



REGENERATION & RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the meeting of the REGENERATION & RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on Wednesday 31 JANUARY 2007 at 7.00PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Lewis ROBINSON [Chair]
Councillors Mary FOULKES, Helen JARDINE-BROWN, Richard LIVINGSTONE, Paul NOBLET, Jane SALMON, Martin SEATON.

OFFICER SUPPORT: Paul Evans – Director of Regeneration
Stephen Gaskell – Head of Policy and Performance
Amma Boateng – Senior Legal Officer
Lucas Lundgren – Scrutiny Project Manager, Scrutiny Team
Duncan Whitfield – Finance Director
Simon Bevan – Head of Planning Policy
Dominic Cain – Client & Commissioning Manager
Bill Murphy – Assistant Chief Executive [Performance & Improvement]
Cathy Doran - Finance

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Toby Eckersley – Executive Member for Resources
Councillor Tim McNally – reserve member

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

CONFIRMATION OF VOTING MEMBERS

The members listed as being present were confirmed as the voting members.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS AS URGENT

Written responses from the Executive member to the Sub-Committee's questions were circulated.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were no disclosures made nor interests declared.

RECORDING OF MEMBERS' VOTES

Council Procedure Rule 1.17(5) allows a Member to record her/his vote in respect of any motions and amendments. Such requests are detailed in the following Minutes. Should a Member's vote be recorded in respect to an amendment, a copy of the amendment may be found in the Minute File and is available for public inspection.

The Sub-Committee considered the items set out on the agenda, a copy of which has been incorporated in the Minute File. Each of the following paragraphs relates to the item bearing the same number on the agenda.

MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the sub-committee meeting held on November 22 2006 be agreed as a correct record of proceedings and signed by the Chair.

1. EXECUTIVE INTERVIEW: COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY [PORTFOLIO FOR RESOURCES] [see pages 1-12, 79-95 & 96-99]

1.1 The Chair welcomed Councillor Eckersley to the meeting. The Executive member's written responses to the Sub-Committee's questions had been circulated in advance to the sub-committee. In addition, updated Council Tax collection volumes and cash collection information, together with updated Fees and Charges data for 2005/06 and 2006/07, were tabled.

1.2 **Question 1: It was recognised in the Ouseley report that BME staff are not represented in Management positions. What plans exist to address this discrepancy?**

1.3 Southwark, with 16% BME staff at or above grade 14, was compared to other organizations nationally in respect of this. Cllr Foulkes noted that her Ward comprised 50% BME and asked whether the figures stated represented progress towards addressing the problems highlighted by the Ouseley report.

1.4 She asked how the Council might ensure that BME interviewees for Council posts were prepared for its recruitment process. Whilst fully supportive of the spirit of this supplemental, Cllr Eckersley noted the necessary distinction between internal and external applicants in respect of appropriate preparation support and that it was likely to be inappropriate to coach the latter group. Corporate Learning & Development's staff programme includes support on interview technique.

1.5 Cllr Foulkes expressed disappointment with reference in paragraph 4 to "positive action" as this assumed that advantage rather than equality of opportunity was sought. Cllr Eckersley accepted this observation and the principle raised by Cllr Foulkes' supplemental question.

1.6 Bill Murphy responded that the Council's Fast Forward programme – directed towards groups of staff traditionally under represented in senior management – offered more intensive personal feedback than on other development programmes. Southwark's overall human resource strategy had demonstrated a tendency towards looking externally for expertise rather than developing existing staff. It was noted that the Metropolitan Police had moved from the former to the latter model successfully. Honest feedback is a key feature of the Fast Forward programme and enables staff to move their careers on within an organization. Bill Murphy apologized for reference to positive action within the response and assured the sub-committee that this would be fed back to its author.

1.7 **Question 2: How are the training and development needs of council staff identified generally and BMEs specifically assessed ?**

