

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**  
**(ORDINARY)**

**WEDNESDAY 26<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2003**

**COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 3.8 : MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

**1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS**

“What volumes of correspondence and what postage and stationery costs have been incurred by Members Services since 3rd May, 2002 for communications from Councillors to ward residents broken down by each ward Councillor?”

**RESPONSE**

The table circulated at Council Assembly on the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2003 in response to Councillor Humphrey’s question to the Leader

**“What volumes of correspondence and what postage and stationery costs have been incurred by Members Services since 3rd May, 2002 for communications from Councillors to ward residents broken down by each ward Councillor?”**

showed postage costs attributed to Councillor Wingfield as £1,960. This figure included correspondence processed on behalf of Councillor Wingfield from both Member Services and his own office. Calculations were based on the following figures:

3,200 first class	-	£ 832.00
5,937 second class	-	£1,128.03
Total	-	£1,960.00

As all of this correspondence was commissioned by Councillor Wingfield and signed by him, either by electronic or individual signature, on a proportion of these letters all three Ward Councillors names were printed. Therefore on the original table all of this correspondence was attributed to Councillor Wingfield rather than being split between the three Ward Members.

Therefore an amended table is now circulated showing the apportionment between the three Ward Members for Brunswick Park on correspondence which contained all three Ward Councillor names.

**Table 2**

Members' Postage and Stationery Costs for communications to Ward residents from Ward Members incurred  
by Members Services for the period 3rd May 2002 – 30th November 2002.

<b>Wards</b>	<b>Correspondence</b>		<b>Total costs</b>
	<b>Postage costs</b>	<b>Stationery costs</b>	
<b>Brunswick</b>			
Cllr Moise	990.40	89.60	1080.00
Cllr Naish	1068.20	94.80	1163.00
Cllr Wingfield	1298.30	110.80	1409.10
<b>Camberwell</b>			
Cllr Dixon-Fyle	166.00	15.60	181.60
Cllr Friary	218.50	20.40	238.90
Cllr Ritchie	208.50	17.90	226.40
<b>Cathedrals</b>			
Cllr McCarthy			
Cllr Moore	3.40	0.25	3.65
Cllr Pursey	66.00	5.20	71.20
<b>Chaucer</b>			
Cllr Olayiwola			
Cllr Thomas	99.30	6.90	106.20
Cllr Zuleta			
<b>College</b>			
Cllr Humphreys	139.30	10.00	149.30
Cllr Robinson			
Cllr Rowe	25.50	1.80	27.30
<b>East Dulwich</b>			
Cllr Gibbes	944.30	89.50	1033.80
Cllr Smith	944.30	89.50	1033.80
Cllr Welfare	944.00	89.50	1033.50
<b>East Walworth</b>			
Cllr Ambrose			
Cllr Bowman	30.40	2.10	32.50
Cllr Watson			
<b>Faraday</b>			
Cllr Bates	881.99	82.44	964.43
Cllr Lauder	916.31	84.82	1001.13
Cllr Mohamed	881.99	82.44	964.43
<b>Grange</b>			
Cllr Capstick	22.90	1.60	24.50
Cllr Manchester			
Cllr Skelly	22.90	1.60	24.50
<b>Livesey</b>			

Cllr Hunt			
Cllr Neale	4.20	0.30	4.50
Cllr Porter	32.80	2.30	35.10
<b>Newington</b>			
Cllr Gurling	78.00	0.55	78.55
Cllr Ladipo			
Cllr Pidgeon	183.60	12.70	196.30
<b>Nunhead</b>			
Cllr Colley	409.60	38.90	448.50
Cllr Hayes	412.80	39.00	451.80
Cllr Thorncroft	409.60	38.90	448.50
<b>Peckham</b>			
Cllr Hargrove			
Cllr Kayada	2.30	0.20	2.50
Cllr Situ			
<b>Peckham Rye</b>			
Cllr Banya	1202.09	145.41	1347.50
Cllr Barnard	1577.01	171.30	1748.31
Cllr Smeath	1198.45	145.11	1343.56
<b>Riverside</b>			
Cllr Flannery			
Cllr Mann			
Cllr Stanton	29.40	2.00	31.40
<b>Rotherhithe</b>			
Cllr Blango			
Cllr Hook			
Cllr Yates			
<b>South Bermondsey</b>			
Cllr Bassom			
Cllr Kyriacou			
Cllr Mizzi			
<b>South Camberwell</b>			
Cllr John	338.00	23.40	361.40
Cllr McInerney	377.00	26.10	403.10
Cllr Ward	377.00	26.10	403.10
<b>Surrey Docks</b>			
Cllr Hubber			
Cllr O'Brien			
<b>The Lane</b>			
Cllr Glover	501.01	40.44	541.45
Cllr Graham	428.88	39.90	468.78
Cllr Simmons	691.61	47.25	738.86
<b>Village</b>			
Cllr Bradbury			
Cllr Eckersley	27.30	1.90	29.20

Cllr Pearce			
<b>Total</b>	<b>£18153.94</b>	<b>£1698.41</b>	<b>£ 19,851.65</b>

**2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS**

“Would the Leader of the Council provide details of

- 1) the eligibility criteria exercised in Southwark for the Starter Home Initiative.
- 2) the level of take-up within Southwark by key-workers working here.

