



**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)**

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Ordinary meeting of the Council Assembly held on Wednesday April 8 2009 at 7.00pm at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor Councillor Eliza Mann

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor James Barber	Councillor Kirsty McNeill
Councillor Paul Bates	Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Denise Capstick	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Gordon Nardell
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Mary Foulkes	Councillor Ola Oyewunmi
Councillor John Friary	Councillor Chris Page
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Andrew Pakes
Councillor Aubyn Graham	Councillor Caroline Pidgeon
Councillor James Gurling	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Sandra Rhule
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Michelle Holford	Councillor Jane Salmon
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Kim Humphreys	Councillor Mackie Sheik
Councillor Peter John	Councillor Tayo Situ
Councillor Jenny Jones	Councillor Bob Skelly
Councillor Susan Elan Jones	Councillor Robert Smeath
Councillor Paul Kyriacou	Councillor Althea Smith
Councillor Jelil Ladipo	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Adedokun Lasaki	Councillor Richard Thomas
Councillor Lorraine Lauder	Councillor Nick Vineall
Councillor Richard Livingstone	Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor Linda Manchester	Councillor Lorraine Zuleta
Councillor Alison McGovern	

1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1.1 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR, MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Mayor announced the sad news that since the last meeting three former councillors had died - Alexander Coveney, Anne Worsley and Anne Matthews. Councillors Adele Morris, Nick Stanton, Peter John, Ian Wingfield, and Toby Eckersley paid tribute. Thereafter a minute's silence was held.

The Mayor stated that a list of Mayoral events for April and May 2009 had been circulated at the meeting.

Councillor Lewis Robinson, executive member for culture, leisure and sport referred to his written statement regarding Camberwell Leisure Centre.

Councillor Adele Morris, executive member for citizenship, equalities and communities, referred to her written statement concerning beacon status for cohesive and resilient communities. The executive member displayed the award to council assembly.

1.2 NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS

The Mayor agreed to accept the following items as late and urgent business:

- Item 8.1 – Implications of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 on the role of Overview & Scrutiny.
- Item 8.2 – Minutes of the council assembly meeting held on December 8 2008.

The Mayor also announced that she had agreed to circulate the following:

- Revised Late Amendment to Item 6.1 – Corporate Plan 2009-2011.
- Late Amendment to Item 8.1 - Implications of the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 on the role of overview and scrutiny.
- Urgent Motion and Amendment on Foreknowledge of council assembly motions.

At this juncture Councillor James Barber, seconded by Councillor Michelle Holford, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11(m), the following rule be suspended in order that the urgent motion on foreknowledge of council assembly motions could be debated prior to the motions listed in item 9 – Motions received on notice:

- Council assembly procedure rule 1.11(c) – Change the order of business in the agenda.

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

1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Danny McCarthy, Veronica Ward, Helen Jardine Brown, Dominic Thorncroft and Evrim Laws and apologies for lateness from John Friary and Jenny Jones.

2. MINUTES

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the minutes of the ordinary council assembly meeting held on Wednesday January 28 2009 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Mayor.
 2. That the minutes of the council assembly (budget setting) meeting held on Monday February 23 2009 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Mayor, subject to the following amendment:

Page 63

- a) In the list of councillors absent for the recorded vote by roll call, delete "Dominic Thorncroft" and insert "Nick Vineall"
- b) In the paragraph starting "During the debate on the substantive motion...":
 - Delete the words "and Susan Elan Jones"
 - Between "Fiona Colley" and "Adele Morris" delete the comma and insert "and".

3. PETITIONS

There were none.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS (see page 1 of the main agenda and page 1-2 of the lilac paper circulated at the meeting)

One member of the public submitted a written question the answer to which was circulated at the meeting. The questioner was not present. The question and answer are attached as Appendix 1.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (see pages 2-8 of the main agenda, and pages 1-30 of the papers circulated at the meeting)

There was one urgent question to the leader, the answer to which was circulated on blue paper at the meeting. The leader answered a supplemental question, the questions and answers are attached as Appendix 2.

Members' questions and written responses were circulated on yellow paper. There were 21 supplementary questions, the answers to all questions are attached as Appendix 3. The time for supplemental questions having expired the written

responses to questions were noted.

6. REPORT FOR DECISION FROM THE EXECUTIVE

6.1 CORPORATE PLAN 2009/10 – 2010/11 (See pages 9 - 34 of the main agenda)

At this juncture Councillor James Barber, seconded by Councillor Jeff Hook, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11(m), the following rule be suspended in order that the revised late amendment could be debated.

- Council assembly procedure rule 2.10 (3) – Notice for amendments to be delivered.

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

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.10(1), the leader of the council, Councillor Nick Stanton, moved the recommendations contained in the report to council assembly.

Councillor Fiona Colley, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved Amendment. A

Following debate (Councillors Lisa Rajan, Barrie Hargrove, Tim McNally, Gordon Nardell, Kim Humphreys, Paul Noblet, Alison McGovern, Lewis Robinson, Paul Bates, Jeff Hook and Caroline Pidgeon), Councillor Nick Stanton exercised his right of reply.

Amendment A, was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

Councillor David Hubber, seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley, moved the revised late amendment.

Following Councillor Nick Stanton's right of reply, the revised late amendment 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 the recommendations of the executive to adopt the council's corporate plan for 2009-2011, be agreed.
 2. That council notes that there are a small number of important issues which have been omitted from the current draft of the corporate plan 2009-11 as they remain under review at the current time, including specifically:
 - a) Road safety targets, which are currently being reviewed through the refresh of the road safety strategy
 - b) Primary school provision in the Dulwich area, which is currently subject to discussions with the governors of the existing schools
 - c) Energy efficiency in homes, which is currently the subject of a new energy efficiency contract which is being procured by the environment and housing department
 - d) Increasing the use of online transactions, which

is currently being examined as part of the review of customer service strategy.

3. That council notes that in paragraph 4 of the report, it states: "The performance elements of the plan are being finalised in line with the local area agreement refresh and top tier indicators will be kept under review to ensure that the corporate plan remains relevant."
4. That council therefore calls on the executive, subject to the outcomes of resolution 2 above, to incorporate these items into the plan and supporting procedures as appropriate.

Note: In accordance with the budget and policy framework procedure rule 2 (g), the executive recommendation had been amended and was treated as an in-principle decision. The leader indicated at the meeting that he did not wish to object to the decision. Therefore the decision was implementable with immediate effect.

7. REPORT FOR INFORMATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE

7.1 REPORT BACK ON CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY (see pages 9-15 of the main agenda)

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

8. OTHER REPORTS

8.1 IMPLICATIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT & PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN HEALTH ACT 2007 ON THE ROLE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY (see supplemental agenda 1, pages 1 - 18)

At this juncture Councillor Chris Page, seconded by Councillor Mark Glover, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11(m), the following rule be suspended in order that the late amendment could be debated.

- Council assembly procedure rule 2.10 (3) – Notice for amendments to be delivered.

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

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.10(2) the Mayor formally moved the recommendations contained in the report.

Councillor Fiona Colley, seconded by Councillor Jane Salmon, moved the Late Amendment.

Following debate (Councillor Susan Elan Jones), the Late Amendment 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 the implications for the overview and scrutiny committee (OSC) arising from the Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) introduced by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 as from April 1 2009, be noted.
 2. That the constitutional changes to Article 5 of the constitution and the overview and scrutiny procedure rules set out in Appendix A to the report and the addition of a new protocol set out in Appendix B to the report, be agreed, subject to the following changes:

Article 5 – Overview and scrutiny committee and sub-committees

In paragraph 5.3 - Specific function:

- **Move** new sub sections (a) – (e) entitled “Crime and disorder” and **insert** as a new section following the “Scrutiny” section.
- Under the title of the new section **insert** the words “Overview and scrutiny committee and its sub-committees may:”

Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

5.1 Terms of reference of the overview & scrutiny committee

Delete a)

15. Agenda Items

In 15.1 **insert** at the end of the paragraph:

“This rule will apply where the call for action procedure set out in paragraph 15.3 does not apply”

In 15.3 **delete** “[who is not a member of the overview and scrutiny committee or a sub-committee]”

In 15.3 **delete** “available” and **replace** with “appropriate”

Appendix B

Councillor Call for Action Protocol

Under the heading “Procedure for CCfA to be considered at scrutiny”, **delete** paragraph beginning “All such written requests will...” and **insert**:

“All such written requests will first be submitted by the head of overview and scrutiny to the first appropriate overview and scrutiny committee or sub-committee for their consideration in a reasonable timescale. The decision on which is the first appropriate committee or sub-committee is at the discretion of the head of overview and scrutiny. The committee may reject any call for action if it:”

8.2 MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL ASSEMBLY MEETING HELD ON DECEMBER 8 2008 (see supplemental agenda 1, pages 19 – 21)

RESOLVED: That Councillor Alison McGovern be added to those members listed as being present in the minutes of the council assembly meeting held on December 8 2008.

9. MOTIONS

The appropriate council assembly procedure rules having been suspended earlier in the meeting, the Mayor announced that the urgent motion and the late amendment would be considered prior to the other motions outlined in the agenda.

URGENT MOTION – FOREKNOWLEDGE OF COUNCIL ASSEMBLY MOTIONS

At this juncture Councillor Chris Page, seconded by Councillor Mark Glover, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11(m), the following rule be suspended in order that the late amendment could be debated.

- Council assembly procedure rule 2.10 (3) – Notice for amendments to be delivered.

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

This motion was taken prior to the guillotine having fallen.

Councillor Chris Page, seconded by Councillor Robert Smeath, moved the urgent motion.

Councillor Nick Stanton, seconded by Councillor Michelle Holford, moved the late amendment.

Councillor James Barber, seconded by Councillor Linda Manchester, moved that the question be put. The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Following Councillor Chris Page’s right of reply, the late amendment was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Councillor David Hubber, seconded by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon, moved that the question be put. The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Following Councillor Nick Stanton’s right of reply the substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council assembly notes that as evidenced by council standing orders from 2000, cabinet members, and then executive members, have been involved in drafting concurrent advice to council assembly motions for the last 9 years and that to assist in this, such members received notice of council motions 1 week before the distribution of the main agenda.
 2. That council assembly notes with regret that this practice was continued – as a result of an oversight – following the discontinuation of concurrent advice, which came into effect in November 2008.

The Mayor announced that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.9 (7), the Liberal Democrat group whip had requested that the order of the Liberal Democrat motions be reprioritised so that motion 5 was considered prior to motion 1. The order of the other motions was unaffected. The motions are set out below in the order that they appear in the agenda. The guillotine fell during the debate on motion 5, which had been taken first.

9.1 MOTION 1 – CROSS RIVER TRAM (see page 43 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Paul Noblet and Caroline Pidgeon respectively.

Amendment B was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Barrie Hargrove and Paul Bates respectively.

Amendment B 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 notes the continuing cross-party support in Southwark for the cross river tram and reiterates its disappointment that the Mayor of London has chosen not to support the project by removing a commitment to develop the project from the Transport for London business plan.
 2. That council believes that the tram would increase access to employment for people from some of London's most deprived areas, support the regeneration of Elephant and Castle, Aylesbury and Peckham and provide construction jobs, while providing a clean, green transport solution for one of the few areas in central London without a tube line.
 3. That council assembly welcomes the decision to kick-start the East London Line extension 2B, which with the cross river tram would transform transport options in Southwark.
 4. That council further notes the chancellor's announcement in his 2008 pre-budget report of £20bn in fiscal stimulus to be brought forward before April 2010.

5. That council notes that the leader of the council wrote to transport minister Lord Adonis, seeking funding for the cross river tram from this fiscal stimulus and that the response said that the cross river tram does not currently qualify for money from the pre-budget report fiscal stimulus, where existing funding is brought forward, because spending on the project is not currently part of Transport for London's business plan: It further notes, however, that the response also said: "Should the Mayor [of London] decide to fund the project, we would be happy to discuss with him the possibility of delivering it expediently".
6. That council assembly therefore calls on the executive to write to the Mayor of London asking him to make the cross river tram project part of Transport for London's business plan.
7. That council assembly calls on the executive to write to the chancellor asking him to review the decision to only bring forward existing funding in the fiscal stimulus, and make provision for the funding of the tram as part of the fiscal stimulus package.
8. That council assembly notes the executive member for regeneration's assertion at the January council meeting that he would "continue [to seek] funding sources for the project, be they public or private, through a variety of forums such as Cross River Partnership".
9. That council assembly calls on the executive member for regeneration to continue to seek such funding sources in his role as chair of the Cross River Partnership and update members on his current progress before council's annual meeting.

