

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday 8 October 2025

6.30 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Membership

Councillor Ian Wingfield (Chair)
Councillor Irina Von Wiese (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Suzanne Abachor
Councillor Cassandra Brown
Councillor Victor Chamberlain
Councillor Esme Hicks
Councillor Laura Johnson
Councillor Richard Leeming
Councillor Jason Ochere
Councillor Bethan Roberts
Councillor Martin Seaton
Martin Brecknell (Co-opted member)
Mannah Kargbo (Co-opted member)
Alie Kallon (Co-opted member)

Reserves

Councillor Rachel Bentley
Councillor Sunil Chopra
Councillor Sabina Emmanuel
Councillor Barrie Hargrove
Councillor Jon Hartley
Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Hamish McCallum
Councillor Margy Newens
Councillor Catherine Rose
Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Cleo Soanes

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. For details on building access, translation, provision of signers or any other requirements for this meeting, please contact the person below.

Contact

Amit Alva on email: amit.alva@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Althea Loderick

Chief Executive

Date: 30 September 2025



Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday 8 October 2025

6.30 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Order of Business

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

PART A - OPEN BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

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 interests and dispensations in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

4. MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2025. *(To follow)*

5. SOUTHWARK COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

1 - 18

To receive a presentation from Councillor Natasha Enin, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Neighbourhoods on Southwark Community Safety – Working Together for a Safer Southwark, supported by officers Stephen Douglass, Director of Stronger Neighbourhoods and Caroline Thwaites, Assistant Director Community Safety & Partnerships.

Item No.	Title	Page No.
6.	CHILTON GROVE ESTATE - INFILL AND MAJOR WORKS	19 - 39
	To receive a report from Hakeem Osiniake, Strategic Director for Housing and Ryan Collymore, Director of Repairs and Maintenance on Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018-19 QHIP Major Works Project.	
7.	CABINET RESPONSE TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONSORT ESTATE	40 - 50
	To note the Cabinet Response to Overview and Scrutiny Committee Recommendations arising from Scrutiny of Consort Estate Major Works, SE15, Charges to Leaseholders.	
8.	WORK PROGRAMME	51 - 59
	To note the work programme as at 8 October 2025.	
	DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.	

Date: 30 September 2025

Southwark Community Safety Working Together for Safer Southwark

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday 8th October 2025



Probation
Service



South East
London
Integrated Care System



Introduction and purpose

Overview and Scrutiny Committee hold to account those who are responsible for tackling crime and disorder in a local area and scrutinise the work of the Community Safety Partnership. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 introduced a statutory responsibility for local authorities, police and partners to reduce crime and disorder in their communities. Under this law, the responsible authorities were required to form partnerships and implement crime reduction plans following an assessment of trends in their areas. The presentation will cover:

- 1 Overview and role of the Community Safety Partnership
- 2 Summary of annual strategic assessment 2024-2025
- 3 New Community Safety Plan 2025-2030 - Draft priorities
- 4 Discussion and questions with partners

Community Safety Partnership



STATUTORY SHARED LEADERSHIP

- Local Authority, Police, Health, Probation and London Fire Brigade.
- Works to prevent crime and disorder through joint action, setting of strategic direction through the Plan (2025-2030) using data and insight to allocate resources.
- Is required under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Serious Violence Duty.
- Aligns to the London Police & Crime Plan and other regional and national plans. Priorities are co-owned and involve resident engagement.
- Works with Safeguarding Adults Board, Children's Safeguarding Partnership, Health & Wellbeing Board.
- Priorities delivered by 5 thematic boards.



A Safer Southwark

Southwark 2030



Feeling safe is a key priority for residents.

A commitment for a Safer Southwark sits at the heart of S2030

Everyone should feel safe, where they live, work and spend time

Community Safety Partnership and Plan



Ambitions are achieved through a whole-system partnership response.

CSP is a statutory body that sets the strategic direction for community safety across Southwark.

The Plan sets out 5 priorities for the borough informed by data.

Annual Strategic Assessment



Identifies crime trends and emerging challenges.

Priorities and approach are reviewed in line with the data.

Continuous community engagement also informs approach

How we operate



Commissioned a review to look at how we operate.

The Council is changing how it delivers services

Strengthening partnership governance and approach to deliver better outcomes.

What the assessment tells us

Crime has fallen over the long-term, but Southwark has seen **small increases in the past two years**, broadly in line with London-wide trends, but significantly less sharp than some other London boroughs. **Southwark has rising crime driven by theft (theft person and shoplifting), concentrated in central/northwest wards**, alongside increases in hate crime, radicalisation referrals, and serious violence (knife and gun crime).

Crime/Problem Type	Volume 24/25	Change (Volume)	Harm Score	Public Opinion	Strategic Priority	Total Score
Arson and Criminal Damage						9
Burglary						13
Drug offences						13
Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society						7
Possession of Weapons						12
Public Order offences						6
Robbery						15
Sexual offences						16
Theft						15
Vehicle offences						8
Violence Against the Person						17
ASB (Council and Police combined)						15

We have used a priority setting matrix to highlight the potential crime types that should be prioritised by the partnership in 2025-2030.

Theme: crime and disorder

Overall Crime

39,146 offences
5th highest
In London

+ 4.4%

	London Ranking		
	23/24	24/25	Change
Arson and Criminal Damage	13 th	13 th	-
Burglary	6 th	4 th	▲2
Drug offences	16 th	11 th	▲5
Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society	25 th	25 th	-
Possession of Weapons	2 nd	9 th	▼7
Public Order offences	13 th	14 th	▼1
Robbery	3 rd	5 th	▼2
Sexual offences	6 th	6 th	-
Theft	4 th	5 th	▼1
Vehicle offences	28 th	28 th	-
Violence Against the Person	17 th	17 th	-
Total	6th	5th	▲1

784 offences

Hate Crime

11th highest in London, majority racist/religious.

794 offences

Knife Crime

Southwark within the top 5 boroughs across London.

↑

28%

Prevent referrals

Mainly males rising concern around violence ideologies.

69 offences

Gun Crime

13th highest in London 44 involved a firearm and 4 involved discharging live ammunition.

Theft

↑ **Overall increase of 15.4% (16,837 offences)**
5th highest in London. With 16,839 offences.

- Theft from the person ↑ 21.6% (6,986 offences)
- Shoplifting ↑ 137.9% (3,932 offences).

Hotspots

Borough & Bankside, London Bridge & West Bermondsey, North Walworth.

Theme: drug related harm and ASB

Drug harm

1,725

Adults in drug
treatment services

+ 2%



Strong link between alcohol, drugs, crime & ASB, especially in **NW Southwark** (licensed venues & ambulance callouts).



Club drugs and novel synthetic opioids are an emerging area of concern identified

9,407
reports

Police ASB

Decreased by
1.8%

2,694
reports

Council ASB

Decreased by
3.5%

Despite the overall decrease in ASB. Reports of drug-related ASB rose to 19.9%, while alcohol-related ASB remained steady at 4.4%.

Southwark Council is the largest social housing landlord in London, managing over 55,000 council homes across the borough. This presents unique challenges in tackling crime and ASB on estates compared to neighbouring boroughs.

Drug related deaths



Southwark reported a higher rate of drug misuse deaths between 21-23, 5.5 per 100k population, aligning with the national average but higher than inner London (5.2)

**ASB
Hotspots**



Old Kent Road,
London Bridge &
West Bermondsey

Theme: VAWG and domestic violence

VAWG decrease in offences were mostly due to violence against the person, which decreased by 17% , 2,765 reported.

➤ Violence with injury decreased by 22.2%, 1,108.

44.1% of VAWG was flagged as relating to domestic abuse, 1,893 offences.

There were 0 recorded FGM, 3 forced marriage and 9 honour based violence offences in 24/25

Southwark Domestic Abuse Service for advocacy and casework support reported 1,150 referrals in 24/25, down from 1,346 the previous year.

The Refuge accommodation supported 32 adults and 20 children

**4266
offences**

VAWG

Decreased by
14.7%

**663
offences**

**Sexual
offences**

Increased by 4.9%
Rape increased
by 7.7%, 238.

2,818

**Domestic
abuse**

56.4% related to
violence without
injury.

**Hotspots
VAWG**



Old Kent Road,
North Walworth,
London Bridge &
West
Bermondsey.

**Hotspots
Domestic**



Nunhead &
Queen's Road,
South
Bermondsey and
Peckham.

Women's safety survey 24/25



41% of respondents reported feeling less safe in the last 12 months, with 3.9% reported feeling safer.

60.2% of respondents reported having experienced sexism, misogyny or misogynist hate crime.

70.4% reported to having experienced gender-based violence.

Theme: serious violence, victim or suspect <25yrs

Hotspots



Personal robbery: Follows same pattern as all crime with emerging hotspots in Newington and Peckham Rye.

Serious violence: Hotspots overlap with personal robbery (<25) and knife crime. Emerging Wards: Rotherhithe, Faraday and St Giles.

Sexual violence: Emerging Wards: Nunhead & Queen’s Road, Dulwich Hill and Faraday.

Knife crime: Faraday, Camberwell Green, Newington and Rotherhithe.

704
offences

Personal robbery

Decreased by
29%
Knives mainly
used to threaten

575
offences

Serious violence

Decreased by
30.1%, mostly due
to ABH (-242). 0
homicides involving
knife use.

269
offences

Sexual violence

Increased by
5.5%, due to an
increase in assault
by penetration
(+12).

353
offences

Knife Crime

Most offences
related to knives
being threatened
(seen or not seen).

Serious violence is a **London and local priority** as detailed in the MOPAC Police and Crime Plan 2025-29 and Southwark 2030 strategy and nationally as part of the Serious Violence Duty.

