



BERMONDSEY AND ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council held on Wednesday 30 January 2013 at 7.00 pm at St James' Church, Thurland Road, London SE16 4AA

PRESENT: Councillor Nick Stanton (Chair)
Councillor Michael Bukola (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai
Councillor Mark Gettleson
Councillor Jeff Hook
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Paul Kyriacou
Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Catherine McDonald
Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Michael Situ

OFFICER SUPPORT: Zoe Bulmer (Customer Resolution Manager)
Farhan Ghafoor (Youth Worker)
Tim Gould (Development Control & Strategic Projects)
Gill Kelly (Community Council Development Officer)
Simon Phillips (Principal Transport Planner)
Juliet Seymour (Planning Policy Manager)
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 Columba Blango, Denise Capstick and Lisa Rajan; and for lateness from Councillors Catherine McDonald, Paul Noblet

and Michael Situ.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

The chair announced that he would vary the agenda as follows:

- Items 10 and 16 "Project bank updated/feedback" and "Community infrastructure project list report" would be deferred to the next meeting on 12 March 2013
- Items 8 and 13 "Workshop feedback" and "Riverside 20mph and Traffic Management report" would be taken together
- Item 14 "Local parking amendments" would be considered after item 8 and 13.

The chair also informed the meeting that SHP Tenancy Support had sent their apologies and were now scheduled to attend the March meeting.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2012 be agreed as an accurate record of that meeting, and signed by the chair.

6. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS (IF ANY)

There were none. At this point, the chair took two announcements.

Canon Gary Jenkins welcomed all attendees to St James' church, and introduced himself as the new vicar for St James & St Anne's, Bermondsey. He informed the meeting that St James' churchyard was soon going to be renovated with the help of Southwark Council.

Southwark's new borough commander, Chief Superintendent John Sutherland introduced himself, saying that he had most recently been Borough Commander in Camden, but had a South London connection, as he had been living in Lambeth for 19 years and had worked a sergeant in Peckham 16 years ago. Since starting in his new position, his first impressions of his colleagues and the council had been very positive. In terms of crime figures, violent crime, burglary and total crime had gone down. The police had, therefore, launched operation Trinity which was going to focus on violence among young people, knife crime and street robberies over the next 15-18 months. He added that times were challenging throughout the public sector and that the

Metropolitan police had to save over £500m. This required changes, however, frontline service provision in Southwark was not going to be affected over the next few years. Rotherhithe police station was likely to close, as it was no longer fit for purpose and expensive to run. The police were, however, looking for a base in the area. The chair asked Chief Superintendent Sutherland to attend a future community council meeting to talk about the proposed closure of Rotherhithe police station.

7. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT WORKSHOPS

The meeting split into transport and traffic related workshops about the following areas:

- Old Kent Road
- London Bridge area
- Lower Road (and Jamaica Road)

8. WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Old Kent Road

Jeremy Leach, from Living Streets, fed back on the issues discussed in the Old Kent Road workshop. Some of these were:

- Potential removal of the Bricklayers Arms flyover
- Bricklayers Arms subways, which are about to be filled in
- The possibility of having a light rail running down the Old Kent Road
- Lorries and dustcarts using side streets, such as Rolls Road and Catlin Street
- Possible speed restriction to 30mph between Rotherhithe New Road and New Kent Road
- Removal of the guard railings
- Putting up images of children to remind motorists to slow down
- Wider pavements to allow pedestrian and cycle use
- Trees as visual, and noise reduction measures
- Longer crossing period at pedestrian crossings especially near Burgess Park, and before and after school
- Possibility of building a pedestrian bridge near the Tesco
- Enforcement action against speeding and dangerous manoeuvres.

The chair remarked that a hierarchy of quickly achievable goals could be established from this list.

London Bridge

Councillor Mark Gettleson fed back on the items discussed in the London Bridge area workshop. Some of these were:

- A survey of traffic movements around the station
- Complaints about existing traffic flows
- Possible pedestrianisation of St Thomas Street
- Need for an assessment of traffic flows in Leathermarket Street and Snowsfield
- Impact of taxis and deliveries to the Shard
- Width of the cycle lane on Bermondsey Street

- Blocked footway in the Bermondsey Street tunnel
- Need for clearer no entry and cycling signs at the Bermondsey Street / Long Lane junction
- Need for a local cycle safety study
- Need for traffic studies to be cross-referenced
- Undertaking by Network Rail to dispose of rubble from the refurbishment works by rail, and their recent proposal to use lorries through Weston Street instead
- Bollards to prevent rat running along Leathermarket Street, Bermondsey Street and Tanner Street
- Making Shand Street one-way southbound
- More and better signs urging motorists to slow down.

ACTION: Officers to come back to a future community council meeting with the results of the traffic survey.

Lower Road

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai fed back on the items discussed in the Lower Road/Jamaica Road workshop. Some of these were:

- Detailed modelling needed following on from the multi-modal study, which would allow the work to be completed over the summer, if funding can be found
- Importance of factoring in pedestrians
- Issues on Lower Road must be discussed with London Borough of Lewisham
- Allowing right turns into Lower Road
- Opening Plough Way
- Issues around Harmsworth Quays
- Getting businesses involved in the process
- Managing the everyday life in the area while works are taking place
- Review of the zebra crossing at Seven Islands Leisure Centre
- Guard rail removal on Jamaica Road
- End of the 24hr bus lanes on Jamaica Road
- There should be yellow boxes at crossings, and these should be designed for pedestrians not cars
- The 188 bus stop is too close to the roundabout.

ACTION: Councillors to write to the Chief Executive of London Borough of Lewisham about the issues around Lower Road.

ACTION: Officers to report back casualty figures from Jamaica Road before and after the removal of the guardrails, to a future meeting.

9. RIVERSIDE 20MPH ZONE AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

This was formerly item 13.

The meeting heard that the proposals as outlined in the report were supported widely, and that this had been an issue local councillors had been campaigning about for many

years. The meeting also heard that the enforcement of the 20mph zone was a police matter and may need to be discussed with the borough commander in the future. Views were expressed that 20mph was still too fast in places. There was agreement with Pottery Street being made one-way, and Wilson Grove made northbound only, however there were concerns about Cathay Street. The six-month monitoring period proposed was welcomed.

Simon Phillips said that he was going to be coming back to the community council regarding Lower Road in the future, and that a list of suggestions regarding moving bus stops, and regarding bus lanes would be forwarded to TfL.

RESOLVED:

1. That the community council agrees with the recommendations in the report:
 - a. That the introduction of the 20mph zone of the scheme outlined in the report is progressed to implementation (subject to statutory consultation).
 - b. That upon analysing the consultation responses from residents on directly affected streets surrounding the proposed traffic management options, option 1 is progressed to the implementation stage. This option will be implemented on a trial basis for 6 months, during which time further traffic analysis of volumes and speeds can take place to ascertain if the measures have been effective.
 - c. That following the trial period, the council re-consults residents to ask them if they would like to make the changes permanent.
2. That the community council asks for the results of the trial period and of the reconsultation to be reported back to a future community council meeting before they go for formal decision.

10. LOCAL PARKING AMENDMENTS

This item was formerly item 14.

Note: This is an executive function.

Councillors considered the information contained in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to the report, be approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:

- Bermondsey Wall East – install one disabled persons' (blue badge) parking bay

- Thurland Road – convert two existing, unrestricted parking bays to G zone permit holder parking bays
- Rotherhithe Street – install double yellow lines at the following locations:
 - a. adjacent to the dropped kerb leading from the Swan Road Estate
 - b. adjacent to the dropped kerb leading to No.133, Hay's Court
 - c. at the junction of Swan Road and Rotherhithe Street.

11. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATES

This item was formerly item 9.

Complaints about licensed premises

The chair informed the meeting that several complaints had been made to councillors about licensed premises in the area. He advised residents that if they witnessed anti-social behaviour in the street, fighting, drinking, urinating etc. to report these to the Police at the time of the incident on:

999 – for serious incidents

101 – for minor or incidents that are likely to be of short duration.

Noise issues associated with the premises should be reported to the council's noise service at the time of the incident on 020 7525 5777.

Residents were also advised to keep a diary or log of all instances and to call the appropriate service to ensure a complaint is logged. A response may be made on the night, however officers may follow up on calls at a later date where an immediate response cannot be made. This usually involved engaging with the premises to find a solution.

If the situation did not improve over time, residents were advised to apply for a review of the premises licence. The incident diaries and logged calls could be used as part of the evidence for the review.

Premises licence review forms were available online or from the licensing section. Licensing officers could offer residents guidance on the review process. Email: licensing@southwark.gov.uk, Tel: 020 7525 2000

Southwark Helping Hands

Vera Keech told the meeting that the group had been founded in 1981, initially to allow disabled young people to experience more of the world. The group, which now also included some disabled adults, operated out of Wade Hall every Wednesday, put on events, arranged holidays abroad, and had recently organised a "mini-Olympics". The group had 30 members and 14 volunteer helpers, and reflected the diversity of the area. It also trained volunteer helpers, but needed help with funding, because the

young people's contributions to the activities only went so far.

