

TAKEnote

Dulwich Community Council



Minutes Agreements Form

southwark.gov.uk/communitycouncil

Date	Monday, 4 June 2007
Venue	Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, London SE22
Start time	7.00pm
Finish time	10.10pm
In attendance	Cllr Nick Vineall (Chair), Cllr Michelle Holford (Vice Chair) Cllrs, James Barber, Toby Eckersley, Robin Crookshank Hilton, Michelle Holford, Jonathan Mitchell and Richard Thomas.
Absent	None
Apologies received	Apologies for lateness were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Kim Humphreys, Michelle Holford and Lewis Robinson
Urgent items	
Members' interests and dispensations	None were declared.

Public questions raised	
Q1	<p>Question addressed to ED Cllrs: Why have eight parking spaces on the junctions of Frogley Rd, Archdale Rd and Crawthrew Grove been removed by further white lines being painted to accommodate drop downs, which in all cases could have been sited on the double yellow lines placed at each junction</p> <p>Second point, for information, for whose benefit are the drop downs installed – able bodied people, mothers with prams/pushchairs or disabled. With parking spaces so limited in East Dulwich, there needs to be a very good reason to reduce the availability.</p>
A1	<p>The response was as people are not meant to park at corners particularly as there is a danger element to it - the purpose of the drop down kerbs is for people with pushchairs and wheelchair users.</p> <p>In relation to the double yellow lines - this is a local traffic decision and would be looked by officers i.e. the removal of eight car parking spaces.</p>
Q2	<p>Is it the case that community organisations like faith communities and community centres have to pay for a recycling service and if so can that be reconsidered please</p>
A2	<p>Cllr Thomas responded that comm. Groups pay for their trade waste which is normally offered at reduced rate for local businesses however recycling facilities are available to comm. organisations free of charge.</p> <p>To find out more on recycling visit: www.southwark.gov.uk/recycle or call 020 7525 2000</p>
Q3	<p>Soap box questions were submitted on behalf of Gill Portwine which the chair read out concerning Dulwich Community Hospital – heritage features relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Land price inflation on such a prime site □ Financial models submitted by Building Better Health (BBH) Liftco □ Reference to Price Waterhouse Coopers report □ Public insistence that the land stays in public ownership
A3	<p>Malcolm Hines, project manager responded to questions during his presentation.</p> <p>Dulwich Hospital presentation is in the Take Note & attached to the minutes agreement form.</p>
Q4	<p>Kenneth Hoole submitted a soapbox item that is attached as an appendix to the minutes.</p>
A4	

Summary of the decision or action

The following is a summary of the decisions and actions taken at this meeting.

The item number relates to the agenda item number where possible.

Clarification or queries on any points should be raised in the first instance with Beverley Olamijulo on **020 7525 7234**

Item number	Summary of the actions and Decisions	Action by
6.	<p>DECISION: The Minutes of the Dulwich Community Council meeting held on the 23 April 2007 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p>	Beverley Olamijulo
7.	<p>Matters arising from the previous meeting</p> <p>Local Implementation Plan bids</p> <p>The Chair referred to item 12, Members' decision on LIP bids to TfL from the last meeting.</p> <p>DECISION: DCC notes that in addition to the LIP bids featuring in the report to the executive, a bid for Court Lane road safety for 2008/09 was added by the Executive.</p>	
8.	<p>Deputations and petitions</p> <p>The chair agreed to accept a brief presentation from Simon Taylor, SPCCG chair as representative of Herne Hill Residents Forum.</p> <p>DECISION: DCC notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents concerns about the increasing number of retail outlets that sell alcohol late at night in the Herne Hill area and how this could lead to an increase in crime 2. Concerns about the Herne Hill shopping area and operation of various night clubs that hold late licences 	

	<p>and to develop better links between the Police, Village ward Cllrs and Lambeth ward Cllrs about these issues.</p> <p>3. Newly formed group of Traders in Herne Hill (Southwark side) are hoping to meet with E&H officers shortly.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>4. Cllr Robinson as a member of the licensing committee agreed to investigate the reason why the licensing minutes were unavailable on the Southwark website which was raised by Simon Taylor.</p>	
	<p>Police Update</p> <p>Inspector Parrott and Sgt Jenkinson introduced themselves to the meeting and gave an update on policing issues. They agreed to provide regular updates at future meetings and further information on SNT ward panel meetings.</p> <p>DECISION: DCC agreed that a standard item on policing issues and updates on ward panel meetings are included on the agenda for each meeting.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Re-shaping of the Community Warden Service</p> <p>DECISION:</p> <p>1 DCC thanked Chris McCracken, manager for the community warden service for his presentation and responding to questions. Chris agreed to keep Members fully informed on progress.</p> <p>2 DCC noted the following issues covered in the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining the difference between community wardens and PCSOs • Streamlining management – 4 area managers and 2 team leaders – 1 team patrolling in the day and evening Mon to – Fri which includes covering priority times • Establishing new units – intel and control rooms 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main aims: to tackle environmental enforcement operations, antisocial behaviour and providing emergency and priority support • Collate data from the Police and council in order to identify hotspots and act as a point of contact for requests. • Better communication – producing a newsletter every two months. For information contact: dulwichwardens@southwark.gov.uk www.safersouthwark.org.uk/communitywardens <p>The Community warden service presentation is attached to the minutes agreement form and Take Note Visit: www.southwark.gov.uk/YourCouncil/AgendasMinutes</p>	Beverley Olamijulo
10.	<p>Cleaner greener safer – launch programme for 2007/08</p> <p>Eleonora Oliva CGS manager was present to inform people of the process for this year’s CGS programme and advised people that each CC area has a designated officer.</p> <p>DECISION: DCC notes the closing date for CGS forms is 16 July 2007 and all bids will be displayed at DCC meeting on 10 Sept 2007. Applicants have the opportunity to address the meeting if they wish and successful bids will be announced at DCC meeting on 15 Oct 2007.</p> <p>Note: information for CGS, online forms and past projects visit: www.southwark.gov.uk/cleanergreenersafer</p>	
12.	<p>Launch of community council fund programme 2007/08</p> <p>DECISION: DCC notes £15K has been allocated to each CC area, the deadline for completed forms is 29 June 2007 and decisions of successful schemes will be announced at the next meeting on 10 July 2007.</p>	

<p>14.</p>	<p>Dulwich Community Hospital – heritage features</p> <p>DCC thanked Susanna White (PCT chief executive) for her presentation and also thanked Malcolm Hines and James Eaton for their contribution and responding to questions. A summary of their presentation concluded it was absolutely vital to have a community hospital to improve the quality of health care, ensure there are modern facilities for local people and that central government imposed constraints on funding mechanisms meant that there was no viable alternative to the LIFT funding process proposed.</p> <p>The Dulwich Hospital presentation is attached to the minutes agreement form and Take Note. www.southwark.gov.uk/communitycouncil</p>	
<p>15. E</p>	<p>Members' decisions</p> <p>Local Parking Schemes (late report) DECISION: DCC agreed to defer the local parking schemes report until the next meeting on 10 July 2007 to enable Members to give full consideration to the schemes.</p>	<p>Michael Herd</p>

The information included in this form, together with the attached notes, form the minutes from the above meeting and have been agreed as a true and accurate recording of that meeting. Any necessary amendments shall be detailed in the **Summary of Actions** held at the Town Hall by the relevant Community Councils Development Officer.

Chair..... **Date**.....

Kenneth Hoole soapbox item presented to DCC

We should be grateful for the fact that the Business Case for Dulwich Community Hospital has not been agreed by higher NHS authority. I understand that the Case was submitted upwards through the NHS by the Primary Care Trust on 15th March and rejected on the 26th March. At least some of its glaring faults and weaknesses have been highlighted by that authority.

- * The document was NOT submitted for consultation with the community.

Not even for consultation with the official Community Involvement Communications Group whose members saw it for information only on 13th March, when important papers were tabled, but not referred to until the very end of their meeting and then only after challenging questions revealed that the Case could not be amended whatever comments were made. The Group was told that Business Case had already been approved by the Trust's Board on 8th March.

