

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

26 FEBRUARY 2024

Present: Councillor Bridgeman(Chairperson)
Councillors Davies, Ferguson-Thorne and Melbourne

Carol Cobert (Church in Wales Representative), Bridgid Corr (Parent Governor Representative), Celeste Lewis (Parent Governor Representative), Patricia Arlotte (Roman Catholic Church Representative).

Jess Manjesh (Youth Council)

49 : APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Saleh Ahmed, Elaine Simmons and Claudia Boes.

50 : DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

As Local Authority School Governors the following CYP Members declared a personal interest in Item 4 (Cardiff Education: Collaboration and Federation Strategy 2024-2033):

Name	Agenda Item	Nature of Interest	Reason for Interest
Patricia Arlotte	4	Personal	School Governor Bernadettes Primary School
Carol Cobert	4	Personal	School Governor, Holy Family Roman Catholic Primary School
Bridgid Corr	4	Personal	School Governor Llanedeyrn Primary School
Cllr Grace Ferguson-Thorne	4	Personal	School Governor, Adamstown Primary and Chair of Governors, Stacey Road Primary
Cllr Robert Hopkins	4	Personal	School Governor, Lakeside Primary School
Celeste Lewis	4	Personal	Parent Governor, Hawthorn Primary School
Cllr Sian Elin- Melbourne	4	Personal	School Governor, Llysfaen Primary School
Cllr Jess Moultrie	4	Personal	School Governor, Springwood Primary School

51 : MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

52 : CARDIFF EDUCATION: COLLABORATION AND FEDERATION STRATEGY

Members were advised that this item would allow them to undertake a pre-decision scrutiny on the Cardiff Education: Collaboration and Federation Strategy which was being considered by Cabinet on 29 February 2024.

The Chair welcomed Cllr Councillor Sarah Merry, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Melanie Godfrey, Director of Education and Lifelong Learning, Richard Portas, Programme Director for the School Organisation Programme, Brett Andrewartha, School Organisation Programme Planning Manager, Michele Duddridge-Friedl, Operational Manager, School Organisation Programme Strategy, Kate Rowlands, Central South Education Consortium and Sarah Coombes, Executive Headteacher, Llanishen Fach Primary School and Pentyrch Primary School Collaboration.

Cllr Merry was invited to make a statement, in which she provided an overview of the Cardiff Education: Collaboration and Federation Strategy. She referred to the fact that both collaboration and federation were already in operation across the city and outlined the benefits of the strategy which brought together schools and built on education practice. She stressed that collaboration and federation was one tool amongst many and it did not mean that all schools would be forced into a federation structure but rather schools themselves could come forward with suggestions of collaboration and federation and it would be an option to be considered when a head teacher retired.

Mel Godfrey provided Members with a presentation referring to the Overarching Strategy Cardiff 2030 Vision – Renewed vision for education and learning in the city and approved by Cabinet in October 2019. She explained that the Cardiff Education: Collaboration and Federation Strategy (Appendix 1) had been developed to build upon the recent achievements across Cardiff's schools, to consider the changing demands for the future and to outline the vision to deliver the themes and goals of Cardiff 2030. Members were advised that in recognising the role of strong leadership and governance in advancing educational outcomes for children and families, Cardiff would look to, through this strategy, enhance collaborative processes for the benefit of its learners and the education workforce in the city. The 10-year strategy provided a framework to encourage collaborative working and included a toolkit that practitioners should consider in localities across the city. She outlined that consultation would happen in the framework of the overarching strategy.

Sarah Coombes spoke on her personal experiences of collaboration and federation through the Llanishen Fach and Pentyrch Learning Collaboration/ Llanishen Fach

Primary School had supported Pentyrch Primary School since 2017 and had resulted in positive outcomes for both schools.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

Sarah Coombes was asked to outline some of the difficulties/challenges from her experience of collaboration and federation. She explained that her school was 6 miles from Pentrych and that it was never meant to be a long term collaboration but it had become one. Members heard how collaboration built on the collective strengths of both schools resulting in a relationship and a partnership. She explained that the challenges were when it became more formalised and longer term. Some of the difficulties arose when it became more of a formal collaboration with the HR and the contractual obligations but Cardiff Council was experienced in this area now. Llanishen Fach Primary and Pentyrch Primary had been a collaboration for seven years with two separate governing bodies on a joint committee but the uniqueness of the schools still remained. Members were informed that the schools were not federated but collaborated and it had not been necessary to ringfence jobs. She stressed that collaboration as a starting point was crucial.

