

Council Assembly

Wednesday 1 December 2010

7.00 pm

Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Supplemental Agenda No.1

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
2.	Minutes To approve as a correct record the Open minutes of the council assembly meeting held on 20 October 2010.	1 - 39
6.	Members' Question Time Addendum report.	40

Contact

Lesley John on 020 7525 7228 or email: lesley.john@southwark.gov.uk;
sean.usher@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 23 November 2010



Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting) held on Wednesday 20 October 2010 at 7.00 pm at Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor for 2010/11, Councillor Tayo Situ (Chair)

Councillor Kevin Ahern	Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor James Barber	Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Catherine Bowman	Councillor Catherine McDonald
Councillor Michael Bukola	Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor Denise Capstick	Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Sunil Chopra	Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor Poddy Clark	Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Neil Coyle	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Patrick Diamond	Councillor Helen Morrissey
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Nick Dolezal	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Gavin Edwards	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor John Friary	Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Dan Garfield	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Mark Gattleson	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Stephen Govier	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Renata Hamvas	Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Althea Smith
Councillor Helen Hayes	Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Claire Hickson	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Geoffrey Thornton
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor Peter John	Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor Paul Kyriacou	

1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1.1 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Mayor invited everyone to a conference that he was hosting in celebration of Black History Month on 30 October. All proceeds from the conference will go to the Mayor's charity appeal in aid of Macmillan Cancer Support.

The Mayor announced that former Mayor of Southwark, Hilary Wines, had passed away on 12 August. He explained that Hilary was first elected to Cathedral ward in 1986. She was re-elected a further three times and was Mayor for the 2001/02 municipal year, after which she left the council.

Thereafter Councillors Ian Wingfield, Nick Stanton and Toby Eckersley paid tribute.

The Mayor also announced the death of Her Majesty's Coroner John Sampson, who died peacefully on Friday 16 July following an illness. John was appointed Coroner in 2005 for the London Inner South district, which comprises Southwark and its neighbouring boroughs.

The meeting then stood for a minute's silence.

1.2 NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE MAYOR DEEMS URGENT

The Mayor announced that there was one urgent item of business:

- Report from the Southwark Democracy Commission.

The Mayor announced that the following items had been circulated:

- Late deputation request from Southwark Trades Council, set out in supplemental agenda 3
- Late Motion and Amendment on the Comprehensive Spending Review, circulated at the meeting
- Late deputation request - King's Stairs Gardens, circulated at the meeting.

At this juncture Councillor Nick Dolezal, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11 (m), the following rules be suspended in order that the late motion on Police Numbers in Southwark could be considered:

- CAPR 2.9 (3) - Notice for motions to be delivered.

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

Councillor Nick Dolezal, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11 (m), the following rules be suspended in order that the late deputation request from Southwark Trades Council could be considered:

- CAPR 2.6 (4) – scope of deputations – referral to the relevant decision making body
- CAPR 2.6 (7) – Deadline for receipt of deputations
- CAPR 1.5 (b) – Variation in the order of business to enable the deputation to be considered after public question time.

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

Councillor Nick Dolezal, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11 (m), the following rules be suspended in order that the late deputation request - King's Stairs Gardens could be considered:

- CAPR 2.6 (7) – Deadline for receipt of deputations
- CAPR 2.6 (4) – scope of deputations – referral to the relevant decision making body
- CAPR 1.5 (b) – Variation in the order of business in order to allow motion 9.3 to be considered after the late deputation on King's Stairs Garden.

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

Councillor Nick Dolezal, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved that under council assembly procedure rule 1.11 (m), the following rules be suspended in order that the late motion on the Comprehensive Spending Review could be considered:

- CAPR 1.5 (b) – Variation in the order of business in order to allow the motion to be considered after the late deputation on Southwark Trades Council.
- CAPR 2.9 (3 & 4) – Deadline for receipt of motions and amendments.

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

1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

2. MINUTES

Report: See supplemental agenda 1, pages 1-46

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2010 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

3. PETITIONS

There were none.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Report: See pages 1-2 of the main agenda and pages 1-2 of the lilac circulated at the meeting

One member of the public submitted a written question, the answer to which was circulated on lilac paper at the meeting. The public questioner asked a supplemental question of the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management. The questions and answers are attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

Report: See pages 2-8 of the main agenda and page 1-19 of the yellow pages circulated at the meeting

There was one urgent question to the leader, the answer to which was circulated on blue paper at the meeting. The leader answered a supplementary question, the answer is attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.

There were 45 members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper. The order of business having been varied earlier in the meeting meant that the guillotine fell shortly after the commencement of members' question time therefore there were five questions dealt with, the answers to which are attached as Appendix 3 to the minutes.

6. REPORT(S) FOR DECISION FROM THE CABINET

6.1 REPORT OF STAGE 1 OF THE DEMOCRACY COMMISSION

Report: See supplemental agenda 2, pages 1-54

The report had not been circulated five clear working days in advance of the meeting. The report was accepted by the Mayor as urgent business because the cabinet was due to consider a report on the councils' future accommodation strategy in November and this item would need to be informed by decisions made by the Democracy Commission that have a bearing on future accommodation requirements. The report was late as the commission had only meet on 8 October 2010 and it was not possible to circulate this report on the main agenda.

Following an earlier variation in the order of business, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.10(3) & (4) the report was afford up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The Mayor informed councillors that the cabinet had considered the same report on the previous evening, 19 October 2010, and had endorsed the recommendations of the Democracy Commission.

The chair of Southwark Democracy Commission, Councillor Abdul Mohamed, presented the report.

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, seconded by Councillor Columba Blango, moved Amendment A.

Following debate (Councillor Peter John), the Mayor announced that the 15 minutes allocated to the consideration of the report had elapsed.

Amendment A was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

Councillors Paul Noblet and Jeff Hook, formally moved and seconded Amendment B. Amendment B was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

Councillors Columba Blango and Anood Al-Samerai, formally moved and seconded Amendment C. Amendment C was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

Councillors Catherine Bowman and David Noakes formally moved and seconded Amendment D. Amendment D was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

Councillors Lisa Rajan and Catherine Bowman formally moved and seconded Amendment E. Amendment E was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the report of the Democracy Commission be noted.
2. That the cabinet recommendation of 19 October 2010 be noted.
3. That the recommendations of the Democracy Commission be agreed (see Appendix 4 of the report).
4. That the cabinet be tasked with producing an implementation plan that fully considers the resource implications of the commission's recommendations.

7. REPORT(S) FOR INFORMATION FROM THE CABINET

7.1 REPORT BACK ON MOTIONS REFERRED TO CABINET FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Report: See main agenda, pages 9-14

Following a variation in the order of business earlier in the meeting, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

8. OTHER REPORTS**8.1 ADOPTION OF SCHEDULE 3 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1982 AS AMENDED BY SECTION 27 OF THE POLICING AND CRIME ACT 2009 - LICENSING OF SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUES**

Report: See main agenda, pages 15-23

Following a variation in the order of business earlier in the meeting, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.10(3) & (4) the report was afford up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The chair of the licensing committee, Councillor Lorraine Lauder, presented the report.

The recommendations were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That the recommendation of the licensing committee be agreed and Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, as amended by section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009, be adopted so as to provide a local licensing regime for the licensing of sexual entertainment venues, with the first appointed date being 1 April 2011.

8.2 GAMBLING ACT 2005 - THREE YEAR REVISION OF SOUTHWARK STATEMENT OF GAMBLING LICENSING POLICY

Report: See main agenda, pages 24-93

Following a variation in the order of business earlier in the meeting, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.10 (3) & (4) the report was afford up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The chair of the licensing committee, Councillor Lorraine Lauder, presented the report.

Following debate (Councillors John Friary, Graham Neale, Barrie Hargrove and Adele Morris), the recommendations were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That the recommendation of the licensing committee be agreed and the revised Southwark statement of gambling licensing policy for 2010 – 2013 be adopted with effect from 1 December 2010.

8.3 MEMBER AND OFFICER PROTOCOL UPDATE

Report: See main agenda, pages 94-96

Following a variation in the order of business earlier in the meeting, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.10 (3) & (4) the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The recommendations were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed revisions to clauses 45 to 47 of the member and officer protocol set out in paragraph 5 of the report be agreed.

8.4 CHANGES TO SCHEME OF DELEGATION - PLANNING COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY COUNCILS - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

Report: See main agenda, pages 97-103

Following a variation in the order of business earlier in the meeting, this report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.10 (3) & (4) the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The recommendations were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:

1. That the cabinet resolution of 15 June 2010 to ask council assembly to amend Part 3F: Planning Committee and Part 3H: Community Councils of the Southwark Constitution to make constitutional amendments on the reporting of enforcement matters be noted.
2. That the consideration and implementation of recommendations 10 and 11 of the scrutiny sub-committee's planning enforcement review report as requested by the cabinet's resolution made on 15 June 2010 (see paragraphs 5 and 7 of the report), be noted.
3. That the constitutional changes recommended by the constitutional steering panel to Part 3F: Planning Committee and Part 3H: Community Councils, as set out in paragraphs 13 and 18 of the report, be adopted.

9. MOTIONS

9.1 MOTION 1: FREE SCHOOL BREAKFASTS

Report: See main agenda, page 105

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Lewis Robinson and Michael Mitchell, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors Rosie Shimell and David Hubber, formally moved and seconded Amendment F. Amendment F was put to the vote and declared to be lost.

Councillors Catherine McDonald and Nick Dolezal, formally moved and seconded Amendment G. Amendment G was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

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

RESOLVED:

That council assembly notes:

1. The current administration's manifesto commitment to provide a "free healthy school meal" for every primary school child studying in the borough.
2. That officers are currently working on proposals and costs to implement this commitment.

That council assembly believes:

3. There is a considerable body of evidence, both academic and within the education profession in our borough, supporting the introduction of "breakfast clubs", especially in primary schools. This has mainly been driven by concerns that a substantial proportion of pupils are not eating breakfast and arriving at school hungry, impacting on learning and behaviour during the school day. Breakfast clubs have a wider impact in assisting pupils to arrive at school on time and provide a safe and calm environment before the school day.
4. Evaluations have taken place in inner city boroughs similar to Southwark (Camden, Haringey and Lambeth in particular) where schools participating believed that benefits derived were: children no longer hungry at the start of the school day; more focused on their work; improved punctuality and less unauthorised absences. It was also concluded that the introduction of a "breakfast club" in schools in deprived neighbourhoods was associated with an improvement in pupils' Key Stage 2 average point score.

That council assembly therefore requests the cabinet:

5. Many of our schools in Southwark have different needs and circumstances. It is often the headteachers, the education professionals at each school, who best understand the needs of their schools pupils rather than politicians.
6. Council assembly calls on the cabinet member for children and young people to explore with officers whether the provision of free breakfasts would be more appropriate than free lunches across the borough and the feasibility of allowing schools to choose themselves and to report back to councillors.
7. Council assembly welcomes cross-party support for the principle of universal free

school meals.

Note: This motion will be referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

9.2 MOTION 2: LABOUR'S BROKEN ELECTION PLEDGE

Report: See main agenda, pages 105-107

The clerk advised that motion 9.2 had been revised as paragraph 4(2) of the original motion had fallen. This was because it was very similar to the motion and amendment considered by council assembly at the July 2010 meeting. Council assembly procedure rule 1.9 states that motions to rescind a previous decision or similar to a motion previously rejected in the previous six months require a notice signed by at least 16 members. In accordance with rule 1.9(3) the notice must be received four clear working days in advance of the meeting. The notice was not received by the deadline, therefore that section of the motion fell. The remaining parts of the motion could be debated.

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Anood Al-Samerai and Paul Noblet, formally moved and seconded the revised motion.

Councillors Cleo Soanes and Gavin Edwards, formally moved and seconded Amendment H. Amendment H was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the title of the motion be deleted and the following title inserted:

“Labour’s record in office so far and the Liberal Democrats’ broken election promises.”
2. That council assembly notes that since the elections in May Labour has, in line with its manifesto:
 - Signed a deal guaranteeing a minimum level of affordable housing at Elephant & Castle and made progress on the swimming pool and demolition of the shopping centre
 - Saved Nursery Row Park and Brayards Green in line with our commitment to value green spaces
 - Cut special responsibility allowances (SRAs) by the same amount that they were increased by the last administration
 - Put in place tough new restrictions on consultancy spending
 - Started a budget consultation as part of our commitment to open up the budgeting process
 - Made every fire risk assessment publicly available
 - Hired a new housing director for the new housing department
 - Started to pilot our dedicated line for social care queries
 - Extended CCTV coverage

- Consulted on our new charter of rights for people who need social care
 - Worked with other boroughs to see what savings can be achieved through cooperative working.
3. That council assembly notes that in the coming months Labour will, in line with its manifesto, at the very least:
- Set out how we will make every home warm, dry and safe
 - Open two air quality monitoring stations
 - Launch the teen pregnancy commission
 - Publish news on the violent crime strategy
 - Continue to consult on the budget, in spite of the coalition government's cuts.
4. That council assembly notes that in contrast to this record of achievement, the last Liberal Democrat council administration left office with at least 50 of its election pledges unfulfilled.
5. That council assembly further notes the Liberal Democrats significant broken manifesto promises since entering a coalition government with the Tories, not least on:
- the scale and speed of spending cuts
 - the hike in the level of VAT
 - the hike in tuition fees, which every Liberal Democrat MP pledged to oppose.
6. That council assembly calls on the cabinet to continue to meet its election obligations, despite the Tory/Liberal Democrat cuts.

Note: This motion will be referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

9.3 MOTION 3: THAMES WATER SEWAGE TUNNEL

Report: See main agenda, page 107

Following a variation in the order of business, the motion was considered prior to the guillotine having fallen. The meeting had heard a deputation from King's Stairs Gardens (see item 14).

In respect of a point of order from Councillor Peter John, the strategic director of communities, law and governance provided legal advice to members of the planning committee on predetermination if a similar issue should later appear at the planning committee. Thereafter several members left the chamber for the duration of the debate and vote on the motion.

Councillor Wilma Nelson, seconded by Councillor Eliza Mann, moved the motion.

Councillor Catherine Bowman made a point of order, stating that the Liberal Democrat group would be in agreement to Amendment I with the following alteration:

In the first line after “to date” insert “and will continue to make”

The mover and seconder of Amendment I, Councillors Barrie Hargrove and Fiona Colley, were supportive of the suggested change to Amendment I. The meeting consented to the revision to Amendment I. Thereafter revised Amendment I was moved and seconded.

Following debate (Councillors Anood Al-Samerai and Andy Simmons), legal advice was given on the use of council assembly procedure rule 1.13 (5) (right to require individual vote to be recorded).

Revised Amendment I was put to the vote and was declared to be carried.

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

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.13 (5) the following members requested that their vote in favour of the revised amendment and substantive motion be recorded in the minutes: Councillors Kevin Ahern, Anood Al-Samerai, James Barber, Catherine Bowman, Michael Bukola, Denise Capstick, Poddy Clark, Fiona Colley, Patrick Diamond, Dora Dixon-Fyle, Toby Eckersley, Gavin Edwards, John Friary, Mark Gattleson, Stephen Govier, Renata Hamvas, Barrie Hargrove, Helen Hayes, David Hubber, Peter John, Lorraine Lauder, Richard Livingstone, Linda Manchester, Eliza Mann, Catherine McDonald, Tim McNally, Darren Merrill, Victoria Mills, Jonathan Mitchell, Michael Mitchell, Abdul Mohamed, Adele Morris, Helen Morrissey, Graham Neale, Wilma Nelson, David Noakes, Paul Noblet, the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole, Lisa Rajan, Lewis Robinson, Martin Seaton, Rosie Shimell, Tayo Situ, Andy Simmons, Cleo Soanes, Geoffrey Thornton, Veronica Ward and Ian Wingfield.

RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly notes the proposal by Thames Water to close King’s Stairs gardens for seven years and the Alfred Salter playground, Druid Street, for two years for the construction of the new Thames Tunnel.
2. That council assembly further notes that if the Thames Water proposals go ahead both sites will be used to construct massive permanent sewage ventilation towers with significant loss of local green space and residential amenity.
3. That council assembly supports the Thames Tunnel scheme, but believes these two sites – which provide welcome recreational and green spaces in some of the most densely populated parts of the capital – are entirely inappropriate for the task of constructing a major infrastructure project.
4. That council assembly supports the progress that the cabinet and community have made to date and will continue to make in finding less environmentally damaging alternative sites by lobbying Thames Water and calls on Simon Hughes MP to use his influence over ministers in government to find such alternative sites.

Note: This motion will be referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

10. LATE MOTION: POLICE NUMBERS IN SOUTHWARK

Report: See main agenda, pages 109-110

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors John Friary and Claire Hickson, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors Wilma Nelson and Linda Manchester, formally moved and seconded Amendment J. Amendment J was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly notes the work of Southwark 1000 police campaign in its ongoing efforts to secure increased police numbers for the borough. It notes the campaign's cross party nature.
2. That council assembly notes that the Metropolitan Police will not be protected from the government's spending cuts.
3. That council assembly notes that the Police Federation estimated on 10 September 2010 that the Metropolitan Police could be forced to axe 4000 police officers across London as a result of the cuts.
4. That council assembly notes that, in contrast, to police cuts under the Tories and Liberal Democrats, the Metropolitan Police grew from 25,400 officers at the turn of the millennium to 31,000 this year, with a corresponding drop in crime.
5. That council assembly believes that cuts in police officer numbers in Southwark will put local resident's safety at risk.
6. That council assembly therefore calls on all Southwark's MPs to vote against police cuts. It calls on Simon Hughes, the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrats, to campaign against cuts that will see officer numbers drop in Southwark.

11. AMENDMENTS

The amendments are set out in supplemental agenda 3, pages 1-7.

12. LATE DEPUTATION REQUEST - SOUTHWARK TRADES COUNCIL

Report: See supplemental agenda 3, pages 8-9

Following a variation in the order of business, the deputation was considered prior to the guillotine having fallen.

RESOLVED:

That the deputation be received.

Councillors Paul Noblet and Tim McNally asked questions of the deputation.

The meeting then debated the late motion on the comprehensive spending review (see item 13).

13. LATE MOTION AND AMENDMENT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW

Report: See white paper circulated at the meeting, pages 1-3

Following a variation in the order of business, the late motion was considered after the late deputation from Southwark Trades Council, and prior to the guillotine having fallen.

Councillor Mark Glover, seconded by Councillor Helen Morrissey, moved the late motion.

Councillor Paul Noblet, seconded by Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, moved the late amendment.

Following debate (Councillors Peter John, Tim McNally, Richard Livingstone, Catherine Bowman, Gavin Edwards, Lewis Robinson, Mark Gettleson, Nick Dolezal, Geoffrey Thornton, John Friary, Michael Bukola, Patrick Diamond, David Noakes, Catherine Bowman, Rosie Shimell, Neil Coyle, Nick Stanton, Andy Simmons, Graham Neale and Ian Wingfield), a procedural motion was moved by Councillor Lisa Rajan and seconded that the question be put. The procedure motion was put to the vote and was declared to be carried.

Councillor Mark Glover exercised his right of reply. Thereafter the late amendment was put to the vote and was declared to be lost.

Following debate (Councillors Toby Eckersely and Paul Noblet), Councillor Nick Dolezal, seconded by Councillor Peter John, moved to the vote. The procedure motion was put to the vote and was declared to be carried.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly notes the publication of the coalition government's comprehensive spending review (CSR) today and the bigger than expected 28% cuts which will be made to the council's budget as a result.
2. That council assembly notes other announced changes with concern, including cuts of 60% to capital budgets for new housing and for rents for new council tenants to be increased to 80% of market value. This would mean an average rent of £1,358 a month for a two-bedroom flat in SE1, not only will this be pricing young families out of the borough, but also creating an impediment to the housing moves needed for Southwark's regeneration projects.
3. That council assembly does not believe that the cuts brought forward within the CSR

needed to be so deep or so quick. An alternative approach could have been adopted.

4. That council assembly welcomes the commitment of the Southwark cabinet to making the budget process open and transparent and the budget principles which have been agreed.
5. That council assembly calls on the cabinet to continue to make the case against the cuts with the government and coalition MPs, but to prepare a budget within the financial constraints imposed by the government in the interests of the residents of Southwark.

Note: This motion will be referred as a recommendation to the cabinet for consideration.

14. LATE DEPUTATION REQUEST - KING'S STAIRS GARDENS

Report See white paper circulated at the meeting, pages 1-2

Following a variation in the order of business, the deputation was considered prior to the guillotine having fallen.

RESOLVED:

That the deputation be received.

Councillors Peter John, Columba Blango, Fiona Colley, Jeff Hook, Richard Livingstone and Barry Hargrove asked questions of the deputation.

The meeting then debated motion 9.3 – Thames Water sewage tunnel.

The meeting closed at 10.43pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**(ORDINARY)****WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2010****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****1. QUESTION FROM SHEILA FAIRFIELD TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT**

Would the cabinet member for housing confirm that the promised security works on the Four Squares Estate will be completed across the whole estate as planned?

RESPONSE

Due to overspending and decisions made before May 2010 there is no current funding for security works in the current two year programme through to 2012. The priorities for future investment in the council's stock will be considered by the cabinet in November 2010, including these security works. Residents will be fully consulted, between November and February 2011 with a final post consultation report back to the cabinet in April 2011 to enable future investment programmes to be finalised. You will be able to feed in your views into this wider consultation before the future programme is agreed by cabinet.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM SHEILA FAIRFIELD TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT

Thank you for seeing us yesterday at cabinet, in that meeting we gave you evidence that no decision had been made to stop security works. Please could you tell us what you are doing to investigate the conflicting information that councillors and residents have been given by officers and the question asked about leaseholder contributions. Thank you.

RESPONSE

Thank you for that supplemental question, yes as you rightly say we met yesterday at the cabinet meeting and it became quite clear to all of us at that meeting that there was a certain amount of confusion over the responses that we had been given at various stages indeed evidence was provided during that meeting to that effect. Therefore the cabinet agreed with Councillor Hargrove's suggestion that the whole matter should be referred to the housing scrutiny committee for it to investigate in full detail as to the background and to exactly what did or did not happen at what particular times. And I am anxious just as much as anybody else to get to the bottom of that as quickly as possible. In relation to the leaseholders and to the security works etc. I have raised that question with the officers as I promised I would do yesterday and I am still waiting for that particular feedback but what I will say to you is absolutely clear is that next month when the cabinet does meet the cabinet will consider what the decent homes programme will be and as part of that consideration we will look very seriously at the situation with your security works. I can't give a clearer

commitment here this evening because obviously we have got to be fair to everybody else in the borough when we consider the decent homes programme and other capital investment when the cabinet meets next week, so as much as I would like to say yes to you this evening, unfortunately I can't because I would be being unfair to others. But I am giving you that solemn commitment we will be looking at it next month and we will give you a definite response month. So thank you again.

SOUTHWARK COUNCIL**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2010****URGENT QUESTION****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Given that officers have removed all financial references from the Liberal Democrat motion preventing full debate at tonight assembly meeting, failed to table a question from an opposition councillor for an unspecified yet confidential reason and issued advice threatening councillors with standards boards investigation if they speak out, what does this say about his commitment to running an administration with 'empathy, openness and trust' and would it be fair to conclude that officers are running the council, not politicians?

RESPONSE

The rules relating to confidential information are there for good reasons. When companies enter into agreements with the council they need to be confident that the council will take commercial confidentiality seriously. Failure to follow those rules jeopardises our reputation as a council to do business with. All councillors therefore have obligations under the code of conduct to maintain that confidentiality. Similarly officers are under an obligation to follow processes designed to protect confidential information. This relates both to questions and to motions.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Thank you very much Mr Mayor and thank you to the leader for his answer. I am a bit troubled, it doesn't really answer the question and I am concerned opposition is being stifled. You won't let us ask questions about the sum lost at the Elephant, the money which belongs to the public. You won't let us ask questions about the conduct of the chair of planning who has been incredibly rude to members of the public. And I just can't understand is it you gagging us or is it officers running the council.

RESPONSE

Well Mr Mayor I don't think it is either and I think if Councillor Al-Samerai reads her constitution she will understand why particular rulings are given and advice is offered to opposition members. I think it is important that we do all as councillors recognise our important duty not to compromise very important contracts, commercially sensitive contracts, that this council enters into and I think that the unwise use of information at the last meeting was a matter to be regretted. I don't think it is really helping the situation, coming back meeting after meeting saying we broke the rules last time why are you trying to gag us this time. I really do think it is time Liberal Democrat members read their constitution and familiarised themselves with the code of conduct which deals specifically actually with the question which you raised, in the second part of the

question you raised and familiarise yourself with those rules. I think that is the proper answer.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**(ORDINARY)****WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2010****MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME****1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Given the new leader of the opposition Ed Milliband has said that the previous Labour government was wrong on Iraq, wrong on civil liberties and wrong on immigration, does he have any regrets about the pledges in the manifesto of the current council administration and how can he reassure council assembly that his successor in four years time won't be apologising on his behalf?

RESPONSE

I am proud of every pledge in our election manifesto and believe that Southwark Labour will not need to apologise as it delivers on those pledges, which were resoundingly endorsed by the electors in May.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANNOD AL-SAMERAI

Thank you very much Mr Mayor and thank you to the leader for his other answer. I am just curious as to whether he thinks Labour were wrong on Iraq, on civil liberties and on immigration and whether he thinks they were wrong to leave every man, women and child £22,400 pounds in debt in this country?

RESPONSE

Of course I am a leadership loyalist so whatever my party leader says must be the party line. I maybe wouldn't have gone as far as the new leader on certain points which he made. As for the debt and the deficit I think that is an issue which we debated thoroughly earlier on and the reasons for us getting to that point. I don't regret the fact that we have new hospitals across our country, I don't regret the fact that we have new schools across our borough, I don't regret the fact that we have made some infrastructure improvements which the last government for 18 years failed to do. So no I have no regrets on those matters but of course I support our national party leader in all things.

2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR VIKKI MILLS

What work has been done in preparation for the comprehensive spending review?

RESPONSE

We have taken a structured approach, which has combined making clear our opposition to the scale and speed of the cuts and taking the necessary measures to ensure that we as a council are able carry on delivering for our residents should we be forced by government to implement them.

We have looked and continue to look for savings. Some of these savings have been achieved by cutting down on the excesses of the past, by introducing tough new rules on consultants and cutting members' allowances, for example. Other developing savings are

more innovative and will be secured by transforming the way we work as a council. We are continuing to explore how we can cooperate with other boroughs to make savings by working more closely together.

But we know that tough decisions are inevitable and that we are going to be forced to make cuts to services that are doing a good job, despite any savings we make through innovation or cutting waste. That is why we have also set out the principles that are going to direct us through the coming budgeting process, so that our residents, partners, stakeholders and staff can understand the reasons behind our decision-making and the way those decisions will be made.

We know that the period ahead will be challenging, unsettling and painful, but I believe we have prepared in the right way to take the council and the borough through the cuts, to work towards a fairer future.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR VIKKI MILLS

I would like to thank Councillor John for his answer I appreciate we have debated the comprehensive spending review at length so just very quickly now that we have got the headline figures is there any further reaction that you can provide for what it means for Southwark?

RESPONSE

Well I would like to thank Councillor Mills. Obviously it is as I indicated earlier very bad news for Southwark taking together with all of the other factors the nationally imposed factors which effect us, whatever decisions we take at a local level here in Southwark. What I can say to members right across this chamber is we will work incredibly hard to ensure that those who are our most vulnerable residents in our borough are protected from the harshness of these cuts and we will do all that we can as an employer to ensure that we keep as many people in work providing those front line services to our most vulnerable residents. I had hoped, I suppose a faint hope that things weren't going to be as bad as 25% in terms of cuts when I had heard that the Ministry of Defence got away with something like 8%. So I was truly horrified, I really was to see 28.4% announced by the Chancellor this morning and even more horrified when I had the letter from Eric Pickles saying it is going to be a 30% cut. I mean the reality is and everybody must recognise this we simply cannot do the same amount of work, we cannot provide the same services, the same provision for residents of our borough if we are receiving 30% less grant from central government. I hear what Councillor Eckersley said earlier on on the point about figures being misleading but I think we as a borough who are so heavily reliant on government grant will not benefit in the way in which Eric Pickles indicates in his letters. I think we are going to be hit far more harshly than the 14% Eric Pickles says is the average that councils are going to suffer when you take council tax into account. I can't work out any figure which gets us below 25% even taking into account of council tax. So these are very serious and very harsh cuts which we will be facing and I do hope all members take that into account right across the chamber in future and don't come here and ask the administration to deliver things which are simply impossible given the funding crisis we now face.

3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL

How many children are educated at Southwark primary schools whose home address is in:

- a) Lambeth?
- b) Lewisham?

RESPONSE

The headcount of children on roll at Southwark local authority maintained primary schools (excluding academies) was 22,385 in January 2010, including those children in nursery classes at primary school.

Of those children, 22,099 were matched to their borough of residence. The home boroughs with over 100 pupils are:

Home LA	Number of pupils	Percentage
Southwark	19904	90.1%
Lewisham	1070	4.8%
Lambeth	886	4.0%
Other	239	1.1%

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL

I would like to thank Councillor John for his answer and ask him whether he could advise me under the Labour proposals for universal free school meals how many of these children whose home addresses are in Lewisham and Lambeth will be eligible for free school meals at the expense of the Southwark Council tax payer?

RESPONSE

We are going to be looking at all sorts of issues relating to this policy in the pilot which we are going to be rolling out in the New Year. I think it is a good policy it is needed now more than ever and I think we as a responsible council are trying to help children to meet the two problems of childhood obesity and ensuring that every child has a healthy meal during the course of the day. These are things that we should be doing as a progressive Labour council borough. In this I am very proud of the pledge that we have made.

More than 90% of the children who will benefit from this policy will be Southwark residents I hope the success of our policy here in Southwark as we roll it out will encourage our colleagues in Lambeth and Lewisham to look to adopting this policy also so any inequities that you might think exist in the policy at this stage will be ironed out in the future. That's what I certainly hope. I think it is a good policy, its a necessary pledge at this time and I am very pleased that we are going to be delivering on it.

4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER

Has the leader yet received a response from Eric Pickles to his offer to visit him and make Southwark's case?

RESPONSE

Yes I have. On 15 September, two months after inviting the secretary of state to visit Southwark to see the impact that significant cuts would have, he replied to say that "diary pressures" meant that he could not attend. The day before he attended a meeting with the Mayor of London at City Hall. On 20 September I sent a letter to Mr Pickles asking if he is willing to accept a delegation from Southwark, so that we can go to him to make our case, but he has not yet responded.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER

I would like to thank the leader for his answer but we do seem again to be in a bit of a pickle here. How does he feel the Secretary of State's answer compares with the Secretary of

State's remarks? His door is always open and councils only need to knock or pickup the pen or fire off an email. Particularly important I imagine after today's announcement.

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Glover for his supplementary question. What I think you do have to question is the seriousness of Eric Pickles' offer. I wrote to him inviting him to come to Southwark because I thought it would be useful for him to see the impact which cuts of 25% would have on some of the most vulnerable groups in our society not just here in Southwark. When he said he couldn't make it because he was too busy, despite the fact he had a meeting over at City Hall the day after he sent me the letter so he could have walked over to Tooley Street, but there we are. I offered to go and visit him and raise the same points I haven't had an answer regrettably to that letter so you do have to wonder whether Eric Pickles is serious about having an open dialogue with council leaders on the issues which he is dealing with as Secretary of State.

5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM MCNALLY

On 1 September he wrote on his blog about Ed Miliband that "his time has not yet arrived". What does it say about his judgement as leader of the council?

RESPONSE

Nothing. I publicly endorsed David Miliband's campaign because I thought he was the best of the candidates. I support Ed Miliband's leadership completely because I believe in our shared Labour values and believe that he will do an excellent job.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY

Thank you Mr Mayor I would like to thank the leader of the council for his answer. I would like to ask him what does it say about his judgement that of the team he fielded in the May elections this year he has one councillor in court accused of serious benefit fraud and another one referred for investigation by the standards committee.

RESPONSE

On the second point again I am going to say to Council McNally this is the second meeting in a row that he is in breach of the code of conduct because it is very clearly in the code of conduct that we do not have any debate and no questions raised in this chamber about issues which are subject to investigation by the standards committee. You might not like the fact that we still have the Standards Board for England and Wales in existence but it is, and it is within our code of conduct. So I really do regret the fact that for a second meeting in a row he has come in and tried to score a very cheap political point by raising an issue which he should not be raising in this chamber. We have our code of conduct, we have our constitution, for very good reasons and I think that if we are just going to ignore it for political convenience than I think this chamber will be in even more of a mess than it sometimes gets into. So that I think that is very regrettable, I don't think it says anything about my judgement, what happens when we select candidates is they go through a very rigorous interview. They have to prove their worth as candidates, sometimes sadly some things go wrong and I regret that. But I think Councillor McNally should be regretting the fact that he has breached the code of conduct for members twice in two meetings. And that is a matter that I will refer to the standards committee.

6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES

In the Labour local election manifesto the leader committed to opening up the budget making process. What has he done to meet this pledge?

RESPONSE

We have opened up the budgeting process by both publishing more information and by launching a full consultation on next years budget challenge.

In terms of publishing information, we were one of the first councils in London to publish all spending over £500. And we have made a full, formal and public cabinet decision on the seven principles that will guide our actions through the budgeting process.

Since September, members of the cabinet have been attending community council meetings, community groups and stakeholder organisation to explain the budget challenge that lies ahead and discuss our approach to the government's cuts. The second stage of this consultation will take place in November, when cabinet members will return to those meetings to discuss local residents' and groups' priorities. The third and final round of consultation will take place in the new year.

7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE

Will he commit to ring-fencing the money repatriated from the London Council's grant committee for the voluntary sector in Southwark?

RESPONSE

The London Councils grant scheme is currently under review and the outcome will not be known until November. I am currently seeking ways to ensure we can ring-fence for the voluntary sector any money that the council saves as a result of reduced contributions to the scheme.

8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR SUNIL CHOPRA

What representations has the Leader made over the proposals to construct long term worksites at the Druid Street playground and King's Stairs gardens?

RESPONSE

The cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy and I have both met with Thames Water and made several direct representations to them expressing our profound disagreement with the sites they have chosen as part of the project.

I have also spoken to Simon Hughes MP and asked him to use his influence as deputy leader of the Liberal Democrats to persuade ministers that these sites are not appropriate.

9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

Does the leader think it is appropriate for members of the cabinet to have other responsibilities either within or outside the council?

RESPONSE

Every member of the cabinet has other responsibilities, not least as ward councillors. This is as true in this administration as it was in the last. Some cabinet members are also parents, grandparents, school governors, charity trustees, carers, and some have other part-time jobs. I think the diversity of the individuals who make up the cabinet, our experience and our backgrounds, is one of our strengths and reflects the diversity of the people we represent.

10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR STEPHEN GOVIER

What innovative proposals is the leader making in order to plug the housing funding gap which was allowed to open up under the last administration?

RESPONSE

When we took office in May we discovered a £300 million funding gap and an indeterminate timetable for the decent homes programme. Even by scaling back the level of decent homes works we will continue to have a funding gap of approximately £50 million. In the circumstances we have been looking at all possible options, including a proposal to fund the gap by taking a commuted sum in lieu of on-site or off-site affordable housing at some of our prime development sites in the borough. With this premium we would have the option of meeting our commitment to make every council home warm, dry and safe, as well as building at least as much new social housing as would be provided by developers on site. This exciting proposal is potentially a unique solution to Southwark's unique housing problems. We are still at an early stage in terms of taking this proposal forward and are in discussion with the Mayor and the Greater London Authority (GLA). I hope to be able to provide members with more detailed information on this proposal shortly.

11. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS

What are the plans in terms of implementing free primary school meals for all, particularly in light of this week's announcement at the which will mean some Southwark families will lose their child benefit which may be 7 percent of their household income or more?

RESPONSE

Several decisions by the coalition government which will hit Southwark's families hard have made the introduction of free, healthy school meals in Southwark more important than ever, namely:

- Their decision to reverse the extension of free school meals to those on income support
- Their decision to freeze child benefit for all
- Their decision to cut child tax credits
- Their decision to cut Health in Pregnancy Grants
- Their decision to restrict the Sure Start Maternity Grant to firstborn children
- Their decision to scrap Child Trust Funds
- A host of other decisions that will impact on families indirectly
- And their decision to end universal child benefits

As a result we intend to introduce free healthy school meals for all primary schools in September 2011.

12. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN MORRISSEY

What impact does the cabinet member believe the government's decision to abolish the NHS Direct will have on local people?

RESPONSE

Although the health secretary, Andrew Lansley, appears to have made a u-turn on the future of NHS Direct, there are still serious concerns about what may happen to the service. The service's current effectiveness is due in part to the 1,400 fully-trained nurses who work there, and the government has not yet confirmed that all of those staff will be retained, despite their pledge to protect the NHS.

If those nurses are not retained, I would be seriously concerned that the service would deteriorate for people in the borough. As well as having a direct impact on the service for users, however, there may also be longer-term financial implications as the service is designed to cut costs for the NHS overall by reducing the burden of queries concerning minor injuries or health complaints that would otherwise fall on our GPs and hospitals.

13. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE

What effect does the cabinet member anticipate the government's emergency budget will have on adult social services in Southwark and how will the council be assessing the impact of any changes?

RESPONSE

The immediate effect of the coalition government's emergency budget in June was to make £245,000 of in-year cuts to the supporting people administration grant, which the council has been forced to find.

However, the scale of this cut is nothing in comparison to the scale of the cuts in future years called for in the budget by the chancellor, George Osborne, and which will have been detailed further in today's Comprehensive Spending Review (this answer was written before the CSR announcement). If the council is forced to make a 25% or greater cut to its overall spending then there is no way that the budget of any service, including adult social care, will be entirely protected. We are still in no position to speculate about what adult social care in Southwark will look like after the cuts, but we are committed as one of our seven budget principles to protecting the most vulnerable in our community.

A further budget principle is that we will equality impact assess all budget changes despite indications from the coalition government that councils may not be duty-bound to carry out equality impact assessments in the future.

14. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON

Please provide an update on progress against the cabinet members' manifesto commitments to introduce a social care telephone helpline and a new charter of rights for those in need of social care.

RESPONSE

We are currently rolling out a single pilot phone-line to deal with all adult social care queries in the south of the borough. Once this pilot is complete we plan to extend it to older people's services in the north and to disabled people's services. See question 19 for more detail

We are working with the community to compose a charter of rights for people in Southwark who may need social care support. We have been consulting on the charter since mid September and welcome feedback to help us shape the final version by 30 October.

15. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD

What feedback has the cabinet member received on the recent visit by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)?

RESPONSE

The review of performance meeting with CQC was held on 10 August. The outcome from this year's performance assessment will be announced on 25 November 2010.

16. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND

What impact does the cabinet member believe the abolition of primary care trusts will have on the provision of health services in Southwark? How does she believe the council's role will change following their abolition? Is she optimistic about that change?

RESPONSE

It is too early to tell what the impact of the changes to health that the coalition government are currently consulting on will be. However, my impression of the proposals in the white paper is that they are not yet fully-formed and filled with uncertainty. Whilst we welcome any democratisation in health delivery and strengthening the role of local government in health provision, I am concerned that these proposals will not necessarily deliver either. Whilst we welcome the opportunity to build a closer working relationship with GPs and other health providers, we definitely don't want to overburden frontline health staff with unnecessary red-tape.

I am working and will continue to work with senior members of the PCT (NHS Southwark), officers, GPs and other stakeholders to attempt to influence and shape the proposals and their implications on local health provision. I have mixed feelings about the changes, and feel that they carry with them a considerable risk, but I am confident that the council is doing all that it can to get the best outcome for Southwark residents.

17. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES

How long does it take to review meals on wheels charges? And when will local people see the review's recommendations on how she proposes to meet Labour's commitment to halve charges for both fresh and frozen meals on wheels and what is the cost to the authority?

RESPONSE

We have a manifesto commitment to halving the price of meals on wheels. Details around the implementation of that commitment are dependent upon the outcome of the coalition government's spending review and will be made public as part of the budget process.

18. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK

Who did you work with to develop the charter of rights for people with social care needs?

RESPONSE

We are currently consulting with the community on the charter of rights and we are inviting feedback to help shape the charter by 30 October 2010. The consultation has been promoted through Community Action Southwark, the patient and public involvement network and our provider e-newsletter. It has been published on the Southwark Council website and through the local media. Staff have also been invited to give comments. We welcome feedback from local people, staff and voluntary and community groups as well as provider organisations.

19. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK

When will the dedicated care line for older and vulnerable people be set up, how much will it cost and who will run it?

RESPONSE

We are currently piloting a single phone-line to deal with all adult social care queries in the south of the borough. Once the pilot is complete a decision will be made about exactly where in the council's structure the phone line will sit. The introduction of the phone line will form part of the council's broader personalisation transformation and as a result it is not anticipated that there will be any additional costs.

20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER

Does she plan to review the eligibility criteria for adult social care?

RESPONSE

There are no current plans to review the criteria.

21. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL

Will she explain to council assembly what she is doing as part of Lambeth/Southwark joint working to ensure local people in Dulwich have services left at their local hospital for them to use given the last Labour government allowed Dulwich Hospital to fall into decay and ruin, with main services such as intermediate care taken away altogether and other outpatient services seriously reduced, blood testing withdrawn and in addition the main lift is still out of use despite a promise in November 2009 that this was only temporary?

RESPONSE

I refer the member to my response to his question at the last assembly. I am working with the primary care trust (PCT), the hospitals, local MP and other stakeholders to ensure that the Dulwich hospital site is brought back into use to assist in the medical wellbeing of local people.

I have asked the PCT to look into the problems with the lift and hope to have more information soon.

22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

Can the cabinet member please provide an update on progress to regenerate the Aylesbury estate?

RESPONSE

The Aylesbury Regeneration project is making good progress on a number of fronts.

Phase 1a

Building works are well underway on Phase 1a of the Aylesbury Regeneration Programme with L & Q (the developer). The first of the four sites comprising this phase, i.e. site A, will

be ready for occupation early next year. The numbers and types of homes comprising the four sites are set out below:

- Site A total 52 units – 37 social rent, 15 intermediate and new Aylesbury Resource Centre - January 2011
- Site B total 131 units - 36 social rent, 12 shared ownership, sale 83 - May 2012
- Site C total 18 units - 15 social rent, 3 shared ownership - May 2012
- Site D total 60 units -13 social rent, 3 shared ownership, 44 sale - late 2012

The existing buildings (Little Bradenham and the Westmoreland Road shops) known as sites B & C have now been demolished and the developer is preparing the sites for construction, which is due to commence early 2011. Construction of the last site, D, which is where the current Aylesbury Day Centre is located will begin next spring.

PFI phases – sites 1b, 1c, 8 & 9

Following submission of the interim outline business case (IOBC) to the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) at the end of July, the Aylesbury Regeneration Programme Team has been in discussions with HCA representatives concerning several issues raised by the HCA. A meeting took place last week with HCA representatives to resolve these issues; as a result, what is expected to be the final version of the IOBC will be submitted to the HCA later this month.

Rehousing Residents:

Aylesbury re-housing timeline (November 2010)

This timeline is based on the Aylesbury Action Plan and reflects the progress the council has made in securing funding and developers. These changes arise from recent council decisions, which have taken account of the resident consultation in July and also changes in national economic conditions.

Site, Block and Project Details	Tenant Re-Housing/ Leaseholder Buyback Start	Tenant Re-Housing/ Leaseholder Buyback Finish
Site 1A – Red Lion Close (1-12), Little Bradenham (1-41) Re-housing complete, demolition and building works under way		
Sites 7 and 10 - Missenden (300-313), Wolverton (1-59) Most tenants and leaseholders have moved, and the council is currently in discussion with the remaining tenants and leaseholders about future moves.	Started	2011
These sites are part of a PFI proposal to the government Site 1b - Bradenham (42-256), Chartridge (1-105)	Started	2012
Site 1c - Arklow House (1-28), Chartridge (106-149), Chiltern (1-172)	2011	2012
Sites 8 and 9 - Taplow (1-215), Northchurch (1-76), East Street (184-218)	2012	2013
Sites 4a, 4b, 5, 6 These dates are indicative at this stage and the council are	2014	2018

Site, Block and Project Details	Tenant Re-Housing/ Leaseholder Buyback Start	Tenant Re-Housing/ Leaseholder Buyback Finish
<p>working towards securing the funding for these sites. When we have more definite block timetables we will update residents. The blocks involved on these sites are:</p> <p>Wendover (1-36, 73-116,157-200), Wolverton (60-125), Brockley House (1-14), Wendover (37-72,117-156, 201-240), Wolverton (126-151), Wolverton (152-192), Wendover (241-471), Ravenstone (1-81), Albany Road (140), Foxcote (1-30), Padbury (1-25), Winslow (1-30)</p>		
<p>Sites 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 11, 12, 13, 14</p> <p>These dates are indicative at this stage and the council are working towards securing the funding for these sites. When we have more definite block timetables we will update residents. The blocks involved on these sites are:</p> <p>Lees House (1-12), Soane House (1-35), Missenden (1-299), Michael Faraday House (1-105) Inville Road (51-67), Chadwell House (1-8), Darvel House (1-8), Calverton (1-31), Danesfield (1-31), Emberton (1-35), Gaitskill House (1-66), Gayhurst (1-162), Hambledon (1-20), Latimer (1-141), Albany Road (198-202)</p>	2019	2024

Reasonable progress is being made on the active (started) blocks (sites 1b, 7 & 10). The vast majority of tenants on these sites are registered and bidding for alternative accommodation. There are several leaseholders who have applied for rehousing assistance and the remainder are in the process of negotiating with the council's property team to sell their properties back to the council.

As of 20 September 2010 the remaining residents are broken down as follows:

Site	Block Name	Block Numbers	Total Units	Secure Tenants	Leaseholders
10	Missenden	300-313	14	7	1
Sub Total			14		
7	Wolverton	1-27	27	5	12
7	Wolverton	28-59	32	13	5
Sub Total			59		
1b	Bradenham	42-256	215	113	12
1b	Chartridge	1-68	68	44	9
1b	Chartridge	69-76	8	8	0
1b	Chartridge	77-105	29	15	7
Sub Total			320		

23. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR CLAIRE HICKSON

How many affordable homes does the cabinet member believe would have been delivered as part of the Elephant and Castle regeneration agreement if she had not secured a minimum guarantee for affordable homes?

RESPONSE

It is impossible to predict with certainty how many affordable units would have been delivered without the guaranteed minimum as the number would have been determined through the Three Dragons Viability Test as part of the statutory planning process. The Three Dragons Viability Test demonstrates how much affordable housing a development can be affordable before the development becomes unviable and does not proceed.

Affordable housing within private developments at Steadmen Street and Crampton Street only achieved 22% and 24% respectively and these units were predominantly shared ownership. These were developed prior to the property crash and included only minimal contributions to local infrastructure including transport.

Lend Lease's financial model demonstrated that under the original heads of terms agreed by the previous Executive in November/December 2009, the scheme could afford approximately 10 – 15% affordable housing on its base assumptions, that is between 298 and 447 affordable homes. However this assumed Social Housing Grant (SHG) to assist delivery and in the current finance climate the availability of SHG in the future is uncertain.

The 25% minimum we have secured is not dependant on SHG and at least 50% will be for rent, this will mean at least 744 affordable homes (372 social rent). If the economic situation improves and SHG is available we would expect the planning process to deliver 35% affordable housing, 1042 affordable homes.

Whilst it is not possible to be precise about the numbers, what is clearly the case is that without a significant improvement in the economy the Heads of Terms agreed by our predecessors – which guaranteed profits rather than affordable homes – would have delivered significantly less affordable housing.

24. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL

Does the cabinet member think the decision to 'call-in' the implementation of the Tory/Liberal Democrat government's in-year spending cuts to the working neighbourhoods fund was in the public interest?

RESPONSE

Whilst respecting the right of members of overview and scrutiny committee (OSC) to call-in decisions, I do believe the call-in of the implementation of the in-year government cuts to our working neighbourhoods fund was not in the public interest.

These unprecedented cuts imposed on us by the Tory-Liberal Democrat government did mean that difficult decisions had to be taken. Whilst we were able to find more than half the money from within council resources, unfortunately some grants to voluntary and community sector (VCS) groups had to be cut.

At the call-in meeting OSC resolved that my initial decision was not referred back to me and was implementable from 26 August.

As a consequence of the call-in there was a delay in implementing the decision and the required one month termination notice was given following OSC, issuing a termination date of 15 October 2010. The projected cost of the additional two weeks into the third quarter of the contract period is £14,117.73 in additional payments to projects. This figure is still potentially subject to change following the end of contract monitoring process.

25. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON

How much did it cost to carry out the consultation on the leisure options for the Elephant and Castle?

RESPONSE

The total cost was £12,525.85 which included stakeholder and resident communications, a public consultation event, postal charges, advertisement and direct mailing services. The consultation was well received, with well over 1300 responses being received. The responses demonstrate that local people are keen to support a new leisure centre at the Elephant and Castle as well as having ideas as to what they would like contained within it.

26. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

How will the Newington Reference Library be retained and improved if Walworth Town Hall is sold off?

RESPONSE

The council has made no formal decision to sell Walworth Town Hall. In the eventuality that it is sold or leased this will have no direct impact on Newington Library as they are two totally separate buildings. Investment in our libraries will be considered by council assembly as part of the capital programme.

27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA

Where will Bermondsey one stop shop be located if Bermondsey Town Hall is sold off?

RESPONSE

As part of the customer service strategy the council is considering options for provision of customer Services once the Bermondsey one stop shop is closed. It would not be appropriate to pre-determine the outcome of that review which is considering a number of options. However this council is committed to improving the customer experience to all our communities.

28. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS

Could the cabinet member reassure council assembly that the adopted Bankside, Borough and London Bridge supplementary planning document (SPD) – which is out for re-consultation with the public at the moment – will clearly reflect the views and aspirations of the local communities, what confidence does she have in the consultation process and how will associated policies will be strengthened to reflect those views?

RESPONSE

The draft Bankside Borough and London Bridge SPD is currently out to consultation for a second time until 29 October 2010 following some dissatisfaction among residents in the Bermondsey area about the effectiveness of the consultation carried out earlier this year. We are, at this stage, consulting on the same draft document as before but we intend to produce a new draft and carry out a further stage of consultation next year following the adoption of the core strategy.

We are looking at ways in which the involvement of the community in the preparation of a revised document can be strengthened further so that when it is finally adopted it will have the greatest possible support from local residential and business communities. We are also continuing to work closely with the Mayor so that the SPD can receive his full support and can operate as his Opportunity Area Development Framework as well.

I would be happy to meet with Councillor Morris if there are any particular policy issues she would like to raise or if she has any proposals for improved community involvement.

29. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK

Does she think it appropriate to make jokes on Twitter about Thames Water's plans to concrete over King's Stairs gardens and the Alfred Slater playground?

RESPONSE

Myself and my cabinet colleagues are extremely concerned about Thames Water's proposals to use King's Stairs gardens and the Alfred Salter playground as construction sites for the Thames Tunnel super sewer.

Since the announcement Councillor Hargrove and I have been in regular contact with local residents, have discussed the issue at length with council officers and met with Thames Water along with local ward councillors. We will provide as much support as possible to the community, united in our aim to save our park and playground.

I don't believe that Councillor Hook is a regular user of social networks, so perhaps he has not read my twitter comment first hand. If he had he would know that my pun was directed at myself and the inherently amusing concept of being made "cabinet member for sewers" and was not in the least inappropriate.

For those who have not seen it I wrote:

"I've been assigned Southwark cabinet responsibility for Thames sewer. Rats."

Responses included:

"sounds like a draining task"

"I can see why the Thames Sewer will give you some extra work, but surely the rats will be pretty self-governing?"

"very good" from the Chair of Friends of Southwark Park

And on Facebook:

Elephant Lane resident: "We need to talk about the Thames Sewer Fiona. We are up in arms by King's Stairs Gardens."

Fiona Colley: "Me too, suspect that why I am now cabinet member for sewers."

Elephant Lane resident: "Great!"

30. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET

Can she tell me how much money has currently been set aside through section 106 agreements, the local implementation plan (LIP) and other funding streams to tackle traffic congestion on Lower Road and Jamaica Road, and to increase road capacity ahead of future regeneration schemes in both Southwark and North Lewisham?

RESPONSE

The Lower Road scheme has been set aside as a major scheme which will be indicated in the transport plan (LIP2) delivery plan to seek funding in 2012/13 with the objective of having funding available for 2013/14. Lower Road is part of the secondary Olympic route network so it is unlikely we would be able to commence work in 2012 and the timetable reflects this. This has not changed since May 2010 and has always been the council's strategy. Between £6.5 and £7 million section 106 funding has been agreed through the planning process but as yet none of this has been received.

In the 2010/11/12 LIP programme £170,000 has been allocated over two years to allow the straight across movement from Plough Way to Rotherhithe New Road.

Myself and Councillor Hargrove are holding regular meetings with Councillor Alan Smith from Lewisham Council regarding measures to tackle transport needs in the Rotherhithe, Bermondsey and Deptford area.

31. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR DARREN MERRILL

How committed is the cabinet member to providing a pool at the Elephant and Castle? What is her opinion of the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group's suggestion that the leisure centre ought to be paid for by guaranteeing profits instead of affordable housing?

RESPONSE

I am 100% committed to building a new leisure centre and swimming pool at Elephant and Castle. The administration has already taken a clear decision on the site and the consultation was an important step towards making this a reality and enabling residents and stakeholders to have a say in the vision.

Over 1,300 people responded to the consultation and I was delighted to receive a 200 name petition from children from a local school, Crampton, in favour of a new swimming pool.

Responses to the consultation will be analysed and the priorities of the local community will be used to draw up more detailed plans as well as exploring further funding options in the hope of being able to afford a larger sports hall as well as the much needed swimming pool.

I am truly astonished by the Leader of the Liberal Democrats' suggestion that the new leisure centre should be paid for by guaranteeing profits rather than affordable homes at Elephant and Castle. Not only would this mean giving up the certainty of at least 25% of the new homes on the Heygate being affordable, but furthermore, any profits from the redevelopment of the Heygate would not be received for many more years to come. Perhaps the Liberal Democrats believe Elephant and Castle residents can do without a pool for another decade, but I certainly don't!

32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES

Does the cabinet member believe that the coalition government's emergency budget will have a disproportionate impact on children and young people in Southwark? What steps is she taking to mitigate this impact?

RESPONSE

The coalition government's budget will have a disproportionate impact on children and young people in Southwark. The Institute for Fiscal Studies found that the measures introduced in the emergency budget were regressive. It said "they hit the poorest households more than those in the upper-middle of the income distribution in cash, let alone percentage, terms" and "families with children lose out the most within each tenth of the income distribution as they are the group that is worst affected by the benefit cuts announced in the June 2010 budget."

Southwark has a disproportionately high level of children living in poverty, at just over one third of the under 16 population. This means that the coalition government's budget cuts will hit Southwark families hard.

Our manifesto commitment to bring in free healthy school meals for primary school children will ensure that these children get at least one healthy meal a day during term time. Another manifesto commitment will ensure childcare help is targeted at the most disadvantaged groups. These steps are in addition to other activities already supporting children.

Note: This answer was written before the government's spending review announcement.

33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS

Is the cabinet member concerned that changes to child benefit might have a harmful impact on parents in Southwark?

RESPONSE

I am very concerned about the impact the Conservative-Liberal Democrat government's changes to child benefit will have on parents and children in Southwark. 34,000 families in Southwark claim child benefit for at least one child. The changes the government is making are unfair and hit families with children in Southwark hard.

The government is taking away child benefit for households containing a higher rate tax payer – meaning, for example a family with three children, with a stay-at-home parent and a parent earning say £45,000 lose £2,449 a year. Whereas a couple with one child each earning £43,000 (so with a combined income of £86,000) will still receive the benefit.

Even those families who will still receive child benefit will suffer from the freeze announced by the government in the budget - meaning they will lose on average around £130 a year in real terms.

The Institute for Fiscal studies already found that the coalition government's Budget hit low income families with children hardest. The recent child benefit announcement is yet another coalition government attack on families and children.

Note: This answer was written before the government's spending review announcement.

34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN

In June's Southwark Life, Councillor Peter John said, 'We've made a commitment to introduce free, healthy school meals for primary children over the next four years. I hope we can roll it out for year one from September' – what happened?

RESPONSE

We are piloting free healthy school meals in a small number of primary schools this academic year. We intend to roll out free healthy school meals to all schools from September 2011.

35. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER

How is help being targeted at disadvantaged groups to increase take up of childcare and early years services?

RESPONSE

We pledged in our manifesto to target childcare help at the most disadvantaged groups, to increase take-up of childcare and early years services. This follows the previous Lib Dem-Conservative council administration's decision to put up the cost of council childcare by up to £60 a week.

Work is already underway to target help in this way, including:

- reviewing existing programmes and services to ensure there is a specific focus on disadvantaged families
- increasing the number of outreach workers supporting disadvantaged families to access services
- introducing a brokerage service to help parents to secure appropriate childcare.

We are also:

- looking at the admission criteria for school nursery classes to ensure children from disadvantaged families are supported
- looking at the policy on commissioning places amongst early years settings to ensure support is available to the most disadvantaged.

36. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON

How many spare places are there in reception classes?

RESPONSE

As at Friday, 15 October 2010 the current total is 94 reception vacancies.

37. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON

Could the cabinet member please update the council assembly on the current status of the Dulwich Village 20mph zone signal junction redesign (Scheme B) at Dulwich Village and Turney Roads and, given 61% of local people backed the junction improvements when consulted, what steps is he taking to progress the remaining improvement works?

RESPONSE

The 2008/09 20mph zones programme was consulted on in 2008. The administration at that time provided the residents with a list of options, which if implemented amounted in cost to considerably more than the £900,000 allocated to the project. A decision was then taken by the executive member in early 2009 that officers work their way down a prioritised list until the funding was exhausted.

There is no funding available for this scheme. However, council officers have recently consulted ward members on an alternative proposal that offers some but not all of the same benefits and is within the remaining budget available for the 20mph zone.

The schemes are complementary so if funding were to become available in the future, scheme B could still be progressed.

38. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER

What lessons have been learnt, so far, from the kitchen leftover recycling pilot?

RESPONSE

Of course the questioner will recognise it is still very early days for this pilot and so consequently there is still much more information to be collected. What does seem to be emerging that we need to consider for the future primarily revolves around space and containers. In particular, we have identified pressures in multiple occupancy properties. As a result we are making available on request blue wheely bins for co-mingled recycling for these residents with necessary storage space. Equally, we have received feedback that perhaps we may need to do more to reduce waste bin clutter. In particular, there could well be some more work for us to do to engage with residents who have limited storage space to discuss opportunities to share bins with their neighbours if they so wish. It is also true to say that we didn't fully anticipate the popular demand for the small brown kitchen cadies, which 40% of residents have now requested. I am looking forward to further feedback as this pilot progresses as we continually seek to improve the recycling service we provide.

39. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN

How much will Southwark Council earn from selling renewable energy back to the grid following the lifting of restrictions by Rt Hon Chris Huhne MP, Secretary of State for Climate Change?

RESPONSE

The lifting of this restriction applies to local authorities eligibility to take advantage of Feed In Tariffs (FITs), for renewable energy provision.

Prior to the restriction being lifted in April 2010, eligibility depended on the specific type of renewable energy infrastructure and it having been installed before July 2009.

Southwark Council has not currently invested in any renewable energy infrastructure that qualifies under the FITs scheme (solar PV panels, wind turbines, etc), and is therefore currently unable to take advantage of the lifting of this restriction, or sell any renewable energy back to the grid.

However, installation of renewable energy infrastructure from now on should be considered against this scheme's financial benefits.

40. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ALTHEA SMITH

How will the council ensure that changes to services and funding are assessed to ensure minimal impact on locally disadvantaged people in light of the new government's lack of

attention to the area in the budget and current attempts to water down duties to equality assess proposals?

RESPONSE

We have pledged to under take the Fairer Futures for All in Southwark's consultation exercise on the budget. This will ensure the most comprehensive consultation exercise ever carried out in budgeting in this borough. We are also planning to ensure that all decisions are fed back to those consulted for views further refining the decisions. The budgeting is also being carried out under the agreed seven budgeting principles which include a guarantee to have an equality impact assessment for all decisions. We will work actively to ensure that there is no unfair effect on any group in the borough as far as can be reasonably avoided. We will have an overview from the overview and scrutiny committee to ensure monitoring of the effect of the budgeting exercise.

The new Equalities Act came into force on the 1 October 2010; I am working to ensure that Southwark sets up robust systems to monitor the implementation of the act in Southwark in the light of the abolition of the Audit Commission and the watering down of this requirement by the government.

41. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO

How much has been spent on the Democracy Commission, including the conference and staff time in supporting its deliberations?

RESPONSE

We wanted to ensure that the Democracy Commission did not cost any more than was reasonable.

It was our objective to utilise our in-house resources and keep costs to a minimum. Costs have been incurred in postage and venue hire which amount to less than £4,000.

42. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON

Why did he cancel the meeting of the Democracy Commission on 1 October and did it have anything to do with Labour representatives not being able to attend and therefore unable to force through his personal proposals and does he feel this is a democratic way to run the commission?

RESPONSE

The meeting on the 1 October was arranged without adequate discussion and consultation; this resulted in members from two political groups being unable to attend.

It later became clear that we did not have the reports and other materials required to have the discussions. The next time suitable was the 8 October, when we met.

43. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS

What progress has been made on delivering Southwark Labour's manifesto commitment to turn the plans for a new One O'Clock Club and changing rooms and pitches for local sports teams into reality?

RESPONSE

A development plan for Peckham Rye was completed earlier this year defining sporting facilities and the future development of the cafe area of Peckham Rye Common. This plan has support from the community. The total estimated cost to realise this plan for the Homestall Road Sports Facilities and the Park Central Area Development Plan is £2.1m. This is broken down into the following:

Homestall Road Sports Facilities and works to park pitches	£1,100,000
New one o'clock club buildings	£500,000
Replacing the temporary changing rooms with a permanent facility on the maintenance area	£100,000
New play area including water play	£100,000
Landscaping and relocating car park to Peckham Rye Common	£300,000
Total	£2,100,000

To date £209,000 has been secured from the cleaner greener safer capital programme. The council has also sought a further £300,000 from Sure Start and £100,000 from the play builder programme. However since the election of the coalition government the Sure Start programme has been cancelled and play builder has been suspended and is unlikely to be available.

Over the last few months officers have been negotiating with the Harris Boys Academy which is willing to invest £400,000 to improve drainage and refurbish the grasses pitches in exchange for exclusive use of the Homestall Road site at specific times. A meeting is being held on 20 October to confirm details. This funding would also be able the council to apply for Football Association (FA) funding in the region of £250,000.

Possible funding for this project is therefore as follows;

Homestall Road Sports Facilities

Harris Boys Academy contribution	£400,000
FA contribution	£250,000

Peckham Rye Park and Common

Current CGS funding	£209,000
---------------------	----------

Total identified funding	£959,000
---------------------------------	-----------------

If FA funding and Harris Academy funding is granted, the project is still left with a shortfall of £1,141,000 to complete the entire project. Officers have submitted a bid for a further capital funding for this amount and this will be considered by the cabinet in November as part of the wider council capital programme.

44. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE & SPORT AND THE OLYMPICS FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES

Could you outline what further work will be carried out with the extra funding raised for the refurbishment of Camberwell Leisure Centre? When will the centre re-open for residents to enjoy the new facilities? What plans are in place to secure the final phases of refurbishment?

RESPONSE

It is excellent news that extra funding has been secured to complete more of the work than intended in the current planned phase. Additional work that can now be carried out is:

- Upgrade of the dry side changing rooms to match the standard on the wet side
- Expansion and refurbishment of existing gym area
- Works to Warwick Hall flooring to bring it up to a good standard
- Re tiling of the pool tank and surrounding walkways
- Structural improvements to ensure the long term future of the sports hall.

This means that the present contractors can extend their work programme while they are still on site. The new completion date is set for February 2011.

To date £4.1m has been raised for the refurbishment. A further capital bid of £1.8m has been proposed to complete the sports hall and public realm works. This will be considered by cabinet when revising the 10 year capital programme in November, going to council assembly in December.

45. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU

How will the cabinet member implement the decision taken at the last council assembly meeting to publish all council expenditure over £500?

RESPONSE

I am glad to be able to report that Southwark has now published all its expenditure over £500 for August and will continue to do so each month for the previous month. From next month, this will be published on the 8th of the month or the next working day.

This makes us one of the first 20% of councils in England to do so – the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government revealed earlier this month that Southwark is one of less than seventy English councils to make this information publicly available to date.

All councils are expected to make this data available to the public from January 2011.

So far, only two other Inner London councils publish this data on a monthly basis: Islington and Wandsworth. Hammersmith & Fulham and Kensington & Chelsea are also publishing this data, but only on a quarterly basis.

Members will have seen the local press interest in the first publication of this information. I believe that this level of scrutiny is helpful in both assisting this authority to be more accountable to local residents and in ensuring that we identify and drive out wasteful expenditure.

Item No. 6.	Classification: Open	Date: 1 December 2010	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Members' Question Time - Addendum	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER

Did the leader know about charges against Councillor Rhoden before the May elections and did he tell her not to worry?

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)
(SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010-11**

NOTE: Original held by Constitutional Team; all amendments/queries to
Lesley John Tel: 020 7525 7228/7236

ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED	Copies	To	Copies
All Councillors	63	Others	
Group Offices		Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission	1
John Bibby, Cabinet Office	1	Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
Paul Green, Asst. in the Opposition Group	1		
Libraries (1 each)			
	4		
Albion / Dulwich / Newington / Local Studies Library			
Press			
	2		
Southwark News			
South London Press			
Corporate Management Team	7		
Annie Shepperd			
Eleanor Kelly			
Deborah Collins			
Gill Davies			
Romi Bowen			
Duncan Whitfield			
Susanna White			
Other Officers			
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Robin Campbell	1		
Sonia Sutton	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
5 copies to Lesley John , 2 nd Floor, Hub 4 Tooley Street and 15 copies to Lesley John, Town Hall Peckham)	20		
		Last Updated: November 2010	
		Total:	103