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Press and Public
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Neighbourhoods and Renewal Scrutiny Panel – Meeting held on Wednesday, 3rd December, 2008.

Present:– Councillor Haines, Buchanan, Davis, Matloob and Walsh

Co-opted Members present:– Glynys Higgins (Slough Federation of Tenants and Residents)

Apologies for Absence:– Councillor Coad, Dale-Gough, Pabbi, Rasib, Goldstein and Mason

PART 1

28. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Davies and Walsh declared a personal interest in agenda items 3 and 4 as they served as Board Members of the People 1st (Slough) ALMO.

29. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting of the Panel held on 27th October, 2008 were approved as a correct record.

30. People 1st - Performance Management Update - October Monthly Flyer

Andrew Billany, Chief Executive of People 1st (Slough) outlined a report updating Members on the level of performance relating to the 12 key business functions for the ALMO to 31st October, 2008.

October’s performance continued to show a high level of performance with six of the 12 key business functions indicating an improved level of performance from September levels. Rent collection had risen significantly from the previous month but was still behind that of 2007/08. It was hoped that these levels would be surpassed in the coming months if the current rates of collection continued. It was possible that the current economic climate could impact on collection levels and the implementation of the new housing management IT package in December could also affect collection rates. The turnaround for void properties in October was at an average of 25.40 days per property and this was in line with the current top quartile performance.

Performance in regard to repairs had maintained its top quartile performance in both urgent repairs completed within target and non-urgent turnaround. The numbers of properties receiving decent homes investment continued to feel the positive impact of the increased funding received following the two star Audit Commission rating and 112 properties had received Decent Homes investment in October.
Neighbourhoods and Renewal Scrutiny Panel - 03.12.08

In relation to the condition of estates, mystery shopping for September had continued to show conditions falling behind the seven out of ten target mark set for 2008/09. The combined rating of three estates visited in September was 5.93 out of ten, but it was hoped that the new system in place to ensure improvements would result in improved performance that would see estates meeting the required target rating. People 1st would be unable to properly gauge whether performance had improved or decreased until a full year’s collection performance was available using the new system.

Members noted that in September, 86.46% of calls were answered within the target time and the Interserve telephone answering performance had improved for a second consecutive month to 85.55% and this was ahead of the 83% target levels. There was a continued high level of performance in October in relation to the percentage of complaints replied to within the target time.

The following points/questions were raised in the subsequent debate.

- A Member felt that the achieved percentage on the condition of estates target was still too low and asked how long it would take to accomplish the corrective measures set out in the report. Mr Billany advised that some measures would only be realised in the long term and stated that he would be happy with a gradual increase in the score. He felt that an approximate six out of ten score was a fair representation of the condition of the estates and it would be important to have continued discussions with Slough Borough Council to find ways to improve. The Strategic Director advised that Ward walkabouts had been held recently and a detailed estates inspection would be done in March, 2009. It was therefore important to get beneath the outstanding problems. The Member suggested that a task group could be set up within the Panel and Mr Billany commented that Members’ input would be welcome. He felt that it was important to radically increase the number of mystery shoppers and raise their profile so that they could report back on problems on estates. It would also be useful to discuss associated problems with the Tenants’ Federation.

- A Member advised that on the recent walkabouts it was evident that in some areas there were problems identifying the owners of various pieces of land. It was known that in some cases the land was owned by Housing but there was no revenue to carry out the work required and this would be looked at as part of the budget proposals for the coming years. It was also hoped that some work around neighbourhoods would help improve the problems on estates.

- A Co-opted Member referred to a number of problems on the Foxborough Estate where the land in question belonged to different people and boundaries cut across the problem areas. In particular a car park on Grampian Way flooded every year but this problem had persisted for ten years and nothing had been done to resolve it. Mr Billany advised that a quote would be pursued on the housing land soakaway and resources had been allocated to this.
A Member was concerned about the fly tipping at garage sites in the Borough. He asked what could be done to clear these areas and set up preventative measures to resolve these problems. Mr Billany advised that the responsibility for these areas lay with SBC but it was possible that People 1st could roll the issue into the best value review and assess how it could be dealt with. The Director advised that the housing garage areas were now within the responsibility of Neil Aves, Assistant Director, Housing Strategy and Renewal, and advised that some cameras were now in place to assist with the prosecution of offenders. Community Wardens were now responsible for sifting through the fly tipping to try and identify the person who had disposed of the rubbish.

In relation to fly tipping a Member felt that the Council could be more proactive and remove the rubbish more often. He was advised in response that there was a patrol at least every week but problems were caused by repeated tipping.

