

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday 10 January 2011

7.00 pm

Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

### Membership

Councillor Lisa Rajan (Chair)  
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Neil Coyle  
Councillor Toby Eckersley  
Councillor Gavin Edwards  
Councillor Mark Glover  
Councillor David Hubber  
Councillor Tim McNally  
Councillor Helen Morrissey  
Councillor Paul Noblet  
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole

### Reserves

Councillor Sunil Chopra  
Councillor Nick Dolezal  
Councillor Dan Garfield  
Councillor Mark Gattleson  
Councillor Jeff Hook  
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE  
Councillor Lewis Robinson  
Councillor Cleo Soanes  
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton

### Education representatives

Reverend Nicholas Elder  
Colin Elliott, Parent Governor  
Leticia Ojeda, Parent Governor

---

## INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

### Access to information

You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

### Babysitting/Carers allowances

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

### Access

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: [www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk) or please contact the person below.

### Contact

Peter Roberts on 020 7525 4350 or email: [peter.roberts@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:peter.roberts@southwark.gov.uk)

---

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

**Annie Shepperd**

Chief Executive

Date: 23 December 2010



## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday 10 January 2011  
7.00 pm  
Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

### Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
----------	-------	----------

#### **PART A - OPEN BUSINESS**

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to an agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.

**3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

Members to declare any personal interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

**4. MINUTES**

1 - 11

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meetings held on 15 November and 6 December 2010.

**5. CABINET MEMBER INTERVIEW: COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

12 - 15

**DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.**

#### **PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS**

**DISCUSSION OF ANY CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.**



## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Monday 15 November 2010  
at 7.00 pm at Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Councillor Lisa Rajan (Chair) Councillor Andy Simmons Councillor Neil Coyle Councillor Toby Eckersley Councillor Gavin Edwards Councillor Mark Glover Councillor David Hubber Councillor Tim McNally Councillor Helen Morrissey Councillor Paul Noblet Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
<b>OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Councillor Richard Livingstone, Cabinet Member for Resources and Finance
<b>OFFICER SUPPORT:</b>	Cathy Doran, Financial Strategy Accountant Stephen Gaskell, Head of Corporate Planning and Performance Duncan Whitfield, Finance Director Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager

### 1. APOLOGIES

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

### 2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 The Chair agreed to accept additional documents in relation to item 6, Cabinet Member interview, and item 7, Election Review.

### 3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

- 3.1 Councillor David Hubber declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as an associate member of the association of electoral administrators. Councillor Andy Simmons declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in any item relating to the Maudsley Hospital. As a governor of one of the pilot schools, Councillor Paul Noblet declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in the question to the cabinet member in respect of free school meals.

### 4. MINUTES

#### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the open sections of the meetings held on 8 and 13 September 2010 be agreed as a correct record.

### 5. BUDGET SETTING PROCESS

- 5.1 Councillor Andy Simmons, Vice-Chair, proposed that the committee hold an additional meeting in the new year in order to interview all cabinet members about budget proposals for their portfolios. The committee agreed to hold a day-time meeting in late January.
- 5.2 Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for resources and finance, presented a briefing on the spending review and a budget update. He set out the macro targets for local government and highlighted issues including the formula grant, area based grant, supporting people grant, benefits and welfare, business rates and council tax. He identified the major risks for Southwark and the stage the council was at in the budget process.
- 5.3 A member asked what population statistics the government was using to determine the level of grants. Councillor Livingstone responded that this was unclear but that traditionally there had been under-counting. In response to comments on the calculation of the index of multiple deprivation, Councillor Livingstone indicated that concerns were being expressed through London Councils. It was important for the council to prepare for next year's census.
- 5.4 Members of the committee were interested in how the cabinet was developing stakeholder involvement in the budget process, including tenants, leaseholders and head teachers. Councillor Livingstone explained that cabinet members had been attending meetings of community councils and the schools forum and that tenants' and leaseholders' forums would also be consulted, particularly on the housing revenue account. There was a broad level of engagement and a range of opinions that had yet to be compiled. It was useful for people to understand the issues that the council was facing and the decisions that needed to be reached.
- 5.5 Some members asked if, after likely spending reductions, the council was returning to government grant levels experienced only a few years ago or longer ago than

that. The finance director explained that it was difficult to model this. Members drew attention to the principles the cabinet had agreed in drawing up a budget and to its manifesto pledges and asked whether, if funding was not available for all the pledges, any priorities had been identified. Councillor Livingstone responded that it was too early in the process to comment on this. He also confirmed that the cabinet was providing guidelines to officers. The finance director reported that directorates were seeking 25% savings on their net budgets, as far as possible to be front-loaded. It was uncertain whether or not the housing revenue account would continue to be ring-fenced and unclear what would happen once the area based grant came back into the formula.

- 5.6 In response to questions, Councillor Livingstone explained that the cabinet had asked officers to undertake equality impact assessments of various proposals. Members were concerned at the possible impact of national welfare cuts. Councillor Livingstone stated that this was being looked at across services but that the likely scale of cuts was still unknown.
- 5.7 Members asked if the cabinet would be prioritising services for the needy and most vulnerable rather than universal services. Councillor Livingstone took the view that it would be deeply unpopular for the council to deliver only what it had to by statute. There needed to be a balance between the universal offer and protecting the most vulnerable. Councillor Livingstone also stressed that there was going to be a lot of pressure on people just above welfare levels.
- 5.8 Members asked whether, at the special January meeting of the committee, the cabinet member would be able to share a list of the possible savings considered and the choices made. Councillor Livingstone indicated that he would share some of the thinking and discussions. Members also asked for an update on progress in working with Trades Unions and staff and whether any legal challenge would be made to the government's proposed cuts in funding. Councillor Livingstone reported that the leader and himself had been having constructive discussions with the unions and with staff. The unions had raised the issue of the council's use of agency staff and consultants, as referred to in the answer to one of his interview questions. In terms of any challenge to the government, this could not be considered until the level of funding was clear.

## **6. CABINET MEMBER INTERVIEW: COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, FINANCE & RESOURCES**

### **Providing free school meals to every primary school child in the borough (questions 11 & 12)**

- 6.1 Members were concerned about the costing process for free school meals and whether, after the pilots and a full costing, the final figures would reach an upper limit where the proposal for free school meals became a disproportionate use of the council's budget. Members acknowledged that a less than 100% take-up would reduce costs but were unclear whether this was reflected in the figures.
- 6.2 Councillor Livingstone was of the view that a ballpark figure of £2.5m had been realistic at the time of the election. He stressed that the level of take-up was an

important factor and that the results from the ten pilots would inform the decision. It was unlikely that a budget would be set for 2011/12 to implement the proposal in full but more likely that a funding envelope would be identified. Councillor Livingstone stressed that times were getting tougher for those families above the income support level but without a lot of money. These families were highly represented in Southwark schools and free school meals could prove very important. Responding to a further question, Councillor Livingstone stated that, although this lay within the remit of another cabinet member, he could confirm that the pilots were also monitoring behaviour and educational achievement in the schools.

- 6.3 Members queried whether, if free school meals were universal, there would be any savings in administrative costs for instance as there would be no requirement to means test. Councillor Livingstone responded that this might be the case but that it might still be necessary to keep a record of those pupils entitled to the service. Members asked whether there would be any additional capital costs associated. Councillor Livingstone explained that one of the conditions of the pilots was that the school was ready to deliver the service. The capital costs of a decision to go forward on universal free school meals still needed to be looked at. It would be essential to ensure value for money.

#### **Lobbying, particularly in respect of minimum funding guarantee/floor**

- 6.4 Members asked whether the three local MPs were sufficiently briefed in respect of issues such as the minimum funding guarantee. Councillor Livingstone confirmed that he had been talking to all three MPs about the challenges facing the council. He also confirmed that most authorities in the capital and the London Councils were lobbying on issues such as the changes in Housing Benefits and funding floors.

#### **Cost and funding of Decent Homes (questions 17 & 18)**

- 6.5 In respect of question 18, members asked what reasons the government might have for objecting to the council's proposed use of the Developer's Premium. Councillor Livingstone responded that this was the first time that a local authority had intended to make this a clear policy. He stressed that the money was still to be used for affordable housing. Objections might be made on the grounds that developers were getting out of providing affordable housing on site. However, affordable housing on site was not always the best option as had been seen with Montreal House. In other cases it might result in high service charges. It was hoped that, although the number of potential sites was fairly small, the policy would be a way to deliver affordable housing,. It could also be part of a solution to funding of Decent Homes.
- 6.6 Members highlighted the final sentence of the first paragraph of the answer to question 17, "If a higher standard is required, the cost will be higher" and asked who would be requiring the higher standard and whether this would depend on the definition of "warm, dry and safe". Councillor Livingstone indicated that the required standard might include elements over and above the minimum standards. The council's current standard was clearly not affordable and a new standard would have to be agreed by the cabinet following the results of the stock condition

survey and consultation with Tenants' Council.

### **Council Tax and Council Tax Collection (question 20)**

- 6.7 Members commented on the unsuccessful partnership arrangements in the past and supported bringing council tax collection back in house. They asked the cabinet member whether he was confident in the level of service once it was in house and sought assurance that external contractors would not be used to prop up performance.
- 6.8 Councillor Livingstone stated that it was clearly a big undertaking to take on the service but that real benefits were already being seen on the Business Rate side. He acknowledged that the council would not have the capacity to fully deliver from day one and would need to bring in additional support. The council will have a resiliency contract to ensure it is not taking a big risk. There were back-logs and issues around data but external support would only be a short-term measure to get over initial challenges. The council was in the process of recruiting and training staff.
- 6.9 Members asked whether there was the potential for any members of staff made redundant to apply for posts in revenues and benefits, bearing in mind that it was important for staff to have the relevant skills sets and aptitudes. Councillor Livingstone agreed, but stressed that it would be necessary to look at where posts were being lost and assess if staff members had the appropriate skills. It was essential to ensure that the council was not taking any risks with council tax collection. Members asked what the assessment process would be for the new posts. The finance director explained that recruitment for the management layers was now underway and needed to be in place by 1 April 2011. This was a complex piece of work.

## **7. ELECTION REVIEW: COMBINED GENERAL AND LOCAL ELECTIONS 6 MAY 2010**

- 7.1 The committee considered the Returning Officer's comments on the review of the combined general and local elections 6 May 2010.
- 7.2 The committee took the view that the count should start as soon as possible after polls closed and not be delayed to the following day. Members also felt that registration forms should be more accessible and therefore not removed from the electoral commission website but that it should be made clear how they were to be returned. It was important that as many people as possible registered to vote and that they were able to do this up until the last possible moment.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Returning Officer and her staff be thanked for their review of the combined general and local elections.
2. That the review and the Returning Officer's comments on its recommendations be noted.

3. That the Returning Officer's views on legislative changes, detailed in paragraph 6, not be supported.
4. That the committee consider a further post-election scrutiny review after the next council election.
5. That the roles of the Deputy Returning Officers and Electoral Services staff be clearly defined so that responsibilities and chains of command are clear on the day of the election and at the count.
6. That staff training be improved so that there is a sufficient pool of staff available to assist Electoral Services at the count.
7. That a re-evaluation takes place of the role and reliance on IT in the count/verification process.
8. That a better process for internal communications during the count process is designed.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm



## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Monday 6 December 2010  
at 7.00 pm at Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Lisa Rajan (Chair)  
Councillor Andy Simmons  
Councillor Toby Eckersley  
Councillor Gavin Edwards  
Councillor Dan Garfield (Reserve)  
Councillor David Hubber  
Councillor Tim McNally  
Councillor Helen Morrissey  
Councillor Paul Noblet

**EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES:** Colin Elliott, Parent Governor

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr David Glue, local resident

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny  
Simon Chambers, Corporate Strategy  
Doreen Forrester-Brown, Legal Advisor  
Graeme Gordon, Head of Corporate Strategy  
Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager

### 1. APOLOGIES

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mark Glover and the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole.

