

<b>Item No.</b> 14	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> February 14 2006	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Motions Referred from Council Assembly	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Chief Executive (Borough Solicitor)	

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That the executive considers the motions set out in the appendices attached to the report.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Council assembly at its meeting on Wednesday, January 25 2006 considered a number of motions which it agreed should be referred to the executive for detailed consideration.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

3. In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10(3), the attached motions were referred to the executive. The executive will report on the outcome of its deliberations upon the motions to a subsequent meeting of council assembly.
4. The constitution allocates responsibility for particular functions to council assembly, including approving the budget and policy framework, and to the executive for developing and implementing the budget and policy framework, and overseeing the running of council services on a day-to-day basis.
5. Any key issues, policy or funding implications are included in the advice from the relevant chief officer.

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Motions submitted in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3).	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London. SE5 8UB	Cameron MacLean Constitutional Team 020 7525 7236

## Audit Trail

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager
<b>Report Author</b>	Cameron MacLean, Constitutional Officer
<b>Version</b>	final

<b>Dated</b>	6.02.06	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Chief Officer	Yes	Yes
<b>Executive Member</b>		
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>		NA

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 – mini motos
- Appendix 2 - Camberwell street drinking
- Appendix 3 - Crystal Palace Park
- Appendix 4 - sale of public assets: requirements for consultation
- Appendix 5 - mobile phone masts
- Appendix 6 - rail pricing
- Appendix 7 - road resurfacing programme
- Appendix 8 - local government finance settlement
- Appendix 9 - Walmer Castle, Peckham Road SE15
- Appendix 10 - street lighting budget
- Appendix 11 - North Dulwich 20 mph zone

**MINI MOTOS**

The motion was moved by Councillor Lisa Rajan and seconded by Councillor Graham Neale. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly notes with serious concern the rapid growth in the sale and use of “mini motos” and mopeds, especially by children and young adults.
2. That council assembly believes the illegal riding of these vehicles is extremely dangerous and anti-social, affecting a number of areas around Southwark.
3. That council assembly understands the serious difficulties faced by the police in preventing or stopping the use of these vehicles and in identifying and catching those who ride them illegally.
4. That council assembly further believes that the current powers afforded to police to deal with the problem are insufficient. Council assembly notes that despite the difficulties police in Rotherhithe have recently managed to secure two arrests and have seized a number of vehicles. Council assembly therefore believes that publicly criticising the police over the issue is very damaging.
5. That council assembly calls on the council to work up proposals for government legislation, in conjunction with other organisations, which will enable local authorities and the police to have better powers to tackle this problem long term.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

Mini moto bikes are extremely popular and the increased availability and reduction in price means that many more are likely to be used in Southwark in 2006 than previously.

Exactly the same legislation applies to mini motos as other motor vehicles. Mini motos are motor vehicles for the purpose of the Road Traffic Act and all rules relating to the use of motorcycles apply. These include that riders must be aged 16 or over and wear a helmet. Riders must hold the relevant driving licence, with learners displaying L-plates. Riders must have passed their Compulsory Basic Training (CBT). The vehicle must be registered with DVLA, display a number plate, be insured taxed and MOT'ed. The only circumstance where mini moto cycles can be used without complying with this is on private land with permission of the landowner. In effect unless complying with the above mini motos cannot be used legally on roads, public parks or open spaces, estates and pavements.

Section 59 of the Police Reform Act gives police the power to seize vehicles being used in a manner causing alarm, distress or annoyance. If police believe that a vehicle is being driven in a careless and inconsiderate manner or being driven off-road (in a public place) and is causing or likely to cause alarm, distress or annoyance to members of the public they may stop, seize and remove the bike. A warning regarding the use must be given and continued use leads to seizure. This warning does not have to be on the same day as seizure. It is true, that in practical terms, it is very difficult for the police to make these seizures because the bikes are not registered and have no number plates, meaning ownership cannot be traced. There are also practical problems for the police to

physically stop the bike safely. One of the primary considerations for the police is risk management and the safety of the public and the rider.

The success of police (working alongside Community Wardens) in Rotherhithe is welcomed and the Council, with the Police, will ensure that this sends a message to the local community that illegal use of mini motos will not be tolerated.

Trading Standards Officials have also seized some mini motos from local shops where the shops did not have the requisite documentation. They also confirmed that in addition to this the vehicles did not comply with relevant safety requirements. It should be noted that prices for mini motos have fallen from over a thousand to a few hundred pounds making them much more accessible. However, the cheaper models are less likely to satisfy safety standards. Intelligence reported to Trading Standards also suggests that young people are attempting to buy petrol for their vehicles. It is illegal to sell fuel to under 16's and this matter is being investigated by the London Fire Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA). A targeted multi-agency enforcement campaign is also being planned.

Legislation and enforcement can only go so far to address the issues and appeal of mini motos to young people. Campaign work to alert the public and in particular parents and young people, to the legal requirements is also being prepared. The key communication messages will be two fold, that it is illegal and that you are likely to risk injury due as a result of using un-roadworthy bikes.

In addition to the work in Rotherhithe, a "Bike Safe" event has been held in Burgess Park (aimed at motor bike users) and the police will shortly be launching "scooter safe". Both are aimed at over 16's who hold a full or provisional licence.

Southwark police and the Youth Offending Team are also working with the Ilderton Motor Project to establish local training schemes to increase knowledge on legal requirements and safe use of scooters and motorbikes etc.

Through the Safer Southwark Partnership (SSP) the Council will ensure that a consistent approach is adopted across agencies to collect data and information on where, and by whom, mini motos are used.

The SSP and the council will work with the ALG and GLA, to campaign for any changes required in legislation. In particular, the council will campaign for legislation to require registration of the bikes at the point of sale.

**CAMBERWELL STREET DRINKING**

The motion was moved by Councillor Ian Wingfield and seconded by Councillor Alison Moise. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly requests the executive to exercise its powers under section 13 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, together with all other enabling powers, to introduce the necessary by-law or public order as appropriate to designate central Camberwell a street drinking control area and to formally approach the Southwark police borough commander to implement Section 155 of the Licensing Act 2003 which extends existing police powers relating to confiscation of alcohol from people who are drinking and causing nuisance in public places, allowing for the confiscation of sealed containers in addition to opened containers, in defined circumstances. This enforcement will not affect licensed street cafes operating within the designated area however, or any special arrangements for festivals as decided by the council in liaison with the police.
2. That the executive should be mindful that support for the introduction of such a street drinking control area has arisen from extensive consultation with the local community particularly through council officer reports (such as from the East Camberwell Street Action Team in 2003) that show street drinking in Camberwell to be a cause of major public annoyance. The introduction of a control area has also been endorsed by decisions of the Camberwell community council and the Camberwell police sector consultative working group.

**COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE**

There are a number of options available when considering responses to alcohol related issues and problematic street drinking within the Borough.

Byelaws have in the past been used to restrict public drinking, and have enabled prosecution for contravening the byelaw. However, as of August 31 2006 any existing byelaw will be replaced by Designated Public Place Orders (DPPO's). DPPO's are already in existence in over 90 areas across the country, and make it easier for local authorities to designate an area where restrictions on public drinking will apply. A DPPO would allow the police, police community support officers (PCSO's) and people accredited to do so, discretionary powers to control the consumption of alcohol within that area.

There are a number of steps required before designating an area a DPPO:

- The local authority must be satisfied that public nuisance or annoyance to the public or disorder have been associated with public drinking in that place (there is no formal assessment necessary as was the case with the byelaws procedure)
- The local authority is required to consult with the police (regulation 3(1)(a)) on the nature of the problem and the appropriateness of the designation order, recognising that it will be them who will have the responsibility for enforcing the resulting restrictions on public drinking.

It is recommended that as per the guidance for Sections 13 – 16 of the Criminal Justice & Police Act that the council executive make a decision relating to a designated public place order (DPPO) in the Camberwell area. It is recommended that the following options are considered:

1. Not to introduce a DPPO in Camberwell but to continue partnership operations to tackle street drinking in the area
2. To propose a DPPO for the Camberwell area
3. To propose a borough wide DPPO to establish effective borough wide street drinking control.

As part of the decision-making process officers advise that the following points should be taken into consideration:

- Street populations and associated problematic street drinking is not confined to the Camberwell Green area of the borough. Other areas such as Borough and Bankside and Peckham Rye experience similar issues
- Street populations are highly mobile and are able to swiftly relocate outside of designated zones/areas and could possibly impact on residential areas within the neighbourhood. Boroughs that have implemented limited area DPPO's have advised that displacement to other sites continues to be a significant issue
- It is also important to continue to offer treatment and social care interventions for people involved in street activity.
- Other boroughs report that it has been necessary to continue the use of a coordinated multi-agency intelligence approach to control street drinking even when a DPPO is in place, this includes the use of targeted interventions such as the use of ASBO's against individuals and dispersal of groups available under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003.

### CRYSTAL PALACE PARK

The motion was moved by Councillor Lewis Robinson and seconded by Councillor William Rowe. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

#### RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly notes the recent public consultation by the London Development Agency (LDA) on their draft planning framework for the future regeneration of Crystal Palace Park.
2. That Whilst many of the proposals put forward by the LDA, including a new sports centre and opening up the centre of the park are welcome, council assembly is deeply concerned at the claims that in order to fund these improvements ideas must be considered for limited development of up to 200 housing units built on the park entrances and edges.
3. That council assembly notes the key findings of the extensive survey carried out by College Ward councillors last December of Southwark residents who live on roads adjoining the park:
  - 78% of respondents were not aware of the LDA's proposals or public consultation.
  - 88% of respondents oppose in principle the development of housing units at the entrances of the park being included in the planning framework.
  - 92% of respondents support further exploration of other means of meeting any funding gaps.
4. That the LDA is now considering responses to its public consultation. Council assembly requests that Southwark Council planning officers support the findings of College Ward councillors in future representations and discussion with the LDA that housing development on this historic park space is not supported by local residents.

#### COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION

The London Development Agency (LDA) will take over the lease of the National Sports Centre (NSC) in Crystal Palace Park in March 2006 and has an option to take over the rest of the park by 2009. In preparation for this the LDA published 'Crystal Palace Park Planning Framework – a draft for consultation' in October 2005. The document states that it "is not intended to be a prescriptive document". It also states that it is a "non-statutory planning document, which will not be formally adopted by the London Borough of Bromley but will be subject to extensive consultation" and that it "should be read in conjunction with the policies contained in the London Plan and the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan".

The document sets out proposals for the park which include development for a variety of uses including housing at two of the park's entrances on metropolitan open land.

The London Borough of Bromley is at a similar stage in the preparation of its unitary development plan (UDP) to Southwark in that a public inquiry into the plan was held recently and they hope to adopt the plan in 2006.

The London Plan policy on metropolitan open land (policy 3D.9) states that the Mayor will and boroughs should maintain the protection of metropolitan open land (MOL) from inappropriate development and that any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by boroughs through the UDP process. Policies should include a presumption against inappropriate development of MOL and give them the same level of protection as green belt.

If the Crystal Palace Park planning framework is followed up by an application for planning permission for these developments, they should be referred to the Mayor who has the power to direct refusal.

Although the document appears to cover the wider spatial planning of the area identifying a range of delivery mechanisms, including development management and control it is not being prepared as a local development document under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. If it were it would be required to have a strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal according to formal statutory processes and to be subjected to external examination before it is adopted.

**SALE OF PUBLIC ASSETS: REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSULTATION**

The motion was moved by Councillor Jonathan Hunt and seconded by Councillor Barrie Hargrove. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

That council assembly believes that community councils and local people should have the opportunity of commenting on whether public assets should be sold or retained before such artifacts, land or premises are put on the market; and

Calls upon Southwark property and other agencies to draw up plans as to how such consultation should take place.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION**

The Council's policy is: to maintain a full register of its property; to have an asset management plan which ensures the effective use of the council's assets to deliver its services; and to dispose of assets when surplus, to secure receipts to finance capital projects in support of service delivery.

Existing assets can be declared surplus by the current service user. These are then reviewed to establish the potential future use by other services or as part of the wider regeneration or development programmes

Members, either through community councils or individually, are able to identify projects or changes to services which might have implications for the use of property. Such proposals would need to be agreed as part of a service through the normal procedures before an assessment is made of the best way in which to accommodate them – whether through existing property, the re-use of property, or the acquisition of new property. Where a freestanding project is proposed the capital and revenue resources for it need to be identified.

The release of information about prospective disposals is commercially sensitive in that developers and other purchasers may be able to secure unfair advantage unless the marketing is properly handled.

Officers will ensure that community councils are notified of prospective disposals once information can be released without compromising that confidentiality.

### MOBILE PHONE MASTS

The motion, as subsequently amended, was moved by Councillor Catherine Bowman and seconded by Councillor Eliza Mann. Council assembly agreed the motion in its amended version, as follows:

#### RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly notes current government planning legislation and government planning policy guidance (PPG8), which permits fast tracking of mobile phone mast applications under 15 metres in height through permitted development.
2. That council assembly further notes the recent decision by Walworth community council to refuse an application for a 15 metre mobile phone mast on the pavement of Dale Road and the recent decision by full planning committee to refuse a 17 metre mast application on Chadwick Road and the successful community led campaigns to prevent the installation of masts in Camberwell and Nunhead.
3. That council believes that current government fast-tracking policy should be reviewed as should the council's own procedures in the light of the ombudsman's report identifying maladministration concerning the mast siting on Camberwell College of Art and calls for an end to this permitted development for telecommunications masts.
4. That council therefore calls on the executive member for regeneration to write to the government minister with responsibility for planning policy calling on the government review and to end this policy and take steps to change the law permitting these "fast-track" mast applications as soon as possible and to amend the council's own procedures to prevent maladministration in the handling of such applications.

#### COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION

All proposals for mobile phone masts require planning permission and fall into two categories: those for masts up to 15 metres in height which follow the prior approval procedure; and those over 15 metres that follow the normal planning application procedure.

Although both procedures do allow the council sufficient time to consult the local community for its comments, the prior approval procedure does not give adequate time for proposals to be properly considered by either community council or planning committee because the applicant must receive the council's decision within 56 days from receipt of the application. There is no power to extend the 56-day period and if the decision is not notified to the applicant by day 56 then permission is deemed to have been given.

The removal of proposals for any masts from the prior approval procedure would ensure that the views of the local community can be properly taken into account by community council or planning committee in reaching a decision on proposals that generally are of great concern to the local community.

**RAIL PRICING**

The motion was moved by Councillor Barrie Hargrove and seconded by Councillor Robert Smeath. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That this council supports the efforts of the Mayor for London to persuade the rail operating companies to incorporate the use of oyster cards into their ticketing arrangements. Much of south London, including two-thirds of Southwark, lacks access to the underground system. Council assembly believes that as a result, Southwark rail travellers are being heavily financially penalised by the rail companies.
2. That council assembly calls on the executive to liaise with the mayor's office, to use whatever means are available to promote fair rail pricing and to strongly communicate this council's concerns to the rail companies operating in Southwark.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION**

The Department for Transport oversees train ticket technology and pricing which the train operating companies then introduce and implement across the networks they manage.

The council is already working closely with the train operating companies that operate within the borough, Southern Railway and South Eastern Railways, to seek the early introduction of oyster card technology into Southwark.

Regular liaison with the train operating companies is facilitated through the transport consultative forum and the South East London Transport Strategy partnership (Seltrans). Seltrans includes representatives from neighbouring boroughs, Transport for London and all public transport operators. If the motion is passed and the executive agrees, officers will raise the concerns directly with the Secretary of State and the Mayor of London.

## **ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME**

The motion, as subsequently amended, was moved by Councillor David Bradbury and seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley. Council assembly agreed the motion in its amended version, as follows:

### **RESOLVED:**

That council assembly recognises that many roads in the borough need resurfacing. It also recognises that councillors will be aware of particular roads in their own wards that would benefit – such as Carver, Tarbert and Trossachs Roads and Warmington Road in Village Ward, Asylum and Naylor Roads in Livesey Ward, Drummond Road, Gainsford Street, Queen Elizabeth Street and Parkers Row in Riverside Ward, Pennethorne Road in Peckham Ward, Cheltenham Road in Peckham Rye Ward, Holly Grove, Bellenden Road, Highshore Road, Choumert Grove and Alpha Street in Lane Ward, East Street, Dawes Street and Southampton Way in Faraday Ward, Machell and Hollydale Roads in Nunhead Ward, Shenley Road, Vicarage Grove, Vestry and St Giles Roads in Brunswick Park Ward, and Stoney Street and Princess Street in Cathedrals Ward, and therefore, calls on the executive to ensure that ward members and community councils are fully consulted before the 2006-07 programme for road resurfacing is finalised.

### **COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

The 2005/06 resurfacing programme was arrived at using the following process.

All streets in Southwark, other than principal roads, were inspected using a national standard assessment system which allows for each street to be scored on its condition. Where streets achieved the same condition score these were then scored again based on usage (e.g. bus facilities, shops, schools, cycling), to arrive at an initial priority list. The top forty streets were all visited to confirm the assessment, establish the extent of works needed and to produce an estimate of work costs. At the same time the list was checked against other works planned for the street which would affect the programme, (e.g. utility works, development, etc.). Any streets affected by other works were withdrawn and the next street on the list inserted. Accordingly this year's programme was prioritised first on condition and then refined based on usage mainly around public transport, cycling and pedestrians.

It is proposed that the repair programme for 2006/07 will be developed using the same process to arrive at a programme of works (established on technical grounds) aiming to resurface the worst rated streets first. The programme will be submitted to each community council for information before the works commence.

Principal roads are not included in this programme because their assessment and repair is financed by Transport for London.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT**

The motion, as subsequently amended, was moved by Councillor Lorraine Zuleta and seconded by Councillor Nick Stanton. Council assembly agreed the motion in its amended version, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly notes with concern:
  - the recent local government finance settlement, announced by the government, which gives Southwark a just above the floor increase of 2.2%;
  - that this compares very unfavourably with other London boroughs, such as Camden with a 3.8% increase and Kensington & Chelsea with a 3.3% increase.
2. That council assembly believes that this represents an enormous challenge to the council to maintain a high level of service provision whilst keeping council tax below the 5% cap that the Government has indicated it will impose.
3. That council assembly is particularly concerned that the local government finance settlement provides no clarity over how relative levels of deprivation are now taken into account in the settlement.
4. That council assembly is particularly concerned that the local government finance settlement provides no clarity over how relative levels of deprivation are now taken into account in the settlement.

**COMMENTS FROM DIRECTOR OF FINANCE**

The settlement for Southwark leaves the council facing a cut in resources in real terms, not only 2006/7 but for the foreseeable future. No account appears to have been taken of Southwark's relative levels of deprivation and in particular the council has suffered significant losses in the formulae for Children and Younger Adults social care at a time when the council is facing tremendous pressure on the ground and is in the process of implementing the government's national policy on the Children's agenda. Since the council was first consulted on these proposed changes to the formulae in early summer 2005, the council with others has continually lobbied the government not to implement the changes but to little avail. While the settlement that we have received has been protected to some extent by damping, the council will be open to the full cash impact in the future and potentially stands to lose £13 million of resources. This is at a time when government are expecting us to make forward predictions of our council tax levels for 2007/08 and beyond. The council will continue to lobby for a review of the formulae to one that fairly recognises real levels of need in Southwark.

Furthermore, the accuracy of the government's mid-year population estimates is a major issue for Southwark. Based on the work of Southwark and others, it is now widely recognised that the population estimates are not robust for local authorities with ethnically diverse and highly mobile populations. We are asking the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister to liaise with Office for National Statistics to consider ways in which Southwark and similar councils can be properly funded, whether within the formula system or outside of it.

**WALMER CASTLE, PECKHAM ROAD SE15**

The motion was moved by Councillor Aubyn Graham and seconded by Councillor Mark Glover. Council assembly agreed the motion, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly notes recent press (Southwark News, December 15 2005) comment and the concerns of local residents - including the Peckham Society, about the possible development of the Walmer Castle public house.
2. That council assembly believes that without this local authority's involvement this important and historic venue will be lost as a local cultural feature and leisure facility.
3. That council assembly requests that the executive member for regeneration report back to the council executive (or the relevant scrutiny panel) setting out options and actions for securing the Walmer Castle public house on Peckham Road, SE15 as a community art facility.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION**

The Walmer Castle public house has not been in use for over a year. A planning application has been made which would result in its demolition and replacement by flats. Officers can discuss with the applicant the options for a mixed-use scheme which could include public house type uses. A mixed-use scheme in this location could provide a venue for local artists' work.

Should members wish to promote a community arts facility, a project would need to be developed with sufficient resources to deliver such a venue (these resources would need to cover the acquisition and development of the site).

**STREET LIGHTING BUDGET**

The motion, as subsequently amended, was moved by Councillor William Rowe and seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys. Council assembly agreed the motion in its amended version, as follows:

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly notes that substantially all of the current budget for street light renewal has been directed to replacement of concrete lamp posts due to the fact that 94% of these concrete columns provide inadequate lighting as they use low pressure sodium (orange) bulbs.
2. That council further notes that these old lampposts mean residents suffer both inadequate lighting and columns that are dangerous.
3. That council also notes that community councils are able to spend cleaner, greener, safer money on street lighting if they feel this is a priority.
4. That nevertheless given the demand for new street lighting, council assembly therefore requests the executive to instruct officers to prepare a policy for 2006/7 which:
  - Includes a balance of priorities between improving lighting and replacing concrete lampposts.
  - Includes consultation with ward members and community councils on which streets should be given priority in their areas.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

The current street lighting capital programme has been developed on the basis of a risk assessment that is aimed at improving lighting and lighting assets. Poorer lighting conditions are associated with low-pressure sodium lighting (orange bulbs) and priority is given to replacing this type of lighting. Of the 239 roads that have the concrete lighting columns which require replacing, 225 (94%) also have low pressure sodium lighting. Additionally, the remaining 14 roads with concrete column lighting do not have column layouts that meet current lighting standards. Thus, by focusing the current capital programme of £2m over the next two years on concrete columns, the programme is improving lighting and upgrading assets simultaneously.

It is recognised that there are other areas where lighting does not meet current day standards and a capital bid has been submitted for a further £0.9m for lighting around train stations, schools and identified crime hotspots as part of the budget making process for 2006/7.

In addition to the capital programme, street lighting renewal is considered when major carriageway and footway works are carried out and these works are co-ordinated.

In addition, in areas that currently have no programme for lighting improvements, community councils have the option to fund such improvements from the cleaner greener safer allocation. In this and the previous years all 8 community councils

between them have allocated in excess of £350k to over 30 schemes for, or containing, lighting improvements.

**NORTH DULWICH 20 MPH ZONE**

The motion (by Councillor Toby Eckersley and seconded by Councillor David Bradbury) stands referred to the executive, as follows:

That Council assembly welcomes the council's success in bidding, through the "Borough Spending Plan," for funds from Transport for London (TfL) for a 20 m.p.h. zone in North Dulwich, and requests the executive to give a high priority to early implementation. It is further requested that the executive ensure that each household receives the relevant consultation material, given complaints that many households in multi-occupied houses in this area have been missed out from earlier consultations.

**COMMENTS FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

In 2004/2005 officers investigated proposals to install a 20 mph zone in North Dulwich for the Dulwich community council. At that time the proposal was not granted funding by the community council as other schemes took priority. During this financial year (2005/2006), the council was made aware of the possibility of additional funding being available from Transport for London (TfL) for 20 mph zones and funding of £25,000 to cover consultation and implementation has been agreed. However, it should be noted that this funding is only available for the current financial year, i.e. the works must be completed by the end of March 2006.

A full consultation exercise has commenced that includes all residents and businesses affected by the proposed zone which is the area bounded by Half Moon Lane, Village Way, Red Post Hill, Elmwood Road, Davencroft Road and Herne Hill. The consultation process includes:-

1. Approval by members of the Dulwich community council of the letter, questionnaire and drawing to be sent to residents prior to the community council meeting of January 19 2006.
2. Brief presentation on the scheme at the Dulwich community council meeting on January 19.
3. The information being sent to residents and businesses located within the area allowing a three-week consultation period.
4. Members of the community council are being advised of the results of the consultation. If there is general support for the proposal following this process of consultation the work will be undertaken before the end of the financial year.