- 1.8 There were no supplementary questions in relation to this question.
- 1.9 **Question 3: What is the breakdown of council staff by the following categories? (% and numbers) and what % of BMEs by (a) Permanent, (b) Temporary (c) Agency**
- 1.10 **Question 4: What % of staff are BME in the following categories (a) Permanent, (b) Temporary (c) Agency ?**
- 1.11 Councillor Foulkes noted that the response appeared not to have understood that temporary meant “fixed term” commonly. If this indicated that the authority had a problem differentiating between temporary and fixed term staff, this needed rectifying. She had asked for further information about percentages on temporary contracts, partly because this employment status commonly presents problems for individuals in gaining access to financial products including mortgages.
- 1.12 Bill Murphy himself had joined the Council on a three year contract with a fixed end date. All fixed term contracts were now paid through Comensura with effect from this year. Staff on fixed term contracts who were engaged prior to this year continued to be paid through other agencies, until such time as they could be transferred across. The new agency contracts enabled collection of information on various equal opportunities categories and as a result the authority now has better data on agency staff than ever before. Cllr Foulkes emphasized that her question concerned fixed term staff on contracts directly with Southwark and not agency staff. Bill Murphy agreed to provide this information for the sub-committee.
- 1.13 **Question 5: Would the Executive Member provide an update on the integration of the Council’s ICT function into 1 London Bridge.**
- 1.14 Cllr McNally remarked that Southwark’s implementation of SAP was in his opinion one of the best he had seen within a local authority, however the market value of the SAP skills needed to undertake this work had not been recognized in the salaries offered to staff. As a result Southwark did not offer market rate salaries and had to fill these positions through agencies, with the associated increased costs to the Council. Cllr Eckersley acknowledged that at times the authority had to bear increased costs to deliver services but that these were to be avoided where possible.
- 1.15 Bill Murphy noted that traditional system assumptions linking staff grade to salary level paid were increasingly unable to reflect highly technical skills such as SAP. Duncan Whitfield welcomed member acknowledgement of SAP as a central although undervalued tool for Southwark’s work and discussions around whether to buy-in or train existing staff in SAP. A premium existed for SAP skills which varied and as such a risk to filling such posts on anything more than a temporary basis. Southwark would shortly appoint a new Head of ICT to review SAP support and delivery.
- 1.16 **Question 6: What is the value of the council's property and land and are there any plans to dispose of any of it during 2007 ?**

- 1.17 Cllr Livingstone asked officers to quantify the Council's estate as property or land to enable scrutiny to determine how much housing is owned. It was noted that Southwark is the second largest landlord in the UK with a huge property portfolio which although a great asset brings challenging management issues. For example, technical discussions with auditors were ongoing around valuation of land necessary for input onto Council systems.
- 1.18 **Question 7: Could the Executive Member outline any examples or concerns he has about "cost shunting"?**
- 1.19 The Chair said that he had raised the issue as a matter of observation, given local issues related to mental health provision. Councillor Eckersley acknowledged that the response did not address individual cases, nor was it directed towards a particular group of clients but was in general terms.
- 1.20 Clarification of the exact nature of budgetary pressures faced into 2008/09 and beyond was necessary as the local impact of shift of use from NHS services to local social care was potentially very significant for London. Duncan Whitfield confirmed that Southwark's Social Services and Childrens Services reported increased use of services, possibly partly as a result of health sector clients now receiving social care services, although data to support this was not available and the current Office for National Statistics projection of Southwark's population was approximately 10,000 lower than it was locally believed to be.
- 1.21 This is a key issue for London which if it continued would need to be supported by some kind of central resource to reflect usage. For example, on a local level, if people no longer had access to the Maudsley Emergency Clinic they would necessarily present at A&E or at more general community services. Cllr Eckersley noted that the Executive was likely at its next meeting to ask officers to clarify the exact nature of financial pressures faced and assured those present that the matter would receive attention. The authority's efforts through London Councils may needed to be intensified.
- 1.22 Cllr Jardine-Brown asked what the Council's obligations towards ..."*clients under the "no recourse to public funds" bracket (linked to the National Assistance Act)*" were. Cllr Eckersley responded that the relation of "recourse" to the National Assistance Act was not yet clarified but that it was clear that the Council had a duty to look after vulnerable members of the community and could not refuse to provide certain assistance.
- 1.23 Cllr Livingstone suggested that in general "public funds" refer to those such as welfare benefits. The Legal Officer added that individuals who are subject to immigration control [including illegal immigrants and those whose status is not known] may apply for certain assistance because they have no recourse to other public funds.
- 1.24 Members asked the Executive member to provide further details about which "public funds" were referred to within his written response and to clarify the link with the National Assistance Act.
- 1.25 **Question 8: Could the Executive Member publish a table of our income for the last financial year from fees and charges?**

