



DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Dulwich Community Council held on Wednesday 8 June 2011 at 7.00 pm at Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, London SE22 0JT

PRESENT:	Councillor Lewis Robinson (Chair) Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice-Chair) Councillor Jonathan Mitchell Councillor Rosie Shimell Councillor Andy Simmons
OFFICER SUPPORT:	Ray Boyce (Head Of Older People Services) Abdullahi Mohamed-Ibrahim (Neighbourhood Co-ordinator - Dulwich) David Farnham (Public Realm Design Quality Manager) Grace Semakula (Community Council Development Officer- Camberwell & Dulwich) Gerald Gohler (Constitutional Officer)

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The chair welcomed councillors, members of the public and officers to the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for absence from Councillors James Barber, Toby Eckersley, Helen Hayes and Michael Mitchell; and for lateness from Councillors Jonathan Mitchell and Andy Simmons.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

The chair announced that the meeting had received an urgent and late deputation

request by residents of Holmdene Avenue regarding parking charges;

and that late and urgent reports had been received for the following agenda items:

- Item 10 - Dulwich Community Council Fund for 2011
- Item 13 - Remedial works in Red Post Hill, reallocation of CGS funding.

5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2011 be agreed as an accurate record of that meeting, and signed by the chair.

6. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS (IF ANY)

AGREED:

That the meeting hear a deputation submitted by residents of Holmdene Avenue regarding the proposed increase in controlled parking zone (CPZ) charges.

The spokesperson for the deputation explained that residents were concerned that Southwark Council was considering increasing the parking fees in Holmdene Avenue for the following year. Parking fees had only been introduced there in January 2011, and it was unfair that the council was proposing an increase already. Furthermore, the council had not sought the views of residents on this proposal. The undersigned residents strongly objected to this proposal and urged Councillor Barrie Hargrove, the cabinet member responsible, to reconsider. They also sought an assurance that they would be consulted and their views would be given due weight before any changes were made to the parking fees in Holmdene Avenue.

Councillors discussed the council's proposed increases in parking charges and the two options which had been consulted on. One of them comprised a flat increase in parking charges for all residents permits, the other proposal was to introduce charges based on vehicle emissions. The chair commented that he felt the CO2 based system of charges was unfair to people on low incomes with old cars, and did not address the fact that some areas in Dulwich Community Council used off-street parking which was free. Councillors reminded residents that putting in place and policing CPZs cost money, and the parking charges were part of paying for them.

ACTION: The chair to write to Councillor Barrie Hargrove, cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling, to support the deputation, and to ask for a response on the impact of increased charges on residents who cannot afford a new car, and the insufficient nature of the consultation on the increase.

The meeting heard calls for controlled parking zones to be abolished and for free parking to be introduced. Councillors said that the council sometimes gave conflicting

environmental messages. Arguments were heard that in order to deter commuters from parking in the area, parking regulations only needed to be enforced 1 hour a day, and savings could be made by reducing the number of wardens. This should be remembered when the parking contract was up for renewal.

7. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS

At this point Councillor Jonathan Mitchell joined the meeting.

The chair explained that an agreement had been reached between the parties for the chair to rotate each year. He continued by saying that he had a clear agenda for the community council for the coming year, including:

- No more powerpoint presentations
- Using the community council to give a voice to this part of the borough, in view of the difficult decisions which would be made at Tooley Street

The chair made the following announcements:

- The next themed debate at council assembly on the 6 July 2011 was Sport and Young People. This would provide an opportunity for residents to voice their opinions.
- Review of the library service: There was a consultation about the library service currently being conducted. This would be included on the agenda for the September meeting of the community council. The chair said that residents and councillors would make their views clear that they value the area's three libraries Dulwich, Grove Vale and Kingswood.
- The Democracy Commission was a cross-party group of councillors tasked with bringing the council closer to residents and making it more accountable to them and more connected with their concerns. The second phase of the Democracy Commission, involved a review of the eight community councils and would include: looking at ways to make savings, discussing what community councils currently do and how this could be improved, and identifying what residents particularly value about community councils. The Democracy Commission was seeking the views of local people as part of this review. Residents were encouraged to fill in the questionnaires provided and to return them to officers at their local community councils by Monday 29 August 2011 or to email them to democracy@southwark.gov.uk
- Dulwich Leisure Centre: £6.2 million was allocated to completely upgrade the building and facilities whilst preserving and enhancing the historical features. On Saturday 25 June visitors would see the completion of the centre refurbishment, now inclusive to all.

8. COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATES

PS Turnbull from East Dulwich Safer Neighbourhoods Team (SNT) gave feedback about his team's priorities and activities. He also reported back that a colleague in village ward had been run over by a car, and was currently off sick. He reminded the meeting that Superintendent Cheryl Burden had been at the previous meeting to ask for feedback on how the public would like to interact with the police. This consultation had been extended to 12 June 2011. He said that the response rate in the south of the borough had been one of the highest in London.

His team were leading on revisiting neighbourhood watch schemes which had been somewhat overshadowed since the advent of the Safer Neighbourhoods Teams. The other priorities of the team were dealing with burglaries and parking around schools.

The meeting expressed their good wishes for the injured SNT officer in Village ward. Questions were raised about what would happen to East Dulwich police station, as residents had difficulties in getting the police to see them. There was a discussion about an alternative home for East Dulwich SNT. Councillors reminded the meeting that they had asked to work closely with the police, and would be defending services in Dulwich. A resident said that there should be a face-to-face reporting facility, which was what people preferred, especially on Saturdays. The fact that there was a police station in the area deterred crime.

A resident said that the areas in front of schools should get a zig-zag rather than a yellow line, and that this needed to be enforced. PS Turnbull said that road enforcement was necessary as well as communicating with parents. In answer to a question from the floor, PS Turnbull said that there was no mystery shopping, but there was a process of calling people back randomly to check they had received a good service from the police. He went to explain that there was no statutory target for waiting times to speak to the police. At Dulwich, there were currently only two counter staff which meant they were stretched because of other commitments such as 999 calls.

The chair said that councillors would take these comments to future meetings with the police, and that members wanted to be kept in the loop about volunteer programmes and school parking enforcement issue.

PS Turnbull responded that there was a schools officer in his team now, who would be speaking to schools about the vehicle obstructions, and educating parents.

9. THE FUTURE OF HOLMHURST DAY CENTRE

Ray Boyce, Head of Older People Services, informed the meeting about the latest developments around Holmhurst Day Centre which provided day care mostly for older people with dementia. He went on to say that closing a centre was always a sad and difficult decision, which had been taken in light of the council's grants having been cut. The attendees at Holmhurst, which had not run at full capacity and was expensive to run, would be transferred to the Fred Francis centre. This was nearby, had spare capacity for the former attendees of Holmhurst, and was able to offer Sunday opening. The closure had been decided after consultation with service users and carers. It ensured that no one was missing out. New arrangements would also include personal

budgets, so some services could be delivered away in people's homes.

The chair expressed his concern that when the budget papers were published, the closure of the centre had been included, while the consultation had still been in progress. This had upset residents. He asked about the capacity of the Fred Francis centre in future years, what would happen to the specialist team and cases from SLAM (South London and Maudsley) Trust, and whether the needs of those attending Holmhurst were matched by the services offered at Fred Francis. He went on to ask whether the money from the sale of Holmhurst would be reinvested in the Fred Francis centre.

Ray Boyce said that the information had been published as part of the budgeting process and had been out of the hands of his team. The council had a very good relationship with SLAM who were considering relocating their specialist services currently housed on the first floor at Holmhurst to Fred Francis. Fred Francis would ideally also be improved, but this would probably not be possible straightaway. He was unable to say what would happen to the capital receipts from the sale of Holmhurst, but said he would like to see more community based services and assisted housing.

Residents pointed out that because of the transferees from Holmhurst, there may not be any capacity at Fred Francis in the future, and that many whose care needs were not caused by severe dementia would not receive care. This would be made worse by the fact that many voluntary sector organisations had had their grants cut, and would not be able to pick up any slack.

Ray Boyce responded that the criteria for receiving care were nationally agreed ones. He went on to explain that services had to look at how they were delivered, and cited the example of St Christopher's hospice who had managed to expand their hours of operation by changing their model of service delivery. Creative solutions were needed.

There was a discussion about personal budgets, and concerns were raised about the size of these budgets, the falling levels of service they may produce and the fact that dementia sufferers would need support from someone else in order to manage their budgets. Ray said that personal budgets were an important issue and he offered to come back to a future meeting to talk about them.

An idea was floated to use the revenue from the sale of the centre to create a new hub for older people's services on the site of Dulwich hospital.

The chair summarised that he was disappointed at the way the consultation had been handled and that concerns remained about whether Fred Francis centre was adequate for future demand.

10. DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL FUND 2011

Executive Function

AGREED:

That the following amounts of Dulwich Community Council funding (2011/2012) be

allocated to:

Organisation	Name of activity	Allocation
Goose Green PTA	Making Maths Fun	£500
The Vale Residents Association	The Vale Residents Summer Social Event	£650
Dulwich Milan Association	Eid.& Christmas	£400
East Dulwich Community Centre	Open Day at the Centre	£450
East Dulwich Community Centre	Freedom After 50	£450
Gumboots Community Nursery	Gumboots Community Nursery Improved building relaunch	£300
Christ Church. Bread of Life Project	`Just Jamboree`	£400
Dulwich Helpline	Life on the edge day out and community engagement	£500
Pioneer African Caribbean over 50s Group	Celebrating Diversity Event in East Dulwich	£400
African Education Needs Network	Early understanding of Autism and other spectrum Disorders	£250
Upland Road Neighbours	Upland Road Street Party	£250
Redthread Youth Ltd	Reinventing local youth club	£500
Dulwich Going Greener	Energy Monitor Loan Scheme	£700
Delawyk Residents Management Org. Ltd	Day Trip/Outing	£250
South London Women Artists	Series of development talks and exhibitions	£450
Dulwich Park Friends	Dulwich Park Fair	£900
The Dulwich Society	Restoration of ancient hedgerow in Gallery Road	£500

