

# **Council Assembly (Annual Meeting)**

Wednesday 22 May 2013  
7.00 pm

Council Offices, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

## **Supplemental Agenda No.1**

### List of Contents

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>2.5. Minutes</b>		1 - 56
	To approve as a correct record the open minutes of the council assembly meeting held on 27 March 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: 14 May 2013



## Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

MINUTES of the Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting) held on Wednesday 27 March 2013 at 7.00 pm at Harris Academy Peckham, 112 Peckham Road, London SE15 5DZ

---

### PRESENT:

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

Councillor Kevin Ahern	Councillor 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 Abdul Mohamed
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton	Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Patrick Diamond	Councillor Graham Neale
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	Councillor Wilma Nelson
Councillor Nick Dolezal	Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Toby Eckersley	Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Gavin Edwards	Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Dan Garfield	Councillor Lisa Rajan
Councillor Mark Gettleson	Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Norma Gibbes	Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Mark Glover	Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Stephen Govier	Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Renata Hamvas	Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Barrie Hargrove	Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Helen Hayes	Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Claire Hickson	Councillor Geoffrey Thornton
Councillor Jeff Hook	Councillor Veronica Ward
Councillor David Hubber	Councillor Mark Williams
Councillor Peter John	Councillor Ian Wingfield

## 1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

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

The Mayor

- Reminded everyone that the Mayor's Ball was on Saturday 4 May at 7.00pm at the Hilton Tower Bridge.
- Stated that the Community Youth Games were about to cease and therefore thanked staff for their contribution towards the games past success.
- Thanked those that had attended the relocation and rededication ceremony of war memorials from the former town hall, Peckham Road.

Councillor Peter John, leader of the council, made a statement about the recent fire at Walworth Town Hall.

Councillor Ian Wingfield, deputy leader and cabinet member for housing management, made a statement about the Lakanal fire inquests.

Councillor Fiona Colley, cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy, tabled a statement about the relocate of Ellison House approved premises.

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

With the meetings agreement the Mayor announced that she intended to receive one late item of business:

- Late Motion on the Fire at Walworth Town Hall.

The Mayor informed the meeting that the petition on the bail hostel had been withdrawn, therefore Motion 5.2.2 and its subsequent amendment had been withdrawn; and that the deputation from Originally Peckham Voluntary Sector Forum (PVSF) "Our Voices, Our Children, Our Future", had been referred to the cabinet.

The Mayor stated that following consultation with the group whips it had been agreed that the order of business be varied to allow the late motion to be considered as the first item of business. The whips had also agreed that there should be a single debate on the motions on the theme, 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.

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

- 1.6 Variation in order of business
- 1.14 (4) Order of debate – single debate
- 2.10 (3) Deadline for receipt of motions.

### 1.3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

#### **Item 7.1: Establishing Southwark's Health and Wellbeing Board as a committee of the council**

Councillor Andy Simmons declared a pecuniary interest in this item as he has honorary contracts with the NHS in Southwark.

### 1.4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Rowenna Davis and Linda Manchester. Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Victoria Mills and Lewis Robinson.

### 1.5 MINUTES

*(See supplemental agenda 1, pages 1 – 65)*

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meetings held on 23 January and 27 February 2013 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 2. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC

### 2.1 PETITIONS - SAY NO TO BAIL HOSTEL CAMPAIGN

*(See pages 1 – 2 of the main agenda and pages 1 – 2 of supplemental agenda 3)*

The petition was withdrawn.

### 2.2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

*(See page 1 of supplemental agenda 2 and green papers circulated at the meeting)*

There was one question from the public, the answer to which was circulated on green paper at the meeting. The question and written response will be appended to the minutes.

### 2.3 DEPUTATION REQUESTS ON THE THEME

*(See pages 2 - 4 of the main agenda)*

#### **Deputation from the St. Giles Trust**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from the St. Giles Trust.

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Rob Owen, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety. Councillor Richard Livingstone provided an oral response.

Councillors Mark Gettleson, Claire Hickson and Patrick Diamond asked questions of the deputation.

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

**Deputation from Southwark Young Advisors Scheme and the Southwark Anti Violence Unit**

Council assembly considered whether to receive the deputation from the Southwark Anti Violence Unit.

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Cleese Buck, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety. Councillor Richard Livingstone provided an oral response.

Councillors Anood Al-Samerai and Columba Blango asked questions of the deputation.

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

**Deputation from Southwark Youth Council**

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the deputation be received.

The deputation's spokesperson, Vanessa Glover, addressed the meeting.

The deputation asked a question of Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle, cabinet member for children's services. Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle provided an oral response.

Councillors Althea Smith, David Hubber, David Noakes and Rosie Shimell asked

questions of the deputation.

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

### **3. THEMED DEBATE - CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

#### **3.1 CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT**

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.7(6) Councillor Richard Livingstone (cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety) invited the Police Borough Commander for Southwark, John Sutherland, to address the meeting for five minutes. Thereafter Councillor Livingstone spoke to the meeting for five minutes on the themed debate.

The opposition spokesperson for community safety, libraries and leisure, Councillor James Barber, replied to the cabinet members' statement.

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

*(See page 9 of supplemental agenda 2 and green papers circulated at the meeting)*

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

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

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

##### **MOTION 1 – BASIC SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR RESIDENTS**

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

The Mayor announced that she had received notice of changes to the speakers on Amendment A, Councillors Dan Garfield and Mark Williams now wished to move and second the amendment rather than Councillors Cleo Soanes and Lorraine Lauder. The meeting consented to the change of speakers.

Councillor Michael Bukola, seconded by Councillor Adele Morris, moved the motion.

Councillor Dan Garfield, seconded by Councillor Mark Williams, moved Amendment A.

##### **MOTION 2 – HEALTH AND WELLBEING PRIORITIES**

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

Councillor Cleo Soanes, seconded by Councillor Lorraine Lauder, moved the motion.

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

Councillor David Hubber, seconded by Councillor Jonathan Mitchell, moved Amendment C.

Following debate (Councillors Mark Gettleson, Mark Williams, Paul Noblet, Gavin Edwards, Anood Al-Samerai and Helen Hayes), at 9.30pm the Mayor adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break. The meeting reconvened at 9.35pm and moved to the vote on the amendments and motions.

### **Vote on Motion 1 and Amendment A – Basic safety and security for residents**

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

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

Motion 2 was the same as Amendment A, which had been carried as the substantive motion, therefore Motion 2 fell.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly believes that crime and the fear of crime are among our residents' main concerns and notes the council's fairer future promise to crack down on anti-social behaviour and implement a violent crime strategy.
2. That council assembly notes the progress being made against the 5 priorities in the violent crime strategy including:
  - 9% reduction in violence with injury
  - 4% reduction in most serious violence
  - 22% reduction in knives used to injure
  - 19% reduction in youth violence
  - 10% reduction in domestic abuse.
3. That council assembly notes that despite savings to Southwark's anti-social behaviour unit, the number of anti-social behaviour cases that have been managed by Southwark antisocial behaviour unit (SASBU) and housing officers over the last three years has actually increased by 40%; the number of acceptable behaviour contracts issued increased by 19% on last year.
4. That council assembly welcomes the establishment of the Southwark anti-violence unit (SAVU), a multiagency team working together to support individuals and families affected by gang and serious youth violence. It welcomes the fact that, the first 10 months evaluation highlights that following engagement with SAVU, 45% of SAVU clients have not come to police notice, compared with the 12 months prior to their involvement in the scheme when 100% had come to notice. Council assembly further notes the favourable review of this work by the Home Office in October 2012, in which the council was praised by the review team for its 'political leaders recognising

and prioritising ending gang and youth violence work and sending out a very strong signal that this is a priority for the borough and will be resourced and supported'.

5. That council assembly also welcomes the announcement in last month's budget of £1.4m to upgrade outdated camera systems on Southwark's housing estates as well as 30 new redeployable cameras and an upgraded control room. It notes that CCTV has supported the police in making around 900 arrests between April and March of 2012/13.
6. That council assembly regrets the government's decision to cut the Met's budget by 20% and the impact this has had on police officer numbers in the borough and on closures to police stations in Rotherhithe and East Dulwich. It welcomes the council's decision to identify £750,000 for community safety initiatives including alternative police front counters.
7. That council assembly asks the cabinet to develop plans to:
  - Work collaboratively with customs and excise, police and neighbouring boroughs to tackle the drugs trade
  - Work with communities and registered social landlords to develop new approaches to resolve conflicts within communities
  - Help communities gain confidence to tackle anti-social behaviour in their midst
  - Continue the excellent work of SAVU despite government cuts
  - Develop further the work with our partners to reduce re-offending
  - Work with Solace, the voluntary sector and local hospitals to develop innovative approaches to tackling violence against women and girls.

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

## **MOTION 2 – CRIME AND ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

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

Motion 2 fell.

## **4. OTHER DEPUTATIONS**

*(See pages 10 – 11 of supplemental agenda 2)*

The deputation request from Originally Peckham Voluntary Sector Forum (PVSF) "Our Voices, Our Children, Our Future" was referred to the cabinet.

## **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 2 to the minutes.

There were 42 members' questions, the written responses to which were circulated on yellow paper at the meeting. There were 11 supplemental questions, all questions and written responses are attached as Appendix 3 to the minutes.

At 10.07pm the Mayor announced that the guillotine had fallen.

## 5.2 MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### **MOTION 1 – LOCALISING PLANNING DECISIONS**

*(See page 14 of the main agenda)*

The guillotine having fallen, Councillors Toby Eckersley and Lewis Robinson, formally moved and seconded the motion.

Councillors Helen Hayes and Darrell Merrill, formally moved and seconded Amendment D.

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

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That council assembly notes the concerns which residents and members from all parties have raised about travel times to Tooley Street from the south of the borough.
2. That council assembly recognises the need to make planning decision-making as accessible to all residents as possible.
3. That council assembly further recognises the need for financial efficiency across all departments in this time of austerity, and the additional unsustainable costs which would be incurred by holding planning committee meetings in a range of different venues across the borough.
4. That council assembly therefore proposes that some planning sub-committee meetings should be held at the council offices at Queen's Road Peckham as soon as it is practical.
5. That council assembly requests the director of planning to report back on the impact of this change of venue in terms of the attendance of members of the public at planning sub-committee meetings in one year's time.

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

### **MOTION 2 – OFENDER HOSTEL ON OLD KENT ROAD**

*(see page 14 of the main agenda)*

Motion withdrawn.

**LATE MOTION – FIRE AT WALWORTH TOWN HALL**

*(Paper circulated at the meeting)*

This motion was considered prior to the guillotine having fallen.

Prior to the late motion being moved, in accordance with CAPR 1.14(15), the mover and seconder of the late motion agreed to the following alteration to the motion:

Last bullet point delete 'urgently reconsider his' and insert 'have regard to this event before finalising the'.

Councillor Peter John, seconded by Councillor Anood Al-Samerai, moved the late motion.

Following debate (Councillors Althea Smith, Richard Livingstone, Catherine Bowman and Mark Williams), Councillor Dan Garfield, seconded by Councillor Tim McNally, moved to the vote.

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

That council assembly:

- Expresses great sadness at the devastating fire this week at Walworth Town Hall and the damage it has caused to the Cuming museum and adjoining buildings
- Thanks the emergency services, council staff and local residents and businesses for their dedicated efforts to protect lives and heritage.
- Supports the work of officers in finding alternative temporary premises for the One Stop Shop and library study space.
- Recognises the need for community conversations to now take place to allow residents to share their thoughts about the buildings and the future, including preserving the external facade in any rebuilding work.
- Notes that the first fire engine on the scene came from Southwark Fire Station, which is currently on the Mayor of London's list for closure, and that other fire engines assisting were from stations also under threat of closure.
- Calls on the Mayor of London to have regard to this event before finalising the planned fire station closures in light of the events of this week, given how much worse the situation could have been without the quick response from our local fire stations.