Serious Violence Category	Serious Violence Offence	23/24	24/25	% Change	Change Volume
Personal Robbery	Personal Robbery	992	704	-29.0%	-288
Serious Violence	Actual Bodily Harm (ABH)	602	360	-40.2%	-242
	Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH)	217	166	-23.5%	-51
	Threats to Kill	4	49	1125%	45
	Homicide	1	1	0%	0
	Serious Violence Total	824	576	-30.1%	-248
Sexual Violence	Assault by Penetration	8	20	150%	12
	Rape	82	81	-1.2%	-1
	Sexual Assault	165	168	1.8%	3
	Sexual Violence Total	255	269	5.5%	14

Theme: community voice

Resident insights

- **Daytime:** 88% feel safe in their local area → *in line with London & national benchmarks.*
- **After dark:** 54% feel safe → *+5 points since Wave 1 but still below benchmarks.*
- Lower feelings of safety in the **North** compared to South.
- **Women, older residents (65+), disabled residents, and social renters** more likely to feel unsafe at night.



Community safety is one of the most emotive and visible issues for residents. The gap between statistical trends and lived experience was a strong theme in the Southwark 2030 engagement and in the recent independent review. Bridging that gap between data and public confidence is a key goal of the work of the partnership and the council.

MOPAC Public attitude survey

- Southwark residents are less confident than London in the MPS doing a good job and feeling that the MPS treat everyone fairly. Less trusting than London of the Police overall and relying on them to be there.
- Similar. to London in their ability to contact their ward officer, feeling informed, having their issues understood and concerns listened to.
- The Resident Insight Survey (Wave 2 – March 2025) found that 54% of residents reported feeling safe after dark, compared with 64% across London and 71% according to Local Government Association benchmarks.

Priorities

The 2024 -25 Strategic Assessment reinforces the need to continue to prioritise the following areas. The Community Safety Partnership Plan will identify the focus and the deliverables for each priority areas. The following slides provide more detail on delivery to date and future plans.



Priority: VAWG and promoting women's safety

Why it matters

- Women & girls disproportionately face domestic abuse, harassment, sexual violence.
- Safety after dark is a persistent concern.

What we've achieved

- 1,150 referrals to Domestic Abuse Service; 116 households supported at home.
- 'Drive' programme for high-risk perpetrators launched.
- Campaigns: 'Through Her Eyes' (1.7m reach), Safe Havens (29) & Safe Spaces (71).
- Women's Night Safety Charter adopted by 50+ businesses.
- Hotspot audits upgraded with CCTV, lighting and street design.

What we'll deliver

- Integrated VAWG service (single front door) as part of the new Women Safety Centre.
- Expanded prevention & education in schools and businesses.
- More visible public space safety measures/ integrated work in hotspot areas including a focus at nighttime.

Priority: Reducing violence and vulnerability

Why it matters

- Knife crime, robbery, exploitation and modern slavery impact young people and vulnerable groups.
- Local hotspots include estates, transport hubs and night-time economy.

What we've achieved

- 200+ young people supported through Community Harm & Exploitation Hub.
- 3 new knife bins and diversion schemes shaped by youth voices.
- 'Our Routes' patrols reducing robbery near schools.
- 65 modern slavery referrals; 120+ professionals trained.
- Anti-theft campaign 'Look Up Look Out' and phone-marking events.

What we'll deliver

- Further develop detailed plans to tackle Theft Person and Shoplifting.
- Sustained area action plans to tackle crime and ASB including hyper-local responses.
- Continue to delivery the local violence reduction plan.
- Strengthened modern slavery and county lines response.

Priority: Reduce drug related harm

Why it matters

- Drugs and alcohol drive violence, health inequalities and antisocial behaviour.
- Drug-related ASB now accounts for ~20% of all ASB.
- Southwark has higher-than-average drug misuse deaths.
- Hotspots in northwest wards including London Bridge, Bermondsey, Old Kent Road.

What we've achieved

- +2% treatment access, 1,725 adults engaged.
- Young people in treatment above pre-COVID baseline.
- Borough drugs profile mapped supply and ASB hotspots.
- Drug & Alcohol Death Panel; borough-wide naloxone rollout.
- Joint operations disrupting supply and visible ASB.
- ASB pilots and Night-Time Patrols introduced.
- Anti-spiking campaigns with venues; 1,200+ students reached.

What we'll deliver

- New community drug & alcohol service contracts (2026/27).
- Expanded school prevention work (cannabis, vaping).
- Preparedness plan for synthetic opioids.
- Extend ASB hotspot pilots to estates, parks & town centres.
- More visible joint patrols in North West Southwark.
- Celebrate recovery and engage residents in solutions.

Priority: Increase trust and confidence in policing

Why it matters

- Trust eroded by national scandals and Casey Review findings.
- BAME residents and women report lower confidence in policing.
- Without trust, crime goes unreported, and safety undermined.

What we've achieved

- 3 Community Conversations shaped local priorities.
- Southwark Trust & Confidence Plan aligned with Met reforms.
- Policing Oversight Board launched with diverse membership.
- Scrutiny of stop & search, taser use, VAWG and neighbourhood policing.

What we'll deliver

- Publish Annual Oversight Board Report for transparency.
- Ongoing resident-led scrutiny of policing practices.
- Strengthened accountability and alignment with London reforms.

Priority: Creating safe and sociable neighbourhoods

Why it matters

- ASB, nuisance and disorder undermine community pride and safety.
- Residents consistently rank these among top local concerns.

What we've achieved

- £3m invested in CCTV: 500+ cameras, 20% more operators.
- Community Wardens expanded with new enforcement powers.
- Night-Time Patrol Service launched in August 2025.
- Town Centre police teams in Peckham and North Walworth.
- Aylesbury Estate pilot: 400+ flats cleared, 11 squats closed.
- Resident-led PSPO consultations delivered.

What we'll deliver

- Sustained area action plans to tackle crime and ASB including focused days of engagement and enforcement action.
- More joint patrols and integrated enforcement.
- Co-designed resident solutions for safer public spaces.

Opportunity for Discussion with Strategic Partners

Police

London Fire
Brigade

Local
Authority

Health

Probation

Q&A

Meeting Name:	Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Date:	08 October 2025
Report title:	Outcome of the Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Rotherhithe
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	N/A
From:	Ryan Collymore, Director of Repairs & Maintenance

RECOMMENDATION(S)

This report recommends:

1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC):
 - notes and comments on the report of the Interim Design and Delivery Manager's Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project
 - notes and comments on the updates in this report provided by the Director of Repairs and Maintenance in relation to:
 - refunds to leaseholders for payments made for the works
 - issues with the lifts
 - condition of the site
 - compensation payments.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The Chilton Grove Estate was part of the 2018/19 Quality Homes Investment Programme (QHIP). This works package was designed to provide for the refurbishment of 68 homes contained within the two part four/part six storey blocks (Blocks A and B) below:
 - 2-68 Chilton Grove
 - 70-136 Chilton Grove
3. It was subsequently decided that the QHIP project would be extended to include the construction of a two-storey rooftop extension and a corner extension on each of the two blocks, to provide 44 new homes (taking the total of homes on the site to 112). This would increase the height of the two blocks to part six/part eight storeys. The 44 new homes would be for affordable, social rent.
4. Works commenced on this project on 24 June 2019 and, with an expected

contract duration of 78 working weeks, was due to complete by 20 December 2020.

5. Unfortunately, this project has not gone to plan and has suffered from protracted delays, changes in the scope of the works, changes in policy, contractual difficulties and disputes and escalating costs. All of this has led to what has been a very difficult, sometimes unpleasant and unfortunate experience for residents affected by the works. This is compounded by the fact that the planned refurbishment works (QHIP) remain incomplete.
6. As a result of concerns raised by residents and councillors, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) 'called-in' the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

7. In response to the decision of the OSC to 'call in' the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project, the Strategic Director of Housing instructed the Interim Design and Delivery Manager (also previously Lead Officer of the Task and Finishing Team) to carry out an internal review of the delivery and management of the project.
8. The Interim Design and Delivery Manager has completed his review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project and his report is attached as Appendix 'A' to this report.

Key Findings

9. The internal review has concluded that the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project did not go well which, resulted in a very difficult, sometimes unpleasant, and unfortunate experience for residents affected by the works.
10. The internal review has identified several factors that contributed to the poor performance of this project including:
 - suitability of the Council's existing partnering contract for use in a project of this type
 - complexity of the project
 - challenges of combining a QHIP project with a new-build (rooftop homes) project
 - performance of the main contractor
 - lack of timely internal decision-making
 - poor communications

Management Response

11. Several of the contributing factors to the poor performance of this project identified by the internal review have already been recognised and addressed by the Council. For example, the partnering contracts previously used for the Housing Major Works projects have now expired and, the remaining QHIP works at Chilton Grove will be subject to a new robust procurement process.

12. The Council has recognised the impact that this project has had on residents in the two blocks of flats at Chilton Grove and, in line with Section 7 – ‘Financial Compensation’ of its Complaints Policy, has agreed to pay compensation to all households (leasehold and tenant) for delay and distress.

Updates

Refunds to leaseholders

13. Leaseholders at Chilton Grove have recently received their ‘final’ invoices for the completed works. In all cases, because the original planned works are not complete, leaseholder recharges have reduced from the original estimates and refunds have been issued.

Lift installations

14. As part of the proposal for the rooftop homes and corner extensions, it was intended that a new lift would be installed to serve the additional floors housing the new rooftop homes (as well as all other floors). In addition, refurbishment works to the existing lifts (where necessary) would be undertaken to ensure they remained in good working order. The omission of the rooftop homes and corner extensions meant that the installation of a new lift and works to the existing lifts was also omitted.
15. The Electrical and Lifts Team has advised that the two lifts in 2-68 and 70-136 Chilton Grove remain in a good serviceable condition. The lifts are subject to regular servicing and maintenance and, there have been few reported issues with their operation. There are currently no plans for refurbishing the two lifts.

Condition of the site

16. Since terminating the order with Equans in January 2024, the Council has carried out some works to improve the condition and appearance of the two blocks of flats in Chilton Grove including:
 - landscaping works to the front entrances of both blocks
 - tidying up the former site compound
 - removing stored items from the previous works
 - tidying up the estate generally
 - replacing the gates and bollards to the car park
 - removing unsightly and unnecessary hoarding
 - grounds maintenance works
17. The site is in considerably better condition than it was when Equans left the site in October 2021 however, there are still obvious signs that the works on site are incomplete including, the condition of the rear communal gardens, the temporary ‘festoon’ lighting in the communal areas and the unfinished cladding detail around the windows.
18. Except for the new door entry installation, there are no other works planned or deemed necessary before the commencement of the project to carry out the

remaining outstanding QHIP works which, is due to commence in January/February 2026 and will take 12 to 18 months to complete.

Compensation payments

19. In view of the delays and distress caused by the poor performance of this project, the Strategic Director of Housing has agreed officer recommendations that all households in the two blocks of flats in Chilton Grove (leaseholders and tenants) will receive an appropriate level of compensation, in line with the provisions of the Council's Compensation Policy.
20. The level of compensation due equates to £4600 per household (pro-rata payments will be made for residents who were not living on the estate for the full duration of the works). Processes are in place to ensure that the compensation payments are made before the end of October 2025.

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project

AUDIT TRAIL

This section must be included in all reports.

Lead Officer	Hakeem Osinaike, Strategic Director of Housing		
Report Author	Ryan Collymore – Director of Repairs & Maintenance		
Version	Final		
Dated	29/09/2025		
Key Decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Officer Title		Comments Sought	Comments Included
Assistant Chief Executive, Governance and Assurance		No	No
Strategic Director, Finance		No	No
List other officers here			
Cabinet Member		Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team			30 September 2025

APPENDIX 'A'**London Borough of Southwark****Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project****Report of the Interim Design and Delivery Manager**

September 2025

APPENDIX 'A'

Contents	Page Number
1. Background	3
2. Key Issues	4
3. Findings	5
4. Compensation	14
5. Next Steps	15
6. Conclusions	16

APPENDIX 'A'

1. Background

1.1 The Chilton Grove Estate was part of the 2018/19 Quality Homes Investment Programme (QHIP). This works package was designed to provide for the refurbishment of 68 homes contained within the two part four/part six storey blocks (Blocks A and B) below:

- 2-68 Chilton Grove
- 70-136 Chilton Grove

1.2 The scope of the works that were due to be undertaken under the QHIP included the following:

- concrete and brickwork repairs
- external redecorations
- renewal of walkway and private balcony coverings
- renewal of roof coverings
- window replacements
- asbestos removal
- timber cladding replacement to bathrooms
- renewal of lateral (electric) mains
- door entry installation
- underground drainage repairs
- fire safety improvement works

1.3 It was subsequently decided that the QHIP project would be extended to include the construction of a two-storey rooftop extension and a corner extension on each of the two blocks, to provide 44 new homes (taking the total of homes on the site to 112). This would increase the height of the two blocks to part six/part eight storeys. The 44 new homes would be for affordable, social rent.

1.4 In addition to the above, landscape enhancement works were proposed that included the provision of a range of child play facilities, 82 secure cycle stand spaces, cycle parking for visitors and four disabled car parking spaces.

1.5 In February 2019, delegated approval was given by the Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation at the time, to proceed with the combined works package set out above, appointing Engie Regeneration (previously Apollo/Keepmoat and latterly, Equans) under the Housing Major Works Partnering Contract awarded on 14 June 2010 and subsequently extended to 2022.

1.6 Delegated approval included the cost of works and contractor design fees of £18,870,270, professional fees of £1,340,952, a 5% client contingency of £1,010,561, giving a total approved scheme cost of £21,221,783. The split in the cost of works and contractor design fees of £18,870,270 was as below:

- New rooftop homes: £16,582,829
- QHIP: £2,287,441

APPENDIX 'A'

- 1.7 At the time that delegated approval for the works was given, there were 22 leaseholders that would have been directly affected by the works. The estimated service charges for those leaseholders affected ranged from £9,600 to £44,860.
- 1.8 Calfordseaden was appointed to work with the Major Works Team to manage the project on behalf of the Council, providing the full range of the required building services including:
 - Contract Project Manager
 - Lead Designer
 - Mechanical and Electrical Engineer
 - Clerk of Works
 - Quantity Surveyor
 - CDM Co-ordinator
- 1.9 Open Communities was appointed as Resident Advisor on this project to help ensure that disruption to residents was minimised. Regular meetings with the Resident Project Group (RPG) were held for the duration of the works to provide regular updates on progress and, to address any concerns that arose as the works proceeded.
- 1.10 Works commenced on this project on 24 June 2019 and, with an expected contract duration of 78 working weeks, was due to complete by 20 December 2020.
- 1.11 This project has not gone to plan and has suffered from protracted delays, changes in the scope of the works, changes in policy, contractual difficulties and disputes and escalating costs. All of this has led to what has been a very difficult, sometimes unpleasant, and unfortunate experience for residents affected by the works. This is compounded by the fact that the planned refurbishment works (QHIP) remain incomplete.
- 1.12 As a result of concerns raised by residents and councillors, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) has now 'called-in' the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project, which will be considered at the next meeting of the OSC on 8 October 2025.

2. Key issues

- 2.1 Based on a combination of feedback from residents, information gathered from the contract files and discussions with relevant staff and Calfordseaden, the key issues that emerged from the review of this project are:
 - suitability of the contract award methodology
 - complexity and challenges of combining the rooftop homes works with the QHIP
 - protracted delays in progressing the works

APPENDIX 'A'

- performance of the main contractor
- internal decision-making processes
- communications
- the 'resident experience'.

2.2 All of the above identified key issues have been investigated and the respective findings and recommendations are included later in this report.

3. Findings

Contract Award Methodology

- 3.1 The contract for the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project was awarded to Engie Regeneration (previously Apollo/Keepmoat and latterly, Equans) under the Housing Major Works Partnering Contract. Awarding the contract was not a 'key decision' as, the approval process for individual works packages within the overall partnering contract was delegated to the Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation.
- 3.2 The key benefits of a long-term partnering arrangement are to improve the quality of service and product, improving efficiency and reduction in costs. These benefits are more achievable in responsive maintenance due to the repetitive frequency of repairs to the housing stock and the use of a pre-agreed Schedule of Rates.
- 3.3 This partnering arrangement is not usually suited to a large refurbishment contract such as the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project, which involves various specialist consultants and subcontractors and, somewhat complex and detailed refurbishment and new build works.
- 3.4 Most of the works included in this contract (particularly in relation to the new rooftop homes), could not have been priced using the rates and provisions within the Housing Major Works Partnering Contract and, would have been priced based on quotations provided by the main contractor and its sub-contractors. Even without the significant issues encountered during this project, this type of partnering arrangement would unlikely have achieved its purposes (cost efficiencies, time saving, quality and value for money).
- 3.5 In the case of additional works, variations and changes in the scope of the works that were required for this project, there are several examples where the need to obtain quotations (and demonstrate value for money), led to delays in progress.
- 3.6 The Housing Major Works Partnering Contracts, which were originally let in 2010, were subsequently extended until June 2022 when they expired. It is understood that no further contracts have been or will be awarded in this way. However, if this proves not to be the case, the suitability of the partnering agreement for works of this nature should be robustly assessed before any further contracts are awarded.

APPENDIX 'A'

Combining the Rooftop Homes Works with the QHIP

- 3.7 The decision to combine the rooftop homes development with the QHIP, seems to have made sense in terms of the anticipated tangible benefits to the Council and the residents of Chilton Grove, which included:
- cost efficiency and economies of scale in combining the two works packages
 - minimising disruption to residents by completing both projects together as opposed to running and managing the works as two separate projects, carried out at different times (shared amenities and services such as scaffolding, welfare facilities, plant and equipment)
 - reducing rechargeable costs to leaseholders due to the development of the rooftop homes (for example, no rechargeable costs for the roof coverings, cladding and landscaping).
- 3.8 As stated previously, this project did not go to plan and, it was subsequently decided, that the works to provide new rooftop homes and new homes around the stair cores would be aborted (due to delays in progress and significant increases in cost as set out later in this report). Once this decision had been made, the project team was left with the very difficult and challenging task of trying to 'unpick' the works that had been completed to date, to try and ensure the completion of the remaining QHIP works and, the reinstatement and making safe of those works that had been done in respect of the new homes. In addition, the project team was tasked with trying to maintain a relationship with the contractor and continue communications with residents and manage their expectations.

Delays in Progressing the Works

- 3.9 This project was essentially a 'pilot' project for the Council, in terms of the development of the rooftop homes, a relatively new concept at the time. Combining the works with the QHIP, although seemingly sensible and practical, posed additional challenges and problems. It was probably inevitable, that delays would occur during the progression of the works however, these proved to be much more significant and damaging than could have been anticipated.
- 3.10 The works commenced on 24 June 2019 and were due for completion on 20 December 2020. From a very early stage, the project encountered challenges and problems that ultimately, caused significant delays including:

Use of Partnering Contract

- 3.11 The suitability of the Partnering Contract for the works included in this project is discussed earlier in this report. Summarily however, the limitations, restrictions and provisions of the Partnering Contract caused delays in the progress of the works.

APPENDIX 'A'

Impact of COVID-19

- 3.12 As a result of the pandemic, the site and project were effectively 'closed down' from mid-March 2020, through to the end of July 2020. Even though the site reopened at the end of July, restrictions were still in place, and these continued to have a considerable impact on the pace and progress of the works.

Complexity of the Works

- 3.13 This was a complex project, particularly in relation to the development of the new rooftop homes which, was a relatively new concept nationally and a 'first' for the Council. The complexity of the project understandably, may not have been fully appreciated at the outset but, the scale of the project soon became apparent.

- 3.14 The success of the project relied heavily on the collaboration, integration and performance of a relatively large team including:

- main contractor
- sub-contractors
- contract administrators
- design consultants
- structural engineers
- building surveyors
- project team (council officers and consultants)
- Building Control
- Planning

- 3.15 There were various delays (some protracted) resulting from the complexity of the works including, deficiencies in the contractor's design proposals, a requirement for further investigations and structural calculations to support design proposals, the need for further verification of the load-bearing capacity of existing foundations, need for third-party review of proposals, delays in the decision-making process (addressed later in this report) and, additional specialist expertise required by Building Control to assist in the approval process and co-ordination and sequencing of the works.

Building Control

- 3.16 The complexity of the works also appeared to be challenging for the Council's own Building Control team who ultimately, required additional specialist expertise to assist in the approval process and the co-ordination and sequencing of the works. To assist Building Control in this matter, a third-party Structural Engineer was appointed (funded from the budget for this project) to assess and review the application and provide advice and guidance to Building Control officers.

- 3.17 Despite the additional assistance provided to Building Control, the project was still delayed by the time taken to progress the application. As an example, there

APPENDIX 'A'

appears to have been a six-month delay between Equans submitting the structural (load increase) calculations required and a response from Building Control. Building Control subsequently sent a response through Arup, a third-party consultancy employed by Building Control, to carry out the structural checks, after it became apparent that Building Control's in-house engineer did not have the capacity to do so, due to workload and upcoming annual leave.

Performance of the Main Contractor

- 3.18 The main contractor, now known as Equans, had worked with the Council under the Housing Major Works Partnering Contract since the contract was awarded in 2010. Prior to being awarded the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project in February 2019, Equans had successfully completed several housing major works projects.
- 3.19 The QHIP works included in this project were typical of previous projects that Equans had successfully completed under the Housing Major Works Partnering Contract. However, the scope and complexity of the rooftop homes development included in this project (for which the contractor had full design and build responsibilities), seemed to present Equans with much more difficult challenges and problems.
- 3.20 The single biggest 'failing' on Equans part, was the length of time it took to obtain Building Control approval for the design of the rooftop homes. Notwithstanding the complexity of the project and the relatively new concept of 'rooftop homes', it took Equans far too long to finalise its design of the rooftop homes and obtain Building Control approval. Equans' initial design proposals contained several deficiencies, which needed to be rectified and, further investigations and calculations were required to validate its design proposals before approval was obtained.
- 3.21 Equans commenced the QHIP refurbishment works to the two blocks of flats in June 2019 and, in anticipation of Building Control approval for the rooftop homes, also commenced work to lay the foundations for the corner extensions. By the end of October 2021, Equans had completed as much of the QHIP works as was possible and, had completed the foundations for the corner extensions.
- 3.22 Unfortunately, at this stage, no further work could be done as, Equans had still not obtained Building Control approval for the rooftop homes. Unable to carry out any further works, Equans subsequently left the site at the end of October 2021.
- 3.23 After leaving the site at the end of October 2021, Equans did return to carry out further investigation works (trial pits etc) to progress its application which, was finally approved by Building Control in June 2022.
- 3.24 Although it had been established that rooftop extensions would be structurally sound and safe to build and would provide much-needed new council homes, the Council's Building Control's interpretation of the Building Regulations,

APPENDIX 'A'

required sprinklers to be installed in every individual flat where rooftop homes were built. Despite conflicting advice from external consultants, Building Control was not suitably convinced to accept a scheme where sprinklers were not incorporated into the existing dwellings.

- 3.25 Aside from the cost and complexity of this work, the Council could not guarantee it would be able to gain access to all flats (leased and tenanted) to be able to install sprinklers. As such, it could not be certain that Building Control approval would be obtained for these works and therefore, in June 2022, following discussions with, and recommendations from relevant officers, the Cabinet Member at the time, took the decision not to proceed with building rooftop homes on any of the Council's social housing estates.
- 3.26 With the omission of the rooftop homes, the revised works to the two blocks of flats now included the refurbishment of the 68 homes (much of which was completed) and the construction of a corner extension on each block to provide 10 new homes (taking the total of homes on the site to 78). The 10 new homes would be affordable, social rented units.
- 3.27 Given the significant reduction in the overall scope of the works (omission of the rooftop homes) and, the time that had lapsed since the contractor had left site in October 2021, Equans was given the opportunity to review and confirm its prices for the remaining works which, essentially, included the construction of the two corner extensions, the reduced partial and full cladding options and, works that would now be needed as a result of the omission of the rooftop homes (including the renewal of the roof coverings to the two blocks). At this stage, it was anticipated that the works would recommence in the Autumn of 2022 and be completed by the Autumn of 2023.
- 3.28 Disappointingly and unexpectedly, Equans' revised prices for the remaining works were considerably higher than anticipated and did not demonstrate value for money. In addition to this escalation in cost, at this time, Equans had still not achieved Building Control approval for the corner extensions. Consequently, in February 2023, Southwark Construction took the decision not to proceed with the corner extensions on the basis that, future schemes must either pay for themselves or can be cross subsidised by other developments. The corner extensions at Chilton Grove did not fall within either of these two categories.
- 3.29 Despite subsequent discussions and negotiations between the Council and Equans on the remaining QHIP works, in February 2024, the Council took the decision to terminate the order with Equans and to retender the remaining QHIP works.

Internal Decision-Making Processes

- 3.30 The internal decision-making process was, at times, slow and cumbersome, causing significant delays in the progress of the works, as well as causing frustration and anxiety for residents and the Council's Project Team. Some key issues took far too long to resolve as set out below:

APPENDIX 'A'

Omission of the rooftop homes and corner extensions

- 3.31 Whilst the logic around the decisions to omit the rooftop homes and corner extensions is understood, especially, given Equans inability to obtain the necessary Building Control approvals in a timely manner, the decisions came at a very late stage in the project, leading to delays in the progress of the QHIP works which, caused considerable frustration and anger amongst residents (especially leaseholders whose service charge bills will increase significantly) and resulted in aborted costs in the region of around £4.5million (£1.3million of which, the Council is seeking to recover from Equans).

Partial or Full Cladding

- 3.32 The original scope of works included for full external cladding to both blocks of flats to ensure a seamless look to the buildings, with the addition of the new rooftop homes and corner extensions. A full cladding system would also go some way to addressing inherent issues of cold bridging within the structure, reducing condensation and damp and mould.
- 3.33 The decision not to proceed with the rooftop homes and corner extensions meant that there was considerably less justification in fully cladding the two blocks of flats. There is an element of external wall cladding (partial cladding option) that is required to finish off the panels below the window installations, as well as other previously clad areas and panels at the base of the balustrading.
- 3.34 The estimated cost of the 'full' cladding option is around £5,850,000 whereas, the 'partial' cladding option is around £1,710,000, a difference of £4,140,000. Whilst the full cladding option will provide some improvement in the thermal performance of the buildings, the cladding of other areas (such as the concrete columns), will only provide aesthetic improvements. As such, it is hard to justify spending an additional £4.14million on the full cladding option, given the constraints on the HRA and, the difficult choices that are now having to be made around future major works projects. In addition, recharging leaseholders for the full cladding option will likely not be possible as, these works will be seen as an 'improvement'.
- 3.35 The Project Team had been waiting for more than two years for senior management to decide on which of the cladding options should be pursued (full or partial). It should be noted however, that over this protracted period, several senior officers inherited responsibility for this project and some of the delays were a result of these officers having to re-visit many of the issues affecting the works. Senior management's position was also made much more difficult by previous commitments to fully clad the buildings and subsequent difficult discussions with leaseholders as to why this may no longer be possible. Unfortunately, this caused delays in progressing the works and led to further dissatisfaction amongst residents.

APPENDIX 'A'

Termination or Retender

- 3.36 The completion of the remaining QHIP works has also been delayed because of the time taken for the Council to decide whether to continue with Equans under the existing contractual arrangements or, to terminate the contract and retender the works. To some extent, Equans had forced the Council's hand when repricing the two cladding options by increasing costs significantly beyond those in its original submission (as part of the original Task Order Price).
- 3.37 Obviously, this was a sensitive matter and, it was understandably necessary for the Council to seek appropriate legal advice on its options. However, this process took too long, causing further delays in completing the remaining works and further undermining the trust and confidence residents had in the Council.

