlain; and the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services.

35. ***DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
The Committee received the report of Town Clerk.

36. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.

37. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no non-public items of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 4.05 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Amelia Christopher
Amelia.Christopher@cityoflondon.gov.uk