

## Executive

Tuesday December 15 2009

7.00 pm

To be held at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

# Supplemental Agenda No.1

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
6.	<b>Deputation requests</b> To note the comments of the strategic director of environment and housing in respect of the deputation request from Tenants Council relating to the varying of Southwark's conditions of tenancy.	1 - 2
20.	<b>Motions referred from Council Assembly on November 4 2009</b> To consider motions referred on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pedestrian Safety at junction of Lordship Lane and Dulwich Common</li><li>• Southwark Council Housing Crisis</li><li>• Freedom Pass Cuts</li><li>• Save the South London Line</li></ul>	3 - 12
21.	<b>Appointments to Panels, Boards and Forums 2009-10 (Admissions Forum)</b> To consider the appointment of local authority representatives to the Admissions Forum.	13 - 15

#### Contact

Everton Roberts / Paula Thornton on 020 7525 7221 or 020 7525 4395 or email:  
everton.roberts@southwark.gov.uk; paula.thornton@southwark.gov.uk  
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: December 11 2009

# Agenda Item 6

## ITEM 6 - DEPUTATION REQUEST FROM TENANTS COUNCIL – VARYING SOUTHWARK'S CONDITIONS OF TENANCY

### Comments from the Strategic Director of Environment and Housing

14. From September 28 2009 a preliminary notice of variation was served to all individual tenants (not just each household) in accordance with the terms of Southwark's conditions of tenancy.
15. The decision to use a distributing company to post the notices instead of hand delivering the documents was based on feedback received in 2003 when this process was last carried out and issues arose regarding the reliability of the hand delivery method.
16. Whilst the council believes the notices were served in accordance with the tenancy agreement and statutory requirements, in view of the representations and deputation, the council is sending out a further preliminary notice to all tenants including the full text of the proposed changes to be read together with the September documents and inviting any further comments to be received by January 18 2010.
17. Further copies of the September documents can be obtained by visiting the Council's one stop shops, viewing or downloading from the council's website or upon request by calling 0800 952 4444 or by emailing [tenancyagreement@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:tenancyagreement@southwark.gov.uk)
18. The borough and bankside area housing forum's motion was not received before the draft agenda was issued for this meeting and so did not appear on the agenda. However, the issues it raised were discussed at length during the meeting on the November 30 2009.
19. In 2003, tenants were given a sixty page booklet containing the current text and proposed text of the conditions of tenancy, the council only received 128 tenant responses. It was deemed by the number of responses and comments received that this format was not accessible. This feedback was considered when the format for the current preliminary notice was drafted.
20. Section 103 (2) (b) states that the landlord must 'specify the variation and its effect'. The council felt that this could be achieved without sending the full text of the proposed new clauses to every tenant, instead summarising each current clause, the change the council was proposing to make and its effect. The notice letter advised that a copy of the full text together with additional documents could be seen and downloaded from our public website or obtained on request by telephone call or email.
21. It was hoped that this would make the document more accessible and correspondingly increase the number of responses received from tenants – which it did -an increase from 128 to 379. It was also an approach used successfully by a number of other local authority landlords.
22. However the council has noted the concerns of the Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations and Tenant Council and the council is therefore sending out a further preliminary notice to all tenants including the full text of the proposed changes to be read together with the September documents and inviting any further comments to be received by January 18 2010. Further copies of the September documents can be obtained from the one stop shops or on request by telephone or email and viewed or downloaded on-line from on the council's

website. Any further comments will then be considered as part of the consultation process.

23. The deputation refers to a 10 yearly review of the tenancy agreement due in 2013. It is understood that officers in 2003 may have advised that a review would be carried out *at least* every 10 years but best practice as communicated by the Charter Institute of Housing, advises a tenancy agreement should be reviewed and updated every 4-5 years.
24. The Audit Commission Tenancy and Estate Management KLOE states an excellent authority:

*'Updates the tenancy agreement, conditions of tenancy and the Tenants' Handbook to take account of changes in the law, regulatory requirements, and its own policy or procedures in a timely fashion'.*
25. The first briefing that was circulated to all area housing forums in May 2009 and subsequently to Tenant Council in July 2009 stated the following three broad themes as the reviews objectives.
  - The incorporation of changes in legislation and legal obligations
  - Ensuring compatibility with all London Borough of Southwark policies and procedures introduced or amended since 2004.
  - Making tenancy agreement more user friendly.
26. The same briefing included a summary of the proposed changes which referenced dog chipping and the removal of an automatic right to two successions of tenancy.
27. The council therefore believes that the purpose and scope of the review was clearly and openly communicated from the outset.
28. The council cannot pay for legal advice advising against the council itself as this represents a conflict of interest.
29. In previous tenancy agreement reviews the Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations secured legal advice and the council encouraged this course of action. The decision on whether or not tenant representatives seek legal advice rests with the tenant's movement itself.

# Agenda Item 20

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> December 15 2009	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Motions Referred from Council Assembly	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That the executive considers the motions set out in the appendices attached to the report.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Council assembly at its meeting on Wednesday, November 4 2009 agreed a number of motions and these stand referred to the executive for consideration.
3. The executive is requested to consider the motions referred to it. Any proposals in a motion are treated as a recommendation only. The final decisions of the executive will be reported back to the next meeting of council assembly. When considering a motion, executive can decide to:
  - Note the motion; *or*
  - Agree the motion in its entirety, *or*
  - Amend the motion; *or*
  - Reject the motion.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.9(6), the attached motions were referred to the executive. The executive will report on the outcome of its deliberations upon the motions to a subsequent meeting of council assembly.
5. The constitution allocates responsibility for particular functions to council assembly, including approving the budget and policy framework, and to the executive for developing and implementing the budget and policy framework and overseeing the running of council services on a day-to-day basis.
6. Any key issues, such as policy, community impact or funding implications are included in the advice from the relevant chief officer.

## REASON FOR URGENCY

7. It is important that motions from council assembly are referred to executive at the first available opportunity to ensure that the issues raised in these motions are considered without delay.

## REASON FOR LATENESS

8. It has not been possible to circulate this report five clear days in advance of the meeting due to the need to receive and provide comments in respect of these motions from the relevant chief officer.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Motions submitted in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.9 (6).	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Lesley John Constitutional Team 020 7525 7228

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Title</b>
Appendix 1	Pedestrian Safety At Junction Of Lordship Lane And Dulwich Common
Appendix 2	Southwark's Council Housing Crisis
Appendix 3	Freedom Pass Cuts
Appendix 4	Save The South London Line

**AUDIT TRAIL**

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	
<b>Report Author</b>	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	December 10 2009	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing – appendix 2	Yes	Yes
Deputy Chief Executive – appendix 3	Yes	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods – appendix 1 and 4	Yes	No
<b>Executive Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	December 10 2009	

### **Pedestrian Safety at Junction of Lordship Lane and Dulwich Common**

At council assembly on Wednesday November 4 2009 a motion on pedestrian safety at the junction of Lordship Lane and Dulwich Common was moved by Councillor Lewis Robinson and seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys. The motion was agreed and stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

#### **Recommendation**

That council assembly notes:

1. The long standing calls by College Ward councillors and local residents, particularly the elderly of the Lordship Lane Estate, for the introduction of a “pedestrian phasing” of the traffic lights at the junction of the South Circular with Lordship Lane at Dulwich Common.
2. The council traffic survey commissioned by College Ward councillors through cleaner, greener, safer funding which concluded that the most effective way to improve pedestrian safety and reduce car collisions at this junction was the introduction of “pedestrian phasing” amongst other measures.
3. Following the survey the description of this junction in local newspapers as “Is this the most dangerous junction in Southwark?” (Southwark News).

That council assembly welcomes:

4. The commitment now given by Transport for London (TfL) under the new London Mayor that a “pedestrian phasing” will now be introduced at this junction in the next 12 months.
5. The recent petition of local residents organised by College Ward councillors which calls on TfL to recognise the importance of making this junction as safe as possible and to bring forward the “pedestrian phasing” forward in their work programme at the earliest opportunity.

That council assembly requests the executive to:

6. Make the appropriate representations to TfL in support of ward councillors to ensure that these works are brought forward at the earliest opportunity in the next 12 months and coincide with upgrading the lights to ease any potential traffic congestion.

#### **Comments of the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods**

None received at the time of despatch.

### Southwark's Council Housing Crisis

At council assembly on Wednesday November 4 2009 a motion on Southwark's council housing crisis was moved by Councillor Ian Wingfield and seconded by Councillor Martin Seaton. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

#### Recommendation

1. That council assembly notes in a draft of the housing strategy a £700 million gap in the funding for the executive's Southwark decent homes programme was reported. It notes the omission of this figure in the housing strategy agreed by the executive as further work is still being carried out as part of the stock condition survey.
2. That council assembly regrets the large number of homes classified as non-decent in Southwark and notes that the housing strategy recognises this is a problem across all sectors with more than a third of housing association homes classified as such. Council assembly further notes that Southwark has far more council housing than any other London borough.
3. That council assembly reaffirms its support for the settled view of Southwark tenants that:
  - a) they wish to remain as tenants of the council
  - b) that the government's so-called decent homes standard is an inadequate and insufficient standard for Southwark's homes
  - c) when refurbishment takes place the work should be comprehensive and take into account landlord obligations, decent homes and other improvements, rather than simply reflect artificial, piecemeal and partial government targets.
4. That council assembly regrets the continued restrictions imposed on the council by government that prevent it meeting the legitimate aspirations of tenants and leaseholders and its failure to provide any additional funding for fire safety work.
5. That council assembly welcomes the review of the housing revenue account (HRA) by the Communities and Local Government department, particularly over suggestions that power will be returned to local government over rent incomes and capital receipts and supports London Councils in its view that 'where an exceptional need to spend is identified, certain local authorities should have their level of debt reduced so as to create additional headroom for local prudential borrowing', but awaits detailed proposals with concern given the government's recent record on housing finance.
6. That in addition council assembly calls on the executive to launch a campaign to persuade the government to recognise Southwark's unique position and look at other solutions, excluded from the HRA review, and allow the council to invest in its homes through a combination of:
  - a) Writing off historic debt – particularly for estates that have been demolished or redeveloped
  - b) Allowing the council to remortgage parcels of its debt at the current competitive rates
  - c) Allowing the council a temporary 'debt holiday'
  - d) Lifting the restrictions on the use of receipts from planning gain
  - e) Giving councils full control over their rent and other income.

## Comments of the Strategic Director of Environment and Housing

The Decent Homes Standard was introduced in 2003 with a demanding target set for all local authority landlords to create 'safe secure and warm homes' by 2010. In translation this meant major capital investment in the external fabric and internal fittings of most council homes. Additionally capital funds were only made available to these authorities who chose to form arms length management companies. London Borough of Southwark decided to remain a local authority landlord and submitted an options approval to Government that suggest that the target could be met from existing resources. These figures are currently being revised.

In response to the specific points in the motion:

1. There is not a £700 million gap to fund Southwark's decent homes programme.

The early draft of the housing strategy contained the estimated cost of the investment need to our stock at the higher Southwark standard. This is not the investment gap, as the council do have resources to fund the programme, albeit not to the full level of need. A review of our funding available is taking place. The housing strategy initially had figures for our five year investment need based on a number of models, ranging from delivering a basic decent homes standard to a more realistic requirement for the wider investment needs of our stock.

The figures in the draft housing strategy had not been fully validated, so were removed from the final draft of the housing strategy. Officers in both environment and housing and regeneration and neighbourhoods are currently reviewing the figures from the new stock condition survey and assumptions of associated costs and an interim base position will be available in January 2010, with final data completed by April 2010. As part of the process of review there will also be a continual up-date of our stock condition which will inform our asset management strategy.

External funding for the programme amounts to around £50 million per annum, comprising £37m through major repairs allowance and £12.5 million GLA supported borrowing; the latter is not likely to be available after March 2011. We have to make up the gap through a variety of sources, mainly capital receipts from housing and land sales but also including revenue contributions. This is a substantial annual commitment from the council and shows the priority for delivering long term improvement to our estates.

Spending priorities for improvement works are consulted with our residents, in line with government guidance. This has tended to give priority to lifts, common areas and the external environment as well as delivering the decent homes standard. This reprioritisation has reduced our ability to meet the strict standard but has been more responsive to tenants and has been a more rational approach in relation to the long term asset management of our stock. This is highlighted in the executive report of April 2008 'Southwark's decent homes standard.'

2. From the recently published data from government (CLG – Business plan statistical returns 2008/9) 206,000, or 11%, of local authority homes will be non-decent at the 2010/11 (original) target date.

Southwark is London's largest local authority landlord. We manage some 54,500 properties, of which 39,500 are tenanted and 15,000 homeowners. Our particular problem is the age and nature of our housing stock, which has required very high maintenance costs in terms of its structure, external fabric, lift maintenance, etc.



We spend around £80m per annum on improvements to our stock, including £40m on decent homes/area priorities. Last year (2008/9) we spent £89 million on our stock and £55 million on decent homes/area priorities.

Even with this funding we will not meet the 2010/11 target. However some 2000 homes have been made decent every year and, as many improvements have been made which have not qualified for the decent homes measure, the average cost of bringing all our stock up to this standard is substantially less per unit than many other boroughs.

No council has unlimited funds and the decent homes challenge for Southwark is probably greater than any other London borough. With resident support, the only prudent answer is to potentially demolish and redevelop the stock that have the highest costs to maintain however this has short term cost implications for the investment programme. Such regeneration schemes will not only transform the overall condition of the borough's stock, they will create more mixed communities and can also generate significant capital receipts.

3. (a) Southwark is a retained authority – maintaining ownership and management of our stock. This was a positive decision and in line with the guidance on option appraisals. *'For an OA to be signed off it is not enough that tenants are merely consulted, they must be able to make meaningful contributions to the process and thus have some ownership of the conclusions'* (CLG Guidance).

Changes in both ownership and management have been tested on a number of occasions within Southwark, for either a full or partial stock funding solution:

2000 – Housing options – transfer of stock to RSLs

2001 – Aylesbury estate – failed LSVT ballot

2002- Tabard Gardens – pre-ballot consultation showed there was no support for LSVT

2006 – Option appraisal process concluded 'There was no strong support for any of other options, including the mixed model, other than stock retention' – Exec report – March 2006.

2005 - present. Option appraisal working group and decent homes review working group

(b) Decent homes standard.

In the executive report 2008, it was determined that this standard was too low and a higher Southwark decent homes standard was to be delivered. It was acknowledged that the higher standard would cost more and take longer to deliver.

4. As retained authority Southwark does not have the same access to funding as have ALMO, PFI authorities, nor RSLs with transferred stock.

Southwark has been lobbying for additional funding from government through the Government Office for London, Homes and Communities Agency and most recently through evidence given to a CLG Select Committee 'Beyond Decent Homes'.

In addition our response on the current housing finance review has been that levels of investment and management funding is up-lifted to enable to meet the true cost of maintaining our stock.

We are also investing significantly in fire safety works following the tragic fire at Lakanal, a cost not met by government and one which could significantly affect our ability to meet the decent homes target. Our stock profile and the size of our portfolio makes balancing demands across these competing areas extremely difficult.

5. CLG has indicated that capital grant would be available in future for remaining backlog works but it is not clear how much, so having an initial debt reduction would be a more definite way of receiving assistance.
6. (a) Debt post-review would be set at an affordable level, given what would be left from future rent income after meeting management and maintenance expenditure - based on future stock. The effect of demolished stock on debt will thus have effectively been removed under the review proposals issued. Full national write-off has been considered in the review and found unaffordable and it would be difficult for CLG to justify and finance fully writing-off debt of particular positive-subsidy authorities.  
  
(b) We are able currently to repay and reborrow debt but suffer early repayment premiums on PWLB debt the premium payments go to government. There is no detail in current proposals on interest rate levels post-settlement and we have asked for reduction for high interest rate authorities to be looked at. Exemption from early repayment premiums during debt resettlement would be useful.  
  
(c) A debt holiday would be quite complicated to set up and as relief against something that is not necessarily a problem, harder to justify than a simple capital grant towards decent homes work.  
  
(e) As stated in 5 the review proposals would give councils control over rents and other income, providing the initial debt settled is affordable.

## Freedom Pass Cuts

At council assembly on Wednesday November 4 2009 a motion on freedom pass cuts was proposed by Councillor David Noakes and seconded by Councillor Tim McNally. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

### Recommendation

1. That council assembly notes the Labour government review of the last year of the 3-year special grant for concessionary fares to support the introduction of the English national concession which has resulted in London losing £28.6 million from the funding it had already been promised.
2. That council assembly condemns this decision for the following reasons:
  - a) It means the council is likely to lose around £1,000,000 of already promised central government funding in 2010-11.
  - b) It goes against sensible financial planning as the government is proposing unilateral changes to the final year of a three year funding settlement.
  - c) The announcement is very late and creates huge uncertainty for London boroughs in dealing with TfL by the end of December.
3. That council assembly notes with anger that every other urban area in the country will receive a 100% subsidy from the Labour government for the cost of elderly and disabled travel, while London council taxpayers will have to contribute between one half and a third of the cost of the scheme in the capital.
4. That council assembly supports the view of London Councils' Chairman, Councillor Merrick Cockell, who said earlier today: "The government's decision at this late stage to renege on the deal they had already agreed is absolutely stunning and will be met with anger across the capital."
5. That council assembly calls on the executive members for resources and health and adult care to write to the Minister for London and the Junior Transport Minister, Sadiq Khan, in the strongest possible terms, to express its anger and demand that London boroughs get a fair deal.
6. That council assembly calls on the executive to use all appropriate means to publicise this funding withdrawal, particularly among Southwark residents applying for freedom passes.

### Comments of the Deputy Chief Executive

None received at the time of despatch.

## Save the South London Line

At council assembly on Wednesday November 4 2009 a late motion on save the South London Line was proposed by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon and seconded by Councillor Barrie Hargrove. The motion was agreed and stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

### Recommendation

1. That council assembly notes the importance of the current South London Line rail service between London Bridge and London Victoria via four stations in Southwark to the residents, businesses and public services of Camberwell, Peckham and South Bermondsey.
2. That council assembly notes that under the current proposals to end the operation of the South London Line, Denmark Hill and Peckham Rye stations would lose half of their daytime services to London Victoria and have no service at all to Victoria at evenings or on Sundays. It further notes that Denmark Hill station will lose all direct services to London Bridge.
3. That council assembly further notes the vital importance of the service for helping some of the borough's most vulnerable residents access health services at Guy's Hospital, King's College hospital and The Maudsley.
4. That council assembly recognises that residents in areas such as Peckham Rye and East Dulwich continue to be poorly served by public transport despite the efforts of the council to secure the implementation of the Cross River Tram.
5. That council assembly notes and welcomes the fact that retention of a direct Victoria to London Bridge service will be considered as part of the Transport for London (TfL) / London Travelwatch study into the options for the future of the South London Line.
6. That council assembly notes that TfL and Department for Transport (DfT) agreed that £24m Department for Transport funding intended for a new London Victoria-Bellingham service be diverted to the provision of East London Line Extension Phase 2.
7. That council assembly strongly believes that this borough needs both the East London Line Extension and the South London Line. This is not an either or debate.
8. That council assembly calls on the Department for Transport to provide the funding necessary to provide platform capacity for the service at London Bridge station as part of its redevelopment.
9. That council assembly congratulates the community and cross-party campaign against the threat to the South London Line services on its high-profile and effective activities to date, and re-affirms its own commitment to the campaign.
10. That council assembly calls on the executive to seek a written assurance from TfL that the retention of direct Victoria-London Bridge services is being considered as part of the South London Line Options Study.

11. That council assembly calls on the responsible executive member to meet with Network Rail and the Department for Transport at the earliest opportunity to put the case for the revision of the plans for London Bridge station so that it is developed to its full capacity, including terminating platforms for the South London Line.
12. That council assembly requests that the executive works in conjunction with the leaders of all political groups on Southwark Council to ensure the strongest representations continue to be made to the Department for Transport, London Mayor, Network Rail, the Minister of Transport and Minister for London to retain the South London Line service.

**Comments of the Strategic Director of Regeneration & Neighbourhoods**

None received at the time of despatch.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> December 15 2009	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Nominations to Panels, Boards and Forums 2009-10 – Admissions Forum	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That the executive appoint two local authority representatives to the Admissions Forum for the remainder of the 2009-10 year.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. As part of the annual nominations process to panels, boards and forums, the executive considered nominations to the Admissions Forum at its meeting on June 23 2009. The executive appointed three local authority representatives (Councillors Toby Eckersley, Nick Stanton and Veronica Ward) to the Admissions Forum for 2009-10 based on the number of nominations that were submitted in the 2008-09 year.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

3. It has since transpired that the revised School Admissions Code (February 2009) made changes to the size, role and membership of the Admissions Forum and now limits the overall number of representatives to a maximum of 20 and local authority representatives to no more than two. The executive is therefore asked to reconsider its nominations and appoint up to two representatives, instead of three in order to comply with the requirements of the revised code.
4. It is for the executive to agree the nomination of places to panels, boards and forums in connection with the functions that are the responsibility of the executive (i.e. housing, education, social serves, regeneration etc).

## Statutory role of admissions forums

5. The statutory role of the Admissions Forum as set out in the Schools Admissions Code is 'to have a key role in ensuring a fair admissions system that promotes social equity'. Part of the role is to advise local authorities and admission authorities on matters relating to school admissions.
6. Admission Forums must:
  - a) consider how well existing and proposed admission arrangements serve the interests of children and parents within the area of the local authority;
  - b) promote agreement on admission issues;

- c) review the comprehensiveness, effectiveness within the local context, and accessibility of advice and guidance for parents by the local authority, both through the published composite prospectus and the delivery of Choice Advice within the area of the forum;
- d) consider the effectiveness of the authority's proposed co-ordinated admission arrangements, and advise on whether the authority's proposed co-ordinated admission arrangements differ substantially from the previous year;
- e) consider the means by which admissions processes might be improved and how actual admissions relate to the admission numbers published.
- f) Monitor the admission of children who arrive in the authority's area outside a normal round with a view to promoting arrangements for the fair distribution of such children among local schools, taking account of any preference expressed.
- g) Promote the arrangements for children with special educational needs, children in care and children who have been excluded from school;
- h) Monitor the effectiveness of local authority Fair Access Protocols; and,
- i) Consider any other admissions issues that arise.

#### **Community impact statement**

- 8. There are no specific community impact issues arising from the recommendations.

#### **Resource implications**

- 7. There are no specific resource implications.

#### **Consultation**

- 8. The political group whips were invited to put forward nominations as part of the annual nominations process in June 2009. The whips have been notified of the requirement to reduce the local authority representation.

#### **REASONS FOR URGENCY**

- 9. The local authority is required to report to the Schools Adjudicator on the membership of the Admissions Forum and the Schools Adjudicator should refer matters concerning membership and the prescribed maximum limit of an Admissions Forum to the Secretary of State where they do not comply. It is therefore desirable that the local authority representation issue is addressed as soon as possible.

**REASONS FOR LATENESS**

10. It was initially thought possible that the matter could be addressed without needing to seek further executive approval. However after further consideration, it was deemed that a decision on the matter by the executive was required. The decision to include the matter on the executive agenda was taken very close to the deadline for the agenda despatch. It has not been possible to carry out internal consultation and report preparation in time for the agenda despatch.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
School Admissions Code (February 2009)	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221
Executive Agenda and Minutes – June 23 2009	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221

**APPENDICES**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>
	None.

**AUDIT TRAIL**

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	
<b>Report Author</b>	Everton Roberts, Constitutional Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	December 9 2009	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Strategic Director of Children's Services	Yes	No comments
<b>Executive Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team</b>	December 10 2009	



This page is intentionally blank.

**EXECUTIVE AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST****MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009-10**

**NOTE:** Original held by Constitutional Team; all amendments/queries to  
Paula Thornton/Everton Roberts Tel: 020 7525 4395/7221

To	Copies	To	Copies
<b>Executive Members</b>	1 each	<b>Officers</b>	
N Stanton / K Humphreys / P Kyriacou		Constitutional Team, Tooley Street	4
L Manchester / T McNally / A Morris		Doreen Forrester-Brown	1
D Noakes / P Noblet / L Rajan / L Robinson			
<b>Other Councillors</b>	1 each	<b>Trade Unions</b>	
F Colley / A Lasaki / T Eckersley / J Friary		Roy Fielding, GMB	1
B Hargrove / J Salmon / R Thomas / V Ward		Mick Young, TGWU/ACTS	1
L Zuleta / P John / P Bates		Euan Cameron, Unison	1
<b>Political Assistants</b>		Tony O'Brien, UCATT	1
Dan Falchicov, Liberal Democrat Group	1	Michael Davern, NUT	1
Political Assistant		James Lewis, NASUWT	1
John Bibby, Labour Group Political Assistant	1	Pat Reeves, ATL	1
<b>Libraries</b>	1 each	Sylvia Morriss, NAHT	1
Albion / Camberwell / Dulwich / Newington		Irene Bishop, SHA	1
Peckham / Local Studies Library			
<b>Press</b>		<b>Others</b>	
Southwark News	1	Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission	1
South London Press	1	Robin Campbell, Press Office	1
<b>Members of Parliament</b>		Constitutional Officer	20
Harriet Harman, MP	1	<b>Total:</b>	<b>77</b>
Tessa Jowell, MP	1		
Simon Hughes, MP	1		
<b>Corporate Management Team</b>			
Annie Shepperd	1		
Romi Bowen	1		
Deborah Collins	1		
Gill Davies	1		
Eleanor Kelly	1		
Richard Rawes	1		
Susanna White	1		
Duncan Whitfield	1		
		<b>Dated:</b> 06/10/09	