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

9.2 MOTION 2 – YOUTH PROVISION (see pages 43 - 44 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Althea Smith and Peter John respectively.

Amendment C was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Lisa Rajan and Michelle Holford respectively.

Amendment C 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 in the Liberal Democrats' 2006 election manifesto the party pledged to carry out a full audit of youth facilities in the borough. Council notes that in July 2007, the executive agreed a report entitled 'Activities for Young People – Things to do, places to go, someone to talk to in Southwark' which reported the results of the audit that had been undertaken.
2. That council assembly notes that the audit informed the creation of the Children and Young Peoples Partnership's *Things to do* priority areas and resulted in a rebalancing of spending on youth services and facilities across Southwark, compensating for historic under-investment in parts of the borough.
3. That council assembly notes that in last year's joint area review the council's youth services were given only an 'adequate' or two star rating.
4. That council assembly notes that in the 2008 residents' survey, youth facilities were the services that residents thought were most important and also the services that they were most dissatisfied with. It notes that the same was true in the 2006 residents survey and that despite massive government grants for children and young people and significant capital investment in youth facilities by the council, residents' satisfaction with youth facilities has not significantly improved.
5. That council notes that as a result of the government's failure to take account of the significant additional pressures placed on the council's budget by the recession, the executive was forced to identify £17.3m of savings in the 2009-10 budget. Council notes that £381,000 (4.5%) of the savings were from the youth service budget, and that this amount equates to approximately 0.3% of the budget for 11-19 year old and youth services division.
6. That council notes that the £381,000 savings identified from youth services will be generated from the modernisation and integration of the division and will not involve cuts in front-line services in the youth service. Council further notes that £150,000 of new funding was allocated to the youth service from the working neighbourhoods fund (WNF) programme for work-based learning sites.
7. That council acknowledges that Southwark has unacceptably high levels of teenage conceptions and child obesity and recognises these are key shared strategic priority for Young Southwark, the primary care trust and the executive. Council notes the coordinated activities undertaken by these agencies to address these problems, including:

- a) The roll out of a healthy schools accreditation which has seen 65% of Southwark Schools attain Health Schools status.
 - b) The recent "Team Around the Issue" event on March 11, where officers came together to discuss approaches to the 5 priority areas, including childhood obesity.
 - c) The Teenage Pregnancy Summit on March 23 2009 which looked at new approaches to tackling this issue.
8. That council assembly notes that Southwark's levels of young people not in employment, education or training (NEETs) were the third highest in London in 2007, but notes that the number of Southwark young people in NEET has fallen from 875 in 2004 to 395 (54.8% fall) as a result of coordinated work by the council, including:
- a) Targeted work with those with poor attendance at end of Year 11 (e.g. 5 hot spot schools targeted and being support).
 - b) Development of Foundation 2 Work programme in Southwark College where 40 young people NEET have been enrolled since January 2009 and therefore off the NEET register.
9. That council assembly notes the children's services and education scrutiny sub-committee's youth provision review, which was discussed by the executive in December last year. It notes that at that meeting, the executive agreed to ensure that the findings of the review would be taken into account in the current review of youth services across the borough. Council notes that officers checked this course of action with the chair of children's scrutiny and agreed with him that the executive would report back as part of that review process in April 2009.
10. That council assembly notes that the youth service is currently being reviewed and restructured, with a view to meeting government demands for an integrated and targeted youth support service. Council notes that the restructure is aimed at streamlining management structures and will not affect front-line staff or services.
11. That council assembly expresses concern that residents' satisfaction with youth facilities remains low and that teenage pregnancy, obesity and the number of young people not in education, employment or training remain serious challenges for the borough.

12. That council therefore endorses the review of youth services offered by the council which is currently being undertaken and calls on the executive to report back to council assembly on the outcome of the review, given its overwhelming importance to all members.

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

9.3 MOTION 3 – BUS ROUTE 42 (see page 44 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Toby Eckersley and James Barber respectively.

Amendment D was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Peter John and Dora Dixon-Fyle respectively.

Amendment D 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 that the extension of the route of the 42 bus from North Dulwich to Sainsbury's via East Dulwich Grove to Sainsbury's on Dog Kennel Hill would benefit Village, East Dulwich and South Camberwell wards.
 2. That council assembly notes the cross party work over many years to promote the proposed new route.
 3. That council assembly welcomes the planning consent obtained by Sainsbury's to accommodate the turn-round on their premises providing a proper terminus for this route with facilities for drivers and standstill space for the buses as presently the buses terminating in Sunray Avenue cause noise and inconvenience to residents.
 4. That council assembly regrets the previous delays by Transport for London (TfL), and welcomes a recent undertaking to review the business case.
 5. That council assembly notes the widespread support for the extension evidenced by the responses to the recent Village ward councillors' questionnaire and the interest shown by "Southwark News".
 6. That council assembly therefore requests the executive to ensure that the council as a whole promotes the extension with vigour and that the executive member for environment writes to London Mayor Boris Johnson requesting that the re-routing proposal be given high priority.

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

9.4 MOTION 4 – A BOROUGH-WIDE FOOD STRATEGY(see pages 44 - 45 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Jenny Jones and Richard Thomas respectively.

Amendment E was formally moved and seconded by Councillor Mark Glover and Andrew Pakes respectively.

Amendment E was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

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

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council assembly:
 - a) Notes the vitality, vibrancy and diversity of Southwark's food industries and cultures.
 - b) Notes that the production, processing and manufacturing, transport, storage and distribution, sale, purchasing, preparation, consumption and disposal of food within and beyond Southwark has significant implications for health, environmental, economic, social/cultural and security issues across the borough.
 2. That the council notes the value of allotments to the production of sustainable and healthy and local food in the borough, and asks the executive to adopt the following action:
 - a) Improve the quality of information available to residents, by improving the council's website.
 - b) Look for ways to increase the borough's allotments, as some of the allotments in the borough are on waiting lists only.
 - c) Engage with the London Food Board to look at practical ways in which food can be grown sustainably.
 - d) Provide an undertaking that the council will not close any allotments, and ensure rents are affordable by the many, not the few.
 3. That this council therefore invites the executive to undertake the development of a borough wide food strategy with a view to:
 - a) improving the health and reduce the health inequalities of people living and working in Southwark
 - b) reducing poverty and deprivation

- c) reducing the negative environmental impacts of Southwark's food system
 - d) supporting a vibrant food economy
 - e) celebrating and promoting Southwark's food culture
 - f) enhancing Southwark's food security
 - g) Encouraging health eating in schools.
4. That council assembly asks the executive to report back to council assembly within 6 months on progress in developing the strategy.

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

9.5 MOTION 5 – COUNCIL HOUSING FOR SOUTHWARK (see pages 45 – 46 of the main agenda)

This motion was taken prior to the guillotine having fallen.

Councillor Nick Stanton, seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys, moved the motion.

Councillor Paul Bates, seconded by Councillor Tayo Situ, moved Amendment F.

Following debate (Councillor Tim McNally, Kim Humphreys, Andrew Pakes, Richard Thomas, Susan Elan Jones and James Gurling), Councillor Kim Humphreys made a point of personal explanation.

Councillor Chris Page, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved that the question be put. The procedural motion was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

During the continued debate on Amendment F (Councillors Jonathan Mitchell and Peter John), the guillotine fell.

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

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

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council welcomes the announcement by the Prime Minister in a speech in January 2009 that: "...if local authorities can convince us that they can deliver quickly and cost effectively more of the housing that Britain needs, and if local authorities can build social housing in sustainable communities that meets the aspirations of the British people for the 21st century, then we will be prepared to give you our full backing and put aside any of the barriers that stand in the way of this happening."

2. That council believes that Southwark is a local authority which has proven its ability to build sustainable communities and to deliver quickly and cost effectively and notes that there are three barriers to the council building new council homes:
 - a) the fact that the council is unable to access grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to support the cost of building new homes.
 - b) the high interest rate applying when the council borrows money under current prudential borrowing rules, which set the effective interest rate at an average of historic rates, rather than the current public works loan board (PWLB) rate.
 - c) uncertainty over the future of housing revenue account (HRA) subsidy during the joint CLG/Treasury review, which has not yet issued any proposals.
3. That council notes with concern that despite past commitments and promises from senior Labour politicians, including the current Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, about the 'fourth option' and council home building, these three barriers have remained in place.
4. That council therefore calls on the government to use the next budget to make provision for Southwark and other councils to access grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and to amend borrowing rules to take account of current low interest rates, thereby allowing us to build new council homes.
5. That council calls on the executive to write to the Prime Minister with immediate effect seeking a clear and unequivocal guarantee that his January announcement will be followed by genuine action, rather than repeating the empty promises of the past, which have left so many across the country trapped on housing waiting lists.

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

9.6 MOTION 6 – SURREY CANAL ROAD STATION (see page 46 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Barrie Hargrove and Richard Livingstone respectively.

Amendment G was formally moved and seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet and Caroline Pidgeon respectively.

Amendment G was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

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

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council assembly welcomes the joint funding of £60 million from the Department for Transport and £15 million from Transport for London (TfL) to complete Phase 2 of the East London Line Extension (ELLX).
 2. That council assembly notes that funding for a new station at Surrey Canal Road, just over the border in Lewisham, has not yet been secured as part of the scheme. It notes the considerable local demand in South Bermondsey and North Peckham for a new station there and the strong regeneration case for the station.
 3. That council assembly calls upon the leaders of all the political groups to write jointly to the Mayor of London and the Transport Secretary urging them to fund this vital piece of public transport infrastructure as part of the planned Phase 2 works. It calls on the executive to work with the Mayor of Lewisham to effectively lobby for the new station.
 4. That council assembly notes the strong support for a station at Surrey Canal Road from Millwall FC and calls on the leaders, in their letter to the Mayor, to request that TfL officers meet with Millwall representatives to discuss the proposals and ways to involve the club.
 5. That council assembly calls upon the leader of the council to also support Lambeth Council in any bid made for a Brixton ELLX stop, for a better linked inner south London.

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

9.7 MOTION 7 – LOCAL INCOME TAX PROPOSALS (see pages 46 - 47 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Fiona Colley and Chris Page respectively.

Amendment H was formally moved and seconded by Councillor Tim McNally and Nick Stanton respectively.

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

The substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

9.8 MOTION 8 – FUEL POVERTY BILL (see page 47 of the main agenda)

The guillotine having fallen, the motion was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Ian Wingfield and Susan Elan Jones respectively.

Amendment I was formally moved and seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet and James Barber respectively.

Amendment I was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Amendment J was formally moved and seconded by Councillors Martin Seaton and Chris Page respectively.

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

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

- RESOLVED:**
1. That this council notes that 418 MPs supported the Warm Homes Act during its passage through parliament.
 2. That council further notes that a recent high court judgment ruled that the targets in the Warm Homes Act 2000 were not targets but merely “aspirations”.
 3. That council believes that urgent action is needed to help the 4 million people living in fuel poverty in the UK.
 4. That council therefore supports David Heath MP’s Fuel Poverty Bill (introduced into parliament with cross-party support on January 21 2009) which seeks to reinstate the statutory duty to end fuel poverty and focuses on increasing the energy efficiency of the housing stock of the fuel poor. It also requires energy suppliers to provide social tariffs to vulnerable customers in the short-term.
 5. That council is therefore disappointed to note that on Friday March 20, the bill failed to proceed beyond second reading as a result of a lack of support in parliament, with only 91 MPs voting for the bill to proceed to its next stage.
 6. That council notes that the Labour climate change minister, Joan Ruddock MP spoke against the bill, the Labour chief whip voted against the bill and that 58 Labour MPs who signed an early day motion (EDM) supporting the bill – including 4 with constituencies in London – failed to attend and support the bill.
 7. That council further notes that neither of the borough’s Labour MPs attended parliament to vote for the bill to proceed and therefore calls on the executive to write to the MP for Camberwell and Peckham, urging her to use her position as Leader of the House to make parliamentary time available to debate this crucial bill.

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

The meeting closed at 10.12pm.

MAYOR:

DATED:

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY)**

WEDNESDAY APRIL 8 2009

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM MR MICK BARNARD

Given the council's own statistics show under-occupation to be an acute housing problem why does planning promote larger houses as the priority need when the provision of suitable properties for the elderly under-occupiers could double or even treble the number of households that would benefit?

RESPONSE

The council has two schemes to limit under occupation. These are:

1. Small is Beautiful

'Small is Beautiful' is a financial incentive to encourage tenants who have too many rooms to downgrade to a smaller council property. People who opt for this programme receive Band 1 priority for re-housing, get to choose their new home and receive varying levels of financial assistance depending on the number of bedrooms that they are giving up, as well as practical advice and support.

2. Cash Incentive Scheme

This is directed towards tenants of properties which are particularly suited to re-house families. It encourages under-occupying households to release their properties in exchange for a grant of up to £36,000 which is used towards the purchase of a property on the open market. Although the scheme is currently directed to all tenants with properties with three bedrooms or more, it is particularly popular with more elderly tenants who are under-occupying, finding it difficult to cope with managing a large property and who wish to move closer to their families or to a property which is more suitable for their needs.

The council identifies what the housing needs are throughout the borough through the Housing Needs Survey. The two key findings of the last survey were:

- There is a general need for more family housing in the borough.
- The greatest need in the affordable housing sector is for three bedroom properties.

In response to this, the Southwark Plan requires that all new developments of 15 or more households should provide at least 10% of the units with three or more bedrooms. However, the council goes further than this by encouraging developers to provide more than the 10% minimum on their developments.

In addition to this, the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), targets funding to those schemes which provide more family houses than the 10% minimum.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

(ORDINARY)

WEDNESDAY APRIL 8 2009

URGENT QUESTION

**URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

I'm sure the leader of the council will want to join with me in expressing his deep concern for the young woman knocked down by a bus at the junction of Penrose Street and Walworth Road on Monday night. When my colleague Councillor Lauder, frustrated with council inaction, first felt driven to write to the local papers concerning the dangers of this crossing her actions were branded by the Liberal Democrat as 'knocking' Walworth. Has the executive urgently reconsidered its position on the traffic arrangement in the light of this tragic event?

RESPONSE

I am concerned by all collisions on Southwark's roads and want to see the numbers reduce. This incident is no different and of course I pass on my sympathies to the young woman involved.

As is the case with all such incidents, there will be a review of road safety at the location following a police report.

As a point of fact, road safety along the Walworth Road does seem to have improved since the extensive renovation but I am sure all members would want to know if anything could be put in place to prevent a similar collision in future.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN

I am grateful to the leader for his response and I know it is difficult to give a really thoughtful response at such short notice but this was exactly the sort of accident that Councillor Lauder has been warning about for sometime and that is why she did go to the press to raise her concerns. So what I would ask the leader to do, as well as learning from this accident and the police report that is produced in respect of it, will he please encourage officers, if not instruct them, to take the concerns of local councillors seriously with regards to such matters in future when they are raised so that we are not left facing consequences of another serious accident in the future if an issue like this is raised by local councillors so that it can be dealt with at an earlier stage. Can he give us that assurance?

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor I am sorry to report that I understand that there has been another fatal road traffic accident earlier this afternoon around the Elephant and Castle, although not I think on the Walworth Road. Indeed there was a possible fatal road accident in Peckham High Street yesterday or the day before as well. I know that Councillor Lauder has raised concerns and Councillor Pidgeon has

also been in contact with officers about this particular junction. The sad truth about severe road traffic accidents in Southwark that kill or severely injured people is that now we are in a position where I think a vast majority of them happen on or near two of our roads especially red routes. I think there is a piece of learning to be done certainly in this council and probably in others about better and faster joint working with TfL about those. I know from the experience that was nearly in my ward about the bus that collided with the tree where branch fell on a passerby, you can guess whose bit of tree it is, and you would have thought that in the spirit of partnership working everyone could agree that the desirable outcome is that everyone has to do their bit of whatever it is. I am certainly happy to undertake that we will be chasing up this one but looking at the statistics I think there is a wider piece of work to be done with TfL regarding accidents around red routes as a whole.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY)**

WEDNESDAY APRIL 8 2009

MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL

Council tenants in Southwark will be pleased that the council was the first in London to pass on the cut in rents. What indication has he had that other boroughs have also passed on the cut?

RESPONSE

London Councils has contacted its member boroughs to find out what their agreed position was in relation to the reduction in guideline rents. Thirteen responded to say they had reached an agreed position. Of these only Southwark had managed to implement the reduction in time for the new financial year. Most London boroughs were committed to implement as quickly as possible but had decided to follow the statutory process to the letter. This means the average time for implementation across London is estimated as 10 weeks. In Southwark we chose to implement immediately, with the full support of tenants council, given the very negative impact on our tenants of increasing the rents to the agreed level.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL

Lambeth's Labour Council is increasing rents for Council tenants by an average of £12 per week and that is a rise of 17% and for many of them this comes on top of the 65% in charges. When local families in Lambeth already feeling the pinch of the recession the last thing they need is another big bill from their Labour Council in breach of their own Labour government. Will you please as the leader of Southwark Council write to the leader of Lambeth Council to tell him that Labour is wrong to propose a 17% rent high for his council tenants and invite him to cut their rent back to the level that the Labour government expect Lambeth to have in the first place.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor I am not surprised that the other side are trying to shout down Councillor Mitchell when he is asking this question because it draws attention to the very nightmare that would happen in Southwark if the Labour group in Southwark was able to implement the same secret plan that their Labour colleagues in Lambeth did to privatise their housing stock immediately after an election without having ever mentioning that during the election. As I understand it Lambeth have to put up their rent by a whopping 17% because they have a massive hole in the HRA, because they have not been able even to balance a budget. It is of course true that if any council in this country try to raise council tax by 17% the government would cap them. The government does not cap rent rise increases – we did protest in Southwark against the level of rent increase that the government subsidy rules oblige us to pass on in Southwark. I think it is bizarre that of all the things Labour may nationalise, it has nationalised the banks, its nationalised the car industry, to nationalise rent settings seems to me to be taking microscopic centralisation just a degree too far. I am pleased that process was a success. I am pleased that we have been able to pass on that cut to our tenants. I am pleased that we

are the first council in London to be able to do so. I do not understand why Lambeth can't do the same if they are getting the same extra money from the government. I certainly would be happy to offer mentoring advice to the leader of Lambeth Council although my fear is that we may have to wait for the electorate in Lambeth to come to their senses and offer him the order of the boot next year.

2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR CHRIS PAGE

At a previous meeting of council assembly, council agreed to publish the production costs of all council publications on the council website. Why has the executive failed to do this? Can the leader of the council tell me when this will be done?

RESPONSE

As part of the restructure of the council's communications function, we have been carrying out an audit of the council's publications to ensure that every publication we send out is value for money, and retiring those that are not.

This audit has been very recently completed and we can now focus the council's communications work around a number of core publications, such as Southwark Life and the A-Z of Services. While the audit has been continuing, we have not published production figures but we will be in a position to start doing so by the end of April.

The production figures will show that we are communicating more effectively through fewer publications and at lower costs. An example is the recently published A-Z of Services which has been produced at a cost £16,000 lower than last year due to better procurement practices.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CHRIS PAGE

Thank you Madam Mayor. We are looking forward to next year as well when this tired administration gets the boot. I would like to thank the leader for his answer which I am actually quite pleased with because we only asked this question in June last year and I am told that a year later you are finally in a position to publish the cost of council publications only after having done an audit to find out which ones are not value for money. Could I ask him if he has discovered which ones are not value for money and how much it cost in the last year buying publications that are not value for money and whether if he would accept that our budget proposals to cut communications costs to actually trim some fat off the communications budget. Actually this money could have been saved and better used on other things in the council.

RESPONSE

Given the number of questions and motions there are from the Labour group tonight which call for the council to do more communication with residents about pet labelled subjects I am surprised that he has the gall to pursue this one. The fact is we have managed to save over £1m on communication costs. If he has seen the latest Mori residents survey he will see that residents want to keep better informed. They want to know what the council is up to with their money and I think they have every right to know and we will continue to tell them.

3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER

In a 2002 referendum, the people of Southwark overwhelmingly rejected the option to have a directly elected mayor. The Local Government Act 2007 seeks to impose either a

directly elected mayor, or a 'strong leader' model with many of the same functions as a directly elected mayor, on boroughs, without a mandate from local people. Does he stand by the results of the 2002 referendum, and will he oppose any government moves to impose an alternative system on Southwark?

RESPONSE

The Local Government Act 2007 forces council's to choose between two leadership models. The elected mayor model has already been overwhelmingly rejected in the 2002 referendum. The second option, the so called 'strong leader model', is similar to the mayoral model in that it diminishes the role of council assembly in the leadership of the authority by placing more power in the hands of a single person.

I am therefore not satisfied that either option is suitable for Southwark and will be writing to the Secretary of State to express my concern.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER

Will the leader write to the Secretary of State before this issue requires a change to the council's constitution requesting that she review the imposition of these draconian rules.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor it seems again our running theme through this evening is that you would have thought that this government of all governments might have better things to do with its time right at the moment than worry about the constitution of 450 principal authorities in England and Wales, most of them which are in better touch with the feelings of their community than central government can ever hope to be. As evidence by Southwark we were told by the Secretary of State that there is a massive ground swell of community support for an elected Mayor, we had a referendum, only 11% of people could even be bothered to vote and 66% of those said no to the idea. I shall of course be writing to the Secretary of State to invite her to concentrate on more serious things like to save the western bank and the economy from collapse for example.

4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM

Given the public statements made by the chief executive accepting that there is toxic waste in the cemetery on Forest Hill Road, SE22, can the leader give my constituents, particularly families living along Rydale, any assurances that the toxic waste poses no risk to their health?

RESPONSE

The council has undertaken extensive tests. The waste is not toxic. The waste has contamination. That contamination poses no threat to the health of visitors or staff while it remains in the ground. It will be removed by specialist contractors once this is agreed with the Environment Agency. The areas concerned are also fenced off from members of the public.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM

Thanks Madam Mayor and I will say many thanks to the leader for his answer. This issue has been causing a lot of concerns amongst my constituents and I have raised this question before but did not get an answer. I think I am probably now in a position to go

back to them and say well the council has taken some step to make sure they can feel safe.

The question I would really like the leader to expand on is the statement says that the council has undertaken extensive tests. I am not aware that the council has the facility to undertake tests of contaminated soil or toxic soil and could he explain what steps have actually been taken i.e. did they get outside contractors to do it and give me more assurance that this was done properly.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor I am very grateful to Councillor Graham for the observation he makes about the need to reassure his constituents and I am grateful he has undertaken to do that. Obviously stories about this raise an awful lot of scares and it is our responsibility to put right. Yes I am sure that the examination has been done by the appropriate experts.

5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR JELIL LADIPO

What plans are in place for the use of the £6 million of funding which has been secured for Burgess Park?

RESPONSE

In March, Southwark was awarded £2m for the redevelopment of Burgess Park as part of the Mayor of London's Major Parks scheme. I am very proud that the council ran a great campaign, involving the local community, council staff and councillors, the park was chosen over five others from across London. This was a great achievement against strong competition.

I would like to commend officers from our parks and communications teams for their hard work on the Burgess Park and "Help a London Park" bids. Unfortunately, following concerted and vigorous efforts, we narrowly missed out on funding for Dickens Park and Camberwell Green. However, I am confident that our work in raising awareness will make local residents think about the value of our parks.

The £2m which the council was awarded has been substantially supplemented by the New Deal for Communities which has contributed an additional £4m, taking the total funding available to spend to £6m.

Our aim is to make Burgess Park a place which: is safe and enjoyable; has a definite identity of its own; is welcoming and seems to be loved and well cared for; and, addresses the aspirations of the communities that it serves. To completely redevelop the Park we would need £15m; something which does not appear realistic at the current time – though we will continue to seek funding wherever possible. So we've chosen to focus the £6m on:

- removing redundant roads and paths
- creating a definite edge to the park
- extensive planting to make the park look better and also to encourage animal life and increase biodiversity
- creating new paths and spaces to make it easier to get around
- creating new and welcoming entrances to the park
- creating unifying structures which help to bring the different parts of the park together.

Meeting these six objectives will cost £6m. Anything additional will need further funding.

We have already made significant steps in delivering improvements to the park. A qualified landscape architect, has been appointed as project manager to lead on the redevelopment of the park. The project manager will bring together a stakeholder group and work on ways to engage and involve local residents in the process of transforming the park. Over the next few months we will be developing a procurement plan, planning the programme of activity for the next three years and making sure that we make the best use of funding as quickly as possible.

I will be happy to keep members informed of the work on the park.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JELIL LADIPO

Would the leader of Council please join me in congratulating everyone in Southwark particularly council officers for their work in securing this investment in Burgess Park.

RESPONSE

Yes Madam Mayor. I think we can safely say that had it not been for the spend on the communications around this, the face book site, the leaflets, the petitions and so on that we would not be so successful in demonstrating the community support that there was for the scheme. Those Labour councillors would cost £1m out of the communications budget and therefore not had a campaign around Camberwell Green, Dickens Square or Burgess Park would presumably now be mortified that this money has gone to Croydon or Brent or Haringey instead. I would like to pay special tributes to the Friends of Burgess Park and especially the Young Friends of Burgess Park. Councillor Hook and I did the presentation to the judges who visited all the parks. They were particularly impressed by the real grounds of the community support that was for it, particularly the Young Friends of Southwark Park, and I think it is them that won it.

6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR DANNY McCARTHY

Why, in the leader of the council's opinion, have satisfaction rates with Borough and Bankside as an area to live fallen by 15% since 2006, according to the recent MORI residents survey?

RESPONSE

It is impossible to say why a random sample of people in the Borough and Bankside area are less satisfied now than two years ago with any certainty. Having said that, it is worthy of note that the drop in satisfaction has not seen a concurrent rise in dissatisfaction; instead, more people responded 'don't know' than in 2006. This may in part be related to the greater proportion of interviewees in 2008 who were new to the area.

On the other hand, one factor may be that in 2006, 1332 residents in Cathedrals ward voted for a Liberal Democrat councillor and were given no say in his choice to join the Labour group only a year later.

7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM JAMES GURLING

Given that the first teams have now moved into the new offices at Tooley Street, can he update us on what feedback staff have given on the new facilities?

RESPONSE

The 5th floor was delivered to the council by the fit out contractor ahead of the contracted date on February 22 2009. The 4th floor north (old building) was also handed over shortly afterwards to facilitate the phased occupation of the building and accommodate key project staff and a temporary post room. These floors are fully furnished as per the approved furniture strategy including recycled furniture being utilised.

Between the February 26 2009 and March 23 2009, 298 staff working in the regeneration & neighbourhoods department moved from Chiltern House and Larcom Street to the 5th floor of 160 Tooley Street. The following teams have moved and are currently operating from the building:

Regeneration & neighbourhoods department:

- Planning & transport
- Strategy & information
- Housing strategy & regeneration
- Economic development and strategic partnership
- Property services

At the end of each move, the project team and departmental managers review how the move has gone. All 5th floor moves were completed successfully and we have received a number of positive comments from staff who are already working in the building.

A formal post-occupancy evaluation is planned to take place in the next fortnight involving all the 5th floor occupants.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES GURLING

Thank you Madam Mayor. Can I thank the leader for his response and observe that there are many places where we as a council offer arguably insubstantial office accommodation to our workers which we are right to address. I am particularly grateful that after looking at some of the original plans for staff reallocation and relocation that the staff in the regeneration department were moved up the priority list and moved out of Chiltern and into an actual workable office probably the first time in many years. Having achieved that substantive step forward could he ensure that the lessons are learnt in the occupancy evaluation that he refers to in his answer are put in place as soon as possible so that staff moving across from other departments can reap the benefits as soon as possible once they move into this vastly more appropriate and more humane place to work.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor – Yes. Councillor Gurling would know better than most of us I think that recruitment and retention, particularly of planners which is a vital function for this authority, has been adversely affected by the office accommodation that we have asked them to work in and I do hope that we will see an improvement in that now that we have been relocated to Tooley Street. I think also in fairness to the regeneration team we should say that their determination to get on with the regeneration at Aylesbury Estate has been, I think it is fair to say, redoubled their understanding why they have been able to move off into the offices many residents in the Aylesbury Estate continue to live in conditions which none of us would particularly wish on them. I think it is right that there will be a lot of learning to be done out of the move to Tooley Street. I hope we can do that more quickly and disseminate that more quickly and indeed Tooley Street, the premises itself, should facilitate that. I think we are about to begin the move of children's services into Tooley Street and that will bring together staff who are currently based in

Mabel Goldwin House and in John Smith House and in other outlying posts of the Southwark Empire. Concentrating on every child matters agenda, trying to make sure that we have that joined up view of children, particularly those vulnerable children at risk on our child protection register would be made more easy simply by staff being able to talk to each other, to have quick meetings and not having to catch the bus or taxi from one end of the borough to another.

8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR CAROLINE PIDGEON

What progress has been made in negotiations with Transport for London about funding for transport works as part of the Elephant and Castle regeneration?

RESPONSE

The meeting with the Mayor on the March 23 was successful and included agreement on a long established council proposal for the removal of the southern roundabout and subways. The Mayor was extremely enthusiastic about the scheme for the Elephant and Castle and undertook to work with the council and Lend Lease to develop proposals for an affordable transport solution which can support the regeneration of the area. Transport for London have agreed a workplan with officers that will ensure sufficient information concerning the cost of public transport [including the northern line tube station] and highway improvements is available in time to inform the council's contractual negotiations with Lend Lease Europe.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CAROLINE PIDGEON

I would like to thank the leader for his answer and I welcome this and given that, yes, you have already mentioned there has been a tragic fatality at the Elephant & Castle this evening. I think it is great to hear that there is going to be real progress in removing this southern roundabout, but will the leader agree with me that Transport for London really has got to up its game and work closely with the council and Lend Lease to ensure that we can ensure that an agreement to ensure the Elephant & Castle becomes a reality soon.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor yes and I think the frustration that we have felt in Southwark, and I know other councils in London have experienced, is that TfL are a wonderful body of transport engineers who love looking at transport schemes but have difficulty, I think sometimes, in understanding that the transport scheme can be part of a wider regeneration agenda. Removing the southern roundabout has all sorts of very interesting implications on shorter traffic flow throughout London but actually it is part of a wide scale inner city urban regeneration which would hopefully take the single poorest place you can live anywhere in the London Borough of Southwark and turn it into a far more vibrant, far more prosperous, far more hopeful community for all of us. I think the problem we have and I hope that the current Mayor is able to break resolutions in getting TfL to engage with us on a regeneration scheme and not just simply just gets obsessed about the traffic and transport details. I was encouraged at the meeting that we had with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor I do hope they will be able to bring that culture change to bear in Transport for London.

9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE ZULETA

What progress has been made in implementing the measures to support local businesses which were agreed as part of this year's budget?

RESPONSE

The council is investing in a range of expanded business support services which will provide expert advice and guidance on the practical steps businesses can take to protect their position through the recession and identify any potential for growth. Additionally we are providing more services to encourage new entrepreneurs to start businesses, particularly young people, to make self-employment a practical alternative to PAYE. We have made significant progress in implementing these measures since the budget was agreed.

As part of our review of service provision we have requested project proposals from specialist organisations. We have assessed the proposals and will be investing in those which offer the best value to provide the support that the local business community requires.

35 contracts were recommended for funding, which included 8 projects for business and entrepreneur support. Taken together, the projects have a budget of almost £700,000. The list of approved projects is below:

Provider	Contract value	Description
Business Extra	£200,000	<p>Trading Through Recession</p> <p>Business start up and sustainable growth project including use of business incubation facilities.</p> <p>The project has been expanded in size and capacity this year to increase opportunities for local business to receive free support and advice. The project targets small and medium enterprises and is open to any Southwark business.</p>
GLE One London	£90,000	<p>Sustain and Grow Small Business</p> <p>This programme focuses on assisting small business to ride out the impacts of recession. It focuses on the sustainability of small business, through business health checks and business planning for growth.</p>
Black Business Initiative	£79,000	<p>Southwark Enterprise Forum</p> <p>This continued programme is to ensure businesses owned by BME individuals can access the support they need during the recession. We are focussing on further development and cross referral for Southwark's Ethnic Minority Business Association.</p>
Latin American Development Association	£46,660	<p>Lada Business Sustainability Project</p> <p>Targeting particular ethnic business community.</p> <p>This new business support programme aimed at a specific ethnic community to encourage business start up within a migrant community.</p>

Provider	Contract value	Description
GLE One London Ltd	£92,150	<p>First Steps to Business</p> <p>This is an outreach estate based new entrepreneurship programme.</p> <p>This expanded programme will provide advice for those communities who may not usually actively seek out self employment as a route to work.</p>
Princes Trust	£56,368	<p>Youth Enterprise Programme</p> <p>Targeting 18-30 year olds on entrepreneurship pathway.</p> <p>This new programme aims of providing specific support for Southwark young people</p>
Black Business Initiative	£65,220	<p>Southwark Youth Enterprise Project</p> <p>Targeting mainly ethnic minority young people for new start business opportunities.</p> <p>The new youth entrepreneurship programme is created following the end of London Development Agency funding.</p>
Elephant Jobs	£61,620	<p>Procurement Project</p> <p>Training and advice to assist small businesses become fit to compete for public sector contracts.</p> <p>This programme continues to expand the capacity of local small businesses to access opportunities.</p>
Total investment	£691,018	

Some of these services are continuing and expanding and some are new. All of the new provision will be available from April 1 2009 for a minimum of a year. They will be advertised on the council website and referred to through the council's business desk run by the economic development team. Local businesses can access this service by calling: 020 7525 5353. In addition, the council has also prepared a communications campaign to promote these services to business.

The council has also invested in a broader range of employment support programmes to help local people through the recession.

The council is undergoing a review of its economic strategies in the next 9 months and will be constantly revisiting the performance and delivery of these organisations to ensure we have the right services in the right places to support Southwark residents and businesses.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE ZULETA

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would also like to thank the leader of the council for his response and I would like to ask a supplementary. If he could explain what the council is doing specifically to help those businesses that are tenants of the council with conditions around their rent payments?

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor Southwark's commercial leases, as is standard across the country, with commercial leases require tenants to pay a quarter of its rent in advance. I note that a number of the businesses have suggested that given current cash flow problems they prefer to be able to pay each month in advance rather than have to save up one lump sum. I see no reason in principle why we should not be able to do that by agreement. That may require agreements about standing orders or direct debits but I am very hopeful that we may be able to put an offer in place to those local business which want to avail themselves of that opportunity, it should make not too much difference to our cash flow but it might help them with theirs.

10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL SAMERAI

Can he provide a progress report on the council's plans for Potters Fields?

RESPONSE

The appointed architects are finalising the plans for submission as an application to the planning authority following a period of consultation which concluded with a public exhibition in December. The application will be submitted in the near future. Negotiations are currently underway between the council and developer which are commercially sensitive and will be subject to executive decision.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Thank you Madam Mayor and thank you to the leader for his response. Could you please assure me and other members that there is no secrecy surrounding this process.

RESPONSE

Madam Mayor with nearly 11 years as a ward councillor I don't think I have seen a planning application more consulted on locally even before it is being lodged than this one. Some stakeholders I think have now had three rounds of consultation. As I understand it, it is hoped that Barclays will be lodging a planning application sometime next month. We have gone public that we are talking with Shunt and with the British Empire and Commonwealth Museum about the potential users in the site. The only secrecy that there is around this entire endeavour is the necessary commercial confidentiality that will appertain to any development agreement between the council and Barclays, which will of course be necessary to protect taxpayers interests.

11. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN

What plans are there for Southwark to resurface The Hamlet, Champion Hill, which has not been resurfaced since The Hamlet was built over 40 years ago?

