

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 8 December 2021	Meeting Name: Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport
Report title:		Determination of Objections – Dulwich Streetspace Review	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Dulwich Village, Goose Green, Champion Hill, Dulwich Hill, Dulwich Wood wards	
From:		Head of Highways	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport:
 - i. Considers the 2095 valid representations regarding Dulwich Streetspace scheme, as summarised in Table 1, received during statutory consultation.
 - ii. Considers the officer's response to the grounds for objections received in relation to '*TMO2122-015_DS Calton Avenue area*' as set out in Table 2, and Appendix A and rejects the grounds for objections.
 - iii. Consider the officer's response to the grounds for objections received in relation to '*TMO2122-16_DS Champion Hill*' as set out in Table 3, and Appendix A and rejects the grounds for objections.
 - iv. Considers the officer's response to the grounds for objections received in relation to '*TMO2122- 017_DS East Dulwich area*' as set out in Table 4, and Appendix A and rejects the grounds for objections.
 - v. Considers the officer's response to the grounds for objections received in relation to '*TMO2122-18_DS Melbourne Grove South*' as set out in Table 5, and Appendix A and accepts those grounds for objections as recommended by officers and rejects those grounds for objections as recommended by officers, and instructs officers not to proceed with the revised proposal for Melbourne Grove (South). Notes that a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) to retain the Melbourne Grove South closure as an any time motor vehicle prohibition order, located south of the junction with Tell Grove, will be implemented under delegated powers and a decision about the permanency of these measures will be brought to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport to determine in due course if so required.
 - vi. Considers the officer's response to the grounds for objections received in relation to '*TMO2122-19_DS bus, cycle and taxi routes*' as set out in Table 6, and Appendix A and rejects the grounds for objections.
 - vii. Instruct officers to write to each person who made representations to inform them of the council's decision.
 - viii. Instruct officers to make the necessary Traffic Management Order(s).

- ix. Instructs officers to review the Dulwich Streetspace measures in six to nine months after implementation and to advise the relevant Cabinet Member on whether the measures should be amended in consideration of the monitoring and consultation results.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Following an experimental trial of the Dulwich Streetspace measures via experimental traffic orders¹ a decision was taken by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport on 1 October 2021 to proceed with the implementation of the revised Dulwich Streetspace scheme.
3. This decision was subject to the necessary statutory requirements for the making of orders. In accordance with this the council advertised its notification of intention to make traffic orders in respect of the implementation of the revised Dulwich Streetspace measures on 21 October 2021.
4. The statutory consultation period ran for 21 days from 21 October 2021 until 11 November 2021.
5. Notice was given regarding the statutory consultation in the London Gazette, local press (Southwark News), an area-wide newsletter, an email mail out to those who subscribed at consultation and street notices were placed in the affected area.
6. Notice was given to statutory and non-statutory consultees on 25 October 2021.
7. Full details of the proposal were also made available for inspection on the council's website or in person by appointment at 160 Tooley Street.
8. All draft traffic orders that were advertised with the notice of intention in regards to the Dulwich Streetspace scheme can be found at Appendix B.
9. This report makes recommendations for the determination of a number of objections that relate to the draft traffic orders for the Dulwich Streetspace scheme proposal.
10. Part 3D, paragraph 23 of the Southwark Constitution sets out that determination of objections to traffic orders is the responsibility of the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport.
11. A total of 2095 valid representations were received through the following ways:
 - 65% email
 - 35% online form
12. A total of 273² representations were deemed invalid as they did not comply with the following criteria as set out in regulation 8 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ("1996 Regulations"):

¹ www.southwark.gov.uk/dulwichstreetspacereview

² These 273 invalid representations includes 123 duplicates, 150 N/A as either did not state grounds of objections or was in reference to other schemes such as Melbourne Grove North or Grove Vale experimental traffic orders.

- be made in writing
 - state the grounds on which it is made
 - be sent to the address specified in the notice of proposals
13. The number and type of representations made are set out in Table 1. The grounds for objection provided are summarised in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (respective of the relevant draft traffic order). Officer's response to the grounds for objections can be found in Appendix A.
14. A separate proposal for the Dulwich Streetspace measure on Melbourne Grove North will be tabled to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport for determination to retain the current measure as a TTRO to undertake further monitoring and engagement.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

15. The Dulwich Village, East Dulwich and Champion Hill area experienced high-levels of through-traffic particularly at peak hours with 1000s of school children commuting to schools in the area. With high-car ownership rates the Dulwich Streetspace area also has high modal shift potential of reducing car use particularly for short journeys and enabling active travel by creating a network of safe walking and cycling routes. Cycleway 17 a key strategic cycle route that is routed through the area where concerns were previously raised with levels of traffic and safety for cyclists.
16. TABLE 1 – Type and number of valid representations by traffic order