It was suggested that Dympna Malloy be invited to attend a future meeting to talk about joint working.

A Member asked what percentage of the Decent Homes were now completed and how many properties were part completed. It was agreed that the required information would be forwarded to Members for information.

A Member asked why the performance in regard to responding to telephone calls within 20 seconds was low. Members were advised that Zena Miller had requested Member feedback if they encountered any problems with telephone answering.

A Member questioned at what time tenants could report repairs needed. He felt that the message on the answering machine was uninviting. Mr Billany advised that a small contact team with a manager responded to calls and there was a particular phone number for emergency work. Mr Billany advised that he would check the current system.

A Member asked whether tenants had a list of the required phone numbers for repairs etc and it was agreed that Mr Billany would forward a list of the relevant numbers to Members.

A Member asked whether there was a system in place to encourage elderly residents to downsize and exchange properties with a smaller household. Mr Billany advised that those tenants would be encouraged to move if they wanted to.

Resolved- That the report be noted and that the concerns raised by Members be noted/ pursued by the Chief Executive, People 1st.
31. Leaseholder Service Charge Collection and Overall Satisfaction

Andrew Billany, Chief Executive of People 1st (Slough) outlined a report updating Members on the current level of leasehold service charge performance by People 1st and detailing the current leaseholder satisfaction with services. The monthly flyer figure for Octobers Leaseholder service charge collection showed collection levels at 72.31%. The figures showed a 13% decrease in collection levels from the previous month and a 12% decrease from the comparable period in the previous year but this was due to changes in the type of collection data used. The new system excluded data from standing order payments and was therefore more challenging. It also appeared that the October's collection rates had declined from September's figures but this was due to the October figure showing performance against a limited window of collection, i.e. 2-3 weeks for monies owed for a six month period.

It was noted that service charges had been increased because the Audit Commission had found that levels set by caretakers were inadequate. Mr Billany felt that current economic circumstances could have an impact on collection levels together with substantial rises in service charges over the last two years. A proposal had been received from Shelter to provide independent advice on hardship issues and a report would be submitted to the Cabinet in January 2009 to allow more flexibility on payments. A meeting of the Leaseholder Forum scheduled for the January period would seek leaseholder views on how assistance could be broadened and responses would be added to the annual leaseholder satisfaction survey scheduled for circulation in February 2009.

Leaseholder satisfaction with People 1st services remained on a par with the majority of top quartile ALMO’s within the country. The Leaseholder Forum met quarterly and allowed residents to discuss their service charges and question the value for money that received for services.

Mr Billany stated that he would like to write to all Members of the Panel to invite comments on casework related concerns to add to the Leaseholder Survey he was compiling.

The following points/ questions were raised in the subsequent debate:

- A Member asked what percentage of tenants paid monthly. It was agreed that this information would be forwarded to the Member.
- A Member asked what help People 1st were giving to Leaseholders in view of the current unemployment situation and possible mortgage arrears. Mr Billany advised that this issue was high on the People 1st agenda and was considered at a Board Meeting the previous week. A range of measures would be agreed to assist individuals experiencing difficulties.
- A Member asked whether it was possible that in cases where a property was repossessed, it could be bought back, by People 1st.
Mr Billany advised that buy back schemes did exist but it was too early to say whether any commitment could be made.

- A Member asked why the undercharging for services highlighted by the Audit Commission had gone on for so long and was advised that this was historical and was not uncommon in Local Authorities.

**Resolved**- That the report be noted and that the concerns raised by Members be noted/ pursued by the Chief Executive, People 1st.

### 32. Future Work Programme

**Resolved**- That the future programme be noted.

### 33. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 27th January 2008.

(Note: The Meeting opened at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.25 pm)
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PART I

FOR COMMENT AND CONSIDERATION

UPDATE ON THE NEW PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR HOUSEHOLD DEVELOPMENT IN RESPECT OF PAVING OVER FRONT GARDENS TO DOMESTIC PROPERTIES.

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recently considered a Member request to consider DEFRA proposals to save water and reduce the risk of flooding, within its work programme. The proposals included the termination of the traditional right of homeowners to cover their front gardens with asphalt. It was agreed that the issues raised by that report and the resulting legislation, fell within the terms of reference of the Neighbourhoods and Renewal Scrutiny Panel. This report provides a Member update on changes to householder permitted development rights following The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008, which came into force on 1st October 2008.

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 The Panel is requested to note the contents of the report and consider any action it wishes to take.