- 1.26 Cllr Eckersley advised that that the gearing on raising fees and charges was inflation plus 2-3% as agreed by the Executive. The tabled within the agenda contained projected 2006/07 figures.
- 1.27 Duncan Whitfield added that this was a flexible target in the Medium Term Financial Strategy [MTFS]. There was total flexibility within each heading and social considerations to be taken into account surrounding all fee setting decisions.
- 1.28 **Question 9: Can the Executive Member publish a list of outside bodies to which we currently pay membership subscriptions?**
- 1.29 The entry on agenda page 89 for *LexisNexis Butterworths* referred to legal case subscription information which facility was reportedly available to other departments, although Cllr Eckersley would look at whether this could be a more centralized resource. Duncan Whitfield noted that discretionary services would be reviewed in Spring 2007 as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review, but that no substantial saving should be expected subscriptions.
- 1.30 **Question 10: Can the Executive comment on any particular criteria within the Government funding formula which adversely impact on Southwark's grant settlement?**
- 1.31 The Chair invited Cllr Eckersley to respond with further detail in respect of the children and young adults social care formula, and asked him to comment on how scrutiny might support existing representations on this.
- 1.32 Cllr Eckersley responded that the Formula Grant had previously been based on a relatively comprehensible formula which had been made less transparent and as a result more difficult for the authority to work out, which made for difficulties in challenging decisions such as grant allocations through the political process. He welcomed scrutiny challenge and suggested external expert advice on the grant formula for example from Tony Travers.
- 1.33 Duncan Whitfield advised that across London application of the "four block" model had resulted in more than two-thirds of all London authorities moving to the floor of grant increases. The DCLG work commissioned in 2005 appeared to have been applied through the final grant settlement. If the damping was removed Southwark stood to lose around £30 million in grant. Already, credit previously given for the number of children living in flats had been removed despite being of key relevance for the borough. Southwark is now relying on this damping and has no assurance of future grant levels.
- 1.34 Members discussed when best scrutiny might explore this issue. Duncan Whitfield advised that there was merit in looking this both pre and post Lyons, in Spring followed by consideration in Autumn 2007.
- 1.35 Cathy Doran added that London Councils was commissioning work on the impact of the funding formula on young adults and the Council would make representations where necessary. Colleagues elsewhere in London were reportedly assuming that grant levels would be frozen this year. However, the floor had yet to be set which it was hoped would be at or above inflation. The Council had already been lobbying prior to announcement of the final grant settlement in order that if the worst case scenario occurred the authority would be prepared.

- 1.36 Cllr Seaton noted that damping had been discussed at the sub-committee's recent briefing and asked how Southwark was preparing for the possibility that it would be removed. Cllr Eckersley replied that there was no current work specifically directed towards this. Depending on the speed at which London Councils work progressed in the coming months, if an imminent threat occurred then action would be taken, but this would add to the enormous pressures on health and social care locally. The authority had to do its best to protect the most vulnerable but if the damping was removed Cllr Eckersley commented that he would view this as an indirect central government attempt to force local authorities to severely reduce services. Although additional funding might be raised by increase in Council Tax there were no moves to raise revenue in this way locally for this purpose.
- 1.37 **Question 11: Given the poor performance by Liberata in collecting Council Tax, can the executive member outline what steps he has taken to date and what future measures he proposes to address this issue ?**
- 1.38 **Question 12: Can the executive member provide a table to show performance on council tax collection on a month-by-month basis for the financial years 2004/05, 2005/06 and the current year to date?**
- 1.39 **Question 13: I understand that the council is projecting a sizable saving from its contract with Liberata, following the relocation of parts of its operations to Barrow. What assurance can the executive member give us that this relocation will not lead to further under-performance? Or is there any indication that performance will improve with these changes?**
- 1.40 Councillor Richard Livingstone asked the following supplemental questions:
1. There appeared to be a substantial drop in direct debit payments from 2005/06 to 2006/07 – why was this ?
 2. What was the executive member's view on the role of this scrutiny sub-committee in respect of (a) council tax collection and (b) bringing in representatives from other authorities to identify good practice ?
 3. What lessons might be learned from the current contract for application to the new ?
- 1.41 Cllr Eckersley stated he fully supported the last two points in the recent Labour amendments to Council. In respect of question (1) above, he noted that the figures remained as those circulated at Council Assembly, but that this might not be a true comparison as like was not being compared with like.
- 1.42 In respect of question (2) above, Cllr Eckersley responded that the results of work requested would be available next week, in addition to information on geographical distribution of payment/non-payment to enable the authority to better target its collection efforts. Senior officers would meet Liberata next week to take this forward and cautioned that more aggressive collection techniques were likely. He emphasized that there was broad cross-party support for this move and accordingly he hoped that people would not therefore be surprised at measures applied.