Street	Support	Object	Total
TMO2122-015_DS Calton Avenue area	230	510	740
TMO2122-16_DS Champion Hill	54	162	216
TMO2122- 017_DS East Dulwich area	73	222	295
TMO2122-18_DS Melbourne Grove south	16	354	370
TMO2122-19_DS bus, cycle and taxi routes	62	412	474

17. A total of 68 comments were received, these did not state an objection or support for a scheme/TMO reference.
18. A number of objections did not specify a TMO reference but made clear the scheme their objection was in reference to. These have also been included in the above table.
19. Majority of representations consisted of individuals objecting to different TMO references, this is also true for representations in support.
20. Local representative and campaign groups submitted representation responses which individuals also made reference to in their own representations.
21. The grounds for objections are listed in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. It should be noted when referring to Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that many objections included more than

one ground of objection.

22. The top recurring grounds for objections across all draft traffic orders were:

- Increased journey times for motor vehicles
- Discriminates against the elderly, disabled, pregnancy and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
- Exemptions are not inclusive enough
- Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
- Negative impact on bus journey times
- Flawed consultation
- Negative impact on local businesses

23. A total of 435 representations were received in support of the Dulwich Streetspace measures (support and wholly support).

24. All representations and comments are available on file for the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport to review. A redacted version will be publically available when the report and appendices are made available.

25. Each piece of written correspondence received during statutory consultation was responded to with an acknowledgement email.

TABLE 2 – ‘TMO2122-015_DS Calton Avenue area’ - Grounds for objection

Ref	Grounds for objection
CA1	Concerns for emergency services access
CA2	Increased journey times for motor vehicles
CA3	Discriminates against the elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
CA4	Exemptions are not inclusive enough
CA5	Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
CA6	Negative impact on bus journey times
CA7	Flawed consultation
CA8	Undemocratic
CA9	Unequal – impact on less affluent areas/other schools
CA10	Negative impact on local businesses
CA11	Safety concerns; speeding, absence of natural surveillance from traffic (impact on women), driver confusion
CA12	Misinformation/flawed data
Recommendation	Consider officer’s response outlined in Appendix A and reject the grounds for objections. The grounds for objections will continue to be monitored.

TABLE 3 – ‘TMO2122-16_DS Champion Hill - Grounds for objection

Ref	Grounds for objection
CH1	Increased journey times for motor vehicles
CH2	Discriminates against the elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
CH3	Exemptions are not inclusive enough
CH4	Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
CH5	Negative impact on bus journey times
CH6	Flawed consultation
CH7	Unequal – impact on less affluent areas/other schools
CH8	Negative impact on local businesses
CH9	Safety concerns; for children on journey to school
CH10	Misinformation/flawed data
Recommendation	Consider officer’s response outlined in Appendix A and reject the grounds for objections. The grounds for objections will continue to be monitored.

TABLE 4 – ‘TMO2122- 017_DS East Dulwich area’ - Grounds for objection

Ref	Grounds for objection
ED1	Concerns for emergency services access
ED2	Increased journey times for motor vehicles
ED3	Discriminates against the elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
ED4	Exemptions are not inclusive enough
ED5	Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
ED6	Negative impact on bus journey times
ED7	Flawed consultation
ED8	Undemocratic
ED9	Unequal – impact on less affluent areas/other schools
ED10	Negative impact on local businesses
ED11	Misinformation/flawed data
Summary of officer response	Consider officer’s response outlined in Appendix A and reject the grounds for objections. The grounds for objections will continue to be monitored.

TABLE 5 – TMO2122-18_DS Melbourne Grove south - Grounds for objection

Ref	Grounds for objection
MGS1	Concerns for emergency services access
MGS2	Increased journey times for motor vehicles
MGS3	Discriminates against the elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
MGS4	Exemptions are not inclusive enough
MGS5	Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
MGS6	Negative impact on bus journey times
MGS7	Flawed consultation
MGS8	Undemocratic
MGS9	Unequal – impact on less affluent areas/other schools
MGS10	Negative impact on local businesses
MGS11	Misinformation/flawed data
MGS12	Against Streetspace/Council objectives
MGS13	Does not improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists
Recommendations	Consider officer’s response outlined in Appendix A and accept MGS12 and MGS13 grounds for objections only. September 2021 monitoring data is indicating the Melbourne Grove South traffic filter may be contributing to traffic reduction of cars on East Dulwich Grove Central, this trend requires further monitoring. Amending this traffic filter may result in an increase of cars on East Dulwich Grove Central which would be contrary to the Movement Plan 2019 aims and Council policy.