Members sought clarification on whether this was an 'opt-in' model. Officers responded that the changes proposed in the collaboration and federation model had already happened across the city and had also been set out in legislation. The importance of a framework was discussed in order that when a headteacher retired there was a strategic context. Officers referred to the toolkit which would enable those discussions to take place at the right time and right place with leaders of the school system.

Members enquired as to the drivers behind the development of the strategy and whether it was the struggle to recruit, budgetary pressures or the belief that Federation was the ideal model and should be spread across the local authority. Officers responded that it was for all of the reasons stated.

The Strategy would enable collaboration from informal through to formal federation. Members were advised it was about organic collaboration to deal with the pressures on individual schools. Members heard how it was not something that was radically different from what was going on but was building the expectation that this was something that could bring wider benefits and inviting schools to present their own proposals too.

Members asked about job security and referred to the fact that there had been concerns amongst headteachers, deputies and officer managers about how secure their jobs would be; and if schools who put themselves forward for collaboration and federation would their roles be ringfenced to the members of staff in the schools joining together. Officers responded that the strategy was not looking to make mass redundancies or mass retirements from those heads that felt they were looking to retire. Members were advised that it was one about having the right discussions to ensure the right resources were available. Members were informed it was not a programme of cuts but would enable the Authority to plan and prepare in the context of the funding resources it had moving forwards. In terms of the roles being ring fenced, this would be determined by the agreement that was in place when moving to

a federated collaboration. It was not a mandate by the Local Authority but would be chosen by the federation if they chose to move to a federated model and the specifics of that federation.

Members ask what support would be put in place for schools who may not wish to follow this model. Officers advised that it was about making the right decision at the right time and that sometimes it might not be the right time for a particular school because a school was going through a significant investment or a proposal to expand. The Authority was aware of the workload and pressure on schools and the need to factor that in. Officers advised that the model was about strengthening the school system and not about weakening or undermining it.

Members noted the location of certain schools and asked whether distance would be a barrier to a federation. Sarah Coombes responded that it was easier collaborating with somebody closer to you but with technology such as Teams it was not an issue as had been proven by the virtual meetings taking place during Covid.

Members asked how federation was approached when it involved schools operating in different socio-economic contexts and with different starting points in terms of school improvement. Officers responded that the model was an example and was not a mandate for all schools. It was noted that some headteachers had come forward with models to support their own thinking.

Members asked if there were plans to federate schools that were Welsh medium and English medium together or was the strategy to look at English to English and Welsh to Welsh only. Officers responded that there was no reason why certain resources could not be shared amongst schools, for example business managers which had been the case at Llanishen Fach. There was also an opportunity in terms of bilingual provision in Groes Wen. Members were advised that the proposition was that it would be school led. There would be early adopters and there would be discussions with the early adopters and if they could or could not work in terms of context of how they operated.

Members asked about the impact of federation in addressing the need to address challenges such as improving attendance, poor condition of the estate, increased access to the estate for communities and recruitment and retention of teachers. Sarah Coombes responded that the capacity was incredible with two schools and not just the smaller school benefitted but both schools. She referred to the excellent inspection report which was due to the ability to step away from bureaucracy and put the emphasis on the learners and the new curriculum. Standards and outcomes in both schools were equal. In terms of absenteeism strategies were shared and attendance was rising to pre-pandemic levels. In terms of estate management before the collaboration teachers used to open and lock up – having that estates commitment meant lettings were increased by 100%. It also generated income for the schools as communities were able to use them as well.

Members asked the extent to which the strategy has been discussed with the Roman Catholic and Church- in-Wales Diocesan Authorities. Officers responded that there had been consultation and engagement with the Diocesan directors in the development and lead up to the strategy and all schools had been communicated with in the same manner. Members were advised that there would be some schools

where collaboration was not working as well and the toolkit would enable those discussions to take place in those schools.

