

# Council Assembly

Wednesday 25 January 2012

7.00 pm

Walworth Academy, 34 - 40 Shorncliffe Road, London SE1 5UJ

## Supplemental Agenda No. 1

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
<b>1.5. Minutes</b>		1 - 58
	To approve as a correct record the open minutes of the council assembly meeting held on 29 November 2011.	
<b>2.3. Deputation Requests</b>		59 - 62
	Deputation requests have been received from the following groups:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Save Your Riverside – on the proposed use of Chambers Wharf</li><li>• John Donne Primary School – on energy efficiency and sustainability in public buildings</li><li>• Transition Town Peckham</li><li>• StreetLeaders</li><li>• City of London School – on recycling and energy saving in schools</li><li>• Southwark Association of Street Traders.</li></ul>	

The deputation requests are listed in full in the report. The meeting rules state that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting. However the meeting can decide to suspend this rule in order to hear more or vary the order.

### Contact

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

Date: 20 January 2012



## Council Assembly (Ordinary)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary) held on Tuesday 29 November 2011 at 7.00 pm at The Charter School, Red Post Hill, London SE24 9JH

---

### 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 James Barber	Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Catherine McDonald
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 Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Neil Coyle	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Helen Morrissey
Councillor Rowenna Davis	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Patrick Diamond	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Nick Dolezal	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Gavin Edwards	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Dan Garfield	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Mark Gettleson	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Stephen Govier	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

- Thanked all the teams who competed in her quiz night on 18 November, when a grand total of £1,127 was raised for her two charities.
- Announced that on the 2 and 3 December Councillor Poddy Clark would be taking part in a Charity Sleep Out from 9.00pm to 7.00am in the grounds of Southwark Cathedral in aid of The Robes Charity. This charity aims to provide overnight accommodation to homeless people through the winter. A sponsorship form was available at the meeting for anyone who wished to sponsor Councillor Clark.

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

There were no late items of business.

With the meeting's consent the Mayor announced that she intended to vary the order in which the deputations were considered as there were children present who were involved in two of the deputations. Therefore the deputations from the 23<sup>rd</sup> Camberwell Scouts Group and the Lollipop Campaign/Safe Routes to School would be considered first followed by the deputations from the Leathermarket Joint Management Board and the Southwark Trades Union Council.

### 1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

#### Item 3.3 – Members motion on the theme - Housing

Councillors Althea Smith, Graham Neale, Lorraine Lauder, Martin Seaton, Michael Bukola declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in this item as council tenants.

Councillors Catherine Bowman, Eliza Mann, Linda Manchester and Wilma Nelson declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in this item as council leaseholders.

Councillor Stephen Govier declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in this item as his partner is chair of the tenants council.

### 1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Chris Brown. Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Columba Blango and Denise Capstick.

### 1.5 MINUTES

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2011 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

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

### **2.1 PETITIONS**

There were none.

### **2.2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

*(See page 1 of supplemental agenda 1 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. One of the public questioners asked a supplementary question. The questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

### **2.3 DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

*(See pages 2-4 of the main agenda)*

The deputations are listed in the order taken at the meeting.

#### **Deputation from the 23<sup>rd</sup> Camberwell Scouts (St Giles) Scout Group**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the 23rd Camberwell Scouts (St Giles) Scout Group.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Daniel Hosier, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Peter John, leader of the council, who provided an oral response.

Councillors Peter John, Mark Williams and Anood Al-Samerai asked questions of the deputation.

#### **Deputation from Lollipop Campaign/Safe Routes to School**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the Lollipop campaign/safe routes to school.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Celia Robertson, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Peter John, leader of the council, who provided an oral response

Councillors Robin Crookshank Hilton, Lewis Robinson and Andy Simmons asked questions of the deputation.

At the close of questions to the deputation Councillor Michael Mitchell, seconded by Councillor James Barber, moved that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.6 the order of business be varied so that item 4.2. (Motion 1: Retention of school crossing patrols in Dulwich) could be considered at this juncture.

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

The meeting then debated the motion on the retention of school crossing patrols in Dulwich (see item 4.2: Motion 1).

#### **Deputation from Leathermarket Joint Management Board**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation request from the Leathermarket joint management board.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, John Paul Maytum, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Ian Wingfield, deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing management, who provided an oral response

Councillors Claire Hickson, Tim McNally and Fiona Colley asked questions of the deputation.

#### **Deputation from Southwark Trades Union Council.**

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Sue Plain, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, who provided an oral response

Councillors Helen Morrissey, David Noakes and Patrick Diamond asked questions of the deputation.

### **3. THEMED DEBATE - HOUSING**

#### **3.1 CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT**

Councillor Ian Wingfield introduced the theme of the meeting.

At the invitation of the Mayor, the lead opposition spokesperson on housing, Councillor Tim McNally, replied to the cabinet members' statement.

#### **3.2 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE THEME**

*(See supplemental agenda 2, page 2 and green papers circulated at the meeting)*

There was one question from the public, the answer to which was circulated on green paper at the meeting. The public questioner was not at the meeting. The question and written response are attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.

#### **3.3 MEMBERS' MOTIONS ON THE THEME**

##### **MOTION 1 - HOUSING**

*(See pages 9-11 of the main agenda)*

Councillor Paul Noblet, seconded by Councillor Michael Bukola, moved Motion 1.

Councillor Gavin Edwards, seconded by Councillor Cleo Soanes, moved Amendment A.

Following debate (Councillors Peter John, Anood Al-Samerai, Toby Eckersley, Ian, Wingfield, Nick Stanton, Helen Morrissey, Poddy Clark, Stephen Govier, Patrick Diamond and Adele Morris), Amendment A 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 assembly believes Southwark faces immense challenges in relation to its housing stock over the next 30 years that can only be resolved by taking a long-term, strategic approach.
2. That council assembly notes that Southwark Council still owns 31% of Southwark's housing stock (down from 70% in 1981) – around 40,000 homes. Despite this reduction in local authority control, there are nearly 17,000 people on the council's waiting list.

3. That council assembly believes that decent housing – where communities are mixed – is key to securing a better future for our young people, developing stable and vibrant communities, tackling crime and anti-social behaviour and improving public health.
4. That council assembly notes the immediate challenge faced on estates with high investment needs including Abbeyfield Estate, Four Squares Estate and Hawkstone low rise and calls for dialogue between council and tenants and leaseholders to continue.
5. That council assembly notes the uncertainty many tenants and leaseholders faced under the last housing investment programme, and welcomes the new £326 million, five year programme which will ensure every council home is warm, dry and safe by 2015/16.
6. That council assembly also welcomes the review of leaseholder charges to ensure Southwark has an accurate, fair and transparent system of charging leaseholders for the services they receive.
7. That council assembly notes the focus of the debate as outlined to all councillors in advance:
  - How do we balance the increasing demand for the council to supply housing with the need to maintain existing stock and with the limited geographical and financial resources available?
  - The proportion of housing stock in the private rented sector has ballooned in the last 30 years to a point where the numbers of private rented, privately owned and council homes are roughly equal. How do we ensure tenants rights and responsibilities are guaranteed in a sector over which the council has less control?
  - What role can other social landlords play in helping to ensure we deliver the housing which Southwark needs?
8. That council assembly welcomes the council's decision to set up an independent housing commission to investigate these issues outlined above and calls on members and residents to contribute their views.

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

## **MOTION 2 - HOUSING**

*(See pages 9-11 of the main agenda)*

The time allocated for the themed debate having expired, Motion 2 and its amendments were formally noted having not been moved and seconded at the meeting.

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

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

*(See pages 3-11 of supplemental agenda 2 and the blue and yellow papers circulated at the meeting)*

There was one urgent question to the leader, the written response to which was circulated on blue paper at the meeting. Two supplemental questions were asked of the leader by Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, the leader of the majority opposition group. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 3 to the minutes.

There were fifty-four members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper at the meeting. There were eight supplemental questions, the questions and responses are attached as Appendix 4 to the minutes.

At 10.10pm the bell was rang and the Mayor informed the meeting that the guillotine had fallen. The remainder of the members' questions were formally noted.

## **4.2 MEMBERS' MOTIONS**

### **MOTION 1 – RETENTION OF SCHOOL CROSSING PATROLS IN DULWICH**

*(See pages 19-21 of the main agenda)*

This item was considered after the deputation from the Lollipop campaign/safe routes to school, prior to the guillotine having fallen.

The Mayor stated that following consultation with the whips and in line with council assembly procedure rule 1.6 she had agreed to vary the way that Motion 1 was considered as follows:

- The motion and each amendment would be moved and seconded and then all the items would be opened up for debate
- The Mayor would move to the vote on each amendment and the substantive motion.

Councillor Toby Eckersley, seconded by Councillor Michael Mitchell, moved Motion 1.

Councillor Rosie Shimell, seconded by Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton, moved Amendment D.

Councillor Richard Livingstone, seconded by Councillor Helen Hayes, moved Amendment E.

Following debate (Councillors Barrie Hargrove and Lewis Robinson), Councillor Helen Morrissey, seconded by Councillor Ian Wingfield, moved that the vote be put.

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

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

Amendment E 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 assembly;
  - Notes the unprecedented financial situation the council must deal with following estimated Tory/Liberal Democrat government cuts over three years of £90 million to the council's non-housing budget.
  - Notes that as part of looking for all possible sources of funding or ways of continuing to run school crossing patrols, senior council officers are currently in discussions with local schools; both private and community and local residents across the borough.
2. That council assembly further notes following the deliberations of the Democracy Commission, the cabinet intends to propose as part of the forthcoming budget process the introduction of a cleaner, greener, safer revenue budget, equating to £10,000 per ward, for community councils to determine from 1 April 2012.
3. That, therefore, council assembly invites Dulwich and those community councils affected by previously agreed budget savings to school crossing patrols to consider whether they wish to prioritise the continued funding of those crossing patrols as part of this cleaner, greener safer revenue spend from 2012/13 onwards.

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

**MOTION 2 – SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS TEAM SERGEANTS**

*(See pages 19-21 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Catherine Bowman and Robin Crookshank Hilton, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors Kevin Ahern and Neil Coyle, formally moved and seconded Amendment F.

Amendment F 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 assembly regrets the loss of five safer neighbourhood team sergeants in Southwark which is a direct result of the government's 20% cut in the police grant. Council assembly further regrets the decision by the Mayor of London to make these cuts irrespective of the level of crime in any borough.
2. That council assembly notes that MPs from all parties had an opportunity to vote against this 20% cut in funding if they wanted to preserve police numbers in Southwark. It welcomes the fact Harriet Harman and Tessa Jowell voted against this cut, but regrets that Simon Hughes, once again, abstained.
3. That council assembly notes that the council's budget allocated £5.5 million in

contingency funds and that the figure of £9.5 million is incorrectly calculated. Council assembly further notes that the quarter 2 revenue monitoring report considered by cabinet on 22 November indicates that £2.6 million of this contingency fund may need to be used to offset pressures in departmental budgets this year.

4. That council assembly believes the council has demonstrated its ability to protect people from the worst excesses of the government; for instance, by introducing a £3 million youth fund as a direct response to the cut to educational maintenance allowances and the trebling of tuition fees.
5. That, in the circumstances, council assembly urges the government to reverse its reckless cut to the Metropolitan Police's budget and calls on Mayor Boris Johnson to maintain police numbers in Southwark.

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

### **MOTION 3 – LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME**

*(See pages 19-21 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Patrick Diamond and Mark Glover, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors James Barber and Paddy Clark, formally moved and seconded Amendment G.

Amendment G 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 assembly notes that the local government pension scheme is a sustainable, good quality pension scheme that benefits from being funded and locally managed. It is valuable to employers and employees alike.
2. That council assembly is concerned by proposals announced by the Chancellor in the last comprehensive spending review to impose an extra 3.2% contribution tax on scheme members, increasing scheme average member contributions from 6.6% to 9.8%.
3. That council assembly also notes that none of the additional revenue raised from this increase will go towards improving the financial security of the scheme and risks the sustainability of public sector pension schemes in the long term by encouraging people to opt out of occupational schemes because they cannot afford to pay this increase; ultimately costing the tax payer more in the future.
4. That council assembly welcomes the recent but limited change in position from the government and hopes that this indicates, after months of grandstanding, a willingness to finally enter into proper negotiations with trade unions.
5. That council assembly believes that both private and public service workers have suffered as a result of the austerity measures of the Conservative/Liberal Democrat

government and regrets the impact any industrial action will have on people in Southwark who rely on council services. We urge both the government and unions to explore every other possible course of action.

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

## 5. OTHER REPORTS

## 6. TREASURY MANAGEMENT - MID YEAR UPDATE 2011/12

*(See pages 22-31 of the main agenda and lilac paper 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 two questions on the report, the answers to which were circulated on lilac paper at the meeting. Two supplementary questions were asked of the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 5 to the minutes.