Leaseholder Recharges for New Homes

- 3.38 As part of the works to develop new rooftop homes on the two flat blocks at Chilton Grove, the Council made a series of commitments (sometimes referred to as the 'local offer') to leaseholders in the blocks in relation to leaseholder recharges as set out below:
- Roof replacement to main roof – leaseholders not to be charged as, the roof is an integral part of the new rooftop homes
 - External wall cladding – leaseholders not to be charged as this is linked directly to the new rooftop homes, to give a seamless look to the two blocks between the new and existing buildings
 - Lift installation – leaseholders not to be charged for the installation as, this is necessary for access to the new rooftop homes (although the existing homes will also benefit). Leaseholders would, however, be charged for future maintenance costs.
 - Landscaping and estate improvements – leaseholders not to be charged for landscaping and limited estate improvement works linked to the development of the new rooftop homes.
 - New flat entrance doors – the existing front entrance doors did not fail under fire safety or condition but are integral to the installation of the new external wall cladding. As such, the doors would be replaced but not recharged to leaseholders.
- 3.39 During the consultation process with Chilton Grove residents for this project, residents voted overwhelmingly for the installation of a door entry system. Whilst it was agreed that this work would be done, the local offer provided that the cost of this work would be rechargeable. Subsequently and unfortunately however, some officers have stated in formal meetings and in correspondence, that the installation of the door entry system would not be rechargeable. This has caused confusion and resentment amongst some leaseholders however, confirmation has recently been received that the installation of the door entry system will now be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) and leaseholders will not be recharged.

APPENDIX 'A'

- 3.40 When the decision was taken not to proceed with the new rooftop homes and corner extensions, there was a distinct lack of clarity and communication around whether the previous commitments made to leaseholders in respect of recharges for the above works would still stand. This lack of clarity caused confusion and uncertainty for leaseholders who were hearing conflicting stories from Council officers (not those directly involved in managing the project) and local councillors as to whether the previous commitments would stand.
- 3.41 Whilst there are several reports and correspondence in the contract files on this issue, no formal decision was taken by the Council until the intervention of the current Strategic Director of Housing. This lack of timely decision-making and direction should have been avoided.

Communications

- 3.42 A robust communications protocol had been set up for the duration of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project to ensure that residents were kept informed and had the opportunity to engage with the Council's Project Team to voice their concerns and raise any queries they had with the management and direction of the project. This included:
- Monthly Resident Project Group (RPG) meetings – chaired by Open Communities, where residents met with the Council's Project Team, the Design Team, CA, and the contractor's management team
 - Drop-in sessions – arranged by the Project Team, residents could ask questions of the Project Team and raise any concerns with the progress of the works
 - Regular newsletters providing information on the progress of the works, upcoming works, details of community activities and relevant contact details of members of the Project Team
 - Leaseholder consultation meetings.
- 3.43 Although the communications protocol was robust, as the works progressed, meetings (particularly the RPG meetings, which are still held every month) became challenging and often tense. This was due to a combination of factors including the delays in the progress of the project, the decision not to proceed with the new homes, the Council's perceived inability to make timely decisions on key issues, the condition of the estate (a building site for nearly six years), escalating crime and anti-social behaviour due to the condition of the estate and the general health and wellbeing of residents affected by the works.
- 3.44 Residents understandably, often vented their frustration at the Council officers attending the meetings although, in the main, those officers were blameless and powerless in the circumstances.

The Resident Experience

- 3.45 The Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project was complex and intrusive and, even if everything had gone to plan, there would still have been considerable disruption and a degree of hardship

APPENDIX 'A'

for residents in the two blocks of flats. That the project did not go to plan and encountered serious, prolonged delays, challenges and difficulties, hugely compounded and magnified the disruption and hardship.

- 3.46 At the very outset of the project, residents lost access to the well maintained rear communal gardens (shown in the photograph at the front of this report) which, was 'flattened' to provide the necessary site and welfare accommodation requirements for the contractor carrying out the works. Whilst this was unavoidable, it would have had a negative and immediate impact in terms of the 'resident experience'.
- 3.47 The 'resident experience' during this project cannot have been pleasant despite the Council's efforts to mitigate the disruption caused by the works. The works, by their very nature, were intrusive, noisy, extensive and disruptive. Demolition works, rebuilding chimneys, replacing windows, concrete and brickwork repairs, walkway and balcony repairs, with all the associated plant, vehicles, tools and equipment, although essential, is hugely disruptive.
- 3.48 The Council provided reasonable 'refuge' facilities for residents but, these would have provided limited comfort to those who took advantage of them. There was a strong Resident Liaison Team employed during the works (employees of the Council and Equans), who worked tirelessly to assist residents as best they could with the various issues that arose during the works. However valuable this service was, it again, would have had a limited impact.
- 3.49 Residents in the two blocks of flats have endured significant disruption and challenges since this project began in June 2019 including:
 - living on a building site for the best part of six years with a significantly reduced quality of life
 - condensation issues due to the external cladding works being left incomplete (although several properties were suffering from condensation long before works commenced)
 - loss of communal facilities such as the communal gardens and car parking facilities for the duration of the works
 - loss of access to the refuse chutes (for residents in the maisonettes) that meant residents had to carry refuse down to the communal bins
 - periodic loss of access to staircases, reducing residents' ability to go about their daily business
 - increase in the level of vermin across the estate due to the nature of the works
 - increase in the level of crime (some very serious instances) and anti-social behaviour due to the condition and vulnerability of the two blocks of flats during the progress of the project
 - increase in the number of instances of squatters, rough sleepers and other criminal and anti-social behaviour activity has left many residents vulnerable and fearful.

APPENDIX 'A'

3.50 Leaseholders in the two blocks of flats have faced additional challenges in terms of the cost of the works, leaseholder recharges and, the impact of the works on their assets including:

- significant recharges for the cost of works that are still not complete, even though invoices have been issued and payments have been made
- uncertainty and lack of clarity as to what works leaseholders will be recharged (local offer, impact of the decision not to proceed with rooftop homes etc)
- strain on finances for some leaseholders (some have informed us that they had to extend their mortgages, take out loans, borrow from family and friends etc)
- impact that the condition of the estate and the incomplete works has had on leaseholders' ability to sell their leasehold interest
- the suspension of the works and the decision to retender will likely result in much higher recharges to leaseholders due to the increase in general building and construction costs from 2019 to 2025/26.

3.51 In recognition of the delays in the progress of the works and the difficulties faced by leaseholders at Chilton Grove, the Council's Home Ownership Unit (HoU), has previously agreed exceptional payment terms that initially, delayed billing for the works included in the contract and also, agreed to a pause in payments on arranged payment options and put a hold on enforcement action until the works recommenced.

3.52 Leaseholders at Chilton Grove have recently received their 'final' invoices for the completed works. In all cases, because the original planned works are not complete, leaseholder recharges have reduced from the original estimate and refunds have been issued. It should be noted however, as stated above, leaseholders will be recharged their legitimate proportion of the remaining works and, it is likely that the overall recharges to leaseholders will be much greater than originally estimated.

4. Compensation

4.1 As set out earlier in this report, as part of the works to develop new rooftop homes on the two flat blocks in Chilton Grove, the Council made a series of commitments to leaseholders in the blocks in relation to recharges. This was often referred to as the 'local offer' and, was predicated on the completion of the new rooftop homes and corner extensions.

4.2 The subsequent decision not to proceed with the new rooftop homes and corner extensions, resulted in a lack of clarity and confusion as to whether the commitments included in the 'local offer' would still stand. There is correspondence in the contract files on this matter and, a common theme is that because of the disruption and distress that leaseholders have suffered, the Council should honour the previous commitments made and not seek to recover the cost of, for example, the new roof coverings, external wall cladding and the door entry installation.

APPENDIX 'A'

- 4.3 Whilst there is no doubt that leaseholders have suffered disruption and distress because of the works, so too have the Council's tenants. The non-recovery of legitimate service charges being used as a method of compensation to leaseholders, raises serious concerns particularly when, there is no consideration given to tenants who have equally suffered disruption and distress. Effectively, if this option is pursued, the HRA bears the burden of those costs that are not recovered from leaseholders.
- 4.4 The HoU has also voiced similar concerns on this matter and, its recommendation would always be that the work is either chargeable or not, as per the terms of the lease. Any compensation that may be deemed necessary, should be made as a compensation payment (in line with the Council's Compensation Policy) to leaseholders rather than through a reduction in service charges. The Council runs the serious risk in setting a precedent for the recovery of service charges for works in other schemes where leaseholders are adversely impacted by the delivery of major works projects.
- 4.5 Taking all the above into consideration, the Strategic Director of Housing agreed officer recommendations that all households in the two blocks of flats in Chilton Grove (leaseholders and tenants) will receive an appropriate level of compensation for the delays and distress caused by this project, in line with the provisions of the Council's Compensation Policy. This equates to £4600 per household (pro-rata payments will be made for residents who were not living on the estate for the duration of the works).

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The works at Chilton Grove were suspended in October 2021 when, the contractor, Equans, left the site. The QHIP works that Equans completed or partially completed before leaving site included:
- window renewals
 - temporary roof coverings to main roof of both blocks
 - concrete repairs
 - walkway coatings
 - private balcony coatings
 - new lateral mains (electrics)
 - new balustrading to walkways and private balconies
 - new extractor fans
 - underground drainage works
 - asbestos removal.
- 5.2 Since terminating the order with Equans in January 2024, the Council has carried out some works to improve the condition and appearance of the two blocks of flats in Chilton Grove including:
- landscaping works to the front entrances of both blocks
 - tidying up the former site compound
 - removing stored items from the previous works

APPENDIX 'A'

- tidying up the estate generally
- replacing the gates and bollards to the car park
- removing unsightly and unnecessary hoarding
- grounds maintenance works

5.3 The Council is currently working through a procurement process, using the SEC (South East Consortium) Framework, to progress the remaining outstanding works which include:

- permanent roof coverings (including insulation) to the main roofs of both blocks
- partial cladding option to windows and external walls (where previously removed)
- concrete repairs and decorations to the exposed concrete surfaces
- redecoration to all previously painted surfaces
- completion of balcony railings to staircase areas
- new flat entrance doors where required
- new communal lighting
- landscaping to rear communal gardens.