3.0 Community Strategy Priorities

- Being Safe, Feeling Safe
- A Cleaner, Greener place to live, Work and Play
- Prosperity for All

The new permitted development regime is aimed at making small scale development to residential properties easier in terms of not requiring planning permission. Although many paving works to front gardens may require planning permission the legislation is intended to make such works more sustainable in drainage terms. Thus the changes should help satisfy the Sustainable Community Strategy Priorities identified above.
4.0 Other Implications

(a) Financial

The changes to the Permitted Development in respect of front garden paving may involve additional income from planning applications or applications for Certificate of Lawful Development resulting from the changes. However, this income is likely to be fairly insignificant compared to other fee income generated by planning applications.

(b) Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

There are no specific issues arising as a result of this report

(c) Workforce

As specified in relation to (a)

5.0 Supporting Information

5.1 Permitted development is development that can be undertaken without the need for a planning application to be submitted to the local planning authority. The Government wishes to give as much freedom as possible for people to extend their homes, such as building extensions and loft conversions, particularly given current pressures in the housing market.

5.2 The Government has a number of objectives for the changes to the permitted development rights. These are presented below with comments.

- to make the need for specific planning permission proportionate to the impact of the development
- To provide clarity, simplicity and consistency
- to keep the number of planning applications to a minimum
- to ensure the legislation is and can remain relevant to new technologies and changing lifestyles.

5.3 While the overall aim is to relax the planning regime, the review proposals would also introduce a need for planning applications for householder developments with potential adverse impacts. In respect of the paving of front gardens it has been recognized that such works might have an adverse affect on drainage and flooding.

5.4 Essentially the new regulations state that:

Where the hard surface is on land between a principle elevation and the highway, and is more than 5 square metres:

- The hard surface should be made of porous materials or
- Provision should be made to direct run off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house.
5.5 Details

Planning permission is now required to lay traditional impermeable driveways that allow uncontrolled runoff of rainwater from front gardens onto roads, because this can contribute to flooding and pollution of watercourses.

If a new driveway or parking area is constructed using permeable surfaces such as permeable concrete block paving, porous asphalt or gravel, or if the water is otherwise able to soak into the ground you will not require planning permission. The new rules will also apply where existing hard standings are being replaced.

As stated above the new rules apply to hard surfaces exceeding 5 square metres in area.

Applying for planning permission will require an application form, draw plans (which have to be to scale) and pay a fee of £150. Planning applications or this type of householder development should normally be decided within 8 weeks after submission.

Extracts from an advice document produced by the Department of Communities and Local Government, in consultation with the Environment Agency is produced at Appendix 1.

6.0 Comments of Other Committees

6.1 None

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 The new permitted development criteria for paving front gardens will require some householders to apply for a Certificate of Lawful Development or planning permission. However the overall aim of bringing such works within the control of the planning authority is justified by the wider sustainability issues associated with controlling water run off and drainage from hard surfaces in domestic front gardens.

8.0 Appendix

8.1 Summary of main provisions of the new Permitted Development Regime

9.0 Background Papers

Section 3

Types of surface

Planted and gravel driveways

The Royal Horticultural Society has identified many simple ways that a green or gravel driveway can be created. These green solutions provide an attractive space that can be used to park cars.

### Loose gravel

This is the most simple type of construction. The driveway sub-base is covered by a surface layer of gravel or shingle. Gravel with different shapes and colours is available to make the surface more decorative. A strip of block paving or asphalt at the entrance can limit the loss and spread of gravel from the drive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple to construct and maintain</td>
<td>Gravel will scatter or form waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>Not suitable on steeply sloping drives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials readily available</td>
<td>Not suitable for wheel-chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily integrated with planting to provide visual enhancement to driveway layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wheel tracks

To keep hard surfaces to a minimum a driveway can be created that has just two paved tracks where the wheels go. These can be surfaced with blocks, asphalt or concrete, but to provide a durable construction they should have sub-base below. The area between and around the tracks can be surfaced in gravel or planted with grass or suitable low growing plants. Water must drain from the tracks into the surrounding permeable area. Typical width is between 300mm and 600mm for each track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple to construct and maintain</td>
<td>Need regular maintenance to keep looking tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily combined with planting to provide visual enhancement to driveway layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not require planning permission if the area covered by the tracks is less than 5 sq m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reinforced grass and gravel

There are a number of systems available that increase the strength of a grass surface so that cars can drive over it without causing ruts. Both plastic and concrete reinforcement systems are available to strengthen the ground and reduce erosion. The plastic systems can also be used with gravel. The species of grass should be specified by the manufacturer of the system to ensure it is suitable for the intended location. Specific low growing grass that does not need a lot of mowing can be used.