RESPONSE

All of the council's non-principal roads are surveyed each year and ranked according to condition. This ranking is then put together with other information, including: expenditure, number of works orders raised, vicinity of schools and other major works. From this data a list of roads in greatest need of resurfacing repairs is created and this is used to put together the annual programme of works.

The Hamlet is a cul de sac and does not feature on the list of roads requiring resurfacing. The highways team have inspected the road and minor repairs have been carried out but there are no plans at present to re-surface The Hamlet.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN

Thank you Madam Mayor. I thank the executive member for his answer but I am appalled by it. He may be interested to learn that when a residents' parking scheme was introduced earlier this year in the Hamlet officers advised that yellow lines could not be painted on the road because there was not a surface to paint the yellow lines onto. So perhaps I could invite him to visit the Hamlet at his earliest convenience, and preferable soon, so that he can explain to the residents of the Hamlet, the council taxpayers there, why their road will not be surfaced after 43 years and what condition it needs to get into before the council will treat it as a priority given that it is now dust and dirt in many places.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor John for his supplemental. He is aware that we have for quite a number of years prioritised the roads on their condition. We actually appoint an independent consultant to inspect all our roads and actually placed all the roads in the list of priorities. I am afraid he is correct the Hamlet do not appear until quite a way down the list. But I have a solution for you, in your community council you can make a cleaner, greener, safer bid to have that road resurfaced anytime you like.

12. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY

Since the council outsourced its waste collection service there has been growing problems with large piles of rubbish bags left on estates waiting for collection for long periods. This obviously represents a risk to public health. What steps has the executive member taken to ensure that this problem is resolved?

RESPONSE

Bag collections for refuse are not ideal but are sometimes the only option available, especially if there is a lack of storage space for wheeled bins, or difficulties in accessing the properties. This method of collection does not represent a significant risk to public health.

Veolia took over responsibility for collecting Southwark's waste in 2008 and the method of collection and the level of resource made available has not changed since then. Veolia provides a bag collection for refuse on 30 estates serving approximately 20,000 homes.

As bags have to be presented before 7am and are collected between 7am and 6pm residents often place the refuse bags outside their homes the evening before collection. Three teams of collectors work on bag collections each day. They take the bags from outside people's homes and gather them at collection points, from where they are loaded into a dustcart at a later time. Loading the bags directly into a dustcart is not normally a viable option, as the collectors are often working at a considerable distance from the kerbside when gathering bags. If they were to work out of a dustcart, the dustcart and driver would be sitting idle for significant periods, and in many cases would be obstructing local traffic, and adding to noise and air pollution in the locality. The method used means that a single dustcart collects all the bags collected by the three crews and is a more time and cost efficient method of collection

The council and Veolia have been looking at ways to improve the waste collection service and Veolia have been endeavouring to minimise the time between bags being taken to the collection points and their being loaded into a dustcart and removed. For example, on the Brimington Estate the time where bags were awaiting collection was, typically, 5 to 6 hours, but this has recently been reduced to between 30 minutes and 2 hours.

Veolia have been asked to review the collection schedules for all estates which have bag collections. This should allow them to work to a time table and minimise the length of time in which bags are in the street awaiting collection. There are also a small number of properties currently served by bag collections which could be serviced by wheelie bin crews. Consultation is currently taking place with residents with a view to changing these collections.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY

Thank you Madam Mayor and I would like to thank the executive member for his answer and also to put on records my thanks to the officers in hygiene services who have been very helpful in trying to sort out the disgraceful refuse collection arrangements on the Brimington Estate. Does he agree with me that two hours is still too long for big piles of black bags to be left all over an estate and will he agree to support my continuing work for further improvements in these arrangements.

RESPONSE

I would like to thank Councillor Colley for her supplemental. Yes I do agree that two hours or so is a long time but that is the maximum we are now aiming for. The timescale we are now looking for is between 30 minutes and two hours. The alternative would probably take longer if you had refuse vehicles hanging around while the refuse collection went to each individual door for instance and brought the bag back each time so this is a compromise but we are looking to reduce it to 30 minutes rather than two hours and the previous situation that you quite kindly brought to our attention was unacceptable.

13. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

Following reports in the local press of dangerous traffic light organisation at the crossing on Walworth Road at East Street, members of the council said that it was Transport for London's responsibility. Transport for London have since said that changing the light arrangement would require a request from the council for such a change, which has not yet been made. Why has the executive member done nothing to change this potentially dangerous traffic light organisation?

RESPONSE

The lights at the Walworth Road/East Street/Penrose Street junction were designed and installed as part of the Walworth Road improvement project. However, Transport for London (TfL) is responsible for the design, implementation and management of the traffic lights as they are for all of London.

I am aware that some issues were raised with the initial sequence of the lights and as a result they were changed so that the pedestrian phase came after all the traffic movements had taken place. The lights were inspected by TfL and Southwark in December 2008 and it was agreed that they were working correctly.

It was however noted that pedestrians were trying to cross when the red man was showing and thus potentially putting themselves in the way of traffic turning right from Penrose Street into Walworth Road. As a result we are now looking to erect some road safety signs to re-enforce the message to pedestrians that they should only cross on the green man. An independent survey will also be carried out.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

I would like to thank the executive for his answer. However, you mentioned that an independent survey will be carried out. If residents say that they find the crossing to be dangerous what will you do then?

RESPONSE

Thank you Councillor Lauder for your supplemental. We have been working very closely with TfL on this particular crossing. You may not be aware but the actual sequence of lights have already changed from what was originally introduced. They have been phased to its current situation and present indications are the situation has improved over previous situation, inasmuch to date it is indicative there has not being any road collision involving pedestrians at this particular crossing. But any sort of collision with the pedestrian is down to more than one person, its possibly the driver and/or the pedestrian and so we really need to look at having pedestrians making sure they don't cross the road if the red man is still showing - so if the red man is still showing they should not attempt to cross the road. Also the onus is on the drivers that whilst they are turning round that corner and going towards the pedestrian crossing, if they see a pedestrian has his foot on the pavement they automatically take the right of way. So it is down to the driver and the pedestrians to be aware of each other. You may be aware this scheme is called shared space and everyone has to share the space available. So drivers have to slow down when they approach a pedestrian crossing and pedestrian should not enter a crossing if the red man is still lit, they have to wait for the green man.

14. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO

What discussions have transport planning officers had with Transport for London regarding traffic management at the Rotherhithe Tunnel roundabout?

RESPONSE

The possibility of Transport for London (TfL) undertaking a review of traffic management at the Rotherhithe Tunnel roundabout has been discussed at a number of recent meetings in particular the regular liaison meeting between officers from both authorities. TfL have indicated that they are prepared to carry out a comprehensive review but, as yet, it has not proved possible to get a programme or timescale. Officers are continuing to press for this as a matter of urgency.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO

I would like to thank the executive member for his response. I particularly appreciate the fact that officers are continuing to press on the review of traffic management in the Rotherhithe area. Will the executive member then write to the Mayor to ask him to progress this as a matter of urgency and provide a timescale for this work to be undertaken.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Blango for his supplemental. We are always in discussion with Transport for London to try and improve our road traffic network and I have taken on board what you have suggested and I will carry that out. Thank you.

15. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN JARDINE-BROWN

In this year's budget, a saving was identified as a result of improvements to the council's parking charges collection. Can he explain how these savings will be delivered and what the impact will be on local residents?

RESPONSE

The saving will be delivered by the extension of the pay-by-phone service to the whole of Southwark. It is currently operating in the north of the borough. We are now in the process of procurement and the expected "go live" date will be September 2009.

To date the service operating in the north of the borough has proved very popular, with up 55% of payments being made through this service in those areas where it's operating. This currently accounts for over 10% of all pay and display revenue. The changes provide the general public with a more convenient way of paying for their parking, for example: by not having to carry lots of change or if delayed returning to their vehicle extending their parking time using this system. The initiative should also see a reduction in vandalism and theft of pay and display machines, lower maintenance costs and reduced capital costs. This will save approximately £50,000 per year.

16. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BOB SKELLY

What progress has been made in developing a markets strategy for the borough?

RESPONSE

Towards the end of 2008 I commissioned a strategic review of markets and street trading in the borough working with the National Association of British Markets Authorities with the full participation of traders and their representatives. This review was completed at the end of January 2009. One of the recommendations of the review was the development of a markets strategy which officers are now actively working on. This is expected to be a relatively quick exercise with a draft available in May that will then go through the individual decision making process before being released for consultation.

The aim of the strategy is to chart the way forward to revitalising markets and street trading so that they play a full part in the regeneration of Southwark, maximise their economic and employment benefits, promote and sustain independent and small businesses, provide access to high quality affordable food and other commodities and contribute to a vibrant public realm.

17. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ADE LASAKI

In his answer to a question at council assembly in January, the executive member said that the council's funeral charges were significantly below the London average. Can he confirm whether he has plans to increase these charges to bring them into line with the London average?

RESPONSE

This year I have no plans to increase fees and charges to the London average. This is shown in the Public Realm Division – Fees and charges 2009-10 decision I signed in March this year. Most rises will not be more than 4.5 per cent, with some reducing in price. A £50 supplement will be applied to adult cremations to fund the government's measures to deal with mercury emissions.

Southwark's cemeteries and cremations prices are significantly below the London average; indeed in 2008-09 Southwark charged £783 for a burial against the Inner London average of £1,432. In 2009-10 our price of a burial increased by 4.5 per cent, to £818; still significantly below the Inner London and London averages. This compares with £1,056 charged by Lambeth and £1,000 charged by Lewisham.

In reviewing what we charge we have also taken the opportunity to make the system easier, simpler and fairer for people to use, including:

- charging children's rates for cremations for all under sixteen years of age, to make it easier for parents at this difficult time
- waiving all fees for burials and cremations of resident members of the armed forces who are killed in action, recognizing their service to the country
- extending the time-limit – from two to five years – for people who have moved away from the borough who will still be treated as residents for the purposes of fees and charges, for example: helping families of older people who might need to move for care. If Southwark's social care services placed someone outside of the borough for care then they will automatically be considered as residents and will only be charged resident rates
- in line with other London boroughs, we have simplified our burial fees for non-residents, which will be set at three times that of the resident fees.

In addition, this year and to comply with a statutory direction issued by government under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2007, we are introducing a flat rate £50 supplement to adult cremations. This will fund new pollution control measures dealing with mercury from dental fillings.

18. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK

Can he provide a list of those private housing blocks which do not allow access to the council to collect recycling?

RESPONSE

Veolia are currently in the process of producing a definitive list of private housing blocks which do not allow access for recycling collections. I will continue to work with officers to ensure that as many private housing blocks as possible recycle their waste.

19. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

In the Canada Water Area Action Plan, Figure 11, 'Sites which may be suitable for new homes', the Fish Farm is given as an example site. Can he explain why the Fish Farm is designated as a site for development when many local people consider it to be part of Southwark Park?

RESPONSE

In planning and development terms, the Fish Farm does not form part of the park, but its use and appearance over the years has understandably created a different impression. I know that many local residents feel it is a part of the park and this inconsistency can be addressed through the next stage of the Canada Water area action plan.

The site was not designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) in the 1995 unitary development plan (UDP), nor was it designated as an open space in the 1983 technical appraisal which supported the North Southwark Plan, the 1981 Southwark Open Spaces Survey, the 1964-69 Southwark Changing Environment Report or the 1951 Country of London Development Plan. These plans consistently state that the size of the park is around 25ha. The Southwark Plan indicates that the size of the park is 26.87ha. The evidence therefore suggests that the Fish Farm has not been considered as part of the park, certainly in recent times.

The site has therefore been identified as a possible development site in the Canada Water Issues and Options Report on the basis that it has no designation in the Southwark Plan. The site has also been included as a potential development site because the sale of the Fish Farm would be essential to make replacement of the Seven Islands Leisure centre on a new site a financially viable proposition.

Alternatively, the council has the opportunity, through the development of the Canada Water Area Action Plan and the Core Strategy, to designate the Fish Farm as Metropolitan Open Land and thereby safeguard it from further development. This would have a major financial impact on the viability of demolishing the Seven Islands Leisure Centre and providing a new centre elsewhere, and would probably mean that the council would refurbish Seven Islands rather than building a replacement.