The recommendations contained within the report were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the 2011/12 treasury management mid-year update be noted.

## 6.1 APPOINTMENT OF AN HONORARY RECORDER OF SOUTHWARK

*(See pages 32-34 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

The recommendations contained within the report were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That pursuant to section 54 of the Courts Act 1971, His Honour Judge Roger Chapple be appointed to the office of Honorary Recorder of Southwark during his tenure as Senior Resident Judge at Inner London Crown Court.
2. That the appointment be formally recognised at an appropriate civic ceremony.

The meeting closed at 10.25pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****1. QUESTION FROM MICK BARNARD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

How do you justify an SEN transport policy that prevents disabled children attending after school clubs when the savings made using the services of a charity status organisation rather than home carers will more than offset any additional cost of transporting them from school to the club of their choice.

**RESPONSE**

Southwark has a duty to provide travel assistance for eligible children to enable them to get to and from school during term time to access their curriculum activity. This duty does not automatically extend to after school provision. Neither the current school travel policy 2011 nor the previous home to school travel policy made provision for transport to and from after school activities - any request for this type of journey would be considered as an exception at the council's discretion.

The cost of short breaks provision varies because of a number of variables, including the child's needs, the facility used, and the skills and experience of the carer. The average hourly cost of a carer in the family home is around £15.50. The hourly cost of an after school or holiday provision for a group of children with mild or moderate disabilities can be as low as £10 per hour. Some children have high cost daily packages because they have high assessed needs. These costs would remain high wherever the children were being provided with support. There would therefore be no obvious savings arising from using a voluntary sector provider as these children are assessed as having high needs. By supporting these children with more complex needs in the community, we can prevent them entering care which is more expensive than supporting them at home with their families.

We seek to deliver best value for money, and must always balance cost with quality. We pay no more than market prices for the required type and quality of provision that children with complex needs require. This includes the cost of transporting children where needed.

**2. QUESTION FROM VICKY NAISH TO THE LEADER**

Could you list the grounds on which a deputation request can be rejected in addition to those listed under council assembly procedure rules page 119 paragraph 4 of the constitution and indicate in which council document each of the reasons for rejection can be found.

**RESPONSE**

There are no grounds other than those listed in rule 2.6 on deputations.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM VICKY NAISH**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I'd just like to say a few words before I ask my supplementary, concerning myself. Some of you may know me, some of you may not know me. My name is Vicky Naish and I have been on the council for 16 years from 1990 to 2006 and I was deputy leader for 8 years and on my last year I became Mayor of this borough and I have lived in this borough for 68 years.

Given that the recent investigation based its report on the hard evidence when all was required was the balance of probability, and on the grounds it would lead to the leader considering rejecting the following deputation request, can the community be confident that the information contained within the constitution and other council policies is not meaningless and that those who are charged with ensuring that the integrity of such documents do so in the best interest of the residents of Southwark; and could I also ask the leader please if he would have a cross party meeting with me as you well know that my case has been going on for five years and I would like to put it to bed in the New Year. Thank you.

**RESPONSE**

Thank you Madam Mayor, I would like to thank Vicky for her question. I think she can be assured that the integrity of the council and the way it works is secure. She has raised issues and complaints with regards to specific matters which have been investigated under the council's complaints procedure by independent investigators and I think the fact that she has come along here this evening and is able raise public questions and continue to quiz myself and others within the administration, demonstrates the integrity of what we are seeking to do in this council. At a time when we are facing huge and unprecedented government cuts and trying to put budgets together which meet the challenges which we face as a community and as a administration, sometimes some issues take priority and precedence over others but she will always have my attention. I hope she knows that and believes that and accepts that, and I will continue always to listen to her and if she needs to meet with me further I will be delighted to.

**3. QUESTION FROM MS K SMART TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Can the cabinet member for equalities please me inform if there were community consultations prior to Southwark Human Right Equality Bureau (S.H.R.E.B) being reconstructed by Southwark Law Centre and Southwark Citizen Advice Centre?

**RESPONSE**

The council carried out a mapping exercise of existing services and produced a consultation document for the future delivery of equalities and human rights services in the borough. The document contained a consultation timetable. The council invited the community's preferred options for the delivery of these services; as well as calling for initial proposals for how they might best be delivered. The council's communications office announced the consultation through a press release on 16 March 2010 and the document was posted on the council's website.

Following the press release the consultation document was extensively presented at a number of voluntary and community sector forums and also comprehensively distributed through community networks. A number of community organisations formally responded to the consultation. Their views were taken into account in the development of the specification for the new service.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011****PUBLIC QUESTION ON THE THEME****1. QUESTION FROM ROY BOSWORTH TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT**

The electrics in the garages at Brenchley Gardens were updated 18 months ago and the power was cut off for re-wiring. Electricity has not been reinstated, neither the council or the utility company will take responsibility for this problem. Could I ask for your help in getting this matter resolved?

**RESPONSE**

As part of the Brenchley Gardens decent homes works programme, renewal of the existing wiring up to the main intake cupboards was to take place.

These works were considered appropriate as we were upgrading the estate lighting to current standards by adding 8 new column lights, and the works to the garages fell within this scope.

As part of the consultation process we invited representatives of the TMO committee and the TMO estate manger to monthly team meetings.

At one of the initial meetings it was explained that the housing management team at the TMO would be responsible for contacting EDF and arranging for the switch over to the new intake.

Subsequently it transpired that EDF discovered that the former set up had some major problems, such as;

- a) Some garages were receiving free electricity as there were no meter relating to them.
- b) Other meters did not relate to the garages they were supposed to.
- c) There were several outstanding charges for electricity used.

The delay is due to confusion about whose responsibility it is to ensure the works are carried out quickly. Therefore, to move things forward, the investment team, housing Management and the TMO are working together to make sure the situation with the electrical connection is resolved satisfactorily.



**SOUTHWARK COUNCIL****COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011****URGENT QUESTION****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

How is the leader funding the early demolition of part of the Heygate Estate and does he believe that this is a good deal for residents?

**RESPONSE**

The open report regarding the variation of the Elephant and Castle regeneration agreement to allow for the early demolition of the Heygate was considered as item 15 of the 22 November cabinet meeting. The comments of the finance director were set out in the confidential closed report as they are commercially sensitive. I am however happy to confirm that subject to the agreement of the business case currently being prepared by the finance director, resources will be made available from the regeneration element of the housing investment programme. This would be possible as a result of re-profiling current projects that are not in need of resources as originally scheduled as sites are vacated and developed. I am certain that our decision to bring forward the demolition of the estate and not have it lingering as a derelict shell is excellent news for the residents who live around Elephant and Castle and the borough at large.

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

Thank you Madam Mayor; thank you to the leader for his answer. It does seem it is always confidential when it is not a very good deal but anyway – maybe he can tell me whether the funding is at the expense of any other estates, given he has said it comes from the housing investment programme?

**RESPONSE**

No. My understanding is that we were talking about the Aylesbury earlier on and we were anticipating that the buyout of leaseholds on the Aylesbury would be slower than initially anticipated, therefore that gives us the funds within the housing investment programme to move forward with demolition, so no other estate will have its works delayed or have the housing investment works affected in any way. That is what I have been assured.

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

Thanks Madam Mayor. Have the residents of the Aylesbury and the tenants' and residents' association been in discussions about this; the fact that some of that funding is moving?

**RESPONSE**

It is not funding moving, it is just simply re-profiling. The same amount of money will be there, it will just be going out at a different time. It does not affect the programme and I have not doubt that Councillor Colley has been talking to residents on the Aylesbury along with Councillor Wingfield and the Creation Trust about this whole project as it moves forward. I just want to emphasise here: we are absolutely committed to the regeneration to the Aylesbury. I am sure I don't have to remind Councillor Al-Samerai that things obviously took a massive hit last November when we lost the private finance initiative (PFI) funding which meant we were going ahead much quicker and part of the PFI funding included some of that leaseholder buy out within it, so that took a hit obviously for the programme going forward, and therefore it has enabled us to re-profile, it has enabled us to use some of that capital for demolition of the Heygate. We are going to make progress on both estates, delivering regeneration both to the Heygate and the Aylesbury.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY)****TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011****MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME****36. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Will the leader be joining me in lobbying central government to invest in green manufacturing jobs and infrastructure in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

As an administration we have already made excellent strides toward improving the green credentials of the council. We have rolled out food waste recycling to around 45,000 homes and seen huge increases in the recycling rate in those areas where this has happened. We have both increased the recycling rate in our council offices and are decreasing the carbon emissions from council buildings.

So far as investing in green investment jobs in Southwark goes, I noted with interest Simon Hughes' comments in the Yorkshire Post that the Green Investment Bank should be located outside London. Personally, I believe that Southwark is hugely threatened by the disinvestment that this government is making in our borough, through cutting the council's budget, cuts to police and education budgets and closing the Camberwell Job Centre to name but a few. This is all happening at the same time as unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, is climbing. I will continue to lobby for a reverse to this trend of disinvestment in our borough and continue to work to ensure that our remaining resources are used in the most effective way they can be.

While neither Southwark nor the rest of London is likely to see substantial investment in manufacturing jobs of any kind given space constraints and government policies for regional investment, the council is actively supporting unemployed residents to access 'green' skills and jobs in the construction sector through our regeneration and S106 agreements with major developers including Lendlease at the Elephant and Castle, Balfour Beatty who are delivering the Southwark Schools for the Future programme, and of course Veolia who are our partners on the new waste transfer facility on the Old Kent Road.

The council also looks forward to the new university technical college (UTC) which will open at Southwark College's Bermondsey campus in September 2012: the UTC will offer an employer-led vocational pathway for Southwark's young people from the age of 14 with specialisations in construction and the built environment linked to the South Bank University low carbon technology facility.

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

Thank you Madam Mayor, I do have a supplemental. Thank you very much for the answer. Just to note on the Camberwell job centre point I am also sorry about the closure, although I was also sorry the Bermondsey job centre was closed in the good times under the Labour government; but anyway. His answer does not really

get to the point, I suppose I suppose maybe I could be more specific. Has he gone to the Mayor regarding enterprise zones for Southwark and has he gone to the government regarding making use of the youth contract for Southwark? Regarding the announcement of the youth contract last week to tackle youth unemployment, has he or any of the cabinet had any conversation yet about how we can make the most of that for Southwark?

## **RESPONSE**

Thank you very much. As far as the youth contract the deputy prime minister announced last week, it sounds similar to our youth fund in some respects in getting young people in employment and employment experience, and the observation has been made that it is bringing back the Future Jobs Fund but at half the price so obviously we will be looking to try and maximise the impact if we can in Southwark.

Just on the first issue; enterprise zones. I think the Mayor is only proposing one enterprise zone which is in east London, which is around the Olympic zone as far as I am aware; but we continue to make the case of Southwark at pan-London bodies and we will continue to do so. We are super conscious of the level of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment in the borough and as an administration we will do all that we can to try to address these issues, and will secure funding from whoever. We are not picky, we don't mind whether it comes from the Mayor (I am pleased to see that the Mayor looks like he will be supporting Peckham Station Square in response to his post disturbances fund) and will work with the government. Any investment that will come our way we will welcome it because we know we have big issues to tackle. I hope that on a cross-party basis everyone continues to lobby. I am sure they will, even the Tories, to ensure we get as much funding in our borough.

### **1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

Now that the government's health and social care bill is set to be implemented what does he anticipate the impact will be on health services in Southwark?

## **RESPONSE**

Given the state of the financial pressures that the NHS is under I believe this is the wrong time for this costly and damaging reform. In fact, we have seen in recent weeks that waiting times in Southwark are up 150% since the government came to power.

In the last year, as part of the Government's drive to cut £15-20 billion from the NHS by 2015, we have seen NHS Southwark merge with the primary care trusts of Bexley, Bromley, Greenwich, Lambeth and Lewisham. And this is all eighteen months before, as the Health and Social Care Bill sets out, all of these organisations are to be abolished and replaced with GP-led Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). To undertake one costly reorganisation at a time of financial pressure is difficult to understand, but to undertake two in the space of two years makes one wonder what is going on.

That's not to say that all of the changes are wrong. The Health and Social Care Bill envisages a new role for councils in terms of health and wellbeing leadership – most notably with councils taking over public health from the NHS, and through new Health and Wellbeing Boards, councils will in future work with GPs and

authorise NHS plans. Councils are well placed to take on this role – and I am pleased that the government has recognised the unique mandate we have to lead work to tackle health inequalities in our areas.

The impact of these changes could be to help ensure people in Southwark receive improved joined up services whether from the council, NHS or voluntary sector. However I am afraid that the evidence to date points to the opportunities in the bill will be lost in the turmoil of top-down reorganisations.

All MPs and peers had an opportunity to vote against the reforms in part or full, and yet many including Shirley Williams and our very own Simon Hughes have chosen to fully back these changes.

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

Thank you Madam Mayor, thank you for the answer. During the avoidable upheaval in the management of Southwark Health Services opposed by much of the health sector, is the leader aware that the number of people waiting more than eighteen weeks from referral to treatment in Southwark has increased by 150% since the government came to power? On a cross-party basis I thought I would add that in. This is the largest increase in London, and can I ask what his view is of this quite shameful record for the coalition government and its impact on local patients?

### **RESPONSE**

I thank Councillor Coyle for his supplemental question. I think it is very worrying, and given the fact that we are going to be assuming significant public health responsibilities it raises question that we should be concerned about as a local authority. I think the way in which the way the government has gone about these NHS reforms, which you will know better than I, the way they have gone about some of these, ‘throw everything up in the air and see where it lands’ almost seems to be the approach, and it is entirely unsatisfactory. There is grave tension within our borough between GP commissioners and GP providers, as well as the NHS Trust which seems to be not everyone’s cup of tea either. We have got real problems in the health service, but I think what we are all concerned about are the return of the days where people are waiting for vital surgery for year after year. Let’s not go back there; and my real concern has been, as I said, I think about six months ago, with the way in which these changes have been introduced that so many people: doctors, health service professionals and administrators, have been caught up in worrying about how these changes are going to be implemented and introduced, that some of the basic and fundamentals in terms in providing a health service and operations for residents in Southwark are being overlooked and time delays are being introduced; it is really regrettable.

### **37. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK**

Will the leader confirm when the work started, and then stalled, to the playground adjacent to Strood House which had been temporarily used during major works, be completed and when Tabard children will again be able to play there?

### **RESPONSE**

Apollo had undertaken refurbishment work to the estate and had used the play area as a temporary site, which they took possession of on 28 April 2008.

The old play equipment was removed and put into storage. The major works completed on 17 April 2009. When Apollo attempted to re-install the old equipment it transpired that it was not suitable for re-installation, as it no longer complied with the current health and safety requirements.

It transpired that there was no budget to undertake the work and the original agreement with Apollo only stipulated that they were required to re-install the original equipment and not provide any new items.

The play manager looked at possible funding from the play service to see what they would be able to provide. A contribution towards the project was offered for the purchase of equipment, approximately £2,500. As the funding was connected to a natural play programme, it did have to be used for equipment that was predominantly made of timber.

The play equipment installed was stepping logs and a pair of mushroom seats which were fitted by a specialist play equipment company called Wickstead. After the play equipment was fitted, Apollo additionally fitted two yellow steel benches on 20 October 2011, and the site was cleared and handed back for use.

Apollo has confirmed that the site has been completely cleared and is fit for use as a play area for the Tabard children.

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK TO THE LEADER**

Thank you for your reply to the question. I am pleased that you say that you are still looking at the issues over the mobile housing office, but I would like to say that the Cathedral ward councillors are very concerned about the fact that no visits come the Cathedral ward at all, and it is good that you are looking at this but remember but there are other wards also which aren't actually visited.

I am sorry Councillor Wingfield; I apologise – have I, ok yes I just realised myself, I just saw your expression and I thought – thank you very much for that, however perhaps we could proceed with that question if you would not mind because as it is question seven and it is to do with Borough and Bankside Community Council it would be good if I could have a reply to my supplementary, thank you.

#### **RESPONSE FROM THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT**

I am happy to answer this on the leader's behalf. Can I say yes, obviously we had to trial this. It started off in Peckham and now has gone to other sites across the whole of the borough and will continue to do that, and we are hoping that this is the beginning of a broader service and certainly if you are saying the service is there and if people want this service brought to their door we are quite happy to do that. There is always an element of costs in these things as I am sure you can appreciate, but it is part of us pushing out our housing service direct to estates, direct to street properties, meeting people face to face, dealing with their issues and this is extremely helpful particularly for those who are elderly or vulnerable or infirm in some way, so yes we are looking for other sites; please suggest some to us. Thank you.

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

Has the leader met with the six Southwark students whose university tuition fees will be paid by the council?

### RESPONSE

Yes. All of the students have demonstrated a commitment to both their studies and their community which was inspirational – on top of which they are all genuinely lovely young people!

I am delighted that we have been able to fund their tuition fees for the duration of their courses and I think they demonstrate the importance of our continued commitment to the scheme. The government is putting up barriers to young people's success – it is trebling tuition fees, cutting educational maintenance allowance and letting youth unemployment top 1 million. In contrast, in Southwark we are ensuring that some of our most talented pupils can go to university, regardless of their financial background.

### SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES TO THE LEADER

I would like to thank the leader for his answer and ask if he might be able to give more feedback on the reaction of the students who are being supported by their local council through their degree.

### RESPONSE

Can I thank Councillor Hayes for her supplemental question, what I think was really encouraging was that the students who not only have achieved well academically but have also made a contribution to their community; I think we are just utterly relieved that they will not have the burden of tuition fees to face at the end of their university degree courses and I think that this is a really important thing and a message which I think we should be sending out as a local authority. I am delighted that in the next few weeks that information about next years' scholarship schemes will be going out to schools, it was a bit of a rushed job this year I accept that but it will be widely publicised in the next few weeks. I am delighted that one of Southwark's ancient charities the Bermondsey United and St Olaves Charity has also committed to fund the Southwark scholarship for a student next year, committing £9,000.

I hope that any member who is involved with other charities in the borough might look towards putting their educational element of their funding towards this. I think this is a very important scheme and I am also going to be asking other leading businesses across the borough for sponsorship and I have got indication of one business already which is likely to be supporting us going forward. I think this is good news and a very positive story. I think the way in which people responded to the rise in tuition fees has been encouraging because we have seen some very innovative responses and I am particularly pleased as well that our partners at London South Bank University; they are going to be making a hundred scholarships available for students from Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham to fully pay their tuition fees – those one hundred students – to go through University of London South Bank University and I think that is a fantastic contribution back to

the local community so a big thank you to them. It is not a good time to be a student because of these financial pressures but we as a council are doing as much as we can and it is good to see partner organisations approaching things in a similar way.

### **38. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES**

Can the leader of the council confirm how many service users at the voluntary day centres have been identified for personal budgets and how many of these were being received by the voluntary day centres on 1 November, 2 months after the grant funding was ended?

#### **RESPONSE**

I understand that the answer to these questions was provided to you in a letter from the deputy director of adult social care on 16 November 2011.

In that letter she stated following the completion of all assessments, 107 people in the centres were identified for personal budgets and that of them:

- 52 have completed support plans
- 5 have been referred for reablement
- 14 with very complex needs are being supported through our case management team to fully explore support solutions that best suit them
- 3 are self-funding and so will make their own decisions about accessing support
- 6 have chosen not to continue going to a voluntary day service
- 25 support plans are still in progress – these are mostly Age Concern but also include circumstances where, for example, individuals are abroad
- 2 have since died.

Of the 52 people with completed support plans, 25 personal budget payments to voluntary day centres have been fully processed. The balance of completed support plans are in the process of being set up. We are working with and encouraging those individuals who still need to provide us with some information to fully process their payments in order to avoid further delay.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES TO THE LEADER**

Can I thank the leader for his reply which was indeed provided to me by the Deputy Director of Adult and Social Care in response to my letter.

Despite the detailed answer that has been provided I am afraid to say the reality on the ground, which I confirmed this afternoon with the three centre managers, is that the personal budgets which were designed to be the main source of funding for the voluntary day centres after their block grant funding was ended in August are still not being received by the day centres. Almost three months after the grant funding ended, of the fifty service users that were identified for budgets the centres are only receiving payments for nine. This is further destabilising the viability of the struggling of the voluntary day centres. Is this what the cabinet expected when they agreed to end the voluntary day centre funding in August?



**RESPONSE**

I can't pretend that we did not think it was difficult and I can't pretend it was an easy decision to take either. I am alarmed to hear what Councillor Noakes has said and I thank him for his supplemental question. Councillor Dixon-Fyle, cabinet member with responsibility for this area, has heard obviously his concerns which he has raised and I would ensure that she looks into this matter, which I am sure she will together with officers and hopefully report back to you, Councillor Noakes, in due course on this issue. Nobody wants to see where there is a funding source potentially available it not being made available and so that is something we need to overcome sooner rather than later.

**3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK WILLIAMS**

Is he surprised by the reaction to the proposal from Sail Greenwich to moor yachts at Greenland Dock during London 2012 Olympics?

**RESPONSE**

I certainly think Sail Greenwich were surprised. I don't think I was alone, when originally I saw their proposal as an opportunity to generate some much needed investment into the dock and opportunity to generate some Olympic "excitement" in the area. In fact, I can say with confidence that at least some of the local ward members were initially also supportive.

On that basis it wasn't unreasonable for the council to take discussions with Sail Greenwich forward. However, we have neither the intention of trying to 'railroad' the plan through nor the inclination to influence the independent planning process on this or any other application.

**39. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS**

Can the leader of the council explain what he meant when he stated in Southwark News on 23 June 2011 that "there is no shortage of affordable housing in this part of the borough" on what figures or information did he base this statement?

**RESPONSE**

You have misquoted me in your question. I said "social housing" and was referring to the proportion of council and housing association homes in Cathedrals compared to the rest of the borough. According to the most recent ward level data available of the 5,204 households, 3,004 (58%) were social rented in Cathedrals ward. For Southwark as a whole, of the 105,806 households, 56,639 (53%) were in the same period social rented.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS TO THE LEADER**

Thank you Madam Mayor, I thank the leader for his answer. I just wondered, given the statistics that you have given that 58% of the housing in Cathedrals ward is social rented housing, and I just wondered if you could give our residents some assurance that – the figures are going to drop quite soon because the volume of private affordable housing which is going through at the moment against policy; that is not providing the 35% that policy said it should, instead giving a sum of money to be spent elsewhere in the borough. I just wondered if you could

reassure my residents at what percentage level we will be entitled to social housing again please?

## **RESPONSE**

Well I know that Councillor Morris knows this is not as simple as 'let's build social housing in Cathedrals ward and all will be well' it is not that simple as well as she knows, and it is not helped in fact in areas like Cathedrals ward where the government introduces a 50% right to buy entitlement which makes the right to buy so much more attractive for those properties and home owners who think they can make a really fast buck on this deal. That is the reality of it and we know that it is the reality of it. We know that over the years – you can argue the case against me, but we know as a matter of fact leaseholders have exercised the right to buy in properties in more desirable areas, have then gone on to sell them at major profits and move away. But trying to take figures out of context and putting them forward in some very simple argument is not very helpful or illuminating. Then you misrepresented my answer because you said I said 58% was enough, which is completely a distortion of what this answer says. Now Councillor Morris will know that in terms of affordable housing – let's look at the Neo Bank Side example for instance, where flats are selling between £1 and 5 million. Affordable housing there if you wanted to live there in affordable housing unit you would have to be earning £70,000 a year. Now that is not dealing with housing for the poor or those on low incomes, I am sorry. And she can argue the case and say this is not fair and it is unacceptable but it is her government which has introduced 80% market rents which means that people have to be earning that sort of money. She can argue against the facts in Cathedrals ward; and I have great sympathy for her, I don't want to see social housing lost in this borough any more that she does and I would like to see it increased because we need a pressing need for it, but we have to be realistic about where we are delivering affordable housing and not vanity projects really which are not affordable to anyone.

## **4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS**

How many fewer Southwark residents have so far applied for 2012 university entry compared to this time last year?

## **RESPONSE**

Unfortunately, UCAS does not keep data for individual boroughs and the deadline to submit applications is not until January 2012. However, as was reported last month, there has so far been a 12% drop in applications nationally this year. My fear is that the people worst impacted are those from less well off communities and families – and that the continuing impact of the increase in tuition fees will only be to undermine social mobility even further.

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

Thank you Madam Mayor, I have a supplemental for the leader. The government have claimed that trebling of tuition fees would not impact on the number of people applying for university. Does the leader agree with me that the preliminary evidence is showing otherwise, with 1 in 8 fewer applying this year so far?

## **RESPONSE**

Absolutely. I am grateful to Councillor Hamvas for her answer. It goes back to the question which we were talking about earlier on actually. We are trying to do what we can in Southwark to encourage young people to still go to university. I think part of the problem is that this government has not really set out a direction of what it wants to achieve in terms of education and training. It has tripled tuition fees, but what does it want to do – does it want people to go to university or not go to university? Because the message it sends out to young people in Southwark is that it does not want young people from Southwark to go to university because they will be taking on such huge debt, which is far and away beyond anything they are experiencing at home, where the average income is £16-17,000 per annum. And I think that the government has to think again about what it is doing on the issue of tuition fees. It is not too late to move away from this. I think it is one of the shameful things that a political party made a pledge, such a clear pledge, such a pledge on which it secured student votes by the bucketful, we have absolutely no doubt – and then they go on to break that pledge in such a absolutely despicable way. And abstaining on a vote is as bad as breaking a pledge. If you break a pledge to vote against something, to vote against an increase; if you don't vote for it and don't vote against it, you are letting the people who elected you down and that is actually the issue Simon Hughes is going to have to face when he faces the electors of Bermondsey and Old Southwark at the next election. He has to stand on his record, and abstention is not a record that I would be proud of. He has abstained too many time on important issues I think in this parliament to have any credibility as a representative of some of the poorest residents of this country.

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

The survey of users of the Fusion managed Elephant & Castle Leisure Centre published 14 October 2010 makes no reference to the single largest group of users, link here:

[http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200229/investing\\_in\\_leisure/1793/elephant\\_and\\_castle\\_leisure\\_centre](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200229/investing_in_leisure/1793/elephant_and_castle_leisure_centre)

Given that the majority (up to 2,000 each week) of the users of the Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre were omitted from the survey, will a survey of the 'lost persons' be undertaken, so that their needs are included in the future of the leisure centre?

Could the leader of the council, given the resources the current administration has committed to consultation of disparate groups, explain why this mainly Spanish speaking group, consisting almost entirely of first and second generation immigrants was excluded from the survey?

#### **RESPONSE**

The initial consultation on the new Elephant & Castle shopping centre was distributed to 9,000 addresses in the Elephant & Castle area. There were also adverts in the press and existing leisure centre about the consultation. No group or individual was excluded from participating in the consultation process. There will be a further round of consultation on the proposals in the early new year and I invite Councillor Neale to work with the administration to ensure that all interested parties are aware of it.

On the specifics of the Latin American church, Comunidad Cristiana de Londres, that have been using the sports hall in the existing Elephant & Castle

leisure centre on Sundays for services on a temporary basis, it is important to note that neither the existing space nor the proposal for its replacement is designed as a place of worship, but for leisure and sports activities by Southwark residents. The council is seeking to assist the group to move to suitable alternative premises although given their requirements the options in Southwark controlled premises are likely to be limited.

**5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR THE RIGHT REVEREND EMMANUEL OYEWOLE**

How will the council be celebrating the Queen's Diamond Jubilee year?

**RESPONSE**

To mark 60 years of the Queen's reign the Diamond Jubilee will take place in 2012. The national celebrations will centre around an extended weekend in 2012 on 2, 3, 4 and 5 June and Southwark will be proud to play its part in celebrating this magnificent occasion.

Although we have not finalised our programme, there is lots of planning activity going on already as we know that Southwark residents will want to celebrate this momentous event in our history. We are working very closely with the organisers of the celebrations in central London, supporting them and seeing what role we can play, as well as developing our own programme of special events.

We are still finalising our full plans, but at present we anticipate a special civic service at Southwark Cathedral celebrating Her Majesty the Queen's 60 year reign so that all communities can come together and honor this incredible achievement.

The council is fully intending to be involved in the nation-wide beacon network on Monday 4 June. The plan is that a network of 2,012 beacons will be lit by communities and individuals throughout the United Kingdom and the public realm department are in the process of finding the most suitable location for the Southwark beacon.

The Mayor will be receiving a Diamond Jubilee Black Poplar tree in early December and it will be planted in a park in Southwark with an official Diamond Jubilee plaque unveiled on Monday 4 June.

The council is currently working with partners on a major community event for June 2, details of which will be available in the new year.

One of the largest public Diamond Jubilee events is the Thames River Diamond Jubilee Pageant, which will take place on the Thames and consist of up to 1,000 boats assembled from across the UK, the Commonwealth and around the world. Southwark's riverside will be a key viewing area for the pageant and we are working with organisers to maximise the celebration of Southwark's own maritime heritage as well as minimising disruption to local residents.

We have other plans in development. For example, I want to see garden parties held in some of our parks. There are many groups and organisations also creating and hosting events to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee and the council will be working with them to promote them to the residents and visitors. The council will be

promoting how residents and tenants can be part of The Big Jubilee Lunch in the new year.

We all know that we are having to watch every penny we spend very carefully so we are working hard so that local people can more easily organise their own parties. Street parties are a regular occurrence in Southwark and over the past twelve months the events team with the public realm department have worked hard to reduce red tape around closing roads and organising these neighborhood celebrations.

We know that Southwark will want to play its part in these national celebrations which I hope will live long in the memory. In these difficult times, we hope that the celebrations will be a real catalyst for friends and neighbours to show that real Southwark spirit and come out together to celebrate Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee and to say thank you to the incredible service she has given to our country.

**41. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL KYRIACOU**

Following the fire at Lucy Way on 2 November 2011, will the leader ensure that fire stops will be urgently installed on the roofs?

**RESPONSE**

The fire could not have been prevented as it started in the dwelling and did not spread to others or into the roof space.

The Lucy Way block has been inspected and it was found that the separation between the top floor maisonettes and the roof space was by way of a continuous 150mm thick concrete slab. No significant breaches of the slab (e.g. access hatches) were identified. This would offer maximum practical fire resistance between the dwellings and the roof.

The roof space already contains properly constructed fire breaks at 20m intervals in accordance with building regulations and these would limit the spread of fire. There are minimal sources of ignition present within the roof space presenting a low risk of fire starting in this area.

For the reasons stated, there are no plans to install further fire breaks to the roof space.

**42. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN**

Please can the leader provide the number of people that were on the council's housing waiting list on:

- a) 1 May 2010
- b) 1 May 2011
- c) Now.

**RESPONSE**

According to the council's records, the statistics are as set out below, based on the information that is currently available:

- a) at 1 April 2010 there were a total of 16,651 households on the housing list

- b) at 1 April 2011 there were a total of 18,724 and
- c) at early November 2011 there were a total of 19,844.

**43. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA**

Does he support the principle of people who earn more paying higher council rents?

**RESPONSE**

I believe that it is right to have a healthy mix of individuals living in council housing. I do not believe in the introduction of a whole new system for checking the income of all of our tenants and the costly bureaucracy that would be required to bill based on their earnings.

**44. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

The cabinet member for children's services recently said that 'there is no guarantees that they (schools) will spend it (the pupil premium) directly on the pupils it is aimed for'. Does the leader share his colleague's view? Is the leader concerned that the cabinet member responsible for education does not trust teachers and school support staff to know how best to improve the educational achievement of the poorest pupils in our primary schools?

**RESPONSE**

The critical word is "guarantees". It is a statement of fact that there are no statutory guarantees.

There is no question of Councillor McDonald or I having anything but the highest respect and faith in our borough's head teachers. As a chair of governors of a local primary school myself, I know how hard our teachers and heads work on a daily basis to deliver outstanding education for our borough's children. But with government cutting the overall amount spent on education at the fastest rate in fifty years, with their policies on education maintenance allowances, tuition fees, early years funding, child benefit and tax credits, Southwark's families are being clobbered. In the face of this, the pupil premium is nothing more than an insufficient sticking plaster

**6. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN (WALWORTH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Does the cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy support and welcome the creation of the Walworth Society?

**RESPONSE**

Yes.

**7. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK (BOROUGH AND BANKSIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

I note that the scheduled visits of the mobile housing office does not include Cathedrals Ward and therefore neglecting a large number of residents from Borough and Bankside from accessing the mobile housing office. Will the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management rectify this immediately and will he consider any more highly visible locations that serve the whole of Borough and Bankside Community Council?

## **RESPONSE**

The mobile office operates at seven locations across the borough. The schedule has been drawn up to reflect a range of factors including distance from the five housing service receptions, density of council owned properties and local community needs.

The mobile office does not include a service in Cathedrals Ward because residents in this location are able to go to the Walworth one stop shop relatively easily. This facility is open Monday to Friday and staffed by resident and income officers who are working with households in the local area. In addition, all resident and income officers are now supplied with mobile technology which allows them to take the service to people's homes and all residents have been provided with the direct contact details for their local officers in order to easily arrange home visits as required.

It is early days for this new service and officers will be reviewing take up and feedback from residents on whether the current locations are the best.

## **8. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN (ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Could the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling please provide:

- a) A detailed breakdown of all the costs associated with the proposal of adding 350 temporary berths and associated facilities to Greenland Dock for the Olympics
- b) A detailed breakdown of the projected income from this collaboration
- c) How much of this will be invested in Surrey Docks ward in mitigating the negative effects of the proposal on the peninsula (e.g. extra waste, rubbish, pressure on local infrastructure, congestion, noise, disruption, emergency vehicle access, pollution, disruption to wildlife)?

## **RESPONSE**

- (a) The costs to the council were estimated to be in the region of £150k, comprising new sanitary facilities (90k), temporary moorings and buoys (£45k) and staffing costs of £15k.
- (b) For the first 200 boats income was set at £75 per boat and for every boat thereafter £50 per boat per night, at an occupancy rate of 75% the estimated income was £370k.
- (c) All the matters raised under c) are matters that were addressed by the planning committee in considering the application. While it is recognised

that the proposed temporary marina and increased opening hours of the Watersports Centre could have some noticeable impacts arising in terms of a number of amenity issues all of these could have been addressed by conditions attached to the planning permission and paid for by the applicant. Thus there will be no need for the council to incur any costs in relation to these matters.

**9. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER (BERMONDSEY COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Does the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling not trust local communities to make decisions about local street lighting?

**RESPONSE**

It is not a question of trust. Our current asset condition assessments have identified the need for a one off investment of over £2m with an annual investment of £770,000 for steady state. This is against a capital allocation of £500,000 per year. Therefore the council has had to prioritise spend to the areas of most need across the borough.

However at the same time the council has committed to allocate more than £15m over the next eight years for local projects of local community choice as part of the cleaner greener safer capital programme. This may of course be spent on lighting projects should the community council wish to do so.

**10. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can the cabinet member for children's services share primary and secondary level demand forecasts for this coming year and each year thereafter (as available) versus current place numbers for Dulwich and advise which schools she is considering requesting bulge classes at?

**RESPONSE**

The Dulwich primary planning area includes College, East Dulwich and Village wards. The following primary schools are located in the area: Dulwich Village CE Infants (3 forms of entry (FE)), Dulwich Hamlet Junior (3 FE), Goodrich (3 FE), Goose Green (2 FE), Heber (2 FE), Langbourne (1 FE) and St Anthony's RC (2 FE).

There is predicted to be an additional need for between 1 and 1.5 forms of entry of reception places in this area in September 2012 increasing to between 2 and 2.5 FE by 2015/16. The forecasts are based on a number of variables including births, migration and new housing and the longer term trend should therefore be treated with caution.

In line with our primary places strategy all primary schools in the borough have been invited to consider (as they were last year) taking a temporary additional class in September 2012. We are currently receiving the schools' responses and officers are assessing schools' capacity for temporary additional classes against



the projected need. Once agreed, the increased admission numbers would be included in the January admissions arrangements.

A review of the primary places strategy is also being carried out because of the continuing predicted pressure of places. This is with a view to permanent expansions of schools to meet the growing need. The investment would require the allocation of significant capital resources by the Department for Education.

The planning for secondary school places is carried out on a borough wide basis and therefore there is not a forecast for the Dulwich planning area.

**11. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES (PECKHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

We the residents of the Peckham Community Council area welcome the council's recent decision to recognise Peckham's special architectural and historic heritage by designating it with conservation area status and thus help to transform the unfair negative perception of Peckham often portrayed by the press to a positive one. Therefore in light of this, what are the immediate proposals for attracting outside funding to Peckham to improve current buildings and for new development?

**RESPONSE**

I too welcome the recent protection of historic buildings and spaces in the Peckham conservation area. The protection means that aside from investment, the area will benefit from high quality development. The Townscape Heritage Initiative application was particularly aimed at regenerating the designated conservation area.

As with Camberwell, we have a vision for the transformation of Peckham. The vision is for Peckham town centre to become a lively place that meets the needs of a very diverse community. Peckham town centre already has a unique feature in comparison with our other town centres; it boasts the largest shopping floorspace of all town centres in Southwark and the aspiration is for the town centre to continue to play a major role in the borough.

Schemes for improvements to Peckham will be delivered in partnership with the council, with funding opportunities sought from Outer London Fund, the GLA Regeneration Fund, and the Townscape Heritage Initiative.

- GLA Regeneration Fund: £7m bid to improve Peckham Rye station, including a new access and improvements to the Old Waiting Room, creation of a station square fronting Rye Lane and introducing an active use into the rear courtyard of the station.
- Outer London Fund: £250,000 to deliver improvements to public realm in Holly Grove and Moncreiff Street, fronting the Peckham cinema and shop front improvements in Holly Grove.
- Townscape heritage: the funding bid will focus on the Georgian high street at the north; the Victorian properties at the southern end; and the Art Deco properties at the centre around the Peckham Rye Station.

**12. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES (CAMBERWELL COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can she outline if there are any proposals for attracting outside funding to improve Camberwell?

**RESPONSE**

We welcome the opportunity to seek funding for the improvement of Camberwell, and particularly the town centre area.

There are a number of schemes and partners who we will be working with to improve Camberwell, including English Heritage, Transport for London, London Borough of Lambeth, South London Gallery, Camberwell Farmers Market as well as local businesses.

- Working with TfL, proposals are already underway for the design and development of Camberwell town centre, which will include major improvements to streetscape in the area (£7m).
- Working with local councillors, the community and other partners, we have recently submitted a bid to the Mayor of London's Outer London Fund; a bid which we hope will support the delivery of a masterplan for Camberwell Green and its improvement along with further shop front improvements. This would be complemented by funds from the TfL LIP programme and S106 to deliver £775,000 worth of improvements to the area.

The council too will be investing for improvements in Camberwell, including to the leisure centre, a new library in Camberwell with an increased public offer, the farmers market, and for shop front restoration work. Work has already started to improve housing in the area as regeneration work gets underway on the Elmington estate to the north.

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

Can the cabinet member provide an update on how the council is working with Transport for London (TfL) and counterparts in Lewisham on reviewing the traffic and road changes in the Pomeroy Street and Kender Road Triangle area and their impact on St Mary's Road and Lausanne Road? Can the cabinet member provide an update on the monitoring that TfL promised to undertake and will he investigate the installation of a safe crossing points for Nunhead children attending Edmund Waller primary school?

**RESPONSE**

Lewisham Council plan to introduce measures to alleviate congestion issues on Pomeroy Street through additional parking restrictions. Southwark Council will be consulted. .

Southwark will continue to request the promised post monitoring data from TfL which will further assist in assessing the impact of the scheme on Southwark streets and highlight any further actions required. Now the scheme is in place,

however, it is unlikely that TfL / Lewisham will consider significant changes to the new road layout.

In addition officers are responding to ongoing concerns from Southwark road users by arranging for a consultation meeting between TfL Planned Interventions (street works), TfL Buses, TfL Surface Transport, the office of Rt Hon. Harriet Harman QC MP, the office of Val Shawcross (Deputy Chair of the Transport Committee, London Assembly) and resident groups.

Edmund Waller Primary School is in Lewisham and as such TfL would be investigating the installation of safe crossing places with the school as part of their travel plan. Southwark officers are currently investigating if and how they can assist.

**14. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR VICTORIA MILLS**

What is the council doing to make savings at senior management level?

**RESPONSE**

The budget report approved in February 2011 indicated proposals to make savings in senior management structures of £500,000 in 2012/13 and a further £500,000 in 2013/14; £1m in total.

These are corporate savings, in addition to some departmental savings in specific service areas. The leader has indicated an intention to come forward with proposals in January for how this will be achieved.

**15. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS**

How would the marriage fee increase have differed under the previous administration's medium term resources strategy?

**RESPONSE**

The medium term resources strategy (MTRS) has remained unaltered regarding discretionary fee increases across the last two financial years, during which time the council has seen a change in administration. That change of administration would therefore have no direct bearing on any increases applied to the marriage fees as the policy has remained the same throughout.

The MTRS does refer to the council's wish to move fee charges towards the most appropriate London average and the recent marriage fee increase has sought to do this.

I would therefore have to conclude that there is no indication that the previous administration would have taken a different decision on this fee increase.

**16. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND**

Will council services be affected by the industrial action taking place on 30 November?

**RESPONSE**

All chief officers are looking at what services are expected to be affected and information will be on the council's website. Judgements will need to be formed on whether to close non-essential services.

Staff members are asked but are not obligated to inform line managers. We are managing leave and other absences more rigorously.

We are still in discussion with trade unions with potential exemptions for emergency duty social workers, hostels etc.

For planning purposes we must assume that all services will be affected and closures of front line services will be experienced; for example, in early years centres and schools. Every effort will be made to run skeleton services at a minimum, where possible and we have started discussions with the trade unions to sustain services which have a "life and limb" element.

**17. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD**

How will you be consulting on the budget this year?

**RESPONSE**

In my interview with the overview and scrutiny committee on 14 November 2011, I set out the process for consultation for the 2012/13 budget.

Given the extensive consultation last year in setting the three-year budget, there does not need to be the same level of consultation before agreeing what is in effect the second of the years within that budget. Nevertheless, we will consult more widely than the council did prior to last year's exercise.

I intend to take a draft of the 2012/13 budget to the cabinet meeting on 13 December 2011, following the local government settlement that we anticipate receiving this week. We will then publish details of this draft budget on the council website for consultation with the public and we will supplement this with meetings with stakeholder groups. We intend, with the agreement of community council chairs, to present on the budget at the January round of community council meetings for discussion with the public.

We have agreed with the overview and scrutiny committee that they will interview the cabinet on the draft budget on 9 January 2012, again following the practice established in setting the 2011/12 budget.

**18. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR SUNIL CHOPRA**

Does he think that CCTV has a role to play in tackling crime and anti-social behavior in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

CCTV is making a valuable contribution in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour in Southwark. On average the Southwark CCTV control room records over 1,000 incidents that are referred to the police and other enforcement services which result on average in around 90-100 arrests, for this financial year.

CCTV has provided the police with valuable images following the summer riots. These images have assisted in the identification and charge of a number of offenders. This includes those involved in some of the most serious offences including the arson attacks on premises in the borough.

The council has taken the decision to upgrade the current CCTV control to provide a digital system. This will provide better quality recording and reduce the time it takes to view crimes recorded by CCTV cameras. The upgrade will be completed by the summer of 2012.

**19. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ALTHEA SMITH**

Can he provide an update on the visit by the riots victims and communities panel?

**RESPONSE**

Following a request from the leader of the council and the Member of Parliament for Camberwell and Peckham, the Rt Hon Harriet Harman, the panel visited Southwark on Monday 14 November. The visit provided the council with an excellent opportunity to raise awareness of the impact of the disturbances on the borough and to be able to feed back to government our early findings and initial recommendations based on the evidence available to date.

The visit began with an opportunity for the panel to meet some of the shopkeepers in Walworth who were affected by the disturbances. This was followed by a round-table discussion at the Cuming Museum. In attendance for this meeting were representatives from the panel, including Darra Singh, the chair of the panel; local MPs Rt Hon Harriet Harman and Rt Hon Simon Hughes; the leader of the council and I; representatives from the local police force and council officers. The council's report which was produced for the visit formed the basis of the discussions, however a wide range of topics were discussed. The council made the following recommendations to the panel during the meeting:

- Any conclusions about the disturbances should be robust and based on evidence
- That the council has the opportunity to continue to feedback to government as all evidence is fully analysed
- In order to deal with the underlying issues and prevent a repeat of the events that occurred in August, new innovative approaches will need to be taken and this may well require additional resources from government
- Early evidence suggests that poverty and deprivation appear to be common factors in those who carried out, steps may need to be taken to address this to avoid a repeat
- A simplified method of reimbursement from government in future would put less strain on council.

The leader and I then accompanied the panel around some of the affected areas of Peckham. Members of the panel were introduced to a number of the shop keepers along Rye Lane who had been affected by the disturbances back in August. The panel were then taken to visit the Peace Wall at Peckham Library to see for themselves a visual manifestation of the sense of community that exists and the way that our residents pulled together in Peckham. The day finished with a meeting at Peckham Library between the panel, some residents and a selection of the local community groups, such as Peckham Shed.

We felt that it was very important, while the negative impacts should be in no way underestimated, that the panel should not leave Southwark with a view of areas like Peckham and Walworth, that did not include taking note of the strength, resilience and cohesion that exists in our communities, particularly demonstrated in the disturbances' aftermath.

The panel will be publishing an interim report in November, which we fed into through the visit. They have invited us to feed into their final report, which will be presented to the Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the Official Opposition in March 2012, once our own evidence gathering and analysis is complete.

**20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ROWENNA DAVIS**

Can you provide the latest estimate of the number of police that have been cut in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

As of last month the total police officer strength was 862 compared to last year when strength was 945 police officers. This is 83 less than this time last year, roughly a 9% decrease. However, I can report that 30 local officers that were dedicated to the Operation Withern investigation into the August disorder returned to their normal duties in October.

These reductions in numbers have mostly been achieved through natural wastage, other than the five sergeants who have been reassigned away from the safer neighbourhood teams on various wards.

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

Given that the cabinet have not used the £4m contingency funds that were put aside by the previous administration in 2010, nor the £5.5m that he allocated in 2011, will the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety review his decision to put an additional £9m into contingency funds in 2012/13 and even more in 2013/14, and use this instead to protect essential front line services and to roll-back some of the savage cuts he has unnecessarily imposed on our residents?

**RESPONSE**

Southwark council had planned for a £4m contingency as part of 2010/11 budget in recognition of the uncertainties inherent in a budget of £360m, representing around 1% of net budget. This was to enable the council to have sufficient flexibility to

respond to the impact of economic uncertainty, service pressures, and any unforeseen events.

In my foreword to the 2010/11 revenue outturn report, I noted that the council had to use £13m of our reserves during the year. This was mainly to support services in invest to save opportunities and for redundancy costs to enable the council to weather the cuts that the council faces over the forthcoming years - the largest in the borough's history.

The use of reserves meant that the council did not have to call upon the contingency fund for 2010/11. This balance was used to replenish the modernisation reserve, which is held to support the redesign of services and invest to save projects to make the council fit for the future.

The budget agreed by council assembly in February for 2011/12 noted that the provision of a contingency fund helped to mitigate risks contained within the budget for 2011-14, including:

- the ability to deliver savings of £84.3m over the three years from 2011/12. (£84.3m is more than double the level of savings that have been delivered in the last three years);
- the impact of increased demands across services;
- the impact of fluctuations in inflation;
- that no certainty is attached to the grant settlement after 2012/13, including the future of the grant 'floor';
- the uncertainty on the distribution of funding to support social care and benefit health; and
- the uncertainty on the new homes bonus grant, including how and when the grant will be distributed, the conditions of the scheme, especially beyond 2012/13, and the basis for the calculation.

In commenting on the 2011/12 quarter 2 revenue monitoring report, I drew attention to the pressures being reported, indicating an adverse variance of £2.6m against spending budgets. Whilst the council will continue to try to control and reduce these pressures as in previous years, it is clear that some will be difficult to turn around fully: the customer services contract savings in particular are challenging. The report also identifies the new pressure on budgets arising from the European Union agency workers directive. It is therefore likely that we will need to utilise our contingency fund to address these pressures.

I also gave a verbal commitment at overview and scrutiny last month to not increasing contingency in 2012/13 to the £9m figure indicated in the three-year budget agreed in February.

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

Given the Borough Commander's confirmation that Rotherhithe Police Station will close in March 2012, what is the council doing to assist the Metropolitan Police in sourcing an alternative 'front desk' in the Rotherhithe area, and alternative premises to base the displaced safer neighbourhood teams?

**RESPONSE**

The council is working closely with local police and the Metropolitan Police Service property services to identify locations which can house the current safer neighbourhood teams in the Rotherhithe areas. There are several locations which are currently being explored however none have been finalised at this time.

I have personally asked the police whether they might look at Albion Street as a possible location, given the anti-social behaviour experienced in the area.

**46. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL**

Please can the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety provide full council with the most up-to-date estimates of the total cost of the universal free school meal programme? Please can he provide a breakdown by capital and revenue costs?

**RESPONSE**

These figures remain as stated in the budget agreed by council assembly in February.

The revenue costs are:

2011/12	£1.145m
2012/13	£2.559m
2013/14	£4.145m

The answer to this question remains the same as it has have every time it has been previously asked, and were confirmed again at my overview and scrutiny interview on 14 November. We will be reviewing the January census projections of pupil numbers to confirm the budget requirement for future years.

The capital cost budget allocation agreed by council assembly in July as part of the 10 year capital plan was £500,000. To date we have spent or committed £241,479, officers are finalising the costs for the remaining expenditure with the schools concerned.

**47. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON**

How many days leave is the chief executive entitled for 2011/12? How many days leave has she taken since 1 April 2011? How many days leave has she got planned until she leaves the council?

**RESPONSE**

The chief executive is entitled to 37 days leave a year. Any other information is personal and not subject to disclosure. This is not information I am privy to in my cabinet role.

**48. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET**

Can the cabinet member for resources and community safety tell me a) what is the council's policy on dealing with stray dogs, b) how many stray dogs were collected



by the council last year and what happened to them, and c) what work is the council doing with neighbouring local authorities and charities such as Battersea Dogs and Cats Home to share costs and best practice?

## **RESPONSE**

The council adopted "A Responsible Approach" Southwark Dog Strategy 2011/14 in the summer of this year. This strategy clearly sets out our approach in dealing with stray dogs.

The council has a statutory duty under sections 149 and 150 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to pick up and detain stray dogs. On 6 April 2008, section 68 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 came into force. This removed from the legislation any requirement for the police to seize stray dogs or to accept any brought to them. As a result, local authorities have sole responsibility for discharging stray dog functions.

At present, the council provides a weekday, daytime acceptance point for strays. Once received, they are transported to the contracted kennels where they are looked after until they are returned to their owner, re-housed or euthanised (due to breed, illness or temperament).

According to our records, 314 dogs were collected by the council last year. All were transported to kennels which are contracted to receive stray dogs collected by the council. They are obliged to undertake the safe custody and care of the dogs in accordance with relevant statutory and non-statutory guidance and good practice relating to the welfare of dogs.

In 2009 The Battersea Dogs and Cats Home (BDCH) provided the primary kennelling service for Southwark. Whilst Battersea provided a cost effective service, since October 2009 they became increasingly unable to accept stray dogs from Southwark. This was due to the high percentage of dangerous breeds and Staffordshire bull terriers strays (which required single kennels). As this left the council vulnerable with regards to fulfilling its statutory obligations, a private kennelling facility (Woodlands) located in Sevenoaks was contracted to kennel the strays. The kennels provide BDCH with a weekly update in order that they can record Southwark's strays on their database.

The council are currently in talks with neighbouring authorities to discuss various cost saving options on stray dog provision

## **49. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

Would the cabinet member agree that there has for some time been an unacceptable level of anti-social, and in some instances, criminal behaviour affecting the Osprey Estate and, if so, does he have any proposals for tackling this problem effectively and soon?

## **RESPONSE**

I agree that the level of anti-social behaviour in the Osprey Estate has been unacceptable. Residents of the estate raised this matter with me in October and I have raised this matter with officers to ensure appropriate action is taken.

There is an issue of anti-social and criminal behaviour in the Osprey estate area that the Southwark anti-social behaviour unit (SASBU), the local safer neighbourhood team and housing officers are working together to address. The problems centre on one specific address which is currently being focused on for action. SASBU and the police have written to all residents providing a confidential telephone number for residents to report any information to assist in taking action.

It would be inappropriate to say exactly what is being planned, operationally, but assurance can be given that this is being treated as a matter of priority.

**50. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON**

How much has the council spent on consultants in 2011/12? How does this compare to 2010/11?

**RESPONSE**

Consultancy support is required on occasion to support a range of council activities, not least one-off large scale projects where in-house expertise needs additional capacity and support, or is simply not available.

The consultancy services contracted by the council, includes specialist financial, commercial, technical, legal and other professional support and advice.

In 2010, we introduced strict controls on consultancy expenditure, as set out in questions to the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety at the overview and scrutiny committee meeting held on 15 November 2010 (supplemental agenda item 6, pages 41-42 contain question and answer):

<http://moderngov.southwarksites.com/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=308&MId=3535&Ver=>

The amount of expenditure categorised as consultants' services fell to £6.4m in 2010/11 from £10.1m in 2009/10. Spend for the first half of 2011/12 is £2.9m.

**22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL**

Will the cabinet member for resources, finance and community safety support our motion to use some of the £9 million he was planning to put in the contingency fund in February to fully fund the safer neighbourhood team sergeants?

**RESPONSE**

The decision by the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) to cut safer neighbourhood team sergeants was not one that was supported by the council. Each ward in Southwark has specific challenges and we have made it clear to the MPA that cutting posts in Southwark at the same level as other London boroughs, who do not experience the level of crime and anti-social behaviour, does not make sense. Having taken advice from senior police officers in Southwark it is also likely that the MPA would not accept the additional funding at this stage, as they are looking to reduce staffing and staffing costs.

A better approach from the MPA would be to review their decision and place sergeants in those wards in London where they will have the biggest impact and reduce posts in the capital's low crime wards.

In terms of cuts, Southwark Council has faced one of the highest levels of cuts in London, considerably higher than those required from the MPA. As a result the council has had to make significant savings of £2.8m from community safety. This has been compounded by a significant loss of central government grant funding for crime prevention and intervention work. 73% of government grant was removed last year amounting to £2.65m.

Lobbying the Metropolitan Police and GLA to ensure that Southwark has the policing numbers that it needs, is our best approach.

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

Will the cabinet member for resources, finance and community safety outline what consultation with local people occurred before he took the decision to shut the access route to the Heygate?

**RESPONSE**

The pedestrian entrance to the Heygate Estate on New Kent Road was closed under emergency closure notice' powers, which does not require any statutory consultation to be carried out ahead of implementation.

A letter was hand delivered to all remaining residents on the estate notifying them of the closure notice in advance of the formal closure and clear signage was also erected at all entrance points informing pedestrians of the no through route.

The police and community safety provided evidence on crime and anti-social behaviour in the New Kent Road area and where the pedestrian access existed leading on to the estate. Both police and community safety officers raised concerns about the increase in crime in the vicinity of the pedestrian access. The recommendation was to close this access at the earliest possible opportunity on safety grounds. As such the council would not undertake formal consultation.

Since the access route has been closed we have seen a reduction in crime in the area.

**24. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER**

Please can the cabinet member for resources, finance and community safety provide figures for:

- a) the total number of complaints received by the noise team since 1 April 2011
- b) the number of out of hours complaints received since 1 April 2011
- c) the number of complaints that have resulted in court action since 1 April 2011?

**RESPONSE**

- a) 5467 service requests have been received since 1 April 2011; this figure includes all requests relating to nuisance and responded to by the noise team but is not limited to noise.
- b) 320 service requests have been received outside of operational hours. All service requests are attended to regardless of the time they are received. During operational hours the team aims to respond to rapid response service requests within an hour. Those received outside of that time are responded to on commencement of the morning shift. The three days response requests are not affected.
- c) Since April 2011 133 notices have been served, and one complaint has resulted in a contravention of a notice. The case was heard at Tower Bridge Magistrates' Court on 14 October 2011 and a guilty verdict was returned. The defendant was fined £250 and ordered to pay costs of £899.

**25. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK**

Will the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety please provide how much the council has spent since 1 April 2011 on refreshments for meetings and training based in council offices? How much of the refreshments are not consumed?

**RESPONSE**

Between 1 April 2011 and 31 October 2011 the council has spent £34,063 on refreshments at meetings in council offices.

The council no longer provides refreshments at training functions commissioned internally so the expenditure can be considered in the wider context of meetings. Protocols were revised on 20 June 2011.

This figure is approximately half of the equivalent figure for 2010/11 as steps have been taken to reduce and control spending. Data relative to consumption of refreshments at meetings is not maintained.

**26. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL**

What further steps will the cabinet member take in order to implement the London Living Wage?

**RESPONSE**

All council staff are paid at the London Living Wage or above. You will recall that we set a budget this year that provided £375,000 in this year and a further £750,000 next year to support our lowest paid workers; that's £750,000 per annum from 2012/13 moving forward. We now need to look to ensuring that our lowest paid agency staff and employees who work for our contractors are properly protected.

The agency workers directive, introduced on October 1 2011, poses some implications for the council but it will allow us to be more transparent on rates for

agency staff. Any agency staff assigned for more than 12 weeks will have to be paid comparative pay rates to permanent employees, and we are working to ensure that all changes are fully in place.

The most significant impact of this legislation will be on low graded staff who will benefit from a pay increase - this will ensure that these agency workers will now earn the London Living Wage as a minimum. We are currently working with the agencies to agree the correct arrangements. The total cost of this scheme (this is likely to be in excess of £500,000 per annum) will be incorporated in the council's budget proposals for 2012/13. I look forward to the support of the whole of council assembly to this initiative.

Other approaches, such as the Swedish derogation model, would result in the council not having to equalise pay for agency workers. But I am of the mind that it would be reprehensible to find ways not to implement the directive in full, and I wholeheartedly welcome the opportunity of guaranteeing a London Living Wage to this group for the first time.

Further, I have requested that the finance director assess the cost of incorporating the London Living Wage within any new contracts or in any contracts that we relet in the future. I have asked him to bring forward a proposal as part of the 2012/13 budget setting process to ensure that we are able to ensure that all London-based employees within these contracts are paid a minimum of the London Living Wage as new contracts are awarded.

We will be reviewing our procurement arrangements accordingly subject to legal advice.

**27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR CLAIRE HICKSON**

Does she believe that the opening of the most recent White Cube on Bermondsey Street, the biggest in London, means that Southwark is continuing to cement its position at the heart of London's contemporary art community?

**RESPONSE**

White Cube Bermondsey opened to the public on 12th October 2011. Jay Jopling set up White Cube in 1993 as a project room for contemporary art and it has been one of the most influential commercial galleries of the past decade. White Cube has presented the work of many leading British and international artists.

The impressive new art space in Bermondsey is the largest of the three White Cube galleries in London and provides space for larger exhibitions, artists' films and lectures, presentation space, as well as an auditorium for an education programme. The art space is beneficial for artists, will bring about commercial advantage and will encourage a more diverse audience to engage with arts and culture; encouraging the next generation of up and coming artists and supporting opportunities for collaboration.

As a gallery with international standing in the contemporary art world, the Cube complements the Tate Modern, adding to an already vibrant art scene across Southwark. It is attracting new visitors to Bermondsey and raises the profile of the borough.

White Cube Bermondsey is a substantial addition to an already thriving cultural offer in the borough; it can only work to strengthen our reputation as a leading borough for arts and culture.

**28. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU**

Does she believe that the savings made in the completion of Canada Water library will diminish the final offer to local residents?

**RESPONSE**

Canada Water library opened to the public on 28 November. The opening was a fantastic event and there was a queue to get in. The library is set to be a stunning example of what libraries can achieve, as well as being at the heart of a public space which will form part of a buzzing new town centre. The impressive library is being delivered despite the unprecedented cuts to the council from central government and at a time when libraries across London are closing.

Savings we have made on the revenue budget through making use of self-service technology, by having robust income targets for the library and by ensuring that spend is focused on areas most important to local people.

In addition to this, a thorough review of all capital funding for the library has been conducted reducing the revenue cost from £1.147m to £944,000 per annum.

The library will still be open seven days per week and include all of the originally planned features – 55,000 items of stock (about 20,000 were in the old small library), a 150 seat exhibition and performance space, extensive free public access to ICT, including wi-fi, a café, and meeting and learning spaces.

There will be a full programme of activity for people of all ages including homework and study support, author visits, performance, exhibitions and adult and family learning.

The library will be a flagship service for the council and will provide excellent facilities for local people. It represents our strong commitment to providing a first class library service for all of Southwark's communities.

**29. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

While it is good news that the council is keeping all 12 of Southwark's libraries open, could she set out the savings the council has found elsewhere in the library services budget in order to achieve this?

**RESPONSE**

Despite having to respond to the cuts imposed by central government, we have worked with the community to identify ways of making savings whilst retaining a high quality library service. The review into library services showed that libraries are a vital part of the community and a key service that support learning and the development of the local communities served. It is also clear that libraries are increasingly used year on year.

Over 5,000 people responded to the library review survey with several hundred attending public meetings and discussion groups. It is the input of local people, in terms of their ideas and priorities that has informed the cabinet decision and the way forward reflects what residents have told us they would like to see.

The cabinet report on the outcomes of the library service review set out a programme of savings to continue to improve our high quality library service within budget constraints. Savings of £400,000 have to be found over the next two years and the areas within which these will be found are detailed below:

- £120,000 to be saved through a staff re-organisation;
- £80,000 to be saved through reduced and refocused opening hours at 4 libraries;
- £40,000 to be saved from the introduction of volunteers to the service;
- £50,000 to be saved through cross-borough working;
- £50,000 to be saved through re-providing Camberwell Library and reducing its running costs; and,
- £57,000 additional rental income through locating additional council services to Peckham Library's currently vacant second floor.

**30. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR KEVIN AHERN**

Can she provide an update on the council's preparations for London 2012?

**RESPONSE**

London 2012 will be a great opportunity for the council to host the biggest sporting event in the world. The Games will play a vital role in ensuring our residents and visitors have the complete London 2012 experience.

Southwark Council is working in partnership with key organisations to develop and deliver its Olympic and Paralympic vision and operational and legacy plans across Southwark. The partnership includes:

- Volunteer Centre Southwark
- Southbank and Bankside Cultural Quarter
- Southwark Arts Forum
- London Southbank University
- Better Bankside
- Team London Bridge
- Fusion.

Plans are being overseen by the Southwark Olympic Delivery Board, chaired by Olympic cyclist Tony Doyle, and delivered via the seven work streams listed below:

- Engaging young people - led by Pat Shelley, LBS head of services for young people
- Southwarkexperience - led by Donald Hyslop, director of regeneration and communities for Tate Modern
- Health and wellbeing - led by Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle
- Olympic capital legacy - led by Councillor Peter John
- Marketing and communications - led by Robin Campbell, LBS head of communications

- Public service operations - led by Jonathon Toy, LBS head of community safety and enforcement
- Volunteering and employment - led by Clive Pankhurst, chief executive of Volunteer Centre Southwark.

A full action plan has been developed and some of the projects and developments are listed below.

- Olympic capital legacy fund - £2m capital investment in ten sports facilities to improve participation in sport and provide a tangible legacy
- Volunteering strategy and web portal - Olympic and Paralympic inspired strategy that takes volunteering in Southwark beyond 2012
- Exercise Redgrave - a full strategic and operational four day test exercise took place in July as part of our business continuity and emergency planning
- Youth volunteering - 120 new young people to sign up to Olympic related volunteering programmes launched in July with over 70 signed up to date
- Community sports - Southwark are delivering two large and eight mini Olympic and Paralympic events from July 11 - September 2012
- Get Set London - 88% of schools signed up to the London 2012 education programme
- Health factor challenge - 13 local people took part in a ten week programme to take small steps in improving their health and spreading the word
- Host borough status - in May Southwark signed up as a 'Host borough of the Olympic and Paralympic Games', allowing us to use the official logos
- Olympic e-newsletter - Southwark is the only borough to have monthly Olympic e-newsletter and half termly schools e-newsletter
- Revealed London - Southwark Council are being funded by the GLA to deliver event management training across London as part of London 2012 Festival
- Signage and wayfinding - Southwark are delivering £250,000 upgrade of signage in the Borough and Bankside area with Legible London
- River walkway improvements - Southwark are delivering £2.6m of improvement to the river walk way to increase physical accessibility.

More details can be found online at [www.southwark.gov.uk/london2012](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/london2012) where you can also sign up to the Olympic e-newsletter.

**51. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO**

Does the cabinet member for culture, leisure, sports and the Olympics think the allocation of the Southwark Olympic Legacy has been proportionally allocated across the whole borough?

**RESPONSE**

The objective of the Southwark 2012 capital legacy group is to invest £2m in capital projects that support a lasting Olympic and Paralympic legacy in Southwark from the 2012 games, improving access to and increasing participation in physical activity and encouraging the development of the Olympic values in the borough's communities.

The group was formed in November 2010 and is chaired by the leader of the council. The group is composed of external delegates from the local business community, London Southbank University and Sport England, the MP for Dulwich



and West Norwood, Southwark Council cabinet members and senior council officers.

The capital legacy funding process was split over two stages. The first stage invited project proposals based on criteria agreed by the capital legacy group. The second stage centred on gaining more detailed information about feasibility, risk and the ability of the proposal to increase participation in sport and physical activity.

Projects were judged on the merit and strength of their submission, the feasibility of the proposal and importantly, the ability of the project to increase participation in sport and physical activity.

While geographical location was considered it was not the only factor. To weight the short listing process towards projects that were evenly spread across the borough may have meant sacrificing projects of high quality, feasibility and with the ability to increase participation in sport in favour of project proposals of a lower quality and higher risk but that were equidistant and covered all parts of Southwark.

Geographically, only Borough & Bankside and Walworth community council areas will not be home to an Olympic capital legacy project. In respect of these areas it is important to note that in November 2010, the cabinet agreed a total project budget of £20m for a re-development of the Elephant and Castle leisure centre. The new centre, due to be completed in 2014, will host a six lane swimming pool, four-court sports hall and fully equipped gym, ensuring that communities in this area will, in the near future, benefit from significant capital investment in local sporting infrastructure. The leisure centre will improve access to and increase participation in sport and physical activity in much the same way as capital legacy projects aim to do in the rest of the borough.

**31. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON**

Our successful Millwall Friday night football sessions at the James Allyn's Girls School's astroturf pitch is currently providing a much-needed healthy outlet for up to 80 young people every Friday night from 7.30pm until 9.00pm, but we have trouble raising funding every year and will run out of funding for this year after Christmas. Because the hours of the sessions are outside community games coaches' working hours, we have always had problems including these sessions within the community games program, which is why we've gone to Millwall for provision. Therefore, can the cabinet member for culture, leisure, sports and the Olympics please provide a breakdown of all the costs of the community games programme - including the locations of all the existing sessions - and will she consider funding our Millwall sessions out of next year's community games budget allocation in tandem with the community games sessions in the rest of the borough?

**RESPONSE**

The total core budget for the community sports team is £300K which comprises £200K in staffing costs for the six full-time community sports coaching and employment of the community sports manager and two sports development officers. The future budget for the community sports team is under review.

The SCG winter street programme is detailed below:

Week Day	Venue	Time	Community Council
Monday	Tabard Gardens, Tabard Street (in Partnership with Millwall community scheme)	5 - 7pm	Borough
Monday	Millwall Lions Centre (in Partnership with Millwall community scheme)	6 - 7.30pm	Rotherhithe
Monday	Damilola Taylor Centre	4.30 - 6pm	Peckham
Monday	Central Venture Park, Kelly Ave Off Commercial Way	4.30 – 5.30pm	Peckham
Monday	Westminster House Youth Centre	Not advertised, closed session	Nunhead
Tuesday	Lorrimore Square Pitch	4.40 – 5.40pm	Borough
Tuesday	4 Squares Est. Pitch Layard Sq.	5 - 6pm	Bermondsey
Tuesday	Dulwich Library, Lordship Lane	4.45 - 5.45pm	Dulwich
Tuesday	Hollington Youth Centre	5.30- 6.30pm	Camberwell
Wednesday	Mint St. Adventure Play Centre	5 - 6pm	Borough
Wednesday	Bacon's College 5 aside Astro turf Pitches	5 - 6pm	Rotherhithe
Wednesday	Damilola Taylor Centre	4.30 - 6pm	Peckham
Wednesday	Hollington Youth Centre	6.30 - 7.30pm	Camberwell
Thursday	Salmon Youth club	4.45 – 5.45pm	Bermondsey
Thursday	Ellen brown Play Centre	4 - 5pm	Bermondsey
Thursday	Burgess Park Adventure Playground	5 - 6pm	Walworth
Thursday	Bethwin Adventure Playground	4.45 -5.45pm	Camberwell
Friday	Ellen brown Play Centre	4pm - 5pm	Bermondsey
Friday	Elephant & Castle Leisure Centre	5 - 6pm	Walworth
Friday	Dog Kennel Hill Adventure	4.30 - 5.30pm	Dulwich

Week Day	Venue	Time	Community Council
	Playground		
Friday	Central Venture Park	5 - 6pm	Peckham
Friday	Damilola Taylor Centre (Kickz session in Partnership with Millwall community scheme)	6 - 7.30pm	Peckham

The Millwall community sports (MCS) team provides a valuable service to young people and the James Allen Girls School (JAGS) session is highly successful, however there has always been a problem with the sustainability of the JAGS based session. The community sports development team has therefore been providing support in kind and in cash to the programme over fourteen months on the understanding that, in order to both be equitable to other community sports groups (who are also desperate for funding) and also because the community sports team does not have funding to commission work from anyone on an ongoing basis, the financial support has to be on a short-term basis in return for a service level agreement. The funding has in any case been diverted from other projects or earned from external sources by the council's community sports team and re-directed to JAGS.

As a charity, MCS are also able to access a wider range of external funding opportunities and officers of the council are more than willing to work with them and other partners in the Community Sports and Physical Activity Network (CSPAN) Partnership, "Southwark Proactive", to try and secure funding from external sources which will make the MSC programme sustainable in the long term. The community sport development team (CSD) has assisted the Millwall community scheme with funding applications and through the 'sportivate' programme whereby £1,640 was secured and also through the 'Us Girls' project, from which a further £600 was raised.

In February 2012 Southwark community games team will be delivering a community sports leaders award level 1 at Belair Park Community Centre in the school half term. The course has been specifically targeted in the Dulwich area to capture young people in that catchment. This is a joint partnership with youth services team and as part of the Engaging Young People Olympic Delivery Board work strand.

**32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN MORRISSEY**

Is she disappointed that there will no longer be a council-run event in the south of the borough this year?

**RESPONSE**

Yes, I am disappointed in the sense that even with a reduced events budget for 2011/12 we envisaged an event in the north, middle and south of the borough and the event in the south could not go ahead in the end.

We will carry out more extensive consultation in the south of the borough before making final plans for next year. A free fireworks display went ahead on 5 November in Southwark Park attended by 10,000 people - double the numbers who attended last year.

We will soon be consulting residents to find out what type of festival or event local people might like to see in the south of the borough next year. A meeting is to be arranged with councillors in the south of the borough in the next few weeks to start off this consultation.

**33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON**

To publish a table containing the following admissions data for school applications to Kingsdale School for entry in September 2010 and 2011:

- a) The number of applications made by pupils from Langbourne Primary School, and show the numbers who successfully gained a place?
- b) The number of applications made by pupils in schools outside the borough, and show the numbers who successfully gained a place?

Any successful applications due to appeals or with statements should be quantified.

**RESPONSE**

Kingsdale Foundation School is an academy, and under government legislation, it is its own admissions authority. This means that the school, rather than the local authority, sets its own admissions criteria and is responsible for ensuring full compliance with these arrangements. As an academy it is also responsible for ensuring any appeals against a decision not to admit a child are heard by an independent appeals panel. The local authority does not hold details of how many appeals have been heard and upheld, and the school is not required to give the local authority this information.

(a) The number of applications by pupils from Langbourne Primary School to Kingsdale Foundation School and the number who successfully gained a school place:

Year	Number of Applications from Langbourne pupils	Number who successfully gained a place
2010	16	8
2011	18	0

18 children from Langbourne applied for places at Kingsdale for 2011. None of these applicants were in the priority categories of being Looked After Children, having siblings at the school or having social or medical needs. All were therefore subject to random allocation, where the applications are randomly selected through a ballot process. Of the 18 applicants, 10 received a place at other schools that they applied to as a higher preference than they had made Kingsdale.

(b) The number of applications to Kingsdale Foundation School by out of borough pupils and the number who successfully gained a place:

Year	Number of Applications by out borough pupils	Number who successfully gained a place
2010	478	114
2011	928	129

**34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Would the cabinet member for children's services please provide a breakdown by ethnicity of children in the council's care:

- awaiting a decision as to whether to put up for adoption (with the shortest, average and longest wait)
- awaiting adoption following a decision to put up for adoption (with the shortest, average and longest wait)
- in respect of whom a decision has been made that adoption would not be in the best interests of the child.

Within each of (a), (b) and (c) above the information being given for the following categories: foundlings; other children under one year of age at the time of coming into care; children aged one year or over but under five at the time of coming into care; children aged five years or over but under 12 at the time of coming into care; and children 12 and over at the time of coming into care?

**RESPONSE**

**Would the cabinet member for children's services please provide a breakdown by ethnicity of children in the council's care:**

- awaiting a decision as to whether to put up for adoption (with the shortest, average and longest wait)**

This cannot be answered because "awaiting a decision to put up for adoption" is not a recognised category that can be measured in the Children Looked After data set.

- awaiting adoption following a decision to put up for adoption (with the shortest, average and longest wait)**

This has been interpreted as meaning the time from when the final order in care proceedings has been made to the time when the prospective adopters have secured an adoption order.

<b>Children waiting for adoption</b>	
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
White British	9 (24%)
White & other ethnicity, & other mixed	15 (41%)
Black (African, Caribbean, other)	13 (35%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>

**c) in respect of whom a decision has been made that adoption would not be in the best interests of the child.**

There are 544 children in care of whom 37 are awaiting adoption. For the remaining 507 children (ethnicity in the table below) there is an alternative care plan in place that does not include seeking adoption e.g. if rehabilitation within the family, or a special guardianship order is considered a desirable outcome. In many cases the decision not to put up for adoption is linked to the age of the children. Most prospective adopters want to adopt a baby or child under 5. The majority (80%) of children looked after are older than this.

<b>Children looked after not awaiting adoption</b>		
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>number</b>	<b>%</b>
White British	128	25%
White & other ethnicity, & other mixed	106	21%
Black (African, Caribbean, other)	224	44%
Asian/other	49	10%
<b>Total Children Looked After</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Within each of (a), (b) and (c) above the information being given for the following categories: foundlings; other children under one year of age at the time of coming into care; children aged one year or over but under five at the time of coming into care; children aged five years or over but under 12 at the time of coming into care; and children 12 and over at the time of coming into care?**

No foundlings (abandoned children with unknown parents) are placed in Southwark's care. Of the 20 children currently placed for adoption: 17 were under one year old; two were under five years; old, and one was over five years old, on entry to care. No children currently placed for adoption were older than 12 on entry to care.

**52. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON**

Please can the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling provide:

- i) the total number of chargeable parking spaces available across Southwark in each of the last 5 years.
- ii) the net increase/decrease in the number of chargeable parking spaces since May 2010?

**RESPONSE**

The boroughs traffic orders, extending back many decades, define the geographical position and type of every parking bay in the borough. They do not, however, state the number of spaces in each bay - this is not required.

Prior to 2010, the number of paid-for (chargeable) parking bays has not been captured on a borough-wide level. There is no duty placed upon the council to hold this data in this manner.

Since 2010, we have moved parking bay data into a spatial database that allows for much greater analysis and sharing; this remains a work in progress.

The data available at the moment was recently provided in the published [Annual Transport Report](#) (figure 15). In specific response to the question, chargeable spaces are identified in the following table.

Parking bay type	Number of spaces (5.5m equivalent)	Proportion of all CPZ parking bays
Pay and display / pay-by-phone	944	5.8%
Shared-use (pay and display / pay-by-phone or permit holders)	4002	24.5%
Data export 12/11/10		

It is noted that any change to the type or extension or reduction of a parking bay (of any type) will be reported to the local community council before statutory consultation is carried out.

### 53. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER

With the dramatic increase in controlled parking zone yearly permit charges from £99.30 to £125 has the cabinet member considered, as a sign of good will to Southwark residents, giving a number of complimentary parking vouchers to people when buying or renewing permits?

#### RESPONSE

I thank him for his suggestion. The suggestion has some attractions, although it would have been more helpful to know whether it relates to residential or visitor permits. Nevertheless, next year we are planning to consult on the introduction of a carbon based fee structure for residential vehicle parking permits, so I am not planning to introduce anything new before then which could have the effect of making the permit system less clear.

Whilst charges have increased by £25.70 to £125 a year, the cost of a resident parking permit in Southwark remains well below the inner London average of £143 as can be seen in the table below.

	Camden	Hammersmith & Fulham	Islington	Kensington & Chelsea	Lambeth	Southwark	West
Annual residents permit price	£119	£119	£0-£200	£125	£180	£31.25-£125	£0-£120

The medium term resources strategy 2010/11 – 2012/13 and the corporate income policy require that all fees and charges are increased to a level, at a minimum, that is equal to the most appropriate London average except where this conflict with council policy would lead to adverse revenue implications or would impact adversely on vulnerable clients.

As the charges are in line with this strategy and set at a reasonable level, complimentary parking vouchers will not be pursued at this time. Residents who drive electric, hybrid or liquefied petroleum gas vehicles will however continue to receive a concessionary 75% discount on the standard charge as compared against traditional fuelled vehicles.

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

Would the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling, Councillor Barrie Hargrove, confirm whether he is taking up the offer of funding by Transport for London to sustain the threatened school crossing patrols in Dulwich and elsewhere in the borough in 2012/13?

**RESPONSE**

Our review of the service is still ongoing. As agreed at the cabinet meeting of 29 July 2011, we are discussing with schools and the wider community to see what might be the best long-term solution for staffing at light-controlled crossings.

While we can explore the possibility of using the Transport for London funding for this purpose, it is money that is already allocated and which we would have to remove from other areas.

**54. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK**

Please will the cabinet member update council on the progress of prioritising ex-service personal on the housing waiting list?

**RESPONSE**

A cross-party member working group will review the council's lettings policy from January 2012 and this will allow for the issue to be given full consideration, taking into account the new guidance and powers the government has indicated they will grant to local authorities in the New Year. Meanwhile, further limited changes on additional priority within the current lettings policy are under consideration, the outcome of which will be announced in January 2012. The policy already provides for ex-service personnel who have sustained serious injury to be given top priority for an adapted home if they have an assessed need for that type of property.



**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY)****TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011****QUESTIONS ON REPORTS****ITEM 5.1 TREASURY MANAGEMENT – MID YEAR UPDATE 2011/12****1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY**

Given the poor interest rates being received, has the cabinet member considered deploying a proportion of the huge sums held on deposit to lend to first-time home buyers in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

The proposal would require a policy review to determine the feasibility of implementing such a scheme, including the financial risks and costs should borrowers default. We do not provide a banking service, however, and have no current plans to. The sums held on deposit underpin the financial viability of the council and are not unreasonable for an organisation of our type, size and activity.

It is not expected that council officers are best placed to make the necessary credit assessment of, and engage financially with, borrowers. We will consider working with banks or other institutions that do have such skills and mechanics, although we are not looking to do the bankers jobs for them or to further underwrite their risks and profit.

A small number of schemes elsewhere have considered that the Housing Acts allow powers for a proposal of this nature. Those schemes have worked with banks through councils providing balances as guarantees and indemnities, in order to allow targeted borrowers to access better and more affordable mortgage facilities from the banks.

The cash balances of the council represent moneys set aside in reserves and other balances to meet future spending plans and liabilities. The use of cash balances to support a proposal of this nature, whether through direct advances or through banks, would need to be treated as capital expenditure, and would therefore reduce the resources otherwise planned to meet current council priorities.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY**

Thank you Madam Mayor, yes I would. I would like to thank the cabinet member for his response and I would like to ask him that given that the council does at any one time carry several hundreds of millions of pounds in its various accounts, would he consider looking at some innovative ways of using some of that, given the really poor interest rates that we do receive; because clearly at times like this it is for the council to help kick-start some of these processes as much as it is for waiting for the government to send the money down?

**RESPONSE**

I will like to thank Councillor McNally for his supplemental question. I think the answer sets out things quite clearly in this situation. I think the real challenge in what he is proposing is first of all the risk that is associated with that, and secondly the fact that these reserves are not unused money, they are money that has been earmarked for a purpose, so what he is really talking about is identifying capital funding for this purpose. Now if we do that, and you will be well aware of the pressure we have on capital budgets at the moment, particularly in this year, next year and the year after, that means we will have to forgo important capital projects in this borough, which I am sure all of us would not want to see. So I think it is an interesting suggestion, it is not that far from some of the suggestions we were making in opposition and the parties opposite were telling us wouldn't work then, so I am not sure the situation has changed a great deal. I think the answer is in terms of the issues about risks that we will be putting the council's funds to, I think mean that it is probably not a sustainable idea but an interesting one.

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

Given the poor interest rates being received, has the cabinet member considered following the example of other boroughs and providing a £2 million subordinated loan to London Mutual Credit Union to give them a greater facility to offer affordable borrowing to Southwark residents in order to address the shortage of affordable credit when compared to payday loans with usurious interest rates?

**RESPONSE**

I understand that the leader of the council recently met with London Mutual to offer any practical assistance that the council can to bring affordable credit to a larger number of people in Southwark, particularly in view of the dramatic rise in short-term, high interest money lending on the high street. Whilst London Mutual did not request assistance through a loan at that time, I understand that conversations with them continue. It is of great credit to London Mutual that their success has been achieved with limited financial support and on the initiative of their management. Their recent expansion into new offices in Peckham is a reflection of the progress that they are making and their growing number of clients who can benefit from their skills and expertise.

A loan to an organisation such as the London Mutual could be a policy objective irrespective of the level of external interest rates and the return the council receives on its balances, as in periods of higher interest rates the alternative providers are still likely to require very high returns, if not even higher.

An advance of this nature does not meet the definition of an investment for treasury management purposes, and would count as capital expenditure albeit that this may be achieved through a revenue contribution. Consideration would need to be given to the rate of return expected from the London Mutual, as this would affect their ability to meet its objectives.

The cash balances of the council represent moneys set aside in reserves and other balances to meet future spending plans and liabilities. The use of cash balances to finance this item as capital expenditure would reduce the resources otherwise planned to meet other council priorities.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER**

Yes please Madam Mayor. Could Councillor Livingstone ask London Mutual if further capitalisation would help them in helping more Southwark residents? I note he said that it would involve capital or revenue, but Southwark has over a quarter of a billion pounds in various types of investments. Offering to buy a one of two million pound bond in London Mutual would count as an investment it wouldn't take capital out of the capital budget and it wouldn't cost revenue.

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Barber, whose supplemental question is similar to my answer before. I mean, it is an interesting idea but it is not something that London Mutual itself thinks is worth pursuing. It is not something they have been discussing with us in any way, but the issues around what we will be doing about capital are pretty much in the answer to Councillor McNally. It is not something that London Mutual Credit Union is seeking. We are obviously trying to work with them in other ways; I think the credit union has a fantastic role to play, a really important role to play. but this is not something which is a sensible investment of our money at this time and it would not be a good use of capital given those pressures in the capital budget that we have.

<b>Item No.</b> 2.3	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 25 January 2012	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council Assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Deputation Requests	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear a deputation from the three groups listed in paragraph 6 of the report.
2. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear any of the other deputations listed in paragraph 7 of the report

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. The council assembly procedure rules state that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting, and deputations shall be considered in the order of receipt. However the meeting can decide to suspend this rule in order to hear more or vary the order.
4. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, council assembly can decide:
  - to receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; *or*
  - that the deputation not be received; *or*
  - to refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
5. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. One member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than five minutes. The deputation spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by him or her shall be invited to ask a question of the leader or relevant cabinet member. After this time councillors may ask questions of the deputation for up to five minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public seating area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

### Deputation requests

6. The following deputation requests were the first three requests received. The deputations are listed in order of receipt.

#### 1. Save Your Riverside

The deputation request states:

“The impact of the proposed use of Chambers Wharf by Thames Water as an industrial site for seven years to build the Thames Tunnel – the impact is a serious one in a densely populated part of Bermondsey. The site is bordered on two sides by council estates. The celebrated Riverside Primary School, of which Peter John is Chair of the Governors, will feel the major impact of up to 90 lorry journeys daily for the duration of the building stage. The impact on small children will be horrendous and the school heads and parents are already up in arms about it. The site is totally unsuitable for what they propose. It is too small for their intended use so that they must build a coffer dam 50m wide into the Thames to remove the spoil by river. For three years they will be working 24 hours a day. There are alternatives to the use of this site in Bermondsey which we shall outline.”

## **2. John Donne Primary School, Woods Road, SE15 2SW**

The deputation request states:

‘We would like to talk about energy efficiency and sustainability in public buildings and speak about what work we have already done.’

## **3. Transition Town Peckham (TTP)**

The deputation request states:

“Post riot the local community have been pulling together to engage and motivate the residents to address and work together to prevent a repetition of these circumstances in the future.

In line with this TTP are concerned that low income families or the fuel poor are not always supported adequately or given opportunities facilitated by the council to provide them with access to a range of creative and flexible sustainable energy options to help lift them out of deprivation, gain energy efficient housing and to help them experience more social equality within their communities.

We would like to hear what the council has planned to address this issue?

We are also interested in the processes that the council are adopting to ensure that they maintain sustainable use of finances for future sustainability programmes by:

- factoring in the lessons learnt from the activities undertaken in the Peckham low carbon zone, for example.
- how will future programmes be rolled-out and extended across the borough and what are your plans for other parts of the borough with new initiatives.”

### **Other deputation requests received by the deadline**

7. If council assembly agrees to hear the three deputations listed above it would need to suspend council assembly procedure rule 2.6(11), which states that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting, in order to hear any of the deputations from the list below.

The deputations are listed in order of receipt.

#### **4. StreetLeaders**

The deputation request states:

“The StreetLeader scheme was formed in 2003 and plays a vital role in improving and sustaining the local environment. It focuses on empowering residents to become StreetLeaders, taking an active role in their communities. The programme enables local people to take ownership of their communities, identifying and reporting issues to the council which provides a pro-active resolution for all. It also creates the opportunity for StreetLeaders to be part of a sustainable solution.

StreetLeaders actively undertake street and area audits across the borough. Some of the most common issues raised during the audits are blockage of pedestrian walkway, dog fouling and dog refuse bins. The issue of dog fouling and dealing with those concerned is an ongoing problem and the dog bin issue is now being addressed with normal litter bins being labelled as accepting dog litter. Overall the most common environmental issue highlighted is the blocking of pedestrian walkways with rubbish from businesses, advertising boards, over grown vegetation and general litter from the public.”

The deputation would like to raise the following issues:

1. “How can the council support and develop the StreetLeader programme in order to increase awareness of the scheme, encourage social responsibility and to assist with issues such as those above?”
2. “What are the council’s plans to encourage wider social responsibility as a way of contributing to a sustainable environment?”

#### **5. City of London School**

The deputation request states:

“The topic our spokesperson is going to talk about is; educating young people in Southwark about recycling and energy saving, and what the council’s responsibilities are in terms of recycling in schools.”

#### **6. Southwark Association of Street Traders**

The deputation request states:

“The Southwark Association of Street Traders are concerned with the current situation in respect of the future of street markets in Southwark, not least in the

decline of the numbers of traders actually trading resulting in the rapid decline of Southwark residents using street markets in Southwark.”

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputation Request File	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228
Council Assembly Procedure Rule 2.6, Southwark Constitution	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager	
<b>Report Author</b>	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	20 January 2012	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Title</b>	<b>Comments sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	20 January 2012	

**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 Ground Floor, Tooley Street	<b>1</b>
John Bidy, Cabinet Office	1		
Opposition Group Office	1		
<b>Libraries</b>	<b>3</b>		
Albion / Newington / Local History Library	1 each		
<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>93</b>