

Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

Wednesday 23 January 2013
7.00 pm

The Charter School, Red Post Hill, London SE24 9JH

Supplemental Agenda No. 1

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
1.5. Minutes		1 - 57
	To approve as a correct record the open minutes of the council assembly meeting held on 28 November 2012.	
6.1. Council Tax Base 2013/14		58 - 77
	Council assembly is asked to note the decision of its November 2012 meeting in relation to discretionary discounts for long term empty properties and the discounts for exempt properties. It is also being asked to set the council tax base for 2013/14 and approve the council tax reduction scheme written policy for both working and pensionable age claimants.	

Contact

Lesley John on 020 7525 7228 or 020 7525 7222 or email: lesley.john@southwark.gov.uk;
andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk; constitutional.team@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 18 January 2013



Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting) held on Wednesday 28 November 2012 at 7.00 pm at Harris Academy Peckham, 112 Peckham Road, London SE15 5DZ

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor for 2012/13, Councillor Althea Smith (Chair)

Councillor Kevin Ahern	Councillor Peter John
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	Councillor Paul Kyriacou
Councillor James Barber	Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Catherine Bowman	Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Chris Brown	Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Michael Bukola	Councillor Catherine McDonald
Councillor Denise Capstick	Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor Sunil Chopra	Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Poddy Clark	Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor Fiona Colley	Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Neil Coyle	Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Rowenna Davis	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Patrick Diamond	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Nick Dolezal	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Gavin Edwards	Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Dan Garfield	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Mark Gettleson	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 Cleo Soanes
Councillor Helen Hayes	Councillor Geoffrey Thornton
Councillor Claire Hickson	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Mark Williams
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Ian Wingfield

1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

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

The Mayor announced that Barry Albin-Dyer had been appointed Deputy Lieutenant to Sir David Brewer, HM Lord-Lieutenant of Greater London on 9 October 2012. The meeting extended its congratulations to Mr Albin-Dyer.

The leader of the council, Councillor Peter John, announced that Councillor Fiona Colley would be returning to the role of cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy with effect from 1 December 2012. As a result a number of changes will be made to existing portfolio arrangements. These will be circulated in a notice to all councillors on executive delegations.

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

There were no late items of business.

The Mayor stated that following consultation with the group whips on the motions on the theme it had been agreed that the three motions and relevant amendments would be moved and seconded, followed by a single debate. At the close of the debate a separate vote would be taken on each amendment and motion. Items 6.1 on council tax reduction scheme would also be considered in a similar manner.

1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

The clerk announced that the deputy monitoring officer had granted a dispensation to those members present who had signed the dispensation form in respect of items 6.1 and 6.2 on council tax reduction scheme and technical reforms.

There were no disclosures of interest.

1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Neil Coyle, Helen Hayes, Victoria Mills, Lewis Robinson and Andy Simmons.

1.5 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of council assembly held on 17 October 2012 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

2. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC

2.1 PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

2.2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no ordinary questions from the public. There was one question from the public on the theme (see item 3.2).

2.3 DEPUTATION REQUESTS ON THE THEME

(See pages 1 - 3 of supplemental agenda 4)

Deputation from Southwark Living Streets

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from Southwark Living Streets.

RESOLVED:

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Jeremy Leach, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Barrie Hargrove, cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling. Councillor Barrie Hargrove provided an oral response.

Councillors Anood Al-Samerai, Peter John and Graham Neale asked questions of the deputation.

Thereafter the deputation returned to their seats in the public seating area.

Deputation from Southwark Cyclists

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from Southwark Cyclists.

RESOLVED:

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Colin Hartridge-Pearce, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Barrie Hargrove, cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling. Councillor Barrie Hargrove provided an oral response.

Councillors Mark Glover, Stephen Govier and Poddy Clark asked questions of the deputation.

Thereafter the deputation returned to their seats in the public seating area.

Deputation from the Camberwell Society

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from the Camberwell Society.

RESOLVED:

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Alex Blacknell, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Peter John, leader of the council. Councillor Peter John provided an oral response.

Councillors Veronica Ward, Columba Blango, Tim McNally and Ian Wingfield asked questions of the deputation.

Thereafter the deputation returned to their seats in the public seating area.

3. THEMED DEBATE - TRANSPORT IN SOUTHWARK

3.1 CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT

Councillor Barrie Hargrove (cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling) introduced the theme of the meeting.

The opposition spokesperson for environment, Councillor Graham Neale, replied to the cabinet members' statements.

3.2 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE THEME

(See supplemental agenda 4, page 4 of the green paper circulated at the meeting)

There was one question from the public on the theme, the answer to which was circulated on green paper at the meeting. The question and written response is attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

3.3 MEMBERS' MOTIONS ON THE THEME

The meeting had agreed that there would be a single debate on the three motions on the theme.

MOTION 1 – SUPPORTING CYCLING IN SOUTHWARK

(See page 4 of the main agenda)

Councillor Geoffrey Thornton, seconded by Councillor Lisa Rajan, moved the motion.

Councillor Rowenna Davis, seconded by Councillor Michael Situ, moved Amendment A.

MOTION 2 – ROAD SAFETY

(See pages 4 - 5 of the main agenda)

Councillor Helen Hayes, seconded by Councillor Mark Glover, moved the motion.

MOTION 3 – BUS SERVICES IN THE SOUTH OF THE BOROUGH

(See page 5 of the main agenda)

Councillor Toby Eckersley, seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson, moved the motion.

Councillor Andy Simmons, seconded by Councillor Gavin Edwards, moved Amendment B.

Councillor James Barber, seconded by Councillor Rosie Shimell, moved Amendment C.

Following debate (Councillor Paul Noblet), at 9.00 pm the Mayor announced that the time allocated to the themed section of the meeting had expired. The clerk announced that each motion and amendment which had been moved and seconded would be voted on separately.

Vote on Motion 1 and Amendment A – Supporting Cycling in Southwark

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

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

RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly believes a lot more should be done to encourage cycling throughout Southwark, including making bicycles more accessible to residents, encouraging the take up of cycling and improving road safety for cyclists.
2. That council assembly therefore welcomes the fact that:
 - The current administration has spent or allocated £2.677 million on cycling in the last two years and plans to spend nearly another £4 million on cycling infrastructure. One third of the money allocated from TfL to Southwark gets spent on cycling.
 - Southwark has installed 174 cycle lockers on housing estates and created over 1500 new spaces for on street cycle parking.
 - Southwark is the first London borough to install life-saving Trixi mirrors at dangerous junctions throughout the borough and welcomes the news that a further eight mirrors will be installed by March 2013.
 - Proposals for 25 cut-throughs, shared use footways and contra-flow schemes

across the borough are currently under consideration and that this will help to improve cycle permeability by improving access and reducing travel times.

- The council's transport plan also proposes: 20mph streets to help make Southwark roads safer for everyone by reducing speeds, developing 'green links' to encourage local cycle trips for less confident cyclists and families, school travel plan initiatives and cycle parking on and off street.
 - Southwark Council's bike loan scheme allows employees to take out an interest free loan of up to £1,000 to buy a bike to use to cycle to work.
 - Despite the fact that Transport for London has reduced the overall budget for cycle training from £163,000 to £156,000, the council continues to offer free cyclist training to anyone that lives, works or is educated in the borough. Around 900 children and 600 adults receiving training each year.
3. That council assembly therefore calls on cabinet to:
- Continue to work with organisations such as Southwark Cyclists to explore how Southwark can realise its ambition of becoming the most cycle friendly London borough.
 - Continue to lobby Transport for London to extend the London cycle hire scheme throughout the borough.
 - Take a serious and sensible approach to increasing the number of people who cycle in the borough and make good on its commitment to review the target for people cycling in Southwark which is in line with the London target and based on key developments such as the introduction of cycle hire, and the existing and planned cycle superhighways. The current target translates into a 33% increase (from 3-4%) in current cycling levels or 4,700 new trips by bike every day.

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

Vote on Motion 2 – Road Safety

Motion 2 was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:

1. That council assembly expresses condolences for the tragic deaths of Hichame Bouadimi, Ellie Carey and many other cyclists and pedestrians who have been killed in road accidents in recent years in Southwark.
2. That council assembly notes that the number of people killed on Britain's roads increased by 3% in 2011 to 1,901 – the first increase since 2003. It also notes that the number of pedestrians killed jumped by 12% to 453.
3. That council assembly regrets the then Conservative Transport Secretary, Phillip Hammond's pledge to "end the war on the motorist" in 2010 which has led to the removal of speed cameras, the abolition of national casualty-reduction targets, the proposal of 80mph speed limits and the reduction in the number of charges for death by dangerous driving.
4. That council assembly also regrets the decision by Transport for London (TfL) to

change the phasing of London's traffic lights, ostensibly to improve traffic flow, which has made roads less safe for cyclists and pedestrians.

5. That council assembly welcomes measures introduced by the council to promote cycling and to improve road safety including:
 - Becoming the first London council to install Trixi mirrors at four junctions in Southwark, with eight more junctions earmarked
 - Carrying out spot checks on cyclists and drivers breaching traffic enforcement laws in order to crackdown on dangerous driving
 - A comprehensive road safety education, training and publicity programme – including for lorry drivers - and a safer routes to school programme (SRTS), which aims to encourage and enable children to walk or cycle to and from school through the introduction of targeted traffic calming and the creation of safer walking and cycling routes.

6. That council assembly believes that the biggest cause in road deaths is speeding and therefore calls on the cabinet:
 - For Southwark to become a 20mph borough
 - To call on the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) to ensure police enforce 20mph speed limits
 - To call on TfL to give greater flexibility and support for the use of average speed cameras.

And also for:

- More to be done to make TfL operated roads safer and calls for greater transparency for TfL's review of dangerous junctions in Southwark.

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

Vote on Motion 3 and Amendments B and C – Bus Services in the South of the Borough

Amendment B was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

Amendment C 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 believes that improvements are needed by TfL to bus services in the south of the borough, and in particular requests the cabinet to report on:

1. Further work lobbying the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) to secure an extension of bus route 42 to Sainsbury's Dog Kennel Hill via North Dulwich station.
2. Continuing complaints about the reliability and frequency of the 37 and 3 bus services, as well as the frequency of the 12 during the rush hour.
3. The feasibility of TfL extending the 201 bus service eastwards from Herne Hill to provide better east/west services through Dulwich.
4. Support and working with TfL on extending the 63 bus service onto Honor Oak Park station to provide connection with London Overground services following the excellent campaign by Peckham Rye's Labour councillors and Val Shawcross, Assembly Member, to extend the number 63 route. Council assembly notes that the extension of the 63 route was a key pledge from Ken Livingstone at the last election but was opposed by Boris Johnson and is concerned whether there is the political will from the current Mayor of London to deliver this extension.
5. Options for new buses on the 12 route that represent an effective use of public money.
6. TfL improving bus links to the Kingswood estate, one of the most geographically isolated parts of Southwark, where many residents can not afford to use the nearby Sydenham Hill train station.
7. TfL providing a direct bus service from the south of the borough to Kings College Hospital.

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

4. OTHER DEPUTATIONS

There were no other deputations.

5. ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS

5.1 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

(See pages 7 - 13 of the main agenda and the blue and yellow papers circulated at the meeting)

There were two urgent questions to the leader, the written responses to which were circulated on blue paper at the meeting. Three supplemental questions were asked of the leader. All questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.

There were 41 members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper at the meeting. There were 14 supplemental questions, all questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 3 to the minutes.

5.2 MEMBERS' MOTIONS

MOTION 1 – SOCIAL HOUSING IN MIXED COMMUNITIES

(see page 15 of the main agenda)

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, seconded by Councillor Michael Bukola, moved the motion.

Councillor Peter John, seconded by Councillor Claire Hickson, moved Amendment D.

Following debate (Councillors Paul Noblet, Nick Dolezal, Gavin Edwards, Neil Coyle, Adele Morris, Ian Wingfield and Lewis Robinson), at 10.11 pm the bell was rung and the Mayor announced that the guillotine had fallen. The Mayor announced that the motion and amendment would be voted on separately.

Amendment D was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That council notes that not only is the current administration investing £326 million to ensure every council home in Southwark is warm, dry and safe by 2016, it is also building 1000 new council homes in Southwark over the next eight years - more than have been built in all of London in the last 10 years. It regrets that the previous administration failed to build enough council housing, had an unworkable and unfunded decent homes programme which left many Southwark residents without decent homes and by the end of their time in office left Southwark with 7,800 fewer council homes.
2. That council notes the publication of the 'Ending Expensive Tenancies' report by Policy Exchange in August 2012, which called on councils to sell off higher valued social homes and replace them with others in cheaper areas.
3. That council also notes the reaction of the leader to the report on his blog: "the blanket policy proposed by the paper of selling-off all council properties above a certain value is flawed and would undoubtedly lead to the removal of genuinely affordable social housing from certain areas."
4. That council recognises that there is a need for affordable housing in all parts of the borough, and that many key workers and other residents in lower pay brackets live in social homes in those parts of the borough where land values are highest. That is why this council opposes the government's housing benefit cap, opposes the introduction of affordable rent at 80% of market rent, opposes the ending of secure tenancies, opposes the slashing of the social housing budget by £3.9 billion and is building 1000 new council homes in Southwark over the next 8 years.
5. That council is concerned that the government's housing benefit cap will further social segregation in the borough and agrees with the comments of Simon Hughes MP when he told the BBC in January "As it currently stands, the benefits cap will

break up families...there are bottom lines in politics and that one is making sure that those with least finances and the most mouths to feed, and the most needy are protected." However it regrets that only five months later Simon Hughes ignored his own warning and voted to cap housing benefit for families in Southwark.

6. That council welcomes Southwark Council's plans to build more council homes, which has been made possible by the council's decision to accept "in lieu" payments from developers rather than requiring them to deliver on-site "affordable housing" where that "affordable housing" is anything but affordable. It is perplexed that the Liberal Democrats claim to support Labour's plan to deliver 1000 new council homes but do not support the proposed means of delivering them and would encourage Southwark Liberal Democrats to explain how they would pay for new council homes.
7. That council notes and regrets that Simon Hughes MP recently voted to allow developers to deliver 0% affordable housing on new developments. Council therefore calls on cabinet to write to the government and call on them to drop the proposal in the Growth and Infrastructure Bill that lets developers wriggle out of their affordable housing requirements.

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

6. REPORT(S) FOR DECISION FROM CABINET

6.1 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME

(See pages 17 - 25 of the main agenda and supplemental agenda 1, pages 1 - 321)

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

The meeting had agreed that there would be a single debate on the report and Amendments E and F.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (1), Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, moved the report.

Councillor Toby Eckersley, seconded by Councillor Michael Mitchell, moved Amendment E.

Councillor Tim McNally, seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet, moved Amendment F.

At 10.28 pm the Mayor announced that the time allocated to this report had expired. The Mayor announced that the amendments would be voted on separately, followed by a vote on the substantive recommendations.

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

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

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendations made by cabinet on 23 October 2012 to adopt a policy under Section 13A Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended), which will form the basis of the regulatory framework for a local council tax reduction scheme, be agreed.
2. That the recommendation made by cabinet on 23 October 2012 to adopt the preferred council tax reduction scheme option, which will result in capping council tax support to 85% of current entitlement levels and abolishing the second adult rebate for non-pensioners in 2013/14, be agreed.
3. That following resolution 1, the council tax reduction scheme finalised policy be presented to council assembly in January 2013 for approval, following the publication of prescribed requirements regulations which are currently in draft form.

Note: The clerk announced that the cabinet recommendation had not been amended, therefore in accordance with the budget and policy framework procedure rule 2 (e), the decision could be implemented with immediate effect.

6.2 COUNCIL TAX TECHNICAL REFORMS

(See pages 26 - 48 of the main agenda and supplemental agenda 3, pages 1 - 23)

The clerk announced that as item 6.1 had been agreed without amendment, Amendment G fell.

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendation of the cabinet on 23 October 2012 to remove the existing 10% discount awarded for second home properties with effect from the 1 April 2013 (see paragraphs 6 and 7 of the main report), be agreed.
2. That the recommendations of cabinet on 20 November 2012 to introduce local discounts and an empty house premium, as set out below, be agreed:
 - (1) The introduction of a local discount to replace class A exemptions set at zero percent from 1 April 2013 for properties where there are major repairs or

structural alterations.

- (2) The introduction of a local discount to replace class C exemptions set at 100% for up to a maximum of 2 months from 1 April 2013 for empty and unfurnished properties, subject to a review within March 2014.
- (3) The introduction of a local discount of zero percent from 1 April 2013 for empty (unoccupied) and furnished properties.
- (4) The introduction of an empty homes premium resulting in council tax of 150% for properties that have been empty and unfurnished for more than two years from 1 April 2013.

Note: The clerk announced the cabinet recommendation had not been amended, therefore in accordance with the budget and policy framework procedure rule 2 (e), the decision could be implemented with immediate effect.

7. OTHER REPORTS

7.1 ADOPTION OF SECTION 16 OF THE LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND TRANSPORT FOR LONDON ACT 2003

(See pages 49 – 59 of the main agenda)

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That Section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003 (“the Act”) be adopted so as to give effect to highway enforcement powers concerning vehicle crossings over footway and verges for the benefit of public safety (see Appendix 1 of the report).
2. That the Appointed Day for implementation of the adopted legislation should be 1 April 2013 pursuant to section 3 of the Act.
3. That the resolution and associated public notices be published in accordance with section 3 of the Act.

7.2 TREASURY MANAGEMENT - MID-YEAR UPDATE 2012/13

(See pages 60 – 70 of the main agenda)

This report was considered after the guillotine had fallen, therefore in accordance with

council assembly procedure rule 1.12 (3) & (4), the report was afforded up to a maximum of 15 minutes.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the 2012/13 mid-year treasury management update be noted.
2. That the changes to prudential indicators as set out in paragraph 17 of the report be agreed.

8. AMENDMENTS

Amendment are set out in Supplemental Agenda No.5.

The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and wished everyone a merry Christmas.

The meeting closed at 10.35pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2012****PUBLIC QUESTION ON THE THEME****1. QUESTION FROM CHARMAINE ELLIOTT TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING**

Commuting into central London or connecting to tube takes 30 minutes plus, impacting getting to work, area investment, community wellbeing, business desirability, shopping attractiveness. Lewisham council is looking at the tube via Burgess Park, then out to Lewisham. What plans have we for better commuting mid-borough tube, tram, more buses?

RESPONSE

Transport for London manages the public transport operations including bus and tube services. We continue to lobby them for both investment in new infrastructure or improvements to existing public transport services.

The council has been a supporter of the East London Line extension and from Sunday 9 December 2012, services on the new London Overground extension running from Clapham Junction to Surrey Quays will launch. The new connections afforded by the Overground line will offer alternative routes from south London to the key economic centres of the capital's future, including Stratford, Whitechapel (connecting to Crossrail) and Canary Wharf.

The council has been working with Lewisham Council to lobby the Mayor of London to progress the extension of the Bakerloo Line to south east London serving the central section of the borough.

To facilitate future public transport provision, the council included within the Aylesbury Area Action Plan a public transport corridor to support either improvements to bus services or a future connection for a tram.

SOUTHWARK COUNCIL**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2012****URGENT QUESTIONS****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Southwark Council has proposed sacking 27 qualified staff from nurseries in the borough and replacing them with less qualified workers. Can the leader confirm this is purely a cost-cutting exercise, and how much does he estimate this will save each year?

RESPONSE

The factual basis of this question is wrong. There is no proposal to sack 27 staff. We are in the process of consulting with staff about a possible structure - the consultation is still open, and no decisions have been taken about the final structure.

The statutory requirements of the early years foundation stage means we are required, by law, to ensure all our nurseries adhere to correct staff to child ratios and appropriate levels of qualifications required for staff in early years settings. This will continue to be the case now and in the future with all our nurseries.

It is worth remembering that this administration is keeping all four of Southwark's Council-run nurseries open, despite the £90m cut to our budget. When the council was run by the Liberal Democrats four nurseries were closed despite year-on-year increases in cash from central government.

In February 2011, council assembly agreed to achieve savings of £800,000 in 2012/14 by changing the way it delivered child care provision at the four subsidised centres - Aylesbury Early Years Centre, Bishop's House Children's Centre, Camberwell Grove Early Years Centre and South Bermondsey Children and Parents Centre. In order to achieve these savings - and keep these nurseries open - a proposed staffing structure is being put forward that reflects parents' views to maintain quality and introduce a more efficient and sustainable staffing model.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Yes I do, thank you Madam Mayor. My question was about nurseries and I just am amazed at how the administration can't get this issue right despite changing cabinet member halfway through. First of all they have no consultation at all, they just decide to close them and then they do have a consultation and come up with the exact opposite of what everyone in the consultation thinks. The leader in his answer sort of says there is no proposal to sack 27 staff but then doesn't actually rule it out which

sounds to me like it is a proposal. Given these are people's jobs we are talking about and their livelihood, will he at least tonight rule out that he will be sacking 27 staff?

RESPONSE

The consultation which is currently taking place is looking at nurseries being run by 67 and a half full time equivalent posts, compared with current position of 77 and a half full time equivalent posts; so that is a difference of 10 and not 27. I think it has to be recognised that in order to deliver savings which we need to do in this current very difficult economic climate and with £90 million of cuts being made to this council, some services have to change and some staff have to leave the employ of the council. That is a situation which we all regret on this side and we are campaigning against it to the government.

However, as I say the consultation that is taking place on the nurseries in Southwark is looking at a reduction of 10 positions only, it is a consultation which continues until the end of this month and I suggest that anyone who is interested in this matter should make their views known during that consultation process.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Yes I do, thank you Madam Mayor. I think I agreed it has made our views very clear that you should do the model that the parents have been suggesting, but perhaps also he heard the announcement yesterday that the government has given £6 million to Southwark to help with early years education and I wonder whether he might consider using that money to fund high quality staff at the nurseries?

RESPONSE

Well, this is not new money; this is money which has already been taken away from us and a little bit less is being given back to us, so this is not going to make up any shortfall or any additional funding, this is funding which has been taken away, the early intervention grant has been taken away; which is a total of £5.5 million, and we are being given less back. So that is the reality of the situation. And I am not going to make up a budget tonight in response to Councillor Al-Samerai's demands. I mean, if she is really concerned about Southwark's budget she should be making the case to Simon Hughes and her Liberal Democrat colleagues not to cut our budget year after year, after year. That is the reality of the situation.

2. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON

Princess Court major works - In light of the email correspondence dated 6 September 2012 from Calfordseaden, consultants to major works at Princess Court in my ward confirming that £14,750 of billed works to leaseholders have been omitted from the works will the leader of the council ensure:

1. Leaseholders accounts are reconciled at the earliest opportunity to ensure any overpayments made are returned to them as soon as possible?
2. That the overall investigation into the contractors (Mears) performance issues on this contract are made available to leaseholders?

RESPONSE

1. In answering the question, it may be useful to reflect on the conditions of the lease signed by leaseholders, and the way in which service charges are billed. Firstly, the council uses an invoice based accounting system, so a leaseholders account will have a number of invoices reflecting annual service charges from the date of sale and invoices for any major works that have been carried out since the completion of the right to buy. Service charge invoices are not "reconciled". In accordance with the lease we charge leaseholders an estimated service charge, and then actualise it when the final costs are known.

It is the nature of all building works that additions and omissions will be made to the specified works, once access has been gained to all areas of the building. All building contracts will contain provisional sums to ensure that monies are available for unforeseen works that may be identified as necessary once full access has been obtained. If these sums remain unspent then the final account will reflect this, and the credit will be reflected in the actual service charge for the work. However, the final account cannot be agreed and signed off, with final payments made to the contractor, until the end of the defects period. It is only at this stage that the actual costs incurred to the council will be known, and the actual service charges to leaseholders is able to be constructed. The recent work carried out to Princess Court is part of a larger contract, and the defects period is not due to end until July 2013. Until then we do not know whether additional monies have been spent on the block, as well as any final omitted sums.

To date none of the leaseholders of Princess Court have paid their estimated invoice in full, so it is incorrect to suggest that anyone has made an "overpayment", notwithstanding the fact that an estimate by its very nature cannot be "overpaid". The estimated service charge is based on tendered prices received for works proposed, including the provisional sums for unforeseen items, and therefore these are correct. Unless there are issues with the final account the service charge invoices are likely to be actualised prior to the end of the 36 month interest free payment period offered. We cannot amend the estimated invoice once it has been raised. However, if home ownership services are provided with a draft final account, which indicates that sums have been omitted and no additional payments made, then our normal process is to "cap" payments to the amount suggested by the draft final account.

2. The performance management of the contract is ongoing and we seek to rectify issues as and when they arise, however in addition on completion of the works we will prepare a report on the performance of this contractor in terms of the quality and delivery of works on site. This will be made available to leaseholders.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON

Thank you very much, leader, for what looks like an essay on leasehold technicalities from the home ownership unit. I would draw his attention though to part of his answer which I actually think has a possibility to contravene data protection in respect to comments about individual leaseholders' financial accounts and I think he probably should have checked that with a legal officer.

However the point about Princess Court is that the works are now complete as far as I understand and the consultants involved clearly know what works have been dropped and omitted and I suspect they have a very good idea that not much is going to be

needed to be done in the future. And therefore rather than home ownership services just waiting for a draft final account, I think it would be beholden on the council to request a draft final account and look to cap off the payments being asked for as soon as possible.

RESPONSE

I am grateful to Councillor Robinson for his supplemental question. I will take that suggestion away and look at it to see what we can do. Obviously it is a concern for all leaseholders not to know exactly what is being demanded of them by the council, that is an issue which is common to all councillors in all wards across the borough. We are looking to improve the way in which we deal with leaseholders and I will take away this specific case and come back to him with an answer as soon as possible.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2012
MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

How many homes for social rent, as officially defined by government, will be included in phase one of the Heygate regeneration project? Following the report in Southwark News of 1 November in which the council stated its definition of social rented homes is based on "housing charity Shelter's guidelines", would the leader give a source for these guidelines? What communication has the council had with Shelter about these guidelines both prior to and after the article was published?

RESPONSE

We will secure at least 25% affordable homes on the first phase of the Heygate and at least that amount across the rest of the regeneration. This is solely because of the decision that we took in mid-2010 to have a minimum guarantee of affordable housing written into the contract with Lend Lease, a decision that the opposition criticised us for as 'selling residents down the river', because they were unhappy with potential lost income for the council. If we had followed their preferred course of action, leaving the level of affordable housing to the planning system, there would be less than 10% affordable housing on the Heygate. That is the difference between our approach and theirs.

On Shelter's 'What is Social Housing?' webpage, they set out the following criteria for social homes:

- Social housing provides affordable housing
- Social housing is allocated on the basis of need
- Social housing is owned and managed by social landlords
- Social housing is tightly regulated.

The 26 rented affordable homes in the first phase of the Heygate regeneration will all be in line with these criteria. The proposed number of homes and different rents is otherwise well-documented. All of them will be in line with Simon Hughes' feedback during the consultation phase that they should be below 66%-80% of market rents.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Thank you Madam Mayor. So we could not get a straight answer on whether you used government money to help with nurseries. Let's try and get this issue which you have got yourself in complete knots with; talking about Shelter guidelines, when we rang Shelter they had no idea what you were talking about. The answer you have given goes to huge lengths to try and avoid actually answering part one

of the question which said, how many homes for social rent will be on phase one of the Heygate? Perhaps you could answer.

RESPONSE

Councillor Al-Samerai might not like it but the fact is, this Labour administration is delivering far more affordable housing, which includes homes for social rent, on the Heygate site than she ever would have done; because if heaven forbid the Liberal Democrats had won in May 2010, we would be asking questions of her or Councillor Stanton now as to why only 8 or 9% affordable housing is being delivered on the Heygate. That is a shame, a shameful position she would have put us in, and I am not going to go into what's this or what's that. We are delivering 25% affordable housing on the Heygate, half of which is for rent and half of which is for intermediate ownership, and yes, thanks to us and thanks to the work I have done, the one and two bed properties on the Heygate, all of them, including phase one, will be at 50% of market rent rate. That is a reduction that we have brought about through our negotiations, so I will take no lessons on social housing/affordable housing in this borough from Councillor Al-Samerai, shame on her.

2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS

In the Southwark News on 1 November 2012 Simon Hughes finally admitted that the government has cut the subsidy it pays for new affordable housing from £120,000 to £20,000 per unit. He then claims that this has had no impact on the deal at the Heygate. Do you agree?

RESPONSE

No. It appears that those who are currently criticising the deal that we have managed to get with Lend Lease are hiding behind the complexity of the issue, so I will attempt to make my explanation of the impact that the government cut to the affordable housing subsidy has on the Heygate as simple as possible:

- Southwark has a planning target of 35% affordable homes on the Heygate site.
- But developers (including Lend Lease) are only obliged, by law, to meet that target to the extent that it is financially viable for them to do so, as determined by a series of standard tests.
- In other words, the law recognises that development will not happen if affordable homes targets are set so high that developers would not make any profit if they were obliged to meet them, so there is a safety measure to make sure development does not grind to a halt.
- If a developer is able to demonstrate that having 35% affordable homes on a site is not financially viable, therefore, because they are less profitable than private homes, they do not have to build 35%. They only have to build, by law, as many as are financially viable by the standard tests.
- At the same time, the government gives a subsidy for new affordable housing so that they are not so unprofitable.

- Under the last government this subsidy was £120,000 per unit. The coalition government has cut this to £20,000 per unit.
- This subsidy is factored into the standard tests for testing whether building a certain amount of affordable homes is financially viable.
- So the over 80% cut to the government subsidy for affordable homes makes each affordable home less profitable, which in turn reduces the amount of affordable homes that developers will be obliged to build in new developments, by law, as determined by the standard tests.
- In short, the cut has meant that on the Heygate site less than 10% affordable housing is viable, according to the standard tests, following the coalition's cut, whereas before the cut much more would have been viable according to the same tests.

It is for this reason that we stand by our decision to write a minimum guarantee of 25% affordable housing into the contract with Lend Lease. This guarantee is not affected by the same viability tests.

I do not underestimate Simon Hughes understanding of this issue and am therefore concerned by his stated belief that cutting off the subsidy has no impact. His government's decision to cut off the housing subsidy to the Heygate has exactly the same impact as cutting off a subsidy to a country bus service would; it makes it less affordable. I hope that he will clarify that he understands this.

On a final note, it is a shame that there was no separate vote on the decision to cut the subsidy. It would have been another opportunity for Mr Hughes to demonstrate his flexible principles by either voting with the government or not opposing their proposals, just as he did on tuition fees, the VAT hike, the housing benefit cap and police cuts.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS

Thank you Madam Mayor, and I thank the leader for his answer. Councillor John will be aware that there was recently a vote in parliament on whether or not to let developers wriggle out of providing any affordable housing by immediately appealing section 106 agreements. Could he tell me if Simon Hughes supported or opposed this ridiculous measure?

RESPONSE

Yes, it is absolutely shocking, given the hypocrisy of the position of Councillor Al-Samerai and her colleagues, that Simon Hughes supported that Bill; the Growth and Restructure Bill, supported it, which means that the developers can get away with delivering zero affordable housing. And do you know what? Councillor Al-Samerai has been shouting for an answer, I have never known her to let the facts get in the way of anything she puts out in any publication or any leaflets; so why does she want the facts anyway? She is just going to make it up and scare the people in Southwark in any event. So go and write your leaflets, Councillor Al-Samerai, don't worry about the facts. You never have before.

3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS

Can the leader explain why the Cathedrals ward councillors are not invited to attend the Blackfriars Road Landowners Forum meetings? These meetings include a range of stakeholders from a wide spectrum and are for the purpose of discussing multimillion pound developments. Does the leader not recognise the ward councillors as important stakeholders who can make a valuable contribution on behalf of their community?

RESPONSE

The Blackfriars Road Landowners Forum is a forum for landowners on Blackfriars Road. Cathedrals ward councillors are not invited in their capacity as ward councillors because they are not, in their capacity as ward councillors, landowners on Blackfriars Road. This is not to say that Cathedrals ward councillors are precluded from ever being landowners on Blackfriars Road, only that it would either require the election of a landowner on Blackfriars Road to that office or a Cathedrals ward councillor to purchase land on Blackfriars Road.

It is not true to say that a wide variety of stakeholders, other than landowners on Blackfriars Road, are invited to this meeting as a matter of course.

I am satisfied that having a dedicated forum for landowners provides a useful space for the council to engage with them directly as well as providing a platform for wider consultation, which I understand Cathedrals ward councillors have previously benefitted from.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS

Thank you Madam Mayor, and I thank the leader for his answer. Perhaps if the leader did allow the Cathedrals ward members to come to those meetings you could allay those fears that the community have that you are having negotiations and making secret deals; I wondered if you would reconsider whether or not perhaps that we can come to those meetings, if only to save your own name?

RESPONSE

Well, I have heard what Councillor Morris has to say, I don't think my name is very highly thought of in any event by the Liberal Democrat circles.

I mean Councillor Morris, the point is this – I mean these secret meetings that everybody knows about that are taking place, which, the purpose of which, let me just explain the purpose behind these meetings.

These are to try to bring developers and landowners in the Blackfriars Road area together to try and agree, so that we get some coordination of public realm; an agreed view on public realm, a shared vision for Blackfrairs Road, because we have got lots of people coming forward all at the same time at the moment with ideas of what they want to do in Blackfriars Road in terms of development. Trying to get one view is better than having 12 or 20 different views. I think there is a place for local ward councillors in that debate at a certain point. I don't think we have got to that point yet, but she is part of the neighbourhood planning forum which is doing work on exactly the same area, where her views are being heard and being taking into consideration, and it is to bring those two sets of views

together. There is no secrecy and negotiation and discussions which are going on. They are not negotiations, it is discussions; it is a bit of blue sky thinking about what we should do with Blackfriars Road. She is not being kept out of anything, and I will invite her and her colleagues along to a meeting in the very near future I have no doubt.

4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU

Can the leader provide an update on the number of police lost from Southwark's streets since May 2010?

RESPONSE

The total number of frontline police officers lost in Southwark since May 2010 is 128 with a further 69 police community safety officers cut.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU

Thank you Madam Mayor, I thank the leader for his response. My supplementary question is in light of Simon Hughes' assertion that more police in Southwark does not actually mean less crime, what does the leader think has been the impact of officers' loss to date and does he believe that there will be further costs in the next few years?

RESPONSE

Well I am afraid, thank you very much Councillor Situ for your supplementary question, I am afraid that there may well be further police cuts in the future, and the trend that we have seen over the last two years is very worrying and we know that the police have to take 20% out of their budget, so the cuts we had already have come without those 20% cuts to the police budget. I think it is very wrong headed to say that more police on the streets doesn't equal less crime; I think the public are reassured by a very visible police presence on their streets, I think that's why the safer neighbourhood teams were so successful, delivered by the last government and the last Mayor of London and I think we all as councillors in Southwark should make the case for more police and more PCSOs on our streets in this borough rather than less.

5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON

Why has the council failed to meet the targeted increase for Bikeability level 1 cycle routes in 2011/12 (an increase of 2km)? Why is the target for 2012/13 only an additional increase of 1km? What is the targeted increase currently projected for 2013/14?

RESPONSE

We have not failed to meet the targeted increase. The current target is 'Increase the length of "bikeability level 1 cycle routes" in the borough by 10 per cent over the next five years'. This translates to delivering an additional 1km of bikeability level 1 roads and or paths per year. This increase is delivered through planned infrastructure improvements which are in the main delivered in the last quarter of the financial year, following this, an independent audit of the bikeability level is

undertaken meaning that the reporting of this target should be best considered on an annual basis.

Currently there are 57.345km of bikeability level 1 routes in the borough and the council is seeking to increase this to 58.5km by the end of 2012/13. The projected target for 2013/14 is 59.5km.

It is worth noting that the previous administration had eight years to undertake a bikeability audit but failed to do so; because of this administration's commitment to cycling we are one of only three London boroughs to undertake a bikeability audit in an effort to improve the cycling experience of our residents.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON

I think I thank the leader for his answer, although he has not directly answered it. I would ask him to confirm that the council has indeed missed its interim target to increase the length of level one bikeability cycle routes, and in view of that, does he think the current target to cover just 80% of roads in the borough is sufficient for beginner cyclists to train in safe, largely traffic free, environments?

RESPONSE

Well we can to-and-fro on it; I can only repeat my answer in terms of what I put in writing, but I would say there is a commitment from this administration at this time to make Southwark the safest cycling borough in London by 2020, and part of that has to be with bikeability level one routes. We are absolutely committed to increasing those across the borough as soon as we can, of course bearing in mind that we have had a £90 million cut to our budget and economic times are very tough; so we are on target I do assure him, and do assure him of our continued commitment to making Southwark the safest cycling borough in London.

6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DARREN MERRILL

When the heads of terms for the regeneration of the Heygate were approved by the previous Liberal Democrat administration, paragraph 57 of the report stated: "The level of affordable housing will be determined through the normal statutory planning processes in accordance with the emerging core strategy." Can the leader confirm how much affordable housing would have been delivered at the Heygate had this approach been followed?

RESPONSE

As I said in my response to question 2, the government cut to the affordable housing subsidy means that we anticipate less than 10% affordable housing would be delivered on Heygate if it was just left to the planning process. That would equal between 230 and 247 homes dependent upon the outcome of reserved matters applications as opposed to the at least 575-617 dependent upon the outcome of reserved matters applications that we will achieve as a result of our minimum guarantee.

Put starkly and simply: had the electoral result been different in May 2010, between 345-370 fewer affordable homes would be built on the Heygate site.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DARREN MERRILL

Thank you Madam Mayor and I thank the leader for his answer. With regards to the Heygate Estate regeneration, the Liberal Democrats are now claiming that they got 35% of affordable housing as an agreement within their planning documents. Is this correct?

RESPONSE

I would like to thank Councillor Merrill for his supplemental question. No, there was nothing secured by the Liberal Democrats to get 35% affordable housing on the Heygate site. It is very wrong headed and it is mistaken to say that. It is planning policy, that's right; it is planning policy, but we all know that planning policy is subject to the usual economic viability tests that developers have to go through, and we know from experience across London, from looking at major schemes of a similar order to the Heygate, that in the region of between 15 and 18 or even less percent affordable housing is being delivered, and we know that if the usual economic viability tests had been applied to the Heygate site, which is the approach which the Liberal Democrats were going to take, about 8 or 9% of affordable housing would have been delivered. That is why our minimum guarantee – and it is a minimum guarantee – of 25% affordable housing on the Heygate site is a good thing at this present time in this economic climate and I don't know why people cannot get that or understand it.

I think what the opposition has to show to us, Councillor Merrill, is how they would deliver 35%, because when I was being interviewed by the overview and scrutiny committee, there was no Liberal Democrat member who could explain how they get to 35%, other than by using the affordable housing fund to put more money in; which is of course something which they fundamentally disagreed with in the first place anyway, so you know they cannot get to this figure of 35%. It is a nonsense and they have to get real about what is going on across our borough, because they are just not being taken seriously at the moment.

7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON

Following the recent inclusion of the Sky Lounge in the 1 Blackfriars developments at a cost of £5.5 million, does the leader think that the construction of viewing lounges is an appropriate way for developers to provide public contributions? What plans does the council have to use the Sky Lounge for its own events and meetings? What steps will the leader take to ensure that the Sky Lounge will not be treated as a profit making exercise for its owners?

RESPONSE

The opposition have both recently stated that public access to a viewing gallery at 1 Blackfriars is a waste of public money and that the council should intervene, which would require spending public money, to get free public access to a viewing gallery in the Shard.

We are clear that providing some sort of public access to the borough's new tall buildings is a positive thing. It is the opposition that need to decide where they stand on the issue.

8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD

While we all appreciate the rough and tumble of local politics, how important is it for politicians of all parties to adhere to a minimum standard of decency when engaging in political debate?

RESPONSE

It is vitally important. I believe that having a vibrant local democracy improves our decisions. Where decisions are subject to scrutiny, debate and competition, the end result will be better than where they are unscrutinised and unrivalled.

But that – what you might call the rough and tumble of local politics – must always remain subject to a level of decency; our residents expect it of us. Members will know that I have recently written to Simon Hughes MP about two matters: politicking at the time of Helen Morrissey's funeral and behaviour around a public meeting, which I have been concerned have not met that level of decency. I know that many members share my concern.

I have further been concerned that Councillor Al-Samerai's recent decision to criticise Councillor Colley for having a private life during her maternity leave represents a continuation of this sort of nasty and personal lack of decency. I hope that – having had time to reflect – she will apologise to Councillor Colley for her remarks.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD

Thank you Madam Mayor, I thank the leader for his answer. Does he think it is the role of any public figure to dictate how mothers should be spending their maternity leave?

RESPONSE

No I don't think it is, and I think it was regrettable that Councillor Al Samerai raised the issue of what Councillor Colley was doing during her maternity leave and in her private time and private life. I think it is a shame that she has not apologised but actually indulged into a Twitter row with Councillor Colley about what Councillor Colley should be doing. Councillor Colley is here this evening; as Councillor Colley would say, 'Would Anood approve?' She probably would approve of you being here this evening, but I hope you are not in East Walworth tomorrow, Fiona.

9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

Please could the leader give an update on the number of new primary and secondary school places needed by 2015, broken down by ward?

RESPONSE

I am interested that the opposition has suddenly become interested in this subject. My colleagues Councillor Colley and the councillors for Peckham Rye lobbied hard in 2009/10 to get the then Liberal Democrat executive to take notice of the growing demand for school places in the borough, but their calls fell on deaf ears.

A telling example of the previous administration's complacency is evidenced in a discussion on primary places in the south of the borough before the elections in 2010. The then leader of the council appeared at a meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee in 2010 and maintained the then executive line that demand for new primary school places in the south of the borough "peaks in 2015 before declining to about one form above the current capacity. This would suggest that additional places are required locally but mostly to accommodate a population bulge, with only a small permanent increase in numbers."

Our estimates indicate that Dulwich will in fact need between 2 and 2.5 additional forms of entry (FE) by September 2015 and this will increase to 2.5 to 3 FE in September 2016.

Our recent cabinet decision to commit real resources to a long-term solution to the growth in the need for school places shows that, contrary to the opposition's complacency, we are getting to grips with the problem.

It is not possible to break down the primary or secondary information by individual ward. The information on the number of new primary places required by 2015 was included in the report to cabinet.

The information on the number of new secondary places is included in the "What's Happening" bulletin circulated to all head teachers. Secondary school place planning is carried out on a borough wide basis. We are anticipating there would be a secondary shortfall of 10 forms of entry by 2016 and if the Compass proposals to establish a 4 FE free school on the Bermondsey site of Southwark and Lewisham College proceeds then we would still anticipate a shortfall of 6 FE over the same period.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

I would like to thank the leader for his response. I am disappointed that you have not been able to supply me with a ward by ward breakdown of the estimates of future need for school places because obviously that would be fairly helpful; and I wondered with that in mind, why didn't the Elephant and Castle supplementary planning document (SPD) make proper provision for increased school places? Clearly people are going to be coming to the Elephant and Castle as a result of the wider regeneration strategy, and there is already a shortage of primary school and secondary school places in parts of the borough; it would have made sense to have that included in that document.

RESPONSE

Well, the education requirements were undoubtedly considered as part of the Elephant and Castle SPD. What I would say to her is if you look at the cabinet report that we considered, it did break down on an area by area basis where the need for both primary and secondary school places would be across the borough. I think what is encouraging, and I said this at the last council assembly meeting, is that our officer team do have in place plans for how to deal with the growth in numbers over the next few years, and they have plans which I think are deliverable and achievable, provided we get financial support from the Department for Education which I believe should be forthcoming. So I think we can take some comfort from that, and I think that officers are looking ahead, they are planning on pupil places and pupil numbers and I think it is beholden on us as councillors,

particularly councillors who are school governors, to work with our schools to ensure that those schools do cooperate with the work that officers are doing to try and find permanent expansions to accommodate this growth in numbers.

10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED

What impact have the government's new planning framework, coupled with the slashing of the affordable housing grant, had on the viability of regeneration projects like the Heygate including on rent charges?

RESPONSE

The introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and reduction of social housing grant have had a significant impact on the viability of regeneration projects. In the current economic climate regeneration projects are a challenge. This is principally due to the substantial costs associated with delivery over and above those of a standard development. These costs include:

- creation of new high quality infrastructure associated with the development of a new neighbourhood including roads, public realm and utility capacity
- contributions to improvements to transport infrastructure
- community facilities, including parks and contributions to health and education capacity
- site preparation works including demolition and site decontamination
- cash flow and finance charges
- socio-economic programmes
- sustainability requirements.

In addition the development is required to meet the cost of providing affordable housing. Under the 2008-11 national affordable homes programme the average social housing grant for new homes in Southwark was £120,000 per unit for social rent and £36,000 per unit for intermediate housing. Under the 2011-15 affordable homes programme, the funding available nationally was substantially reduced and registered providers (RPs) in London were invited to seek funding from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) at a much reduced grant level. This has resulted in an average of £33,600 for affordable rent and £15,400 per unit for intermediate housing with grant generally limited to schemes delivering affordable rent properties.

More recently a government proposal that developers can immediately challenge section 106 affordable housing requirements has the potential to make the delivery of affordable housing on major regeneration projects even more difficult.

The financial impact on the regeneration of the Heygate Estate of the new social housing grant regime over the life of the project is a loss of grant in the order of £40 million, thus putting increasing pressure on the viability of the project. In normal circumstances this challenge is met by a financial assessment submitted to the planning authority which adjusts the level of affordable housing to a level which the scheme can afford. In the case of the Heygate such an assessment would result in the quantum of affordable housing being delivered on site at below 10%.

In order to address the reduction in the availability of social housing grant the government introduced the concept of affordable rent within the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF. This allowed for rents to be charged at up to 80%

of market rents on both new build and a proportion of re-let properties. The council's analysis has demonstrated that rents at 80% of market rent are unaffordable to Southwark's residents therefore this option is not deemed appropriate for Southwark and is therefore not available to meet the funding gap left by the reduction of social housing grant.

11. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK

How many reports of fly-tipping have been made in the last 12 months, broken down by ward? How many fines has the council issued in each of the last three years for a) fly-tipping, and b) littering?

RESPONSE

Reports of fly-tipping

Southwark cleaning services pro-actively deal with fly-tipping across the borough. In 2010/11 the cleansing service introduced a new system which meant that fly-tipping reports by staff was recorded more accurately, by the type of items and the locations. This has meant that there has been an increase in the numbers of fly-tips being recorded and better information on the extent of issues.

The number of reports of fly-tipping which are recorded on the council's confirm data base, broken down by ward, is as follows.

Fly-tipping statistics by Ward 1 November 2011 to 31 October 2012	
Ward	Totals
Brunswick	251
Camberwell	228
Cathedral	430
Chaucer	199
College	150
East Dulwich	254
East Walworth	314

Fly-tipping statistics by Ward 1 November 2011 to 31 October 2012	
Faraday	246
Grange	239
Livesey	262
Newington	315

Fly-tipping statistics by Ward 1 November 2011 to 31 October 2012	
Nunhead	291
Peckham	250
Peckham Rye	262
Riverside	89
Rotherhithe	141
South Bermondsey	163
South Camberwell	106
Surrey Docks	179
The Lane	444
Village	129
Total	4942

Fixed Penalty Notices for fly-tipping

All minor (for example bags only) fly-tips in public area are routinely dealt with by fixed penalty notices. These are all dealt with by means of a littering fixed penalty notice issued under Section 87/88 Environmental Protection Act 1990 which covers a range of waste types and volumes.

The number of fixed penalty notices for fly-tipping issued by the council's environmental enforcement team over the past two years is as follows:

2011/12	Fixed penalty notices issued	376
April – Oct 2012	Fixed penalty notices issued	375

The recorded figures for fixed penalty notices serviced by the combined noise and environmental enforcement in 2010/11 were 3,243. However these include fixed penalty notices for cigarette littering which formed part of a council-wide campaign to tackle this problem. The overall figures were significantly inflated due to this campaign.

Littering

The number of fixed penalty notices for littering issued by the wardens service over the past three years are as follows:

2010	Fixed penalty notices issued	710
2011	Fixed penalty notices issued	475
2012 (YTD)	Fixed penalty notices issued	474

12. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON

How much has been spent on repairs and other works to the roof terrace in the Council's Tooley Street office in 2012/13 and in 2011/12?

RESPONSE

It is unfortunate that the Liberal Democrats are so keen to decry the costs of repairs and other works undertaken on the Southwark's Tooley Street office. It was, after all, their decision to move the council to the new headquarters and since then all costs for occupying and fitting out the building have been contained within the budget set by their administration.

Essential health and safety works were required to the roof terrace and were completed on 29 June 2012. These comprised structural strengthening of the balustrading upstands, perimeter decking and fixings and infill of open panels to meet building control and health and safety requirements. Expenditure to complete this essential work was as follows:

- Expenditure in 2011/12 - £9,625
- Expenditure in 2012/13 - £52,143.

A retention sum of £1,289 is due to be released in 2013/14 subject to a satisfactory completion of the contract defect period.

There are currently no further works planned for the roof terrace. The very low level of day to day maintenance and minor repair is contained within the existing Tooley Street facilities management budget.

13. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL KYRIACOU

Will he give an update on the review of nurseries and children's centres launched in August and when the findings will be made public? Will he commit to keep all existing childcare services and nurseries in the borough open next year?

RESPONSE

The most recent update is available on the council's website here: <http://moderngov.southwarksites.com/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=3230>.

Whilst we have set a provisional budget for next year, we will not know how large the coalition government's cuts to Southwark are until after the Chancellor's 'Autumn Statement' (which will laughably be delivered at the start of the widely recognised autumnal month of December). No one can make any cast-iron commitments on council spending until we know quite how bad the settlement is going to be.

14. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON

Can he confirm how many schemes for new council homes were agreed between May 2002 and May 2010?

RESPONSE

No new build developments of council homes were agreed between May 2002 and May 2010.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON

Yes I have, madam Mayor and I want to thank the deputy leader for his response. Now the deputy leader would appreciate I am both astonished and each time I read his answer I am increasingly angry by the response. The deputy leader may be aware that the Liberal Democrats have recently distributed leaflets and annoyed my constituents on the doorsteps claiming that they care about council housing. Now, given that the Liberal Democrats have failed to agree any new council homes over the past eight years, how many will this administration build in the forthcoming eight years?

RESPONSE

Thank you Madam Mayor and I would like to thank Councillor Seaton for his supplementary question. In fact, it wasn't this government, it was the last Labour government, one of the last things the last Labour government did in office was to give the power back to local councils to build council homes, so let's get the facts right.

I am also proud to be part of an administration that the leader has given a firm commitment to, that is going to build 1,000 new council homes by 2020. We have already taken a report to the cabinet which has identified nearly 300 units in different sites across the borough where we can start to build those 1,000 homes. This is a clear sea-change from the previous administration, as my previous answer says, where nothing was built. So we have started off where the Liberals finished; with a complete empty basket of building new homes. And it is not the only thing they left us with; they left us with a £0.5 billion gap in our housing investment programme and we have had to bridge that gap, we bridged that gap with our warm, dry, safe programme, which is as you know is at least £326 million and we are hoping over the coming years to put more money in that, because if we had continued with the Liberal Democrat programme we would have had over 22,000 homes that would have been non-decent under that programme if we would have continued it. So I am very proud to be part of this administration that has taken housing to the heart of our programme during a period when this government is attacking public housing, is attacking the welfare that supports people in benefits within those houses particularly here in Southwark. So, in a period where the Liberal Democrats didn't build anything in their eight years in office but instead sold over 9,000 council properties, then we do not need to take any lectures from the opposition over there.

15. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL

In 2009 the Audit Commission found that: "In 2008/09, [the council] invested £73 million in works to achieve decent homes whereas double this figure was required to meet their targets. They aim to increase investment further by better contracting arrangements and the sale of buildings."

The report also acknowledged that “not enough has been done so far. There remains a significant funding gap to bridge, and over 18,000 homes are still likely to be non-decent in 2013. This is partly because Southwark has decided, in line with the wishes of residents, to improve homes to a higher standard. This will give more tenants new kitchens and bathrooms. However, it also means that more tenants will continue to live in poor-quality housing for longer. The lack of an up-to-date picture of the condition of council housing means that it is uncertain how much more investment may be needed and therefore how soon the improvements can be made.”

Is this incontrovertible evidence not only that the previous administration planned to sell council homes to fund decent homes work, but also that their decent homes programme was nothing but an abject failure?

RESPONSE

Absolutely. The only thing more depressing than the previous administration’s total failure of a housing investment programme is their utter hypocrisy over void disposals.

In March 2009 the executive affirmed its intention to fund its housing investment programme through, amongst other things, the disposal of void properties.

The executive, as it was then, also agreed ‘that 100% of the receipts generated from the additional disposal of voids and land proposed by this report are used to fund the housing investment programme to deliver Southwark’s decent homes standard’.

However a report to the cabinet in December 2010 identified not only a shortfall of up to £314 million in delivery of the Southwark standard but that by 2015/16 a total of 22,463 properties would actually be non-decent.

So not only was their housing investment programme underfunded, it would have had the perverse effect of leaving less homes decent than when the programme began.

That is why in May 2011 this administration implemented a new fully-funded and timetabled housing investment programme that will make every council homes in Southwark warm, dry and safe by 2016.

This Labour administration is delivering where the Liberal Democrats failed.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL

Thank you very much , Madam Mayor. Could you please detail how the current programme is progressing as a scheme for all and not just the few that they choose?

RESPONSE

I thank Councillor Dolezal for his supplementary question; I am tempted to refer him to my previous answer, but can I say that one of the key things that marks out the difference between this administration and the previous administration with the

warm, dry, safe programme, is that we responded to what the residents wanted in terms of a housing investment programme. They wanted transparency; that was non-existent before, they wanted certainty; that was non-existent before, and they wanted a clear timetable, and that was non-existent before. So we have listened to our residents, we have not acted in a dictatorial manner, we have introduced a programme that they wanted all that time through that eight years when the Liberal Democrats were in power. So we have instituted our warm, dry, safe programme.

It is proving so successful in terms of the works that are on the way that now we are bringing forward those elements that were programmed for the later years. So that means we have not only kept to our programme, we are ahead of our programme; and if that isn't success, I don't know what is.

16. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

Can he provide a breakdown of which estates are due to benefit from improved CCTV coverage thanks to the council's £1.4 million capital investment?

RESPONSE

The programme of investment into the borough's estates CCTV network plays an important role in raising public confidence in the safety of their surroundings. It is also an important resource that aids crime prevention and detection.

In September this year, the cabinet agreed the investment into the upgrade and refurbishment of essential CCTV for the benefit of the following estates:

- Four Squares Estate
- Aylesbury Estate
- Gloucester Grove Estate
- Castlemead Estate
- Wyndham & Comber Estate
- Brandon 1 Estate
- Elmington Estate
- Draper Estate
- Perronet Estate
- Newington Estate
- Abbeyfield Estate
- Hawkstone Estate
- Osprey Estate
- Silverlock Estate
- Bramcote Estate
- Bonamy Estate
- Kingswood Estate
- Tabard Estate
- Kipling Estate
- Tustin Estate.

The programme will also include investment in 30 redeployable cameras, which can be moved across the borough to respond to emerging crime and anti social behaviour issues. The cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety has asked officers to develop a business case considering the deployment of some of these cameras on the Manor Estate.

In addition to the specific estates listed, we will be embarking on an ambitious programme of work that upgrades and installs new transmission equipment that will enable the council to place any of the new redeployable cameras on other estates in Southwark where it is most needed.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

I would like to thank the deputy leader for his answer. My supplementary is, what impact does he believe this investment in CCTV will have on crime and anti-social behaviour on our estates?

RESPONSE

I would like to thank Councillor Lauder for her supplementary question. I believe this will have a significant impact on anti-social behaviour on our estates. Every single councillor in this room gets regular complaints about anti-social behaviour, and may I say that some councillors, and I am looking at my colleague there in the Village ward, are the subject of anti-social behaviour because of where they live. So it affects all of us in this borough as residents in an entirety so it is important we get this CCTV up and running and also I think it runs parallel with the other work that we are doing, and my colleague Councillor Livingstone is at the forefront of this, and again the cabinet paper the other day which is outlining our violent crime strategy.

This is another sea-change from the previous administration. We've lobbied for years over those eight years for this council to adopt the violent crime strategy to deal with gangs and the problems that people were facing on our estates. Did they listen to us? No. They voted it down each time we brought a motion to this assembly, so again we have listen to what the residents have wanted and we have delivered what the residents want through our crime strategy whether it is a violent crime strategy or whether it is through putting CCTV on our estates. Our borough will be a lot safer by the time Labour stands for re-election in 2014 and that's why we will be elected with an increased majority.

17. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET

What definition does the council use to define the various tenures of affordable housing (social rented, affordable and intermediate)? Does the council accept the official government definition outlined in Planning Policy Statement 3?

RESPONSE

I would like to answer the second question first. Unlike Simon Hughes, who has taken contrary positions at a local and a national level, we have been consistent in our opposition to the coalition government's definition of "affordable rent" as anything up to 80% of market rent.

Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes a third type of affordable housing ("affordable rent") it does not explicitly require boroughs to include affordable rent within its planning policies. However, the London Plan is currently being amended to require boroughs to include affordable rent as part of

its policies. The council have objected to this and council representatives are attending the London Plan examination in public on 22 November 2012 to put forward our concerns and request that boroughs should be given the flexibility to deliver affordable housing that meets its housing need.

The council's adopted definitions of affordable housing are set out in the core strategy (2011) and the draft affordable housing supplementary planning document (June 2011). This includes a definition of affordable housing, social rented housing and intermediate housing. However, due to the adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012, the council now use the definitions in the NPPF, bearing in mind the following caveats in relation to affordable rent. We are updating our planning documents with these new definitions (so far we have the new definitions within fact boxes in the adopted Canada Water area action plan, the adopted Elephant and Castle supplementary planning document and the draft Peckham and Nunhead area action plan), and will review this as part of our local plan preparation in 2013.

National government amended the definition of affordable housing through Planning Policy Statement 3 (adopted June 2011). Planning Policy Statement 3 has since been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was adopted in March 2012. The NPPF defines three types of affordable housing in its glossary as follows:

"Affordable housing: Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.

Social rented housing is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency.

Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).

Intermediate housing is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the affordable housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing.

Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as "low cost market" housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes."

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET

I have Madam Mayor; thank you, and I thank the cabinet member for his initial answer.

I suspect we are always going to disagree on housing in this borough sadly, but there we go. So I wanted to try and ask a question following on from the leader's appearance at overview and scrutiny committee which obviously you won't know, so I will explain very briefly, where we got into a discussion about trying to find some practical ways forward in terms of borrowing against the housing revenue account to try and plug gaps left by the reduction in social housing grants, which, yes, does exist. And it is really to ask the cabinet member if I may, Madam Mayor, apologies for the long introduction, which is to say is actually increasing the way we borrow, maybe taking a few more risks, and increasing that gearing, is something which off the back of housing commission you might consider doing? And it is entirely meant in the spirit of being helpful.

RESPONSE

I would like to thank Councillor Noblet for his supplementary question and as always, he is always helpful. Can I say, yes, that was a very sensible question and I will give a sensible response. You're quite right – for a change. You are quite right to raise this issue and I wasn't at the overview and scrutiny committee as you say, but that issue was raised as part of the housing commission report. It is quite clearly detailed in there in terms of the investment options for the future, and we are very keen to spark a debate the length and breadth of the borough on those particular investment options.

There are different schools of opinion on this, as you can well imagine, and before we jump the gun on this and make any policy announcement it is important that we get the feedback from our residents in terms of the housing commission report and also that we deliberate with our own officers in relation to the financial repercussions. But I hope you will make a contribution to that debate as a group and as individual councillors as well, because the more ideas we get on this and the more ideas particularly in terms of how we can mitigate any negative effects on this would be very welcome.

18. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY

Would the cabinet member list the developments where the council has accepted in-lieu payments instead of affordable housing since May 2010, and the value of each of the payments accepted? What proportion of these in-lieu payments has been spent on affordable housing?

RESPONSE

The developments where the council has awarded planning permission and accepted in-lieu payments for affordable housing element of the scheme, since May 2010 is listed below.

Site	Value of in-lieu payment (£)
Bankside Industrial Estate 118-122	9,000,000
Blackfriars Road 231-241	556,000
Kings Reach Tower, Stamford Street	22,435,000
New Kent Road 157-159	15,000
Land at Ewer Street	30,500
Wedge House, 32-40 Blackfriars Road	100,000
1 Tower Bridge Road, Land adjacent to Lambeth College	10,510,000
Spa Road 19	2,100,000
St. Giles Hospital, St Giles Road	100,000
Grove Vale 18-22	711,000
Total	45,557,500

The receipt of payments in each case will be based on milestones in the legal agreements triggered by stages reached in the development process. A number of these developments have yet to commence.

The funds generated as a result of these in-lieu payments are pooled into the affordable housing fund (AHF) and are ring fenced to the delivery of new affordable housing.

Approval for the use of in lieu payments is reserved to planning committee. To date, of the schemes listed above, planning committee has approved the allocation of funds from land at Ewer Street to support the provision of affordable housing on Stead Street car park site.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY

Thank you, Madam Mayor, yes. Thank you for your answer; given that this government has now allowed councils to build council housing and has allowed them to keep the receipts from right to buy, and given that the home ownership unit over the next eight years is forecasting 800 homes will be sold under right to buy and they will be forced to replace them one for one, and given the figure he quotes here in response to question 18 which represents about 250 homes adding up together to over 1050. Are the 1000 new council homes that he is committing to buy in addition to this 1050, or is he just talking about doing what he would have to have done anyway?

RESPONSE

Obviously it is not my particular brief as such, but thank you for your supplementary question. I have just confirmed with my colleague the leader that these are in addition, but I must pick you up on two things. Firstly to correct you again, it wasn't your government, it was the previous Labour government that introduced the policy for councils to build their own homes again; and secondly this fetish with right to buy that somehow this is the panacea to all housing ills across the length and breadth of the land. I mean, it's completely misguided. You do not look at the practical effects that it is going to have on residents in this borough. Yes, people see the advertisements and they think 'oh we'll get the discount on our homes' and they rush out to apply, what they don't think is the longer term financial commitments in buying their properties, whether that is through a

mortgage or whether that is through the service charges that they will receive from time to time.

To say that through the right to buy we are going to have X amount of right to buy sales and the money from that we can then invest in building these new council homes; yes that is one, but only, I think, a very small source of money. I don't think a lot of that will be realised. These are estimates at the end of the day and I think a lot of people who do apply for right to buy will find that they haven't got the financial wherewithal to follow through on those major financial commitments. And I think as a council we have not only a financial but a moral responsibility to point out to our residents the huge financial commitments that they are getting themselves into under right to buy. Because again, I think every ward councillor must have leaseholders coming to them talking about the difficulties they have in meeting their service charges, whether it is on major works or other commitments and so therefore it is important that we act responsibly when people comes to us requesting the right to buy. And I think we should leave the ideology out of it and just look at the practicalities.

19. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA

How many leaseholders were under or overcharged on their service charge account in 2011/12? What is the average time taken by the council to correct these errors? What action has been taken to improve leaseholder charging in 2012/13?

RESPONSE

Leaseholders' service charges by their very nature are variable charges. As such, and in line with the terms of the lease, we invoice the annual service charges on an estimated basis prior to the commencement of the financial year. Only after the end of the financial year (March), can we begin to collate and calculate the actual charges. Most modern service charges are variable, therefore they rise or fall each year in line with expenditure. The process involves gathering information from various service providers and calculating the cost of what we actually spent on providing the services to the blocks and estates. The process takes approximately six months and therefore we aim to provide the credit note or additional invoice in October following the end of the financial year.

Therefore the estimated service charge is not over or undercharged. It is an estimated charge which is based on the actual service charges for the past three years. A combination of known factors (planned preventative maintenance costs, insurance premiums) and unknown factors (gas/fuel prices, responsive repairs) all contribute to the estimated charge.

Below you will find a table which outlines that there were 3,377 leaseholders who received a credit in respect of their 2011/12 actual service charge and 8,627 leaseholders received a debit and a further invoice for their 2011/12 actual service charge. 67 leaseholders received no adjustment.

Credits and debits (excluding tenant management organisations)		
	Leaseholders	Value of credit/debits
Number of leaseholders who will be getting a credit	3,377	-495,538.38

Credits and debits (excluding tenant management organisations)		
	Leaseholders	Value of credit/debits
Number of leaseholders who will be getting debit	8,627.	2,427,055.25
No adjustment	67	0.00
Total	12,071	1,931,516.87

With respect to how many leaseholders were under or overcharged for their service charge account in 2011/12, the answer is 220. These were all leaseholders of houses who were charged an insurance premium (leases of houses require the leaseholder to insure the house). Apology letters have been issued and the service charge accounts credited, this has taken four weeks. The error, caused by leaseholders of houses not being differentiated from leaseholders of flats, has been corrected by the creation of a separate process for constructing service charges for freeholders and leaseholders of flats.

A number of initiatives have been put in place in recent years to ensure the accuracy of the annual service charges. They include a full electricity survey, working closely with the repairs section to ensure data quality monitoring, an audit of pre and post inspections, accuracy of cost recording within the housing revenue account and the implementation of the new billing and accounts receivable (BAR) system.

20. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK

How can the registered nurse in the housing department effectively complete a medical and self care assessment of an individual's needs without visiting them and observing their ability to self care and the effect a medical condition has on their quality of life?

RESPONSE

The medical assessment service (MAS) conducts assessments not on health treatment and support needs alone, but considers the impact of a person's current accommodation on these needs. The applicant completes a self-assessment to explain the impact and can submit documents from health care professionals to support this.

The MAS does not assess an applicant's ability to self-care as this function is the responsibility of occupational therapy and/or social services, who carry out home visits, and MAS does liaise with these other departments as required. Assessments carried out by occupational therapists and social workers are shared with MAS if relevant. The expectation is that most clients assessed by MAS are able to live independently and the nursing officer grades the difficulty they experience in their current home according to the information provided by the client and their healthcare professional and in line with the banding in the council's lettings policy.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK

Thank you madam Mayor, I would like to thank the deputy leader for his answer and I am pleased to see that he thinks that the impact of a person's current accommodation on their needs should be considered as I have actually seen very little evidence to that recently.

What I would like to ask you is would you agree with me that as many vulnerable residents live with carers who enable them to remain in the community, these carers should be considered as essential to individuals' housing needs; and would you agree that those individuals who have very limited mobility and are therefore living in accommodation that basically make them prisoners in their own home be given an above average banding, and be considered higher priority for ground floor and stairless accommodation?

RESPONSE

Thank you Councillor Capstick for that supplementary question, again, another sensible question and I hopefully give another sensible answer.

I am very pleased with what you said because as you know we have had a cross party working party with residents on our lettings review working party. You have had two representatives there at different times, and we have talked about prioritising carers within our lettings policy. The whole of that report is going to go out to consultation across the borough in the near future, and certainly my personal position is that I would like to see the role of carers recognised more formally within our housing allocation process because they are an essential need for the elderly, for the infirm, the vulnerable etc, etc. So I think we are all singing from the same hymn sheet on that; and again when that is out to consultation in the near future I hope that you and other members of your group collectively will respond to that in a positive way to ensure that it is recognised in our lettings policy.

21. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE

How many incorrect rent statements have been sent out to tenants in the last year? What is the cabinet member doing to ensure that this problem is resolved?

RESPONSE

The problem with the rent statements was caused by a software error, which resulted in a failure in the process to accurately generate the documents. At no time was the underlying data compromised, or in error. There were approximately 7,000 rent statements affected in the first run in May 2012, and 300 in June 2012 run. There have been no other errors with the statements in the last twelve months.

450,000 statements are generated each year and this failure therefore represents a 1.5% error rate. It is however, recognised that any level of error is unacceptable in view of the potential distress to tenants, and the problem was therefore escalated immediately to the director level with the software supplier.

The software problem has now been rectified and correct statements subsequently issued. In addition, the supplier has since provided to the council verification software which checks the output before despatch. Together with more robust

sign off procedures, and a review of internal verification processes, we are comfortable that errors of this nature will not occur in the future.

22. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN

How many care leavers have been evicted within three years of signing up to new tenancies in the last 12 months? What is the council doing to ensure care leavers are supported to find suitable housing?

RESPONSE

Care leavers are referred to the housing options services by children's services under our joint protocol and are granted band 2 on the housing list, which offers sufficient priority for them to make a successful bid for a home within a reasonable period.

A total of four care leavers have been evicted within three years of signing up new tenancies in the last 12 months. A further care leaver was evicted who was a licensee.

Of these, three were referred to the sustain team prior to the eviction and two of these received very intensive support and the sustain team were able to help them sustain their tenancy at the time. Sustain are keen to work with housing management to ensure that referrals are made to their team at the point of a young care leaver signing up for a property, rather than at the point of them being at risk, to improve outcomes for young people.

Any person evicted in Southwark is able to approach housing options services for advice, and in some cases we will try to assist with access to a private sector home.

23. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES

How many council homes have been a) sold, b) demolished and c) built since May 2010, broken down by ward?

RESPONSE

The figures below are for the period April 2010 to the most recent data available.

a) **Disposals**

The information for disposals is broken into two categories, right to buy disposals, and disposals of other void properties.

Right to buy	
Brunswick Park	5
Camberwell Green	1
Cathedrals	3
East Dulwich	1

Right to buy	
East Walworth	1
Faraday	2
Grange	3
Livesey	11
Newington	10
Nunhead	4
Peckham	9
Peckham Rye	1
South Camberwell	6
South Bermondsey	6
The Lane	6
Village	1
Riverside	9
Surrey Docks	2
Rotherhithe	4
Chaucer	4
College	1
Total	90

Non right to buy	
Brunswick Park	11
Camberwell Green	8
Cathedrals	2
East Dulwich	12
East Walworth	7
Faraday	4
Grange	1
Livesey	4
Newington	4
Nunhead	13
Peckham	11
Peckham Rye	9
South Camberwell	20
South Bermondsey	8
The Lane	7
Village	6

Non right to buy	
Riverside	1
Total	128

b) **Demolition**

These are the numbers of units removed from the stock for the purposes of demolition from April 2010 to date; not all the units have yet been physically demolished. All of the properties are being demolished as part of the regeneration schemes at Aylesbury Estate, Heygate Estate and Bermondsey Spa.

Faraday	111
East Walworth	43
Grange	30
Total	184

c) **New build**

These are the number of units completed to date. They do not include the properties under construction at Lindley Estate, SE15 or any of those in phase 1 of the direct delivery programme approved by cabinet on 23 October 2012.

Peckham	2
Chaucer	1
College	4
South Camberwell	3
Nunhead	3
Total	13

24. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND

Can he provide a breakdown by a) postcode and b) age of under-occupying social housing tenants that will have their housing benefit cut by the government from next April?

RESPONSE

The data currently available and presented within the attached spreadsheet represents the most up to date projection of the numbers of council tenants affected by the social sector size criteria from April 2013.

(Note: The housing department are continuing to re-evaluate their property sizing information and data and therefore the information presented may be subject to review).

This identifies that currently there are 3,463 council tenants who will be impacted by the size criteria changes from April 2013. Of this number the greatest impact will be seen in the 45-54 age group and the post code with the greatest number of affected claimants is SE15.

The table provides both the post code and age analysis requested.

No of unoccupied bedrooms	No of claimants
Under occupying by 1 bedroom	2,482
Under occupying by 2 bedrooms or more	981
Total	3,463

Post code analysis	
No of unoccupied bedrooms	No of claimants
SE1 ***	567
SE11 ***	38
SE14 ***	12
SE15 ***	858
SE16 ***	508
SE17 ***	606
SE19 ***	8
SE21 ***	76
SE22 ***	169
SE23 ***	19
SE24 ***	35
SE26 ***	1
SE5 ***	553
SE8 ***	12
DA14 ***	1
Total	3,463

Age analysis	
No of unoccupied bedrooms	No of claimants
18-24	53
25-34	235
35-44	583
45-54	1,586
55-61	1,006
Total	3,463

25. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES

Can she provide the latest information on the number of long-term young unemployed people in Southwark and what, if any, impact the government's work programme is having on long-term young unemployed in Southwark?

RESPONSE

The 18-24 jobseekers allowance claimant count has shown a steady decrease over the past 12 months from 2750 to 2132 in September 2012.

Longer term youth unemployment (over one year of claiming) in Southwark is a concern, having risen from 180 to 400 over the same 12 month period.

This experience of the labour market when young can also have a long-term impact on future earnings and employment.

Although the government's work programme went live in 2011, it is impossible to state with any certainty the impact it is having on long-term young unemployed in Southwark as no borough-level performance data has been published. This data is held by the Department of Work and Pensions.

On 20 November 2012 the cabinet agreed a new economic wellbeing strategy. One of the priorities in this strategy is closing the gap between Southwark's employment rate and the London average. To do this, we will need to focus on youth unemployment and in particular the needs of those who have been or are at risk of being unemployed for long periods of time. We will work with public, private and voluntary partners, including developers, to find and support people into work.

26. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROWENNA DAVIS

How many apprentices has the council taken on this year and how many of last year's cohort have gone on to find long-term employment?

RESPONSE

This year the council has recruited directly and provided support to the "major works" contractors to employ apprentices, in line with the council's scheme. The total number of appointments and apprenticeships on programme at present is 46 comprising:

- 24 new apprenticeship appointments to the council
- three existing council apprentices progressed to a higher level apprenticeship framework within the council
- six apprentices are continuing on their learning programme (craft and technical posts, which have a longer apprenticeship learning period)
- 13 new apprenticeship appointments with "major works" contractors.

In 2011, 16 apprentices were appointed with a learning programme of 12 months duration, with the following outcomes:

- 12 people successfully completed their frameworks. Nine people secured employment with the council; two people secured employment with Serco; one person is working in a voluntary organisation in Southwark
- Three people successfully completed their apprenticeship framework and have progressed to a higher level apprenticeship
- One individual did not complete their learning framework.

27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

Please give the ethnic breakdown of a) people on the council housing waiting list, b) school exclusions, and c) registered business owners in the borough.

RESPONSE

The council does not ask business rate payers what their ethnicity is and as such we do not hold this information.

The council does not ask people on the housing waiting list what ethnicity they are and as such we do not hold this information.

The ethnic breakdown for school exclusions is shown in the table below and is for 2010/11.

Note: # = Figures of 10 or below are suppressed for confidentiality reasons.

Note: * = Local authority except pupil referral units and nurseries.

Ethnicity	Number of children*	% of total school population	Fixed Term exclusions	% of school population	Permanent exclusions instances	% of school population
Bangladeshi	977	2.7%	#	#	#	#
Indian	270	0.7%	#	#	0	0.00%
Pakistani	190	0.5%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Any Other Asian	582	1.6%	#	#	0	0.00%
Black Caribbean	3872	10.6%	185	4.78%	13	0.34%
Black African	10587	29.1%	244	2.30%	11	0.10%
Any Other Black	2137	5.9%	53	2.48%	#	#
Chinese	427	1.2%	#	#	0	0.00%
White & Black Caribbean	1263	3.5%	32	2.53%	#	#
White & Black African	522	1.4%	#	#	0	0.00%

Ethnicity	Number of children*	% of total school population	Fixed Term exclusions	% of school population	Permanent exclusions instances	% of school population
White & Asian	247	0.7%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Any Other Mixed	1280	3.5%	30	2.34%	0	0.00%
White British	8119	22.3%	134	1.65%	17	0.21%
White Irish	247	0.7%	#	#	0	0.00%
Gypsy / Roma	16	0.0%	#	#	0	0.00%
Traveller of Irish heritage	44	0.1%	#	#	0	0.00%
Any Other White	2575	7.1%	17	0.66%	#	#
Any Other Ethnic	2155	5.9%	14	0.65%	#	#
Unknown	929	2.5%	28	3.01%	#	#
All	36439	100.0%	763	2.09%	57	0.16%

Sources: Capita One, local authority central database, School Census January 2011

28. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS

A campaign by residents in my ward has succeeded in getting the much loved Ivy House pub placed on the community asset register. Given that Southwark is the first council in the country to have something placed on its community asset register, will she join me in congratulating the campaigners?

RESPONSE

Yes. The whole point of the asset register is that it is led by the community and the campaigners have done an excellent job in gathering the required signatures. The fact that we are the first council to register a community asset demonstrates our genuine commitment to localism and supporting our communities.

29. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER

How much has the council spent on plastic cups in each of the last three years? How many plastic cups were bought in each of the last three years? How much has the council spent on sugar and milk sachets in each of the last three years?

RESPONSE

The quantities and costs set out below are for the vended hot drinks service provided and the provision of plastic cups for drinking water in Tooley Street.

	Number of cups (,000s)	Cost of cups (£)	Cost of sugar sachets (£)	Cost of milk sachets (£)
2009/10	124	2,232	2,507	7,337
2010/11	311	5,598	2,982	7,915
2011/12	326	5,868	4,300	12,109

The phased occupation of Tooley Street took place in 2009/10 with full occupancy achieved in the latter part of the year. The vending machines were phased in over the course of the occupation programme with the related consumption of consumables as reflected in the 2009/10 costs in the table above.

The cost of milk in 2009/10 was significantly high in relation to the lower staff numbers due to the initial use of milk sticks which had a high unit cost. The change to milk pots brought a significant saving which is reflected in the 2010/11 and 2011/12 figures.

There was a similar cost issue with sugar in 2009/10. This related to a 20% increase in sugar prices and a lack of staff awareness that sugar could be delivered directly through the vending machines. Through raising staff awareness and having no further major sugar price increases to date the costs have come into line in the subsequent years.

The cost of sugar/milk increased in 2010/11 due to the move to fair trade products in line with the council's adoption of 'Fair Trade' status.

The higher sugar/milk costs in 2011/12 are largely attributable to the significant increase in the density of occupation within the building and the growing use of the building over extended opening hours for civic and other council related functions. Additionally the number of visitors to the building on a daily basis has increased and will continue to increase as the council maximises its use of Tooley Street.

The 2012/13 figures as monitored are anticipated to be in line with 2011/12 for plastic cups, sugar and milk.

Quantities and costs prior to 2009/10 are unknown as the services were managed departmentally across multiple sites through a variety of individual contract and service arrangements. The current costs are likely to be no higher than the overall pre 2009/10 costs.

The new Tooley Street facilities management contract will deliver savings over our current costs for the overall vending services provided in Tooley Street.

The cups provided are fully recyclable and are sustainably sound. I have been advised that the costs of the cups are less than the energy and associated costs required to wash in excess of 1,000 china cups on a daily basis.

Staff may of course use their own cups and drinking water bottles and are encouraged to use only one plastic cup each working day. This rate of usage is supported by the 2011/12 data which show that 191 cups were used by each member of staff based on daily attendance per annum.

The provision of milk and sugar in sachet form is a key element of the pest control regime in Tooley Street and avoids over 2,000 staff keeping individual supplies of milk and sugar in both the kitchen areas and lockers.

30. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL

How much has been spent in each of the last three years on office chairs and desks? How many desks are available at Tooley Street and what is the current rate of usage?

RESPONSE

Office chairs and desks

The expenditure on office chairs and desks over the last three years is set out in the table below:

	Tooley Street £ revenue	Operational Estate £ revenue	Queens Road 1 £ capital	Talfourd Place £ capital	Curlew House £ capital
2010/11	0	13,183	0	0	0
2011/12	0	3,061	0	10,296	50,133
2012/13	2,850	6,003	183,604	0	0

The main fit out of Tooley Street was completed in 2009/10. The expenditure for Tooley Street in 2012/13 was for additional desking to facilitate the drive to maximise the utilisation of the building supporting the overall disposal programme and associated savings.

The operational estate expenditure has been departmentally driven to accommodate operational service changes around the centrally driven accommodation programme and reflects the resultant churn and rationalisation of accommodation following the decant of staff to Tooley Street and building decommissioning. The higher cost in 2010/11 is attributable to the level of these activities in that year. These costs also include individual business unit expenditure on specialist chairs resulting from display screen equipment and Disability Discrimination Act assessment recommendations for individual members of staff. The first port of call for office furniture requirements continues to be the managed stock of equipment from the decommissioning programme.

The residual stocks of office furniture resulting from the decommissioning programme have been effectively managed with reusable and compliant items being fed back into the estate with any surplus offered and distributed to the voluntary sector, schools and community groups. Unusable and non compliant equipment has been disposed of through a responsible, sustainable process.

The fit out capital expenditure for 2011/12 was primarily for Talfourd Place and Curlew Street and the 2012/13 capital expenditure is for Queens Road 1. The furniture requirements for East Dulwich Road and Sandgate Street were met from our managed stocks of reusable equipment at no cost.

Available desks and usage at Tooley Street

Excluding offices, the members' area and the cabinet suite there are currently 1,812 desks available in Tooley Street.

NHS Southwark has a licence to occupy 158 of these workstations leaving 1,654 for council use.

The current average desk to staff ratio in the building is 8:10 (10 staff utilising eight desks). Prior to the move to Tooley Street the ratio was in excess of 10:10, i.e. there were more desks than numbers of staff in many of our office buildings.

Utilisation rates in Tooley Street vary according to the time of year (e.g. school holiday periods usually lead to lower levels of desk use and a Friday is generally quieter than other weekdays).

During a typical weekday, desk use rates are in the region of 90% to 93%. This compares very favourably to the average desk utilisation of 42% before the move to Tooley Street.

31. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON

Further to the ongoing discussions surrounding the East Dulwich police station closure and the upcoming Dulwich supplementary planning document, can the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety supply us with a list of all council owned, non-residential properties in East Dulwich, Village, College and Peckham Rye wards?

RESPONSE

A spreadsheet listing all council owned, non-residential properties in East Dulwich, Village, College and Peckham Rye wards has been supplied to you. I am happy to circulate this to other members on request.

32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MITCHELL

One year on from the closure of the Holmhurst Day Centre in Burbage Road, the part previously occupied by the council appears to stand empty. Is the apparent continued occupation of the rest of the building by the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust making things difficult for the council? What plans does the council have for this underused resource?

RESPONSE

Holmhurst is still partially occupied by South London and Maudsley NHS Trust (SLaM) under formal lease arrangements. Officers have tried for some time to engage with SLaM to establish their future plans but these remain uncertain. SLaM's leases come to an end next year but they would have rights to renew.

The council would ideally like to see this property returned to residential use with some appropriate development to the rear on the site of the extension. This would be subject to planning consent, taking account of the local conservation area and the Dulwich Estate scheme of management although the council owns the freehold of the site. Conversion is obviously not possible while the upper floors remain leased to SLaM.

If it continues to be impossible to negotiate SLaM's exit, the council will seek interim uses of the former day centre area. Ongoing service reviews are considering whether the property could be retained and used for delivery of other functions.

33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE

Southwark Primary Care Trust held section 106 funding for the provision of health services surrounding new developments. Can the cabinet member explain who now holds that funding and how the resource can be accessed to ensure local health needs are met?

RESPONSE

Southwark Council secures section 106 contributions from many major planning applications by developers, towards extra primary health care provision.

The contributions are paid to and held by Southwark, for expenditure on primary health care in conjunction with the providers of that service, the primary care trust/ GP/commissioning groups.

The contributions legally can only go towards provision that the residents of the development can access and only for primary health care.

Ideas for what to spend the money on can come directly from the providers, NHS South East London, Southwark Council or even through the project bank.

34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL

What is the number of care leavers aged 18-21 for which the council is a corporate parent? What specific steps does the council take to fulfil its corporate parenting role for these care leavers? What percentage of these care leavers is the council in contact with on a regular basis?

RESPONSE

The number of care leavers aged 18-21 for which the council is a corporate parent is 351. From our records we estimate that we are in regular contact with at least 80% of these young people.

Our responsibility towards these young people is to support their journey through early adulthood. This is particularly in relation to finding and sustaining suitable accommodation as well as help to secure education and training opportunities. This support includes practical, emotional and financial assistance.

Some young people stay in their foster placements beyond 18 to complete courses or due to their vulnerability.

Care leavers with disabilities receive a continuing service from our transitions team around their physical and health needs.

The adolescent and after care service offer group work sessions on issues such as budgeting, practical living skills, sexual health and dealing with violent and difficult situations. They also offer a drop in for any care leavers who wish to call in. Each care leaver has a personal advisor who is a key point of contact between the young person and the authority and through them much of the above support is organised and delivered.

35. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN

How many enforcement notices and/or penalty charge notices (PCNs) have been issued to residents and businesses for contaminating recycling or incorrectly recycling since June 2010?

RESPONSE

PCNs are issued in relation to parking matters. We assume Councillor Rajan is referring to Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) which are issued for enforcement issues other than parking.

Since 2010 no FPNs have been issued by the council for recycling offences. We have only ever issued one FPN to a resident as a result of a failure to recycle (in 2007) and have never sought to use enforcement powers to tackle problems with contamination in recycling.

The focus of our work with residents on recycling is positive; emphasising how easy it is to recycle in Southwark and why it is so good for the environment and the borough. Successful enforcement action is very resource-intensive because of the level of evidence gathering required for successful prosecution. Instead of using our resources in this way, and because of the importance of collecting non-contaminated recycling materials, we have run a campaign this year focussing on contamination, with the crews reporting problems and recycling support officers visiting places where issues are found. Problems are solved by working with residents and making sure everyone has the information and configuration of bins that they need. It is also worth noting that the council's powers in relation to household waste enforcement are changing, with the value of the associated fines being reduced for example, so it is even more important that we focus on making the service easy to use and on engaging with residents.

Due to a decision taken in 2008 by the then executive member for environment, the trade waste service was sold off to a private company. Southwark Council retains enforcement powers with regards to waste collection from businesses. This includes the private sector that supplies a collection service in Southwark. The council's environmental enforcement team carry out checks on trade waste licenses to ensure business are compliant with the legislation.

36. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER

How many potholes have been reported in each of the last three financial years, broken down by ward? What were the average time and the longest time to repair potholes in each of those years?

RESPONSE

Potholes are reported from a range of sources including members of the public, councillors, emergency services, and utility contractors/developers undertaking highway works. In every case, the location is inspected and repair works programmed if the dimensions of the identified pothole exceed set borough criteria. If the dimensions do not exceed the criteria, then no further action is taken other than to inform the party that made the report.

The vast majority of potholes are identified as a result of the regular regime of highway inspections where roads are checked on a one, three or six month frequency dependent on classification. Again, potholes are only identified and repair works undertaken if the dimensions exceed the set criteria. All other non actionable potholes are not recorded by the highway inspectors.

The following table identifies the number of works orders issued for road repairs for the past three years in each ward:

WARD	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13		
	1 hr	24 hr	Total	1 hr	24 hr	Total	1 hr	24 hr	Total
Brunswick Park	1	155	156	8	97	105	3	62	65
Camberwell Green	8	190	198	20	167	187	11	97	108
Cathedral	12	77	89	6	121	127	19	92	111
Chaucer	10	23	33	4	33	37	4	25	29
College	15	142	157	3	132	135	18	64	82
East Dulwich	13	172	185	16	171	187	16	66	82
East Walworth	8	46	54	7	43	50	0	30	30
Faraday	13	59	72	12	79	91	9	69	78
Grange	5	149	154	8	132	140	7	93	100
Livesey	11	169	180	12	178	190	12	90	102
Newington	22	128	150	22	158	180	11	67	78
Nunhead	12	93	105	9	106	115	4	58	62
Peckham	2	130	132	5	120	125	4	36	40
Peckham Rye	8	142	150	4	117	121	8	61	69
Riverside	6	142	148	4	86	90	3	54	57
Rotherhithe	8	122	130	6	134	140	6	87	93
South Bermondsey	17	103	120	16	125	141	7	93	100
South Camberwell	8	129	137	12	105	117	5	40	45
Surrey Docks	8	53	61	6	105	111	1	62	63

WARD	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13		
	1 hr	24 hr	Total	1 hr	24 hr	Total	1 hr	24 hr	Total
The Lane	20	214	234	15	168	183	10	84	94
Village	9	154	163	7	118	125	5	55	60
TOTAL			2808			2697			1548

The works orders include for all actionable road defects but are predominantly associated with potholes.

With respect to the query on pothole repair response times, there are KPI's for both one hour and 24 hour works orders. For April to September 2012, our contractor completed 99.75% of all works orders within the required limits.

The job types are broken down into the component parts of the repair work according to the type of repair. However to determine if a job is related to a pothole repair would require a check of each individual works order.

A check of the confirm inquiry system determined the following number of customer reports of carriageway potholes (as opposed to any other road or pavement defect):

2010-2011	730
2011-2012	384
2012-current	250

The reports of potholes ranged from minor depressions to carriageway collapses.

Every one of the above would have been checked to determine if the identified pothole required remedial work.

37. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO

Why is the target increase in the number of adults receiving cycle training in 2012/13 lower than the target increase for 2011/12? How many adults have been provided with cycle training this year to date and what is the cost to the council per person trained?

RESPONSE

As the overall budget funded by Transport for London has been reduced from £163,000 to £156,000, the target number of adults receiving cycling training has had to be reduced.

The council continues to offer free cyclist training to anyone that lives, works or is educated in the borough with around 900 children and 600 adults receiving training each year. Up to the end of September this year 542 adults have received cyclist training, with a cost of £48 or £96 per person depending on whether they required one or two training sessions to reach the required Bikeability standard.

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

What practical steps have been taken to promote the Bakerloo line being extended to Camberwell and beyond? The cabinet member recently talked publicly about the Cross River Tram (which was never placed in Ken Livingstone's funded projects and was canned by Boris Johnson when originally elected over four years ago). Where does he imagine the £1.5 billion required to fund this project would come from?

RESPONSE

The leader of the council and Mayor of Lewisham have continued to lobby the Mayor of London to bring the benefits of the Bakerloo line to the south of the borough, including recently writing to the Mayor of London to seek his support for further preparatory work on the proposed extension of the Bakerloo line south through Southwark and Lewisham.

We hope that the Mayor of London will recognise the range of benefits an extension to the Bakerloo line would deliver in the south of the borough: supporting regeneration in a borough which is projected to see high levels of growth over the next 18 years; improving capacity along parallel corridors such as the Jubilee line in to London Bridge station; reducing journey times to central London for those living in the south east; improving transport choices for those currently living with poor public transport accessibility; and, enhancing opportunities for those living in areas of high deprivation.

Southwark and Lewisham officers have been working with Transport for London to identify key constraints and/or opportunities for a Bakerloo line extension and are also continuing to work on identifying viable plans in light of current resistance by Bromley Council to Hayes being included in the extension.

39. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK

How many ash trees are there in public spaces in the borough? What is the council doing to assess the prevalence of the deadly fungus Chalara fraxinea (ash dieback) which has recently infected ash trees throughout Europe? How many infected trees has the council already identified?

RESPONSE

In Southwark there are approximately 7,000 ash trees with different species and cultivars located across highways, housing and parks. However half of these are thought to be of a species that has not been identified as a problem.

As of 20 November there has been no verified infection of Chalara in greater London or Southwark. Nevertheless, we are taking this threat very seriously and are about to commence a survey of all the ash tree across the borough, starting with surveying in detail all newly planted ash trees to identify any symptoms of ash die back. We are adhering to the guidelines set out by the Forestry Commission and the Department for Environment and Rural Affairs and also posting advice for the general public on the council website.

40. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY

Will the cabinet member confirm that an application has been made to the Department for Transport for a "STOP" sign to be placed in Gallery Road near the junction with the Dulwich Village roundabout, and whether he has an indication of the timetable for the likely response?

RESPONSE

An authorisation request was submitted to the Department for Transport in the week ending 16 November 2012. We anticipate a response by 14 December 2012.

41. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON

Following an investigation into a serious failure in procedure in recording requests for planning enforcement by residents in relation to breaches of planning conditions in my ward, it has come to light that there are no details of enforcement investigations on the council website and the only way to establish whether an investigation is taking place is to view the register at the Walworth One Stop Shop. Neither have the reporting arrangements for enforcement and planning applications and appeals to community councils yet been agreed.

Given that a number of local authorities already have information on "live" enforcement investigations available on their websites, and if the chair is not aware of these shortcomings, can he undertake to ensuring arrangements for establishing an online register, reporting back and further improving transparency are put in place in the next six months at the latest?

RESPONSE

Yes.

Item No. 6.1	Classification: Open	Date: 23 January 2013	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Council Tax Base 2013/14	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That council assembly note that in accordance with the decisions of council assembly about council tax on 28 November 2012:
 - the local discretionary discount for homes counted as long-term empty (over 2 years) will be set at 150%
 - the discount/exemption for empty property the discount for second homes be set at 0%
 - the discount to replace Class A exemptions will be set at 0%
 - the discount to replace Class C exemptions will be set at 100% for a maximum of two months only.
2. That the council tax base for 2013/14 be set at 81,421.05 band D equivalent dwellings, as shown in paragraph 37.
3. That the assumed council tax collection level remains at 96.25%, noting the risks outlined in paragraph 30.
4. That the council tax base for 2013/14 for St. Mary Newington be set at 12,487.57 band D equivalent dwellings.
5. That the council tax base for 2013/14 for St. Saviour's be set at 1,175.02 band D equivalent dwellings.
6. That the net rate yield for national non domestic rates be set at £190,585,401 as shown in paragraph 47
7. Approve the council tax reduction scheme (CTRS) written policy for both working and pensionable age claimants (see Appendix E – circulated separately to all councillors), and note the reduction in tax base of 21,215 band D equivalent properties as shown in paragraph 52.
8. That any minor and consequential amendments to the CTRS written policy are to be delegated to the strategic director of finance and corporate services, in consultation with the monitoring officer.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

9. Regulations require the council to inform its preceptors of the council tax base by 31 January 2013.

10. This report sets out the statutory information that members need in order to set the council's council tax base for 2013/14. A further report will be presented to council assembly in February 2013 setting out the level of council tax needed to meet the council's expenditure for the year 2013/14.
11. As part of the movement from formula grant to retained business rates, it is now a requirement that the net rate yield for national non domestic rates (NNDR) be agreed in the same way as the council tax base.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Council tax discounts

12. In November 2012 council assembly agreed a discount and exemption scheme to apply from 2013/14. This is in accordance with the statutory requirements or local discretion as granted under the Local Government Act 2003.
13. On discounts for single persons, the council is required under statute to offer a 25% discount.
14. On discounts for "all except one person in a household disregarded" is required under statute to offer a 25% discount.
15. Where properties are empty for over two years, the council already charges 100% council tax (that is no discount). Under the new scheme, property owners will be charged full council tax and an additional 50% making a total of 150%, allowing the council to levy more council tax.
16. The schedule of discounts is shown below:

Reason	Local / Statutory	2012/13 discount	2013/14 discount
Single Person	Statutory	25%	25%
All except one person in household disregarded	Statutory	25%	25%
All persons in household disregarded	Statutory	50%	50%
Second Home	Local Statutory Minimum 10% Statutory Maximum 50%	10%	0%
Discount to replace Class A exemptions		N/a	0%
Discount to replace Class C exemptions		N/a	100% for two months only
Empty (unoccupied) but furnished			0%
Empty for over 2 years	Local Statutory Minimum 0% Statutory Maximum 50%	0%	+50%

Council tax base for 2013/14

17. Calculation of the council tax ("the tax") is governed by the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and various regulations there under. In particular, Section

33(1) of the Act requires the basic (Band D) tax to be calculated by applying the formula:

The budget requirement less Formula Grant

Divided by

The council's "tax base"

18. Although the council's net budget requirement has not yet been determined, the "tax base" can be set and is subject to the Local Authorities (calculation of council tax base) Regulations 1992, made under section 33 of the Act and subsequent amendments. Regulation 8 of the 1992 regulations requires the calculation for 2013/14 to be made between 1 December 2012 and 31 January 2013.
19. The proportions applicable to the various council tax bands (the "basic" band being D) are as follows:

Band	Proportion (ninths)
A	6
B	7
C	8
D	9
E	11
F	13
G	15
H	18

20. The council's basic tax is calculated in respect of band D. Band A properties therefore pay 6/9 of the basic tax, band B pay 7/9 of the basic tax and so on up to band H where the tax is 18/9, or twice the tax at Band D.

Council tax collection rate performance

21. Current in-year collection performance as at the end of December 2012/13 is 80.31%. The performance compared to the same time last year has seen a reduction in the percentage of council tax collected by 0.70%. However, there has been a significant increase in the amount billed during this year following discount and exemption reviews and collection of these amounts will take time to realise but has seen an increase in council tax receipts of £1.3m compared to 2011/12 as at the end of December 2012.
22. Arrears collection as at the end of December 2012/13 is £2.5m against the annual target of £3m.
23. During the first year of the service returning in-house, in year collection performance improved by 1.8% which was a significant achievement. However, Southwark continues to provide significant collection challenges and this has been reflected in the collection rate not only for collection in year but in total for the tax year over a 6 year period. The council tax collection and achieved and projected final collection is detailed in Appendix C.

24. During this year, the service has continued to focus on providing a customer focused service with prompt responses to customer enquiries and processing of changes to the council tax records.
25. Cleansing of aged debt and identifying accounts that should be written off continues to be part of business as usual activity alongside operational collection activity.
26. There has been a considerable amount of focus and activity this year on reviewing discounts to ensure that customers who had been allowed a reduction in their council tax were entitled to continue receiving it. Reviews were undertaken and completed for those in receipt of single person and student discounts.
27. The student review was undertaken with the National Fraud Authority and resulted in the removal of over 400 discounts generating potential income of £500,000.
28. There were 2 elements to the single person discount review with 3,500 cases reviewed as part of the National Fraud Initiative. In addition to this, a review of 14,000 discounts was undertaken by Capita Local Government Services resulting in over 4,000 discounts being removed generating additional income of £1.4m.
29. The strategic director of finance and corporate services recommends that, based on collection performance in previous years and to date in 2012/13 (see below), a 96.25% assumed collection rate would give the best estimate of the likely value to be obtained from the demands issued in April 2013.
30. A comparison of this rate to those currently levied and proposed for other inner London authorities is included as Appendix B. It can be clearly seen in the appendix that there is not a firm trend in projected collection rates within Inner London boroughs, the rate of 96.25% is consistent with the current Inner London average, and similar to near neighbours Lambeth and Lewisham. Some boroughs are recommending a lower collection rate for 2013/14 than for 2012/13 to recognise the additional initial burden on council tax support claimants.
31. Consideration has also been given to the age and status of debt when the service transferred in-house, the current economic climate and the high levels of transience and deprivation in Southwark which make collection increasingly challenging.
32. The collection rate of 96.25% for 2013/14 is considered achievable given that the service is now being delivered in-house and the work described in paragraphs 21 to 28 above. However, as there are considerable uncertainties arising from welfare reform, the localisation of council tax benefit, and the on-going economic climate, this figure is considered to be challenging.

Calculation of the council tax base

33. From 2013/14 there will be a significant change in the calculation of the council tax base. The localisation of council tax support has resulted in a substantial reduction in the number of band D equivalent properties in the tax base. Instead of council tax benefit claimants having council tax paid for through council tax benefit, from 1 April 2013 through Southwark's localised council tax reduction

scheme (CTRS) claimants will receive a discount, the elderly will receive a 100% discount, working age claimants a 85% discount.

34. A calculation of the total number of dwellings net of discounts needs to be made for each of the bands A-H. This takes into account the number of dwellings on the official valuation list as at the 2013/14 CTB1 submission, the estimated number of dwellings that are exempt, attract disabled relief, attract single person discount, are empty, or have only disregarded residents, and estimated changes in the status of the dwellings during the year. Appendix A tabulates the above information for each of the bands. Line 5 of Appendix A (i) shows the total number of dwellings net of discounts for each band, which total 85,971.93
35. The line 5 total of 85,971.93 described above must be converted into the number of band D equivalents by applying the proportions shown in paragraph 6 above. The result for each of the bands is shown on line 6 of appendix A, which totals 84,593.30.
36. It is necessary to calculate the council's tax base by applying an estimated collection rate to the total of all properties converted to the average equivalent property at band D shown in Appendix A(i).

	Number of band D equivalent properties
For the parish of St. Mary Newington	12,974.10
For the parish of St. Saviour's	1,220.80
For the whole of the borough excluding the parishes of St. Mary Newington and St. Saviour's	70,398.40
For the whole borough	84,593.30

37. The resultant council tax base is calculated as follows:

Total of the relevant amounts (Appendix A (i) line 6) 84,593.30

Estimated collection rate 96.25%

2012/13 council tax base 81,421.05

38. Additional earmarked income may be available from Trust Funds, which can subsidise the council tax in the former parishes of St. Mary Newington and St. Saviour's. Separate calculations have to be made for these specific areas. These are set out at Appendices A (ii & iii). The subsidy to St Mary Newington is taken from interest earned on the Walworth Common Trust capital sum, divided by the taxbase to give a band D equivalent subsidy. The subsidy to St Saviour's comes from contributions from the Borough Market Trustees, again divided by the taxbase.

39. A comparison of how the current tax base compares with the 2012/13 tax base is shown below. If the CTRS adjustments are excluded the council tax base has increased by 1.8%.

	Band D equivalent properties			
	2012/13	2013/14	Change	% Change
Number of chargeable dwellings	116,169	117,429	1,260	1.1%
Adjustments for discounts	-12,240	-11,670	570	-4.7%
Adjustments for premiums		50	50	
Tax base excluding CTRS	103,929	105,808	1,880	1.8%
CTRS adjustment – Working age		-13,367	-13,367	
CTRS adjustment – Non-working age		-7,848	-7,848	
Total CTRS adjustment		-21,215	-21,215	
Total tax base before collection rate adjustment	103,929	84,593	-19,335	-18.6%

Collection fund monitor 2012/13

40. The estimated balance on the collection fund for council tax transactions to 31 March 2013 is a surplus of £1.2m, of which Southwark's element is £900,000.

	£m
Southwark Council	0.900
Greater London Authority	<u>0.303</u>
Total surplus	<u>1.203</u>

41. The surplus must be accounted for in the council tax calculations for 2013/14. The surplus is one-off and must be utilised to reduce the demand on council tax payers in 2013/14.

National non domestic rates

42. It is now a statutory requirement that the NNDR1 is given formal approval as part of the tax base setting process before submission to the government. The guidance note accompanying the NNDR1 states that this approval should be given "through the authority's usual processes for the exercise of functions". There is no requirement for the form to have been considered and cleared at a meeting of the full council.
43. A provisional NNDR1 was sent to the government on 7 January 2013, this return is based on the current aggregate rateable value on the rating list on 30 September 2012.
44. A final return must be submitted to the government by 31 January 2013, this return allows local authorities to estimate increases in rateable value during 2013/14. The final return is attached as Appendix C.
45. It is not expected that the figures reported in the draft return will change significantly. Final figures will be confirmed as part of the Policy and Resources Strategy 2013/14 - 2015/16 - Revenue Budget report.

46. The net rate yield (NRY) submitted forms the basis for payments to the government and the GLA during 2013/14, and therefore carries risks. If the NRY is overestimated too much will be paid out during 2013/14. If the NRY is underestimated not enough will be shared with the government and the GLA in year and will have to be paid later. The amount of refund due or additional monies owed will not be known until the NNDR3 return for 2013/14 is submitted and audited in the summer of 2014.
47. The final NNDR1 return for 2013/14 shows a net rate yield of £190,585,401. This amount must be shared with the government (50%) and the GLA (20%), with the council retaining 30% as follows.

	£
Net rate yield	190,585,401
Less government share (50%)	95,292,701
Less GLA share (20%)	38,117,080
Retained element of business rates (30%)	57,175,620

48. The 30% being £57,175,620 is retained by Southwark forms part of the overall funding to the council for 2013/14.
49. A collection rate is not required for non-domestic rates as an estimate of non collection forms part of the overall net rate yield calculation.

Revenue budget implications 2013/14

50. Subject to council assembly approval, the tax bases recommended and the projected surplus on the collection fund as at 31 March 2013 will be used in the calculation of the level of council tax that will be recommended to council assembly on 27 February 2013.

Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS)

51. On 28 November 2012 a report was presented to Assembly that set out the background and approach that had been adopted in relation to the CTRS scheme. Council assembly agreed to the adoption of a CTRS scheme that capped council tax support entitlement at 85% of current council tax benefit (CTB) entitlement levels and abolished Second Adult Rebate for non-pensioners in 2013/14.
52. The council tax reduction scheme replaces council tax benefit and will be passed on to claimants through a discount. Current estimates show that this will reduce the overall council tax base by 24,791 equivalent properties (21,215 band D equivalents) before adjustment for collection.
53. Council assembly were presented with a draft version of Southwark's CTRS policy and advised that the written content of the final policy would be informed by the publication of prescribed regulations from central government that were at that time still in draft form. Officers recommended that the final CTRS written policy should be returned to council assembly for approval in January 2013 once final prescribed regulations had been published. As a result, council assembly made the following decision:

- That following resolution 1, the council tax reduction scheme finalised policy be presented to council assembly in January 2013 for approval, following the publication of prescribed requirements regulations which are currently in draft form.
54. As anticipated, the Council Tax Reduction Schemes (Prescribed Requirements) (England) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/2885) that delivered the statutory framework under which the policy was developed were published on 30 November 2012.
 55. These prescribed regulations set out in full the policy in relation to pension-age claimants and how entitlement is to be assessed, over which the council has no discretion. The CTRS policy developed by officers therefore incorporates the appropriate prescribed provisions for pensionable-age claimants.
 56. The prescribed regulations also set out basic elements and rules that must form part of the policy for working-age recipients, such as method of application, start date of claims and change of circumstances.
 57. In accordance with the regulations, officers have developed a CTRS policy for working-age claimants and used as its base the existing CTB rules and regulations. This approach is considered to deliver the least amount of change for existing claimants, for staff administering the scheme and indeed those professional groups who are engaged in offering advice and support to claimants.
 58. The full CTRS policy document is attached at Appendix E.
 59. The content of the prescribed regulations means there are some differences between the draft policy presented to council assembly in November 2012 and the final policy attached with this report. There are also some changes from the existing council tax benefit rules and the significant changes are set out below:

Policy area	Policy differences between the draft policy presented to Council in November 2012 and the final policy
Applications	At present, 25% of all applications for CTB are received via the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) who forward applications on to Local Authorities. Under CTRS the DWP will no longer be accepting claims on our behalf, which will result in duplication for claimants and operationally for Southwark. The DWP will however continue to share data with us to enable us to conduct a means test on claimants.
Backdating awards	In line with CTB, the CTRS policy retains a maximum 6 month backdating period for working age claimants where good cause has been demonstrated.
Change of circumstances	The Government prescribed regulations state that for pensioners, all change of circumstances must now be assessed from when they happen, regardless of whether they are beneficial to the claimant or not. Under CTB, beneficial changes were only handled in this way if a claimant informed the Authority of the change within one month of it taking place. The CTRS policy applies this new way of working to working-age claimants, so all change of circumstances will now be assessed

Policy area	Policy differences between the draft policy presented to Council in November 2012 and the final policy
	from the date the change happened, regardless of claimant age.
War Pensions income disregard	In line with CTB, the CTRS policy disregards income from War Pensions and War Widows Pensions as income in the means test.
Income from Universal Credit	The CTRS policy uses the income assessment method set out under the default scheme regulations provided by Government.
Overpayments	Overpayments of benefit under their current definition cease to exist under CTRS because it is administered as a council tax discount rather than a Social Security benefit. Rules around non-recoverability of overpayments as a result of official error are no longer relevant, so any dispute around recoverability would form part of a wider discussion as part of the standard council tax collection process.

60. The government have announced that they expect to release further regulations in February 2013 relating to the CTRS appeal process specifically. Accordingly officers are unable to complete detailed policy and procedures relating to this area until these regulations are published. These additional regulations will not impact upon the scheme as agreed by council assembly on 28 November 2012.
61. It is also widely considered by industry experts and revenues and benefits practitioners that as a consequence of the need for the DCLG to release complex regulations in challenging timescales, omissions, errors and anomalies exist within the regulations published on 30 November 2012. It is expected therefore that these will be corrected throughout 2013/14 with amendments to regulations published. The nature of these corrections will not affect the council scheme approved by council assembly on 28 November but will simply result in additions and minor changes to the wording of the policy document itself. Officers consider therefore that these changes, including those associated with the appeal provision, should not require council assembly approval and that the decision making on these future changes be delegated to the strategic director of finance and corporate services, in consultation with the monitoring officer.

Consultation

62. Calculation of the council tax base forms an integral part of the revenue budget setting process for 2013/14. The budget is underpinned by the council's medium term resource strategy as agreed by cabinet on 21 June 2011.

Community impact statement

63. This report contains technical calculations relating to the council's tax base for 2013/14. Decisions on the level of exemptions and discounts were made at the council assembly meeting on 28 November 2012.
64. This report also contains technical calculations relating to the council's anticipated non-domestic rate retention for 2013/14, which forms part of the resource base for the council in 2013/14.
65. There is no direct community impact at this stage. The impact on the community of any potential change in service design, outcomes or access arising from recommendations relating to the 2013/14 revenue budget will need to be

addressed and identified as part of the final budget submission to council assembly on 27 February 2013.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Legal Services

66. The director of legal services advises that decisions relating to the budget and the setting of local taxation are reserved to council assembly under Part 3A of the council's constitution. Therefore council assembly is enabled to agree all of the recommendations in this report.
67. Members are reminded of the obligations pursuant to s106 Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Recommendations 1-6 – council tax base

68. The legal basis for agreeing the recommendations relating to the setting of the council tax base is found under Section 31(B) Local Government Finance Act 1992 which imposes a duty on a billing authority to calculate its council tax by applying a formula laid down in that Section. This relies on calculating a figure for the council tax base for the year. The Local Authority (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 require a billing authority to use a given formula to calculate the council tax base.

Recommendation 7-8 – Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS)

69. Council assembly agreed in November 2012 to adopt a CTRS scheme and to receive the formal written policy for approval in January 2013 as a result of a delay in the publication of the regulatory requirements. The Council Tax Reduction Schemes (Prescribed Requirements) (England) Regulations 2012 came into force on 27 November 2012.
70. Council assembly is advised to delegate to the strategic director of finance and corporate services, the responsibility for minor and consequential amendments following the approval of the CTRS policy. The delegation is subject to consultation with the monitoring officer. The policy is completed in so far as including the relevant requirements contained within regulations, however the Department of Communities and Local Government has indicated that further regulations will be published after 31 January 2013. Council assembly is aware that the risk of not agreeing the policy before this date would lead to the imposition of a default policy.
71. In respect of all recommendations, council assembly is reminded of the requirement to consider the public sector equality duty as set out in s.149 Equality Act 2010 before reaching a decision.

REASONS FOR URGENCY

72. Local Government Finance Act 1992 imposes a duty on a billing authority to agree and publish its tax base no later than 31 January. There is no later opportunity to enable this duty to be met.

REASONS FOR LATENESS

73. The scale of changes impacting on the council tax base since the 2012/13 report has required additional data to be provided and validated before the report could be finalised.
74. As this report was being finalised Sharon Taylor, leader of Stevenage Borough Council and chair of the LGA's finance panel, made a public statement that suggested that the government would be cutting council support grant by 8.5% in 2014/15. The need to investigate this in case it needed to be referenced in this report meant that the deadline for report submission could not be met. DCLG have since denied that there would be any decrease in funding in 2014/15. Implications of future cuts on local schemes are being reviewed by the LGA, London Councils and similar organisations.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
CTB (1) Working Papers	Revenues and Benefits, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Dominic Cain, Revenues and Benefits: 020 7525 0636

APPENDICES

Appendix	Title
Appendix A (i)	Council Tax Base for 2013/14 for the Whole Area
Appendix A (ii)	Council Tax Base for 2013/14 for the Parish of St Mary Newington
Appendix A (iii)	Council Tax Base for 2013/14 for the Parish of St Saviours
Appendix A (iv)	Council Tax Base for 2013/14 for the whole area excluding the parishes of St Mary Newington and St Saviours
Appendix B	Inner London – Council Tax Collection Rates Used for Tax Setting
Appendix C	2013/14 NNDR1 Return
Appendix D	Council Tax – Collection Achieved and Projected
Appendix E	Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) written policy (circulated separately to all councillors due to size)

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Duncan Whitfield, Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	
Report Author	John Braggins, Finance and Corporate Services Norman Lockie, Finance and Corporate Services	
Version	Final	
Dated	17 January 2013	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	17 January 2013	

APPENDIX A (i)

COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2013/2014 FOR THE WHOLE AREA – FOR COUNCIL TAX SETTING

		BAND - A	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL
1	Number of Chargeable Dwellings	6.00	11,088.85	36,079.90	32,298.20	20,539.62	13,661.91	5,692.21	4,009.32	559.60	123,935.61
2	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a discount	-0.75	-1,798.75	-4,831.25	-3,153.25	-2,073.00	-852.00	-311.00	-178.25	-24.75	-13,223.00
3	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a premium					50.00				0.00	50.00
4	Adjustment for the localised council tax support scheme	0.00	-3,257.95	-9,927.40	-6,766.85	-3,095.91	-1,445.82	-233.15	-60.80	-2.81	-24,790.68
5	Total in band (1+2+3+4)	5.25	6,032.15	21,321.25	22,378.10	15,420.71	11,364.10	5,148.06	3,770.27	532.04	85,971.93
	Band Factor	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
6	Number of Band D Equivalentts	2.92	4,021.43	16,583.20	19,891.64	15,420.71	13,889.45	7,436.09	6,283.78	1,064.08	84,593.30
7	Estimated Collection Level										96.25%
8	Estimated 2012/2013 TAX BASE (6) x (7)										81,421.05

APPENDIX A (ii)

COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2013/2014 FOR ST MARY NEWINGTON – FOR COUNCIL TAX SETTING

		BAND - A	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL
1	Number of Chargeable Dwellings	1.00	2,735.00	6,968.00	4,984.00	1,754.00	1,242.00	364.00	66.00	20.00	18,134.00
2	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a discount	-0.25	-410.55	-885.50	-455.00	-138.70	-79.35	-20.25	-3.60	-1.00	-1,994.20
3	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a premium	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Adjustment for the localised council tax support schemes	0.00	-207.72	-535.67	-311.81	-87.09	-63.24	-5.63	-1.57	0.00	-1,212.73
5	Total in band (1+2+3+4)	0.75	2,116.73	5,546.83	4,217.19	1,528.21	1,099.41	338.12	60.83	19.00	14,927.07
	Band Factor	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
6	Number of Band D Equivalents	0.42	1,411.15	4,314.20	3,748.61	1,528.21	1,343.72	488.40	101.39	38.00	12,974.10
7	Estimated Collection Level										96.25%
8	Estimated 2012/2013 TAX BASE (6) x (7)										12,487.57

APPENDIX A (iii)

COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2013/2014 FOR ST SAVIOURS – FOR COUNCIL TAX SETTING

		BAND - A	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL
1	Number of Chargeable Dwellings	0.00	58.00	268.00	312.00	185.00	183.00	115.00	141.00	35.00	1,297.00
2	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a discount	0.00	-8.75	-34.35	-36.55	-16.10	-15.30	-8.60	-10.95	-1.85	-132.45
3	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a premium										0.00
4	Adjustment for the localised council tax support scheme	0.00	-3.39	-15.98	-22.15	-7.19	-5.45	-0.42	0.00	-0.18	-54.77
5	Total in band (1+2+3+4)	0.00	45.86	217.67	253.30	161.71	162.25	105.98	130.05	32.97	1,109.78
	Band Factor	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
6	Number of Band D Equivalents	0.00	30.57	169.30	225.15	161.71	198.30	153.08	216.75	65.94	1,220.80
7	Estimated Collection Level										96.25%
8	Estimated 2012/2013 TAX BASE (6) x (7)										1,175.02

APPENDIX A (iv)

COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2013/2014 FOR THE WHOLE AREA EXCLUDING THE PARISHES OF ST MARY NEWINGTON AND ST SAVIOURS – FOR COUNCIL TAX SETTING


		BAND - A	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL
1	Number of Chargeable Dwellings	5.00	8,295.85	28,843.90	27,002.20	18,600.62	12,236.91	5,213.21	3,802.32	504.60	104,504.61
2	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a discount	-0.50	-1,379.45	-3,911.40	-2,661.70	-1,918.20	-757.35	-282.15	-163.70	-21.90	-11,096.35
3	Adjustment for the number of dwellings subject to a premium	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
4	Adjustment for the localised council tax support scheme	0.00	-3,046.84	-9,375.75	-6,432.88	-3,001.63	-1,377.12	-227.10	-59.23	-2.63	-23,523.19
5	Total in band (1+2+3+4)	4.50	3,869.56	15,556.75	17,907.61	13,730.80	10,102.44	4,703.96	3,579.38	480.07	69,935.08
	Band Factor	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
6	Number of Band D Equivalent s	2.50	2,579.71	12,099.69	15,917.88	13,730.80	12,347.43	6,794.61	5,965.64	960.14	70,398.40
7	Estimated Collection Level										96.25%
8	Estimated 2012/2013 TAX BASE (6) x (7)										67,758.46

APPENDIX B

Inner London - Council Tax Collection Rates Used for Tax Setting

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14 Proposed
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Camden	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.75	96.80
Greenwich	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	N/a
Hackney	93.00	97.00	94.00	94.00	95.00	N/a
Hammersmith and Fulham	98.00	98.00	97.50	97.50	97.50	97.50
Islington	96.80	96.80	96.80	96.80	96.80	N/a
Kensington and Chelsea	97.00	97.25	97.25	97.25	97.50	97.50
Lambeth	95.00	95.25	95.25	95.25	95.75	94.46
Lewisham	96.25	96.25	96.25	96.25	96.25	95.00
Southwark	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.25	96.25
Tower Hamlets	97.00	97.00	97.00	97.00	97.00	96.00
Wandsworth	95.00	95.00	95.50	95.50	96.30	N/a
Westminster	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.00
Inner London Average	96.11	96.36	96.19	96.38	96.45	

2013/14 NNDR1 Return

		NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES RETURN 1 NNDR1 2013-14							
Please e-mail to : nndr.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk									
Please enter your details after checking that you have selected the correct authority name.									
Please check the figures shown in the cells with a blue border and enter your own figures if you disagree with those suggested.									
A provisional version of the form should be returned to the Department for Communities and Local Government by Monday 7 January 2013									
The final version of this form, including a signed copy, must also be sent to the Department for Communities and Local Government by Thursday 31 January 2013									
Select your local authority's name from this list:		<table border="1"> <tr><td>Southampton</td></tr> <tr><td>Southend-on-Sea</td></tr> <tr><td>Southwark</td></tr> <tr><td>Spelthorne</td></tr> <tr><td>St Albans</td></tr> <tr><td>St Edmundsbury</td></tr> </table>		Southampton	Southend-on-Sea	Southwark	Spelthorne	St Albans	St Edmundsbury
Southampton									
Southend-on-Sea									
Southwark									
Spelthorne									
St Albans									
St Edmundsbury									
Check that this is your authority :		<table border="1"> <tr><td>Southwark</td></tr> <tr><td>E5019</td></tr> <tr><td>Norman Lockie</td></tr> <tr><td>020 7525 0928</td></tr> <tr><td></td></tr> <tr><td>norman.lockie@soutwark.gov.uk</td></tr> </table>		Southwark	E5019	Norman Lockie	020 7525 0928		norman.lockie@soutwark.gov.uk
Southwark									
E5019									
Norman Lockie									
020 7525 0928									
norman.lockie@soutwark.gov.uk									
Check that this is your E Code :									
Local authority contact name :									
Telephone number of local authority contact :									
Fax number for local authority contact :									
E-mail address of local authority contact :									
		Ver 1.3							
1. Number of hereditaments on the rating list on 30 September 2012	Supplied by DCLG	10,673							
2. Aggregate rateable value on the rating list on 30 September 2012	Supplied by DCLG	£ 511,392,544							
GROSS CALCULATED RATE YIELD			£						
3. Enter line 2 x small business non-domestic rating multiplier (0.462)			236,263,355.33						
MANDATORY RELIEFS									
Small business rate relief									
		£							
4. Additional yield generated to finance the small business rate relief scheme		4,062,968.09							
RRE986e 03/01/13									
5. Cost of small business rate relief for properties within billing authority area		4,660,730.19							
NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13									
6. Net cost of the small business rate relief (Line 5 minus Line 4)			597,762.10						
Calculation									
7. Cost of relief to charities		22,463,385.74							
NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13									
8. Cost of relief to Community Amateur Sports Clubs		51,864.84							
NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13									
9. Cost of relief for rural general stores, post offices, public houses, petrol filling stations and food shops		0.00							
10. Cost of relief for partly occupied premises		0.00							
11. Cost of relief for empty premises		2,953,246.84							
NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13									
12. Total mandatory reliefs (Sum of lines 6 to 11)			26,066,259.52						
DISCRETIONARY RELIEFS									
13. Cost of relief to charities		351,766.74							
From DRR summary + inflation of 2.6%									
14. Cost of relief to non-profit making bodies		26,797.66							
From DRR summary + inflation of 2.6%									
15. Cost of relief to Community Amateur Sports Clubs		0.00							
16. Cost of relief for rural general stores, post offices, public houses, petrol filling stations and food shops		0.00							
17. Cost of relief to other rural businesses		0.00							
18. Other Section 47 reliefs (Localism Act discounts)		0.00							
19. Total discretionary reliefs (Sum of lines 13 to 18)			378,564.40						
20. Gross Rate Yield after reliefs (Line 3 minus lines 12 & 19)			209,818,531.41						
21. Estimate of 'losses in collection'			4,196,370.62						
2% of line 20									
22. Allowance for Cost of Collection			655,771.26						
23. Special Authority Deductions - City of London Offset									

2013/14 NNDR1 Return

NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES RETURN 1 2013-14		Southwark
Ver 1.3		
Section 2		
Enterprise Zones		
		£
24. Estimated level of discount to be awarded in 2013-14		0.00
25. Estimated value of non-domestic rates in the Enterprise Zone area in 2013-14	0.00	
26. Enterprise Zone baseline	0.00	
27. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14 (Line 25 minus line 26)		0.00
New Development Deals		
28. Estimated value of non-domestic rates in the New Development Deals area in 2013-14	0.00	
29. New Development Deals baseline	0.00	
30. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14 (Line 28 minus line 29)		0.00
Renewable Energy Schemes		
31. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14		0.00
32. Net Rate Yield excluding transitional arrangements and rate retention (Line 20 minus the sum of lines 21 to 23, 27, 30 & 31)		204,966,389.53
Rate retention adjustments		
33. Estimate of the change in rateable value between 1 October 2012 and 30 September 2013		-699,453.00
34. Estimate of the change in receipts as a result in the change in rateable value (line 33 times the multiplier)		-323,147.29
This equates to a percentage change of	%	-0.14
<small>See separate sheet for calculation</small>		
35. Local authority's estimate of adjustment due to appeals		14,057,841.57
<small>Line 20 x assumed reduction of 6.7%</small>		
36. Net Rate Yield excluding transitional arrangements but after rate retention adjustments (Line 32 plus lines 34 and minus line 35)		190,585,401.00
Section 3		
Transitional arrangements		
37. Addition revenue received because reduction in rates have been deferred NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13	175,445.51	
38. Revenue foregone because increase in rates have been deferred NNDR1 run on RBTest 03/01/13	660,918.77	
39. Net cost of transitional arrangements (Line 38 minus line 37)		485,473.26
40. Net Rate Yield after transitional arrangements and rate retention (Line 36 minus line 39)		190,099,928.00

NNDR Summary for : Southwark		£
<small>These figures show the percentage shares of the NNDR you estimate your authority will collect in 2013-14. They are based on line 36. See the <i>Tier Split</i> tab for full information</small>		
Amount of NNDR to be paid to central government		95,292,701.00
Amount to be retained by Southwark under the rates retention scheme		57,175,620.00
Amount to be passed to Greater London Authority		38,117,080.00

COUNCIL TAX - COLLECTION ACHIEVED & PROJECTED

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Total Debit	122,283	127,655	135,262	141,920	143,575	145,707	147,217	148,766
Exemptions	(6,497)	(6,876)	(7,493)	(8,058)	(8,435)	(8,173)	(7,402)	(6,443)
Disabled relief	(42)	(44)	(46)	(48)	(48)	(45)	(42)	(41)
Discounts	(14,050)	(14,439)	(14,957)	(14,845)	(14,869)	(15,342)	(15,309)	(14,007)
Collectable debit	101,694	106,296	112,766	118,968	120,223	122,147	124,464	128,274
Council Tax collected to date	(74,440)	(78,700)	(84,358)	(89,406)	(89,303)	(90,884)	(92,666)	(82,407)
Less credit balances	283	408	522	578	437	495	1,255	2,650
Migration Adjustments	71	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
CTax collection to date	(74,086)	(78,269)	(83,837)	(88,828)	(88,865)	(90,389)	(91,411)	(79,758)
Future collection adjustment	0	(5)	(23)	(100)	(300)	0	(400)	(15,262)
Total projected CTax collection	(74,086)	(78,274)	(83,860)	(88,928)	(89,165)	(90,389)	(91,811)	(95,020)
Benefits	(23,980)	(24,458)	(25,127)	(25,842)	(26,889)	(27,090)	(27,724)	(28,123)
Total projected income	(98,066)	(102,733)	(108,987)	(114,770)	(116,054)	(117,479)	(119,536)	(123,143)
Actual Collection to date (as at 31st December 2012)	96.4%	96.6%	96.6%	96.4%	96.3%	96.2%	95.7%	84.1%
Projected final collection level	96.4%	96.6%	96.6%	96.5%	96.5%	96.2%	96.0%	96.0%

This page left intentionally blank.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)
(SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2012/13**

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	1 each	Others	
Group Offices	2	Elizabeth Olive, Audit Commission	1
Alex Doel, Labour Group Office	1	Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
William Summers, Liberal Democrat Group Office	1		
Libraries (1 each)	2		
Albion / Newington			
Press	2		
Southwark News			
South London Press			
Corporate Management Team	5		
Eleanor Kelly			
Deborah Collins			
Romi Bowen			
Duncan Whitfield			
Gerri Scott			
Other Officers	4		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Robin Campbell	1		
Sonia Sutton	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
(Copies to Lesley John, 2 nd Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street)	20		
		Last Updated: November 2012	
		Total:	110