5.4 It is expected that the remaining outstanding QHIP works will commence in January/February 2026 and will take 12 to 18 months to complete.

5.5 Confirmation has recently been received that an application for Construction Infrastructure Levy (CiL) funding made by local ward councillors, for the installation of a door entry system in both blocks of flats has been approved. We have recently carried out a successful ballot of residents in the two blocks of flats (as required by the terms of their respective tenancy agreements and leases) and, this work will be carried out separately from the remaining outstanding works and, will commence and be completed before the end of the current calendar year. The approved CiL funding for the installation of the door entry system is not rechargeable to leaseholders however, leaseholders and tenants will pay for the future maintenance of the system through their respective service charges.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018/19 QHIP Major Works Project has not gone well. Starting in June 2019, the project has suffered from protracted delays, contractual difficulties and disputes and escalating costs. This has resulted in a very difficult, sometimes unpleasant, and unfortunate experience for residents affected by the works. This is compounded by the fact that the planned refurbishment works (QHIP) remain incomplete more than six years after the project commenced.

APPENDIX 'A'

- 6.2 This internal review has identified several factors that contributed to the poor performance of this project including:
- suitability of the Council's existing partnering contract for use in a project of this type
 - complexity of project
 - challenges of combining a QHIP project with a new-build (rooftop homes) project
 - performance of the main contractor
 - lack of timely internal decision-making (senior management)
 - poor communications
- 6.3 Several of the contributing factors identified by the internal review have already been recognised and addressed by the Council. For example, the partnering contracts previously used for the Housing Major Works projects have now expired and, the remaining QHIP works at Chilton Grove will be subject to a new robust procurement process.
- 6.4 The Council has recognised the impact that this project has had on residents in the two blocks of flats at Chilton Grove and, in line with Section 7 – 'Financial Compensation' of its Complaints Policy, has agreed to pay compensation to all households (leasehold and tenant) for delay and distress. In the circumstances, this seems to be a reasonable and appropriate decision.
- 6.5 It should be noted that the frustration caused by the poor performance of this project was shared by the Council's Project Team (including officers and consultants) who, despite being largely powerless and blameless, were left to bear the brunt of the residents understandable discontent.

Meeting Name:	Cabinet
Date:	17 June 2025
Report title:	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Responses to recommendations arising from scrutiny of Consort Estate Major Works, SE15, Charges to Leaseholders
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Sarah King, Council Homes
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Leaseholders
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	N/a

FOREWORD – COUNCILLOR SARAH KING, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL HOUSING

I want to thank the residents of the Consort Estate and the ward councillors for Rye Lane for the time and dedication in bringing their concerns to light through the scrutiny process. This should not have had to be the case. By doing so, the residents of the Consort Estate are helping to shape how the Council will deliver major works projects in the future to the benefit of all Southwark's tenants and leaseholders. This includes that all future contracts will undertake a full survey initially to help reduce provisional costs, including greater levels of information about provisional costs and far greater levels of engagement with residents at this early stage of contract design.

Since the Overview and Scrutiny Committee first heard from residents and ward councillors, the scope and provisional costs for the major works project at Consort Estate have been substantially reviewed in partnership with residents, and the projected costs substantially reduced. The engagement with residents and the Tenants and Residents is ongoing and will continue throughout the delivery of the project.

The committee made several helpful recommendations on the design and delivery of major works projects in the future. Each of these has been considered in detail and where possible accepted. In some cases, where the current legislation will not allow, we are committed to lobbying for change in the law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for the Cabinet

1. That Cabinet notes the responses to the recommendations of the Overview and

Scrutiny Committee.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. At its meeting held on 4 November 2024, the overview and scrutiny committee received a report on Consort Estate, SE15 Major Works – Charges to Leaseholders. The committee heard from representatives of the Consort Estate Tenants and Residents Association in relation to leaseholder service charges and section 20 notices. The committee also heard from local ward Councillor Esme Dobson on the matter.
3. Following hearing from the residents, local ward councillor, and discussion, the committee agreed several recommendations for consideration by the Lead Member for Council Homes. The Lead Member has subsequently asked for the recommendations to be considered by Cabinet.
4. Recommendations have subsequently been considered, and responses are detailed in this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION 1 TO CABINET	
1.	Strengthen the Council's in-house Quantity Surveyor function and skills to scrutinise estimates provided by contractors.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 1	
1.	<p>We have assigned a dedicated internal Quantity Surveyor in the Planned Maintenance Team. He has already scrutinised all projects going ahead after the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting recommendations.</p> <p>The Quantity Surveyor will scrutinise all estimates/ and conduct sample audit checks on valuations submitted by contractors on future projects, including carrying out site visits to check quantities and works claimed by the contractor and approved by the Consultant.</p>
RECOMMENDATION 1: ACCEPTED	

COMMITTEES'S RECOMMENDATION 2 TO CABINET	
2.	Change the way the admin fee is calculated on contracts in order to remove the possible incentivisation of large contracts.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 2	
2.	<p>This item had two elements to it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administration fee under the lease related to the management of the service charge accounts • The Consultant fee charged to the contract

Administration Fee

The administration fee is defined within the lease for the management of the service charge accounts. This service is provided only to homeowners (both leaseholders and freeholders), relating to the construction, billing and collection of service charges. The cost of providing the service to homeowners exceeds the income derived from the fee, and the variance represents a loss to the Housing Revenue Account which must then be covered by other sources of income to the HRA. To increase the variance would be inequitable.

The lease is specific on how the Council's administration costs can be charged (at 10% of the cost of services provided). The Council cannot opt to charge either a fixed cost, or the actual cost of administration, and to do so would need to vary every lease and transfer agreement. With over 15,500 homeowners it would be impossible to get the necessary percentage to agree, and the cost of doing so would be prohibitive. Equally, as the Council does not actually cover its costs in providing an administrative service to homeowners, any change of this kind would be likely to lead to an increase rather than a decrease to the total service charge.

The 10% administration fee is applied on services/works that are the responsibility of the Council and chargeable under the terms of the lease. Whether works are packaged as multiple small contracts or fewer larger scale contracts the 10% administration fee would remain the same percentage of the chargeable costs incurred. If the actual costs come in at a lower figure than the estimate, then the administration fee would be reduced accordingly.

The Consultant fee charged to the contract

As way of assurance and transparency we have collated information on all contracts where Calfordseaden provided consultancy services specifically for schemes delivered under Partnering contracts, which is what the Consort contract will be run on.

The Devon Mansions/Canada Estates were run under a different contract.

The table below shows that Calfordseaden (CS) have worked on 74 schemes over 8 years, 58 of which were within the original approved budget. 11 had an overspend, but the reasons are clearly known and range from additional internal works added to schemes (with no implications for leaseholders), further works uncovered, extension of time due to Covid, or works instructed to third party providers like aerial mast contractors, which are not in the control of the contractor/consultant.

Five final accounts have not been finalised yet. Of these two await final accounts and the contractors claims are being challenged so they may not result in the requirement for a variation. Two are for major street property voids where upon opening up the properties significant

additional structural works have been identified and the council is deciding whether to refurbish at additional costs or to dispose of the properties. The final scheme is one that was due to have a roof top development which is no longer progressing and a new scheme is being procured to complete the works.

The details below are for contracts executed on site by Equans and Elkins contractors.

Total number of Partnering Major works projects managed by CS since 2016	74
Number of these Major Works projects within original delegated approval	58
Number of these Major Works projects with definite overspend	11
Number of these Major Works projects with potential variations or additional costs	5

Based on this information for Partnering Contracts we are satisfied that the system of fees charged for contracts is appropriate and there is no incentive for consultants to scope creep.

However, in the new contracts tendered, consultants will face the penalty of not being awarded further contracts if there is excessive scope creep.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: HOMEOWNERSHIP ADMINISTRATION FEE
NOT ACCEPTED
CONSULTANT FEE ACCEPTED**

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION 3 TO CABINET

3. Review and strengthen communications and cross-department working to improve the services provided by the Homeownership Team and to fulfil a 'whole council approach' to housing. This should include but not be limited to:
- Including a covering letter to leaseholders with annual service charges with clear explanations if there is a large difference between estimates and actuals.
 - Engaging with Tenants and Residents Associations much earlier when major works are being planned.
 - Developing website functionality to enable leaseholders to automatically download service charge breakdowns from their MySouthwark account.
 - Developing a standard FAQ document about major works which is sent out with all Section 20 notices as well as clearer information about payment options and external advice services.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 3

3. 3.1 The homeownership portfolio includes over 14,500 leaseholders, from several thousand blocks. The actual service charges will vary considerably from block to block and from year to year. It would not be possible to tailor individual letters with explanations of the variations between estimated and actual service charges for each leaseholder. The implications of this would be substantial and is not something the Council is currently resourced for under the income produced from the administration fee.

The actual billing pack includes the summary breakdown of both the estimated and actual service charge for the year, which can be used for comparison purposes, and the itemised breakdowns of the charges are available on request. Each billing pack contains an explanatory leaflet which provides an overview of each head of service and how the costs have been constructed. In general, the variations relate to repairs carried out throughout the year to the structure and fabric of the building, and to the communal service installations. Where these are more than the statutory consultation limit then a section 20 notice will normally have been served providing details of the proposed repair and the cost.

At the request of the Lead Member for Council Homes a cover sheet is now being included with the billing pack, providing some general information.

