



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 8 May 2012 at 7.00 pm at 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor Dan Garfield
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Mark Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Ian Ritchie, Buchan TRA
Susanne Webb, Astley Cooper TRA

OFFICER SUPPORT: Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny
Doreen Forrester-Brown, Legal Services
Simon Godfrey, Resident Involvement Senior Manager
Richard Selley, Head of Customer Experience
John Wade, Temporary Parks & Open Spaces Manager
Des Waters, Head of Public Realm
Darren Welsh, Head of Community Housing
Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Toby Eckersley and Geoffrey Thornton. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor David Hubber.

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

2.1 There were none.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

- 3.1 Councillor Mark Williams declared a non-prejudicial interest through his role working for the Greater London Authority. Councillor Andy Simmons disclosed a prejudicial interest for the last item, as he has an honorarium contract with SLAM, and announced that he would withdraw when that item was taken.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 April 2012 be agreed as an accurate record.

5. LONDON BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK CEMETERY STRATEGY

- 5.1 The chair welcomed a deputation from Save Honor Oak Recreation Ground Campaign. Matt Beale-Collins and Fran Swan said that they would not be commenting on the detail of the report. They explained that they were pleased that the council had listened to the campaign's views and that it now looked as though it would be twenty-eight years before the recreation site could be used. The campaign members said that they would like the recreation ground to have a change of status so that it would be permanently protected and in order to secure investment and improve facilities. They explained that a survey indicated that the Honor Oak Recreation ground was very highly used. They reported that the space was particularly well-used at the weekend.
- 5.2 A member encouraged the campaign to put a bid into Cleaner, Greener, Safer, and commented that while funds were scarce there was support for bigger schemes. The member went on to comment that he would support the recreation ground being protected in some way as metropolitan land. This should not prohibit it being used as a burial land if it was needed in the future, as indicated in the action plan. Another member recommended that the campaign submit evidence to the council's Open Spaces Strategy consultation, which closed at midnight that evening. He said that the consultation might well be able to be extended for a day or so. Councillor Barrie Hargrove was the lead member. The campaign asked if members would support this.
- 5.3 Members suggested that the campaign meet with the Friends of Burgess Park and Friends of Peckham Rye Park, as a catalyst for developing plans. It was noted that Friends of Peckham Rye had received Cleaner, Greener, Safer funding that they had matched with Lottery funding. A member suggested Village Green status, however officers questioned whether the recreation ground would fit the criteria as Village Greens needed twenty-four hour access and the council had a need to keep cemetery land secure, which meant that the recreation ground was locked at night.
- 5.4 The chair thanked the Save Honor Oak Recreation Ground Campaign for their deputation. She then invited Des Waters, Head of Public Realm and John Wade,

Temporary Parks & Open Spaces Manager, to present the Cemetery Strategy.

- 5.5 Officers drew members' attention to the principles of the Mayor of London's spatial development strategy that stated that boroughs should ensure that provision of burial space was based on proximity to local communities and was made for those groups where burial was the only option. Officers also highlighted that burial space was green space, whether or not it was used for recreation.
- 5.6 Officers explained that the aim of the strategy was to use the minimal amount of land, and for this land to be utilised for as long as possible in order to be sustainable. Officers explained that there were difficulties likely from 2045 and 2050. Members responded that it seemed that the Honor Oak Recreation Ground was being put aside for this pressure point and officers concurred.
- 5.7 Officers explained that an initial report had been commissioned because of critical issues. The council had taken some immediate steps to meet current burial needs and this included the ending of pre sales and setting aside £400,000 to provide more burial space. It was anticipated that pre sales would start up again in 2013.
- 5.8 A longer report was then commissioned to look further into the future. Over a thousand people had participated in the consultation and stakeholders such as faith groups and funeral directors had given their views.
- 5.9 The preferred options were to re-use public graves, utilise unused space in private graves and to introduce mausoleums. There was also some support, but not a majority, for working with other local authorities to find a new site. Private provision had not been popular as there was concern that the council might have to step in if a company went bust.
- 5.10 Officers reported that the cemetery service had been under huge amounts of stress. Criminal activity on the site from fly-tipping had meant that unwanted material had to be removed offsite. The quality of the service was not what the council would want it to be. The new strategy was about improving the whole service from beginning to end.
- 5.11 Members asked if the strategy had considered the issue of fees and noted that the cabinet member decision on fees and charges had been called in recently. Officers responded that this was part of the bigger picture and commented that Southwark's burial fees were currently some of the lowest in London. There was an expectation that they would need to rise and that this was picked up in the report. The fees meant that the burial services were a net contributor to the crematory service.
- 5.12 Officers explained that the strategy contained short, medium and long-term options. Short-term options, up until 2022, included using the remaining part of the Honor Oak Nursery site, which would mean adding two metres of soil over a concrete base. There was some unused ground in Camberwell New Cemetery and some extra capacity around Camberwell Old Cemetery, which was currently used recreationally by local residents. Officers said that some residents had indicated that they did not want to overlook graves so the council was considering putting up soft screening and releasing some ground for amenity. The short-term