**Pros**
- Simple to construct and maintain
- Attractive
- Can help to reduce temperatures around the house, absorb pollution and dust and reduce noise

**Cons**
- May need mowing and maintenance to look tidy
- Not suitable where vehicles are parked continuously for a long period of time as the grass may die
- Gravel may require sweeping, particularly on a sloping driveway.
Hard permeable and porous surfaces

Hard surfacing which allows water to soak into it can be built with porous asphalt, porous concrete blocks, concrete or clay block permeable paving. The material has open voids across the surface of the material or around the edges of blocks that allow water to soak in. The surface is constructed over a permeable sub-base. Systems are available from a variety of manufacturers. Sources of further information are provided in Section 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard and durable with a very long service life if correctly constructed</td>
<td>Can be more expensive than other options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require the least amount of maintenance</td>
<td>Require knowledgeable contractor to construct correctly (especially porous asphalt which should be provided and laid by a specialist company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide variety of shapes and colours available for concrete blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidance on paving front gardens

Rain gardens and soakaways

Water from a conventional paved surface can be directed onto a border, rain garden or into a soakaway. An area of garden can be formed into a depression to collect and store rainwater from conventional impermeable surfaces (asphalt, concrete and block paving), before slowly allowing it to soak into the ground or to flow to the drains. The depressions can be located along the edge of the drive or as a larger area in the garden at a low point. The depression can be planted with suitable plants to help slow runoff or gravel or cobbles can be used as decorative features. There may be a gravel filled trench below it to increase the storage capacity and allow water to soak into the ground more easily. Soakaways are a similar idea except that water is piped into a gravel filled trench or geocellular box (see Glossary) and allowed to soak into the ground. Many houses have the roof downpipes connected to soakaways. They are more suitable for houses with larger front gardens as they require space and need to be located a suitable distance from buildings. Further information on using gardens with block paving can be obtained from Interpave (see link below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can use conventional impermeable surfaces such as block paving, asphalt or concrete draining to the rain garden</td>
<td>Require deeper excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive landscape feature</td>
<td>Require space to construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require knowledgeable contractor to construct correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require suitable ground conditions (sand or gravel soils)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rainwater harvesting

Water butts and underground rainwater tanks can be used to complement the drainage methods discussed above to reduce runoff from a property. The simplest systems are water butts where the water is used to water gardens or for washing cars. More complex systems use underground tanks and pumps to provide water to outside taps. The underground tanks can collect rainwater from roofs or from permeable driveways. The water can be used inside the house for toilet flushing, but this is more complex and it is best to consult a specialist rainwater harvesting company (see the UK Rainwater Harvesting Association website).

Rainwater harvesting will not only help reduce rainwater runoff into the drains but will also reduce the amount of mains water used. This can contribute to water efficiency and provide a saving on water bills if using metered water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces demand for mains water</td>
<td>Installation requires specialist understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water is naturally soft</td>
<td>Can be an expensive option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If water use is metered it can reduce bills</td>
<td>Difficult to retrofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overflow required to drains or soakaway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4

How to design and construct permeable surfaces

Depth of construction below permeable driveways

From the surface of proposed drive there will normally be approximately 200mm to 250mm of material forming the driveway construction. If it is hard to drive a 50mm square wooden peg more than 150mm into the ground then the soil is strong enough to support the drive. If it is easy to drive a peg beyond 150mm the ground may be too soft and you will need expert advice.

When digging out the drive, if there are any areas which seem softer than the rest, they will need to be dug out and refilled with sub-base. It is important to place a layer of permeable fabric material known as a geotextile at the base of the driveway construction, over the soil. This helps to stop the sub base sinking into the soil and also helps prevents weeds. About 150mm of sub-base is laid over the geotextile and compacted before the final surfacing is placed.

What to consider

Slopes – the driveway should be sloped away from the house wherever possible towards the road. Do not direct water into rain gardens or soakaways close to buildings. If the driveway slopes towards the house use a drainage channel to collect any excess water and connect it to the drains that take the roof water. If the drive is steeply sloping (greater than 1 in 20) it may not be suitable for permeable surfacing. In these cases an impermeable surface could be used and if possible the water directed to a soakaway, rain garden or as a last resort directly to the drains that take roof water. Don’t direct water towards a neighbour’s property.