Since the unprecedented increases seen in fuel prices in the last few years, where the fuel cost for heating and hot water has been higher than anticipated the Council has been pro-actively writing to homeowners to provide an explanation of the increase prior to the actuals being issued. One of the major reasons for the high actual debit in 2023/24 was the increase in insurance premiums. The Council issued section 20 notices in May 2023, detailing the rise in cost, with an explanation of the difficulties it had had in obtaining a buildings insurance policy. The notice also confirmed that the additional premium amount for 2023/24 would be charged within the actual service charge, to be issued in September 2024. Further details were also uploaded onto the website.

3.2 Planned Maintenance had consulted with the tenants and Residents Associations at Consort at the early stages. However, due to COVID, these meetings took place a long time prior to the Section 20 notices being issued.

Planned maintenance will now ensure that the draft specification and budget is consulted on prior to the Section 20 notices of proposal being served so residents have an input at an early stage and are able to influence the works included and be aware of the cost prior to the second stage Section 20 (with costs) being served. Where a scheme is separately tendered, a notice of intention detailing the scope of work and reasons why it is necessary is served on all leaseholders. We would urge leaseholders to make observations on the scope and justification at this stage, rather than waiting for the detailed costs

	<p>which are only available post-tender.</p> <p>3.3 Homeownership Services are working with Technology and Digital Services to develop an option for homeowners to access the itemised breakdown for their actual service charge through their MySouthwark Housing On-Line account or by another on-line route. The breakdown will replicate what is currently provided via an e-form request but will be directly available to homeowners rather than having to be downloaded and e-mailed through the back-office.</p> <p>3.4 Section 20 notices already include a FAQ section entitled “Information about your service charges” which provides further information relevant to the stage of consultation. Notices with estimated charges include information and details on payment options as well as information on how homeowners can become more involved in the process. The notices, including the FAQ sections, were revised following discussion with a working group on major works made up of homeowners and council officers. Details of external advice agencies are included in the “Service Charge Explained” leaflet issued with the annual service charges, and are provided on the website. Homeownership Services will update the FAQ section of the section 20 notices to include details of the external advice agencies.</p>
RECOMMENDATION 3: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION 4 TO CABINET	
4.	Introduce an automatic option of being able to pay over six months where the difference between estimates and actuals is above a certain percentage of the estimated service charge.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 4	
4.	<p>The lease requires any actual debit to be paid within one calendar month of notification. At present all leaseholders can apply to spread payment of any actual debit over the remaining six months of the financial year. While a policy can be created, this will have to comply with the Council’s well-being powers, as this is the basis on which the longer-term interest free periods for major works service charges have been created. The policy would therefore be more restrictive than the ad-hoc nature of the current process.</p> <p>A briefing will be drafted for the cabinet member for housing who will consider the creation of a policy for the implementation of the recommendation.</p>
RECOMMENDATION 4: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION 5 TO CABINET	
5.	Pilot working with solicitors and estate agents to provide far greater clarity on the realities of leaseholder responsibilities and future costs.

	RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 5
5.	<p>The Pre-assignment team works closely with solicitors in providing a detailed management pack, which is paid for by homeowners selling their property. It is standard practice for all sales (both leasehold and freehold) for conveyancing solicitors to obtain all relevant information relating to the property on behalf of their clients. It is also the responsibility of the conveyancing solicitors to advise their clients on their rights and obligations under either a lease or a transfer agreement.</p> <p>The management pack provides information on major works consulted on, planned works and other useful information which the current homeowner is responsible for sharing with the prospective buyer. It gives the prospective buyer a view of works ongoing and future planned works. This information is readily available and provided on request and payment of the pack. It is then the solicitor's responsibility to ensure all parties involved are aware of the information in the pack. The team respond to any additional queries from solicitors following the issuance of the pack, if there is anything which requires further explanation.</p> <p>It should be noted that property sales are private transactions and recourse for professional negligence would be against the relevant solicitors. While the Council can be an information source via the management packs it is not a party to private sales and should not offer advice regarding the property transaction as it could be seen to be prejudicing against either party and opening itself up for recourse.</p> <p>A recommendation may be for the Council to lobby government to improve the quality of conveyancing generally and the information required to be provided by Estate Agents.</p>
	RECOMMENDATION 5: NOT ACCEPTED

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION 6 TO CABINET	
6.	Strengthen the whistleblowing system within the Council.
	RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 6
6.	<p>We welcome the recommendation to review the whistleblowing policy, and can confirm that this is done as standard on a four yearly cycle. The Scrutiny recommendation is timely, as we currently have a new draft policy going through our governance process. We are also arranging training for staff and investigating officers to take place once the policy is approved. Southwark's current policy complies with the law, policy, best practice and is in line with most councils. It is an essential part of our governance framework.</p>
	RECOMMENDATION 6: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION 7 TO CABINET	
7.	Introduce fully itemised billing in final service charge invoices to leaseholders.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 7	
7.	<p>Automatically issuing the itemised breakdowns with all actualised service charges is unfeasible due to the scale required. It has been calculated that approximately 337,000 additional pages would need to be printed to be included in the actual billing packs, with the additional associated costs of postage. Itemised breakdowns have been available on request since 2004, with details of how to obtain these being provided within the "Service Charge Explained" leaflet included in each billing pack, and on the website. Less than 10% of homeowners actually request an itemised breakdown each year. The Council does have a duty to consider climate change implications and is actively working to reduce the amount of paper usage.</p> <p>The Council is working towards publishing itemised breakdowns on-line, through homeowners Housing-on-Line accounts via the MySouthwark portal. It is anticipated that this option, or an alternative digital solution, will be available for the 2024/25 actual service charges due to be issued in September 2025. Homeowners will need to sign up to a Housing-on-Line account via the MySouthwark portal in order to access their individual itemised breakdown.</p> <p>The itemised breakdowns will also still be available on request via e-form or post. The Council has created a new database platform to hold the data, and this will allow the breakdowns to be downloaded both faster and more efficiently especially at times of peak requests. Further development is proposed to allow the data to be downloaded in different formats on request. Final account details for major works schemes are available on request when Homeownership Services issue a draft final account notice. This notice allows homeowners to query the details of the charge and request further information prior to the actualisation of the service charge on the account.</p>
RECOMMENDATION 7: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	

Policy framework implications

5. Southwark construct service charges in accordance with the lease and prevailing legislation. In relation to recommendation 4, a policy could be created to allow a 6 month repayment period for revenue actual service charges. Policy would likely be subject to qualifying criteria.
6. A briefing will be drafted for the Lead Member for Council Housing who will consider the creation of a policy for the implementation of the recommendation.

Community, equalities (including socio-economic) and health impacts

Community impact statement

7. The accepted recommendations will have an impact on homeowners as they would be subject to the amended processes & policy.

Equalities (including socio-economic) impact statement

8. It is considered that these recommendations will have no impact on local people or communities in terms of equalities as they are not directed at any group or triggered by any issue related to equalities.

Health impact statement

9. The council recognises the findings of the Build Back Fairer: COVID-19 Marmot Review (2020) by the UCL institute of Health Equity and the Health Foundation. The council will always work to ensure that the processes in regard to service charge construction and collection do not contribute to or exacerbate any existing health inequalities.

Climate change implications

10. The Council demonstrates commitment to the climate emergency and as a result of which is moving towards reducing its usage of paper.

Resource implications

11. Planned Maintenance Team have assigned a dedicated internal Quantity Surveyor.

Note: Legal/Financial implications (and when to seek supplementary advice)

12. Home Ownership Services identifies that there would be financial implication in regard to the potential acceptance of recommendation 4. Delaying recovery of income comes with an opportunity cost which would need to be considered by the Lead Member for Council Housing.
13. Home ownership service notes that there are potential serious legal implications with regards to recommendation 5 surrounding the council working with estate agents and solicitors. The Council has no responsibility for property forward sales and could open itself up to professional negligence claims should it choose to involve itself in private transactions. The Council could choose to lobby the government as outlined in recommendation 5.

Consultation

14. Statutory consultation with leaseholders is carried out in accordance with legislation. Section 20 notices contain a section of relevant information explaining the content of the notices. The billing pack accompanying contains a "service charges explained" leaflet which signposts to advice agencies and to further information available on the Southwark website.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director, Resources (H&M 25/014)

15. This report sets out the management responses to the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the Consort Estate Major Works – Leaseholder Charges. There are no material financial implications arising at this juncture subject to Cabinet accepting the management responses as detailed in the report. However, should there be any change in that position resulting in the requirement for additional resources and cost, a reduction in income or loss of cashflow to the HRA, then that would need to be quantified, reported and considered within the context of the current financial challenges that the HRA is experiencing.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Agenda and Minutes – 4 November 2024		
Agenda for Overview & Scrutiny Committee on Monday 4 November 2024, 7.00 pm - Southwark Council		
Cabinet report – March 2025 Cabinet scrutiny report - March 2025		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
None	

AUDIT TRAIL

Cabinet Member	Councillor Sarah King, Council Homes		
Lead Officer	Dominic Cain, Director Customer & Exchequer		
Report Author	Trevor Wellbeloved & Shaun Nicholson		
Version	Final		
Dated	17June 2025		
Key Decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included	
Assistant Chief Executive, Governance and Assurance	No	No	
Strategic Director, Resources	Yes	Yes	
Cabinet Member	No	No	
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		5 June 2025	

Meeting Name:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date:	8 October 2025
Report title:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Commission Work Programmes 2025/26
Ward(s) or groups affected:	N/a
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	N/a
From:	Head of Scrutiny

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the committee consider and agree annual work programmes for overview and scrutiny committee and its commissions for the 2025/26 municipal year.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Paragraph 6 of the overview and scrutiny procedure rules states that terms of reference of the overview and scrutiny committee will be:
 - a) to appoint commissions, agreeing the size, composition and terms of reference and to appoint chairs and vice chairs
 - b) to agree the annual work programme for OSC and the commissions
 - c) to consider requests from the cabinet and/or council assembly for scrutiny reviews
 - d) to exercise the right to call-in for reconsideration of executive decisions made but not yet implemented
 - e) to arrange for relevant functions in respect of health scrutiny to be exercised by an overview and scrutiny committee of another local authority where the council considers that another local authority would be better placed to undertake those relevant functions, and that local authority agrees to exercise those functions
 - f) if appropriate, to appoint a joint overview and scrutiny committee with two or more local authorities and arrange for the relevant functions of those authorities to be exercised by the joint committee
 - g) to periodically review overview and scrutiny procedures to ensure that the function is operating effectively
 - h) to report annually to all councillors on the previous year's scrutiny activity
 - i) to scrutinise matters in respect of:
 - the council's policy and budget framework
 - regeneration
 - human resources and the council's role as an employer and corporate

practice generally

- customer access issues, including digital strategy, information technology and communications
- the council's equalities and diversity programmes.

3. The general terms of reference of the scrutiny commissions are set out in the council's constitution (overview and scrutiny procedure rules - paragraph 5). The constitution states that:

Within their terms of reference, all scrutiny committees/commissions will:

- a) review and scrutinise decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the council's functions
- b) review and scrutinise the decisions made by and performance of the cabinet and council officers both in relation to individual decisions and over time in areas covered by its terms of reference
- c) review and scrutinise the performance of the council in relation to its policy objectives, performance targets and/or particular service areas
- d) question members of the cabinet and officers about their decisions and performance, whether generally in comparison with service plans and targets over a period of time, or in relation to particular decisions, initiatives or projects and about their views on issues and proposals affecting the area
- e) assist council assembly and the cabinet in the development of its budget and policy framework by in-depth analysis of policy issues
- f) make reports and recommendations to the cabinet and or council assembly arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process
- g) consider any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants
- h) liaise with other external organisations operating in the area, whether national, regional or local, to ensure that the interests of local people are enhanced by collaborative working
- i) review and scrutinise the performance of other public bodies in the area and invite reports from them by requesting them to address the scrutiny committee and local people about their activities and performance
- j) conduct research and consultation on the analysis of policy issues and possible options
- k) question and gather evidence from any other person (with their consent)
- l) consider and implement mechanisms to encourage and enhance community participation in the scrutiny process and in the development of policy options

m) conclude inquiries promptly and normally within six months.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. In accordance with the provision set out in 2(a) above, the overview and scrutiny committee established four commissions for the 2025-26 municipal year at its meeting held on 17 May 2025.
 - Education and Local Economy Scrutiny Commission
 - Environment, Community Safety and Engagement Scrutiny Commission
 - Housing Scrutiny Commission
 - Health and Social Care Scrutiny Commission
5. In accordance with the provision set out in 2(b) above, overview and scrutiny committee is being recommended to agree scrutiny work programmes for the 2025-26 municipal year.
6. In considering the work programmes the overview and scrutiny committee is recommended to focus on key issues where scrutiny can make a significant impact for local people, and issues aligned to the council's strategic priorities.
7. Attached as an appendix are the proposed remits of overview and scrutiny committee and its commissions based on the cabinet portfolio responsibilities set out in the council constitution and the Southwark 2030 Goals. The document is for reference purposes only and serves to highlight the cabinet member portfolio responsibilities and Southwark 2030 Goals covered by the overview and scrutiny committee and the scrutiny commissions with a view to assist in directing potential issues for consideration to the correct committee/commission undertaking actions referred to in paragraph 3 above.
8. The work programmes are a standing item on the overview and scrutiny committee and commission agendas and enables the committee/commissions to consider, monitor and plan issues for consideration at each meeting.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Council Constitution • Section 3.3 - Cabinet Portfolios • Section 9 - Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules • Southwark 2030 Strategy	Southwark Council Website	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221
Link: Council Constitution Southwark 2030 Strategy		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Cabinet Member Portfolio Responsibilities and Southwark 2030 Goals - Overview and Scrutiny Committee/Commission Remits 2025/26

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Everton Roberts, Head of Scrutiny		
Report Author	Amit Alva, Scrutiny Officer		
Version	Final		
Dated	30 September 2025		
Key Decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Officer Title		Comments Sought	Comments Included
Assistant Chief Executive, Governance and Assurance		No	No
Strategic Director, Finance		No	No
Cabinet Member		No	No
Date final report sent to Scrutiny Team			30 September 2025

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme – 2025-26

Meeting	Agenda items	Comment
23 June 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Commission Work Programme 2025-26 	Lead officer – Vishal Seegoolam (Everton Roberts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny Improvement Review Implementation - Update June 2025 	Lead officer – Vishal Seegoolam (Everton Roberts)
8 October 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Review of the Chilton Grove Estate Rooftop Homes and 2018-19 QHIP Major Works Project 	Lead member – Cllr Situ Lead officer – Hakeem Osinaike
	Southwark Community Safety - Strategic Assessment and Draft Community Safety Plan	Lead member – Cllr Enin Lead officer – Stephen Douglas (Caroline Thwaites)
24 November 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council Delivery Plan Performance (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of Living - Southwark 2030 goals including economies, discounts and subsidies (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer - TBC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Workforce report – (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Doreen Forrester Brown (Ben Plant)
7 January 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Local govt settlement (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Tim Jones)

Meeting	Agenda items	Comment
19 January 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget introduction and scene setting (daytime meeting) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Tim Jones)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual budget Scrutiny (daytime meeting) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Scrutiny – Formulation of OSC recommendations to cabinet (daytime meeting) 	Lead member – Cllr Wingfield
20 January 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southwark 2030 Goal – Well Run Council (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Rhona Cadenhead
11 February 2026	TBC	
16 March 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council's Transformation Agenda (TBC) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Rhona Cadenhead

Agenda items to be scheduled

Meeting (tbc)	Agenda items	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refugees / Borough of Sanctuary (Task and Finish Group) 	Lead Member – To be appointed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southwark Equality Framework (pre-decision scrutiny) 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Ben Plant (Evereth Willis)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cemeteries and crematorium services 	Lead member – Cllr Mwangangye Lead officer – Toni Ainge/ Aled Richards
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Review Panels – Land commission work - regeneration Old Kent Road 	Lead member - Cllr Helen Dennis Lead Officer - Clive Palfreyman (Stephen Platts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of social purpose of land framework 	Lead member - Cllr Helen Dennis Lead Officer - Clive Palfreyman (Stephen Platts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Community Infrastructure Levy Framework 	Lead member – Cllr Dennis Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Stephne Platts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Canada Water 	Lead member – Cllr Cryan Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Stephen Platts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southwark Housing delivery - affordable housing and social rent delivery 	Lead member – Cllr Dennis Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Stephen Platts)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail Infrastructure - CIL investment at train/tube stations 	Lead member – Cllr Dennis Lead officer – Clive Palfreyman (Stephen Platts)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Interviews <p>Cllr Sarah King, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Cllr Jasmine Ali, Children, Education & Refugees</p> <p>Cllr Evelyn Akoto, Health & Wellbeing</p> <p>Cllr John Batteson, Climate Emergency, Jobs & Business</p> <p>Cllr Stephanie Cryan, Equalities, Democracy & Finance</p> <p>Helen Dennis, New Homes & Sustainable Development</p> <p>Cllr Natasha Ennin, Community Safety & Neighbourhoods</p> <p>Cllr Michael Situ, Council Homes</p> <p>Cllr James McAsh, Clean Air, Streets & Waste</p> <p>Cllr Portia Mwangangye, Leisure, Parks & Young People</p>	To be determined (as and when appropriate).

	<p>Cllr Sam Dalton, Supported Housing</p> <p>Cllr Margy Newens, Cleaner Southwark</p> <p>Cllr Bethan Roberts, Landlord Services</p> <p>Cllr Joseph Vambe, Neighbourhoods</p>	
--	--	--

This page is intentionally blank.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MUNICIPAL YEAR 25/26

AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)

NOTE: Original held by Scrutiny Team; all amendments/queries to amit.alva@southwark.gov.uk

Name	No of copies	Name	No of copies
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members		Officers	
Paper copy		Joseph Brown – Cabinet Office Arthur Holmes – Cabinet Office	
Councillor Suzanne Abachor	1	Oliver Bradfield – Liberal Democrat Group Office	
Councillor Victor Chamberlain	1	Paper copy	
Councillor Laura Johnson	1	Sarah Feasey, Legal Department	1
Electronic Versions (no hard copy)		Amit Alva, Governance and Assurance (Spares)	10
Councillor Cassandra Brown			
Councillor Esme Hicks			
Councillor Richard Leeming			
Councillor Jason Ochere			
Councillor Bethan Roberts			
Councillor Martin Seaton			
Councillor Irina Von Wiese			
Councillor Ian Wingfield			
Martin Brecknell (Co-opted Member)			
Alie Kallon (Co-opted Member)			
Mannah Kargbo (Co-opted Member)			
RESERVES			
Councillor Rachel Bentley			
Councillor Sunil Chopra			
Councillor Sabina Emmanuel			
Councillor Barrie Hargrove			
Councillor Jon Hartley			
Councillor Richard Livingstone			
Councillor Hamish McCallum			
Councillor Margy Newens			
Councillor Catherine Rose			
Councillor Michael Situ			
Councillor Cleo Soanes			
		Total paper copies	14
		Dated: September 2025	