

Report for:
DECISION
Item Number:

Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No
Title	Options for the review of the Mattock Lane Public Spaces Protection Order
Responsible Officer(s)	Nicky Fiedler (Strategic Director, Housing & Environment)
Author(s)	Paul Murphy (Head of Community Safety)
Portfolio(s)	Tackling Inequalities
For Consideration By	Cabinet
Date to be Considered	8 th November 2023
Implementation Date if Not Called In	20 th November 2023
Affected Wards	Walpole (wider impact)
Keywords/Index	Protest, Vigil, Sexual, Health, Intimidation, Harassment, Anti-Social, behaviour, ASB, Women, Clinic, Mattock, Space, Protection, Order, Review, Consultation, Variation, PSPO, Safe Zone.

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to invite members to review and consider the impact and effectiveness of the Mattock Lane Safe Zone Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) and to determine whether the Council should commence a further consultation on a potential renewal and / or variation of the order.

Key points for action and decision:

- Review and consider the impact and effectiveness of the current PSPO.
- Consider the statutory framework for extending / varying a PSPO.
- Decide whether the Council will consult to extend or vary the PSPO (or take other action).

1. Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Considers the impact and effect of the Mattock Lane PSPO on the behaviours targeted as set out in this report;
2. Authorises the Strategic Director of Housing and Environment to undertake a consultation on the renewal or variation of the Mattock Lane PSPO

2. Reason for Recommendation

2.1 The Mattock Lane Safe Zone Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) was introduced in April 2018 in response to activities in the locality of the *MS/ Reproductive Choices* (formerly *Marie Stopes*) clinic ('the Clinic') on Mattock Lane that were found to be having a detrimental impact on those visiting and using the Clinic, Clinic staff and others living in and passing through the area. Cabinet introduced the order having considered extensive documentary, testimonial and direct evidence of the harm caused predominantly by Pro-Life represented groups in the locality of the Clinic and following consultation with Ealing residents and statutory and non-statutory partners. A copy of the April 2018 Cabinet report and order made can be found at **Appendix 1**.

2.2 The order was introduced for a period of three years (this being the maximum period a PSPO can be made for in accordance with the *Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act (2014)*). In November 2020, Cabinet took the decision to begin consultation on the future of the order (which would have lapsed in April 2021 if no action was taken). In February 2021 the decision was taken by Cabinet to renew the order in its full terms for a further three years. This means the order will expire in April 2024 if no action is taken.

2.3 Since the introduction of the PSPO in April 2018, the order has been successful in reducing to almost nil the number incidents of Clinic service users, Clinic staff and others in the locality being interfered with, intimidated or harassed by individuals or groups expressing views on abortion services. Until the implementation of the order, instances of this behaviour had been occurring on a near daily basis.

2.4 The order has for the most part been complied with and has been successful in tackling the objectionable activity it was introduced to address. The introduction of the order has not stopped any of the activities of abortion related protest or prayer themselves from occurring, it has simply prevented them from occurring within the narrowly and clearly defined area of the PSPO.

2.5 The order created a designated area within the footprint of the Safe Zone that makes provision for some limited activities associated with protest of abortion related services but in a way that is designed to minimise the detrimental impact on Clinic service users and others, as well as reducing the identification, targeting

and intimidation of Clinic service users and staff. This designated area continues to be used by the same Pro-Life represented groups on a near daily basis.