- 1.43 In response to question (3) he responded that the contract was let on a rolling two-year basis with notice being given in June, 22 months before contract end date. Liberata's contract stipulates 93.4% collection rate. By late April 2007 a more accurate picture would be available. Liberata was under no impression that they held a permanent contract and assured the meeting that he would monitor the situation closely. He would be disappointed if performance remained the same in one year's time.
- 1.44 Dominic Cain acknowledged that when first contracted in 1998 Liberata had performed badly, with benefit payment processing taking 130-140 rather than 30 days. Benefit performance had since improved but Council Tax collection has plateaued and recently dropped off slightly. The collection figures circulated at report page 84 were not vastly lower than previously. Senior managers met regularly to discuss performance and the Council was, through the Executive member, pushing them to perform. It was usual to see a decline in Direct Debit payments toward the end of the financial year as many mandates arrived towards the end of February and March. Southwark would be relaunching its Direct Debit campaign. Members asked that greater detail around collection dates be included in future schedules to scrutiny around Council Tax performance to better enable scrutiny of performance.
- 1.45 Councillor Noblet asked how many contracts Liberata held within other boroughs. Dominic Cain responded that Liberata currently held twelve contracts across the UK including Bromley and Hounslow Councils, but none within boroughs with the same characteristics as Southwark. Capita undertakes similar work to Liberata, he noted.
- 1.46 The impact of instability through high turnover at senior management level on performance was acknowledged. Bill Murphy noted that the Council needed to understand the nature of factors within Southwark contributing to instability such as population churn and senior management turnover. Understanding borough specific factors and gathering trend data was key to future modeling. He did advise however that a point at which performance showed no further improvement might be seen. Although end of year data was open to view, it was a company's in-year data which was most useful in respect of assessing performance.
- 1.47 Cllr Eckersley had circulated revised cash collection figures for 05/06 and 06/07. Cllr Livingstone noted that 06/07 Council Tax collection was down across the board and asked when and by what mechanism this had come to the authority's attention.
- 1.48 The Executive member responded that although the percentage collection rate had fallen, cash receipts had increased and Council Tax itself had not. Future focus on the state of the collection fund was necessary, rates having been masked by an increasing number of properties coming onto the Council Tax list. Deficit in the Collection Fund must be made good in the budget and the Council should be collecting a higher percentage rate of registered properties on list. Dominic Cain confirmed monthly collection performance monitoring meetings between senior Council staff and Liberata management, which mechanism enabled action to be taken immediately a problem was identified. He noted that changing the Council's revenues and benefits system for the first time in 18 years was not an inconsiderable task.
- 1.49 **Question 14: Given the sizable capital requirements the council will need to meet for the Southwark Schools for the Future [BSF] developments, will the executive member be seeking contributions from the sizable balances and reserves that a number of schools in the borough appear to have?**

- 1.50 Cllr Livingstone noted the reported £13 million school balance and asked how this figure compared to those in the first tranche of BSF. Cllr Eckersley offered to provide this information current at 31 March 2007.
- 1.51 **Question 15: When the executive reviews the list of proposed capital programmes (presumably at its February meeting), what criteria will steer the executive member in the recommendations for priorities from this list that he makes to his fellow executive members?**
- 1.52 The Executive member advised that additional information about criteria would be available following the Executive's meeting on 13 February 2007.
- 1.53 Cllr Seaton acknowledged that with new and increasing liabilities coming onstream, careful planning of Council Tax levels was key. He felt that the sub-committee would benefit from input on planning for future risk and liabilities.
- 1.54 Cllr Eckersley noted the resourcing implications of the Capital Programme and suggested that scrutiny might wish to examine the governance arrangements around releasing financial resources [into contract, for example] into capital projects. The Capital Working Party had been disbanded three years previously. He welcomed scrutiny observations on the draft Capital Programme.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the Assistant Chief Executive [Performance & Improvement] provides information on the percentage of BME staff engaged on a (a) Permanent, (b) Temporary (c) Agency basis.
 2. That officers provide a breakdown of the Council's estate as property and land, to enable scrutiny to determine how much housing is owned.
 3. That the Executive member provides further details about which "public funds" are referred to within his written response to question 7 and clarifies the reference to the National Assistance Act in relation to these.
 4. That officers include details of Council Tax collection rates in future performance schedules presented to scrutiny.
 5. That Cllr Eckersley provides information [current at 31 March 2007] to show how the reported £13 million school balance compares to those in the first tranche of BSF.

