

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY  
(ORDINARY)**

**WEDNESDAY JANUARY 25 2006**

**MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

**1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR TAYO  
SITU**

What steps has the leader taken in his role as Southwark's representative on the Cross River partnership to ensure ward councillors are aware of discussions and decisions by the Cross River partnership of relevance to their wards?

**RESPONSE**

The Cross River Partnership, born out of the SRB programme, is a voluntary alliance of 12 partners, created to make the link between wealth and prosperity in central London and more deprived areas and to make the river less of a physical and social barrier. It was formed in 1995, bringing together key players on both sides of the river, including the four central London local authorities - Westminster City Council, City of London, Southwark and Lambeth.

However, it should be noted that CRP continues to be a voluntary alliance with no legal or statutory powers to unilaterally decide upon and/or implement actions or projects. Its main purpose is to act as a lobby organisation for central London and as a body which co-ordinates development and delivery of regeneration both within Boroughs and championing cross-borough working.

As such, CRP does not, as a matter of course, contact Ward Councillors. Where there is specific regeneration within a Ward driven by the Council in partnership with CRP, (for example, the Light at the End of the Tunnel Project) then extensive consultation always takes place using methods such as: exhibitions; events; newsletters; surveys/questionnaires; and local forums.

**2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
JONATHAN HUNT**

When I queried the wisdom of selling the Orchard Lodge playing fields, given the lack of facilities and rise in obesity, the leader pledged to increase the amount of land and number of sites devoted to recreation and leisure uses in the borough. Can he tell us how this programme is progressing, including plans for Greendale and measures to exclude the public, and how many of the Orchard acres have been replaced?

**RESPONSE**

Orchard Playing Fields are in Bromley and were inherited by Southwark on the demise of the ILEA (Inner London Education Authority). Prior to disposal the site was run down through years of neglect and fewer than 20% of the small number of children still using the site were from the London Borough of Southwark. Rather than invest in run-down sites that are not used by our population we have invested in the run-down sites we inherited that can be used by people in Southwark.

That is why, there is now a thriving state of the art tennis centre (where previously there were a group of sorry looking broken courts) at one end of Burgess Park. There is also brand new football centre at the other end to replace the old astroturf that had been unusable for almost a decade. Finally, here is a community grass sports pitch at Waite Street where previously there was none.

The refurbishments at Peckham Rye and Dulwich will provide four new well-drained football pitches and new tennis courts, cricket pitches and multi-use games areas at Dulwich. Southwark Park also has re-furbished tennis courts as do Sunray Gardens and Belair Park. Multi-use games areas have been introduced at Paris Gardens, Guy Street, Brunswick Park, Brimington Park, Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park and Pelier Park. There are two more proposed at Patterson Park and Falmouth Road.

We are just about to commence development of Mellish Fields (a 3.5 hectare site in conjunction with Bacon's College) and there are feasibility studies planned for a number of sports grounds (all inherited in a poor state) including Southwark Sports Ground, Homestall Road and Greendales. There are also a number of partnerships such as those with Dulwich Cricket Club and at Mary Datchelors playing field which allow children in Southwark access to excellent out-door facilities which were previously not available to them.

Over the past three years, community councils have had over £9m allocated to them through the cleaner, greener, safer fund and some have used this money to create, enhance or restore play, sports and recreation facilities.

Finally, there are over 10,000 children involved in the Southwark Community Games which is now in its third year. In coming years the Community Games will take sport and physical activity to every school and housing estate in Southwark.

Orchard was a sprawling site which had little utility value for people in Southwark. The facilities and initiatives mentioned above are the result of prudent planning and investment and are used by thousands of children. They more than compensate for the loss of a dozen dilapidated football pitches in a neighbouring authority.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR JONATHAN HUNT**

I am grateful to the Leader Madam Mayor for his answer. I have not had access to the latest papers regarding the Orchard Playing Fields so I won't mention that at this time. I would like to join him in congratulating Councillor Columba Blango on his borough community games initiatives which seems to go from strength to strength, but I would wish that the list that he has kindly provided were longer. Above all I would like to ask him whether Greendale would remain a public open space what other plans does Southwark property have for it including fencing in so that the public is not able currently to access it and could not sit with a can of shandy on a warm day and drink it in public. I hope he can give local residents assurances that Greendale will so remain.

### **RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Can I thank Councillor Hunt for the supplementary question. I could indeed have made the list longer. I could have for example thrown in the £1m capital investment in playgrounds on council estates and school playing fields which we had in the capital budget last year which community council bid for. I could have thrown in the Whitesground Arch on the border of Grange ward and Riverside ward, a disused railway arch which is to be turned into a state of the art skateboard facility which will be a very welcome addition to the area and so on. So rest assured the list is a lot longer and I will

be quite happy to run on the record in May. Greendale, as I understand it, there are no specific plans. It's an area which I think everyone agrees need a bit of loving care and attention ever since we have managed to fight off the deprivations of the Labour group who, and we won't let people forget that either, decided to sell it off under the previous administration, a move that Councillor Pidgeon and I opposed at the time and something which the planning committee managed to fight against and which we instructed the council to overwhelmingly stick up for that at the appeal: and we won and we then stuck to our promise and withdrew Greendale from the for sale list and, as I understand it, we are about to start consultation with the local community to see what people want in the green space. And I think it is absolutely right that we should seek to preserve and enhance the green spaces in the borough. That's why in the UDP we created our own new category of borough open land to be able to give to a number of small green spaces in the borough the same kind of protection that they would have if they were metropolitan open land – that's why we expanded the boundaries of Burgess Park. One of the first things we did to be able to assess once and for all that what the boundaries of that park were. That's why we are trying to transfer Burgess Park over to Community Development Trust to make it clear that it is not for sale; to put it beyond risk of being developed and that's why, in the radical second term with the vast overall majority, the hoards of little orange men and women sweep across the council chamber to be able to talk to each across the isle that will be able to boast even greater investment and enhancement of our green spaces for ourselves, for our children, for our children's children, for our children's children's, children and so on until the crack of time.

**3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BRADBURY**

Would the leader of the council state how much the cost of printing and postage was for the Christmas cards recently sent round by the community councils and whether the chairs of the community councils were consulted before the cards were printed? Would he also state what was the council's overall spending on Christmas cards?

**RESPONSE**

The total printing and postage cost for the community council Christmas cards was £788.33

Following on from a request for Christmas cards from the chairs of two community council areas, it was agreed to proceed and offer this to all other chairs as the vehicle for promotion of meeting dates after the Christmas/new year break. The minimum print run available meant that there was no saving on card production costs from having one or more community council opt out of the promotion. In total, the chairs of 6 community council areas wished to proceed. All costs were met from within existing budgets for the promotion and publicity of community council meetings.

It has not been possible to identify the overall amount spent by the council on Christmas cards, as there is no separately identifiable cost code that can be seen within the accounts.

**SUPPLEMENTAL - COUNCILLOR DAVID BRADBURY**

Thank you Madam Mayor and can I thank the Leader for his answer. I am grateful that the cost of this was not excessive but could I query the leader's choice of words when he describes this as a promotion. Would he not agree with me that sending of Christmas cards should not be seen as "a promotion" it should rather be a simple exercise in spreading good will to one's fellow man at a particular time of year.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

I certainly would not agree with such a suggestion like that. No Madam Mayor life would not be worth living on this side of the chamber if I did, and I think the Tories have to make their minds up. Either we should listen to the views of community council chairs and accede to them, which is what was being suggested earlier. In which case if they want Christmas cards let them have Christmas cards, if they want cake, let them have cake, or we should exercise a centrally disciplined iron approach which is there shall be no Christmas cards. We are not Ebenezer Scrooge on this side of the chamber – we will never will be Ebenezer Scrooge on this side of the chamber. In the radical second term, the orange people, so many orange people (don't even be rude to them over there), they will be spreading out along here as well and the gallery will be packed with other orange people applauding the orange people who are here – there will be Christmas cards, there will be Eid-al-Adha cards, there will be Hanukkah cards, there will be cards galore and the people of Southwark will say oh good another card and a slice of cake as well.

**4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANNE YATES**

What action has been taken to prevent the theft of Blue Badges from Southwark residents' cars and what has been the result?

**RESPONSE**

In August 2005, a new system was introduced which enabled Blue Badge holders to park without displaying their badge. The new permit is available free of charge to any Blue Badge holder who either has a car themselves or has a resident carer who has one. The permit is vehicle specific and therefore has no re-sale value. Initially, an application form was posted to every Blue Badge holder and now an application form is provided with each new or renewed Blue Badge. To date 2242 permits have been issued. The Metropolitan Police report the theft of Blue Badges from vehicles has fallen from approximately 50 to 10 per month over the last 12 months.

Next steps include:

- A proactive publicity campaign advertising a tough stance on Blue Badge theft and fraud, alerting the public to our plans to prosecute.
- A leaflet, "Keeping your vehicle safe", is to be included in all Blue Badge renewal notices.
- Car registration/Blue Badge details are being passed to the Police for checking when concerns are raised.
- Parking attendants are being briefed on how to identify suspicious behaviour and how to respond.
- Exploring methods to transfer data about stolen Blue Badges directly to parking attendants' handsets so that checks can be made as they patrol the streets.

In addition, Southwark has been a contributor to the Association of Local Government working group looking at ways to introduce the scheme to other Boroughs and at further methods of reducing theft and fraud.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR ANNE YATES**

Thank you Madam Mayor and I thank the leader for his response to my initial question – yes I do have a supplemental thank you. I am very pleased to see such excellent results and will the leader assure me that this best practice will be shared with the Local Government Association as well as the Association of London Government so that all areas can benefit and if I may just sneak in a little bit extra – it is not the Blue Badge scheme it is the Residents’ Badges – it is particularly in the leader’s ward they are being photocopied and used – people who don’t have a permit are photocopying existing permits from somebody else and they are passing them around so residents are losing out on the permits as well.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Yes Madam Mayor. Once again I fear this would be another of those made-in-Southwark solutions which is a real success which has led to an improvement in the quality of life for some of our more vulnerable citizens who are having their cars broken into by people who clearly were not entitled to Blue Badges so that they could scam parking and in the past what we have found is that when we have come up with a really good made-in-Southwark initiative around the whole crime and disorder agenda. It gets highlighted on the No. 10 website, it gets rolled out and highlighted as best practice across the country and somewhere along the line the made-in-Southwark tag disappears and it becomes branded as made in Home Office or made in 10 Downing Street – we know where the credit really belongs – of course we will be more than delighted to share this particular good piece of best practice with other authorities in the United Kingdom and of course we will have a look at making sure that people don’t try other forms of fraud, people don’t try other forms of burglary or breaking in or entry in order to get round what has been a real success in reducing crime in Southwark.

**5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY**

Can the leader outline the council’s plan should there be an outbreak of avian ‘flu in the borough?

**RESPONSE**

At this time, avian flu can only be transmitted to a human via direct contact with an infected bird. At this time, there are no reports of this occurring anywhere within the United Kingdom. If the virus mutates to a form where it may be passed from human to human, then there is an elevated threat of a pandemic outbreak.

The control and disposal of affected birds and poultry is the responsibility of the department for the environment, food and rural affairs (DEFRA). The primary responsibility for pandemic planning (as a public health issue) rests with the primary care trust (PCT), however, the effects of this threat go far beyond public health.

Since this issue came to light, the council has carried out a full assessment of the likely impact to the organisation and its capability, resulting in detailed internal generic guidance being produced by the emergency planning and resilience team. This guidance not only covers the specific issues surrounding a pandemic, but is also applicable to an epidemic, which is a more likely event with similar (if lesser) consequences.

The guidance details the likely impact to the council and the community at large as a result of a pandemic or epidemic, and provides a framework of actions that may be deployed before, during and after such an event. Specific areas of consideration for the council include:

- Business continuity of critical services
- Supporting the PCT in the delivery of mass vaccination and treatment
- Assisting the most vulnerable
- Accelerated funeral arrangements
- Mortuary capability
- Prioritisation of service delivery.

The emergency planning and resilience team has engaged with the PCT at a working level to provide cross-functional support on this subject, in particular, the provision of mass treatment centres. The team have also engaged with other interested parties, such as the coroner, the voluntary sector and the faith community, to ensure that they are aware of the issues and can plan accordingly.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY**

Thank you Madam – I feel rather intimidated asking a supplementary based on the leader's reaction to the earlier question.

I welcome the answer – this is very much about the medical implications, which I understand, but I was interested in the service delivery angle. In my day job I have been given figures from the government which, worse case scenario, something like 30% of staff being absent from work for a month. I know it's a great question how many staff work for Southwark, and people usually say about half of them, but I just wonder what the consequences would be of 30% absenteeism for a sustained period of time and, in terms of service delivery, just to ask the leader is that something that has been factored into the equation. Clearly this is a worst-case scenario, but who knows until the outbreak actually comes on shore as it were. So we need clarification of the factors that have been taken into account.

### **RESPOND – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Yes Madam Mayor the council maintains a risk register which we constantly keep under review. The risk of a pandemic which, lets be clear, is still regarded as relatively low by the medical experts has been factored in. Of course if it were to happen we would not be able to guarantee 100% continuity of service delivery but of course we work with other local authorities and this is good example actually in London where there is good cross borough working on contingency plans to try and ensure that we would maintain services as best we were able.

### **6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM**

Could the leader inform council assembly if Southwark council has a coordinated policy for responding to mental health clients and if there are any instances in the past two years where service user/s have been taken from schools and or any other council establishment to a mental health hospital or unit for emergency assessment. If so, could he give the ethnic breakdown of such clients?

### **RESPONSE**

Most mental health assessments are the result of considerable planning and are normally carried out on known patients. In cases of emergency however, the police are usually the first contact. When a disturbance is caused by a person (whether mentally ill or not) on council premises, it is policy for local managers to decide when it is necessary to call in the police to assist.

Community mental health services in Southwark are managed by the South London & Maudsley NHS Mental Health Trust (SLAM). As SLAM is not directly under council control, it has not been possible, within the timescales, for us to get the precise information Councillor Graham requests in the second part of his question.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM**

Thank you Madam Mayor. Can I say I am grateful to the Leader for his answer but I am bit surprised that the second part of my question is not answered because I had telephone calls from officers asking me to explain the answer I was asking for and I do hope that the leader will ensure that I get a full answer to my question. But could the leader tell me, or agree with me, or disagree with me if in his opinion it has been to be an exceptional case when the police will be called into a special school to deal with a young person who is already statemented.

**LEADER – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Madam Mayor, yes of course I would agree that one would hope that that would be an extremely rare occurrence. It is right to say of course that under LMS schemes schools would have their own policies and it is not a question of having a policy here which the council can dictate. In answer to the previous bit of the supplementary for the reasons given it is very difficult for me to answer these questions because these are not services which we have direct control over and if you want to pursue this then I suggest that you probably need to get in touch with the Maudsley to see what information they have.

**7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

Have there been any additional responsibilities added to the executive brief held by Councillor Paul Kyriacou since he took it over from Councillor James Gurling?

**RESPONSE**

The scope of the communications and performance improvement portfolio has not changed. However, since the CSC contract went live at the end of May the operational work involved has increased significantly.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

I would like to thank the leader for his answer. It does however of course cause me some degree of concern if the operational management of an individual contract requires an additional 3 days of executive time per week. It suggests to me that that contract is in crisis. Could he confirm that the CSC contract is in crisis or could he clarify what operational work involves.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

The CSC contract service is not in crisis. What has changed is that the CSC is now live, the Pearson's contract has been signed and as a result the executive member

constantly monitors the performance information that is available, has meeting with the relevant departments and with Pearsons to ensure that things are working as we would wish. Councillor Glover would be aware that we have been phasing through different services into the CSC through the year and again that has been kept under review and the point we have always made on this side of the chamber is that we expect executive members to put the hours in that are needed. It is up to them to work out whether they do that around the day job or instead of the day job an allowance scheme that we introduced which marks whether people are giving up time from work or they are putting it around existing work arrangements is the way that we deal with that.

**8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

Despite the fact that 82% of the public agree with the issuing of anti social behaviour orders (MORI poll, Social Research Institute, 9th June 2005) the MP Mark Oaten has described the government's Respect agenda to tackle anti-social behaviour as a "mish-mash of gimmicks and spin".

Does the Leader agree with Mr Oaten's attitude towards these new anti social behaviour measures, and if so, will this prevent him from implementing the full package of 'Respect' measures in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

The question takes Mark Oaten MP's quote out of context and misrepresents what was said. The full text of Mark Oaten's statement on the Government's re-launch of the "respect" agenda is as follows:

"If the Prime Minister is serious about helping families and communities to create a safer and more respectful society, we will support him. It is an enormous challenge and it cannot be achieved with this Government's usual mish-mash of gimmicks and spin."

So, yes I do agree with the full text of Mark Oaten's comments. Southwark has an excellent record on combating anti-social behaviour: using anti social behaviour orders (ASBOs) widely and effectively (issuing the eighth highest number of ASBOs in London last year) and successfully introducing an anti social behaviour hotline, which has recently led to the closure of two crack houses.

When Louise Casey, the head of the government's 'Respect Task Force', came to visit Southwark following the successful implementation of a dispersal order around Albion Street she said, "Things have improved immeasurably". The Government has also recognised our excellent work by using Southwark as an example of best practice in tackling anti-social behaviour on the Number 10 website, including a fact sheet entitled "Anti-social behaviour and the Southwark Noise Team".

Further details of our successes are:

- Over 50 anti-social behaviour orders obtained since 2002 – one of the highest in London;
- Over 100 signed acceptable behaviour contracts;
- The establishment of one of the country's largest community warden services with over 130 wardens addressing nuisance and anti-social behaviour;
- The establishment of the wardens' resource centre, one of only twelve national training and development centres for wardens in the country;



- 47.3% reduction in deliberate vehicle fires (year on year); 39% decrease in graffiti; 12% reduction in fly-tipping and 38 successful prosecutions against enviro-crime;
- The issuing of 732 fixed-penalty notices this year alone, with a recovery rate of over 90%;
- Successful use of dispersal order powers in Rotherhithe to tackle anti-social behaviour – these powers were supported by a range of additional youth provision to ensure sustainability beyond the expiry of the order;
- Our Southwark anti-social behaviour unit has been successful in addressing hate crime and homophobic crime through the use of nuisance legislation, including eviction;
- We are the only borough in the country to have a seconded police officer permanently based in our waste enforcement team;
- Our youth inclusion and support panels (YISP) continue to divert at-risk children from crime and anti-social behaviour with 85% not coming to further notice of the police and over 90% attending full-time education.

The support amongst the public for ASBOs shows a desire for action over political posturing and, as Mark Oaten says, “gimmicks”. Many of the ideas the Prime Minister launched as his “Respect” agenda are already being put to good use in Southwark and we will continue to use a wide range of measures to tackle anti social behaviour across the borough.

The Government’s Respect agenda highlights five key themes:

- ‘Activities for Children and Young People’;
- ‘Schools – Improving Behaviour and Attendance’;
- ‘Supporting Families’;
- ‘The Most Challenging Families’;
- ‘Strengthening Communities’; and
- ‘Effective Enforcement’

The council recognises the importance of these themes and can point to a range of existing activity across all services. The action plan has a strong focus on prevention and highlights the importance of parenting. This is something that the council has recognised through its work in developing the every child matters agenda

### **SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I thank the leader for his answer. Obviously I am relieved that the leader has not told me to shut up in his answer. That is obviously a mature response he reserves for the prime minister on the issue of anti-social behaviour. Madam Mayor, sadly it’s not this quote which Mark Oaten is going to be remembered for over the last couple of weeks, but I accept the full quote which the Leader has put down. Would he accept that reveals the Liberal Democrat’s ambivalent attitude towards anti-social social behaviour but furthermore I am gratified that his answer appears to suggest that he is talking tough on anti-social behaviour. So a simple question - will he name and shame the recipients of anti-social behaviour orders, yes or no?

### **RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Madam Mayor I am quite happy to give Councillor John an opportunity to name and shame all those members of his group who wrote in support of Councillor Ritchie to the Adjudication Board in support of his behaviour at Camberwell community council. Will

he expel them from the group tonight and will he disqualify them from standing for the Labour Party in the May elections?

**9. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON**

In light of the 115 occasions when young people aged 16/17 spent more than 6 consecutive weeks in bed & breakfast in 2004/05 can the deputy leader explain what "prevention methods will accelerate the rate of decrease in youth homelessness" to the performance target within the local public service agreement (PSA) of 0 occasions in 2007/08 (page 24, executive Agenda 18/01/06)?

**RESPONSE**

In order to reach our target of eliminating bed and breakfast placements of more than 6 weeks for 16 and 17 year olds the council is using PSA 2 funding to provide:

- Family mediation for school age children in danger of family breakdown
- Literature and information on the reality of homelessness and living alone
- Homeless prevention and advice on independent living workshops in schools

The housing options service has already begun to visit schools to educate children on the reality of living alone. PSA 2 funding will provide an extended programme of workshops as well as target youth clubs and FE colleges. At the same time, a new supporting people respite service will provide an accommodation based alternative to bed and breakfast for under 16 year olds. We hope this approach, which marries strong preventative measures with better assessment, will reduce and possibly eliminate B and B usage over the next five years.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON**

I don't mean to be unhelpful with my question but this is an entirely laudable target that we have been asked to eliminate temporary bed and breakfast completely but I am slightly worried that in the answer there is a lot of talk of mediation and surely the aim is to expand our alternative accommodation and eliminate bed and breakfast completely otherwise there is always the risk of that we are just going to be displacing groups of priority homeless.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

I would not entirely disagree with that. I think it is not acceptable that young people should actually be placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. I think the council absolutely has to work towards zero levels of that happening. One of the things that we are looking for, but which is not included in the PSA target requirement, is setting up a respite centre which would preclude the use of B&B so we are doing what you suggest as well as doing the things strictly speaking in the answer to your question.

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

What action is being taken to ensure local school children are enjoying a decent and nutritional meal at lunchtime?

**RESPONSE**

Members will be aware that primary and secondary schools in Southwark receive delegated budgets to run a school meals service. Governing bodies make the decision as to the arrangements for the service and these vary widely from in-house direct provision to out-sourced contracts with a number of suppliers.

For nursery, special and pupil referral units the council has a contract with a catering company. For these schools the council has arranged for a contract support service to be available to monitor the quality of provision and to address any quality issues with the contractor.

The council has been proactive in taking action to raise the standard of meal and refreshment provision in its schools, while recognising the individuality of schools and their needs.

A review of provision was carried out over the summer to establish a base line of information and this has formed the starting point for work by the healthy food in schools group. Its first meeting was attended by representatives from primary, secondary & special schools, the Primary Care Trust, the education department and by Councillor Pidgeon, lead member for education.

The group will be carrying out detailed work in a number of areas covering school meals and healthy food across the school and into extended school activities. The group also recognised the need to work with families on the healthy eating agenda.

Action groups were established to address:

- Staff training
- Healthy eating education in schools and with families
- Model policies development
- Support to schools with procurement, contracts and client management
- Leadership on healthy food in schools – action plans for improvement

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to thank the Councillor for her response. I was just wondering if she can take into account the needs of families and communities in future.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

Thanks Madam Mayor. With your agreement can I ask Councillor Pidgeon to respond to this because the area actually falls within her portfolio.

### **COUNCILLOR C PIDGEON**

Thank you very much for the supplementary question. In answer, schools have responsibility for school meals and those that I have visited and those we have looked into do have a wide range to ensure that people with different dietary requirements and also those who have particular religious needs in terms of their diet are catered for. But the great thing about our school meals project which we have just launched is that we are now really going to come down on certain areas which are outlined in my first answer including training but also how we can make sure that we spread healthy eating into the wider community. In terms of families and extending schools programme we are going to be looking very carefully how we can look at cookery classes and healthy eating education in the extended schools in the evening and at weekends and so on to ensure that families learn about healthy foods as well as individual pupils and I think looking at school meals and the wider contacts in terms of breakfast clubs, and the after school clubs. We are really going to have to tackle some of these big issues around healthy eating and also try tackling some of our obesity targets.

### **11. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR DR ABDUR-RAHMAN OLAYIWOLA**

How many environmental crimes have been investigated in each year since 1998 and how many have reached a successful conclusion?

### **RESPONSE**

Unfortunately no good data exists in relation to the number of investigations carried out into envirocrime prior to 2002. However, it is estimated that approximately 600 investigations took place during the period 1998 to 2002, mainly concentrating on flytipping.

Since 2002 the council has widened its scope to include litter, fly posting, graffiti and dog mess resulting in the investigation of 8,533 environmental crimes. The table below provides the details of the number of investigations per year and the number of fixed penalty notices and prosecutions that arose as a result of these investigations.

	<b>Investigations</b>	<b>Prosecutions</b>	<b>FPN's</b>	<b>Total</b>
2002/3:	1640	106	353	<b>2099</b>
2003/4:	1241	123	873	<b>2237</b>
2004/5:	843	211	1557	<b>2611</b>
2005/6:	529	95	962	<b>1586 to Dec 2005</b>

### **SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR DR ABDUR-RAHMAN OLAYIWOLA**

I would like to thank the Executive Member for Environment & Transport for his answer and I have a supplementary question and it is this. Does the fact that the number of investigations is increasing proof that our hard approach, that is, the Liberal Democrat hard approach is working to tackle the anti-social behaviour of environmental crime and

that we are tough on the anti-social behaviour of environmental crime and tough on the causes of environmental crime.

### RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS

Madam Mayor thank you. Yes Dr O I think it is, I think you have hit the nail on the head there. It may seem strange to believe now that before 2002 there were practically no action being taken to enforce environmental crime whatsoever under the previous administration. They did do a little bit of work as I set out on flytipping but they did not issue any fines against dog fouling, they did not issue any fines against littering and they did not investigate other environmental crimes either. We have investigated 1,500 and you will see here how many have been successful concluded. We will prosecute if we need to prosecute if we need to prosecute, we will issue the fixed penalty notices if we need to but also Madam Mayor people should understand that that first column of figures there is an indication of where the mere threat of investigation has resulted in a successful conclusion. I think frankly Madam Mayor it is a bit rich for the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Labour Party I am not sure in what capacity he made his visit to come to Southwark and lecture us on what we should be doing to follow his respect agenda when he treat us with so little respect when in fact we are the London borough that is leading the way on this agenda. The Mayor of London has acknowledge that himself in his free newspaper - there is no borough that is beating us in terms of issuing fixed penalty notices for littering apart from Westminster but it is not a Labour borough lets know that and when the Home Office, when 30 other boroughs from across the country have all come here to learn the lessons from what we are doing in Southwark I would have thought that the Prime Minister and the Labour Group should take notice.

### 12. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD PORTER

What arrangements were put in place to grit the roads over winter and how well are they working?

#### RESPONSE

The winter service plan/policy statement is available on the councils website, however briefly the arrangements are as follows:

A pre-determined action plan is automatically activated by daily weather forecasts received from the London Weather Centre. These weather forecasts are received by Council engineers and the contractor who discuss and agree additional actions if required for following 24 hours.

All public roads in Southwark have been prioritised into:-

- **Frost susceptible routes** – North facing roads generally in the south of the borough that have a history of becoming hazardous and certain areas of the Thames embankment in the Surrey Docks area which have a similar history
- **Priority 1 routes** – These include main distributor routes and heavily trafficked roads
- **Priority 2 routes** – These are generally secondary distributor roads are include other less trafficked roads

- **Priority Routes 3 & 4** - All other roads including residential that do not fall into other categories

Where forecasts allow gritting is carried out before frost or snow is expected which helps to prevent the formation of frost or snow laying.

Since the start of winter in November 2005 we have undertaken gritting on 24 evenings. There have been no problems in implementing the service and no reported problems on the streets.

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR RICHARD PORTER**

Thank you Madam Mayor – can I firstly thank my colleague for his very full answer. Would my colleague councillor Thomas join me in congratulating all the members of staff in Southwark Cleaning who have really undertaken their duties over the last few months to ensure that we are kept very safe on our roads and would he agree with me that when compared to neighbouring borough I am thinking in particular of Camden and also Westminster that we really lead the way when it comes to gritting roads ensuring the people who live in Southwark are the safest on the roads than anyone else in London

#### **RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Madam Mayor over the Christmas period I was reflecting on when it was that I first decided that I did not like snow very much and there are two types of adults in life – there are those when it starts snowing it brings out the child in them and they say yippee its snow and they try and get the sledges out and go and find their grandchildren and there are those who just plod through life been more and more miserable hating the snow and hating every minute of it. I was always the former until I took over this responsibility and as Councillor Hargrove has noted in the press in 2002 our gritting programme was less than good actually and ever then whenever I have seen a weather forecast ylppee snow I hope to goodness the gritters are out but I am pleased to say Madam Mayor since 2002 the complete programme of how we grit our streets has been reviewed it has worked every single winter since then and on Christmas day bless him Des Waters was texting me at about mid-day to say that there was a severe weather alert the gritters were out already and happy Christmas. So yes I would like to extend my, our thanks to all the staff who made that happen.

#### **13. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

Recent repairs to pavements in the Surrey Docks and Rotherhithe area have involved substituting the attractive brickwork native to the area with black tarmac. This is detrimental to the appearance of the area, which has walkways that are predominantly brickwork or tiled paving. Many of the repairs are at tree bases, and officers have explained how the choice of black tarmac is to accommodate the growing tree roots, so although it is a good functional choice, it is visually unappealing and out of keeping with its surroundings. Can the executive member investigate whether there are other options that will address the tree root problem without being so unsightly? Can he also instruct that where the pavement damage is not attributable to tree roots, officers will endeavor to replace paving on a "like with like" basis wherever possible to respect the local street scene?

#### **RESPONSE**

Our highway contractor is instructed where possible to relay "like for like" and match the existing footway material. The problem with the brick paving in the Rotherhithe area is the extent of ground movement, which distorts the paving making it difficult to reinstate small patches. The movement is not just associated with tree root growth. Once the bricks have been disturbed it generally requires a large area to be lifted and relayed to achieve a satisfactory result.

Our first and foremost aim is to make the footway safe for all users, particularly the disabled. Asphalt provides an immediate and affordable solution thus avoiding potential injury claims. The repair gangs will only use asphalt if they cannot replace the blocks. They are instructed not to cut tree roots but have to make the area safe by whatever means.

The problem with tree roots is particularly prevalent in the area. The use of black or red asphalt, whilst achieving the desired solution, has not proved visually acceptable to residents. Officers have considered a number of options which will involve excavating, cutting the roots and constructing new tree pits. It is our intention to carry out trial excavations around one or two trees in Surrey Water to see what can be achieved. Alternative materials and designs will be suggested and residents consulted on their preference. It is anticipated that notices will be issued to residents at the end of January informing of the proposals and asking for feedback.

For the future the street scene service is developing a design guide for streets that will set down the type of materials that should be used for footways and other public areas, taking into account local conditions and the ease of future maintenance.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

Thank you Madam Mayor – thank you very much to the executive member for his very full answer. I will find this very useful. Also several of my constituents will be very interested in his response. Knowing how dedicated the executive member is to recycling I would like to ask whether he supports where brick paving is disruptive and can't be replaced the bricks are kept in case they can be used to construct sand pits elsewhere in the area.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Yes I would Madam Mayor if that's possible and feasible then of course it should happen and that's one of the things we have asked Mr. Parkman who is working on our design guide. That's one of the things they are looking at is how we can recycle the stuff that we have in Southwark already and how we can use more recycled materials in resurfacing roads for example you can use recycled glass for resurfacing roads and we should be looking to do that sort of thing too.

**14. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR JANE SALMON**

How many fixed penalty notices have been issued for littering each year since 1998?

**RESPONSE**

Between 1998 and 2002 the council issued one fixed penalty notice, which was for dog fouling. Since April 2002 the council has issued 3,745-fixed penalty notices; the second highest level in the country. In addition, the payment rate for the fixed penalty notices

issued since April 2002 is 88%, which also is the highest payment rate in the country and reflects good paperwork and procedures.

A breakdown of the number of fixed penalty notices issued for littering and dog fouling by year is provided below. It can be seen that the number of fixed penalty notices issued has been increasing year on year, a trend that is predicted to continue in 2005/06.

1998/9:	0
1999/2000:	0
2000/1:	0
2001/2:	1
2002/3:	353
2003/4:	873
2004/5:	1557
2005/6:	962 (to end December 2005).

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR JANE SALMON**

I would like to thank the executive member for environment & transport for his answer and asks how he believes it reflects on the previous administration that they fail to issue a single fixed penalty notice for littering

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Madam Mayor I think it reflects extremely badly on the previous administration but you would expect me to say that in opposition we said we would clean up the borough and since we took control we are cleaning up the borough. I think there was a culture in Southwark before the new administration Madam Mayor in which poverty was seen as an excuse and it was o.k. to say well it does not matter if the streets are stinking actually and people are dropping litter and we are not cleaning them properly because its Peckham, its Camberwell these are areas of great deprivation, we can't possible compete with Westminster. This administration along with the new officers that we have brought in have shown that its comprehensively not the case, we can actually compete with the richest boroughs in London and we are doing that, we are now the fourth cleanest streets in London and as I say the second highest rate of issuing fixed penalty notices and I think the two go hand in hand.

**15. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL WATSON**

How many outside bodies and other councils have sought advice on tackling environmental crime from Southwark Council?

**RESPONSE**

Since the establishment of a dedicated envirocrime enforcement team in June 2002 Southwark has hosted twenty-nine local authority visits to disseminate best practice on how the council is successfully tackle environmental crime. In addition, a significant number of other local authorities have been in contact with Southwark requesting information on specific projects and initiatives.



Since 2002 Southwark has also provided advice on how to tackle envirocrime to central and regional government, and has provided evidence to four House of Commons Select Committees on behalf of both the Association of London Government and the Local Government Association. Officers are also currently working with Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister the Cabinet Office and the Home Office on shaping future legislation and the potential use of administrative penalties. The council also works closely with Encams (formerly Tidy Britain Group) and the Chartered Institute of Waste Management to disseminate best practice.

Southwark was selected to lead all the environmental crime workshops at the Home Office's national 'Together' roadshow; an officer was seconded to the Home Office to lead in environmental crime and also show chaired of the Greater London Authority envirocrime enforcement group.

The council has also attracted a considerable amount of media attention for its pioneering approach to tackling envirocrime. Prime time slots on Tonight with Trevor McDonald and a half hour ITV documentary 'Urban Spies' have been complimented by a considerable number of appearances on regional TV news programmes and a number of national and local newspaper editorials.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR NEIL WATSON**

I would like to thank the Executive Member for his reply and congratulate all the Officers for their hard work and dedication. I wonder if the Executive Member would like to say one more time why the Liberal Democrat administration has been so successful in this area and has made this Council Leader in the field.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

The answer Madam Mayor is yes I would like to say it once more. No I have sort of answered this question to some extent before but I think it is a combination of things. I think when we came we had the political will to say actually this is what we want to do we went out and got a team of officers who knew how to do it and are absolutely committed to doing it and you can see the results. There are other boroughs across London, other councils across the country are coming to us and saying well how do you do it and Madam Mayor one of the officers were saying to me the other day that people was saying well how do you get political support for this sort of thing and the officers were saying to me actually there were never a problem in Southwark - there were never ever a problem in Southwark, there were never ever a problem – from day one we said we want to crack down the officers said that's good we want to crack down too and crack down we have and I really do think that when we have got a success story and accepting that there is still much more that we can do I think it really ill-behave the prime minister and other ministers to so likely sweep some of these success story under the carpet. I don't think it does them any good all actually.

**16. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE**

In the light of the boasting by the Mayor of London about the 2012 Olympics leaving a legacy of vastly improved transport, would the executive member for environment and transport provide a schedule of the transport improvements proposed for the borough, to include the status of the proposals, the dates on which they are expected to be completed and steps he is taking to secure early implementation of those whose status is uncertain.

**RESPONSE**

The most plausible major future transport improvements being actively sought by the borough include East London Line phase two and the Cross River Tram. Other possible projects include the extension of the tube to Camberwell, Thameslink, and improvements at the Elephant and Castle. These projects are set out in the local implementation plan.

Currently, preparatory works are being undertaken and phase one of the East London line extension is scheduled for completion in June 2010.

Unfortunately, no funding has been committed for phase two of the extension. However, through the East London Line Group, the council is strongly advocating its early implementation and inclusion in the Transport for London (TfL) 2007 spending review.

In October 2004, TfL announced that the tram was an integral part of its business plan and committed to fund the project through the developmental stages. Unfortunately no funding has been committed for the construction of the tram. However, the council is actively advocating through the Cross River Tram Steering Group for the tram to be taken to the Transport and Works Act phase to enable its early implementation.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE**

Thank you Madam Mayor - I am grateful to the executive member for his answer. He has identified there are two schemes that are in the forefront and a number of other schemes. The risk of course is that we spread our effort and end up achieving nothing. Could he say something about what his strategy will be to make sure that we do focus on some of these potential projects and really try to make sure that they are achieved.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Yes Madam its that time of year and time of the political cycle when suddenly everyone is coming up with new schemes to improve transport so we do have to be a bit careful but I suggest the best way forward is in our local implementation plan. In the draft of that we set out in priority order what are the major infrastructure projects that we want to see. For my money I think the top 3 priorities have to be the cross-river tram number one on the list followed closely by the Camberwell Station and the East London Line extension. I think there are other things that we need to look at too but to my mind those are the three things that we have got to push hard for and it would be really nice if we could push for them on a cross-party basis.

**17. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS**

Would the executive member for environment and transport please state what steps he is taking to achieve early approval of stage two of the East London Line extension through Peckham and Camberwell to Clapham Junction and to re-instate the proposal for a branch of the line to serve Dulwich?

**RESPONSE**

The council maintains a strong involvement in the East London Line Group through which it advocates the implementation of the phase two of the East London Line extension. Transport for London (TfL's) favoured option for phase two is extension beyond Peckham

Rye to Clapham Junction. However, there is still a possibility that phase two may involve extension through East Dulwich and North Dulwich to Wimbledon. The council will continue to work through the East London Line Group to ensure the best possible option for Southwark is achieved.

In my view this must mean the reinstatement of the Dulwich branch line proposal and I have asked that the local implementation plan be amended to reflect this.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to ask the executive member for environment and transport which of the two schemes detailed in his over two routes detailed in his answer have a greater priority in his view.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

The answer Madam Mayor is that the current Phase II of the East London Line Extension has to have the top priority and is not necessary because that is more worthy than any other particular scheme but it is because that's the scheme that is worked out, it is the scheme that the Mayor is already committed to in principle although he is not committed in financial terms and its for one that politically I think we have the best chance of achieving.

**18. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Would the executive member for environment and transport state whether in his view the current arrangements for bus lanes on Lordship Lane, throughout its length, are optimal, with particular regard to traffic flows and preservation of local businesses; and, if he thinks improvements could be made in certain locations, would he specify those locations?

**RESPONSE**

Following the implementation of the bus lane in 2001, there was a perceived imbalance between the parking restrictions associated with the operational times of the bus and the on street parking demand for local businesses.

This was recognised by the council who lobbied Transport for London to make revisions in order to enhance opportunities for short term on street parking, whilst still maintaining the integrity of the bus lane. Transport for London produced a comprehensive report detailing the benefit for buses during the bus lane operational hours. The report concluded that buses have improved reliability in both the morning and afternoon peak traffic flow periods. However, on Saturdays the benefits were negligible.

As a result of the above analysis the council (with funding provided from Transport for London), designed a number of schemes that resulted in additional parking opportunities for local businesses, particularly adjacent to the southbound carriage and side roads leading off Lordship Lane. The removal of Saturday operation of the bus lane was also progressed to allow all day parking on the weekends. The combined effect of these schemes has resulted in parking opportunities that are comparable to what was present prior to the implementation of the bus lane.

The council is still actively reviewing the operation of the bus lane, with particular emphasis on the afternoon peak period between 4 pm to 7 pm. A further report is being drafted by

Transport for London to ascertain if this operation time is still warranted. The findings of the report will be discussed at forthcoming community councils

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR T ECKERSLEY**

Thank you Madam Mayor. With regard to the last line of your answer Councillor Thomas can you assure us that on this occasion at least the views of the community councils will be listened to

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Yes Madam Mayor I would be very interested in hearing the views of the community council at the appropriate time.

**19. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR KENNY MIZZI**

Can the executive member outline the council's policy on the provision of public conveniences in the borough, the outcome of the current review, and their maintenance schedule?

**RESPONSE**

The executive approved an option for improving the public toilet provision in Southwark on December 13 2005 that maximises provision and minimises costs, while removing toilets that are not Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) compliant. In summary, this means:

- (i) All existing council public toilet facilities are more effectively used
- (ii) Resources provided by others provide part of an overall public toilet offer in Southwark
- (iii) All toilets that are not DDA compliant or subject to above, or do not have a near viable alternative, are closed or removed.
- (iv) Signposting is enhanced for all toilets (in accordance with British Toilet Association and DDA recommendations) including mapping on the Southwark website.

This effectively means that the all-main shopping areas/major transport interchanges in the borough will have an adequate provision of public conveniences.

In addition, future regeneration schemes will enhance toilet provision still further, by making sure that section 106 money is provided as part of the Unitary Development Plan. This will ensure that toilet provision is a matter that is addressed on a long-term basis.

In terms of maintenance, automatic and traditional toilets are currently cleaned daily whilst the East Street toilets also have a permanent staff presence.

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

What powers are available to combat the increasing menace of cycling on pavements?

**RESPONSE**

Section 54 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 allows a police constable in uniform to give a person a fixed penalty notice (FPN), currently £30, in respect of an offence under section 72 of the Highway Act 1835 (c. 50) (riding on a footway) committed by cycling.

The Police Reform Act 2002 created police community support officers (PCSOS), the new civilian role of community support officer and also enabled a chief officer of police to establish and maintain a scheme that accredits suitably skilled and trained non-police employees to undertake specified functions in support of the police. Section 89 allows the chief officer of police to include the power to issue penalty notices for disorder within these specified functions. It also enables both community support officers and accredited officers to stop cyclists in order to issue a penalty notice for cycling on the pavement.

Currently, in London, there are no other accredited officers other than the police officers and PCSO's who have the power to deal with these offences, however the Southwark community warden service is currently working with the Metropolitan Police Service to become the first accredited service in London, which would allow the wardens to serve such FPN's in the future.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to thank the executive member for his response. He talked a lot earlier about cracking down and calling fines for littering which by the way the previous administration did include penalties on. What is his views on combatting increasing menacing of recycling on pavements

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Madam Mayor well since Councillor Hargrove wants to go over old ground no they did not actually the previous administration did not issue fines for littering. The issued one in their entire period. I don't know how many times I have to repeat that but if he has got evidence to the contrary I would be very grateful to see it. On the issue of cycling on pavements I think there are a few things I would say, first of all it clearly is a menace particularly to elderly people and it is not acceptable I think fines should therefore be issued - they should probably be issued where the problem is worse as opposed to willy nilly and certain I would not want to see a fine issued to a 7-year old for example cycling on a wide pavement with his mum or dad – I don't think any reason the person would so one yes crack down, two we need to make cycling safer and appear more safely in trying to address the reasons why some people cycle on the pavement and the third way to do that as well is through good cycle training which I think everyone agrees now is crucial and the final thing I would say is that we should not single one particular group of road users it is for enforcement – it has long been my view that traffic offences should be vigorously enforced. I know the cycling on pavements offends people massively and scares people massively but I also think we should be cracking down on illegal traffic offences in other areas as well on behalf of motorists, the motor cyclists and all the rest of it.

**21. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR ALISON MOISE**

How many cyclists were prosecuted for road offences in the last two years, and can he tell me what he is doing to ensure that the police, Safer Southwark Partnership (SSP), the council warden service and police community support officers are responding to local complaints from residents borough wide about cyclists and moped users who flout the law by riding through red lights, riding without lights, riding down footpaths and riding on pavements?

**RESPONSE**

All police officers routinely issue fixed penalty notices for misuse of motor cycles and bicycles, both on and off road.

In the period January 2004 - December 2005 the police in Southwark issued a total of 110 fixed penalty notices to cyclists. Broken down as follows:-

Cycling on footway	- 73
Contravening traffic signals	- 24
Contravening traffic signs	- 8
Failing to stop when required	- 2
Inadequate lighting	- 2
Riding where prohibited	- 1

The police safer neighbourhood teams - teams made up of PCSOs (police community support officers) and council wardens - are targeting local issues, one of which is cycling. PCSOs and police officers can issue fixed penalty notices for riding on the pavement and are targeting hotspot areas, for example, the Walworth Road at weekends when pavements are busy and therefore more dangerous.

The youth offending team together with the police and Southwark Cyclists are starting a bicycle initiative at the youth project at Surrey Docks Water Centre. This will include advise on the correct use of cycles. If successful, the initiative will be rolled out borough wide.

In 2004, we ran a poster campaign encouraging reporting of anti-social use of scooters, targeted in the north of the borough, where illegal use of scooters was worse at that time. We also installed secure locking points to encourage owners to secure their scooters/mopeds to reduce theft and subsequent misuse. Later in 2006, we will be running another poster campaign, but this time aimed at the illegal use of mini-motos both in parks and estates, where the problem is most prevalent.

**22. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD**

What formal procedure is followed when a resident applies for a crossover (lowered pavement into the driveway of their residence) -

- a) In a controlled parking zone (CPZ) area
- b) In a non CPZ area

What factors are taken into account when recommending to the relevant community council whether or not to grant a crossover?

**RESPONSE**

Vehicle crossovers are constructed to allow vehicular access to properties, the construction is of a higher specification than that of normal footway to allow for vehicle loading without causing damage to the cables and mains that are buried under the footways.

The initial construction or any subsequent widening of a crossover is only carried out by the councils appointed contractor and is paid for by the resident/owner of the property in

accordance with the provisions of section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. Once constructed a crossover becomes part of the adopted highway and is maintained by the highway authority at the expense of the highway authority.

At some locations it is necessary to apply for planning permission for a crossover, in these cases, the officer receiving the application will advise the applicant of the type of permission required and will send out the necessary forms.

The target period between the council receiving the payment and the crossover being constructed is eight weeks, usually the period is less than this and only in exceptional circumstances is it longer.

Crossover applications are received by the street scene and transport infrastructure group and processed in accordance with the council's vehicle access policy. If the application falls within the criteria set in the policy then permission will be granted for the crossover and the house owner charged the full cost of installation. Currently community council's are not consulted on such applications

If the property falls within a controlled parking zone, the parking team is consulted and a traffic order for the removal of the parking bay may be needed. This requires a formal consultation period with objections considered by the community council.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD**

My problem was that the residents in question have no idea how this process worked at all and found it very difficult to find out. Can you assure me that this timetable will conveyed to residents who apply for this crossover.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Yes Madam I can – I agree that this is an area where we may want to review our procedures. We have now got the new team in place in the environment and leisure department who will be looking at these sort of things to make sure that we deal with people's concerns promptly and set out the criteria on which we make a decision very clearly for them.

**23. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER**

Can the executive member please tell me if there is going to be any improvements made to the whole of East Street (i.e. specifically new pavements, seating and litter bins) and, if so, when will these improvements take place?

**RESPONSE**

A feasibility study on potential improvements to East Street to compliment and enhance the market was carried out through funding from the London Development Agency in 2004. The study suggested many improvements, which included resurfacing, new seating, litterbins and new lighting.

Total costs associated with the suggestions arising out the independent report are in the region of £2.6m. Officers have been actively pursuing external funding to implement some and if possible all of the suggestions made in the report. Regrettably, to date no funding has yet been identified or made available to implement the changes suggested.

All requests for capital funding will be considered as part of the 2006/7 capital programme.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER**

Thank you Madam Mayor – I would like to thank the executive member for his answer. East Street pavements are in a dreadful state with large cracks and holes right the way through. Some holes have been filled in but unfortunately it looks like a patchwork quilt and is dangerous and uneven. Many, many people shop in East Street since pavements are being relaid around the borough it is a must, I say a must to see East Street market pavement relaid at some stage as its unsafe and dangerous. I understand £16½m capital funding that the Executives are allocating next week. Can we have some of this funding to improve East Street pavements please.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Madam Mayor I hear the plea and I sympathise to a great extent. The first thing to say if there are dangerous parts of that pavement in East Street or anywhere else then they will be fixed. Of course that does have the effect of ending up with the patchwork quilt effect but that is the sort of position we are in to some extent and also the utilities digging up pavements resulting in that effect being created. Councillor Lauder will know that we put £4m into road resurfacing this year and £2.5m last year for the first time ever that was also for pavements as well as the actual road carriageway and I think it is really important that we do repave the pavements at the same time and not just concentrate on the main carriageway. The short answer to her question is that we have to repave those roads and those pavements that are in the worse condition. If we repave East Street that is fine but something else has to come off the list. I am sure she would not want Portland for example which is in a dreadful state to fall off the list. The capital programme would be considered after the election as I understand it and there will be a formal process then to work out which roads should be resurfaced and I know there is a motion later about how we can include Community Council in that process.

**24. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT SMEATH**

Can the executive member please indicate what percentage of Southwark's waste which is potentially recyclable via the council's current recycling contracts is not separated from refuse by households and businesses?

**RESPONSE**

A recent composition analysis of our domestic waste showed that 31.3% of the contents of residents' bins could have been recycled through our existing kerbside and doorstep schemes, or at one of our 328 mini recycling centres. The waste that residents throw away includes 15.3% paper and card, 4.8% glass, 2.7% plastic bottles, 2.4% cans, 2.9% garden waste, and 3.2% shoes and textiles.

The single largest element of domestic waste that residents cannot recycle is compostable kitchen waste, which makes up 14.5% of the domestic waste stream. We do however offer subsidised home composting units, and will shortly be running a trial scheme of offering subsidised wormeries for people who do not have space for a traditional composter. In the long term, through the council's resource programme, it is anticipated that kitchen waste will be collected through door-to-door service and composting.



The waste composition analyses that we carried out this year were only on domestic waste, so I cannot indicate how much recyclable material is thrown away by businesses. We do however offer businesses a recycling service at a 40% discount on our normal charges.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR ROBERT SMEATH**

I thank the executive member for his answer and asks when the composting trial is likely to start and in which community council areas or other areas it will take place please.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS**

Thank you Madam Mayor. The answer is as soon as our PFI, as soon as our long-term 25-year contract is up and running, then we will be able to offer this facility. It is not the collection of the compost of the waste that is the problem. It is having somewhere to put the compostable waste. As Members know there is a spanner being thrown into the work by Mayor and the government who are now reviewing whether the Mayor should take over all these powers which is not particularly helpful but we are working out how we can get through that and hopefully we can then come up the long-term solution for Southwark's waste that we all need.

**25. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES GURLING**

What was the increase in Southwark's non-schools grant and how does this compare with other London boroughs?

**RESPONSE**

The provisional settlement was announced on the December 5. The final settlement is due at the end January/beginning of February. Southwark's provisional grant for 2006-07 is £207.3m (now excluding schools funding which is met through the dedicated schools grant – DSG) a 2.46% increase on last year. However, this includes a one off windfall of £577,000 for the 2004/05 and 2005/06 amending reports (these correct previous years settlements). Excluding this, Southwark's real increase is just 2.18% (grant of £206.7m). Compared to other London boroughs, we received the 13<sup>th</sup> lowest increase out of the 33 London Boroughs (please see appendix 1 attached for details).

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR JAMES GURLING**

Thank you Madam Mayor. Can I thank the executive member for her response and can I thank you also for being here to receive my supplementary which I am no doubt very pleased to see in your answer the fact that we have received at least some of the moneys that have been withheld to us by central government for not one but 2 previous years that at least resolve this. It does unfortunately mean that we have a significantly low increase in potentially income to us this year – way below the average for inner London and of considerable concerns for us as an Inner London Authority. Can you assure this council that you will be doing your utmost to ensure that we receive similar funding that boroughs such as Camden, Tower Hamlets and Hillingdon have on your answer provided to us and in your attempts to obtain extra funding for us. Could you also tell us what percentage of chance you think there might be in successfully persuading this government to give us an additional supplement.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR L ZULETA**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to thank Councillor Gurling for his supplemental question. I would like to confirm to Councillor Gurling that officers have made representations and there is a motion tonight that will be debating about the 3 local MPs supporting me in making representations to the government to get a better settlement we have got. The chances of making much progress I don't put too high that doesn't mean to say that we will not do it.

**26. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN O'BRIEN**

How much is the Band D council tax in a) Southwark and b) the inner London average?

**WITHDRAWN**

**27. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR ALUN HAYES**

What is the expected/quoted cost of the upcoming refurbishment of the Town Hall?

**RESPONSE**

A recent survey identified that many offices, corridors and other common parts of the Town Hall complex were below reasonable standards. Many offices have not been decorated for at least 10 years, their lighting is not up to modern CAT 2 standard, some window frames are damaged and carpets are worn, some almost to the point of being hazardous. Approximately 50% of offices in the complex need to be brought up to standard but many of these require only one or two items of work, i.e. redecoration, lighting or replacement carpet.

The cost of the works was estimated at £342,000. Tenders have been received and are being evaluated.

**28. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR JELIL LADIPO**

How many affordable homes have been built in Southwark since May 2002?

**RESPONSE**

Figures for the years commencing April 2002 as follows:

	2002/3	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6 to end Dec	Totals
New Local Authority units	15	100	72	7	194
Registered Social Landlords – rented	143	376	317	288	1124
Registered Social Landlords – shared	38	72	76	127	313

ownership					
Totals	196	548	465	422	1631

**29. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER**

Looking at the general direction of government subsidies for housing and repairs, how does London compare to northern cities, such as Sheffield and Hull and what is his assessment of the factors behind the government's U-turn over Southwark's housing subsidy determination?

**RESPONSE**

Looking at housing management and maintenance allowances, where a new allocation formula is being phased in nationally, Sheffield and Hull will receive a 13% increase in 2006/07, whilst London authorities' increases average 6.5%. They will also receive a 5% increase in major repairs allowance towards capital programme renewal works, whereas London's allowance per property went down by 0.6%.

Initially, under the proposals set out in the draft determination, Southwark was facing a £10.6m loss of subsidy. In response to this the leader and executive member for housing management, together with tenant representatives, set out a strong case for the proposals to be reconsidered.

Ministers appear to have been swayed by the argument that tenants should not be subject to high rent rises whilst receiving a reduction in the level of housing revenue account resources, and that protection needed to continue whilst changes to rent restructuring were taking effect.

In the final determination Ministers decided to partition management and maintenance allowances, with the main part now protected in cash terms in 2006/07 and 2007/08 and a rebasing part, worth over 6%, passed to all authorities. The rebasing part now ensures that all authorities get a standard share of rent increase proceeds, whereas in the draft determination these sums, which are passed to government through clawback of guideline rent, would have followed the main allocation formula and largely flowed out of London.

As a result, Southwark receives a 6.1% increase in management and maintenance allowances, worth £5.5 million more than the 0.5% offered in the draft determination.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER**

Thank you for the excellent answer given. Would the leader undertake to ensure that the department is already negotiating next year's subsidy determination so that we are not in the same situation this time next year.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Madam Mayor yes we will certainly seek to negotiate with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister to ensure that we don't have a repeat of this year's Christmas scare but it is clear from the response there is a steady drift of resources out of London and up to northern cities which seems really quite unexplicable on any objective analysis of the scale of demand certainly for investment in the housing stock in Southwark and indeed in London as a whole and I think that the Housing subsidy taken in conjunction with the general Local Government finance settlement does show a government which simply

doesn't fail to understand the sheer scale and complexity of demand that there is in places like Southwark in Inner London and it I think it is quite scandalous that cities like Sheffield and Hull are profiting at the expense of deprived places like Southwark.

**30. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY**

What action is the council taking to address the problem on the Cossall estate and in other areas where a minority of anti-social residents are persistently dumping black bags of household waste around the estate?

**RESPONSE**

The Cossall Estate consists of 372 flatted properties as well as terraced houses built in the late 1980,s. There have been recent problems with individual residents discarding household waste and unwanted bulk furniture on the estate. During the summer of 2005 a circular letter was sent to all residents seeking their cooperation in the responsible disposal of household waste.

This approach has proven unsuccessful in some parts of the estate and as a result further warning letters have been sent. Discussions have taken place between the Nunhead and Peckham Rye area office and the Cossall Tenant and Residents Association to agree a strategy to resolve the problems. This has included the decision to provide wheelie-bins on parts of the estate and this does appear to have assisted in reducing the scale of the behaviour.

The estate is the subject of regular inspections and the area office is working with the cleaning staff to:

- Remove dumped refuse quickly when it appears.
- Identify the perpetrators of the dumping in order that firm action is taken to stop the problem.

The area office will take a range of actions once a perpetrator is identified and this includes the powers available from the tenancy agreement to the service of fixed penalty notices. The latter remedy is currently being trialed in the Borough & Bankside area and Walworth area and will be extended to all housing areas by March. In addition to area office staff undertaking this function the 30 supporters and managers within Southwark cleaning have also undertaken enforcement training to assist further with identification of culprits.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY**

I would like to thank the Leader for his answer.

I am afraid the answer is not entirely accurate as the problems on Cossall are certainly not recent – this was a serious problem when I first became councillor in 2002 and it is still is today and I fear it demonstrates from this answer that just as the Liberal Democrats do not understand the problems of Camberwell. That they also fail to realise the problems of Peckham. With that in mind I would like to ask the leader why the fixed penalty notice has been adopted on estates on the north of the borough rather than on the estates like Cossall in Peckham. The TRE has been calling for this sort of action for a very long time.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Madam Mayor as I understand it was trial in Borough and Bankside because the Managers there Guy Valentine-Neale and Dan Hollis have previous experience of dealing with anti-social behaviour and led on that in the Department. The idea is you can see from the answer that we will now be rolling this out across the whole of the borough that of course is one of the aims for the whole reorganisation of housing officers to try and free up officers from having to sit in housing offices and actually be able to be out on estate to tackle this kind of behaviour and I am sure we will be seeing results soon.

**31. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT  
FROM COUNCILLOR DORA DIXON-FYLE**

What steps has the executive member taken to ensure that ward councillors are kept updated with regard to leasehold management issues, such as delays in the production of finalised accounts etc.?

**RESPONSE**

All leasehold management issues are dealt with at leaseholder council. For example, the delays in revenue service charge billing have been the subject of a report in December 2004, regular subsequent updates and much discussion at the meetings. Some 25 of the council's 63 councillors are members of the leaseholder council and receive notification of the meetings together with the agenda and papers. The leaseholder council is a public meeting open to all leaseholders and members. Any individual councillor wishing to attend the meetings may do so and all are free to request back copies of minutes or to be included in distribution lists.

As with other consultative forums/council meetings it is inappropriate to send all councillors details of all forums but access to them is only a request away!

I find it interesting to note that one of Councillor Dixon-Fyle's own colleagues has confirmed in a letter dated 9th January 2006 (which she asked to be forwarded to the chair of the leaseholder council) that she keeps herself abreast of leaseholder issues/developments by regularly reading the minutes of leaseholder council.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR DORA DIXON-FYLE**

Thank you Madam Mayor. I would like to thank the leader for his answer to my question. I particularly like to thank him for highlighting the fact that one of my own Labour councillors keep us abreast of leaseholder issues by regularly reading the minutes of leaseholder council. Thank you very much this goes to show how efficient hardworking and conscious all my Labour Councillors.

My question actually is about when things go wrong about communication like the delays and production of accounts because it would be really nice for us as members to get information about when things go wrong first rather than reading it in the Southwark News or SLD.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

Madam Mayor I think this is an attempt to avoid duplication of information that is already available to members but I will certainly look at whether it is possible for us at least draw attention to members what items particularly are in the minutes that they might to have a look at.

**32. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

Can the executive member give his current best estimate for the average leaseholder service charge from 1998-2002 and the average leaseholder service charge from 2002-2006?

**RESPONSE**

It is assumed that the question refers to average 'annual' (revenue) service charges, and should not include any figures relating to charges for major works.

There are no comprehensive records for average service charges for 1998/99, and consequently the figure given for that year is derived from other records. The figures for subsequent years up until 2001/02 are based on reliable records, as are the figures for 2002/03 – 2005/06, although at present the figures for 2004/05 and 2005/06 remain as estimates.

1998/99 - £300.00
1999/00 - £340.06
2000/01 - £396.44
2001/02 - £405.20
2002/03 - £458.80
2003/04 - £596.78
2004/05 - £751.51 (e)
2005/06 - £802.62 (e)

A factor to note is that the basis for calculating the charges has been improved in the last three years in order to comply more closely with the terms of the lease, and reflect best practice. One of the effects of this has been to enable the council to capture more costs for recharging – for example, until 2003/04 effectively the only costs recharged to leaseholders for heating and hot water was for the supply of fuel (gas) and some minor repairs. Very little was recharged in respect of the management or maintenance of the boiler houses.

The council is a member of the London leasehold and right to buy benchmarking group, and the 'average estimated revenue service charge' is one of the measures included in their basic statistics. Records for 2003/04 and 2004/05 show that the council's charges are within the range of the average charges for boroughs with a similar stock profile – 2003/04 average £608, LBS £596, 2004/05 average £738.50, LBS £751.51.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

Thank you very much Madam Mayor, thank you to the leader for the answer to the question. In the last 4 years the average service charges almost exactly doubled and the leader does give in the answer some reasons for that. Are there any targets to attempt to cap or control spending so that the service charges don't increase at this rate and does the Leader have an estimate of the service charges for next year based on the budget that is going to the executive next week.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

It is clear from the answer there was historic underbilling I think of leaseholders and probably that meant the Council tenants were unfairly having to subsidise some costs

which should have more properly been properly apportioned to leaseholders in previous years. It is certainly as can be seen from the answer service charges compare very favourably with similar boroughs and I have no reason to believe that that is going to change in the future. inflation since 1998 and we ought to allow for some uplift for that. I don't have an estimate yet for 2006/2007 but I am sure it will be provided soon.

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

In light of the decision to demolish the Aylesbury, what steps are the housing department intending to take to minimise costs to leaseholders once the delayed planned preventative maintenance programme commences across the estate?

**RESPONSE**

Even though the Aylesbury is to be demolished the council cannot abrogate its legal responsibilities and must meet its tenancy agreement obligations.

Essential works will be carried out to the Aylesbury estate during the period of the redevelopment as part of the planned preventative maintenance programme (PPM). The focus of the work will be on the major repair elements that will provide value and ensure the sustainability of the estate to the residents during this period and ensuring continuity and reliability of estate services such as heating and lifts.

The council is working and will continue to work closely with all the interested parties on the estate, including leaseholders, to ensure the PPM programme is consulted on, prior to any work commencing and any charges incurred.'

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES**

Thank you Madam Mayor. Can I thank whoever did write this answer. Absolutely we completely agree that obviously the council cannot obligate its legal responsibilities but I would ask the executive member can he give me absolute cast iron reassurance that the leaseholder charges will be accurate because I am sure he will recognise for the past 3 or 4 years since 2002 leaseholders on the Aylesbury Estate have been punished with completely inaccurate leaseholder charges.

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK**

Councillor Bates knows we are working very closely with leaseholders on the Aylesbury via the Aylesbury Working Party and one of the things we are trying to do is bring forward the citation of right to buy to actually cap the number of leaseholders and then expedite the programme of leaseholders selling up their interest in the Aylesbury and so that would again help in the leaseholders affected by the Section 20 charges so on cast iron I can't really say that at the moment, no.

**34. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED**

Is the executive member satisfied with the arrangements for pest and vermin control on the Aylesbury estate, following the changes in the contract held by Cannon Hygiene? Can he outline the council's holding arrangements during the period of change?

**RESPONSE**

Yes, the arrangements for pest and vermin control in blocks on and around the Aylesbury estate are continuing satisfactorily. There have been no changes to the contract held by Cannon Hygiene.

A significant amount of treatment and eradication work has been carried out recently and work has been done to individual properties to prevent pests entering. Ten blocks are completely clear of pests and a further eleven blocks have less than 10% infestation levels.

A review is being undertaken of pest control arrangements on the Aylesbury estate, to ensure that pest problems are actively reduced in the forthcoming period of change on the estate. The aim of the new arrangements will be to arrange a pest treatment regime specifically for each block, aiming to completely clear pests from individual blocks wherever possible.

**SUPPLEMENTAL – COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED**

Can I through standing orders first ask you whether you could ask the Legal Officer to confirm to us what the consequences of putting untrue statements or paragraphs in answers would be first please before I ask my question.

**BOROUGH SOLICITOR**

Untrue statement in published answer to question. I think that the answer drafted would have been drafted by an Officer. I think the correct course for any member wishing to challenge the veracity of the answer is to do it firstly here and then request the executive to look into an allegation that the answer is not correct.

**COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED**

My supplementary is that we want the executive member for housing management to answer whoever has submitted this response to actually tell us whether the first paragraph is unequivocally true or not

**RESPONSE – COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK**

Thank you for that – I don't know but I will check and I will write to you.

**35. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BEVERLEY BASSOM**

What services will be provided out of the new Ellen Brown community centre located on Spa Park, delivered as part of the Bermondsey Spa regeneration project, and who will manage them?

**RESPONSE**

The facility has been designed to accommodate two specific areas. Each suitable to cater for a different, but complimentary age range.

One half of the building is specifically for children under 8 years of age, their parents and carers. The other half is suitable for children and young people between the ages of 5 and 13 (core service) and at certain times of the week, young people over the age of 13 years.



The overall responsibility for the management of the facility will fall within the Southwark play service.

A structure has been proposed which creates an overall centre manager. They will be responsible for the building as a whole, but will also act as line manager, for the over 5's playworker team.

They will lead on the issues of maintenance, security and housekeeping. They will also develop and direct the use of the facility outside of the initial service core hours (e.g. community room hire, service practitioner usage, etc).

There will be a second playworker team, consisting of three staff, delivering a service within the early years section of the building. This team will report to the centre manager on issues concerning the premises, but will be line managed by one of the local authority play officers.

In addition to the above, there will be specific Sure Start projects operating from the centre (including, toy library and earlier year support sessions).

**36. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

What is the total current balance in our section 106 account compared with May 2002?

**RESPONSE**

The balance at December 31 2005 was £15.9m compared with £13.2m at April 1 2002. The balances do not give a useful picture of the volume of Section 106 resources that have been secured or used over different periods.

Since April 1 2002 agreements have been signed totalling £21.5m. This is over 20% of the total recorded since 1982.

**37. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN**

What plans does he have to use the model of the Tenda Road nursery project, which will provide a new nursery with much needed additional capacity for some Bermondsey residents at no extra capital cost to the council, to provide new community facilities elsewhere in the borough?

**RESPONSE**

The mixed-use development model at Tenda Road has allowed the construction of an 88-place nursery plus additional key worker housing for employees in the education field (16 homes). Additional capital generated through a council/developer partnership arrangement has allowed the funding gap to be filled providing a superior building to that which would have been provided on a stand-alone basis without the additional housing. Additionally due to the construction method used, we will have an operational building within 2 years of initial talks commencing around the project and have been able to take advantage of funding available within the current financial year for spending. The project is currently being delivered on time and to budget.

We intend to repeat this model where it can be successful in bridging funding gaps and providing deliverable mixed use / sustainable communities. Regeneration officers are

currently in discussion with officers from education and children's services as to how this model can be further rolled out across the borough to provide flexible buildings bringing together a variety of services including health, education, youth, leisure, housing and commercial uses.

**38. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DANNY McCARTHY**

I understand that the council is no longer a planning standards authority for planning application performance in 2006/2007. Can the Executive Member confirm that this is the case?

**RESPONSE**

I am pleased to confirm that the council is not a standards authority for any of the three categories of planning applications [major, minor or other] for 2006/2007. The council was made a standards authority in 2005/2006 for its performance on major planning applications in the year ending June 2004.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has recognised the significant improvement in the council's performance in the last year. This has come about through the improvement plan agreed in 2004, bringing together improvements in procedures, the better application of technology and substantial efforts by managers and staff in the planning team.

**39. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARK PURSEY**

Do you agree that the Mayor of London should have the power to direct councils to accept planning applications?

**RESPONSE**

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) published proposals to extend the powers of the Mayor in a range of areas including planning in November 2005. The executive will consider the council's detailed response to this consultation on February 14 in advance of the closing date for representations of February 22 2006. The consultation paper considers proposals put forward by the Mayor himself to have extensive new powers together with alternatives involving more limited increases to his powers. The options include giving the Mayor the power to direct approval of certain categories of planning application.

A motion was considered at the December 7 2005 council assembly commenting on proposals put forward by the Mayor in advance of the official ODPM consultation. council assembly resolved *inter alia* that it believes that it would be inappropriate for the government to remove powers from London boroughs and transfer them to the Mayor. It was noted that the case made for these powers is not strong and many of the proposals militate against the council's role in allowing for local conditions to be considered and for boroughs to be responsive to local concerns. The comments on the consultation paper to be considered by the executive will put forward more detailed arguments to oppose this extension of the Mayor's powers to include directing approval of planning application.

**40. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLIE SMITH**

Can the executive member please supply a list of all council owned properties and pieces of land that have been sold since April 2003 with the total of monies received from these disposals?

**RESPONSE**

**Completed disposals for financial year ending March 31 2004**

1	Ansdell Road, 5, SE15
2	Anstey Road, 1, SE15
3	Bath Tce., Laundry Room, Rumford Hse, SE1
4	Beauval Road, 98a & 98b, SE22
5	Blackfriars Road, 197, SE1 (South Point) - Tranche 1
6	Blanchedowne Garage Site, Champion Hill, SE5
7	Blanchedowne, land adjoining 46, Champion Hill, SE5
8	Brayards Road, 58, SE15
9	Brunswick Park, 22, SE5
10	Burbage Road, 69, SE24
11	Burbage Road, 72, SE24
12	Burbage Road, 100, SE24
13	Camberwell Road, Marble Factory site, 34, SE5
14	Crescent Wood Road, 28, SE26
15	Dundas Road/Ansdell Road site, SE15
16	Dundas Road, 21, 23 & 27 & Kimberley Avenue, 51, 55 & 57 SE15
17	Dylways, 89, SE5
18	Ellery Street Garages, SE15
19	Elm Grove, 37, SE15
20	Elmington Road, 132, SE5
21	Evelina Road, 74-86(e)65-69 Kimberley Avenue, SE15
22	Evelina Road, 120, SE15
23	Glengall Road, 50, SE15
24	Gordon Road, 149-153, SE15
25	Great Suffolk Street, 77-83(o), SE1
26	Grosvenor Park, Garage rear of 121, SE5
27	Grove Vale, Former Public Convenience, SE22
28	Ilderton Road, 1b
29	King Arthur Close, 11, SE15
30	Lordship Lane, 221, SE22
31	Lordship Lane, 320, SE22
32	Lower Road, 122, SE16
33	Lower Road, Chilton Grove, SE16
34	Maxted Road, 58, SE15
35	Muschamp Road, 43, SE15
36	Newington Butts, 86-88(e) and land at Longville Road, SE11
37	Notley Street, Site SE5
38	Ossory Road, SE1
39	Pastor Street Car Park, SE1
40	Peckham High Street, 99, SE15
41	Peckham Partnership, Phase 5a(i), Phase 4, Kelly Avenue
42	Peckham Partnership, Phase 5a(i), Phase 5, Kelly Avenue

43	Peckham Partnership, Phase 5a(i), Ph. 5, Kelly Ave - option land
44	Peckham Partnership, Phase 5A(ii)
45	Peckham Partnership Phase 6D/7B(1) SE15 Tranche 2
46	Peckham Partnership Phase 6D/7B(1), SE15 Tranche 3
47	Peckham Partnership, Phase 6d/7b(i), SE15
48	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(ii), (a) & (b), SE15
49	Peckham Road, Lister Health Centre, SE15
50	Peckham Road, Warwick Park School, SE15
51	Peckham Road, 28
52	Ruskin Park House, 4, SE5
53	Ruskin Park House, 157, SE5
54	Ruskin Park House, 83, SE5
55	Silvester Road Garages, SE22
56	Storks Road, land to the rear of 82-88(e), SE16
57	Trafalgar Avenue, 6, SE15
58	Underhill Road, 79a and b, SE22
59	Union St., Laundry Room, Rowland Hill Hse., 67, SE1
60	Vicarage Grove, 54, SE5

**Total Capital receipt for Year ending March 31 2004 - £27,168,152.00**

**Completed disposals for the financial year ending 31st March 05**

1	Adys Road, 29, SE15
2	Albany Road, 124, Former Walworth Dining Centre site, SE5
3	Alma Grove, 8, SE1
4	Alma Grove, 10, SE1
5	Asylum Road, 81, SE15
6	Bermondsey Spa - Site A, SE16
7	Bermondsey Spa - Site D, SE16
8	Bermondsey Spa - Site D, SE16
9	Bermondsey Spa - Sites E & H, SE16
10	Bermondsey Spa - Sites E & H, SE16
11	Bermondsey Spa Sites E & H, SE16
12	Bermondsey Spa Sites E & H, SE16
13	Bermondsey Spa Site T, SE16
14	Bowen Drive, 122, Sir Ernest Shackleton PH, SE21
15	Brook Drive, 117, SE11
16	Brunswick Park, 4, SE5
17	Champion Hill, 25, Ruskin Park House, SE5
18	Champion Hill, 40, Ruskin Park House, SE5
19	Champion Hill, Ruskin Park House, 66, SE5
20	Champion Hill, Ruskin Park House, 77, SE5
21	Champion Hill, Ruskin Park House, 84, SE5
22	Champion Hill, 99, Ruskin Park House, SE5
23	Champion Hill, 115, Ruskin Park House, SE5
24	Champion Hill, 161, Ruskin Park House, SE5
25	Champion Hill, 192, Ruskin Park House, SE5
26	Champion Hill, 208, Ruskin Park House, SE5
27	Champion Hill, 239, Ruskin Park House, SE5
28	Cobourg Road, 19, SE5
29	Consort Road, 49-73(o), SE15

30	Costa Street, 17, SE15
31	Crown Street, Arches and land, SE5
32	Crown Street, land at, SE5
33	Decima Street, Former Barrow Stores Pmnt 2
34	Dundas Road, 19 & 25 , SE15
35	Elephant and Castle, Castle House - title rectification transfer
36	Elephant & Castle, Underground Garages, Castle House, SE1
37	Evelina Road, 108, SE15
38	Gallery Road, Belair Cottages, SE21
39	Gordon Road, 18-20(e), SE15
40	Gordon Road, 111, SE15
41	Gordon Road, 113, SE15
42	Grove Vale Depot site, SE22
43	Half Moon Lane, 54a, SE24
44	Hatfields, Land in, SE1
44	Hillsboro Road, 15, SE22
45	Hillsboro Road, 31, SE22
46	Ilderton Road, 1c, SE16
47	Ivydale Road, 266-272(e), SE15
48	Ivydale Road, 300, SE15
49	Kimberley Avenue, 53, 59-61(o), SE15
50	Love Walk, Jennie Lee RHE, SE5
51	Lyndhurst Way, 41, SE15
52	Lynton Road, 262 - 284, SE16
53	Marsden Road, 24, SE15
54	Nutbrook Street, 7, Flat 1, SE15
55	Old Jamaica Road, Salmon Youth Ctre., SE16, 4th Court Land
56	Old Kent Road, 761-763(o), SE15
57	Peckham High Street, 28-30(e), SE15
58	Peckham Programme 6d/7b(i) second phase draw down
59	Peckham Programme 6d/7b(i) third phase draw down
60	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(i) fourth phase draw down
61	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(i) fifth phase draw down
62	Peckham Partnership Phase 6D/7B(i), SE15 Tranche 4
63	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(i) sixth phase draw down
64	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(i) seventh phase draw down
65	Peckham Partnership Phase 7c - Newent Close, site at, SE15
66	Peckham Partnership Phase 8a(i) (tranche 1)
67	Peckham Partnership Phase 8a(i) (tranche 2)
68	Porlock Street, 3, SE1
69	Reverdy Road, 55, SE1
70	Rotherhithe New Road, 200-204(e), SE16
71	Scutari Road, 35, SE22
72	Setchell Way, 69, SE16
73	Thompson Avenue, land at (John Kirk Mission), SE5
74	Underhill Road, 216-224(e), SE22
75	West Square, Charlotte Sharman Annexe, SE11
76	Wilds Rents, land adjoining 18, SE1
77	York Grove, 12, SE15

**Total receipt for Year ending March 31 2005 - £39,323,161.00**

**Completed disposals up to November 30 2005**

1	Ambergate Street, 21 & 23, SE17
2	Bermondsey Antique Market SE1
3	Champion Hill, 13, Ruskin Park House, SE5
4	Champion Hill, 23, Ruskin Park House, SE5
5	Champion Hill, 32, Ruskin Park House, SE5
6	Champion Hill, 41, Ruskin Park House, SE5
7	Champion Hill, 119, Ruskin Park House, SE5
8	Champion Hill, 121, Ruskin Park House, SE5
9	Champion Hill, 174, Ruskin Park House, SE5
10	Cobourg Road, 49, SE5
11	Darwin Street, 47a and Mason Street, 47b, SE17
12	Dog Kennel Hill School, SE22
13	Dunton Road, 102, SE1
14	Gallery Road, Belair Cottages, SE21
15	Gordon Road, 130-136(e)SE15
16	Hayles Street, land between 24-26(e), SE11
17	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(l), Part 8
18	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(i) Part 9, SE15
19	Peckham Partnership Phase 6d/7b(ii)c
20	Peckham Road, 86-88(e), SE15
21	Rodwell Road, 1, SE22
22	Urlwin Street, land to the rear of No. 30, SE5
23	Wansey Street Car Park, SE17
24	William Booth Road, Orchard Sports Ground, SE20

Capital receipt up to 30 November 2005 - £5,370,157.00

**41. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC THORNCROFT**

Can the executive member explain why, despite representations from councillors, there are still no information packs available for local residents wishing to access funding for improvement initiatives in the Nunhead/East Peckham renewal areas? This is despite a promise from officers that such information packs would be available in September 2005. Can the executive member explain why there have been delays to date and what will be done to improve communication with local residents in the future?

**RESPONSE**

Officers gave an estimated date of publication in relation to a newsletter, rather than any information packs, for the residents living in both the Nunhead and East Peckham renewal areas. This estimate was based on officers receiving contributions from residents for the newsletter and the successful recruiting of additional renewal staff who would be in a position to deal with enquiries after publication. Unfortunately both of these took longer than officers anticipated. However, both the distribution of the newsletter and the recruitment exercise will be completed by the end of January 2006. Officers have endeavoured to keep local members abreast of developments by offering regular briefings. Three of these have taken place since the two new renewal areas were declared in May 2005.

The first newsletter will be delivered to residents very soon and this will detail all of the forms of assistance that will be available to residents across the areas.

**42. QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION FROM COUNCILLOR BOB SKELLY**

What effect will the department for education and skills (DfES) delay in making a decision regarding the Expression of Interest for Waverley school have on the proposed schedule for opening the new academy?

**RESPONSE**

The expression of interest for Waverley school and the proposed new boys' academy on the lower school site was submitted in July 2005. The Local Education Authority (LEA) was notified of the agreement of the DfES on December 21 2005, a delay of some five months. Clearly, this delayed the detailed work on the development of the funding agreement, a process that would be expected to take approximately twelve months.

However, the notification also informed the LEA of the proposal, agreed with the sponsor, to use the accelerated route for this academy. This involves the separation of the capital elements of the funding agreement from the rest and should allow the signing of an agreement before the summer break for the new academy for girls to open September 2006 (with existing admission arrangements), with the federated boys' academy opening in temporary accommodation in September 2007.

However, the delay does cause a further problem in relation to agreeing admission arrangements for September 2007. Schools and academies are consulting now on these arrangements. Clearly, this will set a problem for the academy project group in relation to both of the federated academies. Officers have flagged up their concerns on this matter with the sponsor and the DfES.

**43. QUESTION TO THE WORSHIPFUL THE MAYOR FROM COUNCILLOR MICK BARNARD**

In relation to the events listed below, can the Mayor confirm that: -

1. At the meeting with the borough solicitor and chief executive on July 19 2005 to discuss my recent allegations, both officers indicated that there was a conflict of interest which prevented their involvement;
2. At the meeting with the leader of the council and myself on August 17 2005, the leader agreed to three independent members of the current standards committee investigating the allegations – a proposal which the leader promised to confirm in writing the following week;
3. That on October 18 2005 (over a month later), it was in fact the borough solicitor who responded to me indicating that the chief executive had persuaded the leader of the council to renege on his promise?

**RESPONSE**

1. Yes.
2. Yes, that was the proposal at that time.

3. I was not present when that discussion took place but I have seen a letter from the borough solicitor explaining the chief executive had agreed to an informal enquiry by Ian Powe. I have since seen a further letter from the leader confirming this proposal.

**44. QUESTION TO THE WORSHIPFUL THE MAYOR FROM COUNCILLOR MICK BARNARD**

In relation to the events listed below, can the Mayor confirm that: -

4. At the meeting with the borough solicitor and chief executive on July 19 2005 to discuss my recent allegations, both officers indicated that there was a conflict of interest which prevented their involvement;
5. At the meeting with the leader of the council and myself on August 17 2005, the leader agreed to three independent members of the current standards committee investigating the allegations – a proposal which the leader promised to confirm in writing the following week;
6. That on October 18 2005 (over a month later), it was in fact the borough solicitor who responded to me indicating that the chief executive had persuaded the leader of the council to renege on his promise?

**RESPONSE - THE WORSHIPFUL THE MAYOR**

4. Yes.
5. Yes, that was the proposal at that time.
6. I was not present when that discussion took place but I have seen a letter from the borough solicitor explaining the chief executive had agreed to an informal enquiry by Ian Powe. I have since seen a further letter from the leader confirming this proposal.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR MICK BARNARD**

Thank you Madam Mayor. Just to let you know I have responded to the leader's letter, which I did yesterday. I hope he has received that response. My question to you is that once the chief executive had declared a conflict of interest and withdrew from any involvement in the matter, would you have expected the chief executive to be given the opportunity to disagree with and influence the agreement both you and I had with the leader of the council at our meeting in July?

**RESPONSE**

Well I understand that there are certain rules concerning procedures with chief executives. Those rules have to be adhered too. It was explained to me afterwards that the procedures we had decided to have were not proper. I can say to you and to the council that things have moved on even since yesterday. I have now been asked to be interviewed, and I am sure others have, by the relevant person who is going to do the informal enquiry, next week. So things have moved on and I do not wish to say any more on that issue, thanks you.