Underground services – make sure there are no underground services close to the ground surface where you are paving (eg water pipes, cable TV, electricity cables, etc).

Contaminated sites – if you live on a site that was contaminated by previous uses the shallow soils may have been specifically designed to prevent water soaking into the ground. If this is the case you will have to connect the paved area to the drains. Permeable surfaces may still be used but a more specialist construction will be required that allows water from the sub-base to flow into the drains (See www.paving.org.uk for more details).
Who can construct permeable and porous driveways

It is best to use an experienced landscape or driveway contractor. Organisations like Interlay – The Association of Block Paving Contractors-, the British Association of Landscape Industries (BALI) or the Quarry Products Association can provide details of suitable contractors (See Section 6). It is also useful to obtain references from previous clients.

Casual jobbing contractors who knock on your door and offer to lay a driveway should not be used to construct permeable driveways.

Other considerations

Changing existing driveways – Existing drives can also be converted to be permeable or drain to a rain garden. You should ask a builder for advice because the drive may also drain water from the roof.

Legal issues – If you are constructing a new access into the garden across the footpath (officially known as the footway) you will need to obtain permission from the local council to drop the kerbs and the public footpath may need strengthening. This is to protect any services buried in the ground such as water pipes.

What to look out for

- the soil below the driveway or rain garden must be sandy or gravely (not clay) otherwise a connection to the drains may be required. This can be checked by a simple test (See Interpave guide to responsible rainwater management around the home).
- on sites with very clayey soils that cannot soak up a lot of water, it is a wise precaution to include a pipe in the sub-base to drain water to the roof drains. This stops water sitting in the sub-base for a long time. The permeable pavement will still have the desired effect as the water has to soak into the surface, the underground structure will also provide some storage for the water which will slowly find its way to the pipe.
- the aggregate used for the sub-base below permeable paving or to build a rain garden must have open voids in it and no fine material. Water should flow freely into it. The sub-base should be compacted as for conventional construction.
- when the paving is completed water should soak easily into the surface of the driveway. If a hosepipe is turned onto the surface for 1 or 2 minutes there should be no puddles and the water should soak straight in without flowing over the surface more than 200 to 300mm.
• rain gardens should not have mulch on the surface as this will float when water collects on it. The surface around the plants should be covered in a thin layer of gravel to reduce evaporation of water

• as a rule of thumb a pipe will be required if it takes a water filled 300mm by 300mm by 300mm pit more than 11 hours to empty (See Interpave guidance for more information)

• do not build rain gardens or soakaways close to building foundations. For small driveways a minimum distance of 3m should be suitable but it depends on the ground conditions and a greater distance may be required. Ask your local authority Building Control Department if you are unsure
Section 5

Looking after a permeable driveway

Permeable paving, soakaways and rain gardens can provide durable and long lasting drainage systems. They are different to normal driveways and observing a few do’s and don’ts will get the best out of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Don’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• clean up leaves, mud and litter before they have a chance to clog the surface</td>
<td>• put soil, sand or similar material on the driveway that will block the surface and stop water soaking in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• brush the surface if any dirt collects on it and this will reduce the risk of it blocking and help stop weeds growing</td>
<td>• mix concrete on the driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• remove weeds by hand or with a weed burner</td>
<td>• pour liquids such as oil on the surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allow the garden areas to drain onto permeable surfaces as this can allow soil to wash into the surface and block it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• use weed killer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the surface of any of the systems blocks then it can be cleaned. For porous asphalt and porous/permeable concrete blocks the surface can be unclogged using a small vacuum road sweeper or a jet washer.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Report Deadline</th>
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<th>Agenda Dispatch</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
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<th>Cabinet Date</th>
</tr>
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| Monday 5 January 2009 | Tuesday 13 January 2009 | Friday 16 January 2009 | • Thames Water - flooding in Slough.  
• Update on the new permitted development rights for household development in respect of paving over front gardens to domestic properties.  
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| Wednesday 4 March 2009 | Thursday 12 March 2009 | Tuesday 17 March 2009 | • People 1st Performance Management report.  
• People 1st-Inspection Action Progress Plan  
• People 1st-Estate Management Services  
• Council Policy on dealing with chaotic tenants and residents  
• Bus Services to Heathrow | Wednesday 25 March 2009 | Monday 20 April 2009 |

### Unprogrammed Agenda Items / Other
- Northern Road/Cumberland Avenue Traffic Management scheme and result of safety audit.
- Implications of ‘Snooping’ (information held by public bodies)- are there safeguards in place to protect public?