TABLE 6 – ‘TMO2122-19_DS bus, cycle and taxi routes’ - Grounds for objection

Ref	Grounds for objection
DV1	Increased journey times for motor vehicles
DV2	Discriminates against the elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
DV3	Exemptions are not inclusive enough
DV4	Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
DV5	Negative impact on bus journey times
DV6	Flawed consultation
DV7	Unequal – impact on less affluent areas/other schools
DV8	Negative impact on local businesses
DV9	Misinformation/flawed data
DV10	Reduced hours compromise safety for cyclists, pedestrians and school pupils
Recommendations	Consider officer’s response outlined in Appendix A and reject the grounds for objections. The grounds for objections will continue to be monitored.

26. In summary, although the Council received a significant number of objections to the measures, the recent monitoring data for September 2021 shows the boundary roads for the Dulwich Streetspace scheme are seeing continual reductions in traffic volumes. In contrast, traffic volumes are returning to pre-pandemic levels

overall in the borough as Covid-19 restrictions are eased. Additionally, monitoring of cycling volumes across the Dulwich Streetspace area continues to show positive increases. The evidence shows that the Dulwich Streetspace measures are achieving their objectives so the schemes should be continued to ensure these trends can be further monitored and developed. A review of the scheme in 2022 and air quality modelling in Spring 2022 will highlight if any further amendments are required, and the grounds for objections highlighted in Table 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will be reviewed at this time.

27. The recommendations detailed in paragraph 1(vi) and Table 5 will be subject to further monitoring to ascertain impact on the surrounding road network, including streets such as Townley Road. Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding specific scheme impact at this location which we will continue to investigate mitigation options if traffic data necessitates this.
28. The detailed officer's response to the grounds for objection can be found in Appendix A.
29. Officers are satisfied that the proposals do not trigger the need for a public inquiry pursuant to regulation 9 of the 1996 Regulations. All closures within the Dulwich Streetspace proposals use point closures and alternative motor vehicle access points are available at any time, if this is not the case exemptions are provided.

Conclusions

30. During the statutory consultation, we received 2091 valid representations. These are summarised as:
 - TMO2122-015_DS Calton Avenue area: Object – 510/ Support - 230
 - TMO2122-16_DS Champion Hill: Object – 162/ Support - 54
 - TMO2122- 017_DS East Dulwich area: Object – 222/ Support - 73
 - TMO2122-18_DS Melbourne Grove south: Object – 354/ Support – 16
 - TMO2122-19_DS bus, cycle and taxi routes: Object – 412/ Support 62
31. A number of grounds for objection re-occurred across the draft traffic orders, the main objection themes were:
 - Increased journey times for motor vehicles
 - Discriminates against elderly/disabled/pregnancy/Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
 - Exemptions are not inclusive enough
 - Increased traffic, pollution and congestion on main roads
 - Negative impact on bus journey times
 - Flawed consultation and data
 - Negative impact on local businesses
32. It is recommended that the grounds for objections received in relation to *TMO2122-015_DS Calton Avenue area, TMO2122-16_DS Champion Hill, TMO2122- 017_DS East Dulwich area, TMO2122-19_DS bus, cycle and taxi routes* are rejected following consideration of officer responses. The grounds for objections will continue to be monitored.
33. However, it is recommended that the MGS12 and MGS13 grounds for objections as found in Table 5 regarding *TMO2122-18_DS Melbourne Grove*

South are accepted and that officers do not proceed with this traffic order. September 2021 monitoring data is indicating the Melbourne Grove South traffic filter may be contributing to traffic reduction of cars on East Dulwich Grove Central, and this trend requires further monitoring. Amending this traffic filter may result in an increase of cars on East Dulwich Grove Central which would be contrary to the Movement Plan 2019 aims and Council policy.

34. Under officer delegated power a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order will be implemented to retain the Melbourne Grove South closure as an any time motor vehicle prohibition order, located south of the junction with Tell Grove. A decision-making report will be brought to Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport to determine the permanency of this Dulwich Streetspace measure if so required.

