

Council Assembly

Wednesday 16 October 2013

7.00 pm

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

Tabled Items

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
1.1.	Announcements from the mayor, members of the cabinet or chief executive List of people associated with Southwark who had been made a working peer.	1
2.2.	Public question time Two questions submitted from the public with responses.	2 - 3
3.3.	QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE THEME Two questions submitted from the public on the theme with responses.	4 - 5
5.1.	Members' question time <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Two urgent questions with responses• Fifty three questions with responses.	6 – 72
7.1.	Children and Young People's Plan 2013-2016 One question from a councillor on the proposed 2013-16 Children and Young People's Plan.	73
8.1.	Representation to proposed Northern Line Extension Four questions from councillors on the Transport and Works Act Order for the Northern Line Extension.	74 - 76

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: 16 October 2013

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
8.2.	Constitutional Review 2013/14	77
	One question from a councillor on a constitutional issue.	

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**(ORDINARY)****WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2013****NEW WORKING PEERS 2013**

On Thursday 1 August 2013 it was announced that the Queen had approved recommendations from the four party leaders for thirty new working peers. The following recipients have an association with Southwark:

Richard Balfe – Conservative, former London South Inner MEP.

Jenny Jones – Green Party, former Southwark councillor.

Brian Paddick – Liberal Democrat who has lived in SE1 for many years, former Metropolitan Police Deputy Assistant Commissioner.

James Palumbo – Liberal Democrat, co-founder and chairman of Ministry of Sound Group.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER
PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

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?

RESPONSE

Council assembly is the only meeting of the council which formally records proposed amendments and the name of the member who proposed the amendment; this is a requirement of the council assembly procedure rules. The council does not record the reason for their amendment.

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?

RESPONSE

I would like to thank Wraybrun Residents for their question.

All windows on Wrayburn are to be replaced with new double glazed UPVC windows. An open day for residents was held recently at Wade Hall to discuss this project. It is anticipated work will commence spring 2014.

The s.106 agreement associated with the planning permission provided the following:

1.	Affordable Housing;	189 units on-site
2.	Education	£788,227.74
3.	Employment	£265,197.50
4.	Public open space and sports	£569,621
5.	Strategic Transport	£233,310
6.	Archaeology	£13,500
7.	Health	£534,293
8.	Community Facilities	£75,548 (standard charge)
9.	Admin costs	£47,622.82
10.	Local Community Project Bank	£1,500,000

A total of £4,027,320.06

There will also be the following provided 'in kind' (i.e. provided by the developer)

1.	Childrens' play equipment	£150,000	(to be provided on 2 sites)
2.	Site specific transport works	£1,180,000	(estimated)
3.	Public Realm improvements	£2,100,000	(estimated)
4.	Community facility	Value unknown	

The payments are staged relative to the development of each phase. The council has recently received the first payments from the first phase however the remaining payments and phases are likely to be some years away. The £1,500,000 towards local community project bank improvements will be considered against the project bank at the time of receiving the contribution. The current local project bank can be found on our website

http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200152/section_106/796/current_project_bank_ideas

The above payments are for mitigation of the impact of the finished development. They do not deal with mitigation of the impacts of construction. These are dealt with through a construction management plan which will control matters such as the hours of operation of the construction site so as to protect the amenity of nearby residents. They also contain codes of practice for considerate contractors so that inconvenience to local residents is kept to a minimum.

However, if before the new windows are fitted, practices on the site are causing noise and nuisance to local residents, this should be looked into by the council's noise team who can also deal with nuisances such as dust.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

(ORDINARY MEETING)

WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER

PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON THE THEME

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?"

RESPONSE

As at the end of September, the council has invested £6.3 million in fossil-fuel companies.

At the most recent Pensions Advisory Panel meeting, held on 18 September, we considered issues relating to ethical investment and asked for further work to be carried out. The appropriate mechanism for doing so would be through the council's Statement of Investment Principles, due for revision next year.

Ethical issues touched on included:

- the arms industry
- tobacco
- alcohol
- fast food and unhealthy food/drink companies
- pay-day loan lenders
- gambling businesses, including bookmakers
- banks
- oil companies - reference was made to oil spill pollution, intervention in sub-Saharan politics and fracking.

The council's pension fund has a legal duty to put the financial wellbeing of its beneficiaries as its foremost concern (*Cowan v Scargill 1985*). The very least ethical decision a pension fund could take would be one that resulted in not being able to pay the pensions of employee who had invested in the fund in good faith during their working lives. As a result, further work needs to be carried out to determine whether dis-investment of some or all of the above can safely be carried out without impacting on the overall financial health of the pension fund.

2. QUESTION FROM PAULA ORR TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

*What is the council doing to promote and conserve green spaces and build connections between these? Transition Town Peckham has produced a green spaces map, with a Southwark Council grant. Feedback shows local people

want to promote and develop green trails to increase opportunities for recreation and support greater biodiversity.

RESPONSE

Thank you to Transition Town Peckham for their question and I will be delighted to have a look at their green spaces map and discuss what initiatives to can bring to build on this good work.

Generally the council is making good progress to promote and preserve its green spaces, as demonstrated by the council receiving a record number of 17 green flag awards as well as receiving a 97% satisfaction rating from a public survey asking residents how they rate parks in this borough.

We have also made steady progress in developing green links. We have completed the Salisbury Row to Burgess Park path. We have implemented some of the Camberwell Green to Burgess Park green route with more future greening planned. We have also been successful in securing funding to revitalise and extend a green route (for walking and cycling) from Dulwich Park to Ruskin Park, along Greendale. We are also proposing Green links from Burgess Park to (1) Myatt's Fields, and (2) Victory Park.

Our Flood Risk Engineers are also working on flood risk alleviation schemes. We have secured £3.5m to introduce flood alleviation measures in the Dulwich and Herne Hill area, which will involve sustainable urban drainage measures delivering enhanced green landscaping. We are also currently seeking funding for a sustainable urban drainage scheme across the Camberwell area which will result additional linking of green infrastructure.

*Note: Question 2 was omitted at the time of Supplemental Agenda No.2 dispatch.

SOUTHWARK COUNCIL

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

(ORDINARY MEETING)

WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2013

URGENT QUESTION

1. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MITCHELL

Leaseholders on the Sydenham Hill Estate have just received actual service charge bills for 1012/13 with demands for payment of an additional £700. Included in the bills are increases in responsive repairs of 400%. Will the Leader request demands for payment are suspended until a full audit and investigation into the causes of these increases on the estate is carried out?

RESPONSE

I can confirm that an audit and investigation has taken place in regards to these charges but have asked officers to investigate any further complaints which the council receives. We have already done substantial amount of work on reviewing the responsive repairs breakdowns, including gathering photographic evidence where necessary. If there are further issues which leaseholders dispute then they should raise them with the council.

We will not be making any requests for payment until 31 days from the date of the amended 2012/13 actual letter (4 October 2013) which will expire on the 5 November 2013.

I understand that Councillor Andy Simmons and Councillor Helen Hayes organised a meeting last week for leaseholders on the Sydenham Hill estate to discuss the actual bills and that further meetings are planned to ensure that leaseholders have as much support as possible in this process.

2. URGENT QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

Will the Leader provide a list of all council land and property assets currently being considered for disposal, broken down by type (commercial, residential, etc)?

RESPONSE

The reason for urgency for this question was that disposal of Styles House has appeared on the November forward plan.

Styles House should not have appeared on the forward plan - this was an administrative error in the regeneration department. Initial discussions have taken place with a private developer, Development Securities, who have an option to acquire a derelict building adjacent to the estate. Development Securities proposed a jointly delivered scheme with the council that could deliver new council housing on the site. We have had discussions with the TRA and following their feedback, we have asked developers to look again at their proposals.

I am very sorry for any concern this has caused residents and have asked that everyone in Styles House is written to explaining the error and apologising for any concern that it has caused. I have also asked senior officers in the department to review the process of putting things on the forward plan to prevent mistakes like this happening in the future.

In answer to your specific question, the council does not hold a definitive list of property assets currently being considered for disposal, broken down by type (commercial, residential, etc).

Disposals are either identified through departmental service plans which identify property assets which are surplus to requirements, cabinet decisions for example the modernisation programme or from direct approaches from interested parties. Decisions to dispose are then referred to Cabinet if over the delegation limit as set in the constitution.

Disposals are a key part of the funding towards both the general capital programme and the housing investment programme - without them there we would not be able to fund new leisure centres, investment in parks or the warm dry safe programme. The level of disposals have not increased in recent years with around £30 - £35m raised per year for the last 10 years.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER
MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NICK STANTON

Can the leader of the council provide an update on plans for a new university technical college in Bermondsey?

RESPONSE

The council has been involved in and supported the development of proposals for a university technical college (UTC) on the Southwark College site in Bermondsey since its inception. The proposals to co-locate the UTC with a new secondary school on the same site were well advanced when Southwark College was taken over by Lewisham College last year. The subsequent sale of the site by the new college to the highest bidder gave no regard to these proposals and proceeded despite a competitive offer from the Education Funding Agency.

The delivery of a UTC would be of great benefit to Southwark by providing alternative educational options and routes into employment for our young people. Cabinet members and officers are working closely and positively with the purchaser of the site as well as other local representatives with the aim of delivering the UTC.