Incorporating the Fish Farm into the park would require capital investment to clear the site, remediate any contamination, and re-landscape and would have ongoing revenue funding implications.

I wish to stress that the use of the Fish Farm site for development is raised as an options in the issues and options report which has been subject to recent public consultation. No decisions on the future of the site have yet been taken, though my personal preference is for designation of the site as Metropolitan Open Land.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

I would like to thank the executive for his response and I do have a supplementary question for him. Can he tell me when the issues and option papers will be published and how local people can give their views at this point.

RESPONSE FROM THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION

Thank you for your supplemental. I suspect that she is talking about the preferred option stage of this consultation which is due to come before the executive and before that the planning committee in the middle of June. We would be going through the usual levels of information, actually what more having learnt from the first round about making information on the preferred options available - particularly in Seven Islands. Because this is obviously such a live issue to her and her constituent as well as Surrey Quay Shopping Centre and the Albion Street Library and I am sure it will happen at a couple of community meeting as well for good measure.

20. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ANDREW PAKES

Why is the council putting speed humps on streets in Southwark where average speeds are already lower than 24mph and which could, therefore, just be given 20mph speed limits?

RESPONSE

All available evidence shows that accidents which occur at speeds of 20mph or lower are less likely to be fatal than those happening at higher speeds. This is the reason behind this administration's commitment to making Southwark a 20mph borough.

The 2006 road safety plan states:

“There will be a preference for the use of emerging speed reduction technology such as cameras. However, it is recognised that in the shorter term, physical measures such as horizontal deflectors like chicanes and vertical deflectors like humps and cushions will be required. These will be implemented to ensure that the 20 mph limit is as self enforcing as possible, whilst recognising the needs of various road users, such as cyclists and bus passengers.”

In line with this policy, the main tool which Southwark has used to implement 20mph speed restrictions across the borough has been the 20mph zone. 20mph zones are intended to be self-enforcing - the various measures are intended to make it very difficult for most vehicles to attain speeds above 20mph. The regulations therefore require that within the zone no point should be further than 50m from a traffic calming 'measure' - such as a speed bump, speed cushion, island, chicane or a sharp bend. In other words, one will generally find such measures no more than every 100m.

Each street or zone where we propose to do work will have a unique set of circumstances and will be assessed accordingly. Therefore there may be instances where speed humps are installed where speeds are already lower than 24mph.

Whilst I recognise that physical traffic calming measures such as speed humps are not ideal, the implementation of self-enforcing 20mph zones is currently the most effective way to reduce speeds to 20mph across the borough. We continue to look at alternative measures to reduce speeds, such as average speed cameras, but until changes are made to the local implementation plan (LIP) funding process or police guidelines, the council will be forced in many cases to use speed humps to reduce speeds to a safe level.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANDREW PAKES

Madam Mayor can I thank the executive member for his answer. I was prompted to put the question in having seen a number of cul-de-sacs and very small streets where I think in a race it would be very difficult to get to 24 miles an hour or 25 miles an hour let alone anything else. Does the executive member does not see a contradiction between the statement in his answer that each street or zone where we propose to do work will have a unique set of circumstances and will be assessed accordingly, a contradiction between that statement and the heavy handed and financial wasteful manner in which the council is imposing speed humps across this borough.

RESPONSE

Thank you Madam Mayor. I thank Councillor Pakes for his supplemental question. We have covered this ground a few times now but we are kind of blocked in a little bit by what the police will accept or sign off on - what will be suitable for a 20 hour zone. Basically they are saying that any road, and it could be a short dead end road, at speed

faster than 24 miles an hour they want a speed hump or some traffic control measure in there. The humps and bumps are not always the best solution but the most cost effective solution. Now how TfL look at the LIPs bids are - what is the most cost effective solution in comparison to the most of accidents or collision involving the person that has happened in that area - and the bottom line is putting speed humps and bumps in is the cheaper solution and that is what they will fund. We could quite willy-nilly put in really massive schemes, lots of fancy different ideas on road traffic and calming measures but they just would not fund it.

21. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS

Can the executive member for the environment provide the results of the consultation on the proposed zebra crossing on Lordship Lane outside Somerfield and will he make a statement?

RESPONSE

Proposals for a variety of pedestrian improvements designed to improve walking cycling accessibility and safety on Lordship Lane and at the Goose Green roundabout were put out for public consultation between the February 6 and February 23 2009. The proposals included: two options for a new zebra crossing outside Somerfield, a new zebra crossing on the Grove Vale arm of the Goose Green roundabout and other changes to adjacent areas including a cycle-contraflow on Spurling Road, and raised table crossing points on Crawthorpe Grove, Matham Grove, Frogley Road, Ashbourne Grove and Chesterfield Grove. Consultation material was sent to 2,217 addresses within the consultation area; 203 responses were returned - a response rate of just over 9%.

Support for the proposals was as follows:

- 86.8% for one of the Somerfield zebra options
- 77.9% for cycle access into Spurling Road
- 89.4% for other changes to the Goose Green roundabout including the new zebra on its third arm
- 80% for the entry treatments to the five side streets.

Construction works are expected to start shortly on the Goose Green roundabout and side entry treatment works and on the civil works required for a raised crossing at Somerfield, though in the short term this will be an uncontrolled / informal crossing. Discussions with Transport for London will continue into 2009-10 in order to install either zebra or signalled crossing facilities at this point.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS

I thank Councillor Hooks for his answer and obviously I welcome the progress that has been made. But on the Somerfield question I have got an extraordinary e-mail from Engineering & Transport for London which says 'as there are high pedestrian volumes and significant volumes of traffic a zebra will cause substantial delays to bus and general traffic'. Does he agree with me that it is precisely because there are high numbers of pedestrians that a zebra crossing is needed outside Somerfield on Lordship Lane and does he agree with me that this is yet another example of TfL using strategic powers to interfere needlessly in local matters and will he ensure that it is escalated to a higher level in TfL so that we can get agreement to proceed with the zebra crossing outside Somerfield on Lordship Lane as soon as humanely possible.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Thomas for his supplemental. I quite agree that we have had quite an amount of talk tonight about people who have been involved in collisions across the borough and the last thing we want is a collision with a person at this point. So it does seem to make sense to have a full blown pelican or zebra crossing at this point but at the moment TfL, in particular London Buses, are saying we don't want to slow the buses down but for me pedestrians comes first, then users of public transport and then other vehicles eventually car drivers.

22. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE

Does the executive member believe that the standard of the council's highways maintenance across the borough is acceptable?

RESPONSE

In 2005-06 the executive agreed an annual investment programme of £5m for highways and lighting that was designed to ensure that Southwark maintains its place in the top 25% of local authorities against the national indicators. This was the first time that the council had established a capital budget for planned maintenance.

In the last four years we have spent over £10m on maintaining the borough roads including the award winning Walworth Road project. This has allowed us to replace over 15km of roads and footway. In addition we intend to spend another £8m over the coming two years which will allow us to replace at least a further 11km. This investment has and will continue to relieve the current maintenance budget of repair pressure.

At the same time we are spending £2.2m revenue per year undertaking short term maintenance on things like pot holes and in the last year we have responded to over 3,500 requests for emergency repairs, 99% of which were completed within 24 hours of inspection.

I recognise that the recent cold snap has led to some rapid deterioration in road surfaces. This has led to a threefold increase in service requests from the customer service centre. We have however managed to inspect and at least make safe all of the roads we have been contacted about with our target time.

We do of course monitor the performance of our contractor in relation maintenance and currently we are satisfied with regard to their performance in relation to identification of defects, response times and standards of safety and workmanship.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE

I would like to thank the executive member for his reply and I would like him though to try to separate the rhetoric from the reality in his answer and tell me that when he is driving around the borough as a driving instructor, is he not embarrassed by the state of many of our roads when he is trying to teach someone to drive. I give an example of these, Consort Road in Lane Ward, Naylor Road in Peckham and Livesey Ward and Whateley Road in East Dulwich Ward. These roads frankly Councillor Hook are a disgrace.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Hargrove for his supplemental question and what I tend to do with my pupils is to tell them to drive with the speed appropriate for both conditions. So if it does

happen to have a pothole in it we will slow down appropriately. But I do tend to plan my routes very carefully where I take my pupils and I tend to avoid any hotspots.

23. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER

Given the commitment of all political groups in Southwark to the retention of the council's housing stock, can he confirm whether the council is a member of ARCH, the Association of Retained Council Housing?

RESPONSE

Southwark has joined forces with over 40 other stock retained authorities across the country as members of ARCH. Southwark will be attending ARCH's executive board meeting in May to lead a discussion about the benefits of stock retention and ways the group can influence decision making about the future of social housing.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER

Thank you Madam Mayor I do have a supplemental. Given the motion we are discussing later this evening has ARCH had any news of the government supposed plans to allow councils to build council houses?

RESPONSE

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to thank Councillor Manchester for her supplemental. We have nothing formal at this stage but we are expecting that there may well be an announcement with regards to that and when we move the debate I do intend to make some announcements in terms of our response to that.

24. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER

What is the council doing to support those who are having difficulties paying their mortgages?

RESPONSE

Any local homeowner who is having difficulty with their mortgage can approach the homesearch centre in Bournemouth Road, or one of the local money advice agencies such as Blackfriars Advice Centre to discuss the best option. Depending on the individual circumstances it may be that money management and debt advice are sufficient, in other situations negotiations with the lender regarding reduced payments or even a payment holiday will be the best way forward. The government's mortgage rescue scheme (MRS) may suit some families and allow them to stay in their own home – by transferring the mortgage to a local recognised social landlord (RSL) and then being rented back to the family or being converted into a shared equity arrangement for a limited period. However, as there are 3 separate assessments for each family required for this scheme (initial financial assessment by finance agency, homelessness assessment by community housing service and final options test by Tower Homes) and the resources are limited to assisting 20 families across 12 London boroughs it is anticipated to have a limited impact locally. Last year the homesearch centre was approached by 24 home owners who were threatened with homelessness. In order not to raise false expectations, the MRS scheme will not be marketed specifically locally, but the relevant agencies locally will ensure that home owners in difficulty will be assessed for the full range of advice and assistance.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER

Thank you Madam Mayor. I thank the executive member for his response. Just one small supplemental. Would he agree with me that the current MRS scheme is unnecessarily complicated and limited and would he agree to make representations to the government to simplify the scheme and to widen it by providing more resources.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Hubber for his supplemental. I do certainly agree that the scheme was much lauded but actually in terms of actual delivery has being comparatively miniscule in terms of impact in South London. I think Greenwich potentially might be one of the first boroughs to avail itself of this. I am pleased to say that actually in terms of the information that we have on foreclosures in the Southwark area that we have seen no significant increase at this stage.

25. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR JANE SALMON

How many Heygate tenants have been re-housed to date?

RESPONSE

As of April 3 2009, the number of Heygate Tenants that have been rehoused are as follows:

Phase 1: 175 (91%)
Phase 2: 137 (77%)
Phase 3: 108 (40%)
Phase 4: 27 (38%)

26. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR MACKIE SHEIK

What representations has he received about his decision on charges for parking on council estates? Has he decided to reduce any of the charges as a result of representations?

RESPONSE

Even with current increases our parking charges are highly competitive with other London authorities. However, we have responded to resident concerns over the impact of increased charges for visitors to the more vulnerable estate residents. These charges will be reduced by 25%:

- Visitor Parking Permits - 60 visits - £100
- Visitor Parking Permits - 10 visits - £20

To

- Visitor Parking Permits - 60 visits - £75
- Visitor Parking Permits - 10 visits - £15

27. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITIZENSHIP, EQUALITIES & COMMUNITIES FROM COUNCILLOR TAYO SITU

In October 2007, the then executive member for citizenship, equalities and communities told the overview and scrutiny committee that the council could only guarantee that 2810 members of council staff, roughly half, had completed equalities and diversity training. How many have completed it today?

RESPONSE

It is council policy that all management staff and all front line staff complete the equalities and diversity training. This equates to around 3,000 staff which is 45% of the total workforce.

The council takes equality and diversity very seriously, as evidenced through individual officer work plans, the council's corporate plan and our sustainable community strategy, which explicitly reflects equality and diversity objectives. Further, our business planning process ensures that equalities are embedded throughout business plans as required under our equalities and human rights scheme. Departments also ensure that where equality impact assessments (EqIA's) are carried out, these are supported by social policy officers and the schedule that is developed is used as a monitor and measure of performance for that department. This successful approach has led to us training external partners.

The 2810 members of staff referred to in the question, were the number of people that completed the "e" learning module developed to inform and provide awareness of our responsibility under the Race Relations Amendment Act at that time.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR TAYO SITU

Thank you Madam Mayor and I thank the executive member for the response though it is not enough. I just want to ask this supplemental question. Does the executive member recognise as a result of the diverse nature of Southwark all members of staff need to complete equalities and diversity training.

RESPONSE

Thank you Madam Mayor and I thank Councillor Situ for his supplemental. I think the most important thing is that in an area as diverse as Southwark is that equalities and human rights processes are embedded into everything that every council officer does within the council. Having the specific training is prioritised according to the people who are in front line services, who are delivering services out there and are not doing the back office functions. I think it is very important and because it is important it is embedded in all of staff training that they do. All new staff are doing it and equalities and human rights training is embedded into all forms of training that the staff do.

28. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITIZENSHIP, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITIES FROM COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED

How does the council ensure that minority communities in Southwark are not excluded from health, education and community and council services and how is this monitored?

RESPONSE

Southwark Council has a well documented history of tackling inequality experienced by minority communities. These minority communities include ethnic minorities, young and older people, people of different sexual orientations, faith and non faith or religious minorities and people with disabilities, as well as refugees, asylum seekers and Travellers.

The equality impact assessment process is robust and ensures that where there are perceived gaps or potential for disadvantage in service delivery to minority groups and communities, these are identified and addressed through an action plan. This process also incorporates human rights and community cohesion considerations. All customer facing services are given high priority in the equality impact assessment process. This process ensures a thorough assessment of service delivery to minority communities.

Monitoring of service delivery to communities is evidenced through the equality impact assessment process, which is an evidence based process. At a departmental level, priority is given to high impact services. For example, children services' monitors attainment at all levels, by ethnicity and gender.

Customer satisfaction across Southwark is monitored through the residents survey administered on the council's behalf by Ipsos MORI, to exacting market research standards.

A significant contribution to the inclusion of all residents and other service users is made through the council's community support grants programme, which supports communities of interest, geographical bases for community activity and capacity building and infrastructure organisations. Equally, support for the community of interest forums, e.g. Southwark Refugee Communities Forum, Pensioners Forum, LGBT Forum and the Multi-Faith Forum is allowing harder to reach voices to be heard so that they can help inform service delivery from a user perspective. The Stronger Communities Partnership within the Alliance, made up of council, police, faith and third sector partners is taking forward work on increasing volunteering and participation, to maximise the opportunities for all to take a full part in local civic life. This includes having an awareness of service entitlement and how to access it.

29. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR NICK VINEALL

Is it correct the police have sourced and offered to the council (free of charge) an existing redundant CCTV camera which could be installed in Norwood Road (using the CGS funds, which have already been awarded, to fund the installation)? If so what response has been given on behalf of the council? What would the executive member's advice be if such an offer were to be made in the future?

RESPONSE

At my request, council officers have spoken to the Deputy Borough Commander who has informed us that he has not sourced, free of charge, a CCTV camera for the Norwood Road. The current funding which has been identified from cleaner greener safer (CGS) is £10,000. This is insufficient to cover the costs of acquiring and erecting a camera, along with the necessary cabling and technical costs. In addition the current British Telecom line rental charges for a camera are just under £2,000 per annum, which would be an additional call on the revenue budget for community safety.

I would be happy to meet with councillors for Village Ward to discuss appropriate and affordable ways in which we could help them to meet residents' wishes for a CCTV camera in this area.

30. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY

How has the violent crime summit held in February changed the council's approach to this pressing issue? What is the next stage of this process?

RESPONSE

One of the aims of the violent crime summit was to allow Southwark and other authorities in the Five Boroughs' Alliance to share best practice. The summit assisted the council and the Safer Southwark Partnership in identifying how we can best target resources on key areas and key individuals to achieve a higher level of success. The summit also highlighted the importance of face-to-face communication. This is an approach which Southwark adopted during 2008-09 and which we are intending to expand in 2009-10. We will continue to work closely with our partner agencies to implement this good practice, develop our work on violent crime and incorporate these approaches in our updated Safer Southwark Partnership three year rolling plan.

In addition the summit identified a number of key priority areas which the Five Borough Alliance will raise with regional and central government.

These include:

- closer collaborative working with the media around responsible reporting of serious violent crime and impacts on people's fear of crime
- a multi agency approach to better manage school exclusion
- the need for work with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and central government for more longer term funding for the voluntary sector.
- the need for relocation arrangements between registered social landlords in order to move families and individuals who are at risk of serious violence
- a training programme on violent crime, weapons, gangs and how these issues relate to young people. The training to be delivered for central and regional government officials, as well as local communities.

We have already arranged to meet with the Mayor's Office, Home Office and the London Councils' Serious Youth Crime Board to progress these priorities.

Finally the summit has helped cement the close working relationship that we have established with our neighbouring boroughs as part of the Five Boroughs' Alliance. As a direct result of the summit there have been discussions with Lambeth in developing a cross border programme to address violent crime that is taking place between the two boroughs. We will present our proposals following a meeting between the strategic leads for the two boroughs later this month.

31. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY

Would the executive member for culture, media and sport please set out what plans he has for reviewing arrangements relating to ownership, trusteeship, custody, and the like, for the works of art which were formerly kept at the South London Gallery (some being loaned for use in council offices), and would he state whether there are any proposals to put some of them on public display?

RESPONSE

The South London Gallery Permanent Collection is part of the Southwark collections that also include the Cuming Museum collections and Local Studies and Archive Collections. When the South London Gallery became independent in October 2003, the collection was signed over to the care of Southwark Council culture service on a 25 year renewable

agreement which means that the council is responsible for the conservation, storage and overall care of the collection, and its display and loan to benefit the public and for educational purposes. The collection is managed to professional standards and this is assessed through the museums accreditation process by the MLA (Museums, Libraries and Archives). The care of the collection has recently been reviewed, and the council will be awarded full accreditation status again this summer, meeting the professional standards set by the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS). The South London Gallery collection is kept with a local art storage company, Constantines.

The council is conscious of ensuring that the public benefits as much as possible from the collection, and it is currently being digitised to enable on-line access on the Southwark collections site (www.southwarkcollections.org.uk).

Recent and current public display of items from the collection includes:

- Southwark secondary schools: 'Double Take' programme with Bacon's College and St Saviour's and St Olave's included key contemporary works from the collection (Gavin Turk, Marc Camille, Chaimowicz and Anthony Gormley) as part of exhibitions in the school, accessed by hundreds of young people
- 'Art in Class' programme in Southwark primary schools
- Hogarth exhibition at the Cuming Museum, now on tour to Canterbury
- Southwark Unwrapped exhibition at the Cuming Museum
- Pictures and coin collection at Brunel Museum
- Bert Hardy photographs as part of the London College of Communications exhibition and on regular display locally
- Bust of Harold Moody on permanent public display at Peckham Library from late April.

Items on tour include De Morgan panels at Wandsworth Museum, Stanley Spencer at Yale, and other items at the Palace of Westminster and Leighton House.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY

Given that some of the better traditional art works appear to be on loan to parliament, Wandsworth and points further afield would he agree that there might be a case for assembling the works in Southwark for at least a temporary exhibition.

RESPONSE

Thank you Councillor Eckersley. Your question caught me a bit on the hop. I share your sentiments that we should value the existing cultural inheritance of this borough and I will endeavour to bring your request about.

32. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT FROM COUNCILLOR MICHELLE HOLFORD

Can the executive member please provide an update on the progress that has been made to date with the refurbishment of the Dulwich leisure centre?

RESPONSE

Dulwich leisure centre has been through the council's planning process and has now been granted listed building consent by the Government Office for London. Some preliminary works have begun and officers are engaged with the building contractors on the final works programme. The aim is to minimise disruption to service and complete the project as soon as possible.

The contractors hope to begin properly on site in May and currently, a phased reopening of the centre (beginning with the refurbished pool) is scheduled for Spring of 2010.

The plans for the centre are impressive and will provide the community with an excellent modern leisure centre whilst preserving and enhancing the building's existing grade II listed features.

33. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE AND SPORT FROM COUNCILLOR ALISON MCGOVERN

Regarding the project management of the new sculpture in Burgess Park: who has been consulted? Which arts organisations are assisting the council? What is the anticipated cost?

RESPONSE

The proposal for a new sculpture in Burgess Park was brought to council assembly in November 2007 and put on display in the council chamber. The sculpture has been created by local artist Sokari Douglas Camp and was submitted for a competition for a national memorial to the abolition of the slave trade in the British Empire Act. It is considered that this could be appropriate to follow on from the bicentenary commemorations and would be an ideal first commission for Burgess Park. The project is being managed by the chief executive's office with appropriate advice and support from parks and the cultural service. Officers have been working with the artist to identify potential funding sources and to ensure that it is installed in consideration with the overall plans and designs for Burgess Park.

34. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR IAN WINGFIELD

On February 20 the executive member for resources sent all councillors an email listing ten ways that the new Tooley Street building will save the council money. Given the fact that the council hopes to save several million pounds on top of the £7.5m that it will spend every year on the rent, will the member account for how much money the council will save for each of the ten points individually?

RESPONSE

The council is seeking to save £3m a year from 2009-10 from sharing support services in human resources, finance and administration, with the co-location at Tooley Street alone contributing an estimated £1m. Savings targets are notionally set for each function individually but there is not a clear demarcation between different transactional support services, so the saving remains an overall sum. Reductions in agency use that may be attributed to the move to Tooley Street relate to shared support services primarily and some smaller savings in facilities management.

The council recruits approximately 650 individuals a year at a cost of £1m on advertising alone. It is impossible to quantify precisely what impact the move to Tooley Street will have on this cost on its own, but it is known from surveys and feedback that poor office location and environment have an adverse impact on recruitment and retention, especially in some hard to fill jobs e.g. planners.

The council will also seek to save a £2m a year in operational savings associated with the move to 160 Tooley Street e.g. fewer car journeys, less stationery and paper, lower overheads per member of staff for lighting and heating. Some £251,000 efficiency

savings have been set for facilities management (FM) and direct running costs relating to Tooley Street as part of the 2009-10 budget process. Further savings will be quantified in future years, following the Tooley Street transitional period and the delivery of the new Corporate FM works and services contracts. The gateway 1 reports on the corporate FM contracts are going to the executive in May 2009.

Disposal of office accommodation surplus to requirements will gain the council £20m to £30m. The disposal programme is proceeding well given the prevailing market conditions, with reasonable levels of interest in all the buildings that have been marketed. Values being achieved in offers recommended so far are in line with expectations. Officers are monitoring progress closely given the need to obtain the best possible return from properties. Individual disposals will continue to be approved through executive in the usual way. We are also making arrangements for the security of properties that are unoccupied for any significant period between vacation and sale.

Foregoing the expense of modernising office buildings which are no longer fit-for-purpose will save up to £20m.

35. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD

I have been informed that members of staff who become home workers will not receive an allowance for the extra utilities they consume at home. They will not be given an allowance for ICT equipment. They certainly will not be provided with £600 chairs by the council. Up and down the country employers are offering their staff allowances to work at home so that home-working does not become a financial burden. Why hasn't Southwark?

RESPONSE

Following tough negotiations undertaken by officers, the actual cost of the new chairs for Tooley Street is far less than £600. What's more, we will be reusing and recycling as much furniture as we can as part of our programme and only purchasing new chairs on a floor by floor basis to replace those that do not meet the health and safety standards for required hot-desking. Tooley Street requires 1765 chairs, but as a result of reuse and recycling, we plan to need far fewer new chairs.

For a number of years, we have allowed staff to work at home as a way to encourage a healthy work-life balance. Whilst for many this has had an IT basis, for others this involves writing reports, undertaking background research or preparation which is predominantly paper based.

The introduction of Citrix as the basic platform for IT has allowed the council to develop a facility whereby staff can access their council systems from their own, non-Southwark computers through a web browser. This has opened up the opportunity for occasional home working to a significantly larger group of people who can use their computers at home (with minimum specification), or other locations. Many staff have welcomed this opportunity to work in a more flexible way which is more sympathetic to their lifestyle choice.

All staff members will continue to have a work base in a council office which remains as their formal place of work, with equipment and facilities provided by the council. There is no compulsion for any member of staff to work at home, but the council continues to encourage some home-working for those who choose it as part of achieving a suitable work-life balance, recognising this is part of modern ways of working.

In the eventuality that staff members choose to work from home full time, the situation changes in terms of equipment, funding of utilities and health & safety requirements. In this type of situation, the home becomes the work base and the council would treat it in the same way as office location. This is not the case in Southwark at the present time.

36. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE

Southwark has the 19th highest unemployment rate as an authority in Britain. Will the executive member provide the detailed breakdown of job losses that come as a result of the executive's budget for 2009-10 that he was not able to provide at the last council assembly meeting?

RESPONSE

The budget agreed by council in February contained £17.3m in savings. These savings were identified in order to help the council produce a balanced budget and cope with the impact of a government funding settlement which has failed to keep pace with increasing demand for services, or account for the damaging impact of the recession on the council's finances.

In order to deliver this £17.3m in savings and protect frontline services where possible, we have had to look at improving efficiency. Most of these savings come from a plan to relocate the majority of staff into either a central HQ or modern hubs in the community and so spend less on administration and staff support. These savings are being delivered as a result of reducing duplication of activity, making better use of technology and improving efficiency.

46% of the council's net general fund budget is spent on staff salaries. It is not possible to deliver significant efficiency savings without reducing the number of staff posts in the organisation.

As such, the 2009-10 budget includes proposals for approximately 180 posts to be removed from the Council's official establishment. However, many of these posts will be removed without the need for redundancies. Our plan is that most of the reductions will be met by not filling existing vacancies, ending the use of agency staff, redeployment or other roles that are no longer needed.

The 2009-10 budget also contained a significant increase in the funding to tackle the worklessness and business support agendas in the borough with an additional £2m for the economic development team who have commissioned local organisations to provide training and support to help an additional 760 people get jobs and help over 150 new businesses start, plus £200,000 to fund 24 apprenticeships within the council.

The budget was therefore a net creator of jobs in the borough.

37. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT SMEATH

How much has the council spent on private hire vehicles for the Mayor since it disposed of the permanent vehicle?

RESPONSE

The total cost for the chauffeur service has been halved from £120,000 in 2007-08 to £59,319 in 2008-09.

38. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR KIRSTY MCNEILL

Given the changing real estate market, has the member re-estimated how much he plans to make in capital receipts from the sale of the council's existing offices? How would the executive member characterise the sales process so far?

RESPONSE

The disposal programme is proceeding well given the prevailing market conditions with reasonable levels of interest in all the buildings that have been marketed. Values being achieved in offers recommended for acceptance so far are in line with expectations therefore there is no need to re-estimate capital receipts from the sale of the council's existing offices. Officers are monitoring progress closely given the need to obtain the best possible return from properties. Individual disposals will continue to be approved through executive in the usual way.

For the financial year 2008-09, the council has once again exceeded its overall target for capital receipts in difficult market conditions. Officers will strive to repeat this success for 2009-10 and maintain a track record of maximising disposal prices.

Void housing properties continue to be processed for sale with a 100% success rate over the last year. These properties have mostly been sold at auction, where there remains a level of confidence among buyers.

39. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH & ADULT CARE FROM COUNCILLOR SUSAN ELAN JONES

In the light of the above inflation increase in adult care fees and charges announced for 2009-10, on top of the 10% increase in the proportion of disposable income that Southwark can charge for care services, can you provide us with an estimate of the average charge that Southwark residents in receipt of adult care services will pay in 2009-10, and the equivalent figure for 2008-09?

RESPONSE

There are a number of services which are available through Southwark's adult care service to assist residents who are experiencing difficulty living independently. These include home care, meals on wheels, occupational therapy, home shopping and services to support older people once they leave hospital. It is therefore difficult to provide an estimate of the average charge that a Southwark resident in receipt of adult care services would pay, as essentially there is no such thing as a 'typical service user'.

The increase of 4.5% in charges has been recommended to ensure that we comply with the council's medium term resource strategy and meets the objective of our charges being at the appropriate London average.

The changes to the fairer charging mechanism to increase the percentage of surplus income used in client contributions towards the cost of their care to 80% over 3 years were agreed, following consultation in 2008-09, and are intended to bring Southwark closer to the London average of 85%.

Furthermore, the majority of client's contribute nothing to the cost of their care (55%) and those who do contribute are assessed on their ability to pay for services such as homecare and day centre attendance.

For example the total cost of providing home care in Southwark in 2009-10 is estimated to be £15m, to which clients will contribute approximately £1m or 7% and the cost of providing meals on wheels will be £970,000 towards which clients contribute £550,000 or 56%.

The average cost to the council of a week in a residential/nursing placement in 2008-09 was £695.46. The average subsidy for these placements in 2008-09 was £567.05 and in 2009-10 this is £560.63.

Fundamentally, there is and remains a significant subsidy in respect of residential and home care packages and this limits the impact on clients of any changes in fees.

The government have consistently underfunded social care in comparison to health and have failed to fund local authorities to meet the growing demands on their services. They appear to have belatedly recognised this crisis in social care funding with their green paper on the funding of long-term care.

40. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES

The Conservative party housing spokesman (Grant Shapps MP) announced in a recent interview in 'Regeneration & Renewal' magazine that an incoming Conservative government would review the performance of the Homes & Communities Agency within 1 year of a Conservative government entering office. Could the executive member tell me his opinion of the performance of the Homes & Communities Agency thus far and what effect would its closure have on Southwark's regeneration schemes?

RESPONSE

The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) have been extremely helpful in enabling housing associations and developers to bring forward schemes which otherwise would not be starting for some time due to the Labour government's mismanagement of the economy over the last decade and the ensuing credit crunch that the whole country, including Southwark, are currently facing.

As someone who is committed to delivering value for money, I think performance reviews are useful to ensure priorities are delivered, and I'm sure that as part of any review by a Conservative government, the deputy leader of the council will be singing the praises of the HCA. I think it is a shame that the Labour government have not been monitoring the Prime Minister's performance as it is far from clear whether he has delivered much for Southwark at all.

41. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER

How much money has the council invested in regeneration projects in Southwark over the three years up until May 2009 broken down by parliamentary constituency, and what is the planned expenditure over the next three years.

RESPONSE

Regeneration projects in the borough are funded through a variety of sources, not just direct capital investment by the council. Many of the new developments are driven by private investment, in partnership with registered social landlords (RSLs), however the

council has successfully bid for grants from the homes and communities agency and other external and government agencies to supplement this investment.

42. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON

The executive member stated at the Monday March 16 Walworth Community Council that he will resist attempts by Guinness Trust to submit building proposals to build on Nursery Row Park. Has he changed his mind since then?

RESPONSE

As he will know I told Walworth Community Council that I wanted to preserve the current community orchard and to avoid as far as possible development on the park, but that there is clearly a balance to be struck between affordable family sized homes and the current opened space which has been zoned for residential development for a number of years. That remains my position.

I have met with Councillor Jane Salmon and Simon Hughes MP to discuss the concerns of local people about the park and have had further constructive meetings to discuss the Stead Street sites with representatives of the Friends of Nursery Row Park.

I have asked officers to work with the housing associations to draw up a new scheme aimed at achieving a compromise which has minimal impact on the park and its entrances but delivers the largest possible amount of much-needed affordable housing for local people. I have also asked officers about the legal position in terms of withdrawing areas of land from development.

43. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND EDUCATION FROM COUNCILLOR ALTHEA SMITH

In the residents survey the council was doing worst in the facilities for young people. In the joint area review (JAR) the council scored only two stars in youth services against a backdrop of three stars in every other category. Why did the executive decide not to prioritise youth services for new funding in the budget? Why did it decide to cut funding to youth provision?

RESPONSE

Improving the council's youth services is one of my top priorities, which is why we are currently undertaking a review of the service and looking to restructure the management of the division.

There will be no cuts in front-line service provision within the youth service, despite the poor local government financial settlement, which left the council with a £35m funding gap. The savings that we are making will be generated from the modernisation and integration of service provision for young people across the department. In addition, £150,000 of new resources were allocated to the youth service from the working neighbourhoods fund programme for work-based learning sites in order to battle the negative effects of inflation.

Examples of capital investment of the youth services can be found below:

The Youth Capital Investment Programme: 2008 - 2016

Capital Projects: 2008 – 2016	Funding level (£)	Activity/Description	Interim Update (March 09)
<p>Dulwich developments</p> <p>Belair Youth Hub</p> <p>Further developments across the Dulwich area (i.e. EDCC, Kingswood Estate Project; Scout Hut)</p>	<p>£540,000</p> <p>£260,000</p>	<p>New build provision in Belair Park</p> <p>Refurbishment/development: EDCC, Kingswood Estate Project; Scout Hut</p>	<p>Programme now at Gateway 2 stage (i.e. confirming contract). Additional funding issues resolved (see.below Outdoor Education)</p> <p>Decision not yet taken on EDCC, Kingswood Estate project and Scout Hut. Subject to 2009-10 decision</p>
<p>Outdoor Adventure Centre development</p>	<p>£300,000</p>	<p>Exploration of Longfield site in Kent and other 'in-borough' opportunities to ensure a coordinated approach/delivery to outdoor education as part of the youth work curriculum/offer.</p>	<p>Longfield site not feasible due to toxic waste and district council planning concerns.</p> <p>Outdoor education to be integrated into Belair Youth Hub development (c. £190,000). Working with Scout Association, Duke of Edinburgh's Award and Groundwork to establish outdoor and environmental programmes.</p> <p>Unallocated £110,000 to be determined in 2011-12 year</p>

Caribb Youth Centre	£200,000	Refurbishment, DDA and health & safety upgrade	Site and condition survey had to be undertaken as well as initial electrical compliance considerations. Report due in April with expenditure likely to start in May/June. Condition of grant aid is that the organisation is H&S compliance and fit for purpose. Report now in with work due to commence May 2009.
Provision in Rotherhithe (i.e.Odessa YC and Canada Water)	£300,000	Refurbishment, DDA and/or new/upgraded provision	Odessa YC in throes of upgrading to meet H & S compliance. Allocation for Canada Water development secured/to be transferred to E & H as part of the project's overall cost to provide the Youth Participation Centre (see below – Participation Centre)
Music, arts and media development	£150,000	New equipment and replacement for arts and media provisions borough wide	Programme will start in 2009-10 year in light of re-organisation of integrated youth support services
Participation Centre	£150,000	Exploration of Nunhead Community Centre to take place with view of developing this site for SYC	Nunhead Community Centre not feasible but Canada Water library development has been identified to support this agenda. Resources therefore allocated to this provision to deliver the Participation Centre (see above – provision in Rotherhithe).
Oxford & Bermondsey Youth Centre	£120,000	Development of changing rooms/gym as part of extended after school/holiday programme delivery	Discussion taking place with the Grange School and After school service on design and arrangements. Works expected to be completed by March 2010.
Multi-use games areas (MUGAS)	£400,000	Replacements and upgrading of MUGAs	Works not due to be completed until March 2010.

		facilities across all 8 CCs	
Portable athletic track	£80,000	Portable athletic track	Portable track used extensively throughout the Summer as part of the holiday offering.
Salmon Youth Centre	£750,000	Contribution to the re-building of a new multi-purpose youth centre in Bermondsey	Project opened in 2008 and further funding secured in 2008 through Myplace to complete phase 2.
Youth Capital Plus	£452,000	Contribution to the re-furbishment of the Camberwell Baths with a dedicated 'youth wing'	Funding pending from DCMS with completion due by March 2010.
Youth Capital Fund	£191,900	Small grants for small 'repairs' and non revenue costs. A number of different organisations have benefited.	The programme is young people led and are for small refurbishment and purchases such as computers, cameras, floors etc. Funding will be annual up to 2011
Total	£3,893,900		