Members raised concerns that although headteachers had been consulted the Chairs of Governors had not. The point was raised that the Chairs of Governors were key to communicating with other governors. Members suggested that the process might have been more effective if a scrutiny committee had been convened and representatives from headteachers and chairs of governors were in attendance.

Earlier scrutiny intervention would have assisted the whole policy development in collaboration with the service area. The committee was extremely disappointed at the timing of this pre-decision scrutiny. They felt that bringing the strategy on the same day as the budget strategy (when discussing huge financial constraints in this area), was very regrettable.

Members felt the discussion needed to be properly carried out and that by going straight to the headteachers it had alarmed them. Officers advised that the strategic framework was in place to have an enriched consultation with appropriate discussions at the right time and that teachers should not be alarmed. Members were reassured that the right consultations would ensue. There was a framework and that allowed the Authority to do so moving forwards.

Officers advised that drop-in sessions would be taking place over the forthcoming weeks for consultations with headteachers and governors to ask questions. Members were advised that consultation, conversations and accessibility for school leaders of school systems would take place and that success was down to their agreement. In addition, the consultation would go out to parents at an early stage.

Members asked if there was a communication strategy in place for introducing the model and the importance of schools having a strong voice in decision making. Officers responded that there would be a communication strategy which would be school led. The Authority was asking for early adopters and that when the proposals were introduced the communication would be tailored around the context of the proposals going forwards. The Authority could consider collaborations through to formal federations. It would be school led and tailored to the context of the schools, leaders of schools and chairs of governing bodies.

Members asked what the communication strategy was currently. Officers responded that it consisted of a series of engagement sessions taking place with a very small number of headteachers who would be able to ask the right questions and a date was being set to speak to Chairs of Governors. Members were advised it was not just a communication strategy but also about having the right discussions that were informative and reflected the needs of the school leaders in that context.

The committee was exercised by the fact that misunderstandings and misconceptions about what the strategy was intended to achieve may already be evident in the response of key stakeholders. The committee considered that this could have been avoided had greater thought been given to the communication process with the committee itself as well as with headteachers, chairs of governors and elected members. How the strategy was communicated to the school community and beyond was felt to be critical to its success. It was agreed that school leaders,

their governing bodies, parents and carers and other stakeholders would need a strong sense of ownership of the strategy and how it affected them.

RESOLVED: That the Chairperson writes to the Cabinet Member on behalf of the Committee expressing their comments and observations captured during the way forward.

53 : DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN 2024-2027 & DRAFT BUDGETARY PROPOSALS 2024-25

Members were advised that they were being provided with an opportunity to consider those items in the Draft Corporate Plan and Draft Budgetary Proposals which fall within the responsibilities of the Committee, prior to them being considered by the Cabinet and the Council.

The Chair advised Members that they would receive a briefing from the Corporate Overview of draft Budget Proposals. The Budget proposals and relevant parts of the Corporate Plan would be considered in three parts: Children's Services relevant to Cllr Lister's portfolio; Education, relevant to Cllr Merry's portfolio; and Supporting Young People, relevant to Cllr Bradbury's portfolio.

Corporate Overview:

The Chair welcomed Cllr Chris Weaver, Cabinet Member for Finance, Modernisation and Performance; Chris Lee, Corporate Director, Resources and Ian Allwood, Head of Finance, Resources.

Cllr Weaver made a statement, in which he provided an overview of the Corporate Plan and Budget Proposals.

Ian Allwood provided a presentation, which included details of the savings and other financial measures required to meet the expected shortfall in the Council's revenue and the impact of inflation on the Council's spending.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

Members referred to Section 114 notices what Cardiff's situation was in relation to these. Members asked about the resilience of the budget and the robustness of the financial strategy, particularly in terms of protecting services. Officers noted there had been no Section 114 Notices served in Wales and there was a specific section in the Cabinet report where the robustness of the strategy was set out. Members were aware it had been a really difficult challenge but Cardiff was in a position where a number of non-statutory services for children had been protected. This year it was proposed that there would be no savings to the Youth Services and in Children's Services there were a number of early years interventions. It was believed there was a resilience in the budget proposals.

Members also sought reassurance that the teacher's NJC pay awards over the last two years had been covered in full and that this would continue for future awards. Reassurances were also requested with regard to the pay awards for non-teaching and support staff and the uncertainty surrounding the funding of the increased costs

associated with the teachers' pension scheme and the significant implications should this not be fully covered.

Members asked about the extent of collaboration in the provision of services across the region currently and in the future and the relationship between this and the potential for making efficiency savings that could then be devoted to the delivery of front-line services. Officers responded that collaboration between authorities was important and was supported where it worked. Members were advised that that was a saving in the proposal around the directorate wide review of the service model.

Members asked about central funding available for in year challenges. Officers responded that that there was no more central funding available for in year. The delegated schools budget had been set making no savings. Officers referred to the fact that the Welsh Government had changed the number grants this year from 22 to 4 and the distribution method had changed. There was a need for some flexibility to be able to support if any individual school had a challenge there. It was also to support some of the initiatives that schools would be taking to drive out inefficiencies. Members were advised that last year despite a lot of work carried out to try and ensure a balanced budget a number of deficit budgets were approved. .

Members asked a number of questions seeking clarity around school budgets - both deficits and surpluses. Concerns were expressed around a potential £10m deficit, and how the Council was responding to, and supporting schools. Officers stated that there needed to be a conversation between finance and education on this issue, particularly around ALN.

Members discussed the key pressures facing local authorities – Adult Social Services, Children's Services, Temporary Accommodation and School Transport which had been driven up by a substantial uptake in demand in recent years and how these would impact on the delivery of non-statutory services. Officers noted that the overall driver was pay, but when there were increases they had to be met. Officers referred Members to the Appendix1 in MTFP report. There was a range that officers calculated to assess the risk with each of the factors having their own modelling in their own rights – (funding, demographic assumptions, price of pay) and built on robust estimates. Officers referred to the fact that it was not just demand that was a factor but price inflation as well with Out of County Placements, Children's Social Care Placements going up year on year. Officers stated that stated that detailed questions on this issue would be welcomed during the year.

Members also discussed the nature of any dialogue between Welsh Government and the Council given the predicted budget gap of £142.3 million over the next three years and the risk this posed to the delivery of services in the short and medium terms

Children's Services:

The Chair welcomed Cllr Ash Lister, Cabinet Member for Social Services, Children's; Sarah McGill, Corporate Director, People and Communities and Director of Social Services; and Deborah Driffield, Director of Children's Services, to the meeting.

Cllr Lister made a statement in which he outlined some of the budget proposals for the coming year. The Children's Services net budget being £99,201m with a net budget increase of £10,751m (12%). The Cabinet Member outlined some of the interventions which were starting to reach fruition including building the accommodation strategy building, addressing placement issues and pointed out that although there was a plateau of children looked after there was still a need to address the complexities. He referred to the positives of reducing the number of agency staff resulting in a more secure workforce. Members noted that the Corporate Plan covered many issues the committee was aware of and had been doing for some time but it was about embedding them to ensure the best outcomes for children and young people, shifting the balance work, work in early help (family advice service) and recognising challenge in performance.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

The Director of Children's Services noted that although it had been a challenging year some progress had been made in terms of areas where the service was under the most pressure – placements and the workforce. Members were informed that the previous year had seen a significant increase in the number of unregistered placements (14) but as of today there was only one. The downward trend could be seen in terms of cost but also in placements.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

Members asked in relation to the 15 existing KPIs how many had been met this year. The Cabinet Member responded that there were 6 green, 2 amber and 2 red.

Members referred to the huge demand on Children's Services and the reasons for that demand. The Cabinet Member referred to the scale of challenge that children and young people were facing when they came in contact with Children's Services which added significant pressures. Reference was also made to the amount of work and intervention to support that child to remain safe in their home or if they become looked after how the Authority met their needs in a placement.

The Director of Children's Services highlighted that poverty and austerity played a large part in a parent's ability to support their children at home. The increasing impact of poor mental health, substance misuse and a significant increase in domestic abuse amongst parents was also factor. Members were advised that the impact of poor mental health on children and young people across all the age ranges led to pressures on services, schools and children's services. Other factor included the increase in the numbers of children with neuro diversity and how they were not able to access mainstream services and the impact on Children's Services. She also referred to the increase in numbers of children surviving birth having complex mental health needs. As these children got older it was challenging to find services that were appropriate to meet their needs.

Members asked about the restructuring in the Youth Justice Service – achievability and risk analysis red/amber. Members asked if it could meet demand. Officers advised that there were a number of proposals regarding the restructuring of the

Youth Justice System to improve the service. Members were informed there had been some difficulty attracting staff and so part of the restructure was looking at other qualifications to bring the service in line with other services.

Members asked, in context of budget uplifts, and efficiency savings of £2m plus, in Children's Services, if there were sufficient resources need to meet the priorities in the Corporate Plan. Officers referred to positive factors such as the plateauing of placements and the increase of in-house provision, and the large cohort of social workers trained through the Council which meant that the Service was more sustainable than it had been in previous years.

Members referred to Appendix 5b - Children's Services placement breakdowns - which had a risk analysis of red/amber and asked what the risks were and how they were being overcome. Officers responded that plans were in place to bring the Interventions Service with the Residential Service under one roof with children spending as short a time as possible in residential care and then carrying out a robust assessment. A post was being set up to implement this model but there had been a slight delay in filling it. Members were reassured that the risk analysis would be overcome once that person was in post. In terms of the number of employees 250 being in the negative as it was a spend to save option with savings further down the line.

Members referred to Appendix 5a – Directorate Efficiency Saving Proposals 2024/25 and asked for clarification around the Business Support Restructure. Officers responded that the rationale was around trying to recruit a skilled workforce that felt part of Children's Services as a lot of the business support in Children's Services was of a lower grade than others in the council. Members also asked for detail around the Children's Services Strategy: Place – Operations without Registration in Appendix 5a. Officers responded that it was red/amber as half had been completed but it was not a straightforward green as it was a regional service.

Members asked how far out of the local authority were external placements and if they would reduce as the locality approach was continued to be implemented and in addition what was being done to reduce external placements. Officers responded that there was a 20-mile radius which meant that the children/young people were still able to go to their school and keep in touch with their friends. The Accommodation Strategy was in place to reduce placements.

Members asked about the progress of the service review in the Family Advice Service. Officers responded that a service area alignment review had commenced; that an external company undertook a review (which revealed that clients were being referred to the MASH, rather than early help); and there were plans for a triage system. There was also a suggestion that bringing those two services together could improve preventative services and offer potential efficiency savings, and that some detail of this could be brought back to this scrutiny committee.

Members discussed how Welsh Government Policy such as the Radical Reform Agenda and the National Outcomes Framework affected the service. The Cabinet Member responded that the element of removing profit was affecting the service. He noted that legislation was due in a couple of weeks and discussions would be taking place with providers. He had been involved in two of the Practice Matters weeks,

developing practices and trying to improve the level of service and offer to children and young people.

Education and Lifelong Learning:

The Chair welcomed Cllr Sarah Merry, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education; Melanie Godfrey, Director of Education and Lifelong Learning; Richard Portas, Programme Director, Schools Organisation Planning; Suzanne Scarlett, Operational Manager – Partnerships & Performance, Education & Lifelong Learning, and Jennie Hughes, Senior Achievement Leader, Inclusion Services, Education & Lifelong Learning:

Cllr Merry made a statement, in which she referred to the themes contained within the Corporate Plan, including Cardiff becoming a Child Friendly City, supporting education recovery post pandemic and continuing to deliver the Cardiff 2030 vision for education and learning; and the additional funding of going into the delegated schools budgets.

Mel Godfrey stated that, what may not have been captured in Corporate Plan was consultation with schools – set up efficiency boards with Secondary Schools, soon Primary and then Special schools – how we can make the system more efficient, distribution for grants. WG now via route all grants through LA not central south.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

Members asked about the Review of the Central South Education Consortium and the fact that the analysis said red/amber. Officers responded that the detail was still to be confirmed.

Members asked about the deletion of two vacant Assistant Educational Psychologist posts. (Appendix 6a) Officers responded that the rationale for deleting these posts was that they were long standing posts that were named on the system, but the structure had moved on and that there was a full complement, and no reduction in service. The Director suggested that she would provide feedback to the Committee to clarify the position on this proposal. Members also asked in relation to the deletion of a post in School Admissions and the reason for the deletion. Officers advised that this was to reflect the move to a more digitalised process and was not a people need.

Also contained in Appendix 6a Members referred the School Catering Service – review of Service to be undertaken to seek efficiencies within the operating model. Members asked if this would affect the health and wellbeing in schools as the risk analysis was red/amber. Officers responded that the review was in relation to a better operating model. It was not envisaged that any children would be affected by the changes.

In relation to the Capital Programme Members asked if there were any challenges in the figures that were not anticipated or if officers were confident the current plans on track. Officers responded that there were challenges in relation to Education Assets and Estates but these were being prioritised and on track.

Members asked about the reduction of grants and how these affected the delivery of priorities. Officers responded that the concerns were more in relation to distribution as the process had been changed. Officers also referred to the fact that they had not been provided with the comparator in terms of adding up the grants.

Members asked a number of questions in relation to the funding of ALN, including seeking assurances that interim funding was available and on the Council's radar; whether ALN additional funding had been clearly communicated; what support was being offered in understanding and when schools could approach the Council for financial assistance. Officers responded that the expectation for schools was to balance their budgets but if necessary, they could approach the Council for an increased deficit budget. In terms of support and also specifically on the ALN funding Members were informed that it had been capped this year, but a piece of work was being undertaken to address the funding approach moving forwards. Members also asked about the overlap between ALN, with Children's Services and School Transport.

Clarity was sought on the numbers of those children who had Individual Development Plans and Members noted that 8% of the current school population had them, which had a knock-on effect in terms of demand and need for provision for complex needs. Members sought assurances in this area and requested that further information be provided.

Members asked about alternative funding for sports facilities. Members were advised that planning permission was being sought for 3D pitches. The Authority was working with individual schools and conversations were taking place with the FAW and WRU to align planning application processes. It was noted that the cost of 3D pitches was very expensive currently and alternative methods of funding was being investigated, perhaps through club subs. There were also links with the Move More Eat Well campaign too.

Members asked whether there were funds in place to shrink the radius from schools (currently 3 miles for Secondary schools and 2 miles for Primary schools) – both in the short time and into the longer term. The Head of Finance stated that he could provide further information on this issue.

Members asked for the number of single sex toilets in schools and whether there had been any issues in schools in relation to this. The Director of SOP responded that he had not had any issues brought to his attention but could find more information/ further clarity on this.

Supporting Young People:

The Chair welcomed Cllr Peter Bradbury, Cabinet Member for Tackling Poverty and Supporting Young People; and Melanie Godfrey, Director, Education and Lifelong Learning

Cllr Bradbury made a statement, in which he outlined the key commitments in the Corporate Plan. He referred to the fact that this year the Service had done well to protect the budget allowing it to rely on the locality model and extending the provision to 52 weeks of the year and strengthening local collaboration.

Members were invited to ask questions and make comments; the discussion is summarised as follows:

Members referred to the £2m allocated for capital investments and hubs. Officers advised that the £2m was for community hubs for the area and not just the city centre youth hub proposal.

Members asked if areas without community councils would be disadvantaged in respect of youth services and areas with community councils would have to pay. Officers advised that areas without community councils would not be disadvantaged. Officers were looking at resources in the youth services across providers in the individual localities. A report on Youth Action Groups to Cabinet in 2023 was referred to and the fact that there were opportunities to extend and partner with new organisations to support youth-based street work to tackle anti-social behaviour.

Members discussed the importance of sustainable youth services and not just offering activities to young people in their areas but also having a community cohesion role, providing mental health and wellbeing support and tackling criminal exploitation.

RESOLVED:

That the Chairperson writes to the Cabinet Member on behalf of the Committee expressing their comments and observations captured during the way forward.

54 : URGENT ITEMS (IF ANY)

None.

55 : WAY FORWARD

Members discussed the information received and identified a number of issues which the Chairman agreed would be included in the letters that would be sent, on behalf of the Committee, to the relevant Cabinet Members and Officers.

56 : DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next Committee meeting is Tuesday 12 March 2024 at 4.30 pm

The meeting terminated at 8.45 pm