

# Council Assembly

Wednesday 12 October 2011

7.00 pm

Harris Academy Peckham, 112 Peckham Road, London SE15 5DZ

## Supplemental Agenda No. 1

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
1.5.	Minutes	1 - 56

To approve as a correct record the open minutes of the council assembly meeting held on 6 July 2011.

### Contact

Lesley John or Andrew Weir on 020 7525 7228 or 020 7525 7222 or email:  
lesley.john@southwark.gov.uk; andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk;  
constitutional.team@southwark.gov.uk  
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 4 October 2011



## Council Assembly (Ordinary)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary) held on Wednesday 6 July 2011 at 7.00 pm at Walworth Academy, 34 - 40 Shorncliffe Road, SE1 5UJ

---

### PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor for 2011/12, Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE (Chair)

Councillor Kevin Ahern	Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Catherine Bowman	Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor Michael Bukola	Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Denise Capstick	Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor Sunil Chopra	Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Poddy Clark	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Neil Coyle	Councillor Helen Morrissey
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Rowenna Davis	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Patrick Diamond	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Nick Dolezal	Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Gavin Edwards	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Dan Garfield	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Mark Gettleson	Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Renata Hamvas	Councillor Althea Smith
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Helen Hayes	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Claire Hickson	Councillor Geoffrey Thornton
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Mark Williams
Councillor Peter John	Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor Paul Kyriacou	

## 1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

### 1.1 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the council assembly meeting and especially thanked Walworth Academy for allowing the council to use their hall this evening.

The Mayor:

- Congratulated Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle and others who lived or worked in the borough who had received an honour in the Queen's Birthday Honours list, a list of which had been circulated around the room.
- Congratulated the achievements of Southwark's young people in the London Youth Games.

Councillor Veronica Ward, the cabinet member for culture, leisure, sport and the Olympics made an announcement about:

- the community games summer activities programme, which will be published next week.
- She also announced that Southwark Council had become one of the first London boroughs to adopt Inclusive and Active 2, a five year strategy to increase opportunities for disabled young people and adults in sports and physical activity.

Councillor Peter John announced that as Southwark was an Olympic borough, Olympic badges had been circulated to all members.

Councillor Tim McNally made a point of order in respect of Amendment E. The Mayor informed the meeting that having considered advice from the monitoring officer, the amendment had been ruled out of order.

### 1.2 NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE MAYOR DEEMS URGENT

The Mayor informed the meeting that there would be a variation in the order of business and that she would hear, in the following order, all public questions, deputations on the themed debate, the themed debate then the remaining deputations.

Councillor Helen Morrissey, seconded by Councillor Tim McNally, moved a procedural motion to suspend council assembly procedure rule 2.6 (20) to allow council assembly to hear the deputation from the Friends of Southwark Park.

The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Councillor Helen Morrissey moved a procedural motion to refer the deputation request on the Pumphouse Educational Museum to the cabinet in light of the consultation process on

the budget. This was seconded.

The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### **1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

Members declared the following interests:

#### **Item 2.2 – Public Question Time**

Councillor Tim McNally declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in the question on Hoptons Almhouses as he is a member of St Saviours Trust.

#### **Item 4.2 – Members' motions.**

Councillors Nick Dolezal and Nick Stanton declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in Motion 3 – Protecting Southwark Park as they are members of the planning committee.

#### **Item 5.2 – Capital Strategy and Programme 2011/12 - 2020/21.**

Councillors Althea Smith, Graham Neale, Lorraine Lauder and Michael Bukola declared personal and non prejudicial interests in the item as they are council tenants.

### **1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Linda Manchester, Jonathan Mitchell, James Barber and Catherine McDonald.

### **1.5 MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the annual meeting held on 24 May 2011 be agreed and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

## **2. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC**

### **2.1 PETITIONS**

There were none.

### **2.2 DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

*(See pages 2-4 of supplemental agenda 3)*

Following the approval of a procedural motion, a deputation request from the Pumphouse

Educational Museum was referred to the next meeting of the cabinet. The deputation from Southwark Gymnastics Club were not present at the meeting, however members noted the excellent display during the informal session that preceded the meeting.

#### **Deputation request from the Burgess Park (Colts) cricket team**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the Burgess Park (Colts) cricket team.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson addressed the meeting.

Councillors Peter John, Veronica Ward, and Anood Al-Samerai asked questions of the deputation.

#### **Deputation request from the Southwark Youth Council**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from Southwark Youth Council.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokespersons from the Southwark Youth Council addressed the meeting.

Councillors Rosie Shimell, Veronica Ward, David Hubber and Tim McNally asked questions of the deputation.

#### **Deputation request from the Peckham Pride Basketball Club**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the Peckham Pride Basketball Club.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Sterling Muschett addressed the meeting, then some of the team members addressed the meeting.

Councillors Paul Noblet, Althea Smith, Lisa Rajan, Peter John and Rowena Davis asked questions of the deputation.

#### **Deputation request from the Friends of Southwark Park**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the Friends

of Southwark Park.

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Mr Patrick Kingwell, addressed the meeting.

Councillors Peter John, Barrie Hargrove, Paul Noblet, and Lisa Rajan asked questions of the deputation.

At this juncture Councillor Tim McNally seconded by Councillor Althea Smith, moved that in accordance with council assembly procedural rule 1.6 (b), Motion 3 – Protecting Southwark be heard after the deputation by the Friends of Southwark Park.

The procedural motion was put the vote and declared to be carried.

The motion was then debated.

**2.3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

*(See page 1 of supplemental agenda 3 and green papers circulated at the meeting)*

There were three questions from the public, the answers to which were circulated on green paper at the meeting. Two of the public questioners, Mr Mick Barnard and Mr Seamus Dark, were present and each asked a supplementary question.

**3. THEMED DEBATE - SPORTS AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

**3.1 CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT**

Councillor Veronica Ward made a statement on the theme of the meeting: Sports and Young People.

**3.2 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE THEMED DEBATE**

*(See page 11 of supplemental agenda 3)*

There were five questions from the public to the leader, the written answers to which were circulated on green paper at the meeting. One public questioner, from Dulwich Table Tennis Club, was present and asked a supplementary question.

**3.3 MEMBERS' MOTIONS ON THE THEME**

*(see pages 6-7 of the main agenda)*

## **MOTION ON THEMED DEBATE: ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOUTHWARK'S YOUNG PEOPLE**

Councillor Veronica Ward, seconded by Councillor Renata Hamvas, moved the motion.

Councillor Rosie Shimell, seconded by Councillor Graham Neale, moved Amendment A.

During debate on Amendment A (Councillors Peter John, Andy Simmons, Richard Livingstone, Toby Eckersley, Fiona Colley and Anood Al-Samerai), a procedural motion to move to the vote was moved by Councillor Tim McNally and seconded by Councillor Nick Stanton. The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

Following further debate (Councillors Catherine Bowman, Neil Coyle, Adele Morris, Renata Hamvas and Nick Stanton), Amendment A was put the vote and declared to be lost. The time allowed for the themed debate having expired, the substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried. Amendments B to D and G to H were formally noted, having not been moved and seconded at the meeting.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly recognises and celebrates the achievements of Southwark's children and young people; their sporting achievements; their improving attainment including record GCSE results; their contribution to the arts especially music and drama and their contribution to our communities.
2. That it be noted that this administration's support for young people includes free healthy school meals for primary school children, keeping all our children's centres open, setting up a £3 million Youth Fund and setting up a Teenage Pregnancy Commission. This council also notes the investment put into our leisure centres and this administration's commitment to a leisure centre at the Elephant and Castle and to a continuation of community games despite financial constraints.
3. That council assembly believes that sports can make a significant difference to the lives of young people and that it delivers a wide range of benefits, from improving young people's health to encouraging team working and embedding discipline. It is a core offer for all our young people, as well as an important element of our targeted interventions for vulnerable young people.
4. That council assembly notes the significant reductions in funding for sports made by government:
  - Withdrawal of free school swimming
  - Withdrawal of funding to the School Sports Partnership
  - Withdrawal of funding available to the council and to national sporting bodies to support community led sport.
5. That council assembly believes that despite these cuts it is vitally important that

the council continues to ensure that young people in Southwark have access to sport and sporting opportunities.

6. That council assembly notes the focus of the debate as outlined to all councillors in advance:
  - Showcasing the talents and potential of young people in Southwark
  - What sport means to young people, and the capacity of sport to open pathways to broader opportunities and achievements
  - How different sectors and partners can work together at a time when budgets are tight to maximise provision and access to sport for young people.
  
7. That council assembly believes that securing future sporting opportunities in Southwark require the following questions to be discussed:
  - How can the council continue to ensure that young people have access to sport and sporting opportunities, with little direct funding, by working with the voluntary, community, educational and private sectors?
  - How can the council work to make sure that all resources available for sport, both facilities and available funding, are maximised across all departments and communities?
  - What are the most effective ways that the council can use its limited resources to encourage young people to get involved in sport?
  
8. That council assembly calls on the cabinet to note the content of the debate and points raised to feed into a review of the council's sports strategy which runs to 2013.

**Note:** The motion was referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

#### **4. ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS**

##### **4.1 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

*(see pages 8-15 of the main agenda and the blue and yellow papers circulated at the meeting)*

There was one urgent question to the leader from the leader of the opposition, the written answer to which was circulated on blue paper at the meeting. The leader answered two supplementary questions on the question. The questions are attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes

There were fifty eight members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper. Six supplementary questions were answered, thereafter the bell was rung and the Mayor announced that the guillotine had fallen. The questions are attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.



## 4.2 MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### **MOTION 1: HOMES FOR FAMILIES** *(see page 17 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillor Rosie Shimell, seconded by Councillor Michael Bukola, formally moved the motion.

Councillor Ian Wingfield, seconded by Councillor Helen Morrissey, formally moved late Amendment I.

Late Amendment I was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That council agrees that good quality housing can play an important role in shaping the future, health and well-being of young people in our borough.
2. That council therefore regrets the actions of the Tory Liberal Democrat government to threaten Southwark tenants security of tenure, cut Southwark's housing revenue account, halve the amount of decent homes funding Southwark is to receive, cap housing benefit and introduce rents of up to 80% of market value, making many properties unaffordable to people living in the borough – all of which will impact upon the future health, happiness and well-being of young people in our borough.
3. That council also regrets the failure of the previous Liberal Democrat administration to set out a coherent housing programme that addressed the needs of people in Southwark and was based on spending money that was not available to the council at the time.
4. That council welcomes the current administration's pledges to; make every council home warm, dry and safe by 2014/15, and believes the new housing investment programme will help to secure a better future for our young people by bringing every Southwark home up to a decent standard, by letting tenants know when they can expect improvements and by being based on funding available to the council to ensure that it is actually delivered unlike the previous Liberal Democrat administration's disastrous programme.

**Note:** This motion was referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

### **MOTION 2: SOUTHWARK'S HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME** *(see pages 17-18 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillor Ian Wingfield, seconded by Councillor Gavin Edwards, formally moved the motion.

Councillor Michael Bukola, seconded by Councillor Tim McNally, formally moved Amendment J.

Amendment J was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly welcomes the council's key pledge to make every home in Southwark warm, dry and safe by 2014-2015.
2. That council assembly also welcomes the council's proposed new housing investment programme of major works to the value of £326.5m over the next five years which will ensure that the council's homes meet the government's decent homes standard and the reestablishment of a separate housing department.
3. That council assembly regrets the previous administration's wasteful and inefficient housing programme which created uncertainty among tenants and leaseholders about when their decent homes works would be done; was based on a commitment that could never be delivered within the funding available to the council and did not offer a solution for all of the council's housing stock or meet central government requirements.
4. That council assembly also regrets that the Conservative/Liberal Democrat government has cut Southwark's housing revenue account by nearly £7 million this year, has only provided half the amount of decent homes funding that was bid for and that the allocation is back-ended in the final two years.
5. That council assembly notes that Southwark's housing revenue account will face a deficit as a result of Conservative/Liberal Democrat government cuts.
6. That council assembly calls on the cabinet and relevant cabinet members:
  - a) To ensure that all of the council's homes are made warm, dry and safe by 2014-15.
  - b) To develop a longer-term sustainable strategy for our housing stock.
  - c) To look at ways to maximise the level of resources available for investment, including savings through new major works contracts, limited disposal of voids, external funding sources and self-financing regeneration options.

**Note:** This motion was referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

**MOTION 3: PROTECTING SOUTHWARK PARK** *(see page 18 of the main agenda)*

Following advice from the strategic director of communities, law and governance, members of the planning committee left the chamber for this item.

This motion was considered prior to the guillotine having fallen.

Councillor Jeff Hook, seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet, moved the motion.

Following debate (Councillors Peter John and Barrie Hargrove) the motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly emphasises the significant environmental, social and community value of the green spaces in our borough.
2. That council assembly notes with regret and concern the suggestions over the last year for tunnels, holes and pipes in Southwark Park.
3. That council assembly and the cabinet clearly state to UK Power Networks that Southwark Park is not a suitable site for their proposals.
4. That councillors and the cabinet work with UK Power Networks to find an alternative brownfield site for their proposals.

**Note:** This motion was referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

**5. REPORT(S) FOR DECISION FROM THE CABINET**

**5.1 COUNCIL PLAN**

*(see pages 19-55 of the main agenda)*

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (1), Councillor Peter John moved the report.

Following debate (Councillors Anood Al-Samerai, Fiona Colley, Lisa Rajan, Helen Morrissey), the recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the recommendations of the cabinet set out in the report, which makes up the council plan; noting the fairer future promises, be adopted.

**Note:** The cabinet recommendation had not been amended, therefore in accordance with the budget and policy framework procedure rule 2 (e), the decision could be implemented with immediate effect.

**5.2 CAPITAL STRATEGY AND PROGRAMME 2011/12 - 2020/21**

*(see pages 56-94 of the main agenda, supplemental agenda 2 and lilac papers circulated at the meeting)*

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

There were three members' questions on the report, the written responses to which were circulated on lilac paper. There were three supplementary questions. The questions are attached as Appendix 3 to the minutes

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (1), Councillor Richard Livingstone moved the report.

The guillotine having fallen Amendment K was put to the vote and declared to be carried. Amendment L was put to the vote and declared to be carried. Amendment M was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

The recommendations in the substantive report were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the recommendations of the cabinet on 21 June 2011 for a refreshed 10-year general fund capital programme 2011–2021 of £351m, as detailed in the cabinet report attached as Appendix 1 to the report be agreed, except that the proposal to use the whole of the Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) Reward Grant (£4.3m) for capital purposes be agreed only to the extent of £4.25m and that the cabinet is invited to take the balance of £50,000 to revenue to support the retention in 2011/12 of school crossing patrols.
2. That the recommendations of the cabinet on 21 June 2011 for the Housing Investment Programme (HIP) 2011–2016 as detailed in the cabinet report attached as Appendix 1 of the report be agreed.
3. That the capital strategy included in the council's medium term resources strategy agreed by cabinet on 21 June 2011 (paragraphs 8 to 9 of the report) be noted.
4. That it be noted that there is unallocated capital in the later years of the programme. Council assembly therefore asks that cabinet consider how this funding should be used in its preparation of the next capital programme refresh in early 2012, in the light of the government's 2012/13 funding settlement, economic conditions and the announcement of the successful bidders to the council's Olympic Legacy Fund.
5. That given the recent progress with the Nunhead and Peckham Area Action Plan the council calls for cabinet to consider the allocation of the necessary capital resources to redevelop the area immediately in front of Peckham Rye Station, with the aim of reinstating the heritage of the station and to create new retail and other opportunities around the station to enhance the potential for the area.

6. That council assembly asks cabinet to bring forward the work on Seven Islands Leisure Centre by a year, to start in the 2014/15 financial year.

**Note:** The cabinet recommendation was amended, therefore in accordance with the budget and policy framework procedure rule 2 (e), the decision is treated as an in-principle decision for seven days unless the leader indicates he has no objection to the change. At the meeting the leader stated he accepted the changes. Therefore the decision can be implemented with immediate effect.

## **6. REPORT(S) FOR INFORMATION FROM THE CABINET**

### **6.1 REPORT BACK ON MOTIONS REFERRED TO CABINET FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**

*(see pages 95-101 of the main agenda)*

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

## **7. OTHER REPORTS**

### **7.1 TREASURY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE - 2010/11 ANNUAL REPORT AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS FOR CAPITAL FINANCE AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT**

*(see pages 102-112 of the main agenda)*

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (2), the report was moved by the Mayor then put to the vote and declared to be carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the 2010/11 outturn report on debt, investments and prudential indicators be noted.

The meeting closed at 10.51 pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**

**SOUTHWARK COUNCIL****COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2011****URGENT QUESTION****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Could the Leader please give an update on the serious fire at Lupin Point?

**RESPONSE**

Around 40 fire fighters attended Lupin Point on Thursday 28 June to tackle a significant fire on the seventeenth floor. The London Ambulance Service were also in attendance and treated one woman for smoke inhalation on the scene. There were no other casualties. The block has recently had substantial fire safety works carried out, including new front entrance doors, screens fitted to each landing and ventilation works. The building's fire safety measures appear to have worked as they should.

The immediate response to the fire included setting up a rest centre at the Beormund Centre, staffed by officers from the housing, children's services and community safety and the Tenant Management Organisation, Two Towers, who are responsible for the day to day management of the block. The Red Cross provided food for those residents who needed it. In the late afternoon, after the fire had been extinguished, residents of Lupin Point began to be allowed back into their homes. All but residents from two flats were allowed back into the block by the end of the day. The council found alternative accommodation for the residents from those two flats that evening.

The resident of the property affected by the fire remains in temporary accommodation whilst work is carried out to repair her property.

I would like to thank all of those who were involved in the emergency response to the fire for the professionalism and bravery that they displayed, and all of those who helped the residents through what must have been a deeply worrying experience, for their commitment and compassion.

While the cause of the fire was initially reported as a lightning strike, we now understand that this was not the case. It is thought that a Beko fridge freezer may have been the cause of the fire. Beko have since issued a national statement and pledged to replace the faulty part on all affected fridge freezers. The council is writing to all residents to inform them to get in touch with Beko directly if their fridge is one of the models affected, and a notice has been posted on the council's website.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Thanks very much Madam Mayor and thank you to the leader for his answer and to all the emergency services and council staff and to my ward colleague Councillor Mann,

who was fantastic and who spent hours helping residents in very distressing circumstances.

I just wondered whether the leader was aware that one of the residents had actually made a complaint of a burning smell before the fire, made a complaint to the council's call centre and I wonder if he was aware of this and what he was doing about it?

## **RESPONSE**

No, I was not aware of that, Madam Mayor. I have had a briefing on it today but I have not looked into any other matters. There are certain aspects of this which are continuing to be investigated and having raised this, this will be one aspect that will be investigated. I know Councillor Wingfield and Gerri Scott are taking this extremely seriously; obviously because we know that there are Beko appliances in homes right across the borough so this is something we are taking very seriously. Obviously if there was an alert which was missed earlier on then obviously we need to look into that; but we will take that on board.

## **SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

I am really quite troubled that you are not aware of this complaint. Certainly I had a call from the press about it this week and they told me the council had given them a statement saying it was being investigated, so I am really troubled if the leader of the council has not been aware of that. I wondered whether he really does have confidence in the cabinet member for housing and the way he has been shoving around housing management over the last year, and whether this is really showing that it is really dangerous to start getting rid of area housing officers and area housing office managers?

## **RESPONSE**

Well I don't think it gives rise to that debate or any questions of confidence in anyone. I think as I have indicated all these aspects are being investigated. I think that Councillor Wingfield was aware of these calls; and calls are being tracked. When she asked me if I was aware, no, I was not aware.

I don't think that the supplemental question in fairness to her is particularly helpful in moving this debate on or moving this investigation on. I have told her that we are looking in to this, I have told her that we are taking this seriously; of course we do. Nobody takes a fire of this seriousness lightly, and she will know that we were both in Birmingham at the LGA conference last week when news of this came through and it really did preoccupy us for a couple of hours whilst we looked into what was going on. It was very worrying and it is not something that we take lightly.

The wider housing management changes are probably for another debate but I have absolute confidence and faith in both members and officers who are looking into this matter. I will ensure and make sure, together with Councillor Wingfield, that all residents and the public know what the outcomes of this investigation are in due course.



**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY)****WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2011****MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME****1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

What are the leader's views on the calls to further delay the regeneration of Elephant and Castle shopping centre?

**RESPONSE**

This administration was elected on a pledge of getting the regeneration of Elephant and Castle moving. For eight years it crawled at a snail's pace. Residents had waited too long for the regeneration to begin and London had waited too long for it to begin.

In line with our commitment, since May 2010 we have signed a regeneration deal, started the demolition of the Heygate Estate and seen genuine progress on a new leisure centre. This marks real change on the ground.

We now face a genuine choice on the shopping centre. Yet again, it is a choice between dither and delay or delivery.

Everybody believes that rebuilding the shopping centre is fundamental to Elephant's meaningful regeneration and for many it characterises everything that is wrong and out-of-date in the area. Just adding a lick of paint will not be enough, but the plan to strip the centre back to its core and start again entails far more than that. As residents will have seen through the concept images, its nature and appearance will be changed beyond recognition. It will not be refurbished, but rebuilt.

Vitality, by rebuilding the centre in this way work can start in a matter of years rather than decades. We will still have the flexibility to seek a full demolition if we aren't satisfied with the designs that the developers bring forward, but my hope is that local residents will see work begin within the next five years.

This is what local residents want: not a return to the days of delay and empty promises, but positive meaningful action. And that is what we're delivering.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

I would like to thank the leader for his answer provided. Does the leader agree that Southwark's Liberal Democrats need to understand that the role of opposition is not just to oppose and that Councillor Al-Samerai's party needs to reconnect with Walworth residents on the Elephant regeneration where demand for action far outweighs their apparent predisposition for doing nothing?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Coyle for his supplemental question. Yes I do agree, I mean it does seem strange that virtually every step, the Liberal Democrats opposed progress that we sought to make on the Elephant and Castle and I think really, to contrast what we have done

over the last 13 – 14 months in office with their eight years – as I characterised it last year – eight years of dither and delay; and really, on too many occasions they do appear to be asking for dither and delay again. But they do have to think carefully, I think, about what message their behaviour sends out, to not only the community but those that we're doing business with, because it undermines their confidence, it undermines the confidence of their investors. So they do have to be careful, they have to get over the fact that we are pressing ahead with this. We are showing the political leadership which we said needed to be shown on this and we are delivering on this project where they failed to deliver; and I know it is a bit of sour grapes and I know it is difficult for them to come to terms with that fact that we are pressing ahead and delivering this but I think they have to recognise it, get on board because otherwise they are going to be left behind and the community will not thank them.

## **2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Does the leader agree that the community should be actively involved in managing local spaces and facilities?

### **RESPONSE**

I can only answer for council-owned facilities and spaces. Certainly, suitable council-owned spaces should have appropriate democratically accountable involvement in management from the community.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Thank you very much for the answer to this question. I apologise that the question was a bit vague but it has certainly become very clear to me from reading Councillors John's blog that he does not really like the community being involved in local spaces and I am talking of course about Potters Field Park Management Trust, which he has been slagging off. It seems like he's saying it is not democratically accountable, so I wondered if he could tell me whether he thought chairs of tenants' and residents' associations who sit on that board count as 'democratically accountable' or whether he is, in the words of one of his very nice Labour party members in my ward, 'being like Thatcher and getting rid of the GLC when she did not like the decisions it was making'?

### **RESPONSE**

I can't imagine which member that is. Look, I think it is important that if we are – I have had this debate with Councillor Steve Reed in Lambeth, because it goes to the very heart of the whole 'co-operative council' and the whole big society and handing assets over to the community. Yes it's fine as a concept, as long as everybody who effectively takes ownership of those has democratic accountability at some stage; and there are certainly people who are simply appointed to the trust in question who do not seem to have any particular network or diagram of democratic accountability and that does concern me, but it is a wider issue that concerns me; I use that as a particular example and I have used it as a particular example as I say in discussions about how this would work in future – the whole co-operative council idea.

I do think we have to be careful. If we as a council are giving over control of assets which belong to the community as a whole, the community does continue to have an accountable route in to it, that's the point I am making. I have said before that I have concerns about us handing over this trust – just yesterday I think we had Hugo Boss who had two cranes in the park with a huge banner – I do worry about the commercial use of this park and it was Councillor Stanton who stood in a chamber not far from here when he was putting this forward as a proposal, saying 'we need to see the end of the commercialisation of Potters Field Park, return it to the hands of local people', and more often or not I am afraid local people can barely get into the park because of the commercial interests which are queuing up to use it and I do

think that is a serious issue and I do think those who represent the trust have to be held accountable for that, but I think there is a wider issue that goes on from it and that is something which I think we all need to be concerned about in this debate about handing over assets to the community. It is a good debate and maybe we should have it in this chamber at some stage.

### 3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS

Has the leader had any parental feedback regarding the council's roll-out of free, healthy, school meals?

#### RESPONSE

A full evaluation of the pilot is currently underway and will include comments from parents. The report is due in the summer, but initial anecdotal evidence from parents is very positive.

### SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS

Thank you Mayor. Since putting in this question I have had a bit of feedback from ward residents and was wondering, Councillor John, have you had any other specific examples of anecdotal feedback from residents who are partaking in the pilot study?

#### RESPONSE

Thank you very much Councillor Hamvas, I alluded to one earlier on when I think one of our focus group parents told us that her child was now asking for fruit when they got home from school, and another parent said 'the money I am saving from free healthy school meals I am buying my child books to read which I did not before'. Another good positive sign; and a third who said 'I can now afford to feed my child a proper meal in the evening as well as at lunch time'. I think these are all three very good positive anecdotes and I think with the feedback that you received and I think that numerous councillors have actually received about the benefits of this I think I am very encouraged that this is a policy which is well worth taking forward.

### 4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM MCNALLY

Please can the leader provide the number of decisions which were called in for each year since the introduction of overview and scrutiny?

#### RESPONSE

Year	Number of decisions called in
2002/3	3
2003/4	7
2004/5	10
2005/6	4
2006/7	8
2007/8	3
2008/9	3
2009/10	3
2010/11	5
2011/12	1 (rolled over from 2010/11) to date

### 5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES

Does the leader believe the roll out of food waste recycling across the borough will help the council meet its pledge to double the borough's recycling rates?

**RESPONSE**

Yes. In the pilot areas recycling rates have increased by approximately 20 percentage points, from around 33% to over 53%. Before May last year the introduction of food waste recycling in our borough was not planned until at least 2015. Without it I am fully confident that the council would not be able to double the borough's recycling rate by 2014.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES**

Madam Mayor, I would like to thank the leader for his answer to my question which I think is great news for the borough. I would also like to ask what the leader thinks of the Liberal Democrats' attempts to claim credit for food waste recycling through Councillor Barber's letter in the South London Press and indeed on his blog where he seems to be simultaneously criticising the council's approach while taking credit for the success of the policy at the same time?

**RESPONSE**

I think it is quite bizarre, quite frankly, because at the end of the day this is a policy which has been introduced five years ahead of the planned time table that the Liberal Democrats were going to introduce food waste recycling across our borough, so for Councillor Barber to say 'this is a Liberal Democrat policy which is being delivered'. Well, it is being delivered five years ahead of schedule by a Labour council, and I think we are the one who deserve the credit for that; Councillor Hargrove who has pressed forward for this deserves the credit for that, and I think with the result we see, that massive increase in recycling in the pilot area, I think that it really demonstrates why this is such a good policy and I think will mark us out as a leading recycling borough when we take it out to all street properties in September, I think it is. But also I think it put us really on track to achieve our pledge to the people of Southwark to ensure that we have got 40% of our waste recycled by 2014, doubling – doubling – the recycling rate in our borough and I think it will be a great achievement, and I think one again which the people of Southwark will thank us for.

**6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

Can the leader tell me whether he would consider extending the plans for harnessing power from SELCHP to estates in Surrey Docks ward?

**RESPONSE**

Discussions are underway with SELCHP to explore the possibility of using heat from the incinerator to provide warmth and hot water to five estates in the north east of the borough. These estates are Silwood, Tissington, Pedworth, New Place and Abbeyfield. The possibility of adding additional sites in the future, if the costs are not prohibitive, is already being factored into our discussions and will be an explicit clause within the final agreement, assuming our discussions are successful.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

Thank you Madam Mayor, I would like to thank the leader for his response, and could I ask that should the happy day come when it is decided that it is possible to extend SELCHP to Osprey Estate and Chiltern Grove Estate that any water pipes won't be put through Southwark Park?

**RESPONSE**

Water pipes right, they are hot water pipes; I can't give that absolute cast iron pledge because if we are going to make use of this SELCHP deal and bring cheap power to our residents, the

pipes have got to go somewhere. What I can tell him is though, bringing those pipes as I understand it across Southwark Park, if that were necessary – and I don't know the final route, it could be around the park, I don't know absolutely – it would not cause the level of disruption to the park which something like UK Power Networks were envisaging causing or which Thames Water were envisaging causing over at Kings Stairs Gardens.

But I think the other point about this and why it is different, is that of course this would be bringing a benefit to Southwark residents and I think that is something that maybe a little bit of disruption, people would put up with that. I think it is when we see something which is not bringing benefit to the people of our borough that we begin to get a bit anxious about whether we should give over our community facilities for that purpose. But certainly before we ever get to the stage of laying those pipes, we will certainly have a consultation with local residents and local councillors about the best route for that; so I do thank you for that question and hopefully we can have some useful dialogue in the future on it.

## **7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN MORRISSEY**

How much have overview and scrutiny committee meetings to consider call-ins cost the council in the last year? (Please itemise by meeting).

### **RESPONSE**

The cost of holding the individual call-in meetings has been as followed:

19/07/2010	£360
08/09/2010	£400
13/09/2010	£470
07/02/2011	£390
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1620</b>

However, this does not account for officer time, including the time of scrutiny officers and officers working in departments on the decisions that have been called in. It is not possible to quantify this cost.

Some call-ins have additional costs. For example, the call-in of the Working Neighbourhoods Fund in-year cuts decision at the September meeting cost the council an extra £18,359.61 in contracts payments as a direct result of the delay caused by the call-in.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN MORRISSEY**

I would like to thank the leader for his answer and I would also like to ask the leader what his hopes are for the relationship with overview and scrutiny over the next, coming year?

### **RESPONSE**

I hope they will be very good, and I hope that we can have a very useful dialogue with overview and scrutiny. The chair of overview and scrutiny wrote to me at the weekend; I am afraid I have not replied yet but I will be saying yes and taking up her offer of a meeting to discuss how overview and scrutiny can work – and the leisure centre as well. I hope we can have a positive relationship; I think OSC has a very important role to play not only in scrutinising what we do but in helping us develop policy as a council; and I think that's something which we probably need to work harder on in Southwark, I think there are some really good things we can do. I would be very happy to, as I say, talk with the chair of OSC and other OSC members on how we can achieve that and of course achieve their ambitions as well for the scrutiny function in the borough.

## **8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE**

To ask the leader, how many parking tickets have been issued by post at The Blue, Southwark Park Road in the last 12 months? How many of these were as a result of the use of surveillance cameras? Have any been challenged successfully?

## **RESPONSE**

**Note:** This question has been referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Recycling.

In the last twelve months, up to the end of May 2011, the council has issued 1498 penalty charge notices (PCNs) for parking and traffic offences on Southwark Park Road of which 1263 were issued by the CCTV vehicle. Of these only 6 notices have been successfully appealed by the parking adjudicator, which is some 0.4% of the tickets issued.

## **9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND**

Has the introduction of deputy cabinet members been beneficial to the work of the council?

## **RESPONSE**

The introduction of deputy cabinet members will deliver real benefits at a time when we are again cutting the cost of councillors for council tax payers.

Councillor Coyle will be providing invaluable work with those council tenants most let down by the previous approach to decent homes work. Councillor Hamvas will be the working side-by-side with parents to make sure that the school admissions process goes smoothly. Councillor Oyewole will be working with our borough's flourishing religious community to help spread understanding of planning obligations, and Councillor Situ will be working with those who give up some of their time to volunteer, to make sure that their views are represented at the highest level as our voluntary sector goes through transition.

We may now have a smaller cabinet, but what we have lost by removing one post I believe we have more than made up for through the new – and at a lower cost.

## **10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL**

If we are waiting for the Democracy Commission report before any savings have been made to community councils, why were the number of regular community council meetings reduced to six for 2011/12?

## **RESPONSE**

The community council meetings were put in a 6 week cycle as that is the normal cycle for council meetings, the allocation of dates necessarily includes a deviation from the 6 week cycle to allow for school holidays, party conferences and other committed dates. Chairs and vice chairs were briefed on the cycle and the link between community councils and council assembly themes in February. The council calendar was noted by council assembly at constitutional council in May.

The 2011/12 calendar provides sufficient time for agenda planning cycles for community councils, which improves the agenda planning process and meeting preparation. The 2011/12 schedule also allows adequate time between community council and council assembly meetings so that engagement activities on particular council assembly themes can take place at community councils.

Although the intention was not to save money but to regulate meetings to the normal 6 week council cycle there will be savings in a reduced level of meetings. It is difficult to ascertain the exact cost of community council meetings as each meeting is different in terms of: length of meetings, venue, agenda size etc. Meeting costs (venue, transport, agenda, PA system) vary but are around £2,000 per meeting. A 6 week cycle would therefore save under £15,000. However, no budget reduction has been made, so any money saved will be available to support other initiatives on improving engagement in community councils.

#### **11. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR KEVIN AHERN**

Why does he think Labour was able to increase its majority in The Lane by-election?

#### **RESPONSE**

When the council is being forced to make cuts on an unprecedented scale, with an unavoidable impact on local services, the result in The Lane is very significant. I think it shows that local residents understand the nature of the cuts and the difficulty of the choices that the council is being forced to make and agree that, while those decisions have been tough, they have been taken in partnership with the community. But more than that, I believe that it represents a rousing endorsement of our positive programme and a rejection of the ugly and negative, old politics demonstrated throughout the last two by-elections by the opposition.

It would have been all too easy for us, when faced with the scale of the challenge presented by the cuts, to hesitate or even capitulate. Instead we have, in 12 months delivered real changes for the community, which include:

- Finally getting the regeneration of the Elephant and Castle moving
- Piloting free, healthy school meals
- Publishing our housing investment plan to make every council home warm, dry and safe
- Piloting food waste recycling
- A transition fund for the voluntary sector
- A youth fund for our young people who are being impacted by government decisions.

And in the next few months we will:

- Roll out free, healthy school meals for all of our primary school children
- And roll out food waste recycling to all of our street properties.

These are real and tangible benefits of our work, and would not have been delivered under a Liberal Democrat administration.

At tonight's council assembly we will agree our council plan, which fully articulates our positive vision. I believe that the values expressed in it are shared with the values of our residents, including people in The Lane. And I believe that they elected Councillor Rhoden with an increased majority because they want to see our work continue.

#### **12. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL**

A decision was taken by the cabinet member for children's services to reduce council funding for teenage conceptions prevention by 54% in March 2011 because "allocations in previous years over-anticipated levels of need and have been under-spent by over £150,000." Does the leader think the excellent recommendations of the Teenage Pregnancy Commission require more funding than previous years? Does he think the good work of the commission will not be fully implemented because of this disproportionate cut?

#### **RESPONSE**

The political commitment to establish a Teenage Pregnancy Commission to help address this major challenge for the borough was matched with resources to help transform our approach. We anticipate that we will implement the commission's recommendations in full over the coming three years, and we were pleased to receive the report and recommendations at the cabinet meeting earlier this month. We fully appreciated how diligently and realistically commission members approached the issue, and recognise that their recommendations have helped us to focus our action on 'what works' and ensure they have the maximum impact.

### **13. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES**

Southwark is being forced to find £500,000 of savings to its library services budget because of the cuts from central government. A library review is promised. What is planned to ensure maximum involvement of residents in this review and that all possible options are considered so that closure is a last resort?

#### **RESPONSE**

The library review is not just promised, it has started.

No one wants to make cuts to the library service. Unfortunately, the scale of the cuts being forced on the council is so great that no area of spending can remain unaffected. We demonstrated through the budget process last year our commitment to making tough decisions about spending in partnership with our residents, rather than just imposing them, and we're now doing the same with the library review.

Over the course of the review, public meetings will take place in all of the libraries and at every community council. Everyone will have the opportunity to contribute to the consultation by filling in the survey, which will also be available on the council's website.

Library closure will be a last resort.

### **14. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER**

Can the leader please state the specific increase in unallocated reserves and contingency funds so far this year?

#### **RESPONSE**

The council made significant calls on its reserves last year and in February we budgeted to take money out of reserves to be spent on frontline services. In that budget we also agreed, due to the huge uncertainty of the current financial climate, to increase the size of the council's contingency fund by £1.5 million. The need for contingency is not only to mitigate the financial risks of delivering budget plans finalised so late in 2010/11 at such short notice, following the late publication of the local government settlement, but also the significant costs of implementing new arrangements necessary to deliver savings of over £30m, not only in 11/12 but also 12/13 and beyond

At the close of the last financial year, £3.906 million of the £4 million set aside by council as a contingency fund in the previous budget remained. This remainder has been put into reserves in line with the Medium Term Resources Strategy 2011/14.

In 2011/12 so far there have been no other contributions to reserves or contingency funds.

This will be kept under review with formal quarterly reports to cabinet.

### **15. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL**



At the Southwark Pensioner's Parliament it was highlighted that the number of podiatrists at Guys and St Thomas Hospital has been reduced from 25 to 12 since the start of the financial year. Is this the first example of the Tory and Liberal Democrats' disastrous NHS reorganisation impacting upon NHS services in Southwark?

#### **RESPONSE**

Before the last election the Tories promised no more top-down reorganisations of the NHS. The last 12 months have seen our local health services thrown into shameful uncertainty. And the fact that frontline care in this borough has been delivered throughout this period is a testament to the dedication of our doctors, nurses and hospital staff.

The real shame of this farcical reorganisation is the amount of resources that it has used up in our borough; resources that should have been directed towards patients. I think the cuts to our borough's podiatry services, highlighted to me by a pensioner in June, just go to show the local real-life impact on our older people. I hope that this is the last example that we hear of, but I fear that it will not.

#### **16. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK**

Please can the leader give an update on the Southwark Park Athletics Track?

#### **RESPONSE**

The council is currently in the process of considering a bid to its Olympic Legacy Fund for Southwark Park Athletics Track. In conjunction with this, officers will also complete applications for external funding to make up the necessary budget. External resources will include potential contributions from the London Mayor's Olympic Legacy fund and the London Marathon Trust.

#### **17. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER**

How many hours a week did the deputy leader work outside his cabinet position in 2010/11?  
How many will he be working in 2011/12?

#### **RESPONSE**

As a committed husband and grandfather, ward councillor, member of the executive of the Southwark Civic Association, school governor, member of the South East London NHS Ethics Committee and active member of many local community groups and charities, I can't say how many hours Councillor Wingfield works on top of the many that he dedicates to his cabinet member role. I believe, furthermore, that tenants and residents will judge his performance on his success in improving the council's repairs service and making every home warm, dry and safe.

#### **18. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK (ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Now we have confirmation of the exact amount of the New Homes Bonus, will the leader look again into keeping open the Pumphouse in Rotherhithe?

#### **RESPONSE**

We had allocated all of the New Homes Bonus into the 2011/12 budget. £1.5 million was allocated into the baseline 2011/12 budget and a further million went to establishing the council's Youth Fund.

The Pumphouse is a charity and not run by the council. Any final decision to close therefore is a decision made by the charity trustees. The council was forced to cut funding to the Pumphouse as a result of the unprecedented cuts made to the council's budget by the government.

We established the council's voluntary sector transition fund so that groups that are able to change the way they are funded do not collapse as they move to their new funding regime. Unfortunately, the Pumphouse's application was unsuccessful. The council has been working with the Pumphouse and other voluntary sector groups to provide advice and support even where we are no longer able to provide finance. My understanding is also that the Pumphouse has been approached by other organisations with offers of help, but that they have not taken them up.

**19. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER (BERMONDSEY COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can the security works on the Four Square Estates be done any earlier?

**RESPONSE**

I am delighted that we have been able to allocate money to carry out the security works for the Layard and Marden Squares. As the recent scrutiny report confirms, the residents of those squares were treated appallingly by the previous administration, who failed to manage the investment scheme properly, failed to take decisions and failed to communicate with local residents.

The works are programmed to commence in 2012/13. Design, procurement, mobilisation and resident consultation mean the works will need a 6-9 month lead-in before start on site. As such the works have been programmed as soon as practically possible. Any opportunities to speed up commencement on site will be pursued.

**20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK (BOROUGH & BANKSIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Please could the cabinet member give details of all council owned land in Borough and Bankside that has been sold since June 2007, and how much of that land was sold to provide affordable housing?

**RESPONSE**

**Note:** This question has been referred to Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety.

The table sets out all land sold in Borough and Bankside since 2007 as requested.

In terms of actual land no deals have been transacted but several prominent properties including Empire Warehouse, Bear Gardens have. Both these sites were sold for redevelopment and will include an element of affordable Housing when plans are brought forward. The remainder of the sales are disposal of void Housing stock requiring inward investment.

<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Date sold</b>	<b>Interest sold</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Abbey Street, 26, Wharton House, SE1 (residential sold at auction)	Grange	18th March 2010	Leasehold	£165,000
Arch Street, SE1 (land for E & C regeneration)	Cathedrals	31st March 2009	Leasehold	£1
Bear Gardens, Empire Warehouse, SE1 (land)	Cathedrals	16th January 2008	Freehold	£5,750,000
Blackfriars Road, 22, Vaughan House, SE1 (residential sold at auction)	Cathedrals	18th March 2010	Leasehold	£126,000
Brook Drive, 193, SE11 (commercial premises)	Cathedrals	27th May 2009	Freehold	£320,000
Dolben Street, 31-32(c), SE1 (land)	Cathedrals	14th May 2008	Freehold	£325,000
Gaywood Street, Prospect House, SE1 ( land for E & C regeneration)	Cathedrals	31st March 2009	Leasehold	£1
Hayles Street, 7, SE11 (residential)	Cathedrals	14th April 2011	Freehold	£640,000
Hayles Street, 28, SE11 (residential)	Cathedrals	27th January 2009	Freehold	£320,000
Hayles Street, 33, SE11 (residential)	Cathedrals	23rd July 2009	Freehold	£355,000
Hayles Street, 34, SE11 (residential)	Cathedrals	10th December 2008	Freehold	£475,000
Hayles Street, 38, SE11 (residential)	Cathedrals	22nd May 2009	Freehold	£277,500
Lant Street, 38, Redman House, SE1 (residential sold at auction)	Cathedrals	21st December 2009	Leasehold	£147,000
Lant Street, 51, Redman House, SE1 (residential sold at auction)	Cathedrals	23rd December 2009	Leasehold	£166,500
Library Street, SE1 (land for E & C regeneration)	Cathedrals	15th March 2010	Leasehold	£1
Long Lane, 171, SE1 (Valentines pub)	Grange	23rd November 2007	Freehold	£750,000
Park Street, 58, SE1 (grant of building lease)	Cathedrals	30th March 2009	Leasehold	£80,000
Princess Street, 11, SE1 (residential) leasehold enfranchisement	Cathedrals	8th December 2008	Freehold	£14,500
Princess Street, 19, SE1 (residential) leasehold enfranchisement	Cathedrals	27th March 2009	Freehold	£11,000
Tabard Street, 14-18(e) & 20-28(e), SE1 post building lease	Chaucer	14th January 2010	Freehold	£1
Tabard Street, 40, Pallant House, SE1 (residential sold at auction)	Chaucer	17th March 2010	Leasehold	£151,000
Tabard Street, 217, SE1 (commercial premises)	Chaucer	21st March 2008	Freehold	£425,000
Tennis Street, Drying room at 25, Boughton House, SE1	Chaucer	26th February 2010	Leasehold	£19,000
Weston Street, 106, SE1 (commercial premises)	Grange	13th March 2008	Freehold	£1,351,000
Weston Street Laundry Room, 1 Seal House, SE1	Chaucer	7th August 2009	Leasehold	£15,000

**21. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES (PECKHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Peckham Community Council recently held a youth themed meeting entitled "Peckham's got Talent" celebrating the achievements of our young people. Could you outline the council's current programme for engaging young people/empowering them to take part in the decision making process about their services?

**RESPONSE**

It is important to get young people's input to decisions that affect them. That's why this administration has committed to giving power over 20% of the youth services budget to young people by 2014. We are currently designing what this looks like, with strong input from Southwark Youth Council. We plan to involve young people in commissioning decisions, and they will also make decisions on a greater range of specific funds, such as the Youth Opportunities Fund which we have committed to continue. We are also strengthening the existing Youth Community Councils so they are more involved in decision making at a local level. Already young people - including Southwark Youth Council and Speakerbox, the council for Looked After Children - were consulted on the council's budget decisions, and young people will be assessing and deciding which activities should be commissioned through the voluntary and community sector for this year's summer activities programme.

We aim to further increase young people's involvement in the quality assurance of services so they can give direct feedback on what works and what they would like more of.

**22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR VICTORIA MILLS (NUNHEAD AND PECKHAM RYE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Following traffic and road changes in the Pomeroy Street and Kender Road Triangle area, how is the cabinet member working with Transport for London and counterparts in Lewisham to review that the new schemes are successfully combating traffic congestion in this area?

**RESPONSE**

Southwark's public realm division were initially contacted in January 2011 via email on road markings and raised table works - to be carried by Lewisham near to or adjoining the borough boundary with Southwark - to which we replied with comments concerning the road markings layout on the 25 January. We subsequently also made comment on the wording of the traffic management order (TMO) for the waiting / loading changes on 16 February 2011. As such, Southwark officers have engaged with the works promoter Lewisham Council to the extent that they were made aware of the proposals. We do not have any record of a specific working group with a remit for design or works coordination in this area, however Southwark would certainly consider involvement in such an effort if the need is established.

**23. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES (CAMBERWELL COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Residents in Camberwell have waited a long time for Camberwell Baths to be fully refurbished. Can the cabinet member for culture, leisure, sport and the Olympics confirm that the council will complete phase 2 refurbishment, including the gym, dayside changing facility and Warwick Hall, this year?

**RESPONSE**

It has indeed taken some time to refurbish Camberwell Leisure Centre, not least because working on a 19th century building revealed previously hidden structural problems and it is great credit to the contractors and our sports department that we are nearing completion of the second and third part of the work this year. Identifying funding sources to do more work has also been ongoing. This has meant that more work has been carried out than planned at the outset. In the long run, although causing delay, this will secure this wonderful building for many more years to come than if we had done less work on it.

The gym and dryside changing facilities as well as the youth facilities are approaching completion but listed building consent is required due to unexpected modifications needed to the gym roofline. This is to accommodate a specific energy efficient air handling system. This work is due for completion September this year depending on the planning permission. The Warwick Hall work, one of the projects for which extra funds were raised, has been submitted for listed building approval. Due to the sensitive refurbishment required the hall may open later than September.

As you know plans are in place to complete work on the Sports Hall in the future and is the subject of a Southwark 2012 Capital Legacy application for funding towards the refurbishment of this hall. All this takes time but will be well worth waiting for.

**24. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON (WALWORTH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

There can be no doubt that the regeneration of the Elephant & Castle shopping centre is absolutely central to the transformation needed in the Walworth area. After 8 years of dither and delay from the Liberal Democrats, how will the cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy ensure that residents in Walworth see the change to the shopping centre which they have been calling for?

**RESPONSE**

The transformation of the shopping centre site is essential for our plans to regenerate the area. The cabinet has therefore moved quickly to bring certainty to the future of this key site. In May cabinet agreed in principle to sell council land adjoining the shopping centre subject to a satisfactory planning consent being obtained. This decision will assist the shopping centre owners to bring forward a developable scheme. We also agreed to enter into a cooperation agreement with the owners and Lend Lease which will ensure that the planning of the central area of the Elephant and Castle is coordinated to achieve our objective of establishing a new town centre including an improved range of shops to meet the needs of Walworth residents. The shopping centre owners are now in the process of establishing a design team which will develop plans for the site and these will be the subject of consultation prior to the submission of a formal planning application in Autumn 2012. I am confident the decisions we have taken will ensure the earliest possible transformation of the site and meet our objectives for the regeneration of the Elephant and Castle.

**25. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS**

Will he provide an update on Southwark's housing investment programme and revised housing strategy?

**RESPONSE**

On 31 May 2011 cabinet agreed a strategy aimed at making all council homes warm, dry and safe by 2015. The key elements are: the replacement of the Southwark decent homes

standard adopted on an interim basis in April 2008 by the government's decent homes standard; approval of a minimum housing investment programme of £326.5m over the next five years, and that resident consultation on the draft 5 year housing investment programme is undertaken during the summer and reported back to cabinet in the autumn.

Consultation on the proposed five year programme will take place via existing mechanisms between July and early September. In addition all residents will be notified of the planned consultation and invited to participate through their local tenants and residents associations (TRAs), through a web based information page, at their area housing office or via a dedicated email address.

**26. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DARREN MERRILL**

What were the criteria on the scheduling of the works programme to bring all homes to a warm, dry and safe standard?

**RESPONSE**

The criteria for prioritisation of improvement works is based on our commitment to make every home warm, dry and safe by meeting the government decent homes standard during the five year programme. The scheduling has been done on the basis of need, unlike the previous administration. As a result properties currently failing decency because of poor external components, such as windows and roofs have been prioritised first. This is because there is considerable evidence to support the fact that failing external components have a detrimental impact on the fabric of buildings, leading to poor insulation, water ingress and is the main source of dissatisfaction and disrepair complaints from residents. New roofs and windows make a positive contribution to delivery of warm, dry and safe homes. Properties requiring internal only works, such as heating, electrics and front doors follow in the later years of the programme.

**27. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARK WILLIAMS**

On 6 October 2010 Southwark News printed a letter from Councillor Al-Samerai, regarding the unfinished security works on the Four Squares Estate stating "The previous executive allocated £8 million for security works and at no point made a decision not to complete the work because of overspend." Since then, Southwark's housing and community safety scrutiny sub-committee has investigated the unfinished works and concluded: "No formal decision was ever made by the previous Executive to allocate money specifically to the Four Squares Security Works" and "No formal decision was ever made by the previous Executive to allocate additional funds to the Four Squares security works following the overspend in phase 1 of the project." Is he surprised that Councillor Al-Samerai has made such potentially misleading comments in the local press in an apparent attempt to divert attention from the last administration's failure to monitor and direct decisions made by senior officers?

**RESPONSE**

I am disappointed, but not surprised. The previous Liberal Democrat administration's housing investment programme was so incompetent and poorly managed that many residents in our borough were left with unfinished works. Councillor Al-Samerai should apologise to the residents of the Four Squares Estate for this failure and for then trying to deny any culpability.

**28. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROWENNA DAVIS**

What impact will the Localism Bill – and especially the proposals regarding flexible tenancies – have on council and housing association tenants in Southwark in the future?

## RESPONSES

Under the Localism Bill the government proposes to give local authority and housing association landlords the flexibility to offer, in addition to secure or assured tenancies, a new 'flexible tenancy', allowing landlords to offer some or all new tenants fixed term tenancies. The proposals apply to new tenants of social housing: existing council and registered provider tenants will generally be unaffected, even if they transfer or mutually exchange properties. However for those existing secure or assured tenants transferring to an 'affordable rent' property, it is proposed that landlords will have the discretion as to whether to offer a lifetime tenancy.

It is proposed that the minimum fixed term for flexible tenancies will be two years. However landlords will be free to offer longer terms, or retain lifetime tenancies should they wish.

The proposals for flexible tenancies allow for succession for spouses or partners, but give landlords the flexibility to grant whatever additional succession rights they choose.

While local authorities will be required to develop strategic tenancy policies for their areas, the recent Homes and Communities funding prospectus makes it clear that it is up to individual landlords to determine the length and type of tenancy they wish to offer. While Southwark as a landlord has chosen to retain secure tenancies, it is likely that different registered providers will introduce flexible tenancies of varying lengths. This could cause some confusion or anxiety for housing applicants. In Southwark property adverts for properties offered under the Homeseach scheme will specify the length of the tenancy term to assist applicants when bidding for new homes.

In developing our strategic tenancy policy in partnership with registered providers, there will be an expectation that very few tenants would be required to move on expiry of their tenancy term as the majority of tenants will continue to need affordable homes.

### Housing Ombudsman

The Bill also proposes to restrict access to referrals to the Housing Ombudsman to 'designated persons' only. For the purposes of the Bill, the following are identified as designated persons:

- a. A member of the House of Commons.
- b. A member of the local housing authority for the district in which the property concerned is situated, or
- c. A designated tenant panel for the social landlord.

## 29. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ALTHEA SMITH

Will he provide an update on the restructuring of the housing department?

### RESPONSE

This is not a 'restructuring' so much as the creation of a brand new housing department. We recognised before May 2010 that the decision to scrap the council's dedicated housing department was a retrograde step. We saw that tenants and residents needed a new department bringing together housing functions from across the council with an absolute focus on improving performance and providing modern excellent customer services. In bringing together all our housing services we are also more equipped to deal with the financial

pressures that the council is experiencing as a result of the changes to the housing revenue account finance regime.

Formal consultation on the new proposals began in earnest in January 2011 and the department is due to 'go live' on 1 September 2011. The new structure provides a flatter simpler structure with two senior posts deleted (Head of Housing Management and Head of AMIP) and the number of area managers reduced from nine to two.

Interviews will take place during the coming months to ensure as many staff as possible are selected for the new roles. Those staff who are unsuccessful at interview will be given the opportunity of securing alternative roles through the council's re-organisation, redeployment and redundancy procedure. We have also received a number of requests for employees to leave on voluntary severance and management are in the process of reviewing requests to see if the numbers tally in terms of required reductions which may remove the need to interview staff and the remainder would be assimilated.

**30. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR SUNIL CHOPRA**

Can the cabinet member for housing management provide an update on why 14,000 rent incorrect statements were issued to Southwark Council tenants?

**RESPONSE**

The incident which led to incorrect rent statements being issued to Southwark tenants during May was attributable to an input error on the IT programme which operates the collation of statements.

Unfortunately a member of the Northgate team running the programme on the council's behalf incorrectly set the programme to produce statements dating to 1995.

The problem was identified before all statements were issued and as a result 3792 statements were issued rather than the 14000 which concerns originally existed over.

All tenants affected by the error were written to within 24 hours of the problem coming to light with an apology letter and letters containing correct balances were distributed during the following week.

The department has now instigated a process of audits for statements prior to their release in order to ensure that a similar accidental error does not result in residents being affected.

**31. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA**

Following Ed Milliband's speech on 11 June 2011, does the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management agree that people who are unemployed should not be given social housing? Will he be including this when he sets his own social tenure policy?

**RESPONSE**

Ed Milliband did not say that people who are unemployed should be barred from social housing. Rather, he said that those people who have made a contribution to their community could be given priority. This is a policy which, in the case of former armed services personnel, the Liberal Democrats agree with us on this locally.



In contrast, the Tory/Liberal Democrat government, by hiking rents and restricting housing benefit, appears set on seriously restricting access to social housing, making it more difficult for people who are trying to get back into work to do so.

**32. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK**

In view of the closure of the Long Lane Housing Office, can I have the cabinet member's reassurance that the proposed mobile housing office will be in place prior to its closure and how will he inform residents and councillors of Chaucer ward?

**RESPONSE**

The changes in office accommodation in the housing service are currently under discussion with residents through a series of presentations and open meetings across the borough. It is intended that residents in Chaucer ward will still have access to a reception desk in the north west of the borough at Walworth one stop shop. No offices will be closed until adequate provision of service is in place including the deployment of a mobile housing office. Officers are currently identifying locations across the borough where the mobile housing office will operate from and will consider Chaucer ward as part of this arrangement.

**33. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES**

Please can the cabinet member provide the number of estates that will receive warm, dry and safe works a) before 2014/15 and b) including and after 2014/15? Please can he provide a breakdown by community council area?

**RESPONSE**

The housing areas are almost the same as the community council areas and the breakdowns are set out in the table below.

<b>Area</b>	<b>2011/12 - 2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15 - 2015/16</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bermondsey	3	52	<b>55</b>
Borough & Bankside	9	26	<b>35</b>
Camberwell	7	33	<b>40</b>
Dulwich	3	20	<b>23</b>
Nunhead & P. Rye	5	60	<b>65</b>
Peckham	2	33	<b>35</b>
Rotherhithe	2	36	<b>38</b>
Walworth	12	36	<b>48</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>339</b>

This is based on the funding that is currently identified. However, we continue to actively explore new additional forms of funding to support our housing investment programme and if new funding becomes available, then we will use it to bring forward work and to carry out schemes more quickly.

**34. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

What is being done to tackle anti-social behaviour, including vandalism and even arson, in the communal areas of the Osprey Estate in Surrey Docks ward?

## **RESPONSE**

Southwark anti social behaviour unit (SASBU) Unit and Southwark Housing are aware of the issues of anti social behaviour being experienced by the community on Osprey Estate. The issue is also a Safer Neighbourhood Team policing ward priority.

The ASB is being perpetrated by a number of young people who are responsible for a range of behaviours from vandalism and graffiti to verbal abuse and noise. There was a number of arson incidents some months ago which appears to have abated. Although investigated by police no arrests were made in connection with this crime.

Staff from SASBU and the interim head of area management recently visited the tenants and residents at Osprey estate to discuss these issues. Following this meeting works have been undertaken to rectify a faulty door entry system which was permitting access to the communal areas of Sheldrake, Fulmar and Tawny Way.

Extensive doorstep engagement has also taken place carried out by local police, housing and SASBU staff. Whilst many residents are complaining it has proven difficult to get hard evidence at this stage that can be put before the courts. Police have been able to forward a number of names to the council anti social behaviour unit of young people who have been visiting the estate and causing problems. These individuals have been written to in the strongest possible terms and advised not to return.

In spite of the above complexities and the difficulties with obtaining strong, credible evidence, enforcement action has commenced against one family and a Notice of Seeking Possession has been served. Legal advice is being sought on the possibility of applying for an Anti Social Behaviour Injunction against the tenant of the property for their failure to exercise due care and control of their household.

This situation will continue to be the focus of concentrated efforts by SASBU, Housing and other partners in the effort find a solution which will bring some long term respite to the tenants and residents of Osprey Estate.

### **35. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS**

Please can the cabinet member provide site specific details for all council homes sold in the last ten years, detailed by bed size and type of property? Please can he provide a breakdown by ward?

## **RESPONSE**

Please find a summary attached. If Councillor Morris would like any further information, I would be happy to provide it.

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total		
BRUNSWICK PARK	FLAT	Bedsit	4		
		1	90		
			2	83	
			3	34	
			4	5	
			HOUSE	2	2
				3	10
				4	4
				5	2
	MAISONETTE	6	2		
		7	2		
		2	44		
		3	48		
CAMBERWELL GREEN	BUNGALOW	4	1		
	FLAT	Bedsit	21		
		1	85		
		2	166		
		3	46		
		4	5		
	HOUSE	2	3		
		3	3		
		4	6		
	MAISONETTE	1	2		
		2	25		
		3	71		
4		3			
5		2			
#N/A	2	1			
CATHEDRALS	FLAT	Bedsit	9		
		1	84		
		2	62		
		3	21		
		4	4		
	HOUSE	2	7		
		3	3		
		4	11		
		5	1		
		7	1		
	MAISONETTE	Bedsit	3		
		1	4		
		2	31		
3		12			
4		2			
CHAUCER	FLAT	Bedsit	10		
		1	143		
		2	270		
		3	97		
		4	25		
	5	2			
	HOUSE	3	3		
		4	9		

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total	
		5	1	
	MAISONETTE	1	3	
		2	45	
		3	30	
		4	6	
COLLEGE	FLAT	Bedsit	4	
		1	29	
		2	66	
		3	34	
		4	3	
	HOUSE	3	13	
	MAISONETTE	3	5	
	#N/A	2	1	
EAST DULWICH	FLAT	Bedsit	5	
		1	32	
		2	15	
		3	3	
		4	1	
		HOUSE	2	9
		3	12	
		4	1	
		MAISONETTE	1	1
	3	1		
EAST WALWORTH	FLAT	Bedsit	10	
		1	97	
		2	134	
		3	54	
		4	5	
		HOUSE	2	1
		3	8	
		4	9	
		5	3	
		MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	15	
		3	24	
		4	6	
		#N/A	Bedsit	1
	1	44		
	2	35		
	3	6		
FARADAY	FLAT	Bedsit	15	
		1	113	
		2	89	
		3	7	
		4	2	
		HOUSE	2	3
		3	4	
		4	1	
		5	2	
		MAISONETTE	Bedsit	1
		2	25	
		3	87	
		4	37	
	5	9		
	#N/A	1	2	

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total
		2	1
		4	1
GRANGE	FLAT	Bedsit	48
		1	87
		2	64
		3	16
		4	2
	HOUSE	1	3
		2	3
		3	2
	MAISONETTE	Bedsit	3
		1	14
		2	85
		3	35
		4	2
		5	1
	#N/A	1	2
		2	4
		3	1
LIVESEY	FLAT	Bedsit	21
		1	83
		2	149
		3	69
		4	18
	HOUSE	1	3
		2	13
		3	38
		4	19
		5	1
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	32
		3	41
		4	14
		5	2
	#N/A	Bedsit	1
		1	2
		2	1
NEWINGTON	BUNGALOW	Bedsit	2
	FLAT	Bedsit	22
		1	151
		2	141
		3	48
		4	2
	HOUSE	2	19
		3	26
		4	34
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	44
		3	75
		4	4
	#N/A	3	1
NUNHEAD	BUNGALOW	1	1
	FLAT	Bedsit	2
		1	125
		2	52

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total
		3	5
		4	4
	HOUSE	Bedsit	1
		1	1
		2	8
		3	63
		4	29
		5	2
		8	1
	MAISONETTE	1	5
		2	9
		3	16
		4	2
	#N/A	1	7
		2	12
		3	1
PECKHAM	FLAT	Bedsit	15
		1	127
		2	53
		3	23
	HA MAISONETTE	2	1
	HOUSE	2	45
		3	55
		4	19
		5	1
		6	1
	MAISONETTE	Bedsit	1
		1	6
		2	81
		3	91
		4	16
		5	4
		6	1
		7	2
	#N/A	3	1
PECKHAM RYE	FLAT	Bedsit	6
		1	37
		2	60
		3	9
		4	4
	HOUSE	2	14
		3	30
		4	5
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	6
		3	3
	#N/A	2	1
		3	1
		4	1
RIVERSIDE	FLAT	Bedsit	43
		1	145
		2	120
		3	15
		4	5

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total
		5	2
	HOUSE	2	4
		3	13
		4	4
	MAISONETTE	1	6
		2	28
		3	30
		4	6
	#N/A	2	1
ROTHERHITHE	FLAT	Bedsit	13
		1	67
		2	101
		3	3
	HOUSE	2	4
		3	15
		4	6
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	62
		3	49
		4	2
	#N/A	3	3
SOUTH BERMONDSEY	FLAT	Bedsit	20
		1	55
		2	53
		3	18
		4	1
	HOUSE	2	3
		3	12
		4	6
		5	1
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	37
		3	38
		4	3
	#N/A	1	1
		2	2
		3	1
SOUTH CAMBERWELL	FLAT	Bedsit	6
		1	79
		2	122
		3	54
		4	13
	HOUSE	2	3
		3	8
		4	7
	MAISONETTE	1	1
		2	13
		3	4
		4	5
		5	1
SURREY DOCKS	FLAT	Bedsit	2
		1	7
		2	8
	HOUSE	2	2
		3	11

Ward	Property Type	Bedrooms	Total
		4	1
	MAISONETTE	2	4
		3	6
		4	1
THE LANE	FLAT	Bedsit	6
		1	51
		2	49
		3	13
		4	3
	HOUSE	2	5
		3	75
		4	17
		5	6
	MAISONETTE	1	3
		2	39
		3	24
		4	2
	#N/A	2	1
3		4	
VILLAGE	BUNGALOW	1	2
	FLAT	Bedsit	2
		1	18
		2	15
		3	6
	HOUSE	4	2
		1	1
		2	4
	MAISONETTE	3	17
		3	2
#N/A	1	1	
	2	1	
#N/A	FLAT	1	3
Total			7023

**36. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON**

Can the cabinet member comment on the practice of accepting in-lieu payments from developers in place of affordable housing being built?

**RESPONSE**

The draft Affordable Housing supplementary planning document (SPD) sets out the council's approach to pooled contributions (payments in lieu of affordable housing). This was approved for consultation on 21 June 2011 by Cabinet. Consultation on the draft SPD will run until 30 September 2011. It is anticipated that the SPD will be taken to Cabinet for adoption in November 2011.

It is the case that some developments can not provide on-site affordable housing, particularly rented affordable housing. For instance in some developments very high service charges or other management issues (such as not being able to accommodate a separate lift core in high rise blocks) make the developments unattractive to registered providers. The government's introduction of the "affordable rent" model and refusal to allow the use of social housing grant for s106 affordable housing units, is likely to exacerbate this problem as we estimate that an "affordable rent" 2 bed flat in SE1 would require a household income of over £70,000 pa and a



4 bed home over £100,000 pa. With average income levels in the borough of around £17,000 pa, it is clear that homes at this level of rent not be affordable.

Likewise in some very high value developments shared ownership units can also fail to provide truly affordable housing options. For instance it was estimated that even based on the minimum 25% share in a flat in Neo Bankside would have required an income of over £90,000 pa. This is not affordable housing and I support the recent decision of the Planning Committee to accept an in-lieu payment of £9m instead.

This £9m and all other money received in lieu of on-site affordable housing will be paid into Southwark's Affordable Housing Fund. By combining this money with our own land we will be able to deliver far more affordable homes than would have been built at Neo Bankside and they will be genuinely affordable homes for Southwark residents. I believe this will be very welcome news to the 19,000 plus families on our housing waiting list.

**37. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Now that Southwark is in charge of its own social tenure policy, can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management please outline his plans for consulting with local residents and tenants and residents associations?

**RESPONSES**

This policy will be fully consulted on.

Southwark has always been in charge of its housing allocations policy, and in addition has nomination agreements with registered providers [housing associations]. Following the Localism Bill, Southwark will have to develop a strategic tenancy policy, which will relate to the types of tenancy to be made available both by Southwark and by registered providers [housing associations] under the new legislation. Registered providers will have little choice with relation to affordable rents, due to the terms of the affordable housing programme, which determines how new homes are funded.

Because of the wide variety of legislative changes and new policies it has also become necessary to 'refresh' the Housing Strategy Key Targets, and this will require a programme of consultation. To avoid 'consultation fatigue' Southwark is considering consulting on both the housing strategy and the strategic tenancy policy at the same time. Plans for this are at an early stage, but it is thought that extensive consultation will be required with the following key stakeholders in drafting a strategic tenancy policy:

- Southwark Housing Strategic Partnership
- Tenant Council
- TMO Liaison Committee
- SOUHAG (Main and Management)

It should be remembered that a strategic tenancy policy is not the same as Southwark's housing allocation policy but that there will be cross-cutting implications.

**38. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET**

Can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management tell me whether district heating boilers and connecting ducts will be included in the five year housing investment programme?

**RESPONSE**

Yes. There is provision in the five year draft programme for extensive work to landlord obligations such as district heating schemes. There are specifically allocated schemes including New Place, Gilesmead, Kinglake, Newington, Portland Street and Salisbury in the 2011/12 programme and a total provision of over £16m over the next five years. A full breakdown of schemes is in the investment programme and can be made available to any member who requests this information.

**39. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON**

Please can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management please give an update on the progress of giving housing priority for ex-service men and women in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

I am very happy to report that significant progress has been made.

We have now amended our current lettings policy to reflect Manchester City Council's policy to give the highest priority that Southwark's lettings policy will allow for ex-service personnel who have sustained a serious injury, medical condition or disability during service.

Consultation is also currently in hand to introduce a choice based lettings scheme for accessible and adapted homes. The consultation period ends on 22 July 2011 and the consultation includes the proposal to give ex-service personnel additional priority in the lettings policy for adapted homes.

The government has also announced that it will be consulting during the autumn on proposals to change the statutory housing guidance on social lettings to give ex armed forces personnel maximum priority (or additional preference) in local authority lettings schemes. I have asked officers to meet with government officials ahead of the publication of the draft consultation paper to help to inform the guidance.

We are also currently considering a policy change to give ex armed forces personnel priority status which will place the applicant at the top of the band they have been assessed in for a set period of time to enable them to make a successful bid.

I am pleased to report that Southwark is helping to lead the way in this area to support our ex service personnel.

**40. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN**

Will tenant management organisations be warm, dry and safe by 2014?

**RESPONSE**

There are currently 14 tenant management organisations (TMOs) across the borough. Two are already warm, dry and safe: Benchley Gardens and Two Towers (Caspin and Lupin). Leathermarket JMB has responsibility for the procurement, delivery and prioritisation of their major works. The remaining 11 TMOs will be made warm, dry and safe during this period the housing investment programme covers 2011/12 - 2015/16.

**41. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL KYRIACOU**

Please can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management confirm what date the works on the Manor Estate will commence?

**RESPONSE**

Design and survey works have started and warm, dry safe works will commence in January 2012.

**42. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO**

Now that Southwark is free to determine its own social tenure policy, please will the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management confirm whether he will choose to give all new tenants life time tenancies?

**RESPONSE**

We opposed the creation of flexible tenancies when the government consulted us on it last autumn, and continue to do so. I have already endorsed the retention of lifetime tenancies for Southwark Council homes, as these are the best guarantee of the council's objective to provide mixed and sustainable communities.

However, as the council will have little no control over whether other social landlords in Southwark choose to move to flexible tenancies, there is a not inconsiderable risk that some new social tenants in our borough will be punished by this government policy. Furthermore, the member will do well to remember that it is his government that is introducing flexible tenancies and it is his local party that put a Tory in charge of housing in this borough 2006-2010. I hate to imagine what might have happened to lifelong tenancies in this borough were the former executive member for housing still in power.

**43. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CLAIRE HICKSON**

How can people in my ward and the rest of the borough find out when they can expect decent homes work to be carried out on their estate or street?

**RESPONSE**

We are committed to making our programme of housing the most transparent ever. As a result we are currently consulting with all area forums, tenants council and home owners council. In addition all the tenants and residents associations in the borough will be written to with the draft programme and copies will be made available in area housing offices. The details of the programme are also being put on the council's website and all residents will be invited to make comments. All the feedback received will be taken into consideration before the final report is presented to cabinet for decision in October 2011.

**44. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON**

What does the cabinet member for housing management make of reports in Southwark News that, under the government's new affordable rent model, council tenants on the Aylesbury would need a household income of £50,400 for a two bedroom council house?

**RESPONSE**

The government's affordable rent model presents significant challenges for the council's ability to meet housing need, not just on the basis of affordability, but at many practical levels as outlined in the question on the impact of the Localism Bill.

In terms of affordability, officers have worked with colleagues in the South East London Housing Partnership to build a picture of housing rental patterns across the sub-region and the effect of rents being set at up to 80% of market rent level or the local housing allowance level.

Our analysis of income levels in Southwark clearly tell us that most residents in housing need cannot afford rents at the levels projected, unless they are in receipt of housing benefit, and that the government's proposed welfare reforms apply opposing pressures. The affordable rent model is being introduced by default, by making the use of the approach, for both new properties and a proportion of their relets, a condition of receiving grant from the Homes and Communities Agency. This is affecting our housing association partners, but the council has chosen not to submit a bid for development funding, although eligible to do so, because of the rent levels and the fixed terms tenancies that go with it.

Although I believe the Aylesbury example was used as a geographic reference rather than relating to the regeneration scheme, it is clear that although the future for housing association properties outlined above is bleak, the difficulties for providing truly affordable replacement housing in regeneration schemes are compounded.

**45. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES**

Can he outline the council's efforts to prevent housing benefit fraud and to improve accountability and fairness in the system?

**RESPONSE**

The Housing Benefits Service considers the risk of fraud in their work to try to prevent fraudulent claims, through its control framework, validation and monitoring processes to help ensure transparency and fairness in the application system. Housing benefit processes are also reviewed as part of the annual cycle of managed audits.

As well as undertaking regular validation checks, the council also undertake proactive fraud work, participating in the National Fraud Initiative and responding to matches identified. With the fraud service having returned in-house, the council's fraud teams are working more closely than ever to help detect and prevent fraud in all areas including benefits. We also undertake activity, for example communications campaigns, to act as a deterrent. We are also exploring pilot exercises with the National Fraud Authority to further help prevent and detect all fraud. As you will know, the council takes all fraud seriously and operates a zero tolerance approach.

In the respect of housing benefits cases, the council operates a prosecution policy and sanctions panel, with a view to helping provide a fair and consistent approach to the sanctions to be applied.

**46. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

Can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management account for the sudden increase in parking enforcement activity on the Brandon Estate as of March this year?