### 2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

- 2.1 The Chair agreed to Mr David Glue, a local resident, addressing the committee. Mr Glue asked the committee to consider a recent planning decision in respect of Capital House. The chair and legal representative explained that the committee was not able to review individual planning decisions and suggested that Mr Glue approach the chair of planning committee in order to take the issue further.

### 3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

### 4. MINUTES

#### RESOLVED:

That, subject to the correct spelling of Richard Rees (page 11), the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2010 be agreed as a correct record.

### 5. SHARED SERVICES

- 5.1 The head of corporate strategy, presented a briefing on shared services. He outlined possible reasons for sharing services across councils and gave examples from around the country and in London. He gave details of the principles behind the council's approach and the process for identifying suitable candidates for shared services in Southwark, including key criteria and opportunities.
- 5.2 In response to questions the head of corporate strategy clarified the situation in respect of Southwark's head of communications who had been seconded from Westminster (this was not a shared service between the two boroughs). He also acknowledged the sharing of senior management between the council and the PCT.
- 5.3 Members suggested that one problem with joint procurement was that contract periods might not coincide across boroughs and asked whether any work was being done to address this. The head of corporate strategy indicated that preliminary work was underway across the whole South East London quadrant to establish where opportunities might exist to align contracts.
- 5.4 Members asked about possible savings that could be achieved by integrating IT contracts set against the cost of integration. The head of corporate strategy indicated that there were a lot of challenges in terms of the IT infrastructure, depending on the compatibility of systems and processes. He also responded that savings were possible, for instance Bromley and Lewisham were reporting a saving of £1.5m pa as a result of their joint ICT.
- 5.5 Members queried whether Southwark and other councils had the capacity to deliver large scale re-organisations. The head of corporate strategy commented that it would be a question of considering proposals on a case by case basis, some services would need a lot more work than others. In terms of procurement, if the skills existed to procure then the same skills would be relevant to joint procurement. In respect of current internal capacity, the head of corporate strategy explained that the preliminary work was being undertaken as part of officers' general workloads.
- 5.6 In response to questions about possible timeframes, the head of corporate strategy indicated that some sharing of services could be in the nearer term, for instance if

an opportunity arose whereby two councils could consider whether they both needed a head of a particular service. More complicated propositions such as setting up a separate company would take longer to work through.

- 5.7 The committee was interested in whether Southwark would consider a joint cabinet. The head of corporate strategy was of the opinion that this could present difficulties in governance. He commented that if the sharing of a service was significant, for instance if Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea shared their whole education service, then it might be appropriate to have a joint committee to oversee that service.
- 5.8 Members of the committee asked at what stage it would be appropriate for overview and scrutiny to be involved in any proposal for a shared service. The head of corporate strategy envisaged that individual services would come to cabinet for decision one at a time and suggested that it might be possible for the committee to look at proposals before they went to cabinet.
- 5.9 Members were interested as to why London authorities had not already pursued the sharing of services. The head of corporate strategy suggested that this might reflect the political diversity of boroughs and the changeability of control within councils. He took the view that the London Councils had encouraged a general sharing of good practice and that there was a developing unity across the capital.
- 5.10 Members stressed that risk was an important criteria in considering the prospect of shared services, giving the example of the shared coroner's service which had recently run the risk of incurring a large bill for the council. The head of corporate strategy agreed that the process called for early risk analysis and subsequently a full risk analysis at the business case stage.
- 5.11 The head of corporate strategy stated that a further report would be going to cabinet in January and that, depending on cabinet processes, it might be possible for the committee to have sight of this in advance of the cabinet meeting. At the present time he could not confirm the content of this report. Members commented that authorities such as Westminster, Kensington & Chelsea and Hammersmith & Fulham were proposing an ambitious programme, in contrast to the more piecemeal approach of Southwark, and wondered whether they had considered firm officer recommendations. The head of corporate strategy referred to the information that was in the public domain. He was not able to clarify whether specific services such as highways, planning and development control were included in the shared environmental services.
- 5.12 Members asked when the council was likely to benefit from any savings from shared services. The head of corporate strategy felt that savings were more likely to be achieved in years two and three rather than the coming financial year. He was unable to comment on when the West London boroughs might achieve savings.
- 5.13 The head of corporate strategy stated that there was a clear expectation in Southwark that officers begin to explore opportunities by identifying possible services, starting conversations with officers in other boroughs and logging these areas with their chief officer. Members asked whether Lambeth was at a different

stage to Southwark in that the report to Lambeth's scrutiny committee listed possible services to be considered for sharing. The head of overview & scrutiny suggested that this was not the case and that Lambeth was in a similarly preliminary stage, exploring models and issues around accountability and the role of scrutiny.

- 5.14 Some members wondered whether there would be any consensus across South East London for the sort of super council being proposed in West London. The chair commented that this was something that could be put to the leader in his interview at the January meeting of the committee as well as any questions about specific service areas that might be considered for sharing across councils.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the head of corporate strategy consult with the chair and vice-chair on the possibility of the committee receiving the January cabinet report at its next meeting.
2. That copies of the Lambeth scrutiny report and Westminster report on shared services be circulated to members for information.

**6. SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEES - CHAIRS' UPDATES**

- 6.1 Councillor Tim McNally, chair of the environment, transport, communities & citizenship scrutiny sub-committee, reported on the sub-committee's progress with its two topics of recycling and cross-border working. Members of the sub-committee had visited Manor Place household recycling centre and would be receiving the results of a food waste pilot in the new year. The sub-committee had also heard about interesting ways of compacting waste which could be useful in developments at the Elephant & Castle.
- 6.2 In terms of cross-border working the sub-committee had been briefed on best practice at The Cut and was organising a meeting to gather views about issues in Herne Hill. Members asked that ward members be invited to the meeting. The sub-committee had also interviewed Councillor Barrie Hargrove.
- 6.3 Councillor Gavin Edwards, chair of the housing & community safety scrutiny sub-committee, informed members that the sub-committee had been investigating Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the Housing Repairs Service. Findings to date indicated that the KPIs were seriously flawed. The sub-committee had interviewed the contractors, listened to a hundred calls which formed part of the satisfaction survey and tracked individual cases. Often calls were logged as completed when the operative had not even turned up at the tenant's property. The sub-committee would be considering a draft report at an additional meeting in January.
- 6.4 At the January meeting the sub-committee would also be interviewing officers about issues raised by tenants of the Four Squares Estate. In addition, the sub-committee would be receiving a report from Councillor Stephen Govier on the impact of changes in housing benefit on Southwark residents.

- 6.5 Members hoped that the report on the repairs service would take account of the financial consequences of jobs being logged as closed but then having to be raised again. Members also asked whether the sub-committee had gained a better idea of the satisfaction level among tenants. Councillor Edwards indicated that officers had commissioned a separate satisfaction survey, including questions put forward by the sub-committee, and that the results would be available in the near future.
- 6.6 Councillor David Hubber, chair of the education & children's services scrutiny sub-committee, reported that the sub-committee had held three meetings and begun work on the topics of parenting support and childhood obesity and sports provision. The sub-committee had started looking at the support parents receive around the admissions process, interviewing officers and planning to meet with governors, school representatives and the admissions forum.
- 6.7 In terms of childhood obesity and the impact of sports provision the sub-committee had taken evidence from the Director of Public Health and a public health consultant. The sub-committee was also inviting residents' views and had asked for a report from Bacon's College Schools Sports Partnership. In addition, the sub-committee had interviewed Councillor Catherine McDonald, had invited Southwark Youth Council to attend a meeting and also invited the new independent safeguarding chair.
- 6.8 Councillor Dan Garfield reported on the work of the regeneration & leisure scrutiny sub-committee. The sub-committee had been updated on progress of the Canada Water Library which was due to be completed on time and within budget. The sub-committee had written to the cabinet asking about the potential for the space to be shared with other organisations, alongside the library. The sub-committee had also received a briefing from the Aylesbury Estate Regeneration Team and would continue to monitor the scheme. Councillor Veronica Ward had attended for her cabinet member interview.
- 6.9 The sub-committee had been looking at the borough's Olympic plans, particularly in view of reduced funding streams, and had asked officers from the Olympic organising team to attend its meeting in February. The sub-committee had also reviewed how regeneration funding has been spent locally over the past five years, including section 106 money and cleaner, greener funding.
- 6.10 The head of overview & scrutiny reported on the work of the health & adult social care scrutiny sub-committee which had been continuing its work on the drugs and alcohol strategy, particularly in respect of Maydew House. The sub-committee had received a number of papers from SLaM relating to disinvestment in mental health and had interviewed Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle and Susanna White. It had received another update on Southwark Circle. In the new year the sub-committee would begin to look at services for older people.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

## **Cabinet Member Interview – Councillor Peter John, Leader of the Council**

### **Budget and savings**

1. Could the leader please comment on how Southwark and London's provisional financial settlement compares to those for other councils? (Cllr A Simmons)
2. Has the council considered the implications of any changes to the index of multiple deprivation on the revenue support grant to Southwark? (Cllr M Glover)
3. How will you demonstrate that residents' views on budget savings have been taken into account in your budget setting? (Cllr T McNally)
4. What savings are you considering making in Council Communications as a part of the budget process? (Cllr L Rajan)
5. Do you intend for the cabinet to make its fair share of savings in line with what you expect from the rest of the council, by either cutting cabinet members' salaries, or cutting the number of cabinet posts? (Cllr P Noblet)
6. Following your joint letter with the leaders of Lambeth and Lewisham to all three Chief Executives about sharing council services and costs, do you think you should share a chief executive and generate a substantial saving that way? (Cllr L Rajan)
7. What progress have you made towards your stated objective of reducing the council's use of consultants? (Cllr D Hubber)
8. How are the government reductions in spending likely to impact on employment in the borough? (Cllr M Glover)

### **Housing**

9. Could you please clarify how the funding for the new Housing Director and restructured housing department will be apportioned between the HRA and the General Fund? (Cllr T McNally)
10. Southwark's Housing Repairs Key Performance Indicators currently show satisfaction rates in excess of 90%. Can the leader of the council give us his impression of the quality of Southwark's Housing Repairs Service (Cllr G Edwards)
11. How many council homes in Southwark are not warm, not safe and not dry? What is your view of what constitutes safe? (Cllr D Hubber)
12. Is it more of a priority to make council homes 'warm, safe and dry' or 'Decent'? And will housing investment funding be committed accordingly? (Cllr D Hubber)
13. Do you welcome the announcement that local authorities no longer have to form ALMOs to get Decent Homes funding and that Southwark will be able to bid directly to government for investment in its housing stock? (Cllr T McNally)

14. Can the leader please give an update on the future for the Aylesbury estate given the disappointing PFI result? (Cllr A Simmons)
15. Can the leader of the council explain how the administration will seek to move forward the Aylesbury Estate Regeneration project following the withdrawal of £180m of central government funding for the Aylesbury PFI? (Cllr G Edwards)
16. What are the implications of the HCA's cut in funding for the Aylesbury? (Cllr M Glover)

### **Education**

17. Could the leader please comment on the concerns raised by London Councils that depending on the method for calculation the Pupil Premium may lead to less funding in Southwark per pupil than in the wealthiest parts of the country? (Cllr A Simmons)
18. The government has recently suggested that some Building Schools for the Future Schemes, which had previously been thought to have been protected, may only receive 60% of their funding. Can the leader of the council tell us if the cabinet has in place contingency plans for how these BSF projects will be progressed should this further cut in funding be confirmed? (Cllr G Edwards)
19. Given the government's current policy of encouraging many community schools to accept academy or free school status, can the leader of the council give further details of the action the administration is taking to communicate with schools on this issue, in particular to ensure that the views of local parents are included in any decisions on changes to local schools? (Cllr G Edwards)
20. What progress are you making towards establishing a new secondary school in Rotherhithe? (Cllr P Noblet)
21. When will you know how much offering free school meals to every school child, including children that do not live in the borough, will cost? (Cllr P Noblet)
22. Do you think that stigma is a barrier to the take up of free school meals in Southwark? (Cllr P Noblet)
23. What is the level of obesity for year 6 pupils who take up their entitled FSM? (Cllr D Hubber)
24. What are you doing to support families who send their children to schools outside the borough and who fall just outside the eligibility criteria for FSMs? (Cllr D Hubber)
25. The ex-Labour government's minimum standards on school meals allow pupils to have chips three times a week. Do you think this counts as healthy? And if not, how will you set a stipulation that is enforceable with the school meals providers that are contracted by the schools themselves? (Cllr L Rajan)

### **Capital Programme**

26. What criteria will you be using for any reprioritisation of the capital programme? (Cllr T McNally)

27. Would the leader please state when a decision will be made on the "Improving Local Retail Environments" element of the capital programme, and, if it is to be curtailed, would he set out the criteria for deciding which projects are to be cut, and whether there will be any consultation with relevant stakeholders before a final decision? (Cllr T Eckersley)
28. Councillor Livingstone stated that if primary school kitchens need upgrading or building to enable that school to provide free school meals to every pupil, the cabinet will commit capital funding to pay for this. How much will this cost and will these works take priority in the capital programme? (Cllr P Noblet)
29. Would the leader advise whether it would now be possible to sell the premises formerly occupied by the Livesey Museum and re-invest the proceeds in accordance with Sir George Livesey's bequest? If so, what plans are there to do this? (Cllr T Eckersley)

### **Performance of contracts**

30. What steps is the leader taking to improve the performance of the call centre to a satisfactory level? (Cllr A Simmons)
31. Do you think the council gets value for money out of the contracts with Vangent and Serco, and if not, do you intend to terminate the contracts? (Cllr T McNally)

### **Community Councils**

32. Will your cabinet continue to devolve capital funding to community councils for the Cleaner Greener Safer programme and Highways and Lighting improvements? (Cllr T McNally)
33. Do you think community councils should have more power devolved down to them, and if so, what powers should they be? (Cllr D Hubber)

### **Regeneration, planning and development**

34. What is the council doing to reduce the inequalities between the regeneration in the North of the borough and the Nunhead, Peckham and Camberwell areas which saw much investment discussed by the previous administration but little come to fruition? (Cllr M Glover)
35. With regard to the cabinet's decision of 23 November to proceed with the construction of a swimming pool at the Elephant and Castle at council expense, would the leader please explain why the construction companies associated with the BSF LEP appear to be favoured over open competition, and would he set out the opportunity cost of building the pool on land suitable for sale for residential accommodation? (Cllr T Eckersley)
36. What have you and the cabinet members for regeneration and environment done in the past four weeks to persuade Thames Water to find alternate sites for access to their sewage tunnel? (Cllr P Noblet)
37. Do you think property developers should be allowed to get out of providing affordable housing on site in major residential planning applications? (Cllr P Noblet)

38. Do you think s106 money should be spend in the environs of the associated planning application to offset its effects on local transport, health and education demands, or should it be spent elsewhere in the borough? (Cllr T McNally)

#### **Other**

39. You have offered scrutiny the opportunity to help evaluate the free school meals and food waste recycling pilots. Can you confirm that Councillors MacDonald and Hargrove are agreeable to your commitment? (Cllr L Rajan)
40. Could the leader please outline the performance of each of the council's departments in replying to members enquiries from April 2010 to date? (Cllr A Simmons)
41. How is the leader ensuring that staff treat members of the public in the same way that they would a member of their own family? (Cllr A Simmons)
42. In the event that the Metropolitan Police Authority were to offer funds to London councils, on the basis of matched funding from any council accepting the offer, for purposes of creating additional police numbers in the accepting borough, what would be the response of the cabinet? (Cllr T Eckersley)
43. Can the leader of the council give details of how Southwark council will be investing in, and securing funding for, sporting activities for young people in Southwark in the run up to the 2012 Olympics? (Cllr G Edwards)
44. Can the leader explain what work is being done by Southwark Council to prepare for the public sector equality duty that is due to come into force in April 2011 as part of the Equality Duty Act 2010? (Cllr L Rajan)
45. When will you be able to confirm where the replacement Bermondsey One Stop Shop will be, and how will you ensure people's access to services is uninterrupted? (Cllr D Hubber)
46. How much money is paid annually by the Corporate Complaints Department, specifically as compensation for the delay in processing complaints, and what steps are being taken to control this? (Cllr L Rajan)
47. What help will there be for the 3,000-4,000 people who currently worship every Sunday at the Elephant & Castle leisure centre to find a new place to worship? Where do you think they will end up? (Cllr L Rajan)
48. Do you plan to continue scheduling the majority of cabinet meetings during the working day, when residents find it difficult to attend? (Cllr L Rajan)
49. What progress has the council made in cutting carbon emissions since May 2010 and what are your plans for achieving further reductions? (Cllr T McNally)

**DISTRIBUTION LIST****MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11****COMMITTEE:**           **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****NOTE:**                   Please notify amendments to Peter Roberts (0207 525 4350)

<b><u>OPEN</u></b>	<b><u>COPIES</u></b>		
<b><u>OSC MEMBERS</u></b>			
Councillor Lisa Rajan (Chair)	1	<b><u>COUNCIL OFFICERS</u></b>	
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)	1	Annie Shepperd, Chief Executive	1
Councillor Neil Coyle	1	Eleanor Kelly, Deputy Chief Executive	1
Councillor Toby Eckersley	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Gavin Edwards	1	Doreen Forrester-Brown, Legal Services	1
Councillor Mark Glover	1	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	1
Councillor David Hubber	1	John Bibby, Labour Political Assistant	1
Councillor Tim McNally	1	Paul Green, Liberal Democrat Office	1
Councillor Helen Morrissey	1	Steven Gauge, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Councillor Paul Noblet	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole	1		
<b><u>RESERVES</u></b>		<b><u>EXTERNAL</u></b>	
Councillor Sunil Chopra	1	Albion, Newington & Dulwich Libraries	3
Councillor Nick Dolezal	1	Local Studies Library	1
Councillor Dan Garfield	1	Press	2
Councillor Mark Gettleson	1		
Councillor Jeff Hook	1	Charles Cherrill, Southwark Pensioners Forum	1
Councillor Lorraine Lauder	1	Mr C George, Southwark Advocacy Alliance	1
Councillor Lewis Robinson	1	Chris Sanford, Community Action for Southwark (8 <sup>th</sup> floor	
Councillor Cleo Soanes	1	Hannibal Hse)	1
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton	1		
<b><u>EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES ON OSC</u></b>			
Revd Nicholas Elder	1	<b>TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>50</b>
Colin Elliott	1		
Leticia Ojeda	1		
<b><u>CABINET MEMBERS</u></b>			
Councillor Peter John (Council Leader)	1		
Councillor Ian Wingfield (Deputy Leader)	1		
<b><u>OTHER MEMBERS [on request]</u></b>			
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	1		
Councillor Renata Hamvas	1		
HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 4350			