Policy implications

35. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the missions of the Movement Plan 2019, particularly:
 - M2 Action 1 - Reduce noise pollution
 - M2 Action 2 - Create simple and clear streets
 - M2 Action 3 - Create things to see and do in our streets
 - M3 Action 4 - Deliver infrastructure to support active travel
 - M4 Action 7 - Reduce the number of cars owned in the borough
 - M4 Action 8 - Use kerbside efficiently and promote less polluting vehicles
 - M4 Action 9 - Manage traffic to reduce the demand on our streets
 - M5 Action 11 - Introduce time restricted street closures and reallocate space for people

Community impact statement

36. The policies within the Movement Plan are upheld within this report and have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
37. An initial Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken during the Dulwich Streetspace experimental measures. Following the outcome of the Dulwich Streetspace informal consultation, meetings with protected characteristic groups and monitoring data, this Equality Impact Assessment was updated to outline the impact on specific protected groups and made recommendations to mitigate any negative impact. These negative impacts were considered when devising the revised Dulwich Streetspace proposal decided upon on 1 October 2021.
38. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest effect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.
39. The implementation of the revised Dulwich Streetspace measures will benefit the local community providing safe walking and cycling routes across the area that enable active travel, reduce pollution and deter through-traffic movements particularly at school peak hours.
40. There is a risk that the Dulwich Streetspace measures may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and additional funding. However this cannot be entirely pre-empted

until the recommendations have been implemented and monitored.

41. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.

Climate implications

42. There is no additional impact in regards to climate impact with consideration to the recommendations in this report.
43. The decision taken on 1 October 2021 with regards to the Dulwich Streetspace scheme considered the proposed measures impact on climate change. The measures support the aims of the council's Climate Change Strategy under Priority 2 – Active and Sustainable Travel. Key aims of the council's Climate Change Strategy include to 'reduce car journeys to a minimum by 2030' and to 'be a borough where the walking and cycling becomes the default way to get around'. Part of meeting the borough's ambition of net zero emissions by 2030 includes a reduction in vehicle km's travelled and a shift to active and public transport; road transport currently accounts for 15% of the borough's emissions. These measure strongly support that ambition.
44. The data provided indicates a positive shift towards active travel modes during the trial period. Data should continue to be collected to inform the ongoing development of the scheme. As permanent measures are considered the use of additional planting, sustainable urban drainage or rain gardens on the highway is further in line with the Climate Change Strategy's Priority 3 – Thriving Natural Environment which include actions to 'create greener streets'.
45. A just and inclusive transition is at the heart of the council's emerging climate policy. These proposals prioritise the movement of people first and foremost, while retaining vehicle access for those who require it. In delivering a safer and more equitable highway network, the measures are in accordance with the council's approach to addressing the climate emergency.

Equalities (including socio-economic) impact statement

46. The data currently shows that the measures are having a positive effect by reducing traffic and providing safer walking environments. These improving conditions support a number of protected characteristic groups.
47. The Centre for Accessible Environments (CAE) has produced an addendum to its Equality Impact Final Assessment (dated 5 September 2021) following the outcome of the statutory consultation and their comments are summarised at Appendix C (page 8). Officers are satisfied that there are no additional impacts in regards to equalities (including socio-economic) impacts with in light of the recommendations in this report, save for the recommendation by CAE that the groups who are car dependent because of their protected characteristic should be assisted by the Council to mitigate any disadvantages they may suffer. Officers are cognisant of these groups, however on balance the benefits of the Dulwich Streetspace schemes outweigh the harm that these may cause.
48. The Council will continue to monitor and engage on the impacts of these measures to understand how it may better assist these groups to mitigate any disadvantages

by undertaking an equality impact analysis review in 6 to 12 months.

49. The proposals are not considered to have any significant adverse effect on socio-economic equalities. There has been various feedback from local businesses about the effect of loss of passing traffic and vehicular access to shops. However, this would potentially be offset by increased cycle traffic and pedestrian footfall. There is currently no quantitative data to support the reported feedback.

Health impact statement

50. There is no additional impact in regards to health impact with consideration to the recommendations in this report.
51. The proposals support the council's mission to have zero people killed or injured on our streets by 2041 by introducing traffic reduction measures.
52. The air quality monitoring and modelling results have indicated that in isolated sections of some roads within the Dulwich area there has been an increase in pollutant levels. These areas will continue to be monitored and investigations and analysis undertaken to determine potential mitigation measures.
53. For other roads, particularly those where modal filters have been installed, there has been a quantifiable reduction in pollutant levels. Overall across the full Dulwich area there has been a reduction in the total number of vehicle movements. The Dulwich Streetspace proposals will further support the trend towards reduced overall vehicle movements.

Resource implications

54. The capital cost of works is approximately £750,000 which includes design, construction and project management costs. This expenditure will be funded by parking revenue funding.
55. There are no resource implications associated with the recommendations contained within this report that have not been previously agreed.
56. This report is to determine statutory objections made in relation to a proposed traffic order.

Consultation

57. Statutory consultation has been carried out as detailed in paragraphs 3 to 12 of this report.
58. An informal consultation was carried out for 9 weeks from May to July 2021. 7,333 responses were received regarding this consultation.
59. Overall, respondents to the informal consultation were supportive of the aims of the scheme as listed under 'Streets for People'. However the majority of respondents, both within and outside the consultation zone, did not feel that the schemes were achieving these aims. In regards to the individual scheme elements, the majority of respondents opted for the response that preferred to 'return the measures to the original state'.

60. On 1 October 2021 a decision was taken in consideration of the informal consultation responses but also the monitoring data which evidenced traffic reduction and a significant increase in cycling. This modal shift is supported by the informal consultation responses which showed a shift from car use to walking and cycling.

Programme timeline

Notice of making – January 2022

Implementation – Early 2022

Monitoring – January to December 2022

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Law and Democracy (AGG/11/21)

61. Experimental Traffic Management Orders (“ETOs”) were made in June 2020 under section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“1984 Act”) and have been in operation for 17 months. The Council now wishes to make the ETOs permanent in accordance with the statutory procedures set out in the 1996 Regulations and the powers contained within the 1984 Act. Before permanent orders can be made the 1996 Regulations require the Council to publicly notify its intention to make the orders and carry out consultation where representations may be made over a 21 day period. The notification and consultation requirements have been carried out as set out in the Background Information section of this report.
62. The Council is required to consider all objections duly made under regulation 8 of the 1996 Regulations before making an order. The Appendices to this report summarise the valid objections, and set out the officer response to the objections for determination by the Cabinet Member.
63. The proposed orders do not meet the requirements as set out in regulation 9 of the 1996 Regulations which would cause the Council to hold a public inquiry.
64. The Equality Act 2010 introduced the public sector equality duty, which merged existing race, sex and disability equality duties and extended them to include other protected characteristics; namely age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief and sex and sexual orientation, including marriage and civil partnership. In summary those subject to the equality duty, which includes the Council, must in the exercise of their functions: (i) have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and (ii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Paragraphs [37, 47 and 57 - 60] of the report detail the engagement which has taken place thus far to comply with the public sector equality duty.
65. The Human Rights Act 1998 imposed a duty on the Council as a public authority to apply the European Convention on Human Rights; as a result the Council must not act in a way which is incompatible with these rights. The most important rights for highway and planning purposes are Article 8 (respect for homes); Article 6

(natural justice) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (peaceful enjoyment of property). The implementation of these proposals is not anticipated to breach any of the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

66. Council Assembly on 14 July 2021 approved a change to the Council's constitution to confirm that all decisions made by the Council will consider the climate and equality (including socio-economic disadvantage and health inequality) consequences of taking that decision. This has been considered in the report at paragraphs [42] to [53] above.
67. Should the Cabinet Member be satisfied with the contents of this report then they have the power to make the decisions recommended at paragraph 1 of this report by virtue of Part 3D paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Council's Constitution.

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (EL19/056)

68. The strategic director of finance and governance notes the recommendations in this report to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport to consider the valid representations and officers responses as detailed in paragraph 1 of this report, pertaining to the Dulwich Streetspace Scheme.
69. The strategic director of finance and governance notes that the estimated costs associated with these recommendations is £750k and there is sufficient earmarked funding from existing Highways capital and revenue budgets to fund these proposals.
70. Staffing and any other costs connected with these recommendations to be contained within existing departmental revenue and capital budgets.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Dulwich Streetspace Decision report and appendices	https://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/mgjs/issueHistoryHome.aspx?IId=50027352&Opt=0	Rachel Gates 07704295743
Movement Plan 2019	Southwark Council Transport Policy 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: https://www.southwark.gov.uk/transport-and-roads/transport-policy	Sally Crew 07908775820
Climate Change Strategy, 2020	https://www.southwark.gov.uk/environment/climate-emergency	Tom Sharland

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	Officer's response to Dulwich Streetspace objection themes
Appendix B	Summary of Dulwich Streetspace draft traffic orders
Appendix C	Centre for Accessible Environment Final EQIA Addendum (page 8)

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Head of Highways – Dale Foden	
Report Author	Project Manager – Rachel Gates Principal Project Manager – Clement Agyei-Frempong	
Version	Final	
Dated	2 nd December 2021	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Strategic Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
Climate Emergency Team	Yes	Yes
Public Health Team	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Member	Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team/Community Council/Scrutiny Team	3 December 2021	