**RESPONSE**

The parking enforcement policy was reviewed between September and December 2010. Enforcement activity was previously based on a timetable of visits to estates on a rotation

basis to provide a high profile presence to deter illegal parking. This policy was expensive and increasingly ineffective in ensuring compliance with the parking rules agreed with the residents. Following the review, enforcement activity has changed to focus on areas of highest breach leading to an increase in the number of vehicles clamped or removed. The basis in which cars are clamped or removed is unchanged, but residents entitled to park on the estate are now benefitting from a reduction in illegal parking.

At the Brandon Estate this new focus has meant that illegally parked vehicles have been subject to the same enforcement rules but with a more focused approach the level of enforcement has increased from approximately 10 actions per month to around 20 actions per month in April and May 2011.

**47. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON**

Can the cabinet publish the total amount of public money spent on new signage on council estates in College ward since May last year?

**RESPONSE**

The total spent on new signage on council estates in College Ward totals £4,098.69 from May last year to date.

**48. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU**

Can the cabinet member of equalities and community engagement provide an update on Southwark's transition fund, what was the publicised aim of the fund and how many voluntary organisations applied for the 1st round?

**RESPONSE**

The transition fund was aimed at providing interim support to help VCS organisations make the changes necessary to meet the challenges faced by reduced public sector funding. It is not a replacement for such funding and instead, the fund should assist organisations in the voluntary sector to become more sustainable as well as introducing a greater degree of innovation to ensure the sector thinks about better ways of operating and providing its services.

As a result of openly advertising the transition fund in February 2011, including on the council's website and through Community Action Southwark's (CAS) e-bulletin, a total of 91 applications for the £1m fund were submitted totalling £2,061,908.

All council funded voluntary sector organisations were provided with guidance on the application process and criteria against which their applications would be assessed. The applications received fell within the thematic funding programmes administered by several council departments and were initially considered by an officer panel, providing recommendations for the final decision. At the end of the first round 19 organisations were successful in receiving transition funding totalling £376,004

I have now made a decision on round 2 applications, where 49 applications were received. Eleven organisations were successful, being awarded a total of £174, 902.

**49. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD**

How many voluntary organisations were successful in applying for the transition fund, how many organisations appealed following an unsuccessful application and how many appeals were successful?

#### **RESPONSE**

The cabinet approved £1.5m transition funding for the voluntary sector over the next two years. In the first round of funding a total of 19 organisations were successful in receiving transition funding totalling £376,004.

Further to the round 2 applications, 11 organisations were successful, being awarded a total of £174, 902.

For Round 1, representations were received from 2 organisations, Southwark Mediation and Peckham Voluntary Sector Forum. Southwark Mediation was successful in its representation and were awarded funding of £17,140.

For Round 2, representations were received from East Dulwich SNUB, the Latin American Development Association and the Blue Elephant Theatre. Blue Elephant Theatre were successful in its representation and were awarded funding of £19,800.

#### **50. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR VICTORIA MILLS**

Can the cabinet member give clear assurance that no decisions have been taken regarding the savings required in the community council budgets and that the Democracy Commission will investigate all possible options for making the £344,000 savings and ensure that the views of members, community councils and local residents are heard?

#### **RESPONSE**

In my scrutiny interview response in March this year, I confirmed that community councils are a valued part of our democratic institutions and the way in which they would evolve will be the subject of the second phase of the Democracy Commission – it remains a priority that community councils operate in the best way possible for local people.

The Democracy Commission is currently reviewing the role and functions of community councils in the budgetary context. No final decisions have been made and the commission aims to make recommendations in January 2012. Focus groups will take place with local residents in July, 'community conversations' are planned for August and questionnaires have been distributed at community council meetings. Phase 2 of the commission's work has been discussed at community council chairs' and vice chairs' meetings and they will continue to be kept informed. I plan to discuss how we best engage the community councils in Phase 2 with chairs and vice chairs at their next meeting in July.

#### **51. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

What role has and will be taken by the council's 'critical friend' in responding to cuts to voluntary sector funding?

#### **RESPONSE**

The "Forum for Equalities and Human Rights Southwark" (FEHRS) is the council's "critical friend" for equality and human rights. It has a role in supporting and facilitating community consultation on equality impact assessments and in providing a response to these.

To date FEHRS has facilitated community engagement in a number of areas affected by budget reductions. These include the consultation on changes to the Taxi Card scheme and an Equality Impact Assessment for Childrens' Services. It has also organised events for Carers Rights Week and Refugee Week.

The service will assist the council in meeting its duties under the Equality Act 2010 and assessing the impact of budget reductions on communities and in particular residents within the protected characteristics of the Act.

New guidance has been issued to departments on the role of FEHRS and the council's duties under the new Equality Act.

**52. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR THE RIGHT REVD EMMANUEL OYEWOLE**

How can we ensure that Black History Month is appropriately celebrated in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

Black History Month is a very important annual event in Southwark which is the opportunity we have each year to celebrate the true diversity of people in this borough, especially their culture and history. This year, as every year, a full programme of events is already in the planning stage and the council will continue to fund the many organisations that have applied for funding to put on events, workshops and performances.

Southwark Council has supported Black History Month activities in the borough for more than 20 years, and provides the highest level of funding for Black History Month of all the London boroughs, demonstrating the significance of the month and our continued support to develop and support its celebration.

It takes the theme of 'Journey: past, present and future'. The events reflect and represent Black History within Southwark, as well as celebrating the achievements of African and Caribbean communities locally and across the UK.

A steering group made up of community representatives and service providers guides the programme, and consultation meetings have been held with community organisations regarding the delivery of BHM 2011.

In 2010, BHM delivered 120 events which included Black Heritage workshops, walks, films, performances, literary events, exhibitions and debates for people of all ages. In the past, however, activities have been scattered across the whole Borough which has sometimes meant that events have not managed to attract the audiences they truly deserve. For 2011, it has been decided, in consultation with the communities, to have four main series of events in centres where the maximum number of people can attend. These "hub" venues will be well publicised and will concentrate on putting on events in the four weekends covering the month. There will also be maximum activities over half term to attract children and young people.

Black History Month is not only about the events taking place during the month. It is about making a positive difference and fostering integration every day. It is vital we learn from the contributions that all our communities make and develop a respect and understanding of what makes our borough such a dynamic and exciting place to live.

**53. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON**

Can the cabinet member state how much the Holmhurst Day Centre is valued by our property department and how much a sale of the property could be expected to release? Please can she provide a breakdown of operating and maintenance costs for the grounds and property?

### **RESPONSE**

The existing use value of the property is estimated to be £300,000. Based on preliminary estimates the market value which could be realised upon sale is expected to be in the region of £1million+, assuming full vacant possession and alternative use.

The running costs for the premises have been stated to be as follows:

Maintenance (building repairs & maintenance)	£5,855
Planned maintenance	£8,000
Utilities (Gas, Electricity, Water)	£8,495
Cleaning	£4,324
Other miscellaneous cost (service & accommodation charges)	£330
<b>Total</b>	<b>£27,004</b>

### **54. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

Could the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling please provide the amount spent by the council on highways and pavements major works since May 2006 for each ward, broken down by funding source?

### **RESPONSE**

See following page.



<b>Expenditure by Community Council Area</b>								
		<b>LDA</b>	<b>TfL</b>	<b>Southwark Council</b>	<b>S106</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CCA Total</b>
Bermondsey	Grange		£1,039,571		£91,500		£1,131,071	£10,294,246
	Riverside	£2,580,000	£213,640	£605,870	£4,305,000	£80,000	£7,784,310	
	South Bermondsey		£998,084	£380,781			£1,378,865	
Camberwell	Brunswick Park		£56,733	£206,895			£263,628	
	Camberwell Green		£816,834	£129,522			£946,356	
	South Camberwell		£184,601	£658,653			£843,254	
Borough & Bankside	Cathedrals	£474,000	£1,500,809	£484,378	£1,246,264	£5,481,000	£9,186,251	
	Chaucer		£418,368	£356,167	£249,905		£1,024,440	
	College		£1,843,890	£1,161,832			£3,005,722	
Dulwich	East Dulwich		£332,960	£976,289			£1,309,249	
	Village		£1,538,710	£1,897,982			£3,436,692	
Nunhead & Peckham Rye	Nunhead		£78,549	£783,317			£861,866	
	Peckham Rye		£209,134	£1,658,972			£1,868,106	
	The Lane		£1,272,995	£890,184			£2,163,179	
Peckham	Peckham		£276,084	£570,075			£846,159	
	Peckham Livesey		£257,680	£375,530			£633,210	
Rotherhithe	Rotherhithe		£597,218	£1,250,000	£1,750,000		£3,597,218	
	Rotherhithe Livesey		£520,317	£777,278			£1,297,595	
	Surrey Docks		£522,429	£160,862			£683,291	
Walworth	East Walworth		£2,537,378	£18,250			£2,555,628	
	Faraday		£73,087	£22,000			£95,087	
	Newington		£127,410	£21,000			£148,410	
	Multiwards*		£6,959,011				£6,959,011	
	Boroughwide		£1,298,352				£1,298,352	
	No ward specified**		£4,283,464				£4,283,464	
<b>Total</b>		<b>£3,054,000</b>	<b>£27,957,108</b>	<b>£13,385,637</b>	<b>£7,642,669</b>	<b>£5,561,000</b>	<b>£57,600,414</b>	<b>£10,294,246</b>

**55. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK**

What is the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling doing to stop the rat running that occurs through the estates from Jamaica Road through the estates of Riverside and Rotherhithe?

**RESPONSE**

Transport for London (TfL) are currently investigating traffic conditions on Jamaica Road. As part of this study they will be considering whether there are opportunities to deter rat running. Council officers are meeting with the responsible TfL officers on 7 July and will be able to update members following that meeting.

**56. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON**

What is the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling's intentions for the future of the street leader scheme?

**RESPONSE**

The scheme is being coordinated by the Community Warden Service who are very keen to support the programme and ensure that street leaders continue to be fully supported in their role. This will be facilitated through the warden supervisors and their teams at the local level. The Service will be holding an information event on 29th July with street leaders as an induction and to involve them in further discussions about the future development of the programme.

**57. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MITCHELL**

Would the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling please set out:

(a) the current policy on assessing the merits of, and deciding upon, the provision of short-term free parking bays to assist shoppers and traders in shopping parades in areas within controlled parking zones, with particular reference to flexibility with regard to the time permitted for free parking; and

(b) any proposals he may have for improving and/or localising decision-making in this regard?

**RESPONSE**

Priority for available parking space is based on a clear hierarchy of road users including pedestrians, cyclists and people with a disability.

The parking hierarchy, below, contained within the Parking and Enforcement Plan is applied when allocating space.

<b>Parking hierarchy</b>	
<b>Road users</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local disabled resident parking need (parking at origin);</li> <li>• Non local disabled parking need (parking at destinations);</li> <li>• Car share and car club bays;</li> <li>• Local resident parking;</li> <li>• Building contractors, appliance repair and other tradesman services;</li> <li>• Essential worker in the delivery of public service and carers;</li> <li>• Local business essential parking/servicing need;</li> <li>• Short stay shopper/visitor parking need;</li> <li>• Long stay shopper/visitor parking need;</li> <li>• Long stay commuter parking need.</li> </ul>
<b>Vehicle type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency vehicle;</li> <li>• Cycle;</li> <li>• Bus;</li> <li>• Public service vehicle including managed levels of short term coach parking;</li> <li>• Taxi;</li> <li>• Shared/pool car;</li> <li>• Cleaner/greener private car;</li> <li>• Private cars and powered two wheelers.</li> </ul>

The hierarchy is applied with regard to the local circumstances. For example, in areas where there is very limited space for residents parking the needs of essential public workers and care workers may need to be given higher priority. In commercial areas, higher priority is generally given to short stay parking in areas adjacent or very near to business premises.

Generally, paid-for parking is introduced within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) for two reasons. 1) As a means of providing an effective mechanism for enforcement (the presence of a pay and display ticket improves compliance and reduces the enforcement costs that are problematic in free limited-waiting bays). 2) As a means of income to offset the costs of implementation, maintenance and enforcement that would otherwise be placed upon resident permit holders.

**(b) any proposals he may have for improving and/or localising decision-making in this regard?**

The detail of proposed new CPZs (including the position and type of parking bays) are always consulted upon with the community council before an individual cabinet member decision and prior to implementation. Where minor adjustments to parking layouts are identified (and in line with policy) decision making is delegated to the community council.

**58. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Would the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling please explain the circumstances, if any, in which the council will designate a "disabled" bay for a specific vehicle, with particular reference to bays in controlled parking zones?

**RESPONSE**

The council does not provide any "disabled" parking bays that are specifically allocated to a vehicle.

We have 1000 on-street bays that are designated solely for use at all times by disabled drivers. The majority of these have been installed following successful application for a bay by a local resident. These are known as ‘origin’ bays.

Additionally, there are about 50 ‘destination’ on-street bays located in key positions across the borough that improve accessibility to services, town centres etc. These usually have a maximum stay limit of 4 hours to encourage turn-over of the space. These bays are in addition to the general entitlement for blue badge holders to park free and without limit in pay and display or shared-use parking bays and on yellow lines for up to three hours (where no obstruction is occurring)

Both origin and destination bays are part of the European “Blue Badge” scheme. That is to say that the bays can be used by any holder of a blue badge and at present cannot be allocated to a specific user or vehicle.

To do this, the council would have to change the parking signs to make the bay specific to an associated permit. The applicant would also need to receive and display the relevant permit.

With 1000 ‘origin’ bays across the borough (approximately 50% within CPZs) there would be substantial consultative and implementation costs in changing all bays from general blue badge bays to vehicle specific bays. Whilst there are advantages to such a change, there are also disadvantages (for example visitors collecting and driving a disabled resident would neither be able to use the blue badge in that bay nor would they, necessarily, have a permit for that particular vehicle-specific bay).

The approximate costs of implementing a change from a general “blue badge” bay to a vehicle specific blue badge bay are outlined below, at a minimum:

<b>Element</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Item cost</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Consultation of all LBS blue badge holders	8000	£ 1.50	£ 12,000
Stakeholder consultation event	1	£ 1,000.00	£ 1,000
Analysis, reports and decision making	1	£ 1,000.00	£ 1,000
Change of signage of existing bays	1000	£ 85.00	£ 85,000
Traffic management orders	1	£ 3,500.00	£ 3,500
Notification to BB holders of permit transfer	1000	£ 0.50	£ 500
Administration for change in permits	1000	£ 10.00	£ 10,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>£ 113,000</b>

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**  
**(ORDINARY)**  
**WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2011**  
**QUESTIONS ON REPORT**

**ITEM 5.2: CAPITAL STRATEGY AND PROGRAMME 2011/12 – 2020/21**

**1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

The capital programme says "Reduction in funding for the MUSCo not proceeding". Is this evidence that the cabinet have abandoned the idea of a MUSCo and what will the cabinet do to ensure the people of Newington ward will still get clean, green and affordable energy?

**RESPONSE**

The company responsible for the MUSCo, Dalkia, was unable to develop a financially sustainable model to deliver this project.

The cabinet remains fully committed to developing clean, green and affordable energy solutions for the Elephant and Castle and we are working with Lend Lease to progress this work. As Lend Lease is taking responsibility for delivering these solutions, we no longer need to identify funding from our capital programme to take this forward.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

I thank the cabinet member for his response and I noticed the abrogation of responsibility for delivering clean energy has now been passed to the developer Lend Lease and I want to ask the cabinet member how he intends to ensure that Lend Lease, whose primary interests after all is to their shareholders, will deliver to the same high standards as the council would have done green energy solutions for residents of the area?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Bowman for her supplementary question. I think our arrangements with Lend Lease are about us working in partnership with them to try and develop appropriate solutions to ensuring that we have clean and environmentally friendly power solutions that unfortunately we are not able to progress through the MUSCo and the proposal that came from Dalkia. Clearly it is really unfortunate that Dalkia's scheme did not stack up financially and was a complete mess.

I think actually going back to the drawing board does give us some opportunities working through with Lend Lease to come up with some better solutions than perhaps MUSCo was suggesting in some areas. I know for example the power station in Mandela Way was not a particularly popular idea in parts of Bermondsey and clearly also we have been talking earlier about Kings Stairs Gardens and the sewage treatment work that we all opposed on both sides of the chamber. The idea that is coming from MUSCo for a sewer treatment plant in Victory Park was something we on this side were also very unhappy about; it is a bit of a shame that the party opposite don't share that view about having a sewage treatment plant in Victory Park.

**2. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

The cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety has decided to earmark in the capital programme any new homes bonus funding from the coalition government which is surplus to £1.5 million that was allocated to the revenue budget. However, on 07 June 2011, the cabinet member informed myself and six other members in an e-mail exchange that this additional £1 million new homes bonus funding had already been allocated to the Youth Fund in the revenue budget and therefore could not be used to save the Pumphouse. Please can he explain this misleading discrepancy?

**RESPONSE**

There was no intention to create any misleading discrepancy and I am now pleased to be able to report that the capital refresh report considered by council assembly this evening fully allocates all remaining estimated new homes bonus resources to capital projects that add value and worth to important schemes for the future across the borough. To be helpful, it is useful to recall some recent history of this new funding source to the council.

As part of council assembly's agreement of the budget in February 2011, some £1.5m was allocated within the 2011/12 budget base. At the time of budget setting the cabinet formally noted the level uncertainty on the new homes bonus grant, including how and when it will be distributed, the conditions of the scheme (especially beyond 2012/13) and the basis for the calculation. This resource was used to support overall service demands on the general fund. This level of funding is assumed in the budget to be available for at least each of the three years between 2011/12 and 2013/14. In addition, council assembly agreed to the provision of an annual £1m contribution to support young people through a youth fund, created for specific purposes as set out in a subsequent cabinet report.

At the time of writing on 7 June no final decisions had been taken by cabinet on the use of additional new homes bonus resources, although government had by then confirmed the 2011/12 allocation of new homes bonus at approximately £2.5m. This created an additional resource of £1m that had been scheduled to be returned to an earmarked reserve in line with the budget report to cabinet on 15th February for future allocation by cabinet.

It is true to say that the cabinet may have chosen to allocate the additional £1m to finance the youth fund which was my preference at the time. This would have enabled a lower of contribution from balances to have been required

which would have provided greater comfort given that the budget agreed in February was already using balances of £3.4m in 2011/12 alone and the extent of the demands on services to generate savings of £33.8m in 2011/12 alone. At that time, any suggestion that these resources may have been made available to reverse council assembly decisions would not have been appropriate in any circumstances.

Hopefully the full allocation of NHB resources now removes any uncertainty or confusion that I may have unintentionally created.

We are delighted to be both continuing to progress the youth fund, a critically important measure that we have introduced to mitigate the harm from the coalition government's policies impacting on our borough's young people, and delivering the ten-year capital programme that we are considering this evening to deliver the facilities that our residents deserve and to create opportunities for communities across the borough.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

I want to thank you for your answer. I read it through twice because I think I am still struggling to fully understand the situation and I am quite happy for you to correct me if I am wrong, but just in the interests of clarity; if I understand correctly the additional resource was originally funding the youth fund, now it is in the capital programme and the youth fund is instead being funded by taking a million pounds out of reserves. I think you said in paragraph four of your answer that it is not appropriate to reverse council assembly decisions but doesn't changing the amount going into reserves do this; and secondly if it is possible at this stage to reassign money from the reserves why can you not reinstate the full amount of funding to the environment and ecology grants programme and particularly the Pump House Museum?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Rajan for her supplementary question. I think what we need to remember is when we as a council passed the budget we did not know how much new homes bonus we were going to have, and that budget that was put forward identified (on officers' advice very prudently) in the original version that we thought about one and a half million was going to come through from new homes bonus. But we learnt subsequently and through talking with the minister (and Councillor McNally who was there with us) that the minister was very keen to point out that we would be getting a higher amount than that and so we went back and did some work on what is the most appropriate way of spending that money.

Now we, on officers' advice, did not put the additional new homes bonus which we could not at that stage rely on (and it is very lucky that we did not rely on that, because it came down from the figure the minister told us we were going to get sadly) but we knew that money was going to come in and the idea was that we were going to put that additional money into reserves to replace the reserves that we had effectively pulled out and put into the youth fund. So what we agreed at council assembly was to take money out of the youth fund on the understanding that additional new homes bonus was coming forward and that was the decision we made at council assembly. So we are not reversing the

decision because the way that decision was taken is entirely consistent with the budget we took and the decision we're taking tonight on the capital programme.

**3. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY**

How much of the allocated £10.69 million for the office accommodation strategy in the capital programme is allocated for the new offices in Queen's Road Peckham? Please can the cabinet member provide the cost per square metre of fitting out the new offices in Queen's Road Peckham and how this compares to the square metre fit out costs of the Tooley Street offices?

**RESPONSE**

The total Queen's Road capital allocation is £4.92m. These costs will be effectively funded from the disposal of buildings liberated as staff move into Queen's Road. These disposals include of Southwark and Bermondsey Town Hall along with a number of other sites. Prudent estimates suggest that the total value of the disposals will exceed the fit out costs and any surplus disposals will be returned as resources to the capital programme. In addition disposals of property in the HRA portfolio will provide receipts that will become available for housing purposes.

It is difficult to make a direct comparison between the fit out costs of the two buildings given that the council has taken leases on Queen's Road and Tooley Street at very different stages in construction and internal fit-out. Tooley Street was at a more progressed stage of construction when the council took over the project from the developer, with mechanical and engineering equipment (M&E) such as heating, air conditioning and lifts already installed. At Queen's Road much M&E is yet to be installed and these costs are included in the capital allocation. This difference is reflected in the different lease arrangements for each building. The chart below sets out the project costs and compares them with Tooley Street by making a distinction between "Cat A" works completed at both Tooley Street and Queen's Road by the council, and "Cat B" fit-out works that are required at Queen's Road, but were completed at Tooley Street prior to the council taking the lease.

Location	Type of work	Cost basis		£/m <sup>2</sup>
Tooley Street	Cat A fit-out	Actual		540
Queen's Road:	Cat A fit-out	Estimated		725
	Cat B fit-out (i.e. M&E, structural alts, etc)	Estimated		726
Queen's Road total :				1,451



The factors influencing higher comparable' Cat A cost/m<sup>2</sup> costs at Queen's Road include:

1. Inflation
2. Smaller floor area meaning less economy of scale
3. A less efficient shape of floor plate at Queen's Road

It should also be noted that the cost of the lease per m<sup>2</sup> at Queen's Road is significantly less than at Tooley Street (£120 per m<sup>2</sup> compared to £318 per m<sup>2</sup>).

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY**

I would like to thank the cabinet member for his answer and I note that it is good to read the reasons as to why the cost of Queen's Road is over 35% higher than the costs we achieved of Tooley Street.

He cites the economies of scale at Tooley Street; he cites the efficient shape of Tooley Street and all the positive aspects but I cannot really understand why he's citing inflation which has been pretty much zero or very small. I don't really think inflation can explain away a 35% increase so could he come up with some other reasons why he is spending quite so much gold-plating these offices?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor McNally for his supplemental question. There is no question as to gold-plating these offices. They will be done as efficiently and as cost effectively as we can.

One of the major challenges we have with the Queen's Road building, which thankfully we are getting at a far lower rent per square metre than Tooley Street, and certainly at the first year will be spending net far less per square metre if you include both the rent and fit out costs in year one at Queen's Road than we were doing at Tooley Street, and obviously in future years we will only have the rent aspect to address; but one of the key challenges at Queen's Road is the building has not been developed to the same specification that Tooley Street had when we moved in, and clearly we are paying a price for that high specification at Tooley Street. What we are able to do at Queen's Road is to secure a building at almost the third of the cost per square metre, but we will have to spend a little bit more money to bring it up to scratch. That actually is cost effective and I am quite happy to work through the figures with Councillor McNally to demonstrate that.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (MINUTES)  
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011/12**

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

<b>ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED</b>	Copies	To	Copies
<b>Councillors (All)</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>Others</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Group Offices</b>	<b>2</b>	Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission	1
John Bidy, Cabinet Office	1	Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
Steven Gauge, Opposition Group Office	1		
<b>Libraries</b>	<b>1</b>		
Local History Library	1		
<b>Officers</b>	<b>5</b>		
Annie Shepperd	1		
Deborah Collins	1		
Duncan Whitfield	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
Sonia Sutton	1		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
<b>Constitutional Team</b>	<b>15</b>		
(Copies to Lesley John , 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street)			
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>91</b>