

# Council Assembly

Wednesday 27 March 2013

7.00 pm

Harris Academy Peckham, 112 Peckham Road, London SE15 5DZ

## Supplemental Agenda No.1

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
1.5.	<b>Minutes</b>	1 - 65
	To approve as a correct record the open minutes of the council assembly meetings held on 23 January and 27 February 2013.	

#### Contact

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

Date: 19 March 2013



## Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting) held on Wednesday 23 January 2013 at 7.00 pm at The Charter School, Red Post Hill, London SE24 9JH

---

### PRESENT:

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

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

## **1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

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

The Mayor:

- Thanked Charter School for allowing council assembly to use their school.
- Stated that a list of residents or people who work in the borough who had received an honour in the Queen's New Year's Honours list had been circulated at the meeting. The meeting congratulated all those who had received an honour.
- Welcomed Councillor Rebecca Lury to her first council assembly meeting.

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

With the meetings agreement, the Mayor announced that she intended to accept one late and urgent item of business:

- Item 6.1: Council Tax Base 2013/14.

With the meetings consent, the Mayor announced that the five deputations on the theme would be considered.

The Mayor stated that following consultation with the group whips on the motions on the theme it had been agreed that the two 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 5.2.1 – Motion on Save Southwark Emergency Services would also be considered in a similar manner.

The meeting agreed to suspend the following council assembly procedure rules:

- 1.1 (1) Deadline for receipt of reports
- 2.6 (11) No more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting.
- 1.14 (4) Single debate.

### **1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

The clerk announced that the monitoring officer had granted most members a dispensation in respect of Item 3 on the themed debate (affordable housing and social housing). Therefore members who had an interest as a council tenant or leaseholder did not need to make a declaration in respect of that item.

There were no declaration.

### **1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Mark Gettleson, Linda Manchester and Abdul Mohamed. Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Lewis Robinson and Rosie Shimell.

## 1.5 MINUTES

*(See supplemental agenda 1, pages 1 – 57)*

### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2012 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 2. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC

### 2.1 PETITIONS

There were none.

### 2.2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were none.

### 2.3 DEPUTATION REQUESTS ON THE THEME

*(See pages 1 - 4 of supplemental agenda 3)*

#### **Leathermarket Joint Management Board**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from the Leathermarket Joint Management Board.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, John Paul Maytum, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Fiona Colley, cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy. Councillor Fiona Colley provided an oral response.

Councillors Claire Hickson and Tim McNally asked questions of the deputation.

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

#### **Southwark Legal Advice Network**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from Southwark Legal Advice Network

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Sally Causer, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Ian Wingfield, deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing management. Councillor Ian Wingfield provided an oral response.

Councillors Darren Merrill, Anood Al-Samerai and Neil Coyle asked questions of the deputation.

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

**Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum.

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Mr Duckett, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Fiona Colley, cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy. Councillor Fiona Colley provided an oral response.

Councillors asked questions of the deputation.

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

**Residents of Draper House**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from residents of Draper House.

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Luisa Pretolani, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor, Ian Wingfield, deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing management. Councillor Ian Wingfield provided an oral response.

Councillors Cathy Bowman and Neil Coyle asked questions of the deputation.

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

Following the deputation from Draper House residents Councillor Ian Wingfield undertook to update members on the major works contract on the estate.

### **Residents of Four Squares Estate**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from residents of the Four Squares estate.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Jim Titchener, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Ian Wingfield, deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing management. Councillor Ian Wingfield provided an oral response.

Councillors Anood Al-Samerai, Eliza Mann, Gavin Edwards and Mark Williams asked questions of the deputation.

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

## **3. THEMED DEBATE - AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SOCIAL HOUSING**

### **3.1 CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT**

Councillor Ian Wingfield (deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management) and Councillor Fiona Colley (cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy) introduced the theme of the meeting.

The opposition spokesperson for resources and housing investment, Councillor Tim McNally, replied to the cabinet members' statements.

### **3.2 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE THEME**

There were none.

### **3.3 MEMBERS' MOTIONS ON THE THEME**

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

#### **MOTION 1 - GENUINELY AFFORDABLE COUNCIL HOUSING FOR SOUTHWARK**

*(see pages 3 – 4 of the main agenda)*

Councillor Richard Livingstone, seconded by Councillor Darren Merrill, moved the motion.

Councillor Michael Bukola, seconded by Councillor Nick Stanton, moved Amendment A.

Councillor Toby Eckersley, seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson, moved Amendment B.

## **MOTION 2 - MAJOR WORKS AND HOUSING REPAIRS**

*(See pages 4 – 5 of the main agenda)*

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, seconded by Councillor Catherine Bowman, moved the motion.

Councillor Gavin Edwards, seconded by Councillor Neil Coyle, moved Amendment C.

At 9.15pm the meeting adjourned, reconvening at 9.20pm.

Councillor Neil Coyle apologised to Councillor Anood Al-Samerai for comments that he had made about her whilst seconding Amendment C. Councillor Anood Al-Samerai accepted Councillor Coyle's apology.

The meeting then debated the two motions and three amendments (Councillors Peter John and Poddy Clark). Following points of personal explanation from Councillors Ian Wingfield, Poddy Clark and Mark Williams at 9.30 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 Amendments A and B – Genuinely Affordable Council Housing for Southwark**

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

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

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

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly welcomes the fact that the current Labour administration is:
  - Investing £326 million to ensure every council home in Southwark is warm, dry and safe by 2016
  - 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
  - Engaging in a borough-wide consultation into the proposals put forward by Southwark's groundbreaking independent housing commission which explored future housing options for strategy over the next 30 years

- And rejecting the government's definition of affordable housing as up to 80% market rents, by ensuring rents on phase 1 of the Heygate were lowered from 65% to 50% market rents to reflect the wishes of local residents.
2. That council assembly regrets the complete failure of the previous administration when it came to housing, including:
    - No new council homes approved between 2002-2010
    - An unworkable and unfunded decent homes programme which was millions of pounds over budget and left many Southwark residents without decent homes.
    - 7,800 fewer council homes in Southwark by the end of their time in office.
  3. That council assembly believes the Tory Liberal Democrat government's housing policy is not geared towards providing more affordable and social housing and opposes:
    - The housing benefit cap
    - "Affordable rent" of up to 80% of market rent
    - The ending of secure tenancies
    - The slashing of the social housing budget by £3.9 billion
    - The Growth and Infrastructure Bill which allows developers to deliver 0% affordable housing on new developments
    - Right to buy discounts of up to £75,000.
  4. That council assembly notes that Simon Hughes MP and the Liberal Democrats have supported all of these measures.
  5. That council assembly notes that sites for the first phase of the council's 1000 new homes have already been identified throughout the borough and calls on cabinet to draw up plans for consultation on the next phase of new council homes.

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

**Vote on Motion 2 and Amendment C - Major Works and Housing Repairs**

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:**

1. That council assembly regrets the incident at Draper House and notes that the



council is doing everything in its power to ensure people feel safe in their homes. It notes that:

- An investigation was immediately begun into the cause of the incident and that the council has agreed to fully adopt any recommendations to ensure residents' safety.
  - Properties where similar work was carried out are undergoing inspection by the council's compliance team to ensure work has been done properly and to the required safety standards.
  - The council has also alerted the health and safety executive as safety is its top priority.
2. That council assembly notes that at Four Squares the project has been completely turned round. The uncertainty for residents caused by the previous Liberal Democrat administration's failed housing investment programme and failure to complete security works has now been replaced with certainty as the works start driving forward the £26 million investment on the estate. The cabinet member for housing and council officers have met regularly with residents throughout the process and the first of the packaged works is now being delivered on time, despite some unforeseen structural issues.
3. That council assembly welcomes the steps taken by the current administration to improve major works project management and performance it inherited from the Liberal Democrats, including:
- Labour's £326 million warm dry safe programme which is realistic, fully-costed and sets out a clear timetable so residents know exactly when their works will take place.
  - A substantial programme of fire risk assessment works, refurbishment of hostels and a programme of improvement to tenants and residents association halls - with 2013/14 individual heating programme brought forward into 2012/13, meaning inefficient boilers are being replaced with more efficient models helping to deliver savings for resident and tackle fuel poverty.
  - The restructure and the setting up of project management teams to give improved focus to project management on site and a more open and transparent culture where problems can be quickly identified and resources committed accordingly.
  - A comprehensive resident consultation process "Putting Residents First" which ensures the council is clear with residents from the outset about what we are delivering and how they can be involved.
4. That council assembly notes the good progress has been made in improving the repairs service but acknowledges that the service started from a low base thanks to the arrangements put in place by the previous Liberal Democrat administration. It notes that contracts have been terminated with Just Housing, Morrison and the council is a few months away from bringing the call centre in-house. It notes that overall contract management is improving. There is a greater focus on completing repairs quickly and to a high standard leading to reduced costs and a reduction in duplication. Repairs completed right first time is improving as is satisfaction with the repairs service. Complaint escalations are at an all time low as are the number of

overdue orders.

5. That council assembly notes that the telephone answering performance at the customer services centre (CSC) for repairs was poor in the last quarter of 2012. This is because the repairs contractor for the south of the borough changed which caused some disruption and resulted in an increase in demand for the telephone service that lasted longer than we predicted. It notes that the council provided further resources and call waiting times have reduced considerably in the first two weeks of 2013. It notes that a customer access strategy has been developed to improve the quality of customer services, ease of accessibility and reduce costs and that the new My Southwark, customer service point opened at The Blue in Bermondsey in mid December and represents the prototype for the future of face to face customer services in Southwark.
6. That council assembly believes an immediate review of major works will be to the detriment of tenants with regards to their works and upgrades being completed on time and would result in severe costs to leaseholders.
7. That council assembly therefore resolves on cabinet to:
  - Continue to deliver its £326 million housing investment programme which will make every council home in Southwark warm, dry and safe by 2016.
  - Continue to improve management of major works contracts and to develop its customer access strategy which will help to improve the quality of the council's customer services.

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

#### **4. OTHER DEPUTATIONS**

There were none.

#### **5. ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS**

##### **5.1 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

*(See pages 6 - 12 of the main agenda and the blue and yellow papers circulated at the meeting)*

There was one urgent question to the leader, the written response to which was circulated on blue paper at the meeting. Two supplemental questions were asked of the leader. All questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes..

There were 41 members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper at the meeting. There were eight supplemental questions. All questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.

At 10.03pm the Mayor announced that the guillotine had fallen.

## 5.2 MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### **MOTION 1 - SAVE SOUTHWARK EMERGENCY SERVICES**

*(See page 14 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Peter John and Richard Livingstone, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors James Barber and Geoffrey Thornton, formally moved and seconded Amendment D.

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

Councillors Michael Mitchell and Lewis Robinson, formally moved and seconded Amendment E.

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

Councillors Helen Hayes and Andy Simmons, formally moved and seconded Amendment F.

Amendment F 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 that the safety and security of Londoners and the residents of our borough is being put at risk as a result of cuts to emergency services being pushed through by the Mayor of London and the Tory Liberal Democrat government to our key emergency services – the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Brigade alongside the London Ambulance Service and the city's accident and emergency departments.
2. That council assembly believes that the cuts are going too far and too fast and that the many millions of pounds being cut from the budgets of the NHS, the Metropolitan Police Service and the London Fire Brigade will inevitably endanger families and communities across the capital.
3. That council assembly believes that the cuts are being carried out without consideration of the impact on Londoners' safety. The mooted closures of police front desks in Rotherhithe and East Dulwich, fire stations in Borough and Peckham and Lewisham A & E department will mean various pockets of London could see the safety of residents threatened by longer response times.
4. That council assembly rejects the position of the Mayor of London and of Simon Hughes MP that the scale of the cuts are necessary and acceptable and calls on both to stand up for Southwark residents against the cuts being imposed by the Tory

Liberal Democrat government to the emergency services on which we rely to keep Londoners safe.

5. That council assembly notes that since the substantive motion was drafted the Mayor has published his draft police and crime strategy for London, and that this document makes a number of recommendations which will have serious consequences for Southwark if they are implemented:
  - (a) The proposed closure of East Dulwich, Gipsy Hill and Sydenham police stations, which will leave a 'black hole' in counter service provision for the residents of College, Village and East Dulwich wards.
  - (b) The proposed closure of Rotherhithe police station, which will leave an isolated peninsula community without adequate access to dedicated police resources.
  - (c) The proposed dismantling of the neighbourhood policing model such that the current dedicated ward based teams of six staff members (one sergeant, three police constables and two police community support officers) will be reduced to one dedicated police constable plus a 'named sergeant'.
6. That council assembly notes the Mayor's election manifesto commitment not to close any police station facility without opening an 'equivalent or better' facility in the same area, and notes that the draft police and crime strategy breaks this pledge.
7. That council assembly deplores the lack of cross-borough co-ordination in planning police station closures which has resulted in the 'black hole' in counter service provision in the Dulwich and Crystal Palace areas, which are close to the boundary with four other London boroughs.
8. That council assembly further deplores the dismantling of the neighbourhood policing model which will see the majority of officers deployed to high crime areas, to the detriment of the very important and successful community liaison and crime prevention roles which have helped to keep crime low.
9. That council assembly records its grave concern at the impact of both police station closures and the dismantling of the neighbourhood policing model on vulnerable residents, victims of domestic violence and others for whom the local police station is a place of safety; and on the ability of the police to record crime statistics accurately. Further, council assembly is concerned at the impact of police station closures on the management of local police teams and the potential for valuable police time to be lost to wards in the south of the borough due to officer travel time from operational bases in the north of the borough.
10. That whilst council assembly acknowledges the need to make budget savings, it believes the 20% cut imposed by the Tory Liberal Democrat government goes too far and too fast. In addition whilst council assembly recognises the inappropriateness of some current police station buildings for on-going use, for example the current East Dulwich police station building, it is extremely concerning that the draft police and crime plan contains no proposals for alternative provision, no definition of 'equal or better' against which future performance can be measured, and no creative thinking. Council assembly requests that the cabinet calls upon the Mayor to honour his

manifesto commitment concerning police counter facilities, and to rethink the proposals for the south of the borough and for Rotherhithe, working creatively with the council and local communities, to ensure that the dangerous 'black hole' scenario is averted.

11. That council assembly recognises the council's commitment to working creatively with the Metropolitan Police in identifying alternative premises which have the potential to meet police security criteria in the south of the borough and in Rotherhithe.

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

## **MOTION 2 - DNA DATABASE**

*(See pages 14 – 15 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Graham Neale and Rosie Shimell, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors Martin Seaton and Renata Hamvas, formally moved and seconded Amendment G.

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

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

## **RESOLVED:**

1. That council notes that in a fair society it is simply not right that innocent people can have their DNA stored by the state.
2. That council also notes with concern that since 2004 the UK's national DNA database (NDNAD) has been permitted to hold DNA samples of any individual arrested of an offence, regardless of whether that individual was actually charged or convicted.
3. That council notes that over million people, who have never been given a conviction, caution or formal warning are estimated to be on the national DNA database and acknowledges that the European Court of Human Rights found indefinite DNA retention to be in violation of Article 8.
4. That while council recognises that DNA evidence can be an important tool in criminal investigations, council believes that the indefinite retention of the DNA of innocent people constitutes a disproportionate intrusion by the state.
5. That council assembly notes the announcement that DNA samples held for innocent people will be destroyed in four months time in May 2013 and supports the Metropolitan Police Service's early deletion request scheme.
6. That in particular, council urges council officers to provide a link to the early deletion request scheme on Southwark Council's website and highlight the scheme in the next edition of Southwark Life.

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

## 6. OTHER REPORTS

## 7. COUNCIL TAX BASE 2013/14

*(See pages 58 – 77 of supplemental agenda 1 and pages 1 – 222 of supplemental agenda 2)*

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.

Following debate (Councillors Richard Livingstone, Anood Al-Samerai and Toby Eckersley), the recommendations contained within the report were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### RESOLVED:

1. That in accordance with the decisions of council assembly about council tax on 28 November 2012, the following be noted:
  - 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 of the report.
3. That the assumed council tax collection level remains at 96.25%, noting the risks outlined in paragraph 30 of the report..
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 of the report.
7. That the council tax reduction scheme (CTRS) written policy for both working and pensionable age claimants (see Appendix E of the report) be agreed; and the reduction in tax base of 21,215 band D equivalent properties as shown in paragraph

52 of the report be noted.

8. That any minor and consequential amendments to the council tax reduction scheme written policy be delegated to the strategic director of finance and corporate services, in consultation with the monitoring officer.

## 7.1 COUNCIL ASSEMBLY DATES AND CALENDAR 2013/14

*(See pages 16 – 31 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.

Following debate (Councillor Tim McNally), the recommendations contained within the report were put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### RESOLVED:

#### Council assembly dates

1. That the following dates for meetings of council assembly be agreed and that these dates be fixed in the council calendar for the municipal year 2013/14, subject to the notes set out in the table below:

**Dates of council assembly meetings 2013/14**

<b>Council Assembly Meetings 2013/14</b>	<b>Theme</b>
Wednesday 3 July 2013	Welfare Reform
Wednesday 16 October 2013	Green Southwark
Wednesday 27 November 2013	Local Business and Enterprise
Wednesday 22 January 2014	Active Communities and the Elderly
Wednesday 26 February 2014	Budget and council tax setting
Wednesday 26 March 2014*  Note: If local government elections take place on 1 May 2014, this meeting would be rescheduled for 19 March 2014. If there is a combined election in June 2014 this meeting would proceed.	Future Vision for Southwark
Wednesday 21 May 2014*	Annual meeting (Mayor making &

<p>Note: This date is based on local government elections taking place on 1 May 2014. In the event of a combined election, the annual meeting would be held after the elections (in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 4.1.2).</p>	<p>constitutional)</p>
---	------------------------

Note: \* - There remains some uncertainty regarding confirmation of the dates for the local government elections and European elections in 2014. This could impact on the proposed dates for the council assembly meetings in March 2014 and May 2014. For further information see notes in table and paragraphs 5 to 9 of the report.

### **Council calendar**

2. That the calendar of council meetings for the 2013/14 municipal year ahead as shown in Appendix 1 of the report be noted.

## **8. AMENDMENTS**

Amendments are set out in Supplemental Agenda No.3.

The meeting closed at 10.12pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**



**SOUTHWARK COUNCIL****COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 23 JANUARY 2013****URGENT QUESTION****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

In light of the publication of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan for London on 9 January and the leader of the council's subsequent statement that the council is "working with the Met and MOPAC" to find alternative police front counter facilities to replace those affected in the plan, what is the leader doing to work creatively with the Metropolitan Police in identifying alternative premises?

**RESPONSE**

Southwark has been actively working with the Metropolitan Police to find alternative counter facilities. Most recently, Councillor Livingstone and I have met with Stephen Greenhalgh, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime on 21 December 2012. In that meeting we made clear our commitment to work with the Mayor to find alternative premises in Southwark including suggesting a range of premises. The discussion included some ideas from Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) about sharing facilities with the council. We have asked officers to look at the practicalities of those suggestions.

To pay for premises, particularly ones not shared with the council, the Borough Commander will need to receive adequate funding from the Metropolitan Police. At the 9 January consultation meeting at City Hall, the Borough Commander stated that he would not be receiving a budget to do so.

This is the funding which has been slashed by this Tory/Liberal Democrat government and which local MP, Simon Hughes failed to vote against. While Simon Hughes and the Liberal Democrats believe that it's "wrong to say that more police equals less crime", Labour is getting on with finding solutions with the Metropolitan Police to keep people in Southwark safe.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

I do Madam Mayor, thank you very much, although the answer has broken Councillor Stanton's new rule of saying 'If you were not going to cut this, what would you have cut?', so it is already failing there, Councillor John.

My supplemental is really, you say that you want to work with the police to find alternative premises and then when you are asked what you have done you just say 'We have asked officers to look at it', so I am not actually sure what the officers have done. I visited the new One Stop Shop in the Blue the other day and asked whether they had explored at all with the police about sharing those premises and was met with blank looks, so clearly the officers you asked have not got very far.

## **RESPONSE**

It has been the community safety team leading on this as well as property. I think it is important to know when Councillor Livingstone and I met with the Deputy Mayor on 21 December, actually before the Deputy Mayor arrived, in the hour before he arrived – he was very late for the meeting – we had a very constructive discussion with Helen Bailey, who is his senior officer, and another officer from the Met Police and together we went through a whole list of potential premises in the borough; and Jonathon Toy who heads up the community safety department was there, and we have been working on that since.

The real difficulty in this, I am going to have to emphasise, is that the neither MOPAC or the police will give us any indication of what budget they might have to spend on premises that they will be located at with us.

We can find as a council a whole list of potential premises, some of which might require some capital expenditure to get them going, some of which will undoubtedly need some revenue to keep them going. We can find a whole host of premises, whether it be co-locating in libraries or One Stop Shops or whatever. But the Met Police and MOPAC will not tell us what funds they have available, or what their budget is so I have no idea what we are working towards.

For instance Councillor Crookshank Hilton has been doing some great work trying to find somewhere in East Dulwich where the police might be located with a revenue cost, she tells us, of £24,000. Now the indication from the Met Police and MOPAC is well that might be okay if that was the whole solution for all your front counters in Southwark but we can't pay that on one location if you want other places, but they have not told us what the total budget will be.

I am rambling on but it is important that you understand that, you know, without something from them as to what budget we are working from, it is very difficult for us to actually identify a solution, so I think we are probably going to come to a situation, we are probably having to go back to them with a whole list of central premises and what the costs are and see what their reaction is, whether they like some or they don't.

There does seem to be a real degree of confusion, I think both the Met Police and MOPAC about what they are doing here and I think that was evident at the public meeting at City Hall, where of course, the big slide on the screen said that Peckham would be a 24 hour police station of Southwark; where the Borough Commander was briefing at the end of the meeting it was going to be Walworth is the 24 hour police station of the borough. So there is a lot of confusion and a lack of information, but we are positive working as a council and I welcome all members' ideas where an appropriate place might be for co-location of premises, so do come forward with your ideas and send them to Councillor Livingstone as a first instance as this is his role. But we are trying to do as much as we can to work with MOPAC and the Met to sort this out, but as I say it is very difficult when you don't know what they are asking for or what the budget is.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Thanks Madam Mayor and I thank the leader for a surprisingly constructive answer; I am a bit thrown now. What I was going to suggest is that we follow Councillor Crookshank-Hilton's model of trying to do things on a cross party level and clearly the leader has indicated he would be up for that. Can I dare to suggest and to see

whether he is still constructive, that we involve the borough MPs as well, all three of them, and have some sort of cross party meeting with the Borough Commander and the Commissioner, and make sure we all actually sit round and talk to try and get some of the answers you are asking for, but also put forward ward councillors' suggestions as well and would he agree to that this evening?

## **RESPONSE**

Absolutely, I think if we can get the Met Police in a room and discuss it this would be fantastic. I mean, clearly all the MPs are concerned; I know Tessa Jowell is particularly concerned because of the impact on the Dulwich area, I know all the Dulwich councillors are concerned about this, right across the parties. All are concerned that there will be a complete lack of police presence south of Peckham under the current proposals. It is important that everybody who is available comes forward with their ideas. I am willing to work with anyone; as I say, what we really need is some information from the Met Police and MOPAC as to what their budget might be to make this happen.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**  
**(ORDINARY MEETING)**  
**WEDNESDAY 23 JANUARY 2013**  
**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS**

Did Simon Hughes vote for the third reading of the government's Growth and Infrastructure Bill? Did he support any amendments to that bill?

**RESPONSE**

Yes he did. Despite claiming to support more affordable housing on new developments, Simon Hughes has just voted through a bill that will allow developers to immediately appeal to the Secretary of State against Section 106 affordable housing requirements. This puts councils like Southwark in a much weaker negotiating position and will mean that in the future it will be much easier for developers to wriggle out of their affordable housing requirements altogether.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS**

Thank you, Madam Mayor, and I thank the leader for his answer. Following the planning decision last week to approve the Heygate master plan Simon Hughes was asked by [the] SE1 [website] if the fact that the coalition had cut the subsidy for affordable housing from £120,000 to £20,000 had any effect on the levels of affordable housing being built on new developments. His answer was "Well, that's disputable." Does the leader share my concern that Simon Hughes has not been honest with local people about the damage his government's decisions are doing to affordable and social housing?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Edwards for his supplementary question.

I think it is absolutely right. I don't think it is disputable actually, I think it is a fact acknowledged by everybody actually, or should be acknowledged by everybody; and it is a shame if it is not acknowledged by the local MP in the north of the borough, that the loss of grant subsidy to social housing has had an impact on the amount of social housing which has been delivered on sites and the level of rent payable at those sites, and I think it is absolutely – it is the rationale of the Growth and Infrastructure Bill. Because developers cannot get on and deliver the affordable housing on site because of the loss of grant funding, the government are saying 'you can come back and reduce it to zero'.

So actually I think it is not disputable. It is a fact. He has to accept his part in that because he is part of this government that is forcing through these cuts right across the piece; and has forced through cuts and loss of grant funding. It is a very, very sad situation indeed and that is why I think the fact that we are delivering 25% affordable housing at the Heygate site is an achievement which I think we should take some pride in. It is not perfect, I know that; I would like to be here with

35% or more affordable housing, but in the circumstances which we are facing, 25% affordable housing with rents of 50%, affordable rents of 50% of market rent rate is a real achievement.

## **2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

What is the Leader's vision for the long-term future of the four council-run children's centres? Can he demonstrate how the views of parents have been included in this vision? Does he believe that parental involvement and engagement has been done well in the last year?

### **RESPONSE**

Our vision for nursery and early year provision is to ensure that all four council run nurseries continue to offer an excellent service to parents and quality learning and care experience for children. We are obliged to ensure they are financially sustainable and better targeted to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged and vulnerable families in the borough; those for whom this provision is intended. This is despite severe financial pressure and the reduction in funding from the government, including a further cut of over £6 million to the early intervention grant announced in December 2012.

I know that the cabinet member for children's services has visited the nurseries on at least five occasions since taking over this portfolio on 29 May 2012 and spoken to parents, carers and staff members. Labour councillors also voted to amend the agenda of our council assembly meeting on 4 July 2012 to hear a deputation of parents from the affected nurseries and to hold a debate on nurseries before we came on to the pre-advertised themed debate of older people.

The views of parents, through consultation, discussions and visits to the centres, were considered, resulting in the council's decision to keep the centres open. Parents' written suggestions to the council included increasing fees, reducing backroom and administrative expenses, reviewing staffing levels and looking at modernising payment methods, which have all been factored into establishing a sustainable financial model, fit for the future. Engagement with parents at all nurseries has been undertaken by officers and cabinet colleagues, in writing and through visits as would be expected. The centre managers have been engaged in the consultation and planning for a staffing model. Staff have been consulted, their views factored into proposals. There have been numerous email communications between parents and the council as well, and the council can guarantee that all suggestions, issues and ideas have been taken seriously, discussed at length and where possible, included in planning for the future.

Apart from the fact that the council listened to parents and decided to keep the centres open, albeit with significant financial reductions in budget, we have also listened to the parents' view of securing a high quality service, a vision shared by all of us.

I am confident that parental engagement and involvement has been as extensive as possible, particularly when needing to adhere to human resources requirements in relation to terms and conditions of staff and employees. The outcome of this issue, i.e. that the centres will remain open, high quality services will be maintained and the financial model is more sustainable for the future, demonstrates that the council listened and responded to parents.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

Yes I do Madam Mayor thank you very much. This one was about nurseries and I am concerned that the leader is “confident ... parental engagement ... has been extensive” and I wondered whether that meant he was not aware of what happened when ward councillors tried to invite parents to a meeting with the director of children services; where literally at the eleventh hour, at 11 o'clock before the 12 o'clock meeting, we were told that parents could not come. When we said that might be slightly unfair to people who might know what is going on in nurseries, they said they were allowed to come, but not to speak. I did not realise Southwark Council had quite become that sort of state, but I wondered either was he aware; or if he was not aware, would he go and speak to the officers about that shameful way to treat parents in this borough?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Al-Samerai for her supplementary question. Yes, I was aware of that situation; and I don't think it is actually shameful of officers, I think it was the way in which the meeting was presented. I am told (and this might be a subject of dispute, and if it is, come back and speak to me afterwards), I was told that members had requested a briefing at a meeting with the director of children's services. Now when it emerged that members of the public were going to be at that meeting, the director of children's services was being placed in an invidious position because she was being dragged into what could be potentially a political meeting and that is not a place for officers, or a way for officers to be treated and certainly that was how it was presented to me.

So I think it is really, if there is blame here, it is I think that members, all members, if they are going to briefings or meeting with officers, have to be absolutely clear about the terms on which they go to have those briefings or meetings. It is not appropriate for officers to become involved in political meetings potentially, with members on either side, in this sort of this scenario.

I am going to correct myself because I have given an inaccurate answer; I am being incredibly constructive tonight. No, you have reminded me because it was in the letter; you are quite right; the officer did not read right through to the end of the letter. That is what I am told. So I am sorry about that, I apologise for that. No, hold on let's not be unfair, the same points applies that I made right at the start; members do have to be careful of dragging officers into meetings with members of the public in circumstances that may be inappropriate, I would emphasise that point and accept the point that she just made.

**3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL**

The first clause of the government's Growth and Infrastructure Bill gives unprecedented powers to the Secretary of State to strip any local authority deemed to be 'failing' of its planning powers. This would enable developers in these areas to ask to have their applications decided by the Secretary of State without ever being reviewed by the local authority. The Secretary of State's decision would be final with no right of appeal. What does he believe the impact of this proposal will be and has the council made any representations to the government?

**RESPONSE**

I think this proposal, as with much of the rest of the bill, will create a confused and highly centralised planning process; ultimately resulting in planning decisions that do not reflect the wishes of local people. It is also indicative of this government's misguided belief that the housing crisis in this country is the result of a cumbersome planning process and fastidious councils. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Last year Southwark approved nearly nine out of 10 (87%) of all planning applications for major developments – in line with the national average. This indicates that the planning system is not the root cause of the housing crisis but rather the government's decision to slash the budget for social housing by 60%.

I wholeheartedly believe that Southwark is a leading example of how planners and local political leadership have seized the opportunity to not just enable development, but take forward-thinking, proactive steps to ensure delivery of development and particularly housing. Southwark has led the way in revisiting and amending legal agreements on stalled schemes where there is a clear link to delivery and not merely a 'technical implementation' to protect a consent. We have in place clear and reasonable review mechanisms on the viability of schemes to secure additional affordable housing on large-scale, phased development. We offer a first-class pre-application service to provide clarity and certainty with regard to the acceptability of proposals. We have consistently improved our planning performance in the face of vanishing resources, a fuzzy, nebulous national policy framework, and the inertia of the financial markets.

It is ironic that two parties which claim to support localism, the Tories and Liberal Democrats, are so keen to strip power away from local government and put it all in the hands of Eric Pickles.

The council submitted a response to the consultation on 17 January 2013.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL**

I have thank you very much Madam Mayor and I will be brief. Given the coalition government's misplaced and blinkered vision for planning, particularly as we touched on earlier the belief that local government is responsible for the shortfall in housing, can you see any redeeming features in their proposals for improving localism, improving planning performance and the release of affordable housing in all categories? And given Cllr Al-Samerai's keenness for evidence-based decisions earlier, is there any evidence of any evidence being used to base the government basing their decision on putting forward these proposals?

**RESPONSE**

Well I think it is really worrying Cllr Dolezal; and thank you very much for your supplementary question. I mean it's this government's version of localism, isn't it; you know, we give with one hand and not really, we don't let go and then we grab with the other. Planning powers being grabbed back from local authorities particularly worrying and also the relaxation of planning powers is particularly concerning, particularly with regard to extensions to houses; it's not applicable right across the borough but applicable to parts of the borough and I think that is a dangerous way to go.

I do think that the government's Growth and Infrastructure Bill is a really regressive step to allow developers off the hook as it were, delivering affordable housing. We know in our borough I think it would be very difficult for developers to make the case that they can't deliver any affordable housing; we know, as I said in my earlier answer the sort of difficulties the developers are coming under in delivering because of the loss of grant funding. If this government was serious about answering the problems that we have got, not only in Southwark but across London in terms of the shortage of housing and social housing and affordable housing, then they would not have put forward a bill like this, they would not have cut the grant subsidy by £6 billion like they did in 2010 and they would be encouraging even to a greater extent councils like us by removing the HRA cap on borrowing so we can carry on building even more housing. There are too many restrictions on local authorities, too many problems facing developers to deliver the housing solutions that we need in this borough, in London and across the country.

#### **4. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

Can the leader give an update on the major works at Draper House following the recent gas leak and when these works are now likely to be completed? What action is being taken to ensure that contractors on other sites adhere to the highest standards of health and safety?

#### **RESPONSE**

The contract with Breyer, the contractor carrying out the major works at Draper House, has been suspended at Draper House following a serious health and safety incident. A material breach of contract notice has been served on Breyer who have provided a response to the council. Further contractual and legal discussions are taking place with Breyer regarding their response. The intention is to complete legal agreements by 25 January 2013 with a view to restarting works by the end of January. This will delay the original completion date of May 2013 by an estimated two months.

Residents have been kept fully informed with two public meetings arranged by council officers and letters. A further meeting will be called once discussions are complete. Checks have been done to other properties where works were carried out by Breyer to ensure that no other resident is at risk.

All contractors are required to provide comprehensive health and safety method statements prior to works starting on-site to ensure that they fully comply with statutory health and safety working practices with regular on-site health and safety and quality checks carried out by the council's project team.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

I do Madam Mayor and I thank the Leader for his answer. Given that the gas leak incident is only the latest in a series, probably the most serious but the latest in a series of errors that have dogged the Draper House major works programme, starting with the commission of custom built windows that did not fit, and had to be sent back and re-commissioned; given the seriousness of the mess up, would he undertake an investigation into what's gone wrong with the management of this contract and as Councillor Eckersley indicated earlier on the costings because this cannot be cost free, and leaseholders are already paying £35,000 for these works and they have been told they will not get charged any extra but I think it is really important that lessons are drawn from this and learnt and applied to other



contracts. Because party politics aside, it is not good enough and I don't think anyone in this room wants this kind of shambolic pattern to be repeated on other estates. Would you please undertake that this is looked at and the findings made public to interested residents on the Draper?

## **RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Bowman for her supplementary question, I don't think that we should lose sight of the fact that Breyer were only part of this picture because of the contract that the previous administration signed the day before the election which was called I think in 2010. The partnering contract that was entered into at the time when they were chosen as one of the partners for the council, so you know, it was not our choice to have Breyer as the contractor on this project, believe you me.

Look, I think it is absolutely right, where mistakes have been made in any contract lessons should be sought to be learned, and I think she is absolutely right as well that leaseholders should not be penalised for costs incurred because of the fault of contractors and Councillor Wingfield has already touched upon this. That is why negotiations are on going with Breyer at the present time. The council is trying to protect its position and the position of leaseholders and council tax payers and others who are footing the bill otherwise. It should be the contractors that pick up the bill, let's be absolutely clear and honest about this. I do accept that lessons need to be learned. I visited – ironically, I visited Draper House on 30 October. There were things there that did strike me as weird that we weren't doing and I did pick them up and raised them. I have been aware of problems relating to this contract, residents have emailed me and you know, they have gone into the system and I have been absolutely aware of it and I was briefed as soon as Councillor Wingfield was briefed about the most serious incident on 28 November, but yes, absolutely right; let's learn lessons, let's be constructive about this, but as Councillor Wingfield said earlier, at the end of the day, I'm sure what the residents want is quick, efficient, speedy, cost effective, safe works to be completed to their block. I certainly know there's one member, I think, particularly interested.

## **5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

60% of the people affected by the government's latest cuts to welfare are in work. What impact will cuts to working age benefits and tax credits have on the incomes of families in Southwark?

## **RESPONSE**

For all their talk of scroungers and benefit cheats, the Tories and Liberal Democrats are cutting the most support - tax credits, maternity allowance, maternity pay, sick pay, and housing benefit - from working people.

I know that people in Southwark are already having their incomes squeezed by this Government. My real concern is that these latest cuts will have the perverse effect of removing the incentive to work from the lowest paid – the people who do the essential jobs in our borough – pushing more people into poverty and increasing unemployment.

Indeed the Joseph Rowntree Foundation estimates there are already 6.1 million people in working households who are in poverty. According to Institute of Fiscal Studies calculations the impact of the changes announced in the autumn

statement between now and April 2015 will be to reduce the real income of a one-earner working family by £534 on average in 2015-16.

It also underlines how two of Southwark Labour's key policies are making a difference: free, healthy school meals - which is not just tackling childhood obesity but supporting families with the cost of living - and introducing the London Living Wage for all our staff. It demonstrates the real difference between a Labour vote and a Tory Liberal Democrat one.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

Yes I do Madam Mayor and apologies again for the offence and disruption caused earlier. The leader is aware that in Southwark thousands of low income working families will be losing out under council tax benefit changes, in particular women who tend to be earning less than men in Southwark and in low, low income employment.

Does the Leader think that the Liberal Democrat councillors will be remembered for their continued support for coalition keeping poverty and disadvantage in our communities, in contrast in keeping positive council policies of living wage, hardship fund and free healthy school meals which all benefit all low income families?

### **RESPONSE**

I mean, it is always difficult, I remember the days when we were in opposition but in government in this chamber, and sometimes, you know, you do have to, you know, defend sometimes unpopular policies. It must be impossible for the Liberal Democrats because every policy this coalition government comes through is difficult to defend in one way or another, I mean now there is an EU referendum in our referendum that the Prime Minister wants but the Deputy Prime Minister does not want it even though he wanted it two years ago or was it three years ago; tuition fees we could go on about; all these terrible policies that they are inflicting upon us.

But you know, I do think as we were constantly reminded and will continue to remind them, that they are in a position to influence the voting of the member of parliament for Bermondsey and Old Southwark and they should use their power to do that, I mean, you know, Sarah Teather voted against the government didn't she the other day? Liberal Democrat MPs do act in accordance with their conscience and what's in interest of their constituents. Simon Hughes does not and always finds weasel words or some excuse to get away from responsibility. No, he has to take responsibility, and you have to take responsibility to try to influence him. I am incredibly proud of what we are doing in Southwark as a Labour administration to try and mitigate the impact of what this government is doing, and at the front and centre of that is improving our council homes with the warm, dry and safe programme, building more council homes through our affordable housing programme, and yes, providing free healthy school meals for every primary school child in this borough so they have a hot nutritious meal at lunch time, a really important policy, opposed by the Liberal Democrats and let's never forget it.

**6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES**

What does the leader believe is a reasonable time for his cabinet members to take in responding to letters?

**RESPONSE**

I would encourage all cabinet members to respond to correspondence as quickly as possible.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES**

Thank you Madam Mayor, and can I thank the Leader of the Council for his response, however as he is aware from our correspondence, I and some of my colleagues have struggled to get responses from cabinet members in a timely fashion. In light of the fact that all councillors have a recognised and important role to perform and that the majority of cabinet members are full time, receive over £30,000 in SRAs and have officers support, are he and his colleagues prepared to commit to the same response times for officers of ten working days for an enquiry and fifteen working days for a complaint, if not why not?

**RESPONSE**

I think that is a very sensible suggestion and I will take that away and discuss with colleagues why we could not possibly do that, I think that is very sensible and Councillor Noakes will know that when I saw this question I got in touch with him and said 'Is it me?', because I was worried and conscious that I might not have got back to him because I don't think it is acceptable for members not to have their emails responded to or queries responded to, so I will take that away and I don't see any reason why we might not come back with a constitutional amendment in due course which reflects that, because it is part of the officer protocol I think it should be part of the members protocol, and in fact I was quite convinced that it was in our protocol already so I am slightly surprised to discover it wasn't.

I think it is absolutely right; if officers are obliged to respond in a timely fashion and within deadlines, so should cabinet members. I think the only query might be sometimes cabinet members who are reliant on officers to come back with the answer and sometime officers do take their full ten days, unbelievably, to answer even cabinet members, to get our response out so we might have to play with the dates a bit, but we should have deadlines and I am very grateful to Councillor Noakes for raising this issue.

**7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR VICTORIA MILLS**

What will the two year local government financial settlement from government announced on 20 December mean for Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

Essentially it will mean more pain. We face more funding cuts in 2013-14 and 2014-15. The cuts are particularly bad in 2014-15 with the council facing a loss of £24.53 million or 9.7% in our revenue spending power through cuts from our government grant, a real terms reduction of £32.38 million - larger even than in 2010.

There are three specific points I would note:

- The fact that the government's autumn statement was made in December and we did not discover our settlement until five days before Christmas demonstrates that we were right to prepare a three year indicative budget back in 2010. We were right to plan prudently and maintain reserves and contingencies in the face of opposition from the Liberal Democrats who, each financial year, call for us to spend everything. It means that despite all the pain that we have been through, Southwark residents and the services they rely on will not fall victim to this government's reckless mismanagement of the economy and its failed austerity programme.
- Most unsettling from this year's settlement is the £6.1 million (29%) cut to the early intervention grant (EIG). EIG funds core, high priority children's services including children's centres; provision of support to get young people in education, employment and training; early intervention services; statutory specialist services and voluntary sector commissioning. Part of the EIG reduction is to pay for the government's offer of nursery places for two year olds. There is no "new" money to fund this. That is money the Tory and Liberal Democrat government has taken from Southwark children centres, Southwark early intervention services and Southwark schemes to help young people in education.
- Finally it will mean more difficult spending decisions in the future. I have always said these are not our cuts; they have been forced on us by the Conservative Liberal Democrat Government which is still wedded to a failed economic theory. They have chosen to cut more from the most deprived areas. Southwark, for example, is the 11th hardest hit council in the country, losing £249.28 between 2010 and 2014-15 for every man, woman and child living in the borough. The equivalent figure for Epsom and Ewell is £15.18. But now that we are faced with this challenge we will continue to deliver our manifesto commitments, protect our most vulnerable residents, deliver value for money and create a fairer future for all in Southwark.

#### **8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROSIE SHIMELL**

What minimum standards do schools need to reach to be considered for temporary or permanent expansions? Does he believe schools that have been rated poorly by Ofsted should still be considered for expansion?

#### **RESPONSE**

After failing to take action when they ran the council, I welcome that the Southwark Liberal Democrats now recognise the urgent and pressing need for more primary school places. It is a shame that Liberal Democrats are not talking to their colleagues in government and asking them to protect funding for Southwark schools so that we can actually see new primary schools in the borough.

School standards are very important when considering which schools should provide temporary or permanent expansions and this is taken into consideration alongside population trends and available space to expand. The school improvement team supports and challenges schools to ensure that they are

providing places of a suitable quality and that their overall quality of leadership, teaching and learning is good or better.

I do not believe schools that have been rated poorly by Ofsted should be considered for expansion and I am pleased to say that none of the schools identified for expansion in our primary investment programme are rated as inadequate by Ofsted.

Of the ten primary schools providing the additional forms of entry three are outstanding (Albion, Charles Dickens and John Donne), five are good (Bessemer Grange, Dog Kennel Hill, Grange, Ivydale and Langbourne) and two are satisfactory (Camelot and Crawford). Both of the schools that are satisfactory will serve different parts of the borough. Crawford has recently been judged as one of the most improved primary schools in London and we are confident will be judged good at its next inspection. Camelot is constantly monitored by the school improvement team and improvement plans to take it to a judgment of 'good' are in place. Already there are improvements being seen as an increased focus on the quality of teaching has been a priority. The quality of teaching is improving as is the progress of the pupils.

#### **9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM MCNALLY**

How many empty homes are there in Southwark? How much has the council paid to secure empty homes in each of the last three years? How many council officers are employed to deal with bringing empty homes back into use?

#### **RESPONSE**

The latest council tax base figures as at November 2012 shows that there are 2,645 empty homes across all tenures.

Empty homes on the regeneration sites at Aylesbury and Heygate estate have cost £659,000 in 2010-11, £706,000 in 2011-12 and £750,000 in 2012-13 (actual forecast to date). The figures include security patrols as well as welding up costs.

The costs are as a result of keeping properties secure from both long and short term squatting, minimising access points onto and off the estate, security measures for remaining estate residents (one leaseholder now remaining on the Heygate), preventing trespass, areas being used for rough sleeping and reducing crime hot spots generally.

On minor voids, the council has significantly reduced costs and its reliance on using grilles as a means to secure empty properties with only one grille used in 2011 on a property that had been damaged; rather relying on the speed of turnaround to ensure these vacant properties are quickly occupied.

The empty homes team consists of two officers who work with private sector empty property owners to find ways to bring their properties back into use as housing. In 2012-13 there were 21 staff employed to bring empty council homes back into use.

#### **10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA**

How many disrepair cases is the council facing with tenants and leaseholders? Would the cabinet member support Liberal Democrat calls for a system of

caretakers to be returned to estates to deal with tenant-leaseholder issues and help avoid cases of disrepair?

## **RESPONSE**

At the end of December 2012 there were 186 disrepair cases down from 307 in April 2011. This is down from 386 in 2010 and 377 in 2009 when the Liberal Democrats ran the council. This is the lowest level of disrepair cases for some considerable time.

Councillor Bukola may be interested to know that the council moved away from employing caretakers about 20 years ago. Estate compliance officers (ECOs) were introduced who took ownership for communal areas, repairs (including disrepair) and monitoring of cleaning and grounds maintenance. The previous Liberal Democrat administration scrapped ECOs when they ran the council in 2005-6 which I assume Councillor Bukola, were he on the council, would have opposed.

It is not currently proposed to introduce caretakers. Instead two alternative proposals are planned. The first is to introduce communal repairs compliance officers who will lead on estate inspections, section 20 consultation, contract management, pre and post inspections, ordering, training and resident and member interaction. The second is to introduce an annual property check. The annual property check involves combining the tenancy check, gas servicing visit (where it applies) and a property inspection into a single annual visit. The principle is to take a proactive approach to identifying repairs early and tenancy compliance.

Both these initiatives will have a positive effect on disrepair and represent significant service improvements for our residents.

### **11. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO**

Following workers being unable to complete resurfacing in Grove Park, Camberwell, due to an expired works permit earlier this month, what was the total cost of this error to the council? Was the specialised tarmac for this work reused and if so at what site?

## **RESPONSE**

The abortive costs to the council total are £6,650. The materials were used by our contractor at a site in the London Borough of Lambeth, where they also hold a contract. Lambeth would thus have paid the contractor for the material ensuring Southwark made a corresponding saving.

### **12. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES (CAMBERWELL COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can the council please provide an update on the regeneration plans for Camberwell?

## **RESPONSE**

We are committed to improving the quality of life for people in Southwark and will invest £11 million to help make Camberwell a place where people can be proud of.

Five key projects will help to transform the area and we invite local people to have a say on the development of the proposed projects.

Consultation began on 21 January 2013. The five projects which are being consulted upon are:

- We want to build on the vibrant and distinctive nature of Camberwell. Through the supplementary planning document we will set out detailed planning guidance for the next 15 years on a number of policies, including the vision for Camberwell, design guidance for key development sites, public realm improvements and setting out the balance between housing, retail and employment uses in the area.
- We are keen to develop a lasting cohesiveness for the town centre and streetscape by improving the quality of streets and links with the town centre. Streetscape improvements will reduce pedestrian congestion and street clutter, enhance crossing opportunities, and aid the movement of buses through the town centre. Transport for London will also be delivering the cycle superhighway 5 through Camberwell, which should see cycle safety improvements at key junctions as well as improved space for cyclists.
- There will be an improved public space and reading facilities at the new Camberwell Library. We have already been engaging with local people about the new design for the building and landscape and this will continue to the planning application stage.
- An exciting redesign of Camberwell Green Park will reinforce the role of the green as a town centre public space, with a new play area and an improved seating offer.
- The pocket places initiative will support the wider streetscape improvements and bring together the large number of public spaces, roads and laneways throughout the town centre.

I welcome everyone to have a say through the stakeholder engagement programme starting with a drop in session on 26 January 2013 in the new Jubilee Hall at Camberwell Leisure Centre. I am also delighted that Councillor Gibbes has agreed to have the regeneration plans as a major item at the Camberwell community council meeting on 13 February 2013 where residents and local people can have a say on the proposed plans.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES (CAMBERWELL COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Yes, Madam Mayor. I want to thank the cabinet member for her informative response. Does she not think that residents and others will be extremely pleased that after the neglect of Camberwell by the previous administration, that this administration has made good progress in actioning the commitment it gave to revitalise Camberwell.

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Gibbes for her question, and the answer is yes I do; in fact I have evidence of that. Just this week I attended a meeting of the Camberwell Business Network, there were people there from the SE5 forum and that is one of the things they said to me, that after so long they were so excited to see things were actually happening. I received even a follow up email thanking us for the work we are doing, and have been delighted to tell you about the five projects we are about to consult on and that isn't even all of the things we are doing in Camberwell. We have the community restoration fund project working with Camberwell Business Network, they have a "Camberwell is Cool!" project; I know Councillor Hickson was there to talk to them about that.

We have the Elmington Project which is now finally progressing; those two empty sites on Edmund Street that had laid empty for such a long time. Construction is starting this month and is expected to be completed in mid 2014, the new schools are under way, the next stages of Elmington are under way and we are actively pursuing the Bakerloo line extension which is perhaps most exciting. It was discussed at our previous transport-themed meeting, and myself, the Leader and Councillor Hargrove had the opportunity to raise that with the Deputy Mayor for Transport, Isabel Dedring, just this week and we are actively pursuing regeneration in Camberwell, because this administration, unlike the last, knows that regeneration is about the whole borough and not just the north.

We are pursuing the north; completing – exactly! This weekend the new sports hall is happening, funded by this administration as an Olympic legacy project, finishing the job; and that is what we are going to keep doing, working hard for Camberwell and all parts of this borough.

**13. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES (PECKHAM AND NUNHEAD COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Please could Veolia Environmental Services improve the pedestrian access for residents at the new recycling waste facility in order for them to dispose/recycle small items made from wood and metals etc. Currently members of the public are prohibited from walking on the ramp which is for cars only?

**RESPONSE**

The current arrangements at the household waste reuse and recycling centre (HWRRC) for pedestrians and cyclists is that that they can drop items off in the reuse area to the left of the ramp, avoiding the need for residents on foot to be in close proximity to cars. Usually, there will be a member of staff on hand to accept the waste but on occasion, this isn't the case.

As a result, a commitment has been made by Veolia Environmental Services (whom are responsible for managing the site) to review the signage in the HWRRC to make it clearer where pedestrians should place their waste. I will ensure this is completed within the next three months.

This arrangement means the site is fully accessible to all residents whilst ensuring their safety.



**14. QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

In view of the concern in Dulwich about the effectiveness of the new arrangements for determining planning applications, would the chair of planning committee advise whether the current system will be reviewed, and whether consideration will be given to holding planning sub-committee meetings at the new council offices at Queens Road Peckham, or at other venues in the south of the borough?

**RESPONSE**

I am already in discussion with officers about how we can best undertake a review of the current planning regime.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Thank you Madam Mayor, I would like to thank the chair of planning for his answer. First of all can you please note that the Queens Road Peckham suggestion is only in desperation if you insist on using council offices, because it is actually very difficult to get to Peckham from Dulwich. The question is do you think you might have this review done by the next municipal year so we can start seeing meetings in the relevant parts of the borough in planning?

**RESPONSE**

Thank you very much for the supplementary, I started having conversations soon after we introduced the new measures and those are not coming to a head or any form of completion before Christmas. I think you are absolutely right; there are a range of views and a range of enthusiasms about how we may progress this. Like everybody else in this room and the government, I am very keen on evidence based decisions and I am currently having a discussion saying what evidence do we need, how much of it do we need, what is the full cycle of meetings that we have to have to be able to make reasonable decisions on whether people find it convenient or not? So those sorts of discussions are going on at this stage. Alongside that, we have to look at what the current government is doing around planning and how they anticipate shaping that out and alongside that we have to look at the local government finance pot, because you will recall that the reasons why we took the decision to reduce the – to have the current planning arrangements in place was budget led by and large. All right, “it wasn’t budget led by and large”; but it was. And as a consequence in an ever reducing budget cycle from central government – saved by the bell!

**15. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON (BOROUGH, BANKSIDE AND WALWORTH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can the council consider developing a consistent process for all public consultation it carries out?

## RESPONSE

On 11 December 2012 the cabinet agreed a future approach to community engagement. The approach acknowledged that there were examples of good practice in consultation and engagement across the council but that at times this was inconsistent.

The new approach sets out some key principles that will apply across the council in carrying out consultation and community engagement. These include:

- Being clear about the scope of our engagement: whether we are communicating, consulting, deciding together or acting together.
- Engaging when we know it will make a difference: when there is a real opportunity for people to have an impact and influence decisions on issues that local people care about.
- Engaging at the right time; at an early enough stage for there to be an opportunity to genuinely influence a policy or service.
- Allowing sufficient time for good quality engagement to take place.
- Being clear about what we are asking; what opportunities there are to shape services and be honest about what can and can't be achieved.
- Ensuring that our engagement is accessible and targeted to those it needs to reach using a variety of engagement methods to broaden participation and overcome any barriers people may have in engaging with us.
- Aiming to engage as widely as possible so that we increase engagement with those who are not already in touch with the council.
- Telling people what has happened as a result of their engagement.
- Building the capacity of the community to deliver services where they can do this better than us and being prepared to take risks and try out new ways of working. Where we can we will devolve responsibility and power to the community to deliver.

The approach is a starting point and as part of the ongoing work that the council is doing officers are producing and implementing an action plan for better coordination of community engagement and consultation activity across the council. This will include developing tools and resources to support officers engaged in consultation to ensure it meets the principles of the approach and is more consistent and coordinated.

Community councils play a central role in community engagement in Southwark. Sometimes consultations at community councils are very effective, sometimes not. This is something we have discussed in community council chairs and vice-chairs meetings. Officers are therefore producing a forward plan of consultations for community councils so that they have more opportunity to plan their agendas effectively in advance and achieve a higher quality of engagement in the actual meetings.

**16. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU**

How will Labour's community restoration fund benefit businesses in Rotherhithe?

**RESPONSE**

We launched the community restoration fund (CRF), not only as a response to 2011 riots but because small and medium-sized businesses in Southwark were struggling thanks to a triple whammy of the double-dip recession, the rise of large out-of-town shopping centres and internet shopping.

Albion Street in Rotherhithe is an excellent example of a place with a fantastic history of economic and commercial activity which is popular with local people and has the right ingredients for success but just needs a small boost. That is why the CRF is providing support to businesses in Rotherhithe. Funding provided through the CRF has allowed Albion Street Traders to deliver a campaign to put this local parade of shops on the "shopping map" of Rotherhithe. This has included running an advertising campaign in Southwark News in October and November 2012, supported by the council's communications team, promoting the street and the Scandinavian market. Traders are also working to promote local art works and are planning an Easter market for the street to increase interest in the local area and attract new customers.

**17. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR KEVIN AHERN**

In the absence of government action, what can the council do to increase employment in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

I have been shocked by the revelations last week that George Osborne's claim that employment was at a record high – a claim endorsed by Bermondsey and Old Southwark MP Simon Hughes – is down to the government fiddling the figures. Of the 500,000 additional jobs created in the past year one in five of the people involved are on government work schemes, including unpaid workers doing voluntary and mandatory work experience in supermarkets and charity shops and many more with no jobs, training or pay, who simply attend regular job hunt workshops. It is clear that the government is fiddling the figures to hide their economic failure.

What is more, long-term unemployment is rising, as is long-term youth unemployment. Over a third of the unemployed have been out of work for over a year.

These are precisely the people the government's flagship work programme was supposed to help but its results have been worse than doing nothing with just two in 100 jobseekers helped into sustained employment

We, as a council, therefore need to do what we can to create jobs and help local people access them here and in the rest of London. Previously we had a great deal more funding to do this through, for example, the working neighbourhoods fund. Cuts to this funding require us to take a different approach. We therefore

launched a new economic wellbeing strategy for Southwark in November. This strategy sets out the council's ambitions for economic development and employment up to 2020. A key part of this strategy is closing the gap between Southwark's employment rate and that of London as a whole by ensuring that we are making the most of Southwark's comparative advantages to create jobs and support Southwark residents into work, enabling people to stay in jobs and progress beyond entry level low-paid work. For example, we will:

- Make the most of opportunities brought by development - for example at the Shard and at Elephant and Castle - by maximising jobs and training opportunities during construction and in the completed developments
- Broker better conversations and foster relationships between employers and academies, schools and colleges about how to get young people ready for work
- Ensure better co-ordination of the many different efforts to help young people into work, increasing engagement with employers and skills providers and promoting a better understanding of how study and training leads to jobs.

The government's failure to get to grips with youth unemployment is exactly why we have introduced our £3 million youth fund, part of which is going towards provision of employment support and advice for 1,500 young people in Southwark aged 16-24. In addition, we are already investing in a range of projects delivered by local organisations this year to provide employment support, including training, employability skills, mentoring, work placements and help to find and keep a job, and keeping this provision under review so we can respond to changing markets for jobs and employment support.

We will be reviewing our employment support activities in light of our new strategy. With long-term employment becoming a growing problem in Southwark, we will be looking for ways to tackle this, particularly among young people

**18. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND**

On 19 December 2012, Southwark was one of two local authorities praised by the New Local Government Network in The Guardian as having a good strategy when it comes to economic development. How is the council planning to build on its work in this in 2013?

**RESPONSE**

I want to congratulate everyone at the council who helped to develop Southwark's new economic wellbeing strategy. The piece in The Guardian identified economic development as an area where local government has not done enough or been innovative enough, but went on to single out Southwark as a local authority that does economic development "really well".

Our new strategy, which covers 2012-20, focuses on what we as a council can do to help local residents gain employment. This includes maximising the opportunities that come from being in central London – such as the borough's major regeneration schemes - to create local jobs by making Southwark an increasingly attractive place for business. It also captures our desire to promote

thriving high streets and town centres and help local people achieve economic wellbeing at a time when the recession and changes to welfare are having an impact on their personal finances.

The strategy was adopted formally by cabinet on 20 November 2012 and work now begins on detailed implementation and consolidating of some of the early measures already put in place to deliver the strategic aims. This is all highly ambitious and the council cannot tackle these challenges alone. So in order to make the strategy work we will seek to build new and better partnerships with all relevant groups – government departments, businesses and voluntary organisations – that have a stake in Southwark’s economic future. In particular, we need to forge a new and better relationship with business in Southwark.

Realising our ambitions will take more than individual initiatives – no matter how effective they are. All parts of the council will have to work together to deliver this strategy and enable our residents to access the skills and support they need to achieve economic wellbeing and ensure the borough is open and responsive to the needs of business.

**19. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD**

Ongoing and meaningful community engagement is essential if the council is to remain responsive to the needs of local people. What is she doing to ensure the council maintains a positive and reciprocal dialogue with local residents?

**RESPONSE**

Good community engagement is already happening in every department of the council. However it currently happens more intuitively than by design, it exists in pockets or not at all, it is not always co-ordinated and could work more effectively across the council. On 11 December 2012 the cabinet agreed a future approach to community engagement aimed at further strengthening our approach to community engagement and ensuring a more consistent approach across the council.

The approach recognises that in a time of austerity we need to use our finance and other resources to support the voluntary and community sector and community involvement in the most effective way we can, linked to our overall vision of a fairer future for all. It is also more important than ever that all groups get to have their say in how our services are configured. As part of this, we need to ensure that the council is engaging with our residents in the most effective way possible. Bad engagement is worse than no engagement at all. But good engagement, where we have a genuine dialogue with our residents, groups and businesses has huge benefits.

The Localism Act 2011 introduced a range of new responsibilities including the community right to challenge, lists of assets of community value, community right to bid and neighbourhood planning, which came into force during 2012. The council has put in place its processes for dealing with these and has led the way, being the first in the country to list an asset of community value and having two active neighbourhood forums working on neighbourhood plans for their areas.

In this context, it is important that the council clearly states to local residents and other stakeholders, including the voluntary and community sector, its commitment to effective engagement and a fundamental shift in the relationship between the

council and our communities. Supporting the various roles volunteers play in communities is central to this fundamental shift in relationships.

The housing commission engagement will be a concrete example of this approach. The proposals for engagement will include finding new ways of reaching more people and engaging them in a more open conversation where we decide together what we are going to do in the longer term. As well as providing information to inform the future of housing in Southwark, this process will be an opportunity to test the effectiveness of this approach.

**20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES**

What impact has the merging of community councils had on attendance at those meetings?

**RESPONSE**

Following the merger of community councils attendances have risen on the whole. In Borough, Bankside and Walworth pre-merger, in the April 2012 meetings the attendance figures were 48 and 33 respectively, totalling 81. Since the merger the highest number of attendees has been 107. In Peckham and Nunhead pre-merger, in the January 2012 meetings the attendance figures were 67 and 44 respectively, totalling 111. Since the merger the highest number has been 120 at the September 2012 Peckham and Nunhead community council. The attendance figures for the two unchanged areas, Camberwell community council and Dulwich community council, remain relatively stable.

The only area where attendance figures have not increased is in Bermondsey and Rotherhithe. Pre-merger there was an average attendance of 61 and 64 respectively. Since the merger there have been two meetings where the numbers have been 85 and 92.

Chairs and vice-chairs of community councils regularly meet to share information and to discuss ways of improving attendance and the running of meetings.

The cabinet recently agreed 'future approach for community engagement' which looks at all aspects of our community engagement, including how we can continue to strengthen community councils and their links to the local community.

**21. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL NOBLET**

What is the council doing to ensure it complies with the Public Services (Social Value) Act which comes into force from January 2013 requiring public bodies to take social value and community benefits offered by contractors into consideration when awarding contracts?

**RESPONSE**

The council requires social value to be considered for all contracts which require a gateway one strategy report; that is all contracts over £75,000. The contracts team has prepared a detailed briefing note detailing the main provisions of the act and providing practical advice about how to include social value issues in the procurement process. The guidance explains that social value should be

considered within the context of local needs and the particular strategic objectives of the council. The briefing note will be available on The Source; it is also proposed to hold specific training sessions for staff on the act.

While the legislation does not require the council to report on how it has included social value in its contracts, we will be looking at how to monitor progress.

In any case, the council already takes steps to ensure that local people and businesses have the opportunity to benefit from the services we procure as a council, which is very much in keeping with our economic wellbeing strategy. For example, cabinet discussions of such contracts frequently focus on the opportunities for local suppliers and for local people to access jobs or apprenticeships through these contracts. This goes beyond our own procurement and we are working closely with major developers to ensure that their supply chains and employment practices benefit local people and businesses.

**22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON**

Will the cabinet member support the introduction of protected shopping frontages for the length of Bermondsey Street so as to better protect existing class uses in the conservation area? Will she set out a process for this to be achieved in the near future?

**RESPONSE FROM THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY**

Yes. It is important to preserve and protect the unique character of many of our shopping destinations. Myself and former Councillor Thorncroft lobbied for this protection for Nunhead's shops in the 2004 Southwark plan and this protection has saved many shops from being converted into residential properties.

From this experience I would highlight to Councillor Gettleson that the existing criteria for protecting shop frontages are 'a frontage of shops where there is a concentration of retail activity. These frontages comprise a cluster of 10 or more retail shops'. These criteria meant that a few shops in Nunhead could not be protected and if there are gaps in the parade on Bermondsey Street we may have a similar difficulty.

The protected shopping frontages for Southwark will be reviewed as part of the preparation of a new Southwark plan. The review of the current Southwark plan will begin in April with a timescale proposal being agreed as set out in the local development scheme. There will then be a number of informal and formal consultations, an examination in public and an inspector's binding report before the Southwark plan is adopted by council assembly. I will ask officers to ensure protection for Bermondsey Street's shops is considered as part of this process.

Another opportunity, perhaps one that could happen more quickly, is to protect the shops in a neighbourhood plan. A neighbourhood plan for Bermondsey has been under discussion for some time and we are consulting on proposed boundaries for a neighbourhood area. A policy to protect shopping frontages could be introduced in a neighbourhood plan. It is not for me to dictate the content of the neighbourhood plan, but I am happy to suggest it to the authors of the plan and suggest you do likewise.

**23. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL**

What steps has the cabinet member taken to promote the principles and practice of Fairtrade to the businesses and the people of Southwark? What evidence is there that Southwark's status as a Fairtrade borough has been strengthened or improved under this administration? What action plan or other set of strategic objectives has been put in place to ensure that Southwark retains this hard won status for the future?

**RESPONSE**

Southwark achieved Fairtrade status in July 2007. This was a remarkable achievement – and we should recognise the leadership of my colleague Councillor Dixon-Fyle and the Fairtrade steering group who made this a reality. Southwark remains a Fairtrade borough, and while the council continues its commitment to supporting Fairtrade, I am pleased to note that other organisations in the borough, including London South Bank University and schools such as Charles Dickens Primary, are helping to support and promote Fairtrade. The borough is host to the seat of the Diocese of Southwark – London's first Fairtrade diocese – and also a very active local Catholic Agency for Overseas Development group. The Bread of Life Centre and cafe in Christ Church, East Dulwich, is a hub for community participation in Fairtrade activities, and recently celebrated its tenth anniversary.

We are reviewing our role in promoting Fairtrade in the borough.

**24. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

What are the criteria for an organisation to be added to the council's approved voluntary and community list? How often will this list be updated? Will organisations not on the list still be considered for local service delivery projects awarded by the council?

**RESPONSE**

A report that recommends the creation of an approved list of voluntary and community sector providers is being considered by the cabinet on 29 January 2013.

Establishing such a list is a groundbreaking initiative that has developed through partnership working between the council and the voluntary and community sector in Southwark. It is a key component in streamlining the council's commissioning processes which are particularly critical in the current difficult financial climate.

Officers have developed this project in response to repeated requests from the voluntary and community sector to streamline the process and reduce the burdens on the council and the sector. It demonstrates the council's commitment to a continued partnership approach with the sector.

The council will advertise that it is setting up an approved list and organisations will be able to apply online to be vetted for inclusion on a database. Organisations that meet the required standards will be included. Those not meeting the standards will be offered support by Community Action Southwark or directed to online self-help assessment tools.



The setting up of the list aims to save time and improve efficiency by eliminating the need for organisations to submit the standard information in response to multiple council procurement opportunities. It will also reduce the time the council spends in vetting information and the development of the database will improve the management of information.

The proposed criteria for an organisation to be added to the council's approved voluntary and community sector list are meeting the required levels in:

- Governance
- Finance
- Health and safety
- Equalities
- Experience
- Quality assurance
- Safeguarding
- Insurance.

Access to the list will be advertised annually for a one month period.

Organisations not on the list will still be able to respond to tender opportunities.

**25. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

How much money has each school in Southwark received through the pupil premium? How many children are eligible for the pupil premium? How many council staff are employed to deal with processing pupil premium issues?

**RESPONSE**

In 2012-13, the deprivation pupil premium is £11.2 million for all Southwark schools, of which £7.3 million is for authority maintained schools. This £7.3 million equates to 4.8% of the total £152 million budget for those schools.

This needs to be weighed against the 5.1% real terms cut in the remainder of schools budgets since 2010-11. If instead of funding the pupil premium schools had just been funded fully for inflation each year, there would have been £456,000 more given to our maintained schools over all.

Full details of each school's deprivation pupil premium can be found from the following link:

<http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/xlsx/p/pupil%20premium%202012-13%20school%20tables%20final.xlsx>

Members will also be aware of government cuts being made to council budgets to support children. In 2011-12, the creation of the early intervention grant saw a cut of £5 million in the funding originally given to the council for these purposes in 2010-11 to its current level of £20.5 million. Government proposes to cut this funding by a further 30% in 2013-14, by removing a further £6.1 million.

17,984 pupils in all Southwark schools are eligible for the deprivation pupil premium, of which 11,703 are in our maintained schools. This number is based on the number of children registered for statutory free school meals. The method of implementation of the council's free, healthy school meals pledge has encouraged greater registration for statutory free school meals, so I am sure Councillor Stanton will be pleased that our policy appears to be benefiting the finances of our borough's primary schools.

The deprivation pupil premium is calculated by the Department for Education and the council's finance team processes the payment which is a small element of one finance team member's role. The children looked after pupil premium is released on receipt of the looked after child's personal education plan; this administrative process is also a small part of one team member's role. The pupil premium has not therefore necessitated the employment of any additional council staff.

**26. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE**

Why has the number of alcohol confiscations dropped throughout the borough despite a significant rise in the number of ambulance call outs for binge drinking? What action has been taken to prevent street drinking in Southwark, and also specifically in South Bermondsey?

**RESPONSE**

During the period 2011-12 the community warden service confiscated alcohol on 719 occasions, primarily from street drinkers. The projected figure for confiscations for this financial year is 313. During the Olympics emphasis was placed on engaging with the street population and signposting them to social/alcohol treatment services, with confiscations forming a secondary part of those interventions. A total of 314 "on street interventions" were completed by council officers, with street drinkers/beggars, and 27 incidents of public drunkenness responded to.

The power to confiscate alcohol from individuals drinking in a public place when behaving in an anti social manner is available to Southwark wardens and police officers (figures from the police are not currently available). The vast majority of seizures relate to individuals with entrenched, long term drinking issues who gather in groups during the day time in our public places.

Ambulance call outs for binge drinking and other health related issues are in the main related to the night time economy. This is reflected in the London Ambulance Service call out data. In the period 2011-12 the London Ambulance Service made 2,895 call-outs to Southwark. The projected figure for call-outs for 2012-13 is 3,261, an increase of 366 or 11%. The ward that sees the most ambulance call-outs is Cathedrals with 15% of the annual total for both years.

Southwark has a robust partnership approach to dealing with street drinking. Confiscations (under the designated public place orders) are one enforcement measure, we can also issue fixed penalty notices, acceptable behaviour contracts (ABCs) and anti-social behaviour orders, with 36 ABCs issued in this financial year to date). We can also utilise the Southwark CCTV system to track, record and provide evidence of street drinking and anti-social behaviour. In December 2012 alone, 19 arrests were made for public disorder/drunkenness as a direct result of CCTV recordings. Assessment and treatment options are also offered for those

that want to make the journey to recovery. Partnership area action plans are developed and implemented where this issue is highlighted through the ward panels or community councils.

The same approach would be taken in South Bermondsey as with any other part of Southwark with treatment and enforcement interventions being used. I am aware of the particular problem of street drinkers congregating around a bench in The Blue which is causing problems for local residents and I have asked officers to investigate further.

Trading standards officers monitor compliance with regards to underage sales of alcohol and other age related products by carrying out targeted test purchasing operations with the help of young people who are under the age of 18. With regards to the ward of South Bermondsey there have been no test purchases of alcohol carried out since 2011 when three premises were tested all of which passed. Any allegations regarding underage sales are investigated by follow up inspections and/or test purchasing. We also work with our licensing colleagues to ensure businesses comply with mandatory licence conditions regarding the operation of age verification procedures.

The new Southwark alcohol strategy will reinforce this approach to robustly tackling alcohol related antisocial behaviour as well as other types of alcohol related harm.

**27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK (TO BE ANSWERED BY THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING)**

What is the council doing to control foxes in the borough, including discouraging people from feeding them and keeping them away from parks and wildlife? How many enquiries have been made to the council about controlling foxes?

**RESPONSE**

Foxes can be a nuisance in urban environments, however controlling urban foxes is very difficult, expensive, and not often successful, not to mention the fact that foxes are protected by law. Foxes are not and never have been classified as 'vermin', so local authorities have no legal obligation to act against them.

We would encourage residents and home owners to take some practical measures to reduce the likelihood of foxes having potential food sources and also to deter them from entering a property. This could include:

- Removing potential food sources
- Keeping rubbish in closed bins
- Not leaving bagged rubbish outside
- Removing piles of garden clippings
- Fill gaps under garden sheds
- Only leave bird food in bird food dispensers
- Protecting small pets like rabbits and guinea pigs in sturdy hutches
- Tidying up overgrown gardens
- Repairing damaged air bricks

- Reporting any cases of nuisance foxes to The Fox Project who might capture and relocate the fox.

In the last year we have not had any formal complaints raised through the pest control unit with regards to attacks on wildlife by urban foxes.

It would be impossible to make our parks and other wildlife areas fox proof as they are excellent climbers and able to dig underground and so would overcome any form of physical barrier.

We will place an article in the council's publication, Southwark Life, to advise people on deterring foxes and the dangers of feeding them.

In the past year we have been contacted 20 times to deal with foxes. These requests for assistance have been passed onto The Fox Project as they are experts in this field. They recommend chemical deterrents such as 'scent-off' which makes gardens less attractive to foxes once applied. In extreme cases, they will capture and relocate a fox. This has not happened in the last year.

Completing a fox cull would make no overall difference to the numbers as foxes breed to a level that the environment will sustain. In completing a culling you would not remove all the vixens so over time the population would grow back to the same level. Other foxes from other areas would also spread into the area whilst this was taking place.

The Fox Project deals with injured foxes and the relocation of foxes sometimes if they are causing a particular concern. They also offer methods of deterrent such as chemicals and ultrasonics to prevent foxes fouling on gardens.

**28. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL KYRIACOU**

Can the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety provide details of all a) lost and b) stolen items of council property since 1 January 2011, including the value of each?

**RESPONSE**

This information is not available in the format that Councillor Kyriacou has requested. However, within Tooley Street there have been no recorded incidents of loss or theft of council assets since January 2011.

**29. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK**

How many visits to the council's website have been made in each of the last three years from a) internal council sources and b) external sources? What have been the top 10 most visited pages on the council website this year?

**RESPONSE**

2010:

- Total visits: 2,574,016

- Internal visits: 116,696 (4.53%)

2011:

- Total visits: 3,483,326
- Internal visits: 200,943 (5.77%)

2012:

- Total visits: 3,990,828
- Internal visits: 186,938 (4.82%)

Top ten pages on the website for 1 - 13 January inclusive (page views):

1. Homepage: 88,606
2. Jobs: 11,168
3. Pay for it: 7,688
4. Libraries: 4,650
5. A-Z: 4,196
6. Contact: 3,948
7. About Southwark Council: 3,739
8. Search for planning applications: 3,307
9. Council tax: 3,175
10. Planning application and appeals - quick search page: 3,073.

Note on figures: Internal visits are those listed as having originated from Southwark Council in our web analytics package. Some internal access such as from libraries is not captured here, as it is not possible to differentiate internal and external use through their network. Figures provided may not include all of the sub-sites present within the southwark.gov.uk domain.

### 30. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

How much has been spent on supplies for the hot drink vending machines in council premises in each of the last three years? How much has been spent on buying new machines and servicing existing machines in each of the last three years?

#### RESPONSE

The modernisation of the council's office accommodation, including Tooley Street and the Queens Road complex, have delivered savings in relation to the cessation of multiple agreements for individual vending services in buildings we have vacated. While there will remain individual departmental arrangements for vending services at other buildings, the information for Tooley Street and Queens Road is set out below:

Building	Year	Vending supplies 2009 to 2012 £	Lease costs 2009 to 2012 £	New purchase costs 2009 to 2012 £	Service costs 2009 to 2012 £

<b>160 Tooley Street</b>	2010	53,850	18,297	0	0
	2011	54,753	18,297	0	0
	2012	57,558	18,297	0	0
<b>132 Queens Road</b>	2010	0	0	0	0
	2011	0	0	0	0
	2012	9,123	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>		175,248	54,891	0	0

For 160 Tooley Street the servicing costs are included in the lease costs.

For 132 Queens Road the lease and servicing costs are included in the per cup cost of the consumables.

The increase in vending supply costs over the three year period is in line with the impact of the Tooley Street maximisation work and the resultant efficiencies achieved in the density of occupation of the building utilising, in some cases, a higher staff to desk ratio.

The increase in the 2012 figure correlates to the impact of accommodating large numbers of revenue and benefit and housing staff over this period. Additionally the increasing use of the building in the evenings and weekends has increased demand on the vending service.

As staff have been moved to Tooley Street various individual vending arrangements have ceased with the requirements brought under the cost effective Tooley Street arrangements with associated economies of scale and reduction in management overhead.

The new facilities management services contract for Tooley Street, commencing on 1 February 2013 incorporates the vending service within the overall contract. This contract is expected to deliver £312,000 per annum savings over current costs.

**31. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LINDA MANCHESTER**

What are the 50 most frequently visited websites from council computers in each of the last three years, and the number of visits to each?

**RESPONSE**

The response to years 2010 and 2011 were taken from summary data already extracted.

Serco can restore the activity data in order for us to be able to run extracts for these years but they are currently engaged with the Capita transition. We do expect to have this data restored next week but this would be too late for the council meeting deadline.

The three months missing data does not affect the overall top 50 given the large number of requests over the whole year. These figures exclude any library access as this goes out via the London grid for learning, which is a different connection.

Number of visits	Website
6,444,416	clients1.google.co.uk
4,853,158	mt0.google.com
4,606,660	maps.google.co.uk
3,131,197	mt1.google.com
3,064,424	b.scorecardresearch.com
3,031,696	www.lse.co.uk
2,999,533	www.facebook.com
2,732,582	prod1.rest-notify.msg.yahoo.com
2,636,146	ad.uk.doubleclick.net
2,334,700	ping.chartbeat.net
2,139,881	www.bbc.co.uk
2,116,907	ad.doubleclick.net
2,080,226	www.amazon.co.uk
1,881,042	t0.gstatic.com
1,853,911	t2.gstatic.com
1,852,699	t1.gstatic.com
1,849,108	t3.gstatic.com
1,809,299	www.bing.com
1,721,550	ad.yieldmanager.com
1,664,179	www.live.com
1,653,113	www.google.com
1,568,263	cdnedge.bbc.co.uk
1,556,210	cbk1.google.com
1,392,520	cbk0.google.com
1,388,423	rad.msn.com
1,296,238	sa.bbc.co.uk
1,252,265	pictures2.autotrader.co.uk
1,240,028	googleads.g.doubleclick.net
1,177,515	oas.guardian.co.uk
1,119,859	a.rad.msn.com
1,065,240	us.bc.yahoo.com
1,036,812	images.littlewoods.com
994,350	db3.api.bing.com
970,979	maps.southwark.gov.uk
937,899	mail.thealbany.org.uk
933,407	cbk3.google.com
918,880	mail.aol.com
890,073	mt1.googleapis.com
884,902	mt0.googleapis.com
872,530	cbk2.google.com
792,141	pixel.quantserve.com
781,995	gg.google.com
773,545	ib.adnxs.com
759,755	ad-emea.doubleclick.net
745,659	platform.twitter.com
736,982	en.wikipedia.org
692,029	maps.google.com
670,408	secure-uk.imrworldwide.com
665,490	iasset.ftphostinguk.com

**32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER**

If the Liberal Democrat three-year budget proposed in February 2011 had been agreed, would the council have needed to make more or less savings next month?

**RESPONSE**

The Liberal Democrat budget amendment, proposed in February 2011, for the council's three-year budget sought to make a £8.475 million contribution to the council's reserves in 2013-14.

In addition, the amendment also sought to increase council tax returns by £800,000 for 2013-14 from improved collection rates. Given the coalition government's changes to council tax benefit in the forthcoming year, this is clearly unrealistic.

To bridge this gap, the Liberal Democrats' budget would therefore have required the council to find an additional £9.275 million in the 2013-14 budget, either through service cuts or by increasing council tax by 10.2%.

**33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER**

What is the view of the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety regarding the proposed police and fire station closures and cutbacks in the borough?

**RESPONSE**

The net impact of all the Mayor's proposed cuts to both the police and fire service in Southwark are deeply worrying.

**Police**

On 9 January 2013 the Mayor's office for policing and crime (MOPAC) put forward the following proposals for Southwark:

- Closure of East Dulwich police station, removing the front counter service
- Closure of Rotherhithe police station, removing the front counter service
- Closure of Camberwell police station
- A 76% reduction in the hours of operation for Southwark police station from 168 hours a week to 40 hours a week
- A 33% reduction in the hours of operation for either Peckham or Walworth station (there is confusion from MOPAC about which)
- A 13% reduction in police numbers since 2010, from 948 officers to 816
- A reduction of all ward-based safer neighbourhood teams to a single named officer.

I will be working with council officers and the new borough commander, John Sutherland, to try to find ways to mitigate the impact of these cuts as much as we can, and the leader and I have already met with MOPAC to discuss where the police might share premises with the council if this is the only way to maintain front



counter services that will otherwise be removed. Nevertheless, the scale of the reduction in hours in the borough is concerning.

In addition, I am concerned that the impact of closures of a number of stations in neighbouring boroughs - Gypsy Hill, Sydenham, South Norwood and Brockley - will create a black-hole of police provision around the south of the borough.

I have made very clear to the Mayor's deputy for policing, Stephen Greenhalgh, that the proposed police numbers for the borough are unacceptable, as is the whittling away of safer neighbourhood teams. I will continue to lobby the Mayor and his office for policing on this matter.

### **Fire stations**

On Friday 11 January 2013 revised proposals regarding London's fire stations were published by Ron Dobson, the commissioner for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

The proposals include the closure of Southwark fire station, along with 11 other stations. 11 stations marked for closure are in Inner London. The proposal to close Southwark seems to ignore the rapid increase in the numbers of people that come to the northwest of our borough every day to work, which will increase further as developments such as The Shard opening. I am therefore extremely concerned that the impact of this closure has not been fully thought through.

There has been one improvement on the initial plans in that the commissioner has backed away from his initial proposal to close Peckham fire station, the only station in the south or centre of the borough. However, the plans still reduce the number of appliances based there from two to one, and the nearby New Cross fire station is still being earmarked for closure. This gives me great concern about capacity in the south and centre of the borough, particularly in the wake of the horrific fires at Lakanal and Sumner Road.

### **34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED**

How do current violent crime statistics in the borough compare to those before Labour took control and introduced its violent crime strategy?

### **RESPONSE**

I am pleased that there are great signs of progress in reducing violent crime in the borough since 2010. The violent crime strategy which was reviewed in November of last year shows that key progress has been made across all five violent crime priority areas.

### **Violent crime statistics**

- Southwark has seen significant reductions in wounding and assault with injury (24%), assault without injury (31%) and domestic abuse (27%) over the last six years.

- 25% reduction in recorded offences of violence against the person over the last six years - 2,200 fewer crimes.

The following statistics are for the financial year to date (April to December 2012) compared to the same period in 2009:

- Violent crime (serious wounding/grievous bodily harm, assault with injury, harassment and common assault) has reduced by 26%, representing 1,559 fewer crimes (from 6,099 to 4,540 offences).
- Overall violence reduced by 16% (from 8,600 to 7,243) when comparing the two periods.
- Gun crime reduced from 175 offences between April and December 2009 to 113 offences between April and December 2012. This equates to a 35% reduction (62 fewer offences).
- Knife crime with injury decreased by 30% in the same period, from 254 to 179 offences.
- Most serious violence reduced by 42% when comparing April to December 2012 with the same period in 2009. This equates to 245 fewer offences (from 582 to 337).
- Domestic offences reduced from 1972 offences in 2009 to 1526 in 2012, a reduction of 22.6 % (446 offences).

The strategy has put into place a number of initiatives that have helped achieve this reduction. These include the work of the Southwark anti-violence unit helping former gang members out of a life of crime, for example through helping them into full time employment; one to one mentoring, training and work placements; prioritising early intervention with young people at risk of making violent lifestyle choices and developing a single multi-agency approach to enforcement and support.

**35. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND OLYMPIC LEGACY FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER**

Can the cabinet member provide an update on plans for moving Grove Vale library? Will the council commit to an end date for this process?

**RESPONSE**

The council completed a formal agreement with the developer last year. That agreement requires the developer to hand a library, as specified in the agreement, to the council by 31 March 2014. Officers have approached the developer asking that he confirm his commitment to this date and provide details of his design team so that detailed discussions can commence. A response is awaited.

**36. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON**

What is the target time for dealing with Blue Badge renewals in each of the last three years? What is the current waiting time for Blue Badge renewals? What was the estimated waiting time for customers applying to renew a Blue Badge in each of the past six months?

**RESPONSE**

The target time for dealing with Blue Badge renewals in each of the last three years is to provide the new badge prior to the old badge expiring.

The current waiting time for renewals is five days, where we have received all of the evidence required. This means that the customer will receive their Blue Badge prior to the previous one expiring.

For customers applying to renew a Blue Badge, in each of the past six months the target was to renew the badge prior to the expiry of the previous one. There were some delays in renewing Blue Badges in the last three months of the year. This was because two members of staff left the Blue Badge team and there was a gap until replacement staff could start. Currently renewals are being processed within five working days.

**37. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & ADULT SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK**

How many adults in receipt of social care services will be transferred to personal budgets? How many of these transfers have been completed to date (broken down by month)? How many people have indicated a wish to keep council managed personal budgets?

**RESPONSE**

The council plan contains the target that 90% of eligible users will be on personal budgets by the end of 2012-13 and 100% during 2013-14. This is in line with the national target.

We estimate that this will be around 3,300 users by the year end and 3,700 next year, although these numbers are subject to any demographic changes.

Latest data shows that 3,057 people have transferred to a personal budget. The recent monthly breakdown this year has been:

- June: 2,571
- July: 2,583
- August: 2,696
- September: 2,725
- October: 2,975
- November: 3,057

The November total represents approximately 82% of eligible users. We are on track to deliver our council plan target and the national target.

Of the November total, 1,711 (56%) have requested council managed personal budgets, this represents top quartile performance nationally.

**38. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS**

Which roads in Southwark have had their yellow lines replaced with restricted parking zones? How many fines have been issued in Clink Street, Winchester Square and Cathedral Street before and since it was designated as a restricted parking zone rather than a yellow line area?

**RESPONSE**

The roads within restricted zones in Southwark where yellow lines have been removed are Bank End (part), Stoney Street (part), Clink Street, Winchester Square, Iliffe Street (part) and Cathedral Street (part).

The number of penalty charge notices (PCNs) issued in streets within the restricted parking zone are:

Location	Contravention	PCNs issued in last ¼ before restricted zone implemented (Sep-Dec '11)	PCNs issued in last ¼ 2012 (Sep – Dec 2012)
<b>Clink Street</b>	01 - Parked in a restricted street	7	15
	26 - Double parked	0	1
	40 - Parked in a disabled bay without displaying a badge	0	12
	62 - Parked on the footway	0	2
<b>Winchester Square</b>		0	0
<b>Cathedral Street</b>	01 - Parked in a restricted street	10	43
	25 - Parked in a loading bay	0	6
	62 - Parked on the footway	3	8

**39. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

Given that the borough has in the past couple of years been suffering an unprecedented amount of road works carried out by a variety of organisations and contractors, would the cabinet member agree there is an issue with many of our streets looking more like patchwork quilts than well surfaced roads? Is he satisfied with the standards of reinstatement after works? What powers does the council have in respect of poor reinstatement, in conjunction with Transport for London when appropriate?

**RESPONSE**

Although there are many large and high profile works being delivered across the borough, such as the Shard, Aylesbury regeneration and London Bridge Station redevelopment, the number of road works in the borough has fallen over the last three years by nearly 10,000 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Number of works per year:

	<b>Authority Permit Applications</b>	<b>Utility Permit Applications</b>	<b>Total Permit Applications</b>
<b>2010</b>	12,118	15,577	27,695
<b>2011</b>	11,769	13,106	24,875
<b>2012</b>	6,723	11,179	17,902

The embargo on road works during the Olympic period has meant that there has been a subsequent rush to complete works, thus the level of work in the last quarter has been high, but it is very unlikely the number of road works will be higher than in previous years.

In 2010 the council reviewed the delivery of street works and implemented an improvement programme which included increasing the level of resources deployed on inspection, implementing new powers, such as fixed penalty notices and in 2011 the implementation of the London permit scheme. This scheme, which requires utility companies to pay for each road works according to the locations and type of work has been one of the key factors in reducing the number of works being carried out, as utility companies are incentivised to improve coordination and planning of their works.

In addition to issuing permits for work the network management team has also issued 77 fines for working without a permit and completed eight prosecutions. This has significantly reduced the number of companies who work without the correct council permit.

The monitoring of works quality is also carried out by the network inspectors. They monitor utility companies works for a wide range of issues including:

- Safety of works sites whilst in progress
- Quality of repairs following completion
- Quality of repairs before the end of guarantee period
- Completion of works on the agreed date to prevent works overrunning
- Inspections of reported failure of manhole covers and other apparatus.

For both safety inspections and reinstatement inspections, failure to meet the required standards results in a defect charge being issued and follow-up inspections scheduled. These inspections continue until such time as the defect is rectified.

The number of inspections has increased by 45% in the past three years (see Table 2), despite the fact that the total number of works has actually reduced. As a result the performance of the utility companies has significantly improved across all monitoring types. The high level of failures on repair quality in 2011 is a result of the delay caused by monitoring of works that had been completed throughout the previous two years.

Newer repairs are consistently meeting the improved standard. Although 31% failure may seem high, the standards set out by the Department for Transport are extremely difficult to achieve and most authorities apply some leniency to the application of defects. In Southwark we believe that the standards set in the code of practice should be achieved and any works failing to do so are issued with

defect notices. The standards set out in the code have been achieved by some companies, with British Telecom bringing their defect failure rate below 10%. Unfortunately each time utility companies change their contractor the levels of defective reinstatements increases, until the new company become familiar with the standards being applied.

Table 2: Inspections of works:

	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Safety and reinstatement inspections completed</b>	7,473	13,620	10,867
<b>Safety and reinstatement inspection failures</b>	2,518	3,068	2,657
<b>% of safety and reinspection failures</b>	33%	22%	24%
<b>Reinstatement inspections total</b>	3,479	3,245	5,046
<b>Reinstatement inspection failures</b>	1,615	2,056	1,576
<b>Fail %</b>	46%	63%	31%

These tables reflect work being carried out on roads for which Southwark is the highway authority. The 'red routes' or Transport for London road network, are not monitored by Southwark inspectors and the management of both coordination and quality monitoring for utility companies works is the responsibility of Transport for London. Southwark inspectors report any defects or safety issues through to them for action and any public reports are fed through the Southwark traffic manager to ensure that action is taken where appropriate.

**40. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON**

How many parking fines were issued in each of the last three financial years? How many of these fines were appealed? How many of these appeals were successful?

**RESPONSE**

The table below is taken from the annual reported figures at the end of quarter 1 of the financial years noted and the figures are available in the annual transport report, which is published on the council's website:

[http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/2873/annual\\_monitoring\\_prospectus](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/2873/annual_monitoring_prospectus)

	Financial Year 2009/10		Financial Year 2010/11		Financial Year 2011/12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total PCNs	121,724		100,635		98,747	
Number of PCNs which have had an informal or formal representation made	29,782	24.5%	26,416	26.2%	29,170	29.5%
Number of PCNs which have been cancelled as a result of informal or formal representation made	12,241	10.1%	12,357	12.3%	10,633	10.8%
Number of PCNs appealed to the parking adjudicator	1,727	1.4%	1,425	1.4%	1,743	1.8%
Number of PCNs cancelled as a result of parking adjudicator appeal	909	0.7%	290	0.3%	531	0.5%

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

What is the average waiting time for households on each of the of the council's housing waiting list bands 1-4? Which waiting list band would a young person on probation be most likely to be included in? What is the average waiting time for young people on probation?

**RESPONSE**

Average waiting times in months, are shown in the table below.

	Bedsit	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
<b>Band 1</b>	1	8 - 15	7 - 16	5 - 15	5 - 16
<b>Band 2</b>	2	2 - 7	2 - 10	5 - 22	7 - 27
<b>Band 3</b>	15	21 - 25	33 - 39	39 - 54	38 - 61

With regard to Band 4 it should be noted that, in the course of a year, many thousand bids are placed in Band 4. However there are few such applicants, if any



that reach near the top of a shortlist for a property (and only then for one bedroom, after five or more years). It is not possible to give any representative statistics.

No priority is given to a young person on the basis that they are on probation alone. All applications for housing are assessed individually and different factors are taken into consideration in order to reach a decision on priority. Such factors would include homelessness, medical need, re-settlement support, etc.



## Council Assembly (Council Tax Setting Meeting)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Council Tax Setting Meeting) held on Wednesday  
27 February 2013 at 7.00 pm at Council Offices, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

---

### PRESENT:

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

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	Councillor Paul Kyriacou
Councillor James Barber	Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Columba Blango	Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Catherine Bowman	Councillor Rebecca Lury
Councillor Chris Brown	Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Michael Bukola	Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Denise Capstick	Councillor Catherine McDonald
Councillor Sunil Chopra	Councillor Tim McNally
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 Lewis Robinson
Councillor Mark Gattleson	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Stephen Govier	Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Renata Hamvas	Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Helen Hayes	Councillor Geoffrey Thornton
Councillor Claire Hickson	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Mark Williams
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor Peter John	

## **1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

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

There were no announcements.

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

There were no late items of business.

### **1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

The Mayor announced that the monitoring officer had granted all members a dispensation to vote on the council tax report. There were no further disclosures of interest.

### **1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Kevin Ahern, Darren Merrill and Lisa Rajan. Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Victoria Mills and Lewis Robinson.

## **2. REPORT(S) FOR DECISION FROM THE CABINET**

### **2.1 POLICY AND RESOURCES STRATEGY 2013/14 - 2015/16: REVENUE BUDGET**

*(See pages 1 – 63 of the main agenda)*

There were two members' questions on the report, the written responses to which were circulated on lilac paper. Two supplemental questions were asked of the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety. All questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

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

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.14 (9), Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, moved the report.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 1.14 (9), Councillor Tim McNally, shadow cabinet member for resources and housing investment, responded to the cabinet member's statement.

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, seconded by Councillor Graham Neale, moved Amendment A.

Councillor Lewis Robinson, seconded by Councillor Michael Mitchell, moved Amendment B.

Following debate (Councillors Claire Hickson, Rowenna Davis, David Hubber, Gavin Edwards, Eliza Mann, Patrick Diamond, Peter John, Columba Blango, Mark Williams, Catherine Bowman, Nick Dolezal, Stephen Govier, Ian Wingfield, Paul Kyriacou, Mark Glover, Michael Bukola, Barrie Hargrove, Mark Gettleson, Rosie Shimell, Catherine McDonald, Jonathan Mitchell, Sunil Chopra, Robin Crookshank Hilton, Veronica Ward, Nick Stanton, Dora Dixon-Fyle, Toby Eckersley, Fiona Colley, Wilma Nelson, Rebecca Lury, Geoffrey Thornton, Andy Simmons, Poddy Clark, Chris Brown, Neil Coyle and Paul Noblet), the Mayor invited Councillor Tim McNally to reply to two questions raised by Councillor Patrick Diamond. Thereafter Councillor Richard Livingstone exercised his right of reply.

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That it be noted that the final settlement was announced on 4 February 2013 with no significant change to Southwark's figures.
2. That it be noted that the GLA precept included in the report is the Mayor's precept, as approved by the London Assembly plenary meeting on 25 February 2013.
3. That the recommendations of the 12 February 2013 cabinet for a general fund budget for 2013/14 of £334.0m and a nil council tax increase for 2013/14, attached as Appendix 1 of the report be agreed.

**3. OTHER REPORTS**

**3.1 SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX 2013/14**

*(See pages 64 – 76 of the main agenda)*

It was noted that an addendum report which set out a revised version of paragraph 13 of the main report had been circulated on page 2 of supplemental agenda 1.

The clerk stated that as part of its consideration of the previous item on the revenue budget, council assembly had agreed the level of council tax for 2013/14. This had been set out in the cabinet's recommendation which had been agreed in the substantive motion on item 2.1. Council assembly now needed to formally agree the council tax resolution in line with the decisions of item 2.1.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (2), the report was formally moved by the Mayor.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly note the Greater London Authority precept of £303.00 at Band D.
2. That the council tax for band D properties in Southwark be set at £1,215.14.
3. That no discount be applied to properties in the former parish of St Mary Newington.
4. That no discount be applied to properties in the former parish of St Saviours.
5. That the council tax for band D properties in Southwark be set for:

	Band D council tax £	Discount £	Net band D for the area £
the former parish of St Mary Newington	1,215.14	0	1,215.14
the former parish of St. Saviours	1,215.14	0	1,215.14
the remainder of the Borough	1,215.14	0	1,215.14

6. That the formal resolution for council taxes in 2013/14 (shown in Appendix A of the report) be approved.
7. That the existing local 100% disregard scheme for war disability and war widows/widowers pensions when calculating housing benefit be continued in 2013/14.

**3.2 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2013/14 INCLUDING ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY, PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS AND ANNUAL MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION STATEMENT**

*(See pages 77 – 100 of the main agenda)*

It was noted that an addendum report which set out a revision to paragraph 23 of the main report had been circulated on page 3 of supplemental agenda 1.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (2), the report was formally moved by the Mayor.

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

carried.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That it be noted that the treasury management strategy 2013/14 is to be managed by the strategic director of finance and corporate services under financial delegation.
2. That the annual investment strategy 2013/14 set out in Appendix A of the report be agreed, with capital preservation a key objective, in line with government guidance on investments.
3. That prudential indicators covering capital finance, borrowing and cash management for the years 2013/14 to 2015/16 as set out in Appendix B of the report, be agreed.
4. That the annual minimum revenue provision statement which sets aside prudent sums from revenue to reduce debt, set out in paragraph 31 and Appendix C of the report, be agreed.
5. That the proposed changes to capital allowances as set out in paragraph 34 be noted, and the level of capital allowances for 2013/14 be agreed as set out in paragraph 30 should the changes not be implemented.

**4. DATE OF COUNCIL ASSEMBLY IN JULY 2013**

*(See pages 101 – 103 of the main agenda)*

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (2), the report was formally moved by the Mayor.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the council assembly dates for 2013/14 be confirmed as set out below, and it be agreed to hold the July meeting on Wednesday 10 July 2013 for the reasons set out in paragraph 4 of the report.

<b>Council Assembly Meetings 2013/14</b>	<b>Theme</b>
Wednesday 10 July 2013  Note: Revised date to that previously agreed	Welfare Reform
Wednesday 16 October 2013	Green Southwark

Wednesday 27 November 2013	Local Business and Enterprise
Wednesday 22 January 2014	Active Communities and the Elderly
Wednesday 26 February 2014	Budget and council tax setting
Wednesday 26 March 2014*  Note: If local government elections take place on 1 May 2014, this meeting would be rescheduled for 19 March 2014. If there is a combined election in June 2014 this meeting would proceed.	Future Vision for Southwark
Wednesday 21 May 2014*  Note: This date is based on local government elections taking place on 1 May 2014. In the event of a combined election, the annual meeting would be held after the elections (in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 4.1.2).	Annual meeting (Mayor making & constitutional)

Note: \* - There remains some uncertainty regarding confirmation of the dates for the local government elections and European elections in 2014. This could impact on the proposed dates for the council assembly meetings in March 2014 and May 2014.

2. That council assembly procedure rule 2.1 (Dates and frequency of meetings) be suspended to allow council assembly to set an alternative date.

## 5. AMENDMENTS

The amendments are set out in supplemental agenda 1.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**  
**(COUNCIL TAX SETTING)**  
**WEDNESDAY 27 FEBRUARY 2013**  
**QUESTIONS ON THE REPORT**

**ITEM 2.1: POLICY AND RESOURCES STRATEGY – 2013/14-2015/16 – REVENUE BUDGET**

**1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Would the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety indicate what steps the council is taking to reduce the unfair burden on Southwark of the current arrangements for the Lea Valley Regional Park levy, noting the recent initiative by Greater London Authority member Richard Tracey on this matter?

**RESPONSE**

The funding arrangements for the Lee Valley Regional Park were first established by the Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966, and the current arrangements for borough contributions were established when the Greater London Council was abolished in 1986. The current arrangements are therefore a legacy of decisions made by the Conservative government of the 1980s and revising these arrangements would require parliament to amend the Act.

According to the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, 67% of its funding comes from councils in London, Essex and Hertfordshire. Around 24,410 visits a year to the Regional Park are made by Southwark residents.

Whilst the majority of visits to the park are made by residents of the adjacent boroughs, it is important to recognise that, as a result of the Olympics, the park includes the only world class facilities in London, east and south east for a number of sports. These include the regional ice centre, the Olympic velodrome, the white water centre, the regional athletics centre and the hockey and tennis centre. We would therefore anticipate that Southwark residents will make greater use of these facilities in the future.

Given the scale of funding by local authorities at the moment, Richard Tracey's proposal to end all public funding in five years is likely to result in the loss of these world-class facilities to London, which is frankly an irresponsible waste of the public money already invested in creating them and would wreck the Olympic legacy that all parties, and the Mayor for London himself, are keen to see flourish.

That is not to say that we would not support a review of arrangements to see if a more balanced approach can be adopted, based on usage of the facilities by boroughs and including other regional sports facilities, such as those at Crystal Palace.



**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Just a quick one Madam Mayor, thank you, thanks for the answer Councillor Livingstone. Just in relation to your – may I ask the cabinet member, in the second to last paragraph the cabinet member was rather scarifying about the loss of the facilities used for the Olympics. Could I ask whether he has any direct evidence for that or is it in a web site link or something could he provide it to me?

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Eckersley for his supplemental question. The information about some of those facilities is within the last report I have seen from the Lee Valley Regional Authority. I know my colleague Councillor Ward can provide a bit more information. The point that I made was the more general one that at the moment two thirds of the money to the Lee Valley Regional Authority comes from public funds and the suggestion made by the GLA member was to remove, in their entirety, those public funds after five years. I think it is very clear that sounds to me that is something that is unsustainable and would certainly run the risk of losing some world class facilities there.

It is interesting that this suggestion is coming up now and you will see from here that this is a situation that has really been going since the GLC was abolished, so of course this is Margaret Thatcher's legacy to us that we have this slightly anachronistic position of funding this. But of course it probably has more relevance now than it has done in any of that time since the regional authority has been established because of those world class facilities there and I am sure Councillor Eckersley, like me, would not want to be robbing any future Bradley Wiggins or anybody else of that calibre that might come from Southwark, from those, the ability use those facilities.

**2. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

The budget report identifies savings of £750,000 arising from the acquisition of the council's Tooley Street offices. Can the cabinet member confirm if there are any plans to use this money in the near future?

**RESPONSE**

On 12 February, the cabinet made the decision to set aside these 2012/13 savings arising from the Tooley Street acquisition for additional investment in community safety schemes in the borough.

The first port of call for this money will be to offer to assist the police in establishing contact points and safer neighbourhood teams base buildings to both maintain face-to-face contact with the police, particularly in Dulwich and Rotherhithe, and ensure adequate safer neighbourhood team capacity. We are doing this in response to the Mayor of London's proposals to otherwise cut these.

We hope that the police will be able to make use of this offer and we believe that we are the first council in London to make such a proposal.

The intention is to use the remaining money for other one-off schemes and we are considering a range of proposals, such as:

- establishing victim contact centres with victim support
- work with the community to tackle crime
- property-marking schemes
- thermal imaging cameras to identify beds-in-sheds and cannabis factories
- targeted work to tackle mobile phone theft.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS**

I would like to thank the cabinet member very much for his response, I just wondered if the cabinet member had any idea about the possible time scale within which the police might get back to us?

**RESPONSE**

Thank you Councillor Simmons, I am meeting with the police tomorrow to have a chat about some of this. We have a little bit of difficulty getting them into the same room as us, so I am going to have a chat tomorrow. How conclusive that will be, I don't know, but I will hopefully have a clearer idea from then.

We are making a very serious commitment here; we are the first authority in London to do so, to say "We understand the difficulties the police authority has." Despite the fact that our money is very tight, we are going to be using that money that we are saving from having bought this building, the money we saved this year, to put that into some one off funding and try and help the police as well as have other community safety measures in patches; and that is a genuine offer and we hope we can work constructively with the police to look at replacement facilities, particularly in Dulwich and Rotherhithe which I think are the two areas which are clearly most affected by the proposed closures of police stations.

This page is intentionally blank.

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

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

<b>ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED</b>	Copies	To	Copies
<b>All Councillors</b>	<b>1 each</b>	<b>Others</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Group Offices</b>	<b>2</b>	Elizabeth Olive, Audit Commission Ground Floor, Tooley Street	<b>1</b>
Alex Doel, Labour Group Office	1		
William Summers, Liberal Democrat Group Office	1		
<b>Libraries</b>	<b>2</b>		
Albion / Newington	<b>1 each</b>		
<b>Officers</b>	<b>5</b>		
Eleanor Kelly	1		
Duncan Whitfield	1		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
Sonia Sutton	1		
<b>Constitutional Team</b> (Copies to Lesley John, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street)	<b>15</b>		
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>90</b>