At 8.22 p.m. it was proposed, seconded and

- RESOLVED:** That the meeting stand adjourned for five minutes for a comfort break.

At 8.29 p.m. the meeting reconvened

2. REVIEW: SECTION 106 DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT [see pages 10-76]

- 2.1 The sub-committee had received an initial briefing on Section 106 from the Strategic Director of Regeneration on 14 July 2006, at which meeting key member concerns were identified in relation to s.106 including: how to ensure dividend meets local community need; the manner in which Community Project Banks would operate; and mechanisms for effective monitoring of s106.
- 2.2 Informal consultation on the Supplementary Planning Document [SPD] for Section 106 ran until 9 January 2007. Formal consultation would conclude on 21 February 2007, following which recommended changes would be reported to members and agreement sought to adoption of the SPD as the core of Southwark Council's Local Development Framework which scheme would be used to determine planning applications.
- 2.3 Planning and Policy Team Manager Simon Bevan was invited to the meeting to respond to the key areas of interest, clarify the impetus for revision of the s106 SPD and its anticipated benefits to the community and provide an update on consultation undertaken and feedback received to date. A copy of his presentation is on the Minute File.
- 2.4 The Chair asked how non-payment of s106 in the past would be addressed through changes to the application system which demanded developers address s106 concerns in respect of new applications. Simon Bevan responded that the legal agreement built into the new contract ensured that default would become a legal matter. The pre-application statement from developers was designed to speed up the planning process to meet the 13 week target. The new arrangements gave potential for widening discussions on initial applications and address the sub-committee concerns about extent of member involvement.
- 2.5 Cllr Livingstone asked what had worked well and what lessons could be carried forward from initial pilots. Simon Bevan responded that in West Bermondsey the piloted project bank model had succeeded in the main in capturing local priorities for the area. Lessons included the need for constant updating of priorities and their development to ensure sufficient sophistication to meet local need. Simon Bevan acknowledged that s.106 agreements each contain different triggers and that information about how s.106 is spent is not always available to members.
- 2.6 Cllr Salmon noted that unspent s.106 was frequently discussed at Community Council meetings and that key elements of the s.106 process such as what money would be spent on or when this might happen felt somewhat "woolly". She recommended that the SPD section around Project Banks be made more specific as it moved nearer becoming a reality. Local people's expectations were raised during engagement on priorities and she emphasized the need to manage this by emphasizing projects as possibilities rather than certainties.
- 2.7 Simon Bevan acknowledged that the s.106 process did not always allow certainty around details of what and when s.106 resource would be brought forward for use on certain projects. The new proposals would however enable greater information to be available about what developments might happen, about their likely size, and about the likely benefits they might bring to a particular area.
- 2.8 Although Cllr Livingstone supported Project Banks as a tool for local involvement, he was frustrated that some financial resource would remain unspent. He acknowledged the model represented a different conversation to guide planners around locally preferred developments.

- 2.9 Cllr Seaton asked :
- (a) How consultation feedback would be used to set priorities and how people might feed in their views ?;
 - (b) What happens to unspent resources ?;
 - (c) What are the governance arrangements for s.106 and what obligations rested with Councillors to ensure that allocated resources are subsequently spent ?

2.10 Simon Bevan responded as follows. In respect of (a) community feedback was at the heart of consultation on any planning matter. S.106 included the potential for community involvement. All consultation comments are tabulated and officer recommendations are presented to members alongside an officer response, indicating whether there is consensus around each point and include additional information. The process is the same for UDP consultation.

The Consultation Plan requires that certain objectives necessary to determining the adequacy of consultation are met - these having been decided by members.

There was yet a long way to go in terms of full community ownership of decisions about use of local resources, but the local delivery plan would be a vehicle by which this might be achieved. London Plan priorities and local sub-priorities would be agreed by the Executive.

- 2.11 In respect of (b) Simon Bevan responded that there were a number of reasons why allocated resources might not be spent. These might be that:
- The system might not be working. Funding to administer the system is now available where previously there was no specific resource for this aspect of work.
 - The money sometimes remain in the bank account, or the interest is returned to the developer. Often more money is available than previously thought. Money may be put aside for a very specific purpose and if this does not happen the resource for it may be returned to the developer. This depends on the nature and detail of the original agreement.

2.12 In respect of governance arrangements, (c), the new proposals covered the full range of issues. The majority of decision around spend is delegated to the Planning Committee, although certain decisions may be delegated to the Head of Planning and Transport. Regeneration continues to look at developments and how impacts might be mitigated. He offered to provide further information on governance arrangements.

- 2.13 Cllr Noblet made the following observations in respect of old s.106 money apparently “locked” into the system:
- (a) Was the issue of unlocking old s.106 allocation included within the consultation ? Would old s.106 monies be carried forward into the new Project Banks ?
 - (b) How widely drawn would the Project Banks be able to be ? Are agreements drawn up with assumptions about how an area would be developed ?
 - (c) How it is intended to involve Councillors in the pre-application process ?

- 2.14 Simon Bevan responded that:
- (a) because of good funding to administer s.106 there would accordingly be more people to look closely at “old” s.106 in the system;
 - (b) geographical reach of the project banks would depend on consideration of what impact was being discussed. For example “educational impact” might concerned with placement of a secondary school or the impact of demand for a local park and hence its location. There would still need to be global consideration of developments across the borough. Project banks were perceived to be local but in the future would include other facilities such as primary care facilities with impacts far beyond the nominal project bank area itself.
 - (c) At the pre-application stage the Statement of Community Involvement states that developers are encouraged to carry out their own consultation, but the authority cannot force them to do this. Arrangements should enable people to get involved, however.

Standard charges were consistent across the borough and were constantly updated. In respect of how other boroughs were applying the formula, Southwark had drawn examples of good practice from other boroughs especially in relation to health.

- 2.15 Cllr Livingstone asked whether s.106 would eventually be superceded by another mechanism. Simon Bevan confirmed that there were proposals for larger changes to the infrastructure, possibly involving a quasi-tax levy centrally collected by HM Treasury and distributed locally. Southwark’s response to the Barker report had been around inbuilt flaws in the method of calculation.

- 2.16 Cllr Seaton asked what money existed in the system for s.106 and what was expected into the system in coming years ? Simon Bevan expected that around 1,500 new dwellings would be built every year in the borough annually until the target of 16,000 is reached. Some of these would not be subject to s.106 but many would be so Southwark might reasonably assume a maximum £4,500 per unit yield in addition to affordable housing being provided. This could not be guaranteed but was a target figure. Of all dwellings, 50% should be affordable housing.

- 2.17 The Chair thanked Simon Bevan for coming to committee.

- RESOLVED:**
- 1. That the Sub-Committee encourage the Executive to make efforts to utilise available revenue for administrative support to enable release of historical unspent s.106 allocation.
 - 2. Whilst the sub-committee is pleased that *Cleaner, Greener, Safer* activity is being considered in the round, members would wish to ensure that any increase in resources to Project Banks would not be accompanied by reduced central government *Cleaner, Greener, Safer* funding and its local allocation to particular areas.
 - 3. That the Planning & Policy Manager provide the sub-committee with further detail in respect of governance arrangements for Project Banks.

3. SUB-COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006/07 [see pages 77-78]

3.1 The work plan was noted.

- RESOLVED:**
1. Members noted that contact had been made with the London Development Agency about the planned session around the scope and involvement in regeneration within the borough, with a view to confirming the invitation to the sub-committee's 28 February 2007 meeting;
 2. Review of office accommodation use was now in train, and the Executive would consider this on 13 February 2007. The first staff move would take place in July 2007. *Members agreed that scrutiny should wait until after this time to avoid duplication of effort in this area;*
 3. Members agreed that scrutiny around the application of Equalities Impact Assessments in relation to regeneration projects demanded a discrete session and agreed to an additional meeting of the sub-committee for this purpose on 20 March 2007;
 4. In respect of Canada Water, work was underway to explore how Canada Water Forum was funded in relation to / as a consequence of the changes to regeneration department structure. Planning applications for the second tranche of development were not yet determined and it was agreed therefore that this topic could be dropped from the 2006/07 work programme;
 5. In respect of proposed scrutiny of the quality of life on estates under change, members noted that Peckham Community Council had proposed establishment of a working group to look at lessons learned from previous regeneration of the area. Members were in favour of exploring links between this work and that of scrutiny. It was suggested that the Sub-Committee might approach the topic in terms of past [Peckham Partnership], current [the Heygate] and future projects [the Aylesbury].

The meeting ended at 9:40PM.

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE:

DATED: