

Council Assembly (Ordinary)

Wednesday 16 October 2013
7.00 pm

Walworth Academy, 34 - 40 Shorncliffe Road, SE1 5UJ.

Supplemental Agenda No.2

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
2.2.	Public Question Time	1
	There has been two public questions submitted.	
2.3.	Deputation Requests on the Theme	2 - 5
	Five deputation requests are listed in paragraph 3 of this report. This report includes details of the five deputation requests on the themed debate.	
3.3.	Questions from the Public on the Theme	6
	There has been one public question on the themed debate submitted.	
4.	Other Deputations	7 - 9
	There has been two deputations submitted that are not on the theme and these are listed in this report.	

Contact

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

Date: 14 October 2013

Agenda Item 2.2

Item No. 2.2	Classification: Open	Date: 16 October 2013	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Public Question Time	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

1. QUESTION FROM MICK BARNARD TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

When a report is presented to members at a committee meeting and is then subject to an amendment by those members present are the names of those proposing the amendment and the rationale behind that amendment recorded and if so where are they recorded?

2. QUESTION FROM WRAYBURN RESIDENTS' TOGETHER TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY

Residents living next to a building site at Chambers Wharf are still living with single paned windows that allow noise/dust into their homes. Regarding the building of new flats, where is all the 106/community money going to and can some be re-allocated to help mitigate against continued disturbance?

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	14 October 2013

Item No. 2.3	Classification: Open	Date: 16 October 2013	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Deputation Requests on the Theme – Green Southwark	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That council assembly notes the deputation requests received for consideration by this meeting as listed in paragraph 3 of the report.
2. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear a deputation from the three groups listed in paragraph 8 of the report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Deputations received for this meeting

3. The following deputation requests have been received by the deadline for consideration by this meeting and they are list in the order received below:
 1. London Wildlife Trust
 2. Friends of Nursery Row Park
 3. Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park Dog People
 4. Friends of Burgess Park
 5. Dulwich Residents' and Amenity Groups
4. The details for the deputations on the themed debate are set out in this report. The details of the other deputation are set out in item 4.

Procedure at the meeting

5. The council assembly procedure rule 2.6 (11) states that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting, and deputations shall be considered in the order of receipt. However the meeting can decide to suspend this rule in order to hear more or vary the order.
6. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, council assembly can decide:
 - to receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; *or*
 - that the deputation not be received; *or*
 - to refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
7. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. One member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than 5 minutes. The deputation spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by him or her shall be invited to ask a

question of the leader or relevant cabinet member. After this time councillors may ask questions of the deputation for up to 5 minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public seating area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Deputation requests on the themed debate

8. The following deputation requests were the first three requests received on the theme. The deputations are listed in order of receipt.

1. Deputation from the London Wildlife Trust

The deputation request states:

Over the past 30 years Southwark has a relatively reputable track record for an inner London borough for protecting biodiversity and supporting community initiatives to enhance greenspaces for wildlife. London Wildlife Trust has worked on a range of activities in Southwark since 1981 to help protect the borough's ecological assets, and work with both the council and a range of organisations, large and small, to ensure that people can benefit from a close contact with the natural world close to where they live. Nevertheless, there are continuing losses to greenspace and adverse impacts to biodiversity across London, and the demands for exploiting space to meet economic and demographic growth will put these under even greater pressure. New concepts such as ecosystem services, green infrastructure and biodiversity offsetting could provide means to redress this loss, but this depends on robust ecological knowledge being embedded at the heart of key decisions, especially in planning, regeneration and the design & management of spaces.

2. Deputation from Friends of Nursery Row Park

This deputation request states:

The Friends of Nursery Row Park would like to apply to make a deputation to the assembly. Our deputation is partly to thank the council for designating the park a Field in Trust after many years of campaigning for better protection, and to ask a question related to the Stead Street development: could the assembly please clarify the extent and timing of S106 funding from the adjacent Stead Street development that is allocated to play and open spaces, and indicate what percentage is likely to be allocated to Nursery Row Park and how we, as a friends group, can get the community involved in deciding the priorities for any such funding?

3. Deputation from the Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park Dog People

The deputation states:

We are responsible dog owners, and we are a diverse and inclusive community. The managers of Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park (GMH) contacted us and we have been working with them on initiatives to support dogs in the park, such as a proposed doggie water fountain. There was a lot of shock among us, then, to see signs up around the park announcing that 'incidents' involving dogs in the borough's parks have increased, and to find an online survey which many of us

found to be extremely negatively biased against dogs. We are concerned that the results of this survey can only be heavily negatively biased by the tone of the survey. We are concerned that responsible dog owners and their dogs in our parks are at risk of being scapegoated, in place of effective action being taken to address the genuine problems in our park, dog-related and otherwise.

On discussion with the head of the parks department, it also became clear that the rise in dog-related 'incidents' almost entirely related to dog fouling, and that excrement in our parks is only recorded as human where it is accompanied by toilet paper, which seems likely to very much under record this problem, while overstating dog fouling. Unfortunately in GMH Park we have a major problem with rough sleepers, and their faeces. We would very much prefer to see something done about this, rather than any new restrictions on dogs.

We recently conducted a survey of our own among the GMH Dog People, with 50 responses. Major themes included concern about the rough sleepers and their excrement and about safety and security for people and their dogs in our parks. The main intention of our own survey though was to gauge support among the GMH Dog People for an area of fixed dog agility equipment within the park. This idea was mooted by the park managers and it received a strong mandate in our survey. 2/3 of respondents were in support, and most of these would use the equipment at least once a week. Rather than pursuing a negative campaign against the borough's dog owners, I urge the council to support this very positive initiative. Piloting an area of fixed dog agility equipment in GMH Park has the potential to raise the profile of responsible dog ownership, and increase the motivation, engagement and skills of those with badly behaved dogs.

4. Deputation from Friends of Burgess Park

The deputation request states:

Our focus for the deputation is to urge the assembly to consider completing the full masterplan which was set out at the beginning of the park's development. Since the revitalisation it has become an even greater asset to the local area and the local community but there is much more which still needs to be done. Other parks of similar sizes such as Mile End Park had more than £50 million invested over the time scale. £8 million and an ongoing maintenance programme is great start but with the scale of the park, we would like Southwark to fulfil the ambitions set out in the original masterplan to ensure Burgess Park reaches it's full potential.

5. Deputation on behalf of Dulwich Residents' and Amenity Groups

The deputation request states:

Dulwich Village residents and amenity groups would like to make a deputation at the council assembly on 16 October 2013 to highlight the importance of flood risk management in the borough, and the need to take steps to prevent surface water flooding particularly in the South part of the borough. Dulwich residents have been working with the council flood risk and drainage team over the past year to develop schemes and secure funding for a sustainable approach to surface water flooding. We would like to share our experience of community engagement with the assembly and touch upon other flood mitigation/green schemes that could be implemented in the future.

Other deputation requests received by the deadline

9. The other deputation requests received by the deadline are set out in item 4.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputation Request File	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228
Council Assembly Procedure Rule 2.6, Southwark Constitution	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer	
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	14 October 2013	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director Finance & Corporate Services	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	14 October 2013	

Item No. 3.3	Classification: Open	Date: 16 October 2013	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Questions from the Public on the Theme – Green Southwark	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

1. QUESTION FROM DONNACHADH McCARTHY TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

How much has Southwark Council invested in fossil-fuel (oil/gas/coal/fracking) corporations, and will the assembly agree to discuss proposal at its next meeting to dis-invest from all fossil-fuel corporations and the banks and pension-funds that fund them, as other councils, universities and institutions are doing?"

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	11 October 2013

Item No. 4.	Classification: Open	Date: 16 October 2013	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Other Deputation Requests	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear a deputation from the groups listed in paragraph 5 of this report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The full list of deputation requests received and the order in which they were submitted for this meeting is set out in item 2.3. The council assembly procedure rule 2.6 (11) states that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting. However the meeting can decide to suspend this rule in order to hear more or vary the order.
3. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, council assembly can decide:
 - to receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; *or*
 - that the deputation not be received; *or*
 - to refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
4. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. One member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than 5 minutes. The deputation spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by him or her shall be invited to ask a question of the leader or relevant cabinet member. After this time councillors may ask questions of the deputation for up to 5 minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public seating area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Other deputation requests

5. The following deputation requests were received on issues other than the subject of the themed section of the meeting. The deputations are listed in order of receipt.

1. Camberwell Library and Orchard

The deputation request states:

Camberwell has needed a proper library for the last 70 years and the current plans to address that need are welcomed!

But, build in haste regret at leisure aptly describes the current plans to build a library that is, on the drawing board, too small by half for current needs and by 2030 will be at best 1/3 the size of what will be needed to house a modern balance of books and computers, study space and meeting rooms.

There is room and need in Camberwell for BOTH a properly built library of well determined size to serve the Camberwell community well into the future and the existing, mature Orchard. We want the council to stop portraying this as either a library or a piece of unusual and much needed open space. There is good reason to doubt the council's sincerity, openness and honesty throughout the history of the battle to retain and cherish a rare oasis of dense quiet green space on an otherwise congested badly planted, planned and built loud urban intersection.

Camberwell Green and the adjacent Orchard are in one of the most cemented, ugly, desolate parts of Southwark. The Orchard must be taken off the table as a building site, for anything.

We want the council to stop an ill conceived plan to jam a very small building called a "library" simply by choice of a word into what could be developed into a spectacular piazza. The problem in this strange left over space in front of the Magistrate's Court is not the Camberwell Green Orchard but all the other awful buildings and the hodgepodge of terrible architecture and design and planning that has characterised this part of Southwark from the moment it stopped being farm land in the 1800's.

2. Deputation from Free Healthy School Meals Programme

The deputation states:

We are a group of parents and grandparents of children at Southwark schools.

We want to bring a deputation to council assembly on 16 October to call on the council to continue with their free healthy school meals programme. We are concerned that the new government scheme falls short of the scheme in Southwark, and with council's under increasing financial pressure, we want to ensure that the council make retaining this scheme for all primary children a priority.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputation Request File	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228
Council Assembly Procedure Rule 2.6, Southwark Constitution	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer	
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	11 October 2013	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director Finance & Corporate Services	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	11 October 2013	

This page is intentionally blank.

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

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

ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED	Copies	To	Copies
All Councillors	1 each	Others	
Group Offices	2	Elizabeth Olive, Audit Commission	1
Labour Group Office	1	Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
William Summers, Liberal Democrat Group Office	1		
Libraries (1 each)	3		
Albion / Newington / Local History Library			
Press	2		
Southwark News			
South London Press			
Corporate Management Team	5		
Eleanor Kelly			
Deborah Collins			
Romi Bowen			
Duncan Whitfield			
Gerri Scott			
Other Officers	4		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Robin Campbell	1		
Sonia Sutton	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
(Copies to Lesley John, 2 nd Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street)	20		
		Last Updated: May 2013	
		Total:	110