strategy would provide 1600 new plots.

- 5.13 Officers then moved on to the medium term plans. They explained that this primarily involved re-use of public graves, reclaiming of private graves and introducing mausoleums. Officers explained that the Corporation of London had re-used graves for some time and that churches had been doing this for the last five hundred years. Mausoleums attracted a premium and had a twenty-five-year deed. The remains were then removed or the lease extended. Officers indicated that they estimated that the medium term plan would provide 6500 spaces.
- 5.14 Officers explained that the longer-term plan was about further reclamation of private and public graves. Some of these could not be re-used as they were on wooded ground. However many of these options would not become available until 2045.
- 5.15 Officers explained that there were some legal problems as Southwark was excluded from being a burial authority, but this was probably because of poor drafting of various acts. This meant that the council would probably need to seek an amendment and this could be done yearly.
- 5.16 Officers spoke about other options for the five-year gap between 2040 and 2045. The council had been exploring options with Lambeth Council, which included looking at funding and forming an appropriate legal vehicle. The council had been approached with an opportunity to purchase spaces in Sidcup, however, if pursued this would need to go through the usual procurement process.
- 5.17 A member asked how much capacity there was to meet the burial needs of the Muslim population and officers responded that there was a year's capacity for Muslim burials in area B, however many people in Southwark were using burial facilities in North London. A member requested that the strategy meet the needs of other faith groups with particular practical requirements, such as Roman Catholics, Eastern Europeans or the Jewish community.
- 5.18 Officers were asked about emergency planning in the event of a disaster. Officers explained that the crematoria had the capacity to meet this need, and that there was some burial capacity. In an emergency, burial was not a statutory requirement and different local authorities had different plans according to their local conditions.
- 5.19 A member asked about the consultation process and noted that most people expressed a preference for local burial sites. Officers were asked if a specific question was asked about how far people were prepared to travel. A member asked about the ownership status of the Sidcup option. Officers responded that a question about travel was not included and that Sidcup would be privately run.
- 5.20 Officers confirmed that they had spoken to the local diocese about re-using burial plots. Church authorities were supportive and had highlighted this on their webpage.
- 5.21 A member noted that that the strategy talked about heritage assessments and indicated that local organisations might well want to assist with this process.

- 5.22 A member asked if all the sites in Camberwell Old Cemetery had been consulted on. She said that she thought that some sites had not been identified initially but had emerged during the consultation process. In particular, the member raised concerns that Ryedale residents were not initially identified as stakeholders. The member reported that Ryedale residents were subsequently written to, however she raised concerns that a scheduled meeting had not taken place. The member also queried consultation with residents from Underhill and Forest Hill Road and asked whether residents were aware of the consultation. She reported that residents were concerned about the risk to mature planting.
- 5.23 Officers confirmed that the meeting with Ryedale residents had not taken place and explained that this was because there had not been much to say about the implementation at this stage. Officers said that all of these sites had risks, which might result in some tree loss. They assured members that there would be a consultation to mitigate biodiversity loss and consider residents' concerns. This would be about how to best implement the plan rather than the nature of the plan. Officers indicated that the sites in question were all part of the cemetery and as such part of land set aside for burials.
- 5.24 Members raised concerns that the community had not formally been given details of these site options. Members said that while the general area had been discussed, residents would want details on the plans for specific areas.
- 5.25 Members asked if there was any risk of a judicial review if consultation had been insufficient with residents in Ryedale and the surrounding areas. The legal officer commented that if further options were added after the start of the consultation then there could be a risk, however this depended on whether the changes were significant. This was something that might warrant a closer look, but there was a balance to be struck. The judicial process was expensive and time consuming and therefore a risk that needed to be managed. A member noted that a judicial review was potentially an expensive process for the council but could be instigated by an individual for a small fee.
- 5.26 Members asked what would happen with the remains from mausoleums and officers explained that these might go to crematoria, a bone yard for crushing or be stored. Officers were also asked about the concrete substrata of one site and whether it might be better to dig this up rather than put soil on top. Officers explained that provision for drainage needed to be made, however this was the most efficient way as it could be very expensive to remove physical obstructions from the earth and there was a risk of contamination.
- 5.27 Officers were asked about provision for more natural and environmental burials, for example in woodland and with natural caskets. Officers explained that in the short term, more space was needed for these types of burials, but they needed less long-term management, as decomposition was faster. Officers explained that there were no sites in Southwark that were suitable for woodland burials, however this was indicated as an option to explore in the longer term strategy.

RECOMMENDED:

The committee noted that three additional potential sites for burial in Camberwell Old Cemetery had been identified after the main consultation was under way, and that residents closest to these sites might not be aware of this. The committee therefore recommended that the cabinet request officers to carry out a risk assessment on the consultation process and consider whether any additional work was required in respect of these particular sites.

6. HOUSING RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

- 6.1 The chair welcomed the head of community housing, Darren Welsh, and the resident involvement senior manager, Simon Godfrey. She reported that she had received a number of comments and complaints from tenants' & residents' associations (TRAs) about the grant application process. The chair invited the officers to present their paper.
- 6.2 Officers explained that they were currently consulting on a new resident engagement strategy for housing. Officers said that they worked with one hundred and twenty-seven TRAs, needing various levels of support. Fifty-nine had been assigned an officer to support them and seven were currently at critical level, the most serious of which might involve suspected fraud and the involvement of the police.
- 6.3 Officers reported that they were developing a model constitution and had recently held a network event promoting financial inclusion. They were also working with TRAs on halls, asset management and stock condition surveys.
- 6.4 The review would look at how the Tenant Fund was utilised; this had an income of over £0.5 million per year and funded a variety of activities including grants, training, resource centres and the annual tenants' conference.
- 6.5 Officers went on to explain the practicalities of making a funding application. This was now linked to a recognition policy whereby TRAs had to demonstrate that they were able to manage a hall or similar facility; were applicable for grant funding; could elect delegates to their housing forum and that the council could consult with the TRA. This was a new process that had been agreed by tenants' council and area housing forums. The application for a grant was also the application for recognition, although some TRAs would be recognised but not seek or be awarded funding.
- 6.6 The recognition process acted as a governance check and officers explained that this allowed them to see for example whether enough meetings had been held and whether halls were managed and accounts were presented.
- 6.7 Officers explained that in 2010/11 the grant application process had changed. Groups now applied within three months of their AGM and grants were paid in advance. The idea was that this would spread the load; however, officers explained that this had created some confusion. There had also sometimes been delays because not all the paperwork had been forthcoming. Officers explained

that they had provided an extension for TRAs until September for 2011/12.

- 6.8 Twelve applications had been refused because of, for example, inquorate AGMs, insufficient general meetings or that the TRA had closed. The report also gave details of issues raised at the Walworth West area forum.
- 6.9 The chair asked why around a third of TRAs had not applied for grants. Officers responded that there were a variety of reasons; for some TRAs this might be because of confusion, others had £10,000 in the bank and some TRAs might not think it was worth it. The chair commented that she was concerned that there was insufficient understanding of the new rules and processes. Officers said that they shared this concern and had been contacting organisations directly, attending events and setting aside funding. The chair reported that at one event the TRA said that the rules had got so confusing that they saw this as a deliberate attempt to reduce funding. Officers assured the committee that this was not a savings issue and that there were no plans to make cuts. Officers said that the council would like 100% of organisations to apply because the process was also a governance check. The chair suggested asking organisations why they did not apply for funding.
- 6.10 In response to a question about contact with TRAs, officers said that some organisations were healthy and therefore contact was less; however they would be chasing all TRAs up. Officers reported that a survey had been done about the new form and that 64% of respondents had said they found it easy to complete. TRAs had said that the hardest part had been the separate form for members of the committee to complete. Equalities questions had not been popular either. Officers said that they intended to retain this information, which would make successive applications easier to complete.
- 6.11 A member commented that even TRAs that were performing well were finding the two-year rule hard to grapple with. He said that the form he had seen demanded a fair amount of financial understanding. An officer acknowledged that there were capacity issues, however he said that support was available from the resident involvement and housing management teams and that officers were available to help with grant applications over the phone. Members requested information on the volume of grant applications awarded in previous years.
- 6.12 Members asked how applications could be made and if there was an option to make an application via email, or online using an application like Survey Monkey. Officers said that there were difficulties with using Survey Monkey to store confidential information as this was stored in the US and could breach Data Protection rules. Members asked about alternatives to Survey Monkey and officers said that there were other applications but that they also had limitations.
- 6.13 Members made a series of suggestions including resident involvement officers attending AGMs; a question being added asking why TRAs did not apply for funding and officers looking at how other parts of the council have developed online forms. Officers agreed that collecting as much information as possible at the AGMs was a good way of progressing applications and agreed that offering an electronic version of the main form would be helpful.

- 6.14 The chair invited the public to comment. An audience member commented that her TRA had recently found out that Resident Involvement Officers did not have to come to meetings and that housing officers would do this in future. She went on to comment that applications for funding used to take place at the end of the financial year and that her TRA had not been told of changes to the application process. The audience member asked why her TRA was no longer getting support and why Resident Involvement Officers did not give assistance in the same way.
- 6.15 A member commented that there appeared to be a number of issues that needed to be looked at including how information was provided and the role and function of Resident Involvement. Another member reported that he had been to a meeting in Rotherhithe recently and had been shocked that many TRA chairs did not understand the process, and this included healthy TRAs, which was of particular concern. Members said that they would like more information on contact to date by officers and to be able to assist in supporting TRAs. The chair asked officers to provide information on the extent of contact with TRAs and how far on in the application process they were.
- 6.16 Officers were asked if the £30,000 unspent grant money had been lost and officers clarified that the money remained and had been carried forward to this financial year. Members asked what comments had been received about the revised process of applying for recognition and grants. Officers responded that there had been a range; for some TRAs the recognition process had been perceived as “big brother”; however, officers said, de-recognition was a last resort. Officers reported that usually it did not come to this and that groups either stepped up or fell apart. Members requested that feedback from TRAs be included in the strategy report.
- 6.17 Councillor Noakes commented that the report indicated that seven TRAs were in critical condition and fifty-nine had a dedicated officer giving support. He noted that in his ward there were a variety of TRAs; some were very good, some were new, some barely met, one was critical and one held an AGM but could not elect a chair. He commented that it seemed that quite a few TRAs were struggling. Officers reported that some of the problems were interpersonal and that officers had been working in the background to support the struggling organisations that were at risk of quietly falling apart, not just the more vocal TRAs. Councillor Noakes requested specific information on TRAs in his area and progress with the recognition and grants process, and said that he was very supportive of TRAs.
- 6.18 An audience member commented that funding was achieved through a small levy on rents and that leaseholders paid a percentage. A member asked officers about estates that did not have TRAs and an officer responded that the service was considering how all householders could gain value from the fund. Officers commented that while they could encourage the formation of TRAs they could not make them form. Members reported that residents had been complaining that funding and rents were rising and questioning value for money. Officers said that the review was considering the priorities for the fund, for example whether a TRA with many resources, or those that offered significant benefit to the community, should get less or more funding.
- 6.19 A member asked if there was a target for processing applications and officers confirmed that this was fourteen days, however this was not being met and they

were looking at the council processes to see what was holding this up.

- 6.20 Members asked if officers would be doing a satisfaction survey and officers confirmed that they would be. Officers went on to comment that sometimes they were addressing problems and that this might make them unpopular with TRA committee members, because officers would be saying difficult things. The other issue was that the communities were often looking back to levels of support that could no longer be sustained.
- 6.21 A member of the audience, Ian Ritchie of Buchan TRA, commented that this process was the triumph of bureaucracy over tenant democracy. He commented that the forms were overly long-winded, which in his view made the process intensive for both tenants and officers. He said that if changes were introduced there needed to be adequate back office support. He went on to comment that resources were wrongly targeted, and that despite his organisation having serious problems he had only seen a Resident Involvement officer once. He ended by asking if the chair would accept a letter outlining his concerns, which the chair welcomed.
- 6.22 Susanne Webb then spoke about Astley Cooper TRA. She reported that at one stage they had been struggling with issues such as hall management and access. She said that officers had given support and that the TRA committee had learned new skills, however there remained an ongoing need for Resident Involvement support. She commented that if the TRA had been more aware of the grant process they would have applied for more money and that volunteers had little time to chase up applications. A member of the audience said that at the very least Resident Involvement officers should come to TRA AGMs. He also added that forms had been delayed for a long time and lost.
- 6.23 The chair thanked the officers for their attendance and for their frankness.
- 6.24 The committee discussed the information that they would like officers to provide and the recommendations for cabinet.

RESOLVED:

1. That officers be asked to circulate all members with additional information on:
 - the number of TRAs who made applications in 2009/10
 - officers' contact with all TRAs, in order to assist with the recognition and grant application process
 - TRAs who have not made an application for funding and recognition, in order to assist ward councilors with supporting local TRAs to complete an application, where appropriate.
2. The officers be asked to provide Councillor David Noakes with additional information on the status and activity of all TRAs in his ward in order to assist with support.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET:

1. That the application process for grants and recognition be made less complicated, less bureaucratic and more accessible.
2. That officers create an online application process to complement the paper based process, so that tenants' and residents' associations (TRAs) have options for making applications. This to be completed within six months.
3. That there be an emphasis on support for TRAs to make funding applications over the next few months, rather than on recognition, in order to clear the backlog of applications and enable organisations to receive funds.
4. That it be obligatory for a Resident Involvement Officer to attend every TRA AGM, and that officers use this occasion to assist TRAs in their applications for recognition and funding.
5. That TRAs create a standing item at every AGM covering the administration needed to complete the recognition and funding application process.
6. That the Resident Involvement Team be asked to consider how to work with ward councillors to support TRAs.
7. That a report on resident engagement be sent to the Housing Commission, Southwark Tenants' Council and Southwark Homeowners' Council.
8. That officers be asked to return to overview & scrutiny committee in six months' time to report on progress on the above recommendations.

7. ALLOCATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES

- 7.1 The committee requested that officers provide more information so that the item could be considered more fully at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

That Officers provide further information on the allocation of primary school places for children residing in postcodes SE19, SE21, SE22, SE23 and SE24.

8. CUSTOMER SERVICE PERFORMANCE MONITORING

- 8.1 The chair invited the head of customer experience, Richard Selley, to present the Customer Service Performance Monitoring report. He explained that, when he had last attended the committee, the council was taking advice on the Vangent contract. The council had now informed Vangent that it would be terminating the contract two years earlier than anticipated and that the customer services functions would now be delivered in house. Officers believed that the council could make savings as Vangent's overheads were high and the service would no longer need to make a profit. The head of customer experience explained that the council had

already released considerable savings in the last year through closer management of the contract and service channel shift – i.e. encouraging customers to access services using cheaper channels, like the web.

- 8.2 The head of customer experience said that the council's contract with Vangent was based on transactional costs, so that every time a customer called the Customer Service Centre or visited a One Stop Shop they would receive a payment. This provided no incentive for Vangent to reduce call volumes or seek to get customers to use cheaper service access channels. The new service would be investing in staff and would not be a script-based service.
- 8.3 A member welcomed this development and asked if officers also thought that the council should take the housing repairs service in house. The head of customer experience responded that, for contracted services, having a sole provider could mean that you lost the competitive edge.
- 8.4 Members asked how moving the customer service in-house would improve the quality of the service and how the council would deliver the new service. The head of customer experience explained that the new service would be under member and officer control. The service would be delivered largely from the new Queen's Road site in Peckham. The Vangent service had delivered well in terms of answering calls; however the outcomes for customers had sometimes been poor. The new service would promote advocacy for the customer by the customer service centre. This would be easier once the service was not divorced from its implementation. A member commented that he hoped that staff would be empowered to chase repairs and contractors.
- 8.5 Members asked how the council was managing the risks of disengaging from the Vangent contract and if the council was developing the in-house service in shadow form. The head of customer experience explained that there was an exit strategy and strong governance around transition of the service. He explained that one of the possible risks was that the Queen's Road site might not be ready in time. Some work might be done in parallel to mitigate the risk and there would be a phased approach, for example, a new switchboard was being developed.
- 8.6 The head of customer experience explained that there were up to three hundred and fifty staff that could be transferred over using TUPE, however many of these were part time. There was also a delivery site in Yorkshire, but these staff were not expected to transfer to Queen's Road. The in house service might have to take over more staff than were eventually needed.
- 8.7 A member noted that when the council brought in the council tax service there were hiccups. He recommended that officers looked at this.
- 8.8 Members asked if the ending of the contact with Vangent had meant that the council incurred costs and the head of customer experience explained that Southwark had not incurred any costs, as there had been a technical breach of the contract. He went on to explain that there would be costs to be incurred as the council would need to invest in setting up the new service. He further explained that there was some question over the service operating model and whether there would be a large contact centre and that this would go to chief officers and then to

cabinet for discussion and decision in July.

- 8.9 Members asked if there were risks around Vangent's delivery for the duration of the remaining contract. The head of customer experience said that there were risks of quality falling, however the council was still managing the contract proactively and many of the staff would TUPE over, which was an incentive to maintain performance.
- 8.10 Members then moved on to consider the report on complaints. A member commented that he thought there would be more complaints on Children's Services, particularly around admissions. The head of customer experience explained that this was a situation where there was a split; the call centre handled some questions, but Children's Services dealt with more sensitive or complex calls directly.
- 8.11 A member asked if there was a council wide report and the head of customer experience said there was and that this went to CMT.
- 8.12 A member commented on the volume of complaints to Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and the head of customer experience said that this was improving.
- 8.13 There was a discussion about members enquires and the different methods used, including using icasework, member support or the use of informal contacts. The head of customer experience said that complaints that came to his team were resolved quite quickly. Members noted that a web interface for the iphone would be helpful.

RESOLVED:

That Officers return to a meeting of the committee in the next municipal year with:

- A global report on complaints received by the call centre and more sensitive or detailed complaints dealt with by departments. This would provide details on whether complaints were falling in volume, on the amount escalating to the next stage and the numbers resulting in a payout.
- A detailed report on complaints received on the allocation of school places, including information on how many places were allocated manually.

9. SOUTHWARK CLINICAL COMMISSIONING CONSORTIA (HEALTH & ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE)

- 9.1 Councillor Mark Williams, chair of the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee, presented the report. He drew the committee's attention to recommendations 5 and 16. The first recommended that any commissions made by the consortia, other than minor changes outside of the NHS, should be referred to the Health and Wellbeing Board and the health scrutiny sub-committee. Recommendation 16 proposed that locally determined contracts should contain clauses on patient satisfaction.

RESOLVED:

That the report be agreed.

10. SUPPORT FOR PARENTS AND CARERS OF DISABLED CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE)

- 10.1 Councillor David Hubber, Chair of the Education and Children's Service Scrutiny Sub Committee, presented the final report. He said that he would particularly like to highlight the recommendations in respect of the need for better and more sensitive sharing of data. He also drew the committee's attention to the appendix, which detailed a pilot scheme from Wandsworth Council that supported parents back into work. The chair reported that a parent of a disabled child had recommended this report to the committee.

RESOLVED:

That the report be agreed.

11. EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN SOUTHWARK (REGENERATION & LEISURE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE)

- 11.1 Councillor David Noakes, Chair of the Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee, presented the report. He said that the sub-committee instigated this report because of concerns about unemployment and particularly about youth unemployment. There were also concerns that large local employers such as the local authority and health authority were not areas of local growth.
- 11.2 The chair of the sub -committee explained that officers from regeneration gave evidence of the council's successes in regeneration and that there were jobs in Southwark, however sometimes there was not a good skills match. The report contained some interesting recommendations on this.
- 11.3 A member suggested that recommendation 4 cover all education providers.
- 11.4 The chair of the sub-committee outlined the work of the Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee throughout the year and tabled a paper.

RESOLVED:

That the report be agreed with the amendment that recommendation 4 be changed to cover all education providers; including schools, academies and further education providers:

"That the council acts as an enabler regarding the creation of a generic borough-wide careers advice service across school, academies and further education providers in Southwark and encourages the greater involvement of local employers in these educational providers in order to help young people secure jobs and

careers when they leave school, including how to set up and run a business.”

12. MINUTES

- 12.1 The minutes of the closed section of the meeting held on 16 April 2012 were agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm