

Council Assembly

Wednesday 6 April 2011
7.00 pm
Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Supplemental Agenda No.2

List of Contents

| Item No. | Title | Page No. |
|----------|---|----------|
| 2.2. | Public question time | 1 - 2 |
| 2.3. | Deputation Requests The deputation request from Hawkstone Tenants and Residents Association and a cross section of the Rotherhithe community has been withdrawn. | |
| 3.2. | Questions from the public on the theme | 3 |
| 7.1. | Licensing Act 2003 - Extension of Borough & Bankside Saturation Area – Addendum Report | 4 |
| 8. | Amendments | 5 - 10 |

Contact

Lesley John on 020 7525 7228 or email: lesley.john@southwark.gov.uk;
sean.usher@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 5 April 2011

Agenda Item 2.2

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Item No. 2.2 | Classification: Open | Date: 6 April 2011 | Meeting Name: Council Assembly |
| Report title: | | Public Question Time | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | | All | |
| From: | | Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance | |

1. QUESTION FROM TONY OSBORNE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Should all the contents of a stage 1 complaint letter when escalated to stage 2 be responded to by the stage 2 investigator in accordance with council procedures? If they are not and there is no supporting statement for the stage 1 responses is the investigation considered to be completed?

2. QUESTION FROM MICK BARNARD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

If an offer of half the market rent for a monthly renewable lease was made on a commercial property, unoccupied for 2 years, with a view to full market rent lease within 18 months would Southwark Property be justified in refusing the offer given the requirements of "best consideration"?

3. QUESTION FROM COLIN HARTRIDGE-PRICE TO THE LEADER

There has been considerable opposition from local residents to a 9/11 memorial (its correct description) in the Potters Fields Park. How will you make sure the council does not ignore the views of local residents?

4. QUESTION FROM BARRY MASON TO THE LEADER

The Southwark Connect 2 project to turn the disused railway bridge by South Bermondsey station into an east-west walking/cycling route that will help regenerate the area, is now formally "at risk". The £600,000 Big Lottery grant will be lost. What is the council doing to ensure this project proceeds?

5. QUESTION FROM PETER SALTER TO THE LEADER

The "Southwark Connect 2" project to bring a railway bridge into use as a walking and cycling route is "at risk". This project would provide valuable amenity. If the Big Lottery grant is lost, can Southwark Council ensure the project proceeds?

6. QUESTION FROM JOHN FRANKS TO THE LEADER

Due to lack of progress of the Southwark Connect 2 scheme this has been identified as 'at risk' by Sustrans. This means that the £600,000 this Big Lottery grant could be lost. What is the council doing to ensure that the scheme goes ahead?

7. QUESTION FROM STEPHEN HILL TO THE LEADER

The Southwark Connect 2 project to turn the disused railway bridge by South Bermondsey station into an east-west walking/cycling route that will help regenerate the area, is now formally "at risk". The £600,000 Big Lottery grant will be lost. What is the council doing to ensure this project proceeds?

8. QUESTION FROM ANN WARREN TO THE LEADER

The very popular Southwark Connect 2 project to turn the disused railway bridge by South Bermondsey station into a walking and cycling route is now formally "at risk". The £600,000 Big Lottery grant will be lost. Will the council ensure this project goes ahead?

9. QUESTION FROM IAN MCPHERSON TO THE LEADER

The 'Connect 2' project converting a disused railway bridge at South Bermondsey into a walking and cycling route is now reportedly 'at risk'. How will the council ensure that this project goes ahead, as it would be a travesty if the £600,000 Big Lottery grant for this scheme was lost?

10. QUESTION FROM SALLY EVA TO THE LEADER

There is £600,000 of Lottery funding to be spent on the Southwark Connect-2 project. This could soon be lost. What is being done to spend this urgently? The scheme is to turn the unused railway bridge by South Bermondsey Station into a walking and cycling route.

11. QUESTION FROM JULIAN GRIFFITHS-SEARLE TO THE LEADER

By her direct interventions to assist the 9-11 London Project Team achieve their goal to install a memorial on Potters Field Park, did the chief executive of Southwark act in an appropriate way?

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Item No. 3.2 | Classification: Open | Date: 6 April 2011 | Meeting Name: Council Assembly |
| Report title: | | Questions from the Public on the Theme | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | | All | |
| From: | | Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance | |

1. QUESTION FROM JANE SALMON TO THE LEADER

How does the leader expect residents to ask genuine questions about his vision for the Future of Southwark when public questions have to be submitted before they have heard his presentation?

2. QUESTION FROM MAUREEN BAKER TO THE LEADER

We in the Peckham community council area strongly believe in the advantages of 'learning from each other'. Therefore, what are the council doing to encourage all ethnic minority groups and the wider community to collaborate with each other and fully engage in community cohesion in the future?

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| Item No: 7.1 | Classification: Open | Date: 6 April 2011 | Meeting name: Council Assembly |
| Report title: | Licensing Act 2003 – Extension of the local saturation policy dealing with the “cumulative impact” of licensed premises in Borough and Bankside. – Addendum Report | | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | Cathedrals, Chaucer & Grange | | |
| From: | Strategic Director of Environment and Housing | | |

Addendum

Members are asked to note the following errors, contained within paragraph 35 of the report:

- The phrase “To assist with the committee’s consideration ...” should read “To assist with the assembly’s consideration ...”; and
- The place name “Waterloo Road” should be substituted with “Westminster Bridge Road”.

Accordingly, the amended paragraph should read:

“To assist with the assembly’s consideration of a possible extension of the western boundary of the policy area, the partnership analytical report also provides analysis of the position within the extended footprint. This includes the additional area bordered by Blackfriars Road, Westminster Bridge Road, the Lambeth border and the river frontage (see appendix 2) incorporating The Cut.”

3.3 MOTION ON THE THEME: THE FUTURE FOR SOUTHWARK – RISING TO THE COMMUNITY CHALLENGE (see pages 11-12 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

Seconded: Councillor Lisa Rajan

Delete points 3 and 4 and **insert:**

3. Council welcomes the opportunity given to members to contribute ideas on shaping the future of Southwark.
4. Council calls on the cabinet to note and formally include in its business plan and community strategy going forward: (a) ideas and contributions made verbally in the debate and (b) members' questions on the theme and the resulting written and supplemental answers to demonstrate the council's claimed commitment to truly make council assembly more open, transparent, accountable and democratic.
5. Council believes that in debating the future of Southwark the cabinet must urgently address its failings in the following areas:
 - 1) The failure to deliver what residents deserve at the Elephant and Castle, including the failure to secure a green energy scheme and lower energy costs for local people, to provide comprehensive sporting facilities in the proposed leisure centre and to fully redevelop the shopping centre.
 - 2) The lack of progress towards or political interest in reducing the borough's carbon emissions and tackling climate change.
 - 3) The failure to understand and commit to a new school in SE16.
 - 4) The strategy of playing party politics with council funding, and sidelining and forcing closure of voluntary sector groups through its budget choices rather than using, then replenishing in later years, the council's sizable reserves.
6. Council calls on the cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy to report back in not more than six months on which of these ideas will be pursued further with communities and neighbourhood forums.

4.2 MOTION 1: REPAYMENT OF MAJOR WORKS CHARGES BY LEASEHOLDERS (see pages 21-22 of main agenda)

AMENDMENT B

Moved: Councillor James Barber

Seconded: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

In paragraph 7 after “48 months” **insert** “and capped to £10,000”.

Revised paragraph 7 to read as follows:

That where exceptional circumstances occur, and the council is required to carry out more than one programme of major works on an individual estate in one financial year, the current repayment schedule of 36 months will be extended to 48 months and capped to £10,000 so that those affected leaseholders are better placed to budget for the additional financial burden.

4.2 MOTION 2: SECONDARY SCHOOL IN SE16 (see page 22 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT C

Moved: Councillor Catherine McDonald

Seconded: Councillor Renata Hamvas

Delete all and insert:

1. Council assembly recognises the need for more secondary school places in SE16.
2. Council assembly notes that this administration has always been firmly committed to a new school in SE16 - and that this has consistently been reflected in the Canada Water Action Plan.
3. Council assembly notes that:
 - 1) The Labour government and the previous council administration agreed a programme of 12 Building Schools for the Future (BSF) schools in Southwark, including a brand new, 5 forms of entry (150 places per year group) school in Rotherhithe.
 - 2) In July 2010, the Secretary of State scrapped almost all the BSF programmes across the country, but told this council that Southwark's 12 schools were 'unaffected' by these changes – including schools in Phase 3 of Southwark's BSF programme.
 - 3) Last June the government asked the council to resubmit the borough's pupil place demand projections.
 - 4) In October 2010 Partnerships for Schools (an agency of the Department for Education) informed the council that programmes referred to as 'unaffected' in July would be subject to the Department for Education value for money review. Initially, reference was made to the Department for Education seeking savings of up to 40% across remaining BSF programmes nationally.
 - 5) In November 2010 the government wrote to the council saying that they were withdrawing the £19.6 million it had previously allocated for a new school in Rotherhithe. In the letter, however, the government said it considered there was a need for 2 forms of entry (60 places per year group) worth of places in the area. The letter from the Department for Education to the council said:

"It is not considered that a case can be made for the delivery of a new 5 form of entry secondary school in Rotherhithe at this time. As such the £19.6 million funding provisionally allocated to this project through the Stage 0 approval process in April 2010 will no longer be available to the Authority to deliver that proposal.

"The Department [for Education] considers that there is the need to establish 2 forms of entry of additional secondary places in the Rotherhithe area in the next five years. As such the Department will work alongside

Southwark and PfS [Partnerships for Schools] to identify an alternative proposal for the delivery of these places."

- 6) To date the government has not confirmed how much funding the government will provide to the council for these extra places and when the council will receive it. Until the government confirms this, the council can not progress plans.
 - 7) Last month a working level BSF spreadsheet, emailed from an official in Partnerships for Schools to an officer in the council, which suggested that the government had still allocated the full £19.6 million to a new school in Rotherhithe. This was despite the fact that the government had formally told the council in November that it had withdrawn the funding.
 - 8) .As a result, the council wrote to the government demanding clarity on how much funding the council will receive for new secondary places in SE16. The letter said:

"The council has always maintained that, despite borough-wide figures, there is a specific need for additional places in Rotherhithe and our proposals for a new school responded both to this and the specific demand in Rotherhithe.

"I am writing to seek confirmation that we can now move forward....I hope you can advise without delay in order that I can progress, because we need to give certainty to local families."
4. Council assembly further notes that:
 - any suggestion in the media or otherwise that the council should 'welcome the government's funding for a new school in SE16' is based on a fundamental and complete misunderstanding of the situation
 - any suggestion in the media or otherwise that £10 million for new places may be available from the government does not match the facts as they are known to the council.
 5. Council assembly supports the cabinet in its calls for the government to clarify how much funding is available for new secondary places in SE16.
 6. Council assembly welcomes the cabinet's wish to work with stakeholders, including both the MPs for SE16, to find a solution to the need for places in the area.

4.2 MOTION 3: SECURE TENANCIES (see pages 22-23 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT D**Moved:** Councillor Linda Manchester**Seconded:** Councillor Paul Noblet**Delete** from point 2 onwards and **insert:**

2. Council assembly further notes that many council tenants remain in overcrowded accommodation and that there are a significant number of council tenants also technically 'under occupying' council homes.
3. Council assembly welcomes that current tenancies are not affected by the coalition government's proposals.
4. Council assembly notes the council's response to the government's consultation - 'Local Decision: A Fairer Future for Social Housing' but is concerned that subsequent statements by the administration appear to be contrary to their consultation submission.
5. Council assembly welcomes the proposal to give local authorities and registered providers discretion to set long term tenancies beyond the two year minimum.
6. Council assembly believes that Southwark should offer a standard flexible tenancy period across all client groups, to make it easier to manage and to offer tenants sufficient level of security and believes that local authorities should be free to set this period.
7. Council assembly believes that local authorities, who have the overall strategic and enabling role for their districts, should be free to set their terms based on their needs and to give strategic direction to registered providers on such matters
8. Council assembly calls on the cabinet to ensure that decisions and criteria for extending tenancies should be equality impact assessed to ensure that there is no unfair impact on particular groups such as those with long term severe disabilities.
9. Council assembly calls on the cabinet to fully consult with all tenants when the cabinet sets its own social tenure policy and reflect the position the deputy leader took in the response to the government's 'Local Decision: A Fairer Future for Social Housing.
10. Council assembly further calls on the cabinet to seek clarification of the government's proposals regarding the rights of existing social tenants in Southwark to a secure tenancy if they move to a new council or housing association property, and to clarify its own definition of making Southwark's homes warm, safe and dry so tenants and leaseholders can hold the council to account.

4.2 MOTION 4: CABINET PRIORITIES (see pages 23-24 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT E

Moved: Councillor Mark Williams

Seconded: Councillor Nick Dolezal

Delete all and insert:

1. Council assembly notes that in just under a year of the Labour administration, despite the savage cuts from the Tory/Liberal Democrat government:
 - The administration's success in taking the regeneration of the Elephant & Castle forward, with progress on new leisure facilities
 - The administration has delivered a food waste recycling pilot, meaning that, where carbon would be produced through incineration and methane through landfill, fewer emissions are produced. It notes the planned reduction in the carbon produced by the council's estate
 - The cabinet's commitment to a new school in Rotherhithe. It notes that the government withdrew the Building Schools for the Future funding for a new school.

2. It notes the other following deliveries on the administration's commitments:
 - Piloting free school meals and securing the finance for free meals in primary schools across the borough
 - Establishing a commission on reducing teenage conceptions
 - Cutting spending on special responsibility allowances by the same amount that they were increased by the Liberal Democrat/Tory administration
 - New safeguards on spending on consultants and the amount spent on them cut as a result
 - The most open budget process in the borough's history
 - All fire risk assessments of council homes now available to the public
 - New dedicated housing department created
 - Two air-quality monitoring stations reopened
 - Consulted with the voluntary sector on our care service charter of rights
 - Piloting a new dedicated phone line for queries about social care.

3. It notes the other following achievements in the administration's 2011/12 budget:
 - Transition fund for voluntary sector, thought to be unique in London, and funding cushion for day care centres and lunch clubs
 - Youth fund to help young people in Southwark find work or stay on in education
 - Pay increase for the lowest paid council employees, despite a national pay freeze.

4. Council assembly believes that this administration delivers. It calls on the cabinet to put delivery at the core of the new council business plan.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (AMENDMENTS)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11**

NOTE: Original held by Constitutional Team; all amendments/queries to
Lesley John Tel: 020 7525 7228

| ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED | Copies | To | Copies |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|
| All Councillors | 63 | Others | 2 |
| Group Offices | 1 | Ms Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission, Ground Floor, Tooley Street | |
| John Bibby, Cabinet Office | | | |
| Steven Gauge, Opposition Group Office | 1 | | |
| Libraries (1 each) | 4 | | |
| Albion / Dulwich / Newington / Local Studies Library | | | |
| Officers | 5 | | |
| Annie Shepperd | 1 | | |
| Eleanor Kelly | 1 | | |
| Deborah Collins | 1 | | |
| Duncan Whitfield | 1 | | |
| Sonia Sutton, Mayor's Secretary | 1 | | |
| Doreen Forrester-Brown | | | |
| Constitutional Officer | 30 | | |
| 5 copies to Lesley John , 2 nd Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street and 25 copies to Lesley John, Town Hall, Peckham) | | | |
| | | Last Updated: November 2010 | |
| | | Total: | 107 |