



## **Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council**

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council held on Saturday 8 December 2012 at 1.00 pm at Walworth Academy, 34 - 40 Shorncliffe Road, London, SE1 5UJ

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Martin Seaton (Chair)  
Councillor David Noakes  
Councillor Catherine Bowman  
Councillor Poddy Clark  
Councillor Neil Coyle  
Councillor Patrick Diamond  
Councillor Dan Garfield  
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE  
Councillor Rebecca Lury  
Councillor Darren Merrill  
Councillor Adele Morris  
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Iona McConnell, Investigations Manager  
Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager  
Earl Legister, Team Leader Food Safety  
Pauline Bonner, Neighbourhood Coordinator  
Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer

### **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

### **2. APOLOGIES**

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Claire Hickson and Tim McNally. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Neil Coyle.

### **3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

Members made the following declarations regarding items on the agenda.

#### **Agenda Item 8 Bankside Neighbourhood Forum**

Councillor Adele Morris, Non Pecuniary, as a member of the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum.

#### **4. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the chair.

#### **5. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS**

There were none.

#### **6. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

There were none.

#### **7. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The following community announcements were made:

##### **Borough Commander**

The chair explained that the Borough Commander had given his apologies but wished to attend a future meeting.

##### **Civic Awards**

Ken Hayes from Southwark's Civic Association explained that nominations for the awards had opened. People could be nominated for the awards in recognition of voluntary work undertaken in the borough. Different awards were given such as a young people award, mayor's discretionary award and lifetime award. Ken advised that applications were available at the meeting or could be completed online and that people should give details such as what the volunteer does, where and for how long.

##### **Campaign for Safer Roads**

Jeremy Leach, updated the meeting on the campaign for safer roads around the elephant and castle following recent tragic events and numerous accidents in the area. The campaign was suggested the following changes:

- Slower speeds
- Enforced 20 m.p.h limit on the TfL roads in the area
- Super Cycle infrastructure on the north roundabout
- Safer pedestrian crossings

The campaign had launched an online petition and Jeremy asked the community council for support in bringing the changes requested. In response to questions Jeremy explained that the campaign was not seeking to address the issue of subways and was looking more

at the big picture changes required to improve road safety in the area. Although there were cycle routes which avoided the elephant and castle roundabouts research suggested that 2 out of every 3 new cyclists would opt to use a more direct route through the roundabouts so the route needed to be as safe as possible for cyclists. Councillors offered to facilitate meetings with the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling and TfL. It was suggested that TfL are invited to a future community council meeting.

### **Complaints Procedure**

Iona McConnell, Investigations Manager, pointed out that the council were consulting on changes to their complaints procedure. A reduction in the stages of complaints from 3 to 2 was being considered, it was hoped this would reduce the time taken to deal with complaints. Iona invited people to comment on the proposals, with changes implemented from April 2013. Iona also explained that landlord complaints would now go to the housing, rather than local government, ombudsmen.

In response to questions Iona explained that although the council aimed to resolve complaints at stage 1 this was not always possible. The complaints team were offering additional help and advice to council officers to deal with complaints better. In terms of addressing whether something was a query or complaint officers often had to use their judgement.

## **8. BANKSIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM**

Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager, explained the background to neighbourhood planning and that the community council were being asked to comment on the proposals to designate the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum as a qualifying body and to comment on the appropriateness of the boundary suggested for the plan.

The chair of the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum was not in attendance some other members of the forum, including Cllr Adele Morris, commented on their work.

Members asked how the membership was made up, how people became part of the forum and whether the forum was representative specifically in terms of BME groups. Councillors also questioned whether the forum overlapped with other groups in the area such as TRAs or historical societies. Members also raised concerns about how the forum was constituted and how the membership would replenish – stating that the constitution was more of a statement of current arrangements rather than a document outlining the governance arrangements of the forum (for example the process for electing a chair).

In response to these questions members of the forum explained that the forum was made up of 21 individuals: 7 from local business, 7 from community groups and 7 residents. There were no BME members of the group. The function of the forum specifically related to neighbourhood planning so if a plan was agreed the role of the forum would be to monitor the delivery of the plan. The planning policy officer advised that the governance issues could be addressed before a final report went to the cabinet member for decision and clarified that the role of the community council was to comment on the appropriateness of the area and the group before the cabinet member took a decision.

Members noted the work that the forum had put in getting to this stage.

## **RESOLVED**

That the community council notes the work of the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum and welcomes the development of a neighbourhood plan in the area however the community council requests that the forum considers its governance arrangements and how far the group is representative specifically in terms of BME membership.

## **9. REGENERATION**

Juliet Seymour, Planning Policy Manager, gave a brief update on regeneration projects in the community council area focusing on timescales for the Heygate regeneration. The master plan was scheduled to be considered by the council's planning committee on 15 January 2013 – the committee would consider the applications to demolish the existing buildings on the site, the outline planning permission and detailed design rules. The application was for approximately 2,400 residential units with up to 16,000 sqm of retail.

## **10. FOOD SAFETY**

Earl Legister, Team Leader Food Safety presented the item outlining the role of the food safety team which was to regulate food hygiene compliance in all food businesses in Southwark. The team inspected food businesses on different frequencies based on a risk assessment. If contraventions were found they were dealt with using: written warnings, formal hygiene improvement or prohibition notices and prosecution or simple cautions. Officers cannot issue fines or fixed penalties for contraventions. Earl explained that the team rely on information from members of the public and complaints as source of intelligence.

Earl outlined some statistics in the Borough, Bankside and Walworth area where: 305 inspections have been completed so far this year. Of the 91 high risk premises in the community council area:

- 49 of these are due an inspection by 1 December 2012
- 47 inspected, and the remaining two have been scheduled
- 2 have had formal notices served, both have now complied with the requirements.

296 written warnings have been issued this year. There has been one successful prosecution brought for seven offences identified on the related business premises. Of 110 complaints about food or food businesses this year, 92 have been satisfactorily resolved or were unfounded, and 18 are still subject to follow up or ongoing investigations.

People could contact the team by telephone on 0207 525 2000 and follow the voice prompts or email: [food@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:food@southwark.gov.uk)

In response to questions Earl explained that the team could not enforce across local authority boundaries in the case of takeaways. Non-fixed vendors who for example sold nuts or hot dogs were targeted and food standards could vary at these outlets and currently no information about businesses which contravene food law requirements is published but this may be reviewed in future. However, Earl referred to the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme operated by the team which allows the public to view hygiene ratings of

individual businesses online. .

Ylva Johannesson from Jubilee Hall Trust gave a presentation on healthy eating and shopping. Ylva stressed the importance of choosing wholegrains, five portions of fruit and vegetables a day and sticking to a list and checking labels for hidden sugars when shopping.

## 11. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following questions were raised at the meeting:

East street – when the market has been cleared and cleaned shops on the street are leaving rubbish outside. Can this be addressed?

Can the length of time the payments offices are open over the Christmas period be re-considered so that they are open more over Christmas?

A resident asked if the councillors knew about the GLA funding programme for pocket parks as initial submissions had to be made by the council by 7 Jan 2013 – the chairs advised that councillors would pick this issue up.

A resident asked about whether claims could be made against contractors who had dug up the pavement on East Street. Cllr Lauder responsive that the pavement would be re-tarmaced in certain places as a short term measure and then addressed for the long term. The chair requested that Cllr Lauder given an update at the next meeting on the progress.

The following questions were submitted in writing:

### **Stead Street Development**

- What are the scheduled disruption in terms of road closures, parking , safety for pedestrians, parents travelling to and from school industrial machinery travelling to and from the site
- What will the immediate effect to the Peabody residents be at for what period of time?
- How will Peabody residents benefit directly from Section 106?

How can future neighbourhood forums look at governance issues or have them built into their constitutions i.e bankside neighbourhood forum has 21 representatives with no BME members and shouldn't the neighbourhood boundaries be the same as ward boundaries?

Is there funding or grants available to residents wishing to set up their own business?

### **Conservation areas**

Did the conservation team consider the inclusion of the almshouses on Brandon Street and the Peabody buildings on Rodney road into the proposed Larcom Street Conservation

area? If yes why were they not included?

Henshaw Street and Balfour Street and Victory Place are frequently mentioned in regeneration document due to the number of listed buildings and their architectural value (and most of Balfour is run as a cooperative) why can't they be included in the Larcom Street area?

## **12. HIGHWAYS REPORTS**

### **12. EAST WALWORTH AND FARADAY GREEN LINKS**

Members considered the report , a resident raised that the groups who had formed the East Walworth Green Links had not been consulted on the proposals. The groups were concerned that the area had been limited and did not consider their proposals. Further concerns were expressed relating to how the plans related to the master plan for the area and how much of the routes would be blocked to public access.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the community council notes the proposals and the comments raised by residents which expressed concerns about the consultation process.

### **12. CYCLE PERMEABILITY REPORT**

Members considered the report. Councillors raised concerns about the Redcross Way cyclist contra flow proposals in terms of the loss of any parking spaces, also raising that a CPZ review had recently taken place and the relocation of any parking bays would result a waste of council resources and that vehicles frequently drive the wrong way down the one way street and cyclists need to be made aware of this and that lorries are allowed to travel south from Union St to access the Travis Perkins site.

In general terms councillors and some residents welcomed the improvements although they questioned whether a more joined-up approach could have been taken.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the community council notes the improvements set out in the report and makes the comments outlined above.

## **13. CONSERVATION AREA REPORTS**

### **13. ELLIOTT'S ROW AND LARCOM STREET CONSERVATION AREAS**

Members considered the report a resident requested that changes outlined in the consultation response to include Larcom Street be supported noting the architectural value of Balfour Street, Henshaw Street and Victory Place.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the proposals to designate the Elliot's Row and Larcom Street conservation areas be noted.
2. That the results of the consultation on draft Elliot's Row and Larcom Street area appraisals are noted.

**13. LIVERPOOL GROVE, THRALE STREET, WEST SQUARE CONSERVATION AREAS**

Members considered the report residents and councillors raised concerns about the consultation process for the area appraisals specifically what information is sent to residents and what language is used. Queries were also raised on the impact of judicial reviews on planning decisions in the area.

**RESOLVED**

That the decision is deferred and officers are requested to attend to present the item.

**14. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**

The community council considered whether to submit a question to the next council assembly meeting and agreed the following: Can the council consider developing a consistent process for all public consultation it carries out?

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**

The meeting ended at 4.50pm