- 2.6 Every year during the period of Lent (the six-week lead up to Easter in the Christian calendar), an increased presence of Pro-Life groups has been noted on the threshold of the footprint of the order. Primarily, Pro-Life groups base themselves in the locality of Ealing Green (a map detailing this location can be found at **Appendix 2**).
- 2.7 Since April 2018, some of the individuals or groups who had until that time stationed themselves at the gates of the Clinic, have on occasion instead based themselves outside Ealing civic centre (Perceval House), where they have displayed signs and images expressing a Pro-Life view and objecting to abortion.
- 2.8 The continued regular use of the designated area by Pro-Life groups, the sporadic Pro-Life protests at Perceval House and the presence of Pro-Life groups involved in protest / prayer at the threshold of the PSPO area all indicate a continued focus on the location by the same represented groups who had previously been congregating at the entrance to the Clinic. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that, were the order to expire, these groups will return to the area outside the Clinic and continue in the activities previously engaged in at this location.
- 2.9 Members are asked to consider whether it is appropriate to consult on the extension or variation of the PSPO, in view of the legal framework for consultation, implementation and extension of PSPOs. That legal framework, including the human rights and equalities considerations, is set out in Section 3 of this report. Members are asked to have this framework firmly in mind in reaching their decision.
- 2.10 Members are directed to the evidence base set out in the report to Cabinet in April 2018, links to which can be found in **Appendix 1** of this report. The April 2018 report and appendices set out in full the evidence on which the Council's decision to introduce the PSPO was made, including the responses to the Council's original consultation on the introduction of a PSPO (conducted from 29th January to 26th March 2018).
- 2.11 Included in the Appendices to this report are a copy of the existing PSPO (**Appendix 1**), copies of subsequent court judgements and decisions in respect of this order (**Appendix 3**) and a copy of the comprehensive Equalities Impact Analysis undertaken prior to the Council's decision to introduce the order (**Appendix 4**).
- 2.12 Members are then invited consider the impact and effectiveness of the PSPO in terms of what it set out to achieve and the necessity for the continuation of the order in its current or varied form.

3. Background

- 3.1 On 10th April 2018, Ealing Council's Cabinet voted unanimously to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in response to issues in the locality of the *MSI Reproductive Choices* (then *Marie Stopes*) clinic that were believed to be having a detrimental impact on people in the locality, including those accessing the clinic, clinic staff and residents who live in and pass through the area.
- 3.2 The decision was taken by Cabinet after considering a report on the outcome of an investigation by the Council's community safety team during late 2017 and the outcome of an eight-week consultation conducted during the period January to March 2018, including all of the extensive evidence obtained as a result. The Council was clear its decision was a local solution to a local problem but recognised Ealing's local problem was part of a wider national problem of interference, intimidation and harassment primarily of women taking place in the locality of abortion clinics across the UK.
- 3.3 On 26th April 2018, Ealing Council were notified of an appeal made to the High Court to challenge the Council's decision by individuals employed by and connected to Pro-Life groups.
- 3.4 A directions and full hearing took place in the High Court in May and June 2019 respectively. Judgement was handed down in July 2019. The High Court rejected the appeal and upheld Ealing's PSPO in its full terms. Members are directed to **Appendix 3**, which contains a copy of the High Court judgement.
- 3.5 The appellants further appealed the decision of the High Court to the Court of Appeal and, in January 2019, the Council was informed that the Court of Appeal had granted permission for this appeal to be heard. This appeal hearing took place over two days in July 2019; judgement was handed down on 21st August 2019. The Court of Appeal rejected the appeal and upheld Ealing's PSPO in its full terms. Members are again directed to **Appendix 3**, which contains a copy of the Court of Appeal Judgement.
- 3.6 Following that judgement, the appellants then applied for permission to appeal the court's decision to the Supreme Court. On 11th March 2020, the Council were notified of the decision of the Supreme Court to refuse permission to appeal. A copy of this judgement can be found within **Appendix 3**.
- 3.7 Although the appellants indicated in social media posts, press releases and by word-of-mouth their intent to further appeal the order to the European Court of Human Rights, no direct communication has been received from either the appellants or any court in relation to this.
- 3.8 The Council's decision to introduce the Safe Zone PSPO has been subject to intense challenge and independent scrutiny, and has consistently been upheld in full throughout. Throughout the period April 2018 to present, the order has been under continued review in terms of its effectiveness and necessity.

3.9 With the law providing for a three-year maximum period for PSPOs to be made before they must be reviewed, in 2020 the Council began the process of formerly considering options for the future of the order, and in November 2020 Cabinet decided to undertake formal consultation on the renewal of the order. In Spring 2021, upon considering extensive evidence and feedback from this formal consultation in conjunction with all of the evidence already obtained from the historic investigation and continuous review and monitoring of the order, Cabinet decided to renew the order in its full terms for a period of three years, meaning the PSPO will expire in April 2024 if no action is taken.

4. Evaluation and review of the Safe Zone

4.1 Prior to the introduction of the current PSPO, protests and vigils by individuals and groups representing Pro-Life and Pro-Choice views had been occurring outside the Clinic for over 20 years. The Pro-Life groups involved consisted of members from a variety of networks and organisations, including *The Good Counsel Network*, *The Helpers of God's Precious Infants*, *40 Days For Life*, *Ealing Pro-Life Group* and *The Society of Pius X*. The principle Pro-Choice group involved was *Sister Supporter*.

4.2 During the second half of 2017, the Council's community safety team opened an investigation into the issues reported to be affecting Clinic users, staff and those in the locality of the Clinic. The key activities identified through the investigation and consultation as having a detrimental effect were:

- Women and their partners / friends / relatives being approached by a member or members of the Pro-Life groups when entering the Clinic and attempting to engage women and those with them in conversation or to hand them leaflets.
- Women being approached by members of Pro-Life groups when leaving the clinic, who attempted to engage them in conversation, including making reference to what has happened to their unborn child.
- Women being closely observed entering and leaving the Clinic by a members of the Pro-Life groups.
- Members of Pro-Life groups engaging in prayer outside the Clinic, which was said to be on behalf of the women and / or their unborn children.
- Images of a foetus in stages of development in the form of colour photos being held by members of Pro-Life groups, handed to women or left on the pavement.
- Shouting and other disruptive activities when Pro-Choice counter demonstrations were taking place.
- Women feeling they were being monitored, watched and judged by members of the Pro-Life groups.
- The presence of placards with references to 'murder' and other similar statements.

- 4.3 The evidence obtained through the investigation and consultation demonstrated that, while many of the activities in and of themselves may not have been viewed as objectionable in isolation, the very specific time and place in which these groups were choosing to engage in these activities meant they were targeting women at the precise moment they were accessing health services of a deeply personal nature.
- 4.4 The Council has kept the Mattock Lane PSPO under continuous review as part of its monitoring arrangements. These arrangements include the presence of CCTV at the location, proactive observations of the space by Police and Council officers, engagement with the Clinic and careful examination of any alleged breaches. Such continued and careful examination of the impact and effectiveness of the order has not only formed part of the existing local arrangements for monitoring PSPOs, it has been a key part of the Council's efforts in responding comprehensively to the legal challenges it has faced.
- 4.5 Since the introduction of the order in April 2018, there have only been a small number of alleged breaches of the order the Council is aware of. One alleged breach took place in April 2018, when an individual attended the area outside the Clinic for a brief demonstration about PSPOs and freedom of speech; no action was taken in this instance. A further breach took place in August 2019, when a male was detained by Police after refusing to disperse from the area when asked. The case was ultimately not proceeded with by Police. A third alleged breach of the PSPO occurred in March 2020, when an individual deposited leaflets regarding abortion services at two entrance / exit points of the Clinic. This breach was enforced via service of a Fixed Penalty Notice, which was paid in full within the required time period. A fourth breach of the PSPO took place in 2023 and the individual involved is currently subject to legal proceedings by the Council. There have been no other reported breaches of the PSPO.
- 4.6 As part of the continued review of the PSPO, Council officers have engaged with the Clinic, who have provided feedback on the positive impact the order has had in reducing to almost nil instances of interference, intimidation or harassment of women at the entrance to the Clinic. A diary which had been maintained (contents of which formed part of the original evidence base considered by the Council in reaching its decision to make the Order) historically contained extensive recorded instances of alarm and distress by women using the Clinic caused by the activities of Pro-Life groups at the location; it also contained statements from family members who had reported being adversely affected and upset by the activities outside the Clinic. Following introduction of the PSPO, the Clinic have advised Council officers that these incidents ceased and that it has been unnecessary for them to maintain an incident diary.
- 4.7 Following a review of the order with the Clinic management, they have described an 'air of normality' as now existing at the Clinic; saying this permeates the Clinic

environment in a positive way. The Clinic have described clients presenting as 'less tense' when they arrive at the Clinic.

4.8 As outlined in Section 2 of this report, an important aspect of the Safe Zone PSPO has been the provision of a *designated area* within the geographic footprint of the Order, where the prohibitions and requirements of the PSPO do *not* apply and where activities such as protest relating to abortion service are permitted, albeit with some restrictions. As outlined, this designated area has habitually been used by Pro-Life group members on a continual basis since the introduction of the order. The individuals using this area congregate in small groups, often displaying small signs relating to abortion, offering leaflets to and attempting to engage with (predominantly female) passers-by. While the Council continue to on occasion receive reports from residents and people visiting the area who find the activity distasteful and upsetting, none of these reports have identified any breach of the PSPO taking place and the designated area continues to form an important part of the careful balance the Council has sought to make in balancing the rights of those visiting the Clinic with those of the groups wishing to assemble, protest, impart information and express their religious beliefs. To the best of the Council's knowledge, people attending the designated area have always complied with the restrictions which apply within that area.

4.9 As outlined in the evidence to Cabinet in April 2018 and again in 2020-21, during every Lent period, the Mattock Lane area has had high levels of Pro-Life groups congregating in the designated area and on the very edge of the Order's geographic footprint. These groups often identify with the *40 Days for Life* initiative. During the Lent period of 2020, these congregations took place at the east end of Mattock Lane on the threshold of the PSPO area.

5. Options and consultation process

5.1 Moving into 2024, the Council have two options in relation to the Mattock Lane Safe Zone:

1. Take no action. This will mean the PSPO will come to an end in April 2024.
2. Proceed with consultation on renewal or variation of the existing order. This will require a consultation to be undertaken in line with the process previously undertaken during November 2020 - January 2021.

5.2 Should option 1 be considered appropriate by Cabinet, no further action needs to be taken by members. The PSPO will expire on 10th April 2021, signage will be removed and none of the prohibitions or requirements of the Order will apply to any persons in the locality thereafter, save for by introduction of national powers, further order by the Council or other party or some other action.

5.3 If Cabinet are conclude option 2 is most appropriate, a full consultation will be undertaken. This will involve specific consultation with all groups known to be involved in the activities regulated by the PSPO, as well as with *MSI Reproductive Choices, British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS)*, clinic service users, the Metropolitan Police Service, Integrated Care System (ICS), NHS, Public Health and local faith groups. It will also involve an online survey in line with the public surveys undertaken in 2018 and in 2020-21.

5.4 Following consultation, a further report will be provided to Cabinet (most likely in February 2024), detailing the outcome of the consultation alongside an assessment of the impact and effectiveness of the Order to date and providing advice to Cabinet on the requirement for renewal or variation of the PSPO.

6. Financial implications

6.1 As outlined in previous reports to Cabinet, the original extensive investigation and subsequent consultations, reviews and monitoring have been managed within the existing resources and budget of the community safety team, albeit with the requirement to on occasion realign priorities. Costs of the investigation, consultation, implementation, review, monitoring and enforcement of the PSPO have been met from the community safety approved budget.

6.2 The Council's legal costs (primarily incurred from resisting the appeals) have to date amounted to approximately £0.150m. This does not include officer time in investigating the activities, collating evidence and witness statements, coordinating consultations, analysing the results and preparing reports, legal bundles and representations.

6.3 The cost of the recommended consultation will be managed within the existing resources of the community safety service.

7. Legal framework

7.1 The power for local authorities to draft, implement, vary and extend PSPOs is governed by the *Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act (2014)*. The Act gives councils the authority to implement PSPOs in response to defined issues affecting their communities, provided certain criteria and legal tests are met. PSPOs can be used to prohibit specified activities, and / or to require certain things be done by people engaged in particular activities, within a defined public area.

7.2 Breach of a PSPO without reasonable excuse is a criminal offence. The Police or a person authorised by the Council can issue fixed penalty notices, the amount of which may not be more than £100. A person can also be prosecuted for

breach of a PSPO and on conviction the Magistrates' Court can impose a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (currently £1,000).

7.3A PSPO can be made by a local authority if it satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met. These are found in section 59 of the 2014 Act:

7.4 The first condition is that:

- i) activities carried on in a public place within the Council's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or*
- ii) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.*

The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities:

- i) is or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature,*
- ii) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and*
- iii) justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.*

The PSPO must identify the public place in question and can:

- i) prohibit specified things being done in that public place*
- ii) require specified things to be done by persons carrying on specified activities in that place; or*
- iii) do both of those things.*

7.5 The only prohibitions or requirements that may be imposed are ones that are reasonable to impose in order to prevent or reduce the risk of the detrimental effect continuing, occurring or recurring.

