

Cabinet

Tuesday 20 March 2012

4.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room GO1A, 160 Tooley Street, London
SE1 2QH

Supplemental Agenda No. 1

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
6.	Deputation Requests To consider deputation requests.	1 - 3
7.	Four Squares Estate Options Appraisal – Appendix 4 To consider the resident responses to the preferred option survey relating to the Four Squares Estate Options Appraisal report, item 7 on the main agenda.	4 - 8
13.	Elephant and Castle Supplementary Planning Document / Opportunity Area Planning Framework This is a replacement page 63 of Appendix A to the report. It details changes to paragraph 5.1.10 (last bullet point) which had been omitted in error from the appendix prior to printing.	9
17.	Motions referred from Council Assembly To consider the comments of the deputy chief executive in respect of the motion on Save Chambers Wharf, Appendix 3 of the report contained on the main agenda.	10

Contact

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

Date: 16 March 2012

Agenda Item 6

Item No. 6.	Classification: Open	Date: 20 March 2012	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Deputation Requests	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the cabinet consider whether to hear a deputation from the Elephant Amenity Network Group.
2. That the cabinet consider whether to hear a deputation from the Four Squares Estate Residents Steering Group.
3. That the cabinet consider whether to hear a deputation from the Abbeyfield Estate Residents Steering Group.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, cabinet can decide
 - To receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; or
 - That the deputation not be received; or
 - To refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
5. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. Only one member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than five minutes. After this time cabinet members may ask questions of the deputation for up to five minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Elephant Amenity Network Group

6. A deputation request has been submitted by the Elephant Amenity Network Group about the Elephant and Castle Supplementary Planning Document.
7. The Elephant Amenity Network Group have asked to make representations on the following areas:
 - Shopping and retail (affordable rent, uncertainty and consultation, small retailers, Latin American Community, nature of street markets)
 - Homes (affordable housing ratios, lack of family housing, density, high rise buildings)
 - Community facilities (use of S106 contributions, lack of concrete proposals)
 - Transport & parking

- Open and green spaces
- Sustainability & interim use

Four Squares Estate Residents Steering Group

8. A deputation request has been submitted by the Four Squares Estate Residents Steering Group in respect of the Four Squares Estate options appraisal report, item 7 of the agenda. The outline of the issues the residents steering group wish to raise are:
- The scope of the works proposed
 - The project management of the works
 - Resident Involvement in the works
 - The costs to leaseholders
 - Funding of the works.

Abbeyfield Estate Residents Steering Group

9. A deputation request has been submitted by the Abbeyfield Estate Residents Steering Group in respect of the Abbeyfield Estate options appraisal report, item 8 of the agenda. The outline of the issues the residents steering group wish to raise are:
- The scope of the works proposed
 - Right to return for Maydew tenants
 - The project management of the works
 - Resident Involvement in the works
 - Costs to leaseholders
 - Funding of the works.

Community impact statement

10. The Southwark Constitution allows for deputations to be made by groups of people resident or working in the borough.

REASONS FOR URGENCY

11. The deputation requests were received in line with the constitutional deadline for the receipt of deputation requests and is therefore eligible for consideration by cabinet as to whether or not to hear the deputations at this meeting.

REASONS FOR LATENESS

12. The deadline for the receipt of deputation requests was 14 March 2012, after the main cabinet agenda despatch on 12 March 2012. It has therefore not been possible to send out this report five clear days in advance of the meeting because of the need to ensure that all deputation requests received by the deadline were included in this report.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Correspondence from the deputations	160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221 / Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager	
Report Author	Paula Thornton, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 March 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	16 March 2012	

Four Squares Preferred Option Survey

Analysis of responses to statements

%s may not always sum due to rounding

Total no. of surveys sent out: 687

Total no. of surveys returned: 177

Response rate: 26%

Section A - tenure

Count of A1 and A2 [section A]

Block	Secure tenant	Leaseholder	Tenure not known	Grand total
Layard Square	28	10		38
Lockwood Square	23	18	1	42
Marden Square	37	20		57
New Place Square*	29	10	1	40
Total	117	58	2	177

* includes Jamaica Road respondents

Section B - the preferred option

B1a - it is better to refurbish the blocks to an enhanced standard so that in coming years, the need for repairs and for major works will be reduced

Count of B1a - all survey respondents	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Blank	Invalid	Grand total
Secure tenants	63	38	3		2			7	117
Leaseholders	9	17	3	7	14	1		7	58
Tenure not known	1							1	2
Total	73	55	6	7	16	3	3	15	177

Count of respondents to B1a (%)	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total no. of respondents to question
% of secure tenant respondents	58%	35%	3%		2%	2%	108 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	18%	33%	6%	14%	27%	2%	51 [100%]
% of tenure not known respondents	100%						1 [100%]
Total	46%	34%	4%	4%	10%	2%	160 [100%]

B1b - Selling some properties that become empty in any of the blocks is an acceptable way to raise money for investment on the estate

Count of B1b - all survey respondents	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Blank	Invalid	Grand total
Secure tenants	18	30	20	18	12	7	10	2	117
Leaseholders	27	11	3	3	7	2	4	1	58
Tenure not known		1					1		2
Total	45	41	24	21	19	9	15	3	177

Count of respondents to B1b (%)	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total no. of respondents to question
% of secure tenant respondents	17%	29%	19%	17%	11%	7%	105 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	51%	21%	6%	6%	13%	4%	53 [100%]
% of tenure not known respondents			100%				1 [100%]
Total	28%	26%	15%	13%	12%	6%	159 [100%]

B1c - If possible, it is better to combine the security works at Marden and Layard Squares with other major works to be done there

Overview of B1c responses:

Count of B1c - all survey respondents	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Blank	Invalid	Grand total
Secure tenants	35	34	25	6	5	2	9	1	117
Leaseholders	6	12	12	7	13	4	3	1	58
Tenure not known	1								2
Total	42	46	37	13	18	6	13	2	177

Count of respondents to B1c (%)	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total no. of respondents to question
% of secure tenant respondents	33%	32%	23%	6%	5%	2%	107 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	11%	22%	22%	13%	24%	7%	54 [100%]
% of tenure not known respondents	100%						1 [100%]
Total	26%	28%	23%	8%	11%	4%	162 [100%]

B1c responses by blocks and tenure:

Count of B1c - all survey respondents	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Blank	Invalid	Grand total
Layard/Marden	21	22	9	4	2	1	5	1	65
Secure tenants	3	8	5	7	5		1	1	30
Leaseholders	24	30	14	11	7	1	6	2	95
Total	14	12	16	2	3	1	4		52
Lockwood/New Place	3	4	7		8	4	2		28
Secure tenants	1								2
Leaseholders	18	16	23	2	11	5	7		82
Total									

B1c responses by blocks and tenure:

Count of respondents to B1c (%)	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total no. of respondents to question
Layard/Marden	36%	37%	15%	7%	3%	2%	59 [100%]
% of secure tenant respondents	11%	29%	18%	25%	18%		28 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	28%	34%	16%	13%	8%	1%	87 [100%]
Total	29%	25%	33%	4%	6%	2%	48 [100%]
Lockwood/New Place	12%	15%	27%		31%	15%	26 [100%]
% of secure tenant respondents	100%						1 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	24%	21%	31%	3%	15%	7%	75 [100%]
Total							

B1d - It is better to carry out major works to the whole estate in one contract rather than dealing with the Squares separately in different years

Count of B1d - all survey respondents	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Blank	Invalid	Grand total
Secure tenants	51	39	8	4	2	3	9	117
Leaseholders	11	12	8	9	15	2	1	58
Tenure not known	1						1	2
Total	63	51	16	13	17	5	11	177

Count of respondents to B1d (%)	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't mind	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Blank	Total no. of respondents to question
% of secure tenant respondents	48%	36%	7%	4%	2%	3%	107 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	19%	21%	14%	16%	26%	4%	57 [100%]
% of tenure not known respondents	100%					1	1 [100%]
Total	38%	31%	10%	8%	10%	3%	165 [100%]

Section C - respondent views of the preferred option/s

C1 - Are you happy with the choice of option 3 as the preferred option [enhanced refurbishment]?

Count of C1 - all survey respondents	Yes	No	Blank	Grand total
Secure tenant	106	5	6	117
Leaseholder	19	35	4	58
Tenure not known	2			2
Total	127	40	10	177

Count of respondents to C1 (%)	Yes	No	Total no. of respondents to question
% of secure tenant respondents	95%	5%	111 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	35%	65%	54 [100%]
% of tenure not known	100%		2 [100%]
Total	76%	24%	167 [100%]

C2 - Does this option include the works to your home that are most important to you?

Count of C2 - all survey respondents	Yes	No	Blank	Grand total
Secure tenant	104	4	9	117
Leaseholder	15	38	5	58
Tenure not known	1		1	2
Total	120	42	15	177

	Yes	No	Total no. of respondents to question
Count of respondents to C2 (%)			
% of secure tenant respondents	96%	4%	108 [100%]
% of leaseholder respondents	28%	72%	53 [100%]
% of tenure not known	100%		1 [100%]
Total	74%	26%	162 [100%]

Section D - respondent priorities

D1 - The survey included a list of priorities collected from resident feedback in November. Respondents were asked to tick 3 of the statements which are most important to them.

Number of respondents who indicated the following statements are most important to them:	Secure tenant	Leaseholder	Tenure not known
a] Improving the condition and appearance of the blocks and communal areas	77	30	1
b] Improving the internal condition of my home	95	6	1
c] Having a solution that is affordable to me	27	50	
d] Not having a new development built that may overlook or overshadow my home	45	29	
e] Not losing any green space or play areas around my home to new development	70	26	1

165 respondents indicated their preferences. 10 did not indicate any preferences and 2 responses were invalid because respondents picked more than 3 of the statements.

Elephant and Castle Supplementary Planning Document / Opportunity Area Planning Framework – Appendix A: Replacement page 63

opportunity to improve the retail offer in the area. Any redevelopment or remodelling of the shopping centre will be expected to demonstrate that it is increasing the appeal of the centre for Southwark’s residents and will reduce the amount of expenditure generated in Southwark which currently leaks to centres outside the borough. It can also provide an opportunity to introduce residential use to bring more activity to the site at different times of day and help make development viable.

- 5.1.9 A range of town centre uses will be appropriate at Elephant and Castle. These include hotels as well as arts, cultural and entertainment facilities. Existing arts, cultural and entertainment facilities include the bingo hall and bowling alley in the shopping centre, as well as the Coronet theatre. Arts, cultural and entertainment facilities help boost the evening economy and provide a valuable resource for Southwark’s residents.
- 5.1.10 However, the town centre is not well used in the evenings and night-time. Enhancing the evening and night-time economy can be a tool for positive regeneration. Proposals should improve the evening economy and we will assess this using the criteria in SPD 7.

SPD 22: Transport and movement

- Development should help facilitate the following improvements:
 - Provision of strong east-west routes for pedestrians and cyclists through the shopping centre and railway viaduct.
 - A north-south route to the shopping centre which provides a strong link to the northern end of Walworth Road.
 - Removal of subways and creation of new pedestrian/cyclist crossings on key desire lines.
 - Improvements to the Northern Line ticket hall and capacity between there and platforms.
 - Addressing bus-on-bus congestion at stops, and providing sufficient footway space for waiting bus passengers.
 - Explore the opportunity to Createing a bus-only street in London Road and reverting St George’s Road to two-way operation.

We are doing this because

- 5.1.11 The current environment is hostile to pedestrians and the shopping centre and railway create a barrier which makes east-west movement difficult. Our objective is to reduce this barrier and to make the central area more accessible from the Heygate development site and 50 New Kent Road site to the east. This area will provide a new market square as well as shops, office and leisure space, cafes and restaurants. Providing strong links through the railway viaduct and shopping centre is critical to drawing pedestrian movement east of the viaduct and enabling commercial development on the Heygate and 50 New Kent Road development sites to flourish.
- 5.1.12 The central character area provides the hub for transport serving the whole opportunity area, and so improvements here are important to support development throughout the opportunity area. Some of these improvements rely on changes that can only be delivered through changes to existing buildings, for example the proposed pedestrian route through the shopping

ITEM 17 - MOTIONS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**Appendix 3 - Save Chambers Wharf****Comments of the Deputy Chief Executive**

Thames Water recently consulted on its preferred route and sites for the tunnel. In its response to Thames Water dated 8 February 2012, Southwark raised significant concerns over the current proposal. The issues raised in the motion are consistent with those identified by the council in its response. In its February letter, Southwark indicated that Thames Water has not demonstrated that the tunnel proposal is the most appropriate means of meeting the requirements of the EU waste water directive. Southwark also strongly objected to the use of Chambers Wharf as a shaft construction site on the grounds that Thames Water has not satisfactorily addressed impacts on the amenities of nearby residents and schools. The council also has significant concerns about the number of anticipated lorry movements and potential impacts on residential amenities, congestion and highway safety.

Serious concerns were raised about the escalating costs of the Thames tunnel and the impact this will have on customers, pushing a significant proportion of Thames Water bill payers into water poverty.

Thames Water expects to submit a development consent order application in autumn 2012 which would be determined by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit in the Planning Inspectorate or the Secretary of State. Southwark will be invited to make representations as part of that process.

CABINET AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011-12**

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

Name	No of copies	Name	No of copies
Cabinet Members		Corporate Management Team	
Peter John	1	Eleanor Kelly	1
Ian Wingfield	1	Romi Bowen	1
Fiona Colley	1	Deborah Collins	1
Dora Dixon-Fyle	1	Gill Davies	1
Barrie Hargrove	1	Gerri Scott	1
Richard Livingstone	1	Susanna White	1
Catherine McDonald	1	Duncan Whitfield	1
Abdul Mohamed	1		
Veronica Ward	1	Officers	
Other Councillors		Doreen Forrester-Brown	1
Catherine Bowman	1	Jennifer Seeley	1
Andy Simmons	1	Trade Unions	
Toby Eckersley	1	Roy Fielding, GMB	1
Gavin Edwards	1	Mick Young, Unite	1
Dan Garfield	1	Chris Cooper, Unison	1
David Hubber	1	Tony O'Brien, UCATT	1
Victoria Mills	1	Michael Davern, NUT	1
David Noakes	1	James Lewis, NASUWT	1
The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole	1	Irene Bishop, ASCL	1
Geoffrey Thornton	1		
Mark Williams	1	Others	
Group Offices		Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission	1
Alex Doel, Cabinet Office	1	Robin Campbell, Press Office	1
Tom Greenwood, Opposition Group Office	1	Paula Thornton, Constitutional Officer	20
Press		Total:	66
Southwark News	1	Dated: 7 February 2012	
South London Press	1		
Members of Parliament			
Harriet Harman, MP	1		
Tessa Jowell, MP	1		
Simon Hughes, MP	1		