The first 6 pages of a Report from Price Waterhouse Copper were missing from the copy tabled on 13th March. Those six pages dealt, as required, with the issue of value for money in the sale of the land. There is nothing confidential in either the Business Case or the PWC Report. So we have to ask;

- * Why were they not allowed to be subject to proper prior study by the community and by this Council for that matter ?

We have studied the Price Waterhouse Cooper Report which was selectively exploited to bolster the Business Case which was built on financial models provided by BBH LIFTCO .. in effect models produced by the developer not by the SPCT. We have now seen the missing six pages. We do not need to guess why those first 6 pages were withheld even from those who were allowed to see the Business Case , even if they were not consulted about it. 8th March [the date of the PWC Report] was the very date on which the Primary Care Trust Board met and agreed the Business Case. So :-

- * How could Board members possibly have studied the PWC Report version dated 8th March?
- * On which Report did the SPCT Board members actually base their decision to agree the Business Case ? February [an earlier draft KH] or March ?

The first 6 pages of the 8th March Report make it clear that PCW believe that the project as described in the developers Business Case, demonstrates that it is NOT VALUE FOR MONEY. [to sell the land KH]

- * Is that why the first 6 pages were withheld ?

Instead, selective references to that report in the Business Case lead the unwary reader to the conclusion that the developers want and intend to see...our land in their

ownership. We have been told that it is the special desire of the Private equity company, the William Pears Group, to own our land.

PWC wisely defend themselves against the possibility of future criticism of their ethics and professionalism, which I do not question, by repeatedly issuing warnings and cautions in paragraph after paragraph of those first 6 pages, which record, for example, that they (PWC) had NOT audited the models provided by BBH LIFTCO and that they could not calculate the impact on value for money or affordability of a wide range of other factors ; warning also that the proceeds of any sale might be clawed back by the Centre (ie they probably mean by NHS Estates).

* Were Trust Board members aware of all the significant caveats built into the 8th March report?

The developers built their models on a figure of 2.23 % inflationary increase in land values. The PWC Report makes it clear that if land values inflate by 2.7% or more across the 32 years of the lease (as most of us must believe that they will)then to sell our land is simply not good business.

If Southwark PCT sells our land, we lose any real clout that we might have had over the future of the project. To sell would also be in defiance of the overwhelming demand from the community that our lands must stay in the public domain as testified by the thousands of signatories to our two petitions.

The developer's financial case, is predicated on Southwark PCT selling our land for a miserable £3.5 million to the LIFTCO in order to buy a mere 6.6% of the shares and for other purposes. [ie equipping the hospital KH]

We must be very clear about this. It is impossible to conceive that we in Southwark will be able to buy back the land and our hospital at the end of the 32 years. PWC in effect actually warn about this reality in their 8th March Report. * Did Board members not notice this ?

Although there is a right to buy back, we will not be in a position to exercise that right. We will not be able to afford it. If we go along with this Business Case as it stands, we will be in financial bondage for the next 32 years. This must not be allowed to happen.

According to the NHS there is already a £65 m. deficit in NHS finances in SE London. That is already affecting services. For one example:- the Maudsley Emergency Clinic has already closed without a true alternative being ready at Kings A&E. So the SPCT & SLAM are in clear breach of the Secretary of State's instructions to secure proper alternative arrangements are in place before closing the clinic.

The deficit in SE London will balloon to £300m ... a figure calculated in an official NHS Report entitled "THE IMPLICATIONS OF FIXED COSTS AND PFI SCHEMES FOR SERVICE REDESIGN IN SE LONDON" If shared across the six boroughs that means a local deficit rising to £50m to add to the £54 million debt which the Business Case hides from us in Southwark. Senior Medical figures in London warn that PFI schemes will be protected only at the expense of existing NHS services and institutions because it is costly to close down PFI / LIFT schemes.

Do not let this PFI / LIFTCO scheme get off the ground through so defective a Business Case so that we fall into that trap. I beg this Council to make urgent arrangements to look deeply into the Business Plan and any amended Business Plan and into the Price Waterhouse Cooper Report and into all the related, current proposals for providing health and care services to your constituents. And to do this realising that not only financial matters are involved.

I urge you to do this in partnership with the community by calling a special meeting of the Community Council to discuss the Dulwich Community Hospital Project.