7.6 Prohibitions may apply to all persons, or only to persons in specified categories, or to all persons except those in specified categories.

7.7 The PSPO may specify the times at which it applies and the circumstances in which it applies or does not apply.

7.8 Unless extended the PSPO may not have effect for more than 3 years. There is no statutory requirement to review a PSPO once made, however Ealing has continually reviewed the impact of the Order as part of its on-going monitoring arrangements and in the significant work undertaken to respond to challenges in the High Court and Court of Appeal.

7.9A PSPO can be made for a maximum duration of up to three years, after which it may be extended if certain criteria under Section 60 of the Act are met. For a council to make the decision to extend a PSPO, they must be satisfied that:

- i) *An extension is necessary to prevent activity recurring, or*
- ii) *There has been an increase in frequency or seriousness of the activity*

7.10 Guidance for councils sets out that, where activity having a detrimental effect has been *eradicated* as a result of a PSPO, it is proportionate and appropriate to consider the *likelihood of recurrence of problems* if the Order is not extended.

7.11 If a PSPO is to be extended or varied, the Council is required to undertake a further consultation process. If no action is taken the PSPO will end at the end of the period for which it was made (in the case of Mattock Lane, this would mean the Order expiring in April 2024 if no action is taken).

7.12 Safe access to abortion services has been a topic of wider public debate nationally and internationally. Since Ealing's decision to introduce the Safe Zone PSPO at Mattock Lane, the national picture has shifted significantly. The Home Office position had been that councils' local powers were sufficient to address the issue of intimidation and harassment at abortion clinics: following a review undertaken during 2018, Baroness Williams of Trafford (then Minister of State at the Home Office) then concluded national legislation would 'not be proportionate'. Since that time cross-party support has built around a national solution to the problem. In 2022-23 Stella Creasy MP led on an amendment to the *Public Order Bill* in March 2023. Section 9 of the Public Order Act makes specific provision Safe Access Zones around all sites in England and Wales where abortion services are offered. However, to date this provision, which is now part of an Act of Parliament has not yet been brought into force and there is currently no timetable for the implementation of Safe Access Zones in England and Wales.

7.13 Ealing has had dialogue with the Scottish Government, Government of Northern Ireland and with the Home Office. Officers from Ealing contributed to the Home Office consultation on the issue and have presented to both the Scottish Government and the Government of Northern Ireland on the evidence of harm Ealing uncovered within its investigation, consultation and ongoing monitoring work. Ealing have also provided insight to the Home Office, the Scottish Government and the Government of Northern Ireland on our experience navigating the existing legal framework and devising, implementing, monitoring and enforcing our PSPO.

7.14 Ealing remains clear that, while the Mattock Lane Safe Zone is a local solution to a local problem, there remains a broader national problem in need of a national solution.

8. Risk management

8.1 By introducing the Order and defending numerous legal challenges, the Council has been exposed to financial risk, albeit all of which has to date fallen well within the contingencies originally made in 2018.

8.2 In proceeding with further consultation on the future of the Order, it should be noted that, as with the introduction of any order, any subsequent decision to vary or renew the order can be challenged in the High Court.

8.3 Along with these risks to the Council, the risk of taking no action would itself result in the risk of the return of activities and behaviours extensively evidenced to have caused detrimental effect to people (in particular women) in the locality of the Clinic.

9. Community Safety

9.1 The Council has a duty under the Equality Act 2010 and our commitment to a safer Ealing to protect women, and particularly pregnant women, (both of which are groups with protected characteristics under the 2010 Act), accessing health services. The Council's duties pursuant to the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 are also engaged by the issues evidenced to have been occurring in the locality of the Clinic.

10. Links to Council Priorities

10.1 Protecting women accessing abortion services and ensuring they are protected from fear of intimidation, harassment or distress, links to a number of the Council priorities as set out in the Council Plan, including the Council's commitment to Healthy Lives, Thriving Communities and Tackling Inequality and Crime.

10.2 The Mattock Lane Safe Zone delivers part of Ealing's commitment to improving safety for women and girls in the borough; as evidenced in the 2018 report and in the monitoring and review process, the interference, intimidation and harassment that had been taking place at this location had disproportionately impacted women and girls and affected their ability to access health services in a safe and dignified way. In delivering a compassionate solution to an identified local problem, the Mattock Lane Safe Zone also connects at a broader level with Ealing's commitment to being an open, transparent and inclusive Council that listens to residents and puts residents at the heart of its decision-making.

11. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

11.1 A full Equalities Analysis Assessment and assessment of the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty was completed prior to the introduction of the PSPO and is exhibited at **Appendix 4** of this report. Should Cabinet be minded to proceed with the recommended consultation, an additional Equalities Analysis Assessment will be completed prior to the recommendation from that consultation being sent out to Cabinet in February 2024.

12. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications

12.1 There are no proposed changes to Council staff or workforce within the outlined proposal beyond the staffing commitment from the Council's community safety team, corporate performance team and legal and democratic services, to

collectively coordinate the consultation process, analyse and present the responses to Cabinet.

13. Property and assets

13.1 There are no implications for council property or assets beyond the continued deployment of CCTV and signage at the locality.

14. Any other implications

14.1 There are no implications of the proposals that have not been addressed within the key implications outlined above. However, Cabinet are asked to keep in mind the broader national picture as set out in Section 7 of this report, given the progress of national legislation and potential future implementation of 'Safe Access Zones' across England and Wales. While there remains specific local factors in relation to the problem profile at Mattock Lane, it may be the case that national legislation (when it is implemented) may reduce the requirement for some of the prohibitions or requirements of the PSPO.

15. Consultation

15.1 Prior to the introduction of the PSPO the Council engaged with and sought engagement from all groups known to be involved in vigils and protest outside the Marie Stopes clinic. It additionally engaged with Marie Stopes, British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS), clinic service users, the Metropolitan Police, Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS, Public Health and local faith groups. These same groups were engaged as part of the formal consultation undertaken in November 2020 - January 2021 as part of the consultation on the renewal of the PSPO. It is recommended that any consultation on the renewal or variation of the PSPO includes all of these groups.

15.2 If the decision is made to consult on the renewal or variation of the PSPO, it is recommended formal consultation be progressed in line with the approach taken prior to the decision to introduce the Order and in line with the practice developed in 2020-21 when the Order was considered for renewal. This will include an online survey for a period of eight weeks, with the full results, along with an open and transparent analysis and consultation report published and provided to Cabinet in February 2024.

16. Timetable

16.1 Should no action be taken, the PSPO will expire in April 2024.

16.2 Should Cabinet conclude to proceed with consultation on extension or variation of the PSPO, the following timetable is provided as a guide for the subsequent milestones:

- **November 2023** – Consultation begins.
- **January 2024** – Consultation closes.

- **February 2024** – Cabinet consider the evidence and feedback from the consultation exercise and make a decision on the future of the Order.

17. Appendices

Appendix 1: Copy of PSPO and map.

Appendix 2: Detailed map.

Appendix 3: Copy of judgements of High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court.

Appendix 4: Copy of Equalities Impact Analysis.

Section 18: Background Information

Link to Mayor of London commitment of the 16/11/2017, page 13:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s67400/Appendix%20%20-Questions%20to%20the%20Mayor%20-%20Transcript.pdf>

Link to Hansard Select Committee of the 12th of December 2017:

<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/home-affairs-committee/harassment-and-intimidation-near-abortion-clinics/oral/75524.pdf>

Link to Cabinet report and appendices of 10th April 2018:

<https://ealing.cmis.uk.com/ealing/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/4980/Committee/3/Default.aspx>

Link to Cabinet report and appendices of 9th February 2021:

<https://ealing.moderngov.co.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?CommitteeId=137&MeetingId=509&DF=09%2f02%2f2021&Ver=2>

Consultation

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent to consultee	Date response received	Comments appear in paragraph:
Internal				
Shabana Khan	Lawyer			
Cllr Jasbir Anand	Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality			
Nicky Fiedler	Strategic Director, Housing & Environment			
Jess Murray	Assistant Director, Community Protection			
Justin Morley	Head of Legal Services (Litigation)			
Yalini Gunarajah	Finance Manager			
External				
Kuljit Bhogal	Counsel			

Report History

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision	Yes
Report no.:	Report author and contact for queries:
	Paul Murphy Head of Community Safety (ext. 8807)