**RESPONSE**

The Starter Home Initiative has been in place since 2001-2 . For teachers and police officers the scheme in Southwark is administered by Tower Homes; for NHS staff it is administered by Moat Housing Association. All schemes in Southwark involve the use of an interest free loan on a proportion of a purchase of a home on the open market.

1. Southwark teachers are eligible for the scheme if they have permanent contracts and have 2 years cumulative service in Southwark. NHS staff are eligible if they have permanent contracts. Eligibility for police officers has just been changed from 12 months service to 6 months service or completion of any probationary period.
2. Take up (and total allocation) for key workers in Southwark is as follows:
  - Teachers 30 (51)
  - Police 5 (28)
  - NHS staff 29 (32)

A number of key workers have also been approved for the scheme and are currently looking for properties or are due to complete purchases. With the possible exception of the police, 100% take up is anticipated by the end of 2003-4.

**3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE**

"As a Council, what efforts are we making to encourage film makers, whether feature, documentary or television, to come to Southwark, bring investment into Southwark, and portray our Borough as a place to live and work?"

**RESPONSE**

There is considerable interest shown by film makers in the Borough, in particular around Borough Market and Park Street with its Dickensian feel, with the Millennium Bridge (where we work with the Corporation) and in our Parks and housing estates.

We encourage this interest and operate in collaboration with other bodies, particularly the London Film Commission and the Association of Location Managers. The Commission lists Southwark's main attractions and we have had numerous enquiries. Officers meet location managers and this direct contact brings further opportunities.

Direct advertising in trade magazines has not been cost effective.

A good relationship with the film industry is only part of our approach to encouraging inward investment in the Borough. We support several local groups in Bankside who promote the area and the tourism potential. The new Unitary Development Plan and the enterprise strategy are both designed to encourage new development and investment of benefit to local people.

**4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ALFRED BANYA**

“Given the results of the Local Government Chronicle Councillors survey which gave a figure for the percentage of black/ethnic minority Liberal Democrat members across the country as 0.0%, could the Leader inform me how long it will be before Southwark has a BME Liberal Democrat Executive member?”

**RESPONSE**

I would like to take issue with the question, especially its main premise.

First, the LGC story gave a figure for the percentage of black/ethnic minority Liberal Democrat Cabinet/Executive Members as 0.0% - not just ‘members’ as Cllr Banya suggests.

Second, the figure of 0.0% must be wrong. Liberal Democrat Islington, which was featured in the article, has a BME Cabinet Member. I know that neighbouring Lambeth also has a BME Cabinet Member. Moreover, and this has clearly escaped Cllr Banya’s attention despite my pointing this out previously, Southwark has a BME Executive Member as Councillor Bowman is of mixed race heritage.

Councillor Banya will note that the LGC article drew attention to other equality issues like gender, age, sexual orientation and disability. Southwark’s Executive is gender balanced, probably the youngest in the country, has two openly gay Members and one registered blind Member.

One can never be complacent about equality issues. Of course it is ideal that we reflect the local population as far as possible and we still have some way to go before we reach that model. However, it is also important that Councillors represent their constituents ably and fairly - this can still be achieved irrespective of whether members reflect the community they serve.

**5. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ALUN HAYES**

“Can the Executive Member confirm that she supports the principle that the distribution of Environmental Improvement Programme and community safety funding for 2003/2004 should be carried out according to the objective by which the Council measures need?”

**RESPONSE**

The Executive has already decided via the report on Community Councils that was agreed at the Executive of 19<sup>th</sup> November 2002 that there would be an allocation formula that is needs based and addresses the policy objectives of the Community Strategy. The Executive is currently working on devising an appropriate formula that meets this objective and will take account of deprivation as well as resources and planned capital spending and will be making an announcement on the results by the end of April. This work will clearly be informed by the work on identifying need that has been undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Strategy.



**6. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR DORA DIXON-FYLE**

“How will community safety and environmental programme capital funds be divided between the eight Community Councils?”

**RESPONSE**

I refer the member to the answer I have given to question 5.

**7. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

“Would the Executive Member please explain what action he is currently taking to address the concerns of residents of Surrey Docks ward in re poor police response times and the general presence of police in the area?”

**RESPONSE**

I have contacted the police on this matter.

They advise me that Charter standards require that 75% of calls for assistance received by the police which are graded ‘immediate’ should be responded to within 12 minutes. This standard has been met in the Rotherhithe Sector over the last year. The next grade down of calls have to be met within an hour. The standard in relation to these is not being met.

The police acknowledge the importance of a prompt response to individuals making calls whatever the nature of the call or its prioritisation. There is also an acknowledgement on the part of the police that the grading of calls can appear to minimise the concerns of individuals whose calls do not achieve a priority response

The police advise that new computer systems which are already operating in the south of the borough have just been installed in the north. These systems provide better information within the local control center (CAD room) of the location individual police patrol cars. This facilitates a more efficient targeting of police patrol resources in response to calls for assistance. The benefits of this should shortly be felt in the north.

A new home beat officer starts on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2003. The Surrey Docks area is nevertheless still one home beat officer down due to medical incapacity. Rotherhithe is also due to benefit from seven police community support officers two of which will cover Surrey Docks Ward.

Members will know that I have personally supported the campaign for 1,000 police officers in the Borough. I am also committed to supporting improvements in the performance of all the partners in the Safer Southwark Partnership in order to better meet residents’ expectations of living in safe communities.

**8. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN O'BRIEN**

"Can the Executive Member advise of the level of cuts that were made to the voluntary sector for the 2002/2003 funding round, under the previous administration?"

**RESPONSE**

Total value of Council grants budgets in the years indicated was/is as follows:

Year	£ -millions
2001/02	8.4m
2002/03	7.6m

These figures represent the value of all programmes at the beginning of each financial year. They do not take into account movements into/out of grants programmes which may have increased or decreased the level of the overall programme

**9. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN HUNT**

“As the member knows the Millwall walkway will considerably reduce dangers to my constituents who live in adjoining roads. Can he explain why the Millwall Walkway has not yet been completed and why Mayor Livingstone and GLA member Valerie Shawcross seem to be under the misapprehension that the police are opposed to this scheme?”

**RESPONSE**

Implementation of the Millwall Walkway Scheme is an important priority for the Council and I am pleased to announce that we are finally making progress in its construction. Site clearance work commenced on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March. It is particularly pleasing that this work is being undertaken by Network Rail who at long last have recognised the importance and value of the project. Site clearance prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April is particularly important since the site is defined as of Borough 2 importance for nature conservation under the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act and that date marks the start of the bird nesting season. If not cleared by then, no construction work could be undertaken until August.

The scheme was originally planned for completion by the start of the current football season. Problems in securing agreements with Network Rail and, in particular, a licence to undertake construction, have largely been responsible for the delays. Both Members and officers of the Council at the most senior level, as well as Council works consultants, have sought to overcome these delays, succeeding only recently in progressing the scheme through sheer pressure. A licence is now about to be issued. This will allow contractors to be engaged and construction to proceed with completion projected for the start of the 2003/4 football season in mid August.

The scheme has, from the start, attracted the full support and close attention of the police. This has included, Lewisham Police who are responsible for policing the stadium and stadium events, Southwark Police and British Transport Police. Police from all three areas have been fully involved on the project team and their advice has been instrumental in securing significant improvements to the design.

**10. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR SARAH WELFARE**

“Can the Executive Member please detail the attendance of Councillors at the SRB6 Hate Crimes Board since May 2002?”

**RESPONSE**

The table below sets out Council Member attendance over the past two years.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of meetings held in period</b>	<b>Number of meetings attended</b>
<b>2002 – 2003</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Liberal Democrat Group</b></li> <li>• Cllr Richard Porter</li> </ul>	End June 2002 to present	7	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Beverley Bassom - <i>deputy</i></li> </ul>	End June 2002 to present	7	<b>0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Labour Group</b></li> <li>• Cllr John Friary</li> </ul>	End June 2002 to present	7	<b>0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Alfred Banya -<i>deputy</i></li> </ul>	End June 2002 to present	7	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conservative Group</b></li> <li>• VACANT</li> </ul>	Since Dec. 2001		

**11. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION YOUTH & LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR KENNY MIZZI**

“Would the Executive Member please state, for each maintained school in the Borough for 2003/03 and 2003/04:

- a) the number of pupils.
- b) the formula funding allocation from the Council.
- c) the overall resources available to the school after taking account of Standards Fund and other relevant changes.

with the totals (and percentage change from year to year) for primary, secondary and other schools.

**RESPONSE**

See attached schedule.



**12. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR MICHELLE PEARCE**

“Given recent press reports (Southwark News ‘Race is on for school places’), can the Executive Member for Education, Youth and Leisure give parents an assurance that every Southwark pupil needing a Secondary School place within the Borough will get one? Could he also inform Council as to the steps being taken by WS Atkins to reduce the disruption caused by parents accepting more than one place and dropping it on the first morning of the school term?”

**RESPONSE**

All Year 6 children living in Southwark who have not secured a school place by May/ June will be automatically allocated a place by the authority. Letters to all those parents whose children not known by Atkins to have been offered a place as of today’s date will be going out in April.

Constant cross-checking with neighbouring LEAs/schools and Southwark non-community schools is taking place by the Admissions section and has been since January to ensure that any child with multiple offers lets the home LEA know which school they will be attending in September. Letters going to these parents gives 5 working days to respond, if the parent does not respond the Southwark community school place is withdrawn and offered to the next from the waiting list.



**13. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM**

“Could the Executive Member for Education, Youth and Leisure please detail the current number of excluded Secondary School pupils at present and the equivalent for this time last year?

Could he also provide a breakdown of the figures to include ethnicity and inform the Council what proactive actions are in place to reduce the number of pupils excluded from schools, in particular black males and older pupils of Key Stage 3 and above.

**RESPONSE**

The information given below relates to the average numbers of secondary school students who were out of school on any one day because of exclusion from a Southwark school during the week commencing 10<sup>th</sup> March 2003 compared with the equivalent period in 2002. The data includes Southwark pupils excluded by out-borough schools and notified to Atkins Education.

	Daily Average – March 2002	Daily Average – March 2003
Permanent Exclusion	21	12
Fixed-term Exclusion	86	53

As part of the Behaviour Improvement Programme, pupils excluded from schools where BEST teams are operating are now receiving off-site alternative education through the Mainstream Support Service and Behaviour Support Team. This provision aims to address the unacceptable behaviours, whilst ensuring continuity of education and a supported reintegration into the mainstream school. At both primary and secondary levels, a number of schools are now operating in-school Learning Support Units for pupils whose behaviour places them at high risk of exclusion.

Permanent exclusions by ethnic group 2001/2

White British	Male	9	Female	5	Total	14 =28%
Black British (Caribbean)	Male	8	Female	7	Total	15 = 30%
Black British (African)	Male	6	Female	3	Total	9 =18%
Black British (other black)	Male	3	Female	2	Total	5 = 10%
Turkish Cypriot	Male	2	Female	0	Total	2 = 4%
Europea	Male	3	Female	1	Total	4 = 8%

n						
South American	Male	1	Female	0	Total	1 = 2%

Whilst the Southwark exclusions data does appear to show an over-representation of Black Caribbean pupils, it should be noted that the percentages are calculated against a low number of permanent exclusions overall – 49 out of a total pupil population of approximately 35,000. There are however, national concerns about the over-representation and under-achievement of Black Caribbean boys and the schools and strategic partnerships in Southwark continue to look at ways in which attainment and inclusion of vulnerable pupils can be supported and promoted. Examples of such partnership initiatives include the Pathways Project, the Black Mentoring and Inclusion Project, Boyhood to Manhood Foundation and Children’s Fund mentoring projects – e.g. Heartbeat International.

**14. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

“Can the Executive Member for Education, Youth and Leisure please provide details of the total arts grant for 2003/2003, the total arts grant for 2003/04 and the real terms cut between the two years after taking into account inflation?”

**RESPONSE**

The total arts grant for 2002-3 was £404,639. The total arts grants for 2003-4 will be £354,211. The reduction is therefore : £50,428. The reduction inclusive of inflation is : £60,543. Further details are contained in the appended report.

I should add too that those figures alone are not a fair measure of the support the Council has given to Southwark arts this year.

The figures do not reflect, for example, the section 106 money given to the Unicorn Theatre, the agreement reached with the Globe on Bear Gardens, the Southwark Council and Southwark News sponsored Blue Plaques scheme, plans for a Southwark Heritage Centre and the fact that we have recently helped to secure the long-term future of the South London Gallery.

Organisation	2002 - 2003	Service Level Agreements	2002 – 2003 plus inflation	2003 – 2004 Funding confirmed	Inflation @ 2.5%	Savings (inclusive of inflation)	Savings (exclusive of inflation)	Comments
<b>AAWAZ</b>	1,936		1,984	0	48	1,984	1,936	Did not reapply to the grants programme. Asian Women's organisation – main funding for core services is through Strategic Services.
<b>Art in the Park</b>	4,000		4,100	4,000	100	100	0	Art and environment agency working with early years, schools, and adults (Burgess Park).
<b>Artsline</b>	2,050		2,101	0	51	2,101	2,050	Arts and Disability advice organisation. Is used by residents but is London-wide service.
<b>Beormund Centre: African Women's Fashion Class</b>	1,517		1,555	1,517	38	38	0	Core funding through Strategic Services. Option for ESF funding programme at the Centre.
<b>Bermondsey Artists Group / Café Gallery</b>		39,020	39,996	39,020	976	976	0	High quality contemporary gallery with community and education provision in priority neighbourhood (Southwark Park).
<b>Blue Elephant Theatre</b>		18,000	18,450	18,000	450	450	0	Quality venue in priority neighbourhood with education, youth and community programme.
<b>Borough Music School</b>	4,000		4,100	4,000	100	100	0	Music and instrumental tuition out-of-school hours for Southwark children who cannot afford private tuition.
<b>Camberwell Artsweek</b>	7,000		7,175	7,000	175	175	0	Visual arts festival with associated education and community programme.
<b>Carl Campbell</b>		34,620	35,486	34,620	866	866	0	Caribbean dance company working with schools, youth and

<b>Dance Company 7</b>								elders.
<b>Child and Sound</b>	1,076		1,103	1,103	27	0	0	Music club for autistic children and their families. (Education SSA)

Organisation	2002 - 2003	Service Level Agreements	2002 – 2003 plus inflation	2003 – 2004 Funding confirmed	Inflation @ 2.5% 2003 - 2004	Savings Inclusive of inflation	Savings Exclusive of inflation	Comments
<b>Coral Dance Company</b>	5,000		5,125	5,000	125	125	0	Learning disabled dance company.
<b>Feminist Library</b> <i>(Education SSA)</i>		12,000 (SLA ends in March 2003)	12,300	3,000	300	9,300	9,000	Archive of women's writing and history – not Southwark specific.
<b>First Framework</b>	2,050		2,101	0	51	2,101	2,050	Performance work with older people, but not Southwark specific group.
<b>London Bubble Theatre Company</b>		20,000	20,500	20,000	500	500	0	Work with schools and young people, incl. Issue-based programmes addressing racism and hate-crime,
<b>New Peckham Varieties</b>		59,411	60,896	59,411	1,485	1,485	0	Music Theatre and performance training for young people in schools and after-school facility.
<b>Oval House Theatre</b> <i>(Education SSA)</i>	9,456		9,692	9,692	237	0	0	PSE related activities for secondary schools.
<b>Pumphouse Educational Museum Trust</b> <i>(Education SSA)</i>		66,934	68,607	68,607	1673	0	0	Environmental, local museum with education centre and curriculum provision for schools.
<b>Rockingham Somali Support Group</b>	1,076		1,103	0	27	1,103	1,076	Under performing group – non-delivery.
<b>SASS</b>	12,000		12,300	0	300	12,300	12,000	Did not reapply to the grants programme.

Shakespeare's Globe (Education SSA)	11,275		11,557	11,557	282	0	0	Theatre education programme for schools.
---	--------	--	--------	--------	-----	---	---	--

Organisation	2002 - 2003	Service Level Agreements	2002 – 2003 plus inflation	2003 – 2004 Funding Confirmed	Inflation @2.5% 2003 - 2004	Savings Inclusive of inflation	Savings Exclusive Of Inflation	Comments
Southwark Arts Forum		31,160	31,939	31,160	779	779	0	Networking organisations for artists and arts organisations, including programmes of work in neighbourhood renewal areas. Includes education officer post for schools, and training for teachers.
Southwark Cathedral Education Centre ( <i>Education SSA</i> )		11,828	12,124	12,124	296	0	0	Curriculum provision for schools based on the heritage of the cathedral.
Southwark Muslim Women's Association	480		492	0	12	492	480	Core funded through Strategic Services. Made application for festival, not existing classes.
Southwark Playhouse		20,735	21,253	20,735	518	518	0	Acclaimed theatre with well-established schools provision.
Southwark Vietnamese Refugee Association	2,414		2,474	1,665	60	809	749	Music classes for young people. Festival grant cut.
Southwark Vietnamese Chinese Community	1601		1,641	0	40	1,641	1601	Festival costs only. Core funded through Strategic Services.
Young Vic	2,000		2,050	2,000	50	50	0	Support for schools and youth programme.
Women of Nigeria	1,000		1,025	0	25	1,025	1,000	Did not reapply to the programme.
Southwark Irish Festival	24,600		0	0		0		<i>Transferred to Environment &amp; Leisure.</i>
								<i>Transferred to Environment &amp; Leisure</i>



<i>Southwark Park Opening Festival</i>	<i>20,050</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>		<i>0</i>		
<i>Dulwich Festival</i>	<i>4,100</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>		<i>0</i>		<i>Transferred to Environment &amp; Leisure</i>

Organisation	2002 - 2003	Service Level Agreements	2002 – 2003 plus inflation	2003 – 2004 Funding confirmed	Inflation @ 2.5% 2003 - 2004	Savings Inclusive of Inflation	Savings exclusive of Inflation	Comments
Community small grants, including older people's grants programme.	21,000		21,525	0	525	21,525	21,000	Community grants to be covered by NRF programme, and other funding programmes. Older people's grants retained.
Total 2002/ 2003 including events.	140,131	313,708						
Total 2002 – 2003 plus	90,931	313,708	414,754					

<b>inflation (excluding transferred events)</b>								
<b>Total Funding confirmed 2003 -2004</b>				<b>354,211</b>				
<b>Total inflation @ 2.5% for 2003 - 2004</b>					<b>10,116</b>			
<b>Savings inclusive of inflation (14.6%)</b>						<b>60,543</b>		
<b>Savings exclusive of inflation</b>							<b>50,428</b>	

**15. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR IAN WINGFIELD**

“Why have Southwark Headteachers written to the Department for Education and Skills in an expression of no confidence in WS Atkins?”

**RESPONSE**

In answer to this question it would not be appropriate to provide either an interpretation or précis of the Headteachers views. To avoid any confusion the letter is reprinted below with the permission of the Headteachers' Council Executive. As you will see, it clearly states why the Headteachers felt compelled to raise their concerns about WS Atkins management of the Southwark contract.



Cllr Nic Stanton  
Leader of the Council  
Southwark Town Hall

4<sup>th</sup> February 2003

Dear Cllr Stanton,

The executive body of Southwark Headteachers' Council met today to consider the growing feeling of concern and unhappiness amongst headteachers in Southwark regarding the impact of WS Atkins' parent company's management on the delivery of educational services in our LEA.

We have taken note of headteachers' mounting loss of confidence in the ability of Atkins Education to retain senior managers who are able to organise and lead the delivery of effective services to schools.

We regret the departure of 3 out of the 4 senior managers who were originally recruited by Atkins to lead the outsourced delivery of educational services. We also regret the departure of a highly regarded joint head of the School Improvement Division.

Southwark headteachers, working through the Headteachers' Council, have given considerable time and their full commitment to ensuring that we have an effective partnership with Atkins Education. We have been determined to make the partnership work in order to raise standards and achievement and to increase opportunities for all our pupils.

Whilst some progress has been made towards improving service delivery, as evidenced by last year's Ofsted report, it has become clear to us that the management culture of the parent company has been the source of great

unhappiness for ourselves and for many of our Atkins colleagues in Southwark, a major factor in causing them considerable frustration and alienation.

Regrettably we believe the time has come to state that we have no confidence in the ability of WS Atkins to play a leading role in the delivery of education services - to recognise the needs of schools and of its own staff in Southwark, to communicate effectively with schools, and to deliver effective services to schools.

We are deeply unhappy with the departure of so many of the senior managers of Atkins Education who had originally expressed a sense of enthusiasm and excitement about working in Southwark. We question what caused them to resign their positions after such a short period of service in Southwark, with such negative consequences for any continuity of management expertise, knowledge of Southwark's difficulties and challenges, and understanding of the needs of the schools.

We regret the build-up of mistrust amongst headteachers of the corporate style of WS Atkins, a style that appears to demotivate and demoralise senior staff with previous outstanding track records of public service within local authorities.

We have noted also the recent problems experienced by the Atkins parent company – the departure of some of the group's most senior executives, and the failures of some of the group's management systems, in particular its internal financial systems. We are concerned about the repercussions of these management and financial systems failures on the delivery of education services in Southwark, and we call upon the Council to report to us on the extent to which they believe financial issues and constraints have impacted on service delivery in Southwark.

We further call upon the Council to report to us on the views of the officers and members who are monitoring the contract with Atkins - to show whether Atkins have the capacity (given their recent problems) to recruit, retain and motivate senior managers of the highest calibre.

We intend also to seek an urgent meeting with senior officers of the DfES and with the Schools Minister to discuss with them the current situation and to ask whether in their view WS Atkins, a company with no previous experience of, or proven ability in, delivering services to schools, is still deemed to be capable of fulfilling such responsibilities. We will ask them whether the Southwark PPP is still considered to be viable, and whether they consider Atkins to be capable of developing the necessary management expertise, style and culture that will guarantee the delivery of effective services to schools, services that will help raise attainment and achievement in all our schools, particularly in the light of Atkins' continuing difficulties with the retention of key personnel.

Yours sincerely,

Southwark Headteachers' Council Executive

Gary Foskett	Cathy Loxton
Irene Bishop	Dianna Bell
Stephen Owens	Malcolm Macdonald
Jeanne Peskett	Paul Lewis
Peter White	Kath Burton
Peter Coleman	Sylvia Morris

cc: Cllr Bob Skelley  
Stephen Twigg MP  
David Hinchliffe  
Dr Roger Smith  
Bob Coomber  
Graeme Snow

**16. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY**

“Does the Executive Member for Education, Youth and Leisure agree with me that significant cuts in local authority’s funding to voluntary groups, in particular education, leisure, youth and arts (15%) will severely hinder the ability of community groups attracting external funding for Southwark in the future. Can the member tell this Council what the Liberal Democrats long-term strategy is for funding the voluntary groups?”

**RESPONSE**

There is no evidence that reductions in Council grants to voluntary groups, including education, leisure, youth and arts groups, hinder the ability of those groups to attract external funding. In terms of future funding for the voluntary sector as a whole, the Executive have agreed a ‘fast track’ review of voluntary sector funding. This will examine how well funding priorities are aligned to overall priorities, and what arrangements may be most appropriate for funding different types of organisations. This is due to report in September 2003.

**17. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

“Was any Southwark Council Member or Officer responsible for the delay in granting planning permission for the Bermondsey City Academy?”

**RESPONSE**

No. Officers and Members pressed hard for the delivery of the City Academy.

The overall time to complete the planning permission was caused by two factors: the intervention of the Mayor of London who first directed that the application be refused and the need to conclude a legal agreement with the Corporation of London to, inter-alia, secure community use of the new school's facilities and fund traffic management measures around the site.

This Council first resolved to grant planning permission in January 2002. The Mayor, to whom the application had been referred as a departure from the Unitary Development Plan, directed that the application be refused on the grounds that it would result in a loss of public open space. Following lengthy negotiations between Council and GLA officers, the Mayor was persuaded to withdraw his objection in April 2002. Completion of the legal agreement was not possible until the City Academy Company, representing the Corporation of London, had acquired the lease of the site. The Corporation also sought assurances from the DfES that it would underwrite the costs of the traffic management measures. The legal agreement was finally concluded in November 2002, at which point the Council was able to issue the planning permission.

Implementation of the scheme has been further delayed by the threatened legal challenge by a local resident to the grant of planning permission. In January 2003 the Council granted planning permission for the erection of temporary classrooms on the site pending the resolution of the legal challenge. In February 2003 the Corporation submitted alternative proposals to temporarily locate the City Academy at Waverley School in Peckham.



**18. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

“Would the Executive Member please state the distances, for purposes of primary schools admissions, in metres between:

- (i) Bessemer Grange School pupil entrance and (a) the dwelling in Ruskin Park House, Champion Hill, SE5, which is nearest the school [Point A], and (b) the eastern-most house in Half Moon Lane, SE24 [Point B];
- (ii) point A and all other community schools admitting pupils at reception or Year 1 (whether in Lambeth or Southwark) within 1 kilometre of point A; and
- (iii) point B and all other community schools admitting pupils at Reception or Year 1 (whether in Lambeth or Southwark) within 1kilometer of point B.

**RESPONSE**

Cllr Eckersley has been sent the detailed information requested. As this material identifies specific properties and could be used to identify individuals, it is not appropriate to publish it in a public form.

**19. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BRADBURY**

“What response have officers received from Transport for London (TfL) regarding its willingness or otherwise to fund a ‘limited hour’ scheme in the streets near Herne Hill rather than an all-day Controlled parking Zone”?

**RESPONSE**

Transport for London has been approached about the introduction of a limited hour zone in this area. Whilst they would be willing to consider such a scheme it would need to meet the objective of deterring commuters from parking on street all day close to railway stations. Unless such a scheme met this objective it is unlikely that TfL would agree to fund it.

For TfL to give further consideration to such a proposal it will be necessary for Southwark to submit a scheme, with the limited hours of operation so that they can give the matter their full consideration

The London Borough of Lambeth is proposing to introduce controlled parking zones within their Borough in the Herne Hill area, towards the end of the summer period. I understand that these zones will be operational Monday to Friday 8 30am to 6.30pm. As such there could be displacement of parking from Lambeth into Southwark if the hours of any Southwark zone or zones did not coincide.

The cost effectiveness of enforcement would need to be taken into account with regards the introduction of any parking scheme that differs from standard operational hours.

**20. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE**

“What are the level of parking charges for 2002/03 and 2003/04 for each of the council's car parks and what percentage increase will there be for each of the car parks?”

**RESPONSE**

At present the charges for car parks are :

Tower car park	60p per hour
Copeland Road car park	60p per hour
Multi storey car park	60p per hour
Stead Street car park	50p for 2 hours.

Permit charges Peckham car parks :

1 month	£32.00
3 months	£96.00
6 months	£192.00
12 months	£384.00

Permit charges in Stead Street car park

1 month	£45.00
3 months	£135.00
6 months	£270.00
12 months	£520.00

Officers are currently in process of reviewing all fees and charges in the context of the overall Strategic Parking plan for the borough which will be considered by the Executive in due course.

**21. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY**

“Will the Executive Member confirm that the Council has ring-fenced funding agreed in 2002/2003 of £272,000 necessary to carry out regeneration work at Queens Road Station? Will the Executive Member also agree that delays in implementing a project of improvements at Queens Road Station are down to in-action on the part of Rail track, and will he write to them to urge their speedy recovery?”

**RESPONSE**

There has been money ring-fenced for this project for some time. I confirm that the money available for this project is just under £272k. The main delay in proceeding with this project has concerned protracted negotiations between Railtrack and Southwark's Property Team over the sale of a property. The sale details were agreed before Christmas 2002. The sticking point is that the Strategic Rail Authority need to register a 'Station Change Control' process regarding responsibilities for the enlarged forecourt before the sale can proceed. I understand that the completion of this process is imminent.

The train operator for the station is South Central, which has not yet signed its agreement for the franchise renewal. The signing of this agreement has been delayed and delayed, as the size and scope of the franchise renewal has been downscaled due to the SRA difficulties in managing costs in the rail industry. I suspect that the Station Change Control process has been affected by franchise renewal discussions. Officers assure me they continue to make representations but have asked for a further letter to be written to the SRA as requested.

**22. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE**

“What arrangements will the Executive Member be instructing Officers to make in order to provide members who wish to receive it, with clear, detailed, reliable, timely and regular information on the Council’s income and expenditure compared to the budget?”

**RESPONSE**

Those arrangements you refer to are already in place and have been in operation in the current financial year. Indeed this year this administration has maintained the Council’s balances when many neighbouring Council’s have seen financial crisis.

So as to remind members, you all members receive an up to date report on the Council’s financial position every quarter.

Again this year saw the provision of more information to members as part of this process than in previous years - such as:

- Showing gross income and expenditure compared to budget with explanations
- the position on reserves and earmarked provisions
- the position of the collection fund
- the position on driving down debt

Chief Officer’s I know review their departments budgets monthly. I myself review the Council’s budget position with the Chief Finance Officer monthly and ask for explanations regarding deviations.

It was pleasing to note in the District Auditors Annual Letter that he recognises the improved arrangements for monitoring devolved budgets including reducing the time taken to produce monthly reports

**23. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON**

“Given that many Local Education Authorities have ‘passport’ resources for 2003/04 into schools under the Education Act 2002 on the basis of actual (rather than uncapped) FSS resource increases, and that the Secretary of State has not found that unacceptable, please would the Executive member explain:

- a. When she became aware of the opportunity to passport on the actual basis?
- b. Why the Executive persisted in using the uncapped basis?

**RESPONSE**

The Council’s financial strategy (agreed by Council Assembly on 24 February 2003) is to passport in accordance with the Education Act (in other words to passport the increases in schools funding). For the 2003/04 budget the Council Assembly agreed to passport both the schools and non-schools increase to the Education service budget.

Under the Education Act 2002 the Secretary of State for Education has the power to intervene and to set the local schools budget if he deems it to be insufficient. His powers to intervene are very wide. During the passage of the Act, assurances were given by the then Secretary of State that intervention would only take place if the LEA did not passport to schools.

The clear inference from the new legislation and ministerial statements was that only full passporting was the acceptable minimum. To have done differently, with the information available at the time, would have risked ministerial intervention.

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) announced on 13 February 2003 that 124 out of 148 LEAs were planning to passport the increase in FSS to schools. The Secretary of State chose to intervene in 2 of these LEAs. Other LEAs (names not released by the DfES) have been called in to see the Secretary of State or have received letters from him. Some of these authorities might only have passported on the actual basis. It is possible that the Secretary of State could take action against any of these authorities next year.

**24. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE FROM COUNCILLOR BILLY KAYADA**

“The Liberal Democrat budget for 2003/04 contains a number of cuts targeted specifically at the Peckham area for example the reduction to the Sojourner Truth and Unity budgets and the Peckham Town Centre Management programme. What assessment has been made of the adverse impact on service delivery and community access and how will this impact on the black and minority ethnic communities in particular?”

**RESPONSE**

**To follow**

**25. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

“What is the total cut in capital and revenue to the Peckham area as a result of the 2003/04 budget?”

**RESPONSE**

In setting the 2003/04 revenue budget, total savings of £4.307m were made. Cuts which could be attributed to Peckham total £334,000 (7.8% of the global amount) are as follows:

	£000
• grants to Peckham based voluntary sector groups	244
• reconfiguration of services offered by Unity Centre and Sojourner Truth Community Centre	60
• freeze Peckham Town Centre Manager’s post	30

While this includes a reduction of £160,000 from the closure of the Bellenden Neighbourhood Advice Centre in 2002, this has been replaced by an outreach service provided by the Blackfriars Advice Centre.

The 2003/04 capital programme includes £18m of new money. The programme will result in significant new investment in Peckham as the eight Community Councils will have a total of £3.914m to be spent on community safety and environmental improvements. Southwark is contributing £1.726m to a total Private Housing Renewal budget of £3.9m – some of which will undoubtedly be spent in Peckham.



**26. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR STEPHEN FLANNERY**

“Could the Executive Member please give an update on the progress of the Four Squares feasibility study?”

**RESPONSE**

A feasibility for the Four Squares was carried out last year, to look at issues from maintaining and repairing the existing fabric of the estate; meeting Decent Home standards; safety and security issues; to partial re-development.

From public consultation and in light of the recent issues around drug related crime, safety and security issues were seen to be the priority for the residents on the estate, particularly the under used garage areas.

Specific options are being drawn up to address the crime and fear of crime on the estate. These include:

- ◆ Securing the garage areas with an electronic access system and some re-design. Before any work will be carried out the Neighbourhood are assessing what demand there is from local residents for secure parking.
- ◆ Closing off the squares to public access.
- ◆ Security systems to access the dwellings – from entry-phones with a second door access, CCTV – monitored remotely or on-site, to a concierge scheme. As all these options would have associated revenue charges and so residents would need to be surveyed on whether they would want such systems.
- ◆ Provision of accommodation to areas where there is no street activity – for example, Drummond Rd- south. It is envisaged that a number of garages could be converted to provide level access dwellings with in-curtilage parking.

The Community Safety Officer from the Police and a Security Consultant have endorsed these works, and when fully costed a decision can be made on what level of security can be funded.

Current data shows the estate fully complies with Decent Homes criteria, however when the specific stock condition survey for the whole borough is completed, the priority for the Four Squares for major investment can then be determined.

**27. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER**

“What reassurances can she give that tenants and residents of the Aylesbury Estate will not again have to tolerate the situation where, because of the problems with the District Heating system, they are without heating and hot water; and can she confirm that in cases where both heating and hot water have been out of commission for a long period, compensation will be paid?”

**RESPONSE**

The Council is proud of the large number of district heating schemes that are in place serving the residents of accommodation owned and managed by Southwark Housing. These systems provide hot water throughout the year and space heating for the majority of the year with the exception of the summer period.

Whilst a rigorous planned maintenance programme is in place it is impossible to prevent or diagnose in advance defects that occasionally disrupt this service.

In such circumstances the priority is to respond quickly and effectively to restore the service with the minimum of inconvenience that is possible. In the event that the disruption cannot be rectified quickly the Neighbourhood Office working with the contractor will be responsible for making suitable arrangements for tenants with special needs including the provision of temporary alternative heating.

The Council also has a policy that entitles individual households to receive a reduction in their rent charges based on a pre-agreed formula to reflect the period that the service is disrupted.

**28. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC THORNCROFT**

**“Will the Cabinet Member confirm definitively whether or not the Council plans to implement a programme of private sector housing renewal in the Nunhead area in 2003/2004?”**

**Note:** This question was originally submitted to the Executive Member for Regeneration. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9(6), the Executive Member for Regeneration has referred it to the Executive Member for Housing.

**RESPONSE**

Funding from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund is currently available to undertake a Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment (NRA) in Nunhead and East Peckham. The NRA is a statutory process that identifies the problems of an area in consultation with residents and then develops and assesses various packages of options designed to remedy those problems. Funding was agreed for 2002/03 and although some survey work has been completed an application is being made to carry an underspend forward into 2003/04. It should be noted that the NRA will cover both Nunhead and East Peckham and that no decision may be taken in advance of its completion regarding the location of any renewal area or areas.

The reason for the delay in this project is that during 2002/03 there was uncertainty with regard to the budget available for renewing private housing due to changes to Government funding.

Knowledge of forward funding is essential to the declaration of a renewal area as such areas are long term projects. The current legislation gives Renewal Areas ten-year statutory lifespans but under the new rules to be introduced in July 2003 Councils will be given more flexibility. There will be no fixed lifespan for any new renewal area under the new rules and so renewal areas of a shorter duration may be declared.

Forward funding for private housing renewal work will be considered as part of the next stage of the capital review in July of this year.

This is of direct relevance to the NRA process because the study involves a great deal of consultation with local people and a cautious approach has been taken so far in order to avoid building up the hopes of residents in advance of funding being available. In advance of the next stage of the overall review of capital resources a definitive commitment cannot currently be given.

However, if the capital strategy identifies funding officers are well placed to rapidly progress the NRA. The work on the Priority Areas in both East Peckham and Nunhead will form a valuable springboard for the next stages of the process and will make it much easier to develop a dialogue with residents and relevant agencies across the areas in question.

Officers view is that the process should be completed within nine months from confirmation of funding.

**29. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES**

“Will Councillor Bassom confirm that Taplow Neighbourhood Housing Office will not be closed as a result of the Best Value report on housing Management – yes or no?”

**RESPONSE**

I can confirm that no decision has been taken to close down any offices. Consultation on possible location of offices and sub-offices in the new structure will be carried out at all Neighbourhood Forums and Tenant and Leaseholder Council during the latter part of March and April 2003. Until consultation has taken place, officers will not be in a position to make any recommendations on the location of offices in the new structure. A report is scheduled to be presented to the Executive on 3rd June, when it is likely that decisions will be taken on this issue, providing that there has been sufficient time for formal consultation to have taken place within the current recognised consultation structures.