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

## 6. REPORT(S) FOR INFORMATION FROM THE CABINET

### 6.1 REPORT BACK ON MOTIONS REFERRED TO THE CABINET

*(See pages 16 - 20 of the main agenda)*

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

## 7. OTHER REPORTS

### 7.1 ESTABLISHING SOUTHWARK'S HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AS A COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL

*(See pages 21 – 45 of the main agenda)*

Councillor Andy Simmons, having declared an interest in this item withdraw from the meeting during the debate and vote on the report.

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.

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

Councillor David Noakes, seconded by Councillor Denise Capstick, moved Amendment F.

Following debate (Councillors Catherine McDonald, Neil Coyle, Toby Eckersley, Anood Al-Samerai, Peter John and Nick Stanton), the Mayor announced that the time allocated to this report had expired and the meeting would move to the vote on the amendment and substantive.

Amendment F 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.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Southwark's Health and Wellbeing Board be established as a committee of the council from 1 April 2013 and the membership of the board be as set out in paragraph 22 of the report be agreed.
2. That the necessary constitutional changes including the roles and functions / matters reserved and procedural rules as presented in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report be agreed.

## 7.2 CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES - ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

*(See pages 46 – 56 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.

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

Councillor Lisa Rajan, seconded by Councillor Graham Neale, moved Amendment G.

Following debate (Councillors Dan Garfield, Lewis Robinson, Tim McNally, Nick Dolezal, Peter John and Anood Al-Samerai), the Mayor announced that the time allocated to this report had expired and the meeting would move to the vote on the amendment and substantive.

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

The recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the constitutional changes outlined in relation to the annual meeting set out in paragraphs 8 to 13 and Appendix 1 and 2 of the report be agreed.

## 7.3 ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT

*(See pages 57 – 69 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.

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

Councillor Tim McNally, seconded by Councillor Catherine Bowman, moved Amendment H.

Following debate (Councillors Richard Livingstone, Poddy Clark, Peter John, Paul Noblet and Columba Blango), the Mayor announced that the time allocated to this report had expired and the meeting would move to the vote on the amendment and substantive.

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

The recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the council's pay policy statement as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, be agreed.

**7.4 ANNUAL REPORT ON THE WORK AND PERFORMANCE OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE IN 2012/13**

*(See pages 69 – 81 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.

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.11 (1), Councillor Mark Glover, chair of the audit and governance committee, moved the report.

The recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the work and performance of the audit and governance committee in 2012/13 be noted.

**7.5 ANNUAL REPORT ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS (ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROCEDURE RULE 21.3)**

*(See pages 82 – 87 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.

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

The recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the schedule of special urgency and urgent implementation decisions (Appendix 1 of the report) taken in accordance with overview and scrutiny procedure rules 18 and 19, be noted.

**8. AMENDMENTS**

Amendments are set out in Supplemental Agenda 3, pages 3 – 10.

The meeting closed at 11.01pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 27 MARCH 2013****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****1. QUESTION FROM LES ALDEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING**

Following the recent decision to reduce the number of fire stations serving Southwark will the cabinet member agree to review the use of traffic calming measures on strategic routes in the borough, bearing in mind it is claimed that each road hump causes 10 second delay to emergency services?"

**RESPONSE**

The only research relating to delays to vehicles caused by road humps that officers are aware of is from the US. It is not felt this research is relevant to Southwark's road environment. Officers are unaware of any relevant research on this matter at this time.

There is sound research however that shows that for every 1mph speed reduction, there is a 5-6% reduction in personal injury accidents.

Southwark has not formally designated a strategic network for emergency services.

We rarely (if ever) implement 'road humps' on main roads. On main road, we use speed cushions which are less disruptive to emergency vehicles and buses.

However, whenever we propose implementation of a traffic calming scheme on any road in the borough, the emergency services are all consulted. They are not known to have objected to any traffic calming scheme in recent times. If the emergency services were to raise with me concerns as a result of the proposed reduced number of fire stations in the borough and its impact on response times, specifically in the context of traffic calming measures, I would welcome any opportunity to meet them to discuss these and consider measures to assist.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 27 MARCH 2013****PUBLIC QUESTION ON THE THEME****1. QUESTION FROM PATRICIA HICKSON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

As someone who has used the ASB services and who would like to be more involved, could you please outline what opportunities you have in place for communities to become more involved in tackling ASB and crime in their area?

**RESPONSE**

We recognise that dealing with ASB is a high priority for Southwark residents as well as for the council itself. Residents wanting to become more involved can find out more about the ASB service and become involved through:

- By attending local meetings such as community council, tenants council, tenants and residents association meetings and other community forums
- Getting involved with your police ward panel meetings held by the safer neighbourhood team
- Taking part in surveys/ consultations such as the council's reputation survey or the MPS public attitude survey or other independent surveys carried out by officers at events or who come to resident properties
- Finding out about local focus groups such as cafe conversations and community workshops
- Attending organised road shows and events delivered by the Safer Southwark Partnership which give residents the opportunity to meet council officers, police and wardens
- Attending 'Action Days' in areas where issues of ASB have been highlighted involving all of our partners which assist in providing community re-assurance and promote how ASB can be reported and tackled
- Becoming a volunteer and helping to engage with some of our harder to reach communities
- You can also get information about the ASB service and means to be more involved through partnership newsletters and publications such as Southwark Life, on the council website and through the public services website ([www.direct.gov.uk](http://www.direct.gov.uk))



**SOUTHWARK COUNCIL****COUNCIL ASSEMBLY****(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 27 MARCH 2013****URGENT QUESTION****1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI**

After a number of stories in local press in the past week highlighting the absolute chaos in the housing department, what is the leader doing to get a grip on the situation?

**RESPONSE**

I do not recognise Councillor Al Samerai's description of our housing department. In 2010 we inherited a housing service which was in chaos, repairs going undone, false recording of customer satisfaction and a gaping black hole in the housing budget. Since that time we have been turning around Southwark's housing. For the first time in a decade we recreated a dedicated housing department and are properly investing in the homes of people in this borough.

In the last year alone we have taken back 310 properties from illegal occupancy, our best ever and one of the best in the country. We are bringing the call centre in-house from the beginning of June so that we can ensure that we have control over the customer service that our tenants receive. Our warm, dry and safe programme is moving forward and government have brought forward future years' allocations of backlog funding in recognition of our ability to deliver. We are judging our repairs based solely on what residents say to us, and this is showing our best customer satisfaction rates since 2010.

With the volume of housing we have in the borough there will be times when we get it wrong or when people don't get the level of service that they deserve. However, with this administration we hold our hands up when we get it wrong and then put it right. This is in stark contrast to the previous administration who would brush problems under the carpet and tell us that everything was fine. Rather than scrabbling around for bad news about the borough and talking down our borough, its residents and the hard working staff of the council, the Liberal Democrats should be welcoming the fact that there is a Labour administration with the competence to sort out the mess that they created in the first place.

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

Yes I do, I am slightly concerned that the leader of the council is in denial. If I can just remind him about the letter in the press last week where his housing chief had to apologise to a terminally ill man who was given an eviction notice? Then ninety people received letters saying they were not going to get housing benefit for their extra

bedroom when they only lived in one bedroom. And then finally his housing chief can't send a letter because his secretary was out of the office on the day it was due to be posted? Doesn't that sound like chaos to him?

## **RESPONSE**

No it isn't, I thank you very much Councillor Al-Samerai for your supplemental question but it doesn't sound like chaos. And I think it says something actually that this is an urgent question and clearly there was no chaos in the housing department which she could put down in a timely manner in order to ask the question but she had to wait until last week's paper in order to see any stories that she could jump on at the basis of this question.

Look, this is a housing department which is in transition; don't forget in May 2010 there wasn't a housing department in Southwark. In that three years we have got to a stage where satisfaction levels with repairs completed right first time is improving quarter on quarter. Complaint escalations are at an all-time low, as are the number of overdue orders. Our lifts are now at an all-time high lift availability of over 90%. The historic high of gas servicing compliance of 100% has been maintained throughout the year. Red Bus Contract Management has meant that more than £1 million has been reclaimed from poor performing contractors over the past twelve months. We ended the Morrison contract in October last year. The warm dry and safe major works programme is on target, [we have] spent £58 million pounds in this year. We have terminated poor performing contractors Waites and Breyer. We have just been awarded the highest rating of 4 stars for our website by the Society of IT Managers; we are now rated amongst the top twenty in the country, and that's important in terms of keeping tenants informed of how we are performing for housing matters. We have set up our new customer experience or are setting that up later this year which will be employing 40 local apprentices who are residents of Southwark. 310 properties have been recovered from illegal occupancy in the year to date, exceeding our target, and that is the best result ever. A combined annual gas servicing tenancy check programme is now in place. Key fob reconfiguration has been introduced where door entry systems and access codes have been changed and new fobs can only be collected by the legal tenant.

I could go on and on. This is not though, I don't think, evidence of a housing management department in chaos. It is a housing management department doing its work day in, day out, improving day in, day out a service for the residents of this borough.

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

Thank you Madam Mayor, as I said, it's denial. Perhaps you could tell this chamber what you said to me privately last week about the quality of the repairs department and its cabinet member?

## **RESPONSE**

I am not sure what I did say, but it is always nice you can rely on a Liberal Democrat to have a Chatham House rules conversation and to be questioned about it later, I will tell you what – I know that our housing management has got to get better. It has to improve and we are working on it, but you know, I think constantly talking down what we are doing as a council; constantly talking down what our department are doing and what our staff are doing, does not improve service performance.

Given the level of savings we have had to find, given the level of added work that they are having to take on, day in, day out, this is a council that I am proud of and staff in this council I am proud of, and I am proud of every level of the staff and the work that they are doing, particularly in the housing department. That's the story we need to be talking about in this borough because that is the service people are experiencing.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**  
**(ORDINARY MEETING)**  
**WEDNESDAY 27 MARCH 2013**  
**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES**

Can he provide an update on the council's discussion with the Metropolitan Police Service regarding funding for alternative police front counters in Southwark?

**RESPONSE**

The Conservative/Liberal Democrat government cut the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) budget by 20%. As a result police officer numbers in Southwark have been reduced and Rotherhithe and East Dulwich police stations are closing. We have made a cash offer to the MPS to fund replacement police counters in Southwark, including in council premises.

We have had several meetings with the police as a result of which eight locations have been identified across the borough which can be used as contact points for neighbourhood policing team bases. These include locations in Rotherhithe, Camberwell, Dulwich, Nunhead and Walworth, which will provide alternative locations where a member of the public will be able to talk face to face with a police officer.

There has been a specific focus in Rotherhithe to ensure that there is a dedicated neighbourhood policing team base. Two potential locations are being actively pursued. The MPS have confirmed that the current neighbourhood policing team based at Rotherhithe Police Station will be retained until an alternative can be found.

The current Police Safer Neighbourhood Team base in Dulwich is being retained and Dulwich Library has the capacity to provide a contact point.

The council has agreed with Victim Support to provide Victim Care Points at each of the eight locations above. This will enable victims of crime the opportunity to have a face to face meeting with a victim support specialist, in confidence, providing bespoke support and advice.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES FOR THE LEADER**

Thank you Madam Mayor, further to my comments in the themed debate I would like to ask the leader whether he shares my concern about the Mayor's proposed reduction of College ward SMT to a single PC and PCSO.

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Hayes for her supplementary question, and I want to congratulate her also and Councillor Simmons for their sterling work actually in working with residents in College ward on this issue.

I am concerned right across the borough about the impact which the Mayor's changes and proposals are going to have on our safer neighbourhood teams.

I think one thing that stood out, I think stood out in the last debate – members were making it on all sides – was how popular and successful safer neighbourhood teams have been, that relationship that you as a residents have with the sergeant and the officers and the PCSOs, and I think what the Mayor is doing and what the Deputy Mayor for policing and crime is doing is completely undermining that relationship. And I think we have to be absolutely vigilant as representatives of our area going forward to ensure that there can be no further erosion, and in fact the Deputy Mayor needs to step back from where he is going with this, because I think it will undermine policing and it will undermine public confidence in policing in our borough.

**2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER**

Is the leader aware that the broadband speeds in the Surrey Docks area are abysmally poor and well below the average in England? Given the growing population in Rotherhithe – including many people working from home – and the hoped for increase in business activity, will he make strong representations to BT and other relevant organisations to urge them to remedy this problem as soon as possible?

**RESPONSE**

The council wishes to see the most modern broadband technologies across the whole of the borough; however we must be mindful that these technologies have become the responsibility of private sector communication companies including, but not exclusively, BT.

The Greater London Authority (GLA) recently received a modest government grant to help commission fast broadband connection and it is understood that this is being allocated across a number of sites in London and that a communications contractor will be procured by the GLA.

More recently the strategic director of finance and corporate services and I met with BT to discuss the issue of broadband speed in the north of the borough. At this meeting BT encouraged the council to lobby for allocation of funds to parts of Southwark including Rotherhithe.

We will continue to encourage the GLA and private sector providers to give priority to fast broadband access across the whole of the borough.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER FOR THE LEADER**

Thank you Madam Mayor yes I do and I thank the leader for his response to my question.

Is he aware that the £25 million allocated to London from the Urban Broadband Fund has already apparently been earmarked by the Mayor for various areas in London, none of which are in Southwark; and in view of the fact that we are urging our citizens to use the internet more and more to communicate with us, would he make further representations to the Mayor to change that allocation so we get some of it?

## **RESPONSE**

Yes. I want to thank Councillor Hubber for his question. It raises a very timely issue because the director of finance and I met recently with a BT regional manager on this very issue. It was startling; when you looked at a map of super fast broadband coverage of Southwark, the further north you got in the borough the worse it got and there are pockets, and you are absolutely right to identify the Rotherhithe peninsula area as one of those areas, where super fast broadband coverage is appallingly low but actually the whole of the north of the borough is suffering. If you live in Dulwich, you are doing fine on super fast broadband – you will be able to report your crime to the police over the internet faster than ever; but in terms of the rest of the borough – but I think we have to look at other companies and other initiatives other than BT that may be able to provide a solution.

But you're absolutely right; we'll continue to lobby the Mayor, particularly, I'm going to take advantage of my seat on the left now, to lobby the left and the Mayor through that for some investment which would be a local enterprise partnership for increased funding for our part of the world for super fast broadband. The Mayor didn't spend the £100 million last year that he should have done, and I think he should divert more money into super fast broadband for central London.

### **3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND**

I welcome the news that the council is investing £1.4 million in CCTV on council estates at a time when the government is cutting the Metropolitan Police Service's budget. Can he confirm when residents on the Brandon Estate will see new CCTV cameras installed?

## **RESPONSE**

Three new CCTV cameras have recently been installed on the Brandon estate in close proximity to the Henry Moore sculpture 'Two piece reclining figure no 3'. A further four CCTV cameras are due to be installed during April and May of this year. All seven CCTV cameras will be monitored from the CCTV control room.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND FOR THE LEADER**

I would like to thank the leader for his response and can I say on behalf of residents in Newington ward and on the Brandon Estate particular how warmly welcomed this investment in CCTV is, particularly in the constrained circumstances in which we are working given the massive cuts imposed by central government.

Can I ask the leader to elaborate and to say whether it would be possible to extend these very welcomed improvements in CCTV to other parts of Newington ward which have suffered high rates of crime? In particular could he update us in relation to improvements that can be made with CCTV in the area around Draper

House and also the area around the Newington Estate which has suffered from too much crime in the last few years?

## **RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Diamond for that supplementary question. He will know that there are seven estates that we have identified where we are installing new CCTV across the borough in the coming weeks and months. One of the things which of course has come out of the housing revenue account this year is the potential for increased funding into CCTV and it is indeed the housing revenue account which is funding this particular programme and we will continue to look at that and obviously any representations received by any members in respect of particular estates or areas where we do need to increase CCTV coverage will be considered as part of that programme. I mean the important point is that there is a funding stream now identified and available which we hope will meet this going forward. Councillor Livingstone can always add something in writing to you later.

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

How much of the discretionary housing payments budget has been spent in the current financial year 2012/13? What are the council's spending plans for the 2013/14 budget, broken down by fulfilment need type?

## **RESPONSE**

As a result of the welfare reforms introduced by the Conservative/Liberal Democrat government and backed every step of the way by Southwark Liberal Democrats and Simon Hughes, the council has made full use of its discretionary housing payment (DHP) allocation of £331,962 for 2012/13 and has in fact spent a further £30,000, made available through the council's own resources in housing options.

The DHP allocation for 2013/14 will be £1,119,665 comprising:

Local housing allowance reforms	£200,000
Social size criteria	£213,000
Benefit cap	£562,500
At risk group	£144,165

In addition we have created a £800,000 welfare hardship fund to help vulnerable residents in Southwark who are at risk of being made homeless, which Southwark Liberal Democrats have opposed.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI FOR THE LEADER**

Thanks very much Madam Mayor. As you know at the previous council meeting I had said that we were very keen to take up concerns about direct payments particularly in the pilot with government ministers, and although it was still a bit of a struggle to be honest to get information before the press releases went out, we did finally get some information and we fed that back to Steve Webb at the Liberal Democrat conference in Brighton a couple of weeks ago and we have had some positive noises about flexibility around direct payments.

If there are other things that are generally concerning this administration it seems to me a sensible way forward that we try and use cross party ways of raising this, so can I ask the Leader if he would be willing to do that in the coming few months so that we are able to take up concerns with central government in a constructive and not just about press releases manner?

#### **RESPONSE**

I will always join with Councillor Al-Samerai in seeking to lobby government that they are wrong in what they are doing in terms of welfare reform changes and they are wrong in terms of cutting our budget back by £18 million over the last three years.

It is a pity she has not been quite so eager to lobby government up to now on some of those issues, but if she is sensible and serious about wanting to tackle some of the problems which are undoubtedly going to be a consequence of changes to welfare benefit payments going forward I will more than happily work with her, because I do think it is important that the residents of the borough hear that all of their councillors are standing up for them and not just Labour councillors, although Labour councillors will always do it on our own if we have to. We are happy to stand up for our residents whatever the circumstances.

#### **5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR REBECCA LURY**

After the opposition spokesperson for resources and housing investment poured scorn on the idea that parents in Southwark are using money saved from Labour's free, healthy school meals to pay for dancing classes, is the leader aware that Liberal Democrat run Sutton Council paid for children to have ballroom dancing classes because it helped "to engage those who might not enjoy more traditional school sports like football or rounders to get fit and stay healthy"?

#### **RESPONSE**

I was not aware of this scheme but it demonstrates how out of touch Southwark Liberal Democrats are – even with their own party colleagues.

Rather than mocking the fact that a parent in Southwark has been able to use money saved from Labour's free, healthy school meals to pay for her kids to take part in a fun and healthy activity perhaps Southwark Liberal Democrats should actually listen to what parents, teachers, students, the Children's Society, the government and even Simon Hughes are saying and drop their ridiculous opposition to free, healthy school meals.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR REBECCA LURY FOR THE LEADER**

Yes I do Madam Mayor. Does the leader agree with me that if Councillor McNally and his Liberal Democrat colleagues continue to oppose Labour's free healthy school meals that this will be their last tango in Southwark?

#### **RESPONSE**

Yes thank you very much Councillor Lury. Yes, well maybe it will be the case that the Liberal Democrats in Southwark will be tangoed as a consequence of their opposition at this incredibly popular and forward thinking policy.



## 6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS

What proportion of residential units in new developments does the council estimate will be sold to foreign investors? How will the council ensure that those homes will not be bought up as asset investments and left long-term empty?

### RESPONSE

The council does not hold information on foreign investment in Southwark properties. While our records show where properties are empty, this can be for a number of reasons and is not a reliable measure of the extent of foreign investment. The council does not have legal powers under planning or any other legislation to control who buys property on the open market.

Nonetheless, it is fair to estimate that in the prime residential sector, represented in Southwark by the highest value developments along the river, sales to foreign investors make up a significant proportion. We are turning this situation to our advantage by using planning agreements with developers of a handful of the most valuable riverside sites to fund the delivery of 1,000 new council homes in Southwark over the next eight years – more than have been built in London in the last 10 years. These council homes will be built across the borough, from Long Lane to East Dulwich, and represent the biggest council house building programme of its kind in the country.

Unfortunately, the Liberal Democrats have opposed our method of funding new council homes, meaning – until they come up with an alternative way of paying for it – they are opposed to building 1,000 new council homes in this borough.

### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ADELE MORRIS FOR THE LEADER

Yes thank you Madam Mayor; and I don't really thank the leader for his answer because I am actually quite shocked by it. While other leaders in London and the GLA and other academics and various other people are talking about the issue that we have potentially 60% of our central London properties being bought up by foreign investors and potentially not then renting them out but just sat on.

But you don't seem to care at all; in fact you have quite blatantly said you will take the money and spend it on council housing elsewhere in the borough. Are you not ashamed of yourself to be treating communities in the north with such disrespect that you really don't care, and are not interested in looking for – do you not care, is my question, that anything goes when there are things that the planning officers can do and our planning policies can implement and you don't seem interested?

### RESPONSE

Thank you very much Councillor Morris for that very temperate question. I am not ashamed of wanting to see investment in this borough which brings jobs and growth and genuine affordable housing to residents in our borough. If she had her way I know there would be no new homes in the north of the borough because she systematically opposes virtually every new development in the north of the borough on the basis that she is standing up for her residents. No. Her residents want to see investments in to the borough which brings jobs and growth, and that

is what we are about. And yes, the investment which comes from new housing in the north of the borough, which is bought by foreign investors in certain circumstances, will pay for a thousand new council homes, not just in the north of the borough but right across the borough and that has to be good news.

Look, I do take her point seriously about empty properties and I think we do have to look as a council at the possibility of what we can do with council tax etc, to penalise those purchasers so that they are not leaving their properties empty.

But if she is inviting me to say that we cannot have foreign investment in property in Southwark I am going to say no. I think that is wrong. It means we will not get development and investment in our borough, we will not get the jobs and the growth we need. This is an administration which is focusing on jobs and growth and that is what we will deliver.

## **7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES**

How many signatures has the leader collected for his online petition to extend the Bakerloo line to Camberwell and Peckham? How does he plan to advance the campaign?

### **RESPONSE**

As it stands my petition has collected 2,177 signatures, just 323 from its target. While I would encourage those who have not already done so to sign up, I believe the level of support the petition has already received demonstrates the overwhelming support for this scheme among Southwark residents.

We are working with Transport for London (TfL) and Lewisham Council to develop the case for the Bakerloo Line extension. We are working with TfL on a study looking at:

- options for the route taking account of planning policies and future development potential
- wider social factors – employment, education, health, environment
- funding potential.