Grange Community First

Bill Owen, from the Grange Community First board, informed the meeting that Community First was an England-wide programme, funded by the Office for Civil Society, on behalf of the Government. Grange ward had been successful in attracting some money from the Neighbourhood Match Fund, which was a £30m fund to encourage people to give time and expertise to local projects. The match-funding could be in in-kind donations - cash, services, free products or volunteer time. The aims of Grange Community First were, for example:

- facilitating the provision of complementary, additional activities for young people
- supporting developmental activity to develop a social identity for Grange Ward and to foster community cohesion within the ward
- enhancing the physical identity of the ward with a view to developing a sense of community ownership.

Community First grants ranged between £250 and £2500, and only one grant per year could be given to any one organisation. Projects were only allowed to last one year. All grants had to be matched in cash, or in kind (services or volunteer time).

For further information and to apply, go to <http://grangewardaward.blogspot.co.uk/> or email grangewardaward@gmail.com.

Councillor Mark Gettleson thanked Bill Owen for helping to set up this group.

Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Youth Community Council

Members from the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Youth Community Council informed the meeting that they were fielding applications for the Youth Restoration Fund. Issues they had recently also looked into were litter and cleaner streets. This had also included the members going to Southwark Park and helping with litter picking. For this, they had been rewarded with some fun activities, including driving a Mercedes for an hour.

The chair thanked the members of the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Youth Community Council for attending.

The chair informed the meeting that during the break, attendees had a opportunity to comment on the lists of anonymised projects which were displayed in the church, by way of sticking dots the lists. The result would help to inform the final allocations, which would be decided at the March meeting.

12. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following public questions were submitted in writing:

Boer War Memorial

Responding to a written question about the Boer War Memorial, the chair informed the meeting that he had been given an update by officers. The design had been agreed with stakeholders in October 2012, and an architect had been commissioned to draw up final designs for the tender and works in November 2012. Officers were currently

waiting for designs, and the remainder of the project was as follows:

w/c 4 February 2013	Tender sent to contractors
w/c 25 February 2013	Deadline for tender returns, commission contractor
March - April 2013	Off-site works (3 weeks)
May 2013	Works on site at St James Church.

Canada Water Decathlon site

Responding to a question about a possible planning application for the Canada Water Decathlon site, the chair said that no planning application had formally been submitted, but that one was likely to be submitted imminently. He advised the resident to check the council's planning webpage. There, interested individuals could also sign up to automatic alerts about planning applications which had been submitted in their area.

Tourist Office

In answer to a question about having a tourist office in the area, the chair explained that there had been a council funded tourist office in the London Bridge area, but there had been questions about whether it had provided value for money. The meeting heard that it would be good to signpost and enhance areas like the conservation area around Shad Thames, and that the council should look into providing tourist information in partnership with the management of the Shard, as this was predicted to attract 12 million visitors a year. The area was home to major tourist attractions such as Tate Modern and the Globe. The meeting heard that a new heritage cultural facility next to Potters Field would be created and that there may be some scope for a tourist information point as part of this facility.

Public Toilets

In response to a question about a lack of public toilet facilities in the London Bridge and Tower Bridge areas, the chair told the meeting that the council had closed a number of public toilets in the area, because they had been difficult and expensive to maintain. Toilets in the area, and across the country, were increasingly provided by private businesses. There were public toilets at More London and in Potters Field, however, these could be sign-posted better. Councillors would raise this with the Potters Field management team. The new one-stop shop and the library in the Blue also had toilet facilities which could be made available to the public. Councillor Richard Livingstone said he was happy to follow up on this. The meeting also heard that Kingston council paid businesses a small amount of money to make their toilets available to members of the public, and that the problem was especially bad around Tower Bridge Road and Shad Thames. Councillor Richard Livingstone asked the person who had put the question to speak to him after the meeting, regarding the nuisance caused by people, due to the lack of facilities. The chair reminded the meeting that the development of 1 Tower Bridge Road would provide extra toilet facilities in the new cafes that were being built.

13. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

This item was formerly item 11.

The chair introduced the items by informing the meeting that the community council

was being asked to comment on the Neighbourhood Planning reports, which had been circulated, as part of the consultation process. Two related to Bermondsey, and one to Bankside. These reports had already been considered by main planning committee. In addition to this, there was also a general consultation process which members of the public could feed into directly. All residents and businesses were free to contact the cabinet member responsible, as the consultation about the areas was open to all.

Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager, outlined that the community council was being asked to comment on the proposed boundaries and make-up of the Bankside Forum, and to comment on the proposed boundaries only in relation to the two proposed Bermondsey areas.

