



**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY  
(ORDINARY)**

MINUTES of the open section of the meeting of the ordinary Council Assembly held on Wednesday, December 7 2005 at 7.00 p.m. at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

**PRESENT:**

The Worshipful the Mayor Councillor Vicky Naish

Councillor Alfred Banya	Councillor Kenny Mizzi
Councillor Mick Barnard	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Beverley Bassom	Councillor Alison Moise
Councillor Paul Bates	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Michelle Pearce
Councillor Catherine Bowman	Councillor Caroline Pidgeon
Councillor David Bradbury	Councillor Richard Porter
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Mark Pursey
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Stephen Flannery	Councillor William Rowe
Councillor John Friary	Councillor Jane Salmon
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Tayo Situ
Councillor Aubyn Graham	Councillor Bob Skelly
Councillor James Gurling	Councillor Robert Smeath
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Charlie Smith
Councillor Jeffrey Hook	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Richard Thomas
Councillor Kim Humphreys	Councillor Dominic Thorncroft
Councillor Jonathan Hunt	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor Peter John	Councillor Neil Watson
Councillor Paul Kyriacou	Councillor Sarah Welfare
Councillor Jelil Ladipo	Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor Lorraine Lauder	Councillor Anne Yates
Councillor Linda Manchester	Councillor Lorraine Zuleta
Councillor Eliza Mann	

## **1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

### **1.1. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor made the following announcements:

1. In response to the recent earthquake in Kashmir, she encouraged the people of Southwark to support the various relief appeals.
2. That a number of council departments had won “Investors in People” awards including the education, environment & leisure and strategic services departments, and that the social services department had been awarded 3-star status.
3. That the council’s policy banning smoking in the work place had been awarded the National Clean Air Society’s silver Clean Air Award.

Councillor Nick Stanton thanked those who had organised the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary dinner to celebrate the establishment of the borough.

### **1.2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE MAYOR DEEMED URGENT**

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

1. Report on the appointment of a vice chair of the overview and scrutiny committee.
2. Report setting out motions by members

### **1.3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

The following members declared personal, but non-prejudicial, interests, in the following items:

1. Councillor Ian Wingfield: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre.
2. Councillor Veronica Ward: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as she was a member of Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre.
3. Councillor John Friary: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre.
4. Councillor Caroline Pidgeon: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as she was a member of Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre.
5. Councillor Jane Salmon: Item 8.3 “Motion 3 – Heating Charges for Council Tenants” as she was a council tenant, and Item 8.5 “Motion 5 – Congestion Charge Zone” as she lived within the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.
6. Councillor Nick Stanton: Item 7.2 “Future Management of Potter’s Field Park” as a member of Riverside Ward.
7. Councillor James Gurling: Item 8.5 “Motion 5 - Congestion Charge Zone” as he lived in the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.
8. Councillor Graham Neale: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Friends of

Camberwell Leisure Centre and Item 8.5 “Motion 5 - Congestion Charge Zone” as he lived within the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.

9. Councillor Paul Bates: Item 8.5 “Motion 5 - Congestion Charge Zone” as he lived within the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.
10. Councillor Toby Eckersley: Item 8.5 “Motion 5 - Congestion Charge Zone” as he lived within the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.
11. Councillor Aubyn Graham: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre and a member of Fusion.
12. Councillor Tayo Situ: Item 8.3 “Motion 3 – Heating Charges for Council Tenants” as he was a leaseholder.
13. Councillor Lorraine Lauder: Item 8.3 “Motion 3 – Heating Charges for Council Tenants” as she was a leaseholder.
14. Councillor Alfred Banya: Item 8.3 “Motion 3 – Heating Charges for Council Tenants” as he was a leaseholder.
15. Councillor Peter John: Item 8.5 “Motion 5 - Congestion Charge Zone” as he lived within the vicinity of the congestion charge zone.
16. Councillor Jonathan Hunt: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a user of Camberwell Leisure Centre.
17. Councillor Mark Glover: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a user of Camberwell Leisure Centre and a member of Fusion.
18. Councillor Columba Blango: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Fusion.
19. Councillor Richard Thomas: Item 4.1 “Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre – deputation”, and the motion arising thereof, as he was a member of Fusion.

#### **1.4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Danny McCarthy, Gavin O’Brien and Denise Capstick, and Mother Pat Alden (the Mayor’s spiritual adviser).

Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Kim Humphreys, William Rowe and Mark Pursey.

Council assembly expressed its best wishes to Councillor Danny McCarthy for a full recovery.

## **2. MINUTES**

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the amended motion no. 10 in the open minutes of the meeting of September 14 2005 be approved and signed as a correct record; and,
  2. That the open minutes of the council assembly ordinary meeting of October 19 2005 be approved and signed as a correct record.

### **3. PETITIONS**

There were none.

### **4. DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

#### **4.1 DEPUTATION FROM FRIENDS OF CAMBERWELL LEISURE CENTRE** (see pages 1-2)

The meeting agreed to hear the deputation. Members were addressed by the deputation's spokesperson. Councillors Veronica Ward, Abdul Mohamed, and Columba Blango asked the deputation questions. The Mayor thanked the deputation, which then withdrew to the public gallery.

At this point in the proceedings, council assembly agreed to consider motion 10 – Camberwell Leisure Centre (see item 8.10)

#### **4.2 DEPUTATION FROM THE BLACK AWARENESS GROUP** (see page 2 and supplementary agenda no. 3, pages 2-5)

The meeting agreed to hear the deputation. Members were addressed by the deputation's spokesperson, Mr Seaton. Councillors Toby Eckersley, Peter John, Neil Watson and Catherine Bowman asked the deputation questions. The Mayor thanked the deputation, which then withdrew to the public gallery.

At this point in the proceedings, council assembly, in accordance with the council's procedure rule no.3, considered a motion submitted without notice relative to the issue raised by the deputation.

Councillor Tayo Situ, seconded by Councillor Aubyn Graham, moved the motion.

Following debate (Councillors Jonathan Hunt, Peter John and Nick Stanton), the motion was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

### **5. MEMBERS QUESTION TIME – QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULES 3.9 and 3.12** (see the blue paper and pages 1-49 of the yellow papers circulated at the meeting)

Two urgent questions from Councillor William Rowe and Peter John were submitted. The questions and the responses are attached as appendix 1.

Forty-three questions were submitted, the answers to which were circulated round the chamber. Twenty-six supplementary questions were asked. The questions and responses are attached as appendix 2.

At 9.29 pm it was moved, seconded and agreed that the meeting be adjourned for the next ten minutes. The meeting reconvened at 9.49 pm.

### **6. REPORT BACK ON MOTIONS REFERRED TO THE EXECUTIVE FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY** (see pages 12-20)

Members considered a report back on motions referred to the executive from council assembly on the following matters:

1. Timebank Pilot Scheme
2. No. 12 Bus Route
3. Safety and Security on Trains and at Train Stations
4. Housing Repairs Call Centre
5. Planning Design
6. Housing Issues
7. Bicentenary of the Battle of Trafalgar
8. Southwark Credit Union
9. 2012 London Olympics
10. Wells Way, Southampton Way
11. Fair Trade

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

## **7. OTHER REPORTS**

### **7.1 APPOINTMENT OF THE VICE-CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE** (see pages 21-22)

Two nominations for the vacant position of vice-chair of the planning committee were received. Councillor David Bradbury had been nominated by Councillor William Rowe and seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley. Councillor Norma Gibbes was nominated by Councillor Paul Bates and seconded by Councillor Peter John.

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor David Bradbury be appointed vice-chair of the planning committee.

### **7.1A APPOINTMENT OF THE VICE-CHAIR OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** (see supplementary agenda no. 3, pages 6-7)

Two nominations for the vacant position of vice-chair of the overview and scrutiny committee were received. Councillor Bob Skelly was nominated by Councillor David Hubber and seconded by councillor Nick Stanton. Councillor Fiona Colley was nominated by Councillor Paul Bates and seconded by Councillor Peter John.

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Bob Skelly be appointed vice-chair of the overview and scrutiny committee.

### **7.2 FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF POTTER'S FIELD PARK** (see pages 23–31 and supplementary agenda no. 3, page 12)

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.15(2) the Mayor formally moved the recommendations contained within the report.

Councillor John Friary, seconded by Councillor Barrie Hargrove, moved amendment A.

Following debate (Councillors Peter John, Toby Eckersley, Nick Stanton, Andy Simmons, William Rowe, Richard Thomas, and Michelle Pearce), amendment A was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

Following debate (Councillors Nick Stanton and Peter John), the substantive motion was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That it be agreed to enter into an 'agreement to lease' with the London Development Agency and the Potter's Field Park Trust that will commit the council to leasing the area of metropolitan open land known as Potter's Field to Potter's Field Park management trust, a newly constituted trust (in the form of a company limited by guarantee) and once the conditions in the agreement to lease have been met, to dispose of Potter's Field by entry into a lease between the trust and the council.
  2. That the proposal to enter into a service performance agreement with the newly constituted trust following negotiation as a single supplier in due course be agreed.

## 8. MOTIONS

### 8.1 MOTION 1 - DULWICH AREA HOUSING OFFICE (see supplemental agendas no.1 and 3, pages 1 and 13)

Councillor William Rowe, seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson, moved the motion.

Councillor Charlie Smith, seconded by Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle, moved amendment B.

Following debate (Councillors Andy Simmons and John Friary), Councillor William Rowe exercised his right of reply. Amendment B 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 assembly notes the increasing frustration and disappointment expressed by residents at the performance and responsiveness of the Dulwich area housing office.
  2. That council assembly therefore requests the executive to instruct officers to investigate the causes of the perceived unsatisfactory performance of the area housing office and provide the additional support to remedy them so that residents see a noticeable improvement in performance as early as possible in the new year. Officers should report back to the first executive meeting in January 2006 and to ward members by January 2006.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

### 8.2 MOTION 2 - WASTE MANAGEMENT AND THE RESOURCE PROJECT (see supplemental agendas nos.1 and 3, pages 34-35 and 14)

Councillor Richard Thomas, seconded by Councillor Graham Neale, moved the motion.

Councillor Barrie Hargrove, seconded by Councillor Robert Smeath, moved amendment C.

Following debate (Councillors Toby Eckersley and Peter John), Councillor Richard Thomas exercised his right of reply. Amendment C was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

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

**RESOLVED:** That this council -

- Reaffirms its support for the resource programme to procure a long-term, fully-integrated, multi-million pound waste management solution and development of new waste management facilities on the Old Kent Road;
- Believes the resource programme is vital for Southwark to achieve its commitments to recycle half, and recover energy from three quarters, of its waste by 2020;
- Notes that a failure to complete the resource programme would expose the council to serious financial risk due to the impact of financial penalties under the landfill allowance trading scheme (LATS) regime;
- Welcomes the government support for the programme with the single largest private finance initiative (PFI) credit to a unitary authority for a waste contract (£34.5 million) and the support of the Greater London Authority (GLA);
- Notes that the resource programme has reached a stage where significant investment will shortly be made by bidders for the PFI contract and by the council in relation to site acquisition;
- Is concerned that the business case for the resource programme has been impacted by the issuing of the Mayor's proposal to centralise waste disposal and planning across London through the establishment of a London Single Waste Authority (LSWA);
- Calls on the leader of the council and the chief executive to seek urgent assurances and indemnities from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Mayor of London to protect Southwark's capital investment and ensure the continuation of the resource project.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.3 MOTION 3 - HEATING CHARGES FOR COUNCIL TENANTS** (see supplemental agendas nos.1, 2 and 3, pages 35-36, 4-5 and 15)

Councillor Paul Bates, seconded by Councillor Charlie Smith, moved the motion.

Councillor William Rowe, seconded by Councillor David Bradbury, moved amendment D.

Following debate (Councillor Nick Stanton), Councillor Paul Bates exercised his right of reply.

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 notes with concern the proposed increases of 29% in hot water and heating charges to Southwark's tenants and residents.
  2. That while council assembly recognises increases in wholesale gas and electricity prices, council assembly believes the proposed increase to be a substantial additional burden to users of the district heating and hot water systems.
  3. That council assembly believes such an increase to be particularly distressing to those residents living on certain estates who have had to endure regular breakdowns and failures of the heating and hot water systems in recent years.
  4. That council assembly calls upon officers to bring forward a new and comprehensive report as a matter of urgency which will be made available to provide those residents who are charged for district heating and hot water with a clear and comprehensive explanation of the increase, setting it in the appropriate context in relation to time and increases in fuel costs.
  5. That council assembly calls upon the executive to re-examine the proposal of a 29% increase on heating and hot water charges, taking note of the dissatisfaction with the new charges on the part of tenant council and individual tenants and residents associations and instruct officers to develop a formula and proposals to issue rebates to residents affected if the actual heating costs incurred are lower than those anticipated in setting the 29% increase.
  6. That council assembly further requests the executive to closely examine innovative ways of supplying heating and hot water systems including application for government grants to fund feasibility studies to explore renewable energy schemes such as solar photovoltaic panels, wind turbines, solar water heating, ground source heat pumps, biomass and small scale hydro systems, and requests that a report be brought back to council assembly as quickly as practicably possible.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.4 MOTION 4 - PRESS AND PUBLICITY** (see supplemental agendas nos. 1 and 2, pages 36 and 6-7)

Councillor Kim Humphreys, seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley, formally moved the motion. The motion was unopposed and declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:** That council assembly desires that generally, and in particular with regard to the council's communications policies, the activities and functions of community councils in particular and of the



overview and scrutiny committee (OSC) and its sub-committees are, within existing resources, given greater emphasis; and accordingly calls for the necessary action beginning with consultation by the communications team with the chair and vice chair of OSC and of each community council and a subsequent report to be brought forward by the executive.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

#### **8.5 MOTION 5 - CONGESTION CHARGE** (see supplemental agenda no.1, pages 36-37)

Councillor James Gurling, seconded by Councillor Jane Salmon, formally moved the motion. The motion was unopposed and was declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council assembly notes the official council response to the Greater London (Central Zone) Congestion Charging Order 2001, which was specifically amended to include the suggestion of a buffer zone to minimize the adverse impact on those living and working near the border.
  2. That council assembly further notes the Mayor of London's recent indications that he is considering extending the resident discount zone (i.e. creating a buffer zone) in areas of Kennington.
  3. That council assembly understands that this reflects the inconvenience to residents living close to the border and the additional cost incurred conducting everyday family, social, commercial, and community activity.
  4. That council assembly is disappointed that, whilst this concession is a positive move for some London residents in neighbouring Lambeth, Southwark residents are continuing to lose out.
  5. That council urges Transport for London (TfL) to take this opportunity to reconsider establishing a buffer zone for residents in Southwark who have already been affected for almost three years.
  6. That whilst council assembly appreciates that any arbitrary demarcation line will be unpopular there is a real opportunity to ease the burden which falls unfairly on residents and businesses in Southwark and who are based just outside the congestion charging zone.
  7. That council assembly therefore requests that the executive member for environment and transport and the relevant officers in our transport division work with London Assembly members to present a strong case to the Mayor of London and TfL regarding the prospect of allowing communities close to the boundary to benefit from a graduated residents discount. As a package of public transport incentives for the area the proposals should also include the extension of the central Zone 1 to include both Kennington and Bermondsey tube stations.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.6 MOTION 6 – ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN SOUTHWARK** (see supplemental agendas nos.1, 2 and 3, pages 37-38, 7-10, and 16-17)

Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved the motion.

Councillor Nick Stanton, seconded by Councillor Richard Porter, moved amendment E.

Following debate (Councillor Jonathan Hunt), amendment E 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 with concern the finding of the local government ombudsman, Mr. Jerry White, who found Southwark council to be guilty of 'maladministration, causing injustice' in the case of 'Mr. Kelly', a victim of anti-social behaviour. However, council assembly also notes that this incident occurred before the neighbourhood housing system was restructured and a number of improvements to case management have been made.
  2. That council assembly notes -
    - Southwark is in the top quartile for issuing anti-social behaviour orders, when compared with other London boroughs in 2004/05, having recently secured its 50th ASBO and that the government awarded Beacon Status to Southwark for its crime and disorder partnership.
    - The results of recent local crime surveys, which revealed concerns among respondents about anti-social behaviour, in particular noise nuisance and gangs of youths.
  3. That council assembly therefore calls on the executive to:
    - Discuss the overall approach to issuing anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) and acceptable behaviour contracts (ABCs) with the authorities responsible for doing so.
    - Receive a report from officers on when it may be considered useful to name and shame the recipients of ASBOs.
    - Continue to improve the standard of investigative work at Southwark anti-social behaviour team (SASBU), and improve communications between case officers and complainants.
    - Continue to develop closer joint working between the housing department, community safety unit, and the anti-social behaviour unit, to prevent the failures described by the ombudsman.
    - Continue to work with the Safer Southwark Partnership and to seek to work with the Home Office in order to ensure that fear of crime is not needlessly exacerbated by misleading and unfounded communications.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.7 MOTION 7 - FURTHER POWERS FOR LONDON MAYOR** (see supplemental agendas nos.1 and 2, pages 38-39 and 18)

Councillor Toby Eckersley, seconded by Councillor William Rowe, moved the motion.

Councillor Caroline Pidgeon, seconded by Councillor Nick Stanton, moved amendment F.

Following debate (Councillors Peter John and David Hubber), amendment F 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 this Council is extremely concerned at the comment by the respected local government commentator Tony Travers in the Local Government Chronicle of November 3 2005:

“The GLA is to be given enhanced responsibilities for such provision as transport, waste, planning, housing, learning and skills, and the arts”

and requests the executive to submit a report to the next council assembly with up to date developments on this matter together with a statement of the executive’s policy in respect of where responsibility should lie for the discharge of the functions listed above in the quotation from Mr Travers.

2. That council assembly notes that the office of the deputy prime minister (ODPM) has begun to consult on a review of the Mayor of London’s powers and that the Association of London Government and the Greater London Authority have formed the Commission on London Governance.
3. That council assembly believes that it would be inappropriate for the government to remove powers from London boroughs and transfer them to the Mayor but that serious consideration should be given to reviewing the powers of central government and the Government Office of London (GOL) and the burgeoning quangos and transferring those powers to appropriate democratically elected institutions.
4. That council assembly calls on the executive to respond to the consultations by the ODPM and the Commission on London Governance accordingly.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.8 MOTION 8 - PUPIL MOBILITY** (see supplemental agendas nos.1 and 3, pages 40-41 and page 19)

Councillor Bob Skelly, seconded by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon, moved the motion.

Councillor Andy Simmons, seconded by Councillor Robert Smeath, moved amendment G.

Councillor Bob Skelly exercised his right of reply. Amendment G 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 the conclusions of the recently published Association of Local Government (ALG) research entitled “Breaking Point - examining the disruption caused by pupil mobility” and in particular:
    - a) Schools with mobile children face additional demands that translate into additional costs for extra administrative, teaching and other support. The impact of these additional demands can be critical for some schools and their pupils.
    - b) High mobility is not evenly distributed between schools. There are underlying factors which cause high pupil turnover to be heavily concentrated in specific geographical locations and in specific schools.
    - c) High mobility in schools with high levels of educational disadvantage reduces equality of opportunity for all pupils in that school.
    - d) Under funding already results in a high level of unmet educational need in schools with large numbers of children with multiple deprivations. High levels of pupil mobility compound the pressures these schools face and help perpetuate under-achievement for all children attending that school.
    - e) Improvements in pupil achievement may continue to be compromised without a better understanding of the relationship between pupil mobility, deprivation and English language acquisition and the role of a more cohesive investment strategy in offering genuine equality of opportunity to all children.
  2. That council assembly believes therefore that 'tackling the implications of pupil mobility should be a key funding priority for the government. Multiple disadvantage and pupil turnover are major determinants in reducing life chances for mobile pupils and other deprived children who compete for teaching support and whose education is constantly disrupted by classroom instability and joins with the ALG Chair Sir Robin Wales in his declaration that “real opportunities to lift children out of poverty must be supported by additional teaching capacity. This means ensuring that schools with multiple deprivation and high pupil turnover receive sufficient funding to make equality of opportunity a reality”.
  3. That, however, council assembly also notes the reply from Jacqui Smith to Simon Hughes MP in the House of Commons on November 24 2005 on this subject that “given the wide spread of

mobility across a range of local authorities, the effect of distributing between authorities on the basis of mobility would have been to flatten and reduce the extra contributions to those authorities with additional educational needs on the basis of distribution”.

4. That council assembly notes that local authorities can take account of pupil mobility in their local funding formulae and asks the executive member for education to report to the January 2006 education scrutiny sub-committee meeting on the steps she has already taken to address this key priority as part of the 2006/2007 budget.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.9 MOTION 9 - SQUATTING OF COUNCIL PROPERTY** (see supplemental agendas nos.1, 2 and 3, pages 41, 11-13 and 20-21)

Councillor Robert Smeath, seconded by Councillor Aubyn Graham, moved the motion.

With the consent of council assembly, Councillor Nick Stanton, seconded by Councillor Jeff Hook, moved amendment H.

Councillor Robert Smeath exercised his right of reply. Amendment H 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 with serious concern the damage caused to council property following squatting and the apparent anti-social behaviour of some squatters. In particular council assembly notes concerns regarding the apparent organised nature of squatting on the Coopers Road estate, Wooddene, and East Dulwich estate.
  2. That council assembly additionally notes the fires at Marchant Court and Waverley School lower site, which are areas that have been subject to squatting, but does not accept that there is necessarily a direct link. Council assembly further notes that investigations into these fires are ongoing and would not wish to prejudice the outcomes.
  3. That council assembly recognises that Southwark takes an extremely tough line on squatting, which it enforces rigorously.
  4. That council assembly calls on the overview and scrutiny committee to review council procedures and recommend to the executive any further steps that could reasonably be taken to avoid future recurrences.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the overview and scrutiny committee for consideration.

**8.10 MOTION 10 - CAMBERWELL LEISURE CENTRE** (see supplemental agendas nos.1 and 3, pages 41-42 and 21)

Councillor John Friary, seconded by Councillor Ian Wingfield, moved the motion.

Councillor Richard Porter, seconded by Councillor Lisa Rajan, moved amendment I.

Following debate (Councillors Andy Simmons, Veronica Ward, Nick Stanton and Alison Moise), Councillor John Friary exercised his right of reply. Amendment I 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 the ongoing work between the council and Fusion to enable Fusion to raise the capital needed for much needed investment in Camberwell Leisure Centre and other leisure facilities in the borough.
  2. That council assembly believes this building to be important to Camberwell as a Leisure Centre.
  3. That council assembly notes Camberwell community council's own report to the executive, now adopted as the community council's own strategy, which envisages the development of the Leisure Centre as key to regeneration in Camberwell. Council assembly notes that at present the building is in a poor state of repair and is deteriorating. Council assembly further notes that this is the result of years of under-investment in Leisure Centres by the previous administration and that the council now spends eight times as much on repair and maintenance of Leisure Centres as it did in 2002.
  4. That council assembly regrets the necessity to close the nearby Peckham Pulse swimming pool due to structural defects, despite a massive overspend by the previous administration on the project
  5. That council assembly calls upon the executive to continue to work urgently with Fusion to reach a successful outcome to the investment strategy for leisure facilities across Southwark, so that work can begin both to ensure the continuation of current facilities and to start developing this centre as a resource for the residents of Camberwell, including urgently needed facilities for the young people of Camberwell.

**Note:** The motion was referred to the executive for consideration.

**8.11 MOTION 11 - NUNHEAD GREEN CONSERVATION AREA** (see supplemental agendas nos.1 and 3, pages 42-43 and 23)

Councillor Dominic Thorncroft, seconded by Councillor Andy Simmons, formally moved the motion. Amendment J was formally moved by Councillor James Gurling and seconded by Councillor Bob Skelly.

The motion and amendment were both unopposed and declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That council assembly notes:
    - Council assembly's support on July 20 2005 for urgent action to be taken to establish a conservation area for the Nunhead Green area;
    - That officers have indicated that the likely timescale for establishing a conservation area is April 2006;
    - That planning applications continue to be worked up by landowners in the area.
  2. That council assembly's request that urgent action is taken by the planning committee to establish a conservation area be reiterated.
  3. That it be noted that the planning committee received an urgent item at its meeting on November 29 and agreed to redeploy resources to commence work on the Nunhead Green conservation area.

#### **8.12 MOTION 12 - FEAR OF CRIME IN SURREY QUAYS** (see page 43)

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10(3), the motion stood referred to a meeting of the executive.

In closing the meeting, the Mayor wished everyone a happy Christmas and a prosperous and successful New Year.

The meeting closed at 11.40 p.m.

**MAYOR:**

**DATED:**