Southwark officers are commissioning studies to enhance this work with more detailed examination of the economic benefits and the ways in which funding options will impact on Southwark.

Crucially, I have now also secured a commitment from the Mayor of London for the extension of the Bakerloo line as well as his Chief of Staff. I have also spoken to the Transport Minister for London, Stephen Hammond MP, who has agreed to meet with me once the business case has been prepared.

I am thrilled that we are closer than ever before to delivering the tube to Camberwell and Peckham. The jobs, growth and opportunity it will bring to this part of South London will be a lasting legacy for the people of Southwark.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES FOR THE LEADER**

Yes Madam Mayor. I would like to thank the leader for his comprehensive response to my question.

In the final paragraph of his statement he claims that we are much closer to delivering a tube to Camberwell and Peckham; I would like to know how much closer? Thank you.

## **RESPONSE**

Somebody said “about two foot.” I would like to thank Councillor Soanes for her supplementary, obviously I was absolutely delighted that we have got the Mayor of London’s support for this project going forward, I don’t pretend for a moment that this is a done deal and the contracts are signed and the tunnelling has begun, but there are three elements that we need to get supporting this campaign; the Mayor of London, TFL and the government.

We have got the Mayor of London firmly on board, and only today, talking to one of his principal advisors who has been tasked, she has been tasked with the job of finding how the finance will stack up and how it is put together; and I also believe TFL are going to be bringing out a brief soon, also to put this business case together.

We are closer than ever, I think, at this time to seeing this project become a reality. We have got it at last right at the top of the Mayor of London’s agenda. That is very exciting for the residents of Southwark, very exciting for the residents of Lewisham; it would be exciting for the residents of Bromley, but their Conservative leader is utterly opposed to the extension of the Tube to Bromley – he does not want to see growth and jobs in his borough. Well shame on him, and I hope that we and everyone in this room goes out and tells their friends in Bromley that their leader is opposing jobs and growth.

## **8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON**

Can the leader provide an update on discussions with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) about establishing a Dulwich safer neighbourhood team patrol base at the gatehouse of the Dulwich Hospital site on East Dulwich Grove?

## **RESPONSE**

The discussions with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) are that they will be retaining the safer neighbourhood team base at Seeley Drive. This will act as a patrol based for the Dulwich areas. Options for a contact point in Dulwich library are being pursued.

The MPS Southwark Borough Commander has told us that there is no operational requirement for him to use Dulwich hospital and feels that spending monies on a facility the MPS do not want would be a waste of public funds.

The current police safer neighbourhood team base in Dulwich is being retained and Dulwich Library has the capacity to provide a contact point.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON FOR THE LEADER**

Thank you Madam Mayor and I thank the Leader for his answer, I just wanted to ask a supplemental. I was quite astonished to hear from Councillor Mitchell that he had just spoken to the Borough Commander and he did not seem to be aware of the fact that we could pay a one-off capital payment for the Gate House and just to underscore this point: for £150,000 we can have the Gate House for either five years full use or ten years shared use and includes all the services, electricity, heating, cleaning of offices; all they have to do is put police in there. It has the facility to provide a front counter, a private room for victim support, plus it can actually store all of our bits and pieces we bought from CGS, our speed guns and our thermal imaging supplies, and it can actually act as a patrol base.

My question is, the Deputy Mayor is in favour of this. Can we please sit down with you and us and the Borough Commander and actually really go through this? Because it is such a good solution to the problem, it's creative and it's positive.

### **RESPONSE**

I want to thank Councillor Crookshank Hilton for her supplementary question. Well look, what I would say about this – I've already made observations about Dulwich Hospital – what I would say about this particular site: we are not standing in the way of what might happen with the Gate House and what might happen with the police premises in East Dulwich. We have made, I think, the incredibly generous and sensible offer of £750,000 to MOPAC and the Met Police to cover the capital costs of premises in across the borough and it really is up to MOPAC and the Met Police to come back with a positive response to that. We are not opposed to any proposal which sees policing continue across our borough. We want to see that continued police presence; we always have. So if the Met Police and MOPAC can make it work, the money is there for it to happen.

### **9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK WILLIAMS**

Can the leader provide information on resident satisfaction with street cleanliness? How does this compare with the last five years?

### **RESPONSE**

We only have tracker data going back to 2009 and this is set out in the table below

Date	Sep-09	Jan-10	Mar-10	Nov-10	Mar-11	Oct-11	Apr-12	Oct-12
Percentage satisfaction	84	89	86	81	89	83	92	84

The seasonal dip seen each autumn is believed to be as a result of leaf fall making the streets look scruffy.

This demonstrates a rising trend in satisfaction with street cleanliness in Southwark. While this is something of which we can all be proud – and I praise the work of our street cleaning teams – we will continue to be vigilant in this area and ensure Southwark remains one of the cleanest boroughs in London.

### **10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN**

What would be the cost of replacing all the black tarmac repairs to the red brick paving in the streets around Greenland and South Docks in Surrey Docks ward

with original style red bricks, so as to restore the character of the area? Would he give consideration to undertaking this work?

## **RESPONSE**

The black tarmac repairs to the red brick paving on the streets around Greenland and South Docks are usually as a result of tree root disruption or local subsidence. It is impossible to replace the dislodged paving units without significant tree root removal which could destabilise the tree and require its removal; hence the black tarmac option. A major problem in this area is that the bricks have been laid on inadequate foundations, usually a 400mm sand bed. This has led to widespread subsidence problems.

In recent months we have undertaken extensive works in the area. In Finland Street and South Sea Street, we used a red tarmac repair option. In Rope Street, which was a community council capital funded scheme, we lifted and replaced the red bricks on a concrete foundation. However, the latter was significantly more costly. Any blacktop repairs which are excavated and replaced with the original red bricks would require a similar concrete foundation to prevent future subsidence.

For areas where black tarmac has been used to replace dislodged bricks, the total cost for replacing the bricks would be £15,530 at current contract rates. For areas where red tarmac has been used, the total cost for replacing with red bricks would be £244,355. However, for the reasons stated above, this would require potential tree removals where the root systems would have to be trimmed to accommodate the bricks and associated foundation work. These costs are not included in the provided figures.

Cleaner, greener, safer funding is available to community councils for this type of work, as demonstrated by the £50,000 scheme in Rope Street.

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

What consideration has the leader given to using the Mandela Way car pound as a site for a new school? Does he agree that any council land being considered for disposal should also be considered for new school sites?

## **RESPONSE**

Any council land being considered for disposal is subject to review of need across the council's services whether that is for housing, uses to create employment and economic activity or indeed school places.

The council is actively looking at options to open a new primary school in Bermondsey as well as identifying a number of existing schools for expansion meaning the use of Mandela Way for a new school is not necessary.

Furthermore, Mandela Way is identified in the council's planning policy as a preferred industrial location, to provide places for businesses and industry. Southwark Liberal Democrats should already be aware of this as it is in the Southwark Plan which they agreed in 2007.

### **12. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL**

How many people on the electoral roll have chosen to opt out of having their data used for commercial purposes? How many times has the council sold the edited register to third parties in each of the past three financial years (2010/11 to 2012/13), and what was the total sum received for this information by the council in each of these years?

## RESPONSE

The number of electors who have opted out of the edited register, and thereby chosen not to have their name and address used for commercial purposes is as follows:

<b>2013 Register details</b>	
Total number of electors (January 2013 register)	203,618
Total number of electors with Z markers (January 2013 register)	127,935
Total number of electors on the edited register (January 2013 register)	75,683
Percentage of electors with Z markers (January 2013 register)	62.83%

This information is for the revised register published on 15 January 2013 – the publication of the register was delayed from 1 December 2012.

The edited register has been sold to third parties for the following total amounts, and on the number of occasions indicated, as follows:

<b>Edited Register – Sale to Third Parties</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of sales (borough and specified wards)</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
2010/11	5	381.50
2011/12	4	276.50
2012/13	2	149.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>807.00</b>

The councillor may also be interested to see indicative data for the three years prior to 2010/11:

<b>Edited Register – Sale to Third Parties</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of sales (borough and specified wards)</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
2007/08	4	377.00
2008/09	2	179.50
2009/10	5	518.50
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,075.00</b>

### 13. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON (BERMONDSEY AND ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)

What can the council do to help Southwark police with their front counter provision, in light of the proposed closure of Rotherhithe police station?

## **RESPONSE**

As part of the savings in rent we have made through the purchase of Tooley Street we have offered the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) up to £750,000 to fund replacement front counters in Southwark, including in Rotherhithe.

Officers have been actively pursuing potential neighbourhood policing team bases in Rotherhithe that can offer some form of front counter or contact point provision. There are two potential locations that we are working on, Seven Islands leisure centre and retail space through Hyde Housing. Officers are working on these options at this time and liaising with the MPS central property division on the option at Seven Islands. Options for a contact point at Canada Water library are also being discussed.

In the meantime officers have been advised that the current neighbourhood policing team base at Rotherhithe police station will be retained until a viable alternative is found.

Of course, if Southwark Liberal Democrats and their party colleague, Simon Hughes, had not supported the government's decision to cut the MPS's budget by 20% we might be in a situation where Rotherhithe police station would still be open. I am sure Liberal Democrat councillors will be happy to explain to residents in Rotherhithe that the closure of their local police station was a necessary part of their government's failed economic policy to deal with the deficit.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON FOR THE LEADER (BERMONDSEY AND ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Can I ask the leader what response he has had since this answer was given, to the proposal to relocate the front counter to the Seven Islands Leisure Centre; and I think I am right in saying that the £750,000 comes from the very wise purchase of Tooley Street which was only made possible to the fact that under the previous administration the decision was taken to move to Tooley Street in the first place?

## **RESPONSE**

Well, I would not want to put the leader of the previous administration in the position where – look, I don't think there is any significant update since this answer. We have made this offer to the police, if there is any further update Councillor Livingstone can provide it very briefly, would that be helpful?

## **RESPONSE FROM THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

Just very briefly in terms of the safer neighbourhood team base, we took the police with our officers to look at the site last week. We think this could be a solution that works. We are going to have to work with the entrenched bureaucracy of the Metropolitan police which is quite Byzantine in how it operates, but we are hopeful we will find a solution. We are working very constructively with the police to ensure that neighbourhood base can be secured as we discussed earlier, and we

are looking at what we can do about a contact point in Canada Water Library as well to provide that service for local people.

**14. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Would the leader of the council please provide the evidence, broken down by the original eight community council designations and contrasted to the record of main planning committee, for his statement in a letter of 21 December 2012 (responding to a letter from the chairs of the Dulwich Society and the Turney Road Residents Association of 4 December 2012) that the council were "the unsuccessful respondents in a disproportionate number of planning appeals in respect of matters determined at community council planning committees" and the cost of the cases by community council designation?

**RESPONSE**

Whilst it is recognised that local knowledge is sometimes helpful in decision-making for planning applications that are finely balanced, the number of applications allowed on appeal where community councils were the decision maker have, in the main, been costly to the council in respect to the resources required to submit and give evidence in defence of appeals. In some cases where the council decision was considered unreasonable by the Inspectorate, the council was ordered to pay the associated costs of the appellant. These extraordinary costs paid out to appellants amounted to £6,487.50 for the last fiscal year reporting.

In fiscal year 2011 to 2012, there were a total of 15 appeals against decisions taken by community councils. Out of these 15 cases, 60% were allowed by an Inspector. If one looks to the number of decisions overturning the officer recommendation (11 of these 15 cases), the record is worse with 64% of the appeal cases being allowed. In respect to overturns by the Dulwich community council, 75% of cases were allowed on appeal.

Turning to the main planning committee in comparison, for the same period, there was only one appeal which was dismissed by the Inspector. There were no overturns of an officer recommendation and no award of costs. Set out in the following table is the information broken down by the eight community councils.

**Appeals against decisions made by community councils and planning committee 2011/2012**

Decision level	Officer rec. to grant Decision – refused		Officer rec. to refuse Decision – refused		All decisions	
	Appeal allowed	Appeal dismissed	Appeal allowed	Appeal dismissed	Appeal allowed	Appeal dismissed
<b>Borough &amp; Bankside</b>	1	2	1	0	2	2
<b>Bermondsey</b>	1	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Camberwell</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0



	Officer rec. to grant Decision – refused		Officer rec. to refuse Decision – refused		All decisions	
<b>Dulwich</b>	2	1	0	1	2	2
<b>Nunhead &amp; Peckham Rye</b>	1	1	0	1	1	2
<b>Peckham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Rotherhithe</b>	2	0	0	0	2	0
<b>Walworth</b>	0	0	1	0	1	0
<b>All CCs</b>	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)
<b>Planning Committee</b>	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)
<b>All decision levels</b>	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	9 (56%)	7 (44%)

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CROOKSHANK HILTON  
FOR THE LEADER (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Madam Mayor I have a supplemental, I have consulted with my colleagues, and they feel that just having one year of figures is not representative and can we have three years of figures please?

**RESPONSE**

I will see what I can do to supply those figures.

**15. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES  
(CAMBERWELL COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

Please update Camberwell community council on the council's work to lobby Transport for London to bring the Bakerloo line to Camberwell and onto Peckham.

**RESPONSE**

Please see answer for Question 7

**16. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES  
(PECKHAM AND NUNHEAD COMMUNITY COUNCIL)**

As a result of the government's welfare reform changes, will families be forced to leave homes which have been expensively adapted for the needs of disabled and vulnerable people and how many residents of the Peckham and Nunhead community council will it affect?

**RESPONSE**

The Conservative/Liberal Democrat government will cut housing benefit for people with a spare room in their social or council let home, despite its own impact assessment which acknowledges that there is a shortage of smaller properties for tenants to move to. The infamous “bedroom tax” will make disabled people in council and housing association homes pay more when they need more space due to their disability. Divorced parents whose kids come to stay will be affected. Grandparents will pay more. And, at exactly the same time as the bedroom tax comes into effect the government is giving thousands of millionaires a tax cut of £100,000 a year.

It is difficult to tell how many families may be forced to leave their home as a result of the bedroom tax as it will depend on personal circumstance. What we do know is that, as a result of the bedroom tax, households with adaptations for the needs of disabled people will lose housing benefit. We are taking action to deal with this – creating a £800,000 welfare hardship fund as a further means to support people who might be at risk.

Below is a table showing the number of council homes within Peckham, Nunhead and Peckham Rye housing management areas that have been adapted for the needs of disabled or vulnerable people. It is important to note that this data is based on accurate updating of the rehousing database and so may not cover all council homes especially if the adaptations have been removed by the current occupant. This does not include housing association homes – which cater for a large proportion of disabled residents – or private rented homes although very few of these are adapted for wheelchair use

<b>Peckham and Nunhead &amp; Peckham Rye Area Special Usage</b>							
Description	Bedsit	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed
Disabled (full wheelchair) unit	0	52	35	18	11	3	2
Disabled (non wheelchair) unit	1	22	15	25	6	1	1
Adapted unit – showers and ramps	8	168	133	160	46	8	3
Adapted unit – other adaptations	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

The table below shows the impact of the government’s welfare reforms in the five wards within Peckham community council area

#### **Analysis of average annual loss of benefit from 1 April /2013 by ward**

Ward	Data	1 Bedroom	2+ Bedrooms	CTRS*	Benefit Cap
<b>Nunhead</b>	Average loss of benefit	£838.66	£1,569.32	£116.00	£4,211.03
	No. households affected	96	32	1,523	45
<b>Peckham</b>	Average loss of benefit	£799.05	£1,531.46	£117.07	£3,526.98
	No. households affected	175	77	1,642	50
<b>Peckham Rye</b>	Average loss of benefit	£941.37	£1,561.21	£117.47	£5,433.65
	No. households affected	63	24	847	21
<b>Livesey</b>	Average loss of benefit	£838.31	£1,454.67	£117.58	£3,765.59
	No. households affected	194	87	1,482	41
<b>The Lane</b>	Average loss of benefit	£854.39	£1,443.94	£116.46	£4,239.47
	No. households affected	128	55	1,269	35

\*Council tax reduction scheme

#### **17. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK**

What is the council doing to tackle anti social behaviour on estates in Chaucer ward? How will the new complaints procedure ensure that council officers respond properly to anti social behaviour complaints by residents?

## **RESPONSE**

The Southwark anti social behaviour unit (SASBU) works closely with the Chaucer safer neighbourhood team and resident involvement officers within housing to deal with anti social behaviour on estates and in the wider community.

Since April 2012 four notices of seeking possession have been served on tenants responsible for causing serious nuisance in their homes. Behaviours have included allowing dogs to trouble residents, rowdy behaviour associated with alcohol abuse, using the tenancy for cannabis cultivation and in one case allowing Class A drugs to be sold from the tenancy. One premises closure order has been secured under the Anti Social Behaviour Act 2003 and one tenant evicted.

23 acceptable behaviour contracts have been signed to deal with anti social behaviour (ASB) occurring in Chaucer Ward including:

- Six with young people who were found to be congregating in stairwells and causing a nuisance
- Two with households who were breaching their tenancy agreement and failing to control household members and visitors to the property
- 15 with street drinkers and rough sleepers found in the area.

In addition two ASBOs were secured against aggressive beggars and street drinkers who frequented Chaucer ward. As part of the ASBOs both are excluded from entering Chaucer ward including the estates therein. SASBU and police continue to carry out late night patrols on estates in Chaucer ward where residents have complained about rough sleeping and drug taking in their blocks.

Southwark is committed to dealing effectively with anti social behaviour. We do not anticipate that the change to a two stage complaint policy will have any impact on how the council responds to complaints of ASB on estates.

Other steps being taken include the replacement of CCTV cameras as part of the council's wider replacement programme for CCTV on estates. Not only will this improve the quality of cameras but they will also be monitored live and recorded at the improved CCTV control room based at Southwark Police Station.

The cameras on the Rockingham estate are scheduled for replacement in May and those for Tabard Gardens estate are scheduled for September (these dates are determined by the timing for the installation of microwave antennas to transmit pictures to the control room).

A deputation from Decima Street tenants and residents association attended the last cabinet meeting about anti social behaviour in their area. As a result, we are working with them to look at how to fund physical solutions, such as an entryphone system, as it is clear that the solution communicated to them by your ward colleague, Councillor McNally, to fund this through section 106 monies is unlikely to materialise in the near future.

The new complaints procedure is intended to offer a quicker and more streamlined approach to resolving customer complaints with a focus on resolution. The council aims to resolve all complaints locally, however if a resident remains unhappy they are able to escalate their complaint to the Housing Ombudsman for review.

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK TO THE CABINE MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

Yes I do Madam Mayor. I would like to thank Councillor Livingstone for his reply, although in the way it is worded, and I understand that is why that has to be issued separately from the document, and I would just like to pick up some thing from the penultimate paragraph; where you have named that Councillor McNally and the 106 funding actually allocating money to the Decima entry phones system. Now this happened before the other two Chaucer councillor were in post, so Councillor Hickson and myself are not aware of this. But as I understand it the Borough and Bankside Community Council in 2008 agreed this funding for Decima entry phones and they have, it was number four on the listing, and therefore in the 106 some of these have already been put into place.

So why are you saying that, that answer, that the money was going from 106 is unlikely to materialise when some of the money has already been allocated? Thank you.

**RESPONSE**

I would like to thank Councillor Clark for her supplementary question. I am a great fan of the project bank process and indeed as I am sure Councillor Clark will know, it actually originated around parts of Chaucer ward and Grange in the first place with the workers, the West Bermondsey Community Forum and I know that very well because I was one of the people who came up with the idea of the project bank in the first place.

The project bank has its limitations. It is only a list of potential projects which then need to be matched up again against potential 106 projects to come along, so in any case whenever the 106 could have come along is not dependant on where it is ranked by the community council, it is dependent on when there are relevant developments being brought forward that can provide that 106 money.

Now, unfortunately the 106 money it looks now as if it is very unlikely that it can ever provide for entry phone systems on council estate blocks and so that is why the statement is there.

As I put it, I am not trying to make any comment about people's motives in saying things to tenants and residents associations when they make those statements, what I am trying to point out is that that money was extremely unlikely ever to be able to come forward in the way it was suggested to the tenants and residents of Decima Street, and therefore it is absolutely right that we as a cabinet have agreed to work with the tenants and residents association to find what other ways can be put forward to ensure that the entry phone which I think that we all recognise there is a strong case for can be put in place on the Decima Estate. So that is all my statement means, is the fact that the project bank has its limitations and section 106 has its limitations. It is clear because of those limitations this work could not be brought forward through the project bank and section 106 we understand, and therefore it is absolutely right that we are working on a different solution so we can

help the residents of Decima Street who have suffered far too long with anti social behaviour.

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

What consultation was carried out regarding the planned relocation of the hostel for offenders to the Old Kent Road?

**RESPONSE**

The “hostel for offenders” which the councillor refers to is an approved facility currently located within the first phase of the Aylesbury regeneration area. It is operated by the Probation Trust and the site is held on a long lease by the Ministry of Justice. The facility provides accommodation for up to 30 offenders who have completed their prison sentence.

A drop-in consultation on the option of using this site for the re-provision of Ellison House was held for local residents in February and officers attended a further meeting to discuss this proposal in March. The views of local residents have now been taken into account and the use of this site has now been reconsidered. Officers will now look at the possible alternatives use for this site including housing that will contribute to the regeneration of the area. The re-provision of Ellison House within the Aylesbury area will also be reviewed.

In addition to the drop-in consultation, briefings were offered to local MPs and Bermondsey councillors as well as an offer to attend Bermondsey and Rotherhithe community council, which was declined – at which point a drop-in consultation was proposed as an alternative.

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

How many complaints have been received by the council relating to rogue landlords in each of the past three financial years (2010/11 to 2012/13)? How many successful prosecutions were recorded in each of these years?

**RESPONSE**

Rogue landlords often provide accommodation in overcrowded properties that are also unsafe for habitation and this presents a great concern for us. Our aim is to safeguard the health, safety and welfare of private tenants and take appropriate enforcement action against irresponsible landlords who place tenants in harms way.

The figures for complaints from tenants against a landlord due to the condition of their accommodation, for each three years are:

2010/11	766
2011/12	832
2012/13 (from April 2012 to February 2013)	824

The council carries out formal actions where environmental health officers have formally requested the landlord to carry out works as they have refused or ignored

requests from the tenants. The figures for formal actions for each of the three years are:

2010/11	58
2011/12	246
2012/13 (to the end of February 2013)	185

Figures for prosecutions of landlords:

2010/11	0
2011/12	4
2012/13 (from April 2012 to February 2013)	6

I commend the work of the fraud team, other council departments and our partners in targeting areas where there are a high number of properties let by rogue landlords. We have worked closely with the local safer neighbourhood teams, the UK Border Agency and the London Fire Brigade who have been fundamental in getting these prosecutions. This partnership approach is helping to stamp out the problem.

I am pleased that our work in responding to rogue landlords has been recognised by the Department of Communities and Local Government, and additional funding has been received to fully investigate and crack down on this problem. We have also acquired a thermal imaging map of the borough alongside a mapping dataset which shows all outhouses, sheds and garages so that we can target areas where we believe rogue landlords may be renting out accommodation that is not suitable for residential use.

**20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR TIM MCNALLY**

How much surplus cash is there in the housing revenue account? What is the predicted surplus for 2013/14?

**RESPONSE**

The housing revenue account (HRA) holds reserves and working balances to protect against financial risks and exceptional events given the scale and complexity of housing services and investment commitments. HRA reserves as at 31 March 2012 stood at £27.5m of which £16.8m is committed and £10.7m is uncommitted. This is broadly comparable with the council's general fund in percentage terms, but ranks twelfth lowest of the 29 London boroughs (as a percentage of gross expenditure). To put this in context, Southwark is the fourth largest housing authority in the country and the largest in the capital (in terms of stock and gross HRA expenditure). Moving to the inner and greater London averages would require Southwark to increase reserves to £67.2m and £55.4m respectively.

In common with other local authorities, the council anticipates considerable pressure on rent arrears as a result of welfare reform policies being implemented by central government during the course of 2013/14, and has prudently increased its provisions in this regard accordingly. Clearly, the policies of the coalition government in this regard are increasing the risk for the authority on levels of rent

collection and it would be irresponsible not to make some provision within the HRA to address this significant risk.

Over the last decade, audited HRA reserve balances were as listed below:

	<b>Earmarked £m</b>	<b>Non-earmarked £m</b>	<b>Total £m</b>
31 March 2002	4.8	4.4	<b>9.2</b>
31 March 2003	13.5	9.2	<b>22.7</b>
31 March 2004	23.9	13.9	<b>37.8</b>
31 March 2005	18.0	9.5	<b>27.5</b>
31 March 2006	24.4	7.6	<b>32.0</b>
31 March 2007	31.7	5.7	<b>37.4</b>
31 March 2008	24.7	5.7	<b>30.4</b>
31 March 2009	13.9	4.3	<b>18.2</b>
31 March 2010	11.7	2.4	<b>14.1</b>
31 March 2011	19.0	1.6	<b>20.6</b>
31 March 2012	23.9	3.6	<b>27.5</b>

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

How much has the council spent dealing with illegal fly-tipping in each of the past three years? How many successful prosecutions has the council made for illegal fly-tipping in each of the past three years?

**RESPONSE**

Enforcement in relation to fly tipping is dealt with across several different services areas that carry out a range of environmental enforcement, prevention and educational duties. The cleansing teams for example, collect fly tips along with other waste across the borough such as the bags from litter bins, waste collected by our street cleaners and commercial waste. As a result, it is not possible to separate out exactly how much of the budget is spent purely on illegal fly-tipping. However, the resources deployed to clear fly tips have not been changed since 2008.

The number of reports received from residents in the last three years has fallen from 5,500 in 2010/11 to 3,970 in 2012/13, which suggests that the problem with fly tipping in the borough is reducing. The council's cleaning team are very efficient in responding to concerns of fly tips; with more than 98% of tips being removed within 24 hours of a report.

Residents and the public are well informed about the dangers of fly tipping and how illegally dropped waste encourages the look and feel of an unkempt and unsafe environment. Those caught illegally fly tipping face a number of sanctions, including being issued with a fixed penalty notice and vehicles being used for fly tipping being seized and/or crushed.

This year there has been one successful prosecution for an eight wheel lorry, dumping two loads. A £1,500 fine, £15 surcharge and £1,033 legal costs were issued.

We have also been using stronger fixed penalty notice (FPN) powers under Section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This is designed to target producers of controlled waste that have no legal way of disposing of their waste (i.e. to target waste producers before they fly tip). An officer issues a 'Producer' and failure to produce waste documents results in a £300 FPN being issued.

A three year breakdown is noted below.

	<b>Section 34s issued</b>	<b>FPNs issued</b>
01/04/2010 to 31/03/2011	181	48
01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012	162	22
01/04/2012 to 21/03/2013	381	67

**22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD**

What work is being done to provide community safety reassurance for residents living on the Aylesbury Estate?

**RESPONSE**

Considerable work has been done to provide reassurance for the residents of Aylesbury Estate following the tragic murder of Dogan Ismail in December 2012.

A multi agency action group has been established, chaired by Councillor Lauder, to oversee this work and an action plan has been drawn up.

The following has been implemented:

- A warden service has been introduced to the estate to provide an increased visible presence, to gather intelligence and to engage with the community
- CCTV has been installed in critical locations in and around the Aylesbury Estate. Four cameras are already installed and a further three cameras will be added following consultation with local residents. The cameras are monitored at the council's CCTV suite
- Southwark anti social behaviour unit (SASBU) have a dedicated anti social behaviour (ASB) officer working on the estate. As well as liaising closely with resident officers in housing, he also works closely with police to co-ordinate enforcement against offenders on the estate and those coming in to the area to offend and cause ASB
- A dedicated safer neighbourhood police team has been established for Faraday Ward with one additional police constable and one additional police community support officer allocated to the team
- A dedicated ASB reporting line has been established for Aylesbury residents to report issues. This phone line is located with the housing area office and calls responded to within 24 hours
- Early morning patrols have taken place on the estate involving police, wardens, SASBU and community safety's migrants impact worker to identify rough sleepers and disrupt them whilst signposting them to support services



- The eXcel Project (XLP) Youth providers are now based on the estate engaging with young people at a street based level
- 'Redeeming Our Communities', a charitable organisation who undertake restorative justice work, have been engaged to work with Aylesbury residents to introduce restorative justice and neighbourhood panels on the estate
- Funding has been secured to run youth programmes on the estate for Easter and Summer 2013
- DNA property marking has been offered to residents on the estate as part of an initiative to drive down burglary.

There is ongoing work to develop other projects to support the area including:

- Introducing 'Growing Against Gangs' targeted provision for pupils at Walworth Academy
- Providing a dedicated family focus officer to support the most complex families on the estate
- Creating a forum for young people to have input into the action plan, working with the principal of Walworth Academy to achieve this; this is part of ongoing partnership work with the principal at Walworth Academy
- The establishment of a neighbourhood watch scheme to cover the estate.

Officers from the Metropolitan Police Service, housing, regeneration, community safety and Creation Trust meet on a fortnightly basis to drive forward the Aylesbury Action Plan and to review crime and ASB levels, targeting resources across the estate as required.

Feedback from Creation Trust is that residents have recognised the increase in visible presence and activity in the area and have reported increased reassurance.

**23. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE**

Can he outline the council's preparations for implementing the government's poorly analysed welfare cuts, including plans to make monthly payments into individuals' bank accounts?

**RESPONSE**

The council has been one of six demonstration projects nationally for the direct payments for housing benefits to individuals' bank accounts rather than landlords. The project has been running since June last year.

The experiences of these pilots have exposed significant problems with the government proposals for those direct payments.

Of the Department of Work and Pensions initial sample of 1,474 Southwark tenants, only 805 (55%) were judged capable of receiving direct payments under the project. Despite this sifting, rent collection for this group has been 88%, compared to the 98% the council achieves across its total stock.

This suggests that arrears would increase by £14m per year if direct payments were applied to all our tenants.

It is worth stating that this is, if anything, a slightly rosy picture of the current arrears arising from the project, as any tenant who falls eight weeks into arrears is automatically switched back out of the project and into direct payment to the landlord. To date, 89 of the 805 Southwark council tenants within the project are 'switchbacks', meaning that only 716 tenants are continuing within the project, less than half the original sample.

The council has also written to households impacted by the introduction of the bedroom tax to explain this to them and what options could be available to them to help them address the shortfall, such as a mutual exchange or taking in a lodger, where it is safe to do so.

We are also working with advice services, such as the Citizens Advice Bureau, to provide advice and support.

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

Can the cabinet member outline how the council is responding to the Mayor of London's police and crime plan?

**RESPONSE**

The Mayor's police and crime plan, published on Monday, sought to identify a set of goals and objectives to tackle crime and make London a safer place, but we are concerned that with the disparity in demographics across London, that it is unlikely that a one size fits all approach would work as there are a wide range of priorities and competing demands across this diverse city.

We have addressed, amongst other points, the following key areas in our response to the Mayor's consultation:

- The need to acknowledge that effective crime reduction is more successful through a strong partnership approach. As well as the council, the probation service, fire service, health sector and the voluntary sector have been key contributors that have helped to shape and deliver innovative programmes to make people feel safe and reduce reoffending. The current plan makes little reference to the role of councils or voluntary organisations and does not have the feel of an inclusive plan which can reduce crime and anti social behaviour, and support victims.
- Ensuring that Southwark receives the number of police officers that it needs to address the crime and anti social behaviour issues that it faces as one of the capital's busiest inner London boroughs. An increase of two officers from 814 to 816 is wholly unsatisfactory, when just over three years ago the total number of officers accounted for over 900. This is particularly important if the Mayor is to focus officers to meet his own policing and crime priorities for London as a whole, in particular violent crime and crimes where young people are the victims.
- The loss of safer neighbourhood teams, to be replaced by a single PC and PCSO, will leave an inadequate community policing capacity to meet the needs of Southwark, particularly in our higher crime wards. It is clear that

many otherwise intractable issues have only been resolved in recent years through the ward-level team approach giving sufficient localised capacity.

- The 20-20-20 targets for reducing crime, improving victim satisfaction and improving criminal justice outcomes are unrealistic and appear to be political sound bites rather than based in and analytical evidence. In addition, the basket of seven priority crimes set out in the plan do not fully reflect the overall priorities set by the London Criminal Justice Board, the GLA crime priorities, or those of London boroughs. A better basket of indicators, which would tackle the crimes that matter to Londoners most would be:
  - Burglary
  - Street crime including robbery
  - Youth crime
  - Weapon crime (gun and knife crime)
  - Group offending
  - Violence with injury (including domestic violence)
  - Harassment (including a reduction in the number of repeat victims of anti social behaviour).
- In addition I have written to the Deputy Mayor to outline our offer of one-off money, from the savings generated through the purchase of 160 Tooley Street, for community safety initiatives, with the police having first call on this money for capital works to provide neighbourhood policing bases and contact points so that our community can keep the necessary police presence in areas where police stations may be closed.

Sadly, it appears that the Mayor has paid scant attention to these critical points.

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

Can the leader confirm the budget, staffing levels and operating hours for Southwark's anti social behaviour unit (SASBU) and the noise team for each year from 2009-10 until the present year?

**RESPONSE**

**Southwark Anti Social Behaviour Unit and Staffing Levels**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Staff numbers</b>
<b>2009/10</b>	1,090,469	16
<b>2010/11</b>	986,543	16
<b>2011/12</b>	845,550	12
<b>2012/13</b>	790.138	12

Southwark anti social behaviour unit operates during office hours from 9.00am to 5.00pm. However, due to the nature of the work the team do work flexibly so that they are able to support victims and witnesses out of office hours and to visit areas at times when anti social behaviour may be happening.

The unit currently has 12 members of staff. Attached to the unit are 2.5 police officers funded by the Metropolitan Police Service.

Following community safety's re-organisation of services in 2010 SASBU deleted two posts: one manager post and one case officer post. Two other posts were transferred to other business units within community safety. They were the ASB policy officer which was transferred to the community safety partnership business unit and the arson reduction officer post which transferred to emergency planning and resilience service.

The council is now dealing with 28% more cases than in 2010/11 (1,884 in 2012/13) and so it is not the case that fewer cases are being dealt with as a consequence of these changes.

### **Noise Budget and Staffing Levels**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Staff numbers</b>
<b>2009/10</b>	719,158	15
<b>2010/11</b>	694,770	14
<b>2011/12</b>	526,178	15
<b>2012/13</b>	662,117	15

### **Noise Hours 2009-13:**

For the financial years 2009-2011 the environmental enforcement team delivered the noise function and provided a 24/7 service.

The 2011 reorganisation saw the disaggregation of noise and enforcement with their functions being delivered by separate dedicated teams. The 24/7 element was removed and a new reduced out of hours rota was drawn for the noise team.

The new noise and nuisance team rota was reviewed in line with statutory requirements, the current financial situation, service request trends, benchmarking against our six nearest neighbours and best practice.

From June 2011 the 24/7 element of the noise team was reduced to a daytime service and out of hours cover at the following times:

- Sunday to Thursday 8.00pm to 2.00am
- Friday 9.00pm to 3.00am
- Saturday 9.00pm to 3.00am
- Saturday daytime 1.00pm to 9.00pm
- Sunday daytime 8.00am to 4.00pm.

However, following a pilot introduced in February 2012, the operational hours were extended from 1 March 2012 to:

- Monday to Thursday 7.00am to 2:30am
- Friday to Saturday 7.00am to 5.00pm then 6.30pm to 4.00am
- Sunday 8.00am to 02.30am.

The changes have allowed for an increase in the number of professionally qualified staff in the team to improve the quality of the response. Only 2% of calls have been received outside the hours of operation of the service. All response targets continue to be met.

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

How many complaints were received by the noise team in the past year? How many complaints were received outside operational hours? What percentage of rapid requests received outside operational hours were responded to within the target timeframe?

**RESPONSE**

8,487 service requests were received by the noise team from 1 April 2012 to 20 March 2013; 6,766 of these requested a rapid response. Of the total rapid service requests, 0.3% (23 total) were received outside of operational hours, and 61% (14) of these were responded to within the target timeframe.

The service is available between the following hours:

Day	From	To
Monday	7.00am	2.30am next day
Tuesday	7.00am	2.30am next day
Wednesday	7.00am	2.30am next day
Thursday	7.00am	2.30am next day
Friday daytime	7.00am	5.00pm
Friday night	6.30pm	4.00am next day
Saturday daytime	7.00am	5.00pm
Saturday night	6.30pm	4.00am next day
Sunday	8.00am	2.30am next day

\*No service on Christmas Day.

These hours amount to 135 hours 30 minutes a week, significantly greater than the hours covered in our neighbouring boroughs in south London: Lambeth (98 hours 30 minutes a week), Lewisham (76 hours 30 minutes a week), Bromley (45 hours a week), Greenwich (88 hours 30 minutes in summer, 74 hours 30 minutes in the winter), Croydon (84 hours a week) and Wandsworth (95 hours a week).

Eighty percent of cases reported are classified as requiring a rapid response within 45 minutes, whilst the remaining cases require a response within three days. The service continues to meet its targets for these response times: 75% for rapid requests and 95% for non-rapid requests.

**27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN**

When will the CCTV on the Arnold estate be fixed? Will the cabinet member commit to reviewing and improving CCTV across the whole estate?

**RESPONSE**

I am pleased to be able to confirm that the upgrading of the CCTV on the Arnold Estate is already included as part of the CCTV refresh programme that cabinet agreed in September. This work will upgrade all housing estates CCTV over the forthcoming year, and will also include the provision of additional redeployable CCTV cameras.

The cameras on the Arnold estate are part of this programme, and are scheduled for replacement in the autumn by new cameras. The work should be complete in November.

Part of the upgrade programme is to ensure that the new cameras can be monitored and recorded from the council's CCTV control room at Southwark Police Station, and a microwave network of antennas is being installed to provide the capacity to do this as part of the overall programme. The pace of the CCTV replacement programme is determined by the installation of these antennas. The relay antenna for Arnold Estate will be installed at Lupin Point.

The full schedule of estates in the replacement programme is:

By May	Draper Estate, Brandon Estate, Castlemead, Wyndham & Comber Estate, Elmington Estate, Rockingham Estate
By June	Perronet House, Newington Estate
By August	Abbeyfield Estate, Hawkstone Estate, Osprey Estate, Silverlock Estate, Bonamy Estate
By September	Tabard Gardens Estate, Kipling Estate
By November	Rouel Road Estate, Longfield Estate, Arnold Estate
By December	Tustin Estate
By January	Kingswood Estate
By February	Gloucester Grove Estate

In addition, there is a stock of deployable cameras as part of the programme. Four of these are now operational on the Aylesbury Estate, with another three to be located there in April. Four are to be located on the Manor Estate in April. The others will be located later in the year on the basis of cases put forward by Southwark anti social behaviour unit.

Finally, there is a separate programme outside of the above for cameras on the Four Squares Estate, which will also include John Roll Way.

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

How much has been spent on a) the purchase of mousetraps and b) other pest control measures at council offices in the past two years?

**RESPONSE**

There are currently 34 sites that receive pest control services as a service within the council's corporate cleaning contract. The number of sites has reduced over this period as a result of the ongoing accommodation strategy.

- a) Mousetraps are not generally utilised as part of the routine and reactive pest control service. However as part of a specific and additional programme of work at Tooley Street undertaken in January 2013 they were successfully

deployed in key locations within the building. The specific cost of mousetraps as an element of this programme was £580.

- b) The cost of pest control services for council sites within the contract in 2011/12 was £31,500. For the 2012/13 financial year we are forecasting a reduced cost of £28,500 due to the decrease in the number of operational buildings. Expenditure for the two year period 2011/12 and 2012/13 is therefore expected to be £60,000.

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

What breaches of confidential council-owned data have occurred since 1 January 2011? What measures are put in place to encrypt confidential data? What process is in place to deal with incidents of sensitive data loss?

**RESPONSE**

The council operates a data protection policy which is available at:  
<http://thesource/Content.asp?id=3215&cat=621>

The council maintains a data loss register but this only records personal data breaches (i.e. relating to an individual) not confidential council-owned data (i.e. broader 'leaks').

As an example, the accidental posting of the regeneration agreement during the compulsory purchase order is not considered 'personal data' and not recorded.

Since January 2011 there have been 31 potential breaches concerning personal data which were reported and investigated in line with the council's data protection policy and the Information Commissioner's Office were advised in each case.

All staff have access to information about how to keep data safe and on the council's confidentiality policy. Staff are required to protect information and encrypt information, especially that which would be deemed confidential in order to increase the security of data and prevent unauthorised access.

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

Can the cabinet member please provide details of all grants which Southwark has applied for in the current financial year, including the funding organisation, amount involved and whether the application was successful or not?

**RESPONSE**

Whenever a bid is made in application for a grant, this will be accompanied by a contract Gateway 1 (GW1) report. If the bid is later successful, it will be confirmed through a contract Gateway 2 (GW2) report, both of which are signed off by the relevant strategic director. The table below provides a summary of this.

Applications yet to be determined would still be subject to a GW2 report, depending on the success of the bid and so not all bids are able to be confirmed in the list below. There can be a lengthy or short period between bid application and bid acceptance/decline.





Date	GW1 / GW2	Revenue £	Capital £	Rev/Cap £	Description	Funding Body	Year
01/06/2012	GW1		230,000		TfL Greenways	TfL	
11/06/2012	GW1	150,000			Southwark Flood Alleviation Scheme		
11/06/2012	GW1		5,232		Whites Ground play area	Leathermarket JMB	
11/06/2012	GW1		30,000		Bethwin Road MUGA	London Marathon Charitable Trust	
12/06/2012	GW1	483,848			Drug Intervention Programme	Mayor of London	
28/08/2012	GW1		1,424,000		Empty Homes Programme	GLA	2012-15
14/09/2012	GW1	12,000	150,000		Southwark Park Sports Complex	Sport England	2012/13
14/09/2012	GW1	2,500			Run Athletics Activator	England Athletics	2012/13
14/09/2012	GW1	40,000			Young Roots	HLF	2012-14
14/09/2012	GW1		97,719		Camberwell Baths Sports Hall	Sport England	2012/13
14/09/2012	GW1	30,000	220,000		Southwark Park Sports Complex	Mayor of London Facilities Fund	2012/13
14/09/2012	GW1		100,000		Southwark Park Sports Complex	London Marathon Charitable Trust	2012/13
11/10/2012	GW1		31,250		Community Learning Innovation Fund	NIACE	2012/13
11/10/2012	GW1		509,000		Willowbrook Road Bridge and Dulwich Wood park retaining wall	London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG)	2013/14
17/10/2012	GW1	69,039	7,630		All about the Band	Youth Music	2013-15
30/11/2012	GW1		1,000		Belair Park Lake Planting	Dulwich Society	2012/13
07/03/2013	GW1	65,000			Herne Hill and Comber Grove Flood Alleviation Scheme	GLA	2012/13
07/03/2013	GW1		10,500		Peckham Rye Station Grand Stair £4,500 2011/12 and £6,000 in 2012/13	Railway Heritage Trust	2011/12-2012/13
15/03/2013	GW1		11,830		Peckham Rye Station Grand Stair £10k and £1830 by email	National Rail	2011/12-2012/13
15/03/2013	GW1		121,700		Burgess Park BMX	Mayor of London Play Sports Facility Fund	2013/14
15/03/2013	GW1		75,000		Burgess Park BMX	London Marathon Charitable Trust	2013/14
15/03/2013	GW1	16,408			Recycling Communication support	WRAP	2012/13

Date	GW1 / GW2	Revenue	Capital	Rev/Cap	Description	Funding Body	Year
01/06/2012	GW2	50,000			Peckham Townscape Heritage Initiative	HLF	
01/06/2012	GW2	78,000	360,000	438,000	Nunhead Area Renewal		
11/06/2012	GW2		5,232		Whites Ground play area	Leathermarket JMB	
11/06/2012	GW2		30,000		Bethwin Road MUGA	London Marathon Charitable Trust	
12/06/2012	GW2	483,848			Drug Intervention Programme	Mayor of London	
18/06/2012	GW2	108,163			Youth crime and substance misuse prevention	Mayor of London (Policing and crime office)	2012/13
11/10/2012	GW2	21,450			Cleaner Air 4 schools	DEFRA	2012/13
11/10/2012	GW2		31,250		Community Learning Innovation Fund	NIACE	2012/13
30/11/2012	GW2		509,000		Willowbrook Road Bridge and Dulwich Wood park retaining wall	London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG)	2013/14
30/11/2012	GW2		1,000		Belair Park Lake Planting	Dulwich Society	2012/13
07/03/2013	GW2	65,000			Herne Hill and Comber Grove Flood Alleviation Scheme	GLA	2012/13
07/03/2013	GW2		10,500		Peckham Rye Station Grand Stair £4,500 2011/12 and £6,000 in 2012/13	Railway Heritage Trust	2011/12-2012/13
15/03/2013	GW2		11,830		Peckham Rye Station Grand Stair £10k and £1830 by email	National Rail	2011/12-2012/13
15/03/2013	GW2		121,700		Burgess Park BMX	Mayor of London Play Sports Facility Fund	2013/14
15/03/2013	GW2		75,000		Burgess Park BMX	London Marathon Charitable Trust	2013/14
15/03/2013	GW2	16,408			Recycling Communication support	WRAP	2012/13

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

What is the average resolution time for a) members' enquiries b) resident complaints in the last 12 months from the point the enquiry is made to when it is finally resolved, broken down by department?

**RESPONSE**

As set out in the table below, housing and community services (HCS) receives the majority of member enquiries (MEs) and complaints. These statistics include housing repairs. Repairs MEs and complaints are not closed until the customer verifies that they are happy for the matter to be closed. If repairs were removed, the statistics for HCS would show 16 days to completion for complaints and eight days for MEs.

While the chief executive's department shows low numbers of MEs and complaints received, these tend to be the most complex and challenging cases, which can take some time to resolve, which is reflected in their statistics.

The figures do not include social care as they do not log MEs in the same way as the rest of the council. Additionally, management of adults' complaints transferred from the primary care trust in October 2012 and it has not been possible to provide a full set of data. However, children's and adults services complaints are now managed by the customer resolution team who will be bringing the reporting for social care in line with the rest of the council.

<b>2012-13</b>	<b>Chief Exec</b>	<b>Environment</b>	<b>Finance</b>	<b>HCS</b>	<b>LBS Total</b>
MEs - Volume	103	1016	277	2938	4334
MEs - Average working days to complete	20	7	6	16	14
Complaints - Volume	136	1328	982	3646	6092
Complaints - Average working days to complete	29	11	9	32	23

**32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND OLYMPIC LEGACY FROM COUNCILLOR ABDUL MOHAMED**

How will the council ensure that the aims and objectives of the Olympic Legacy Board are sustained?

**RESPONSE**

I am determined that we continue to build on the opportunities that have been created by our successful 2012 Olympic and Paralympic programme. The Olympic Legacy Board was set up to ensure we have feedback and agreed actions on the programmes initiated under the work streams of volunteering, young people, health and wellbeing and experiencing Southwark cultural scene. The board meeting this week assessed progress so far and agreed forward actions. The board will receive regular reports from officers and partners which will include:

1. The delivery of projects funded through the council's capital legacy programme including the restoration of the Herne Hill velodrome, the BMX track in Burgess Park and regenerated football pitches in Peckham.
2. Assessing ongoing volunteering opportunities for local residents, especially young people. Young people now have the opportunity to become volunteering ambassadors for the "y-volunteer" programme. Other volunteering opportunities include a volunteering passport programme, funded by the National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NAICE) which gives young people in Southwark opportunities to volunteer with arts organisations, Big Dance sustainability programme and a renewed volunteer strategy.
3. Community sports and health and wellbeing are developing programmes which will involve both young people and adults, including those with disabilities, in sport and fitness activities. Extensive research has been carried out by our sports development department to assess the impact of the Olympics on the level of sporting activity that young people now aspire to. It is evident that running and other athletics sports are particularly popular which indicates how important it is to restore the Southwark Park track. There has been significantly increased use of the Southwark Get Active web page which lists all the sporting activities available in the borough.

**33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND OLYMPIC LEGACY FROM COUNCILLOR THE RIGHT REVEREND EMMANUEL OYEWOLE**

With comparable London boroughs making reductions in spending on Black History Month, what is the council doing to maintain its appeal and innovative themes with all ages?

**RESPONSE**

The council believes Black History Month (BHM) is an important event in Southwark and the budget has been maintained since 2010.

BHM 2012 statistics revealed that 98% of the audiences were happy with the programme. Over a third of the attendees were young people. Detailed work is now taking place on setting up the 2013 programme and we will be consulting the community and stakeholder organisations which we hope will include a programme for schools in conjunction with the Cuming Museum.

**34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND OLYMPIC LEGACY FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU**

What is the council doing to bring Southwark Park track back into use so the youth of the borough have a track to utilise and build upon the great performances of recent years in the London Youth Games?

**RESPONSE**

Southwark Park track has been awarded £370,000 from the council's Olympic legacy fund. This funding is attracting external funding to the project.

Council officers are currently developing a proposal for the facility and continuing to apply for funding to:

- Replace the track.
- Improve accessibility – to create opportunities to develop disability sport
- Improve energy efficiency – replacing boilers, lighting systems etc
- Improve ambience – air conditioning and improved decoration to enhance customer experience
- Improve utilisation – streamline the operational spaces
- Improve amenity value – ensure the building integrates better with the park environment through sympathetic refurbishment of the building fabric
- Providing a lasting Olympic and Paralympics legacy.

The facility will be reconfigured and upgraded, including a re-laid athletics track, new field events areas and infield. The building would be refurbished to support activities, with improved changing facilities and ancillary areas.

It is clear from the research on sport activity take up since the 2012 Olympics that many people, especially young people, want to do athletics, including running. Replacing the track is therefore very important for Southwark.

The project will also have a positive impact on sport in the community by:

- Development of disability sports
- Increased regular fitness participation among local residents
- Contribute to reducing obesity and heart disease
- Used by local schools and colleges
- Provision of a valuable training and multi-sports outlet for young people from local estates
- Establishing a Southwark athletic club and delivery of athletic development plan
- Enabling aspiring Southwark athletes to train in the borough tapping into local talent.

### **35. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK**

Will Southwark consider introducing a short extension to parking before enforcement for residents only, as has been introduced in other London boroughs, to allow local residents extra time to park without the need for a full permit?

#### **RESPONSE**

The logistics required to implement 15 minutes free parking for all residents would be complex and costly. To be available to all in the borough, all resident vehicle owners, as opposed to only those currently with residential permits, would need to register and maintain their vehicle details with the parking service, which would then need to verify that the vehicles are registered in Southwark.

As well as a significant direct loss of revenue, additional costs would be incurred as the civil enforcement officers would need to check the vehicle details and return after 15 minutes to ensure compliance. This would require significantly more staff if the current enforcement levels on Southwark's roads are to be maintained.

**36. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON**

Following the council's recent decision to sign up to the London cycling campaign 'safer lorries, safer cycling' pledge, what changes will be made, and when?

**RESPONSE**

I am proud to have signed the council up to the London cycling campaign's 'safer lorries, safer cycling' pledge. This is a very good thing. It further demonstrates our continued commitment to being especially responsive to the safety needs of vulnerable road users and creating one of the most cycle friendly boroughs in the capital.

Officers have completed a draft action plan to work towards meeting the conditions of the pledge with cross-council colleagues and our partners including suppliers as well as contractors, and anticipate that the work outlined in the action plan will be completed by the end of this year.

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

How many parking penalty charge notices (PCNs) have been issued in each of the last three years in the borough for illegal or improper use of disabled parking bays? What is the council doing to ensure disabled parking bays are not used improperly?

**RESPONSE**

Over the last three years the number of vehicles parking illegally in disabled persons' parking bays has reduced by nearly one quarter.

<b>Financial year</b>	<b>PCNs issued in disabled bays</b>
2009/10	2,807
2010/11	2,182
2011/12	2,119

As well as enforcing by PCNs, the parking service has removed 257 vehicles from disabled bays to the car pound. Under the new contract vehicles will continue to be removed from disabled bays.

All motorists should be aware that they cannot park in a disabled bay without displaying the appropriate badge through national driver training and associated knowledge of the highway code and the council has pages on its website explaining the rules covering use of disabled bay for blue badge holders.

**38. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MITCHELL**

How many residential council properties are overcrowded? Please provide the information by ward.

**RESPONSE**

There are 6,048 applicants on the General Register categorised as being “overcrowded” (OC).

Of these 2,482 are Southwark tenants and 3,566 are non-tenants.

The 2,482 Southwark tenants are in the following wards:

Ward	Total OC
Brunswick park	132
Camberwell green	204
Cathedrals	64
Chaucer	124
College	81
East Dulwich	16
East Walworth	125
Faraday	272
Grange	106
Livesey	190
Newington	193
Nunhead	128
Peckham	172
Peckham Rye	67
Riverside	105
Rotherhithe	130
South Bermondsey	101
South Camberwell	112
Surrey docks	12
The Lane	122
Village	19
No data	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,482</b>

**39. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON**

What is the most recent estimate of the number of empty homes in the borough? How much has the council paid to secure empty residential council properties in each of the past three years?

**RESPONSE**

Using recent records from November 2012 and council tax base figures it is estimated that there are approximately 2,645 empty homes across all tenures. From this figure, 2,101 empty properties lay within the private sector.

There are 544 council housing voids, these include 96 voids in major regeneration schemes such as the Aylesbury Estate which are broken down as follows:

Aylesbury	35
East Dulwich	10
Elmington	10

Maydew House	41
Total	96

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 turn around to ensure these vacant properties are quickly occupied.

Since April to December 2012 the council has paid circa £900,000 for regeneration sites at Aylesbury & Heygate.

**40. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO**

How many evictions of squatters has the council been involved with in the current financial year, and how much has the council spent on such evictions? How many properties have been squatted in on more than one occasion?

**RESPONSE**

There are two estate properties which have been squatted more than once in recent times.

1. 24 Mayward House, Glebe Estate, SE5 7NA (non residential – converted office space) was squatted three times from 11 July 2012 to 26 November 2012.
2. 28 Mayward House (residential) was squatted two times from 10 November 2011 to 17 September 2012.

Legal costs for 2012/13 are currently running at £28,000.

24 Mayward House is included in Phase 1B of our hidden homes programme. The property address was brought forward for works due to the squatter issue.

28 Mayward House was re-let to a new tenant on 12 November 2012.

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

How much does it cost on average to replace a communal fluorescent light bulb in residential property blocks? What is the total amount of money spent on replacing communal light bulbs in each of the past two financial years (2011/12 and 2012/13 to date)?

**RESPONSE**

There are (circa) 100,000 fluorescent light bulbs across the council's stock. Approximately 20,000 are replaced each year because the average life expectancy is 2.4 years. The average cost to replace each bulb is £26.50. The total expenditure over the last two years was £438,000 for 2011/12 and to date in 2012/13 £482,000.

The council has embarked on a programme of retrofitting existing fluorescent bulbs with LED (Light Emitting Diode) bulbs across the borough. Seven pilot



projects have shown that LED uses, when compared with fluorescent, up to 48% less electricity. Equally, the bulbs have a life expectancy of 10 years (more than four times that of fluorescent bulbs). However, at between £70 to £90 each, they are clearly more expensive but the longer life and reduced energy consumption more than compensate for this. Further installations are planned throughout the borough.

**42. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY**

Noting that Southwark Life, Spring 2013, states that "by 2025 £3 billion will have been invested in the Elephant", please would the cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy provide a breakdown of that forecast expenditure indicating purpose and date of the expenditure and agency which is expected to incur it, together in each case with an indication of the date on which the agency is expected to commit to the expenditure?

**RESPONSE**

The figure has been calculated by totalling the anticipated development costs (land purchase and construction costs) of all the major schemes within the Opportunity Area. These are detailed below together with the current programme for the projects.

<b>Development</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Investment Commencing</b>
Heygate Estate Redevelopment	Lend Lease	£1.5bn	2013/14
London College of Communication Campus Improvement	UAL	£85m	2014/15
London South Bank University Campus Improvement	LSBU	£100m	On-going
Shopping Centre Redevelopment	St. Modwens	£500m	2015/16
One the Elephant	Lend Lease	£80m	2013/14
Strata Tower	Brookfield	£110m	Complete
Eileen House	Oakmayne	£80m	2014.15
Newington Triangle redevelopment	Hollybrook	£150m	2014/15
Tribeca Square	Oakmayne	£100m	Ongoing
360 Tower	GLA	£100m	2014/15
Heygate Rehousing Site Programme	LBS/RSL Partners	£90m	Complete
Manor Place Depot Redevelopment	TBC	£100m	2014/15
<b>Total</b>		<b>£2.995bn</b>	

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (MINUTES)  
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/14**

**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>