Under the Localism Act 2011, residents could ask for the creation of these Neighbourhood Forums. Their purpose was to put together Neighbourhood plans, to run alongside the council's development plans, which planning officers would refer to. Once the forums had put together their draft plans, there would be an informal consultation for six weeks. The results of this would be included in the plan, which would then be handed over to the council. After the full, legal consultation conducted by the council which followed this, the plans could not be changed anymore and would be checked by the planning inspector. The final stage was a referendum for residents and one for businesses, if applicable.

Areas, which had Neighbourhood Plans, would be able to retain 25% of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) generated by them, compared with the usual 15%. The council could change the boundaries of the proposed area, but not refuse applications for neighbourhood forums.

Responding to a comment from the floor, Councillor Mark Gettleson explained that these forums were planning forums and, therefore, different in scope from community councils. If people did not like the proposed neighbourhood plan, they could vote it down in the referendum.

Concerns were expressed about the repercussions for the areas which were not designated in a Neighbourhood Plan, and about the scope and cost of the referenda. Views were expressed that these forums should have been put in place earlier, as much of the regeneration and development of the area had already taken place.

13.1 BANKSIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

Councillors discussed the boundaries and the make-up of the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum.

RESOLVED:

That the community council is happy with the composition of the forum, and with the western and southern boundaries of the proposed area. In terms of the eastern boundary, the community council suggests including both sides of Borough High Street in the area, as the street feels like it is part of the Bankside area.

13.2 BERMONDSEY NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

The chair said that the discussion about items 13.2 and 13.3 would be combined as they overlapped.

The chair proposed to first discuss the boundaries which were broadly the same in both proposals, and said that following on from what had just been discussed under 13.1, the western boundary of the proposed area should exclude Borough High Street. By the same token, both sides of Tower Bridge Road should be included in the area. There was a discussion about the council estates on the eastern side of Tower Bridge Road, and about whether they should also be included in the area in full, in order not to exclude parts of these estates. There was a discussion about the inclusion of St Saviour's estate and the Arnold estate. The meeting heard that care needed to be taken for the proposed area not to become unwieldy due to its size. A suggestion was made to call the area "West Bermondsey", as it effectively ended east of Tower Bridge Road.

There was a discussion about the northern boundary of the area. The chair summarised that there were three possible northern boundaries: Tooley Street, the river or the railway line. There was a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of these options in terms of their impact on the consultation and the referenda. There was also a discussion about the impact of ward boundaries, whether the boundaries should be drawn at the centre of the roads, and about the reasons why the two groups had proposed their respective boundaries.

In terms of the southern boundary of the area, there was a discussion about whether a larger or a smaller scale area would be better, whether the areas covered in the two options faced common issues, and whether they had the same natural constituency. The meeting heard a suggestion that the proposed larger area could be split into a "northwest" and "southwest" Bermondsey neighbourhood. Juliet Seymour explained that this was not a proposal which had been submitted to the council. She explained that if there were two areas, they would both require consultations and referenda. This would probably double what the council had to spend on these. Responding to a question, Juliet explained that officers had been advised these referenda could not be tacked onto other, upcoming elections.

The chair reminded the meeting that the community council had been asked to submit comments only, and that the decision was to be taken by the cabinet member responsible.

RESOLVED:

That the following comments by the community council be relayed to the cabinet member:

- In terms of the western boundary of each of the proposed Neighbourhood Forum areas, this should run up to Borough High Street but not include it. Instead it should border the eastern boundary of the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum plan, which should include the eastern side of Borough High Street.

- That consideration be given to extending the eastern boundary of each of the proposals to include Tower Bridge Road, on both sides, with any necessary “kinks” to prevent the artificial splits in council estates that would follow by just having a rigid straight line.
- In terms of the northern boundary, consideration of a third option, of simply adopting the railway line as the northern boundary, should be given.
- In terms of the southern boundary, there was a straight choice to be made, between the benefit of having a relatively small “St Thomas Street-centric” plan, and the benefit of having a larger “West Bermondsey plan”. The community council believes that if the larger area is to be adopted, the area should be called “West Bermondsey”.

13.3 BERMONDSEY VILLAGE ACTION GROUP

See discussion and resolution under 13.2.

14. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Councillors discussed the question which they would like to put to the Council Assembly meeting on 27 March 2013.

RESOLVED:

That the following question be forwarded to the Council Assembly meeting on 27 March 2013:

“What can the council do to help Southwark Police with their front counter provision, in light of the proposed closure of Rotherhithe police station?”

15. PROJECT BANK FEEDBACK

This item will be considered at the next meeting on 12 March 2013.

16. COMMUNITY INTRASTRUCTURE PROJECT LIST REPORT

This item will be considered at the next meeting on 12 March 2013.

Meeting ended at 10.35 pm

CHAIR:

DATED: