

Item No. 8.1	Classification: Open	Date: December 8 2004	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Report Back on Consideration of Motions Referred from Council Assembly	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Executive	

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – EAST DULWICH COMMUNITY CENTRE

Executive on October 12 2004 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on July 21 2004, which had been moved by Councillor Sarah Welfare, seconded by Councillor Charlie Smith. Amended by Councillor William Rowe and seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys:-

- “1. That it be noted that:
 - The East Dulwich community centre is an essential community resource for people in East Dulwich and Peckham Rye; is used by people of all ages, ethnic groups and religious faiths; has been run by volunteers for over two decades; and includes the only outside space for young people to use in East Dulwich;
 - The Executive have put forward plans to dispose of the site and, as part of a private development, build housing on the site and flats over a re-built community centre that would retain a third of the existing outside play space;
 - At the May Dulwich Community Council many members of the public strongly opposed incorporating housing on to this site.

2. That Council calls upon the Executive to note the unanimous resolution of the Dulwich Community Council of 18th May 2004 and in particular:
 - that residents are concerned about the community centre and housing being in the same building.
 - that the Executive should foster a community led initiative.
 - that the timetable should be delayed by six months to allow proper consideration of practical solutions.”

The executive member for regeneration and economic development reported at the meeting that he had met with the East Dulwich residents on September 7 and that a further meeting had been arranged with the residents and architects for October 16 2004.

The Executive noted the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – DOUBLE GLAZING COSTS

Executive on October 12 2004 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on September 15 2004, which had been moved by Councillor William Rowe and seconded by Councillor Kenny Mizzi. Amended by Councillor Alfred Banya and seconded by Charlie Smith:-

1. Council assembly notes that double-glazing costs remain a very high component of major works costs borne both by the housing revenue account and by leaseholders and that there remains widespread concern that these costs are excessive.
2. Council assembly notes that the cross party capital working group agreed that officers would investigate this issue in early 2002 but that no report has been provided to members as of yet.
3. Council assembly requests the executive to obtain a report from officers by the end of November 2004 setting out how significant savings in this area of cost could be made. The report should address;
 - How other major landlords (including public sector, social rented and private sector) purchase double glazing: for example via general building contractors, from specialist suppliers, or by direct deals with manufacturers setting out the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative approach.
 - The cost implications of different “environmental standards” applied to double glazing (UPVC, timber & metal frames etc) – setting out alternatives and their costs clearly.
 - Benchmarking data available on double glazing costs.
 - Any other information pertinent to obtaining reliable double-glazing at a reasonable cost.
 - Proposals for steps to be taken by the council to obtain better value for money on its double-glazing purchases.

We noted that a full report on the issue would be submitted to the executive in November 2004.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – PARKING REDUCTION CONSULTATION

Executive on October 12 2004 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on September 15 2004, which had been moved by Councillor David Bradbury and seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys. Amended by Councillor Richard Thomas and seconded by Councillor Stephen Flannery:-

“This council assembly is concerned ward councillors and some members of the public have suggested that, in relation to initial council proposals to reduce

parking in Half Moon Lane in connection with the London Bus Priority network, consultation with local residents was not wide enough and did not fully cover the area that would have been affected by displacement and therefore requests that the executive review its policy towards such consultations in the future.”

We agreed the following:

1. That the executive is concerned that ward councillors and some members of the public have suggested that, in relation to initial council proposals to reduce parking in Half Moon Lane, in connection with the London Bus Priority network, consultation with local residents was not wide enough and did not fully cover the area that would have been affected by displacement and therefore requests that the strategic director of regeneration to review the policy towards consultations in the future.
2. That it be noted that the review of parking will be reported back to the executive as part of the Local Implementation Plan approval process.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Executive Agenda and Minutes October 12 2004	Constitutional Unit, Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Paula Thornton/Everton Roberts 020 7525 4395/7221

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Deborah Holmes, Borough Solicitor & Secretary	
Report Author	Everton Roberts, Constitutional Team	
Version	Final	
Dated	November 26 2004	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	No	No
Chief Finance Officer	No	No
Executive Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services	November 26 2004	