Burbage Road Residents Association	Communication Initiative	£500
Dulwich General Gymnastics Club	To provide one more term of gymnastics	£250
Millwall Community Scheme	Millwall Street Pro [Summer 2011]	£1,000
Sydenham Hill T&RA	Community Fun Day	£750
Kingswood Network	Kingswood Community Festival	£1,000
Caribb Youth & Community Assoc.	Pynners Close Family Day Fun 2011	£500
Southwark CAB	Making the most of your money	£750
Croxted Road T&RA	Croxted After School Project	£500
Croxted Road T&RA	Coach Trip	£690
New leaf path	Community Planting Day	£500
Dulwich Festival	The Dulwich Festival	£710

11. PUBLIC REALM CONSULTATION: ON YOUR STREET, YOUR SAY

David Farnham, Public Realm Design Quality Manager, presented the consultation and conducted a quick poll of attendees about the options included in his presentation.

These were as follows:

Issue 1: Footway materials in Dulwich

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 1. Asphalt (blacktop) | 4 |
| 2. Gravel dressed asphalt | 2 |
| 3. Self-binding gravel | 1 |
| 4. Concrete slab paving | 20+ |

Issue 2: Level surfaces and shared surfaces

Q2a Crossings

- | | |
|--|----|
| a. pedestrians 'cross where they like' | 0 |
| b. easy crossings, but not everywhere | 18 |
| c. restricted crossing points | 6 |

Q2b Curbs

- | | |
|-----------------|----|
| a. raised curbs | 17 |
|-----------------|----|

b. no difference in level 4

Q2c Appearance of surfaces

a. different 17

b. the same 1

Q2d Possible mixed use of streets

a. pedestrians at the edge of street 14

b. mixed use of street 0

Issue 3: Cycle tracks on footways and footpaths

Q3a Cycling on footways

a. cyclists on the road only 2

b. cyclists generally on road,
on footways at dangerous points 15

c. general dual use of footways 2

Q3b Cycle tracks

a. adjacent use 15

b. shared use 2

Issue 4: Providing more seating in streets and other public places

a. regular intervals 5

b. seating only where appropriate 9

c. only minimal seating 1

The chair asked how viable all these options were given the council's tight financial situation.

12. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The chair said a public question had been received in writing regarding the number of estate agents in Lordship Lane. The questioner had expressed their fear that the trend of attracting a large number of individually owned and run businesses was being reversed. At one time there had been concern over the number of cafes and restaurants opening on Lordship Lane, and a ruling had been introduced that not more than 50% of premises should be occupied by catering, with 50% for retail. The questioner had also explained that by "retail" the planners had probably meant shops rather than estate agents, and had called for restrictions to be placed on the number of estate agents. There was a discussion about whether a saturation point had been reached with regards to the number of estate agents on Lordship Lane.

ACTION: Planning department to address the points raised above and to report back to a future meeting in relation to Lordship Lane, and all shopping parades in the Dulwich Community Council area.

A local trader complained that the traders on Norwood Road had been promised that parking on the pavement would be extended to 1-hour-parking from the current half hour parking. He asked why this had not been done.

ACTION: Parking section to report back to the next meeting.

A resident praised the work of the “New Leaf Path” organisation, which had been awarded Community Council funding.

13. CLEANER GREENER SAFER PROJECT FOR RED POST HILL

Executive Function

The meeting heard from a local resident who explained the background to the consultation and its outcome from the perspective of many residents in Red Post Hill. She expressed her concern that the consultation report seemed to imply that 50% participation was required for the consultation to be regarded as valid, i.e. any turnout of under 50% would automatically be a vote for the status quo. She criticised that this had not been made clear to residents, and that if it had, the turnout would have been higher.

The chair said that officers should take this criticism on board, and said that the Democracy Commission would be informed of this.

At this point Councillor Andy Simmons joined the meeting.

AGREED:

- That councillors wish to proceed with the following traffic calming works in Red Post Hill, following public consultation:

Option 3

To replace three sets of cushions with pedestrian refuge islands, and replace the one set south of the junction with Casino Avenue with a pedestrian island on the existing raised zebra crossing.

- That this to include the changes immediately south of the raised pedestrian crossing at the junction of Casino Avenue and Red Post Hill only if resources allow.
- That the set of cushions outside 82/84 Red Post Hill be removed and not replaced.

AGREED:

That identified underspend from Village ward Cleaner, Greener, Safer (CGS) funds can be reallocated to the Red Post Hill scheme to meet any underspend where possible.

Meeting ended at 9.40 pm

CHAIR:

DATED: