

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

(ORDINARY MEETING)

27 MARCH 2019

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1. QUESTION FROM ANDY CAWDELL TO COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT AND AIR QUALITY

Does the council agree that in light of the issues raised in the Climate Emergency motion, measures such as controlled parking zones (CPZs), which the council's own Transport Strategy recognises are effective in discouraging car use, must not be allowed to be blocked by minority interests?

RESPONSE

The council consults on each proposed CPZ both informally and in line with our statutory responsibilities.

We advertise the consultation widely to ensure we get as many views as possible.

Once those views are known, I receive a report from officers detailing objections and comments in support of a given scheme. I'm then able to consider the comments and decide accordingly if a scheme should proceed.

Clearly, if there is a majority of residents that will actually be affected in support of the scheme, it is highly likely I would approve its implementation. Consultations are not referenda though, and the feedback received also gives the council an opportunity to consider whether it should revise its proposals before presenting them at the next stage for statutory consultation.

2. QUESTION FROM JO FORD TO COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT AND AIR QUALITY

Please could you confirm that if a majority of residents on the streets around East Dulwich station respond to the controlled parking zone (CPZ) survey in favour of parking controls, that a CPZ will be granted for these streets irrespective of the decision for the wider consultation area?

RESPONSE

Yes I can. As explained in question 1 above, we consult widely to ensure we hear the views of as many people that a proposed scheme would affect to help make the right decision. If it was clear that different areas within the proposed CPZ had different views, we would then consider whether we should amend the proposals.

3. QUESTION FROM MARK BREARLEY TO COUNCILLOR JOHNSON SITU, CABINET MEMBER FOR GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

The Mayor of London requires Southwark to plan for no net loss of industrial floorspace, to meet evidenced need. In contempt of that policy, the New Southwark Plan proposed submission version (NSP PSV) allows loss of the majority of Southwark's quantum, a hefty threat to jobs and economic diversity. Why no amendments to correct this?

RESPONSE

The council is committed to supporting our diverse range of businesses across the borough, including providing additional light industrial workspace. The recent New Southwark Plan (NSP) amendments saw additional designation of strategic protected industrial land (SPIL) with the addition of Old Jamaica Road Industrial Estate and the introduction of an affordable workspace policy for the first time.

The NSP puts in place requirements for protection of jobs and business. In addition P28 has been updated to protect business space and assist businesses who need to move. Following discussions with the Greater London Authority (GLA) most of the site allocation changes in the NSP PSV have been strengthened to include locally significant industrial site (LSIS) with a requirement for business space.

Discussions with the GLA have also covered the council's approach to the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan (OKR AAP) which we have always said is a work in progress. To coincide with amendments to the NSP we have held regular forums on the AAP and will shortly start sub-area engagement with businesses along the Old Kent Road. The Forum and business engagement will play a key role to amendments to the OKR AAP, which will seek to retain a mix of employment uses whilst building the much needed new homes.