The cabinet member for children met with your ward colleagues, the local MP and others last month about this and will continue to engage with local councillors who have an interest in this.

2. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RENATA HAMVAS

Does the leader of the council agree with Liberal Democrat Peer, Baroness Shirley Williams, that Simon Hughes and the Liberal Democrats in Southwark were wrong to oppose free healthy school meals?

RESPONSE

Yes, Baroness Williams is right to criticise the Liberal Democrats in Southwark who are not only out of touch with local people but clearly an embarrassment to their party nationally.

Simon Hughes and the Southwark Lib Democrats are now trying to rewrite history and suggest that their virulent opposition to free school meals was simply a question of where the budget came from. This is not true. They opposed the principle of free healthy school meals and the universality of it. They said that families with an income of around £17,000 were too rich to receive a meal. They have built their entire opposition since 2010 on scrapping the meals and using the money for other things. They are saying that this change in policy will mean that Southwark has extra money. This too is absolute rubbish. The government is slashing our budget by £23 million next year - that means for every £1 we potentially receive for meals, they will take away £10!

3. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR STEPHEN GOVIER

Will the leader undertake to follow the example of the city of Copenhagen where all policy documents are void of any moaning about poorly parked bikes or anarchistic road behaviour by

cyclists and list all the steps taken to turn his ambitious words about making Southwark cycle friendly into reality before yet another cyclist is killed or seriously injured in Southwark?

RESPONSE

Southwark's transport plan sets out our ambition to improve cycling; this is framed in a positive and proactive manner.

This administration has set out our ambitions to make Southwark a safer place to cycle and to encourage more people to cycle. To help us achieve that aim we are currently undertaking the following initiatives:

- Delivered the Connect 2 walking and cycling bridge.
- Bikeability - a detailed survey of the authority's roads and motor traffic free paths to assess the skill level needed to cycle on them in relative safety. This is being used to identify gaps in the network and improvements.
- Developing a program of quietways and securing funding
- Green links in Camberwell, East Walworth and Faraday
- Supported improvements to the Herne Hill Velodrome
- Created a world class BMX track in Burgess Park
- Cycling events including a mass children's cycle ride, Dr Bike', 'safe urban drivers' courses and HGV exchanging places events
- Continue to offer cycle training free to adults who live, work or study in the borough.
- Working with schools on bikeability training, offer a bike loan scheme to teachers and run 16 school cycling clubs across the borough
- Bike security initiatives with the Metropolitan Police Service as well as continuing the program of on street and estate cycle parking.

Through our regeneration programme we are also:

- Redeveloping Elephant and Castle with Transport for London (TfL) to make it safer and more pleasant for cyclists
- Introducing 20mph through Camberwell town centre, improving the highway network and support the implementation of Cycle Superhighway 5
- Reviewing traffic management in the Lower Road area and working with TfL to deliver Cycle Superhighway 4.

We have also opened a new cycle parking hub at Peckham Rye Station.

There has been an increase in those cycling in the borough and in September the cabinet agreed to set a new target, this target sets a trajectory where 10% of all trips will be made by bike by 2026 – effectively doubling the previous transport plan target.

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

What is the timetable for the demolition and rebuild of the Elephant & Castle shopping centre?

RESPONSE

The current owners of the shopping centre are aware of the council's determination to see the shopping centre redeveloped and that a refurbishment option would not meet our wider regeneration and place making objectives. They are also aware that the Mayor of London supports our approach. St Modwen have previously sought to argue that uncertainty over the public sector's plans for the highway network and the requirements for a new Northern Line station has prevented them from bringing forward development plans. During the summer the council, supported by the Mayor of London, announced a funded plan to deliver the

peninsularisation of the northern roundabout and to provide a new enhanced Northern Line station with escalators. Therefore, St Modwen are now fully aware of how transport and the public realm will be improved at the Elephant and this long awaited agreement provides them with the clarity they have asked for. On the basis of this announcement St Modwen have stated that they intend to bring forward new plans to redevelop the site before the end of the year. As the council has previously stated we have reconfirmed that we are prepared to make available our compulsory purchase order (CPO) powers to support the right scheme for this vital site which provides a gateway into the new Heygate redevelopment and to the existing Walworth Road.

While there is now a transport plan in place the redevelopment of the site is still complicated and challenging. The site is constrained by roads on three sides and a railway viaduct on the fourth. There are many businesses operating within it and there are inevitably third party interests which will need to be acquired to enable a consented and viable scheme to go ahead. The council understands that many of the leases are likely to expire around 2015/16 however some do not and therefore it is likely that a CPO may be needed to enable development to proceed. All of these factors mean that any timetable is inevitably provisional at this time. However, subject to planning, CPO, other legal issues and commercial considerations we would expect the owners to start development from 2016/17.

5. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MARK WILLIAMS

What impact will Liberal Democrat plans to limit free healthy school meals to just children in reception, and years 1 and 2 have on children in Southwark?

RESPONSE

In Southwark, we have now rolled our free healthy school meals programme out to all primary school children against a backdrop of Liberal Democrat opposition.

Nationally the Liberal Democrats have now followed our lead by introducing free school meals, but have stopped short of Southwark's policy – by only providing meals for the youngest children. In Southwark that means that 11,694 children in years 3-6 will lose out on a free meal unless the council continue to fund them. I will continue that funding, but with the Liberal Democrats numerous other spending commitments it is clear that free school meals would not be safe if they ran the council. Faced with government cuts of over £23 million and with more to come, people will need to decide who they trust to protect their school meals. Labour with its record of delivery, or the Liberal Democrats with their record of opposition?

6. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN

How many two-year-old free early education places have been pre-purchased from providers? What were the criteria for selecting the providers to receive pre-purchased funds? By ward, which providers have been identified by the council to offer weekend, night or holiday free early education hours?

RESPONSE

To date we have pre-purchased 663 two year old places from providers, with further places currently under development. Providers have also been informed that should they fill all these places and still have demand for more, the council is likely to extend funding.

Under the terms of the new Department for Education (DfE) statutory guidance for early education and childcare, local authorities should fund any provider who is 'good' or 'outstanding'. The guidance also sets out the hours in which the free places can be offered - funded places cannot be offered later than 7pm, so night time places are not available under this offer. It is up to providers to determine which hours they can offer within the constraints of

the DfE guidance, but where providers are open all year round it is generally an option for parents to stretch their entitlement over holiday periods. No providers are currently offering weekend places, but given that the current national eligibility criteria are focused largely on children in workless households it is unlikely that there would be demand for this at present.

7. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR CLAIRE HICKSON

What action did the council take to stop the English Defence League (EDL) from marching in Southwark?

RESPONSE

On 7 September the English Defence League (EDL) organised a march from Southwark to Tower Hamlets. The EDL, and their message of hate, is not welcome in Southwark and I strongly opposed the march and their presence in our borough. I believe that the march was threatening and intimidating to Southwark's residents and visitors. People should have the right to go about their lives without fear of violence, disorder or disruption.

The council was notified just over two weeks before the march. We immediately raised our concerns with the police and also called the Acting Borough Commander into meet with us about the council's opposition to the march. The police were confident that they could operationally manage the march. However, my concern was not just about public order but also the threat and intimidation to residents, so I also wrote to the Home Secretary ahead of the march and asked her to use her powers to stop the march.

As the police allowed the march to go ahead, officers worked with them to ensure that we did all we could to enable it to be peaceful and limit disruption. This included working with licensed premises and community safety teams, ensuring services could continue to be delivered around the site, and that we were able to communicate with the public who had concerns about the march. We also contacted various groups in the borough including Islamic groups to offer support to them.

8. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL BUKOLA

How many hours has the council's IT service been down in each of the last 12 months? What does the council estimate to be the loss of staff productivity as a result of IT problems in the last year? What agreements exist within the council's IT contract regarding compensation for this loss of productivity?

RESPONSE

IT performance is monitored continually by the strategic director of finance and corporate services. Performance and specifically systems availability is subject to contractual arrangements that must meet a minimum standard. Below this level of performance, penalties are invoked on the contractors responsible. For the twelve month period, Serco were responsible until February 2013 and since then Capita have managed the service.

We do not have an estimate of the loss of staff productivity, but we all understand the disruption that unstable IT problems can create for staff. Issues particularly over the last month or so have been unacceptable and are being managed on a daily basis by Capita in response to the strategic director. Detailed plans are in place to resolve a range of issues that arose directly as a result of a serious hardware failure some weeks ago. Looking ahead, Capita are contractually committed to a series of core enabling projects that will give this council one of the most modern IT platforms available to any local authority in London - these projects are still on schedule to complete by February 2014, within one year of Capita taking over an ageing estate that had been overseen by previous contractors for over ten years.

Where appropriate and in line with terms of contract, the strategic director will recover all additional costs from Capita for any failings and will seek further compensation where appropriate.

Separately, the divisional executive director of Capita is writing to all members individually on recent issues and on future plans. We will of course keep a close eye on performance which must recover to the expected levels very soon. The cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety will be receiving regular reports on progress and will liaise with the strategic director as necessary.

9. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LAUDER

Would the leader update me on the council's progress building new council homes?

RESPONSE

Our commitment for 11,000 new council homes remains the most ambitious local authority housing programme in the country for a generation. Southwark is leading the way, showing how councils can play their part in solving the countries housing crisis and build new, quality, council homes.

The first phase of our council housing programme was agreed by cabinet last year, with the second phase coming to cabinet for approval on 22 October 2013.

Work on phase 1 is now underway. Work has started on site at Willow Walk, and all the remaining schemes are expected to be on site by April 2014, with completions following through between July and December 2015. The new homes will be a mix of social rented, shared ownership, and much needed extra care and short stay accommodation.

The table below sets out the timetable for the first 1,000 council homes.

Tranche/Phase	Approximate No. of Units			First start on Site	Last Finish on Site
	Affordable	Market	Total		
1	290	51	341	Aug 2013	Mar 2016
2A	101	4	105	Jun 2014	Dec 2016
2B	217	46	263	Jul 2015	Jun 2017
3	157	35	200	Jan 2016	Dec 2017
4	157	35	200	Jan 2017	Dec 2018
5	78	29	169	Jul 2017	Jun 2019
Float				Jul 2019	Dec 2020
Total	1000	200	1200		

The cabinet meeting in October will also consider the development of our long term plans to deliver an additional 10,000 new council homes.

10. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARBER

Southwark education improvement managers told the last Liberal Democrat led administration that the ideal size for a primary school is 2 or 3 form entry to ensure the best possible child focused experience in a sustainable school. This has been reiterated by Sir Robin Bosher who led the very successful London Challenge. Considering this advice why is his administration pushing for Ivydale School to permanently expand from 2 to 4 forms of entry per year?

RESPONSE

The relationship between school size and effectiveness is not as straightforward as Councillor Barber implies in his question. There is no simple causal relationship between the size of schools and academic performance.

Ofsted's 2009 report on Twenty Outstanding Primary Schools does not mention school size as a determinant of school success. However the study identifies outstanding schools of all sizes. Analysis indicates six of the outstanding schools are one form entry schools, nine are two/one and a half form entry schools, four are three/two and a half form entry and one school is a four form entry. Across the country schools are inspected and judged by Ofsted irrespective of size. Outstanding schools are outstanding schools.

What makes a difference in outstanding schools is excellent leadership, team work, and quality of teaching, assessment, values, aspiration and inclusion. Ivydale's most recent Ofsted report rated it as good, and said that "The headteacher's high expectations and ambition for improving the school are communicated well through her senior team and this is having a strong impact on rising standards."

11. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR DARREN MERRILL

What plans does the Leader have for the future of Walworth Town Hall?

RESPONSE

Following the fire at the Walworth Town Hall, the council's immediate focus was on the safety and security of the building. The council has been working with safety experts, insurers, English Heritage and other interested groups to agree a programme of works to stabilise the building while plans are put in place for its future use.

A four week contract to remove debris has recently been completed and works to install a temporary roof along the full length of the town hall building will start shortly. These works will prevent further damage to the historic fabric of the building. Donald Insalls Associates have been appointed to undertake an architectural condition survey and they expect to report back on their findings towards the end of the year.

On 16 July the cabinet agreed a vision for the future development of the building which took account of the feedback received from the initial public meeting in April. We are consulting on this vision which will continue through to the end of November. Our vision include:

- An enhanced Library space
- A space for the display of the Cuming collection and potentially a Southwark museum
- A flexible space that could be used for a variety of purposes including community and civic events, exhibitions and performances
- Facilities for marriage, civil partnership and citizenship ceremonies undertaken by the Southwark registrar's service.

The outcome of this work will come back to cabinet early in the new year.

12. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON

Why has the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) for the council's Tooley Street headquarters not been on prominent public display, as required by law? When was the last time it was on public display? Is the leader of the council aware of the law regarding the display of EPCs and the possible fines that can be issued for non-compliance?

RESPONSE

Energy Performance Certificates are for commercial buildings over 500m² that are frequently visited by the public. New legislation for them to be displayed was brought in earlier this year. For these purposes, the Council's Tooley Street offices are not classed as a commercial building. An EPC is therefore not required, and would only be required when selling or renting the premises.

However, a different Display Energy Certificate is required for public buildings over 500m² and occupied by a public authority. The draft DEC for Tooley Street is kept and ready for inspection if required. I have asked for this to be formally lodged and to be put on public display by the end of this week.

Officers have confirmed that neither an EPC nor a DEC was put on public display when the previous administration set up Southwark's headquarters in Tooley Street. I am pleased to rectify this.

13. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL COYLE

Can the leader update me on the impact that the Bedroom Tax is having on people in the borough?

RESPONSE

The Tory/Liberal Democrat government continues to hit people with the lowest incomes the hardest whilst voting for tax breaks for millionaires. In Southwark, our most recent data shows that there are 2,807 council tenants who are classed as under-occupying and where the bedroom tax applies, 58.7% of tenants are in arrears. The total arrears that is £1.5 million which has increased by £376,000 since the introduction of the bedroom tax as families already in arrears and struggling find it even harder to pay. In addition to those affected by the bedroom tax, there are also 171 council tenants who from this summer were also impacted by the benefit cap. Many tenants who want to move cannot do so because of the lack of available smaller properties in the borough.

However, while the Liberal Democrats and Conservatives in government hit local people hard, this Labour administration is taking steps to protect local residents from the worst excesses of the government's policy. £700,000 of the £1.2 million discretionary housing payment's budget had been spent by the end of September. The council obtained approval from the Department of Communities and Local Government to use £1 million of extra housing revenue account (HRA) funds to support additional discretionary housing payments. In the first six months of 2013/14, we have made 646 discretionary housing payments, compared to 468 for the previous 12 months of 2012/13.

We are also taking steps to support people who need to downsize. During 2012/2013 the council moved 150 under occupiers through our SMART Move initiative. Since April 2013 we have moved an additional 150 tenants. An additional £200,000 has been awarded to this initiative to support additional moves and tenants with arrears up to £1,000 will now automatically be approved to go onto the SMART Move scheme.

A new mutual exchange scheme has been launched with a 100% increase in tenants actively looking to exchange. During October 2013, the tenants who are overcrowding and under-occupying their homes will be invited to a series of speed dating events across Southwark to encourage customers to select suitable Mutual Exchanges and to facilitate moves to protect the tenants financial well-being and reduce overcrowding in council and housing association properties.

The council is working in partnership with Job Centre Plus to provide advice and assistance to 400 tenants who are under-occupying their homes on employment advice, interview skills, and CV writing. These same customers are in receipt of discretionary housing payments and are on the SMART Move list for a transfer to smaller accommodation.

14. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY

Please list the 10 highest cost taxi journeys paid for by the council since 1 January 2012, including details of each journey (pick up point, destination, cost and reason for journey).

RESPONSE

Set out below are the 10 highest cost taxi journeys through the council's taxi contract since 1 January 2012.

Booked Date	Dept	Business Unit	From	To	Journey Details	Cost (£)
07/02/2012	C&AS	Childcare North	SW16*	SE1*	Vulnerable Children	726.34
08/08/2012	C&AS	Out of Hours SWT	SE14*	PE3*	Vulnerable Children	372.07
28/08/2012	H&CS	Coroners Court	SE1*	SE7*	Coroner Service	287.76
05/10/2012	CE	Regeneration	SE1 2TZ	SE1 2TZ	Site visits - multiple locations	276.68
08/03/2012	C&AS	Childcare North	SE1*	SW16*	Vulnerable Children	256.36
04/07/2012	H&CS	Coroners Court	SE1*	SE1*	Coroner Service	251.79
08/11/2012	H&CS	Major Works	SE1 2TZ	SE1 2TZ	Site visits - multiple locations	241.00
10/02/2012	C&AS	Childcare North	WC1N*	SW2*	Vulnerable Children	231.40
18/03/2013	H&CS	Major Works	SE16 2BS	SE16 2BS	Multiple locations	223.00
29/02/2012	C&AS	Childcare North	SE1*	SW16*	Vulnerable Children	222.04

*We have not provided the full postcodes or details of the journey for those which involved the coroner's service or our work with vulnerable children to maintain their confidentiality.

I am pleased to report that our overall spending on staff taxis has reduced considerably. The table below shows the total spend figure for taxi transport (excluding VAT) for the financial year 2012/13 and previous years.

Financial year	Administration	Cost £000
2007/08	Liberal Democrat/Tory	226
2008/09	Liberal Democrat/Tory	222
2009/10	Liberal Democrat/Tory	246
2010/11	Labour	195

Financial year	Administration	Cost £000
2011/12	Labour	65
2012/13	Labour	52

15. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS

In light of recent serious accidents involving cyclists, what action is the leader of the council taking to improve cycle safety in the borough?

RESPONSE

My answer to question 3 sets out many of the infrastructure changes we have made and have planned to make cycling safer in the borough. In addition to this by becoming a 20 mile per hour borough, we will lower traffic speeds - the single most effective thing we can do to improve safety for cyclists and all vulnerable road users.

In addition to this Southwark:

- Are working closely with Transport for London (TfL) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) on implementing the Mayor's cycling vision and have committed to delivering a package of cycle routes over the next three years.
- Have delivered a wide range of measures such as free cyclist training (training around 900 children and 800 adults per year), HGV/cyclists awareness days, safer urban driver courses for HGV drivers, and school travel plans,
- Were the first borough in London to implement 'Trixi' cycle safety measures at key signalised junctions.
- Enforce moving traffic offences which cause risk to cyclists, such as driving in a bus lane, and we are supporting TfL in its quest to get further moving traffic offences decriminalised such as driving in a mandatory cycle lanes.
- Through our cycle joint steering group and working group we ensure that we work closely with local cyclists on all our road improvement designs, creating a better and more inclusive design process.
- Works closely with developers to ensure that they minimise wherever possible impact on cyclists from construction works related to major developments.
- Continues to press TfL to deliver better junctions on the red route network where the great majority of serious cycle accidents in the borough sadly occur.

16. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR SEATON (BOROUGH, BANKSIDE AND WALWORTH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)

What can the council do to mitigate the expansion of betting shops, pawn shops and fast food outlets along the local high streets, such as the Walworth Road and the Old Kent Road?

RESPONSE

Our ambition is to have successful town centres and shopping areas which have a range of shops, services and facilities which meet the needs of people in Southwark. We have taken a number of steps to try and tackle issues such as the proliferation of fast-food shops. For example we have set a maximum threshold for the number of hot food takeaways in the main shopping frontages in some areas of the borough to address the clustering and number of

these shops in the future. In addition we are concerned about the clustering of betting shops, payday loan shops and pawnbrokers on some of the borough's high streets and the impact this is having on town centres and local residents.

Local authorities' ability to manage the balance of uses on the high street and proliferation of individual uses is constrained by the General Permitted Development Order which allows a change of use from Class A3 (restaurants and cafes), Class A4 (drinking establishments) and Class A5 (hot food takeaways) to uses in Class A2, and also changes of use within the A2 use class without the need to apply for planning permission. The government also recently introduced further flexibility to permitted development which allows a temporary change of use from A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments), A5 (hot food takeaways), B1 (business), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) to a A1, A2, A3 and B1 for a period of two years.

The advice given by the government is that local authorities can use an Article 4 Direction to help control certain uses, such as betting shops, by removing permitted development rights and requiring a planning application to be made. The proposal would then be determined in accordance with the Local Plan policies. Southwark has taken action on this issue our planning committee recently endorsed the making of two Article 4 Directions with immediate effect in all of the borough's protected shopping frontages. These are the areas most affected by the clustering of betting shops, payday loan shops and pawnbrokers. This includes withdrawing the permitted development rights for:

1. Change of use from A5, A4, A3 to A2 use; and
2. Change of use from a range of town centres uses to A1, A2, A3 and B1 for a temporary period of two years.

The preparation of the new Southwark Plan will provide an opportunity to explore a more "fine grained" approach to assessing the mix of uses in our town centres and protected shopping frontages. The first stage of preparation will be an Issues paper, which will be published later this year for consultation.

In August I announced my ambition to introduce a levy on betting shops and to use this money on our high streets. I have asked officers to do further work on this and to look at how this could work in Southwark.

17. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE (BERMONDSEY AND ROTHERHITHE COMMUNITY COUNCIL)

Can the administration of the council please confirm that they will prioritise maximum community benefit and infrastructure from the sale of the Harmsworth Quays site, including a new school, medical facilities and on-site affordable housing, over maximising profit from residential flats?

RESPONSE

We want to make sure that Harmsworth Quays is redeveloped in a way that delivers a range of benefits to local people including: creating a significant number of jobs: the building of new educational facilities; housing and on-site affordable housing; and, generating community infrastructure levy (CIL) contributions, as well as delivering a receipt for the council's capital programme.

The council owns the majority of the Harmsworth Quays site but the property is subject to a number of long leases, which means our tenant has operational control of the site. The council does not therefore have complete say over the future of the land. When it sells property the council has a duty to get the best price that can be reasonably obtained.

Extensive public consultation has been carried out in Rotherhithe over the last few years as part of the preparation of the Canada Water Area Action Plan (CWAAP), and more recently as part of the review of the CWAAP. I fully support the aspiration of local people to see the area around Canada Water redeveloped along the lines of a more traditional town centre with a mix of uses, and less dominated by cars.

The principal reason for the revisions to the Area Action Plan is the relocation of the Daily Mail Group print works from Harmsworth Quays, making a very substantial area of land available for redevelopment. Our vision is to prioritise non-residential uses on the site, in particular education uses including the opportunity for a new campus for Kings College London. This vision was strongly supported in the consultation on the proposals.

Southwark Council owns the freehold of the Harmsworth Quays site and so, alongside the changes to the AAP, officers in the regeneration team are working closely with Kings College and British Land (who have acquired the Daily Mail Group's lease on the site). We hope to come back to cabinet within the next few months to agree a process for developing a masterplan for the area which meets the vision as set out in the AAP revisions.

Final decisions about the future of this important site will of course be consulted on with residents.

18. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES (DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL)

Dulwich community council would like an update on the review and effectiveness of the new local policing model including on-going work which the council is doing to secure a fully functioning police base in Dulwich?

RESPONSE

The Metropolitan Police Service and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) are responsible for delivering the new policing model. The changes in policing in Southwark result from cuts in government funding, decisions for the Mayor of London and implementation decisions made within the Metropolitan Police Service. Measuring the impact of these operational changes are therefore matters for the police and the Mayor's office.

As you know, we have spoken out against these changes and remain concerned that insufficient police officers have been allocated to Southwark by the Mayor and his deputy. The reduction in stations, allocation of police officer support, and the loss of front counter services all reduce visibility of the police for local people and cause us a great deal of concern.

I met with representatives of MOPAC and the police on 17 May to ensure that the effectiveness of the new arrangements for Dulwich is kept under review. After six months of the new arrangements (around December), a full review will be carried out by the police and MOPAC. In case a new base is required for Dulwich, MOPAC have agreed to hold back money to match any funding from the council's community safety fund to help achieve this.

On 4 October I asked the police's temporary borough commander for Southwark to arrange a meeting with Dulwich councillors to obtain feedback on how the new arrangements are progressing before the review process starts.

In addition I will be meeting with Blair Gibb, the advisor to the Deputy Mayor, in the next fortnight to discuss progress.

19. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES (PECKHAM AND NUNHEAD COMMUNITY COUNCIL)

Residents and leaseholders on the Cossall and Gloucester Estates, who are specifically dependent on the district heating model for their heating are currently suffering erratic fluctuations in heat gain and loss and an unnecessary waste of energy. Therefore, what is the council doing about addressing this problem with the view of saving energy costs borough wide?

RESPONSE

We are aware of the difficulties faced by residents. Upgrading works on the Cossall Estate will start in April 2014 and the Gloucester Estate in June 2014.

The council maintains over 100 district heating systems across the borough. Some of our larger heating systems have become old and inefficient in recent times, but we are making major efforts to redress this. Each year over £5 million is invested to improve both individual and communal heating systems.

Over this and next year, to March 2015, an additional £4 million will be invested in a range of energy efficient measures aimed at improving energy consumption, system control and reducing energy costs.

All communal systems will have remote energy management systems installed. This will provide us with the ability to monitor performance and make necessary adjustments remotely to ensure that the boilers and plant are running at their optimum efficiency. It also will allow early fault detection meaning our engineers can respond to and resolve outages even before residents become aware of a problem. In addition, a number of sites will have new boiler burners fitted and pipe work cleaning technologies applied to further aid efficiencies and lower gas expenditure that will benefit all residents.

20. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID NOAKES

Can the cabinet member for health, adult social care and equalities give an update on the current status of each of the Voluntary Day Centres listed below and indicate what, if any, support they have received from the council to continue since 100% of their funding was withdrawn in 2011?

- Southwark Irish Pensioners
- Black Elderly Group
- South Asian Elderly Association
- Golden Oldies Community Care Project
- Vietnamese Day Centre
- Goose Green Day Centre
- Age UK Stone's End
- Southwark Cypriot Day Centre
- Black Elders Project

RESPONSE

Government policy is that local authorities should give people 'personal budgets', so people eligible for social care can choose, with advice from social services, which services best meet their needs. It gives people greater choice and control to lead the lives they want to lead.

This means that providers are now being paid directly – from people’s personal budgets – for the services they provide, rather than being paid in a ‘block grant’ by the local authority. To continue to block-fund providers would be to double-fund providers.

The council worked with providers over several years to help providers move to this new funding model, including helping develop sustainable business models, providing ‘transition funding’ and creating an £200,000 ‘innovation fund’ to help providers develop innovative services to meet people’s needs.

The council’s decision to withdraw block funding – as part of the move to the personal budgets model - was made with effect from April 2011, however each organisation was given an additional six months funding to assist with the transition to new arrangements, £500,000 in total. After this further transitional funds were provided for specific purposes such as business development.

Transition funding and innovation funding for the organisations listed in the question came to £281,405 in 2011/12 and 2012/13, split as follows:

Day Centre	Transition Funding/Innovation Funding
Southwark Irish Pensioners	£0
Black Elderly Group	£48,405
South Asian Elderly Association	£52,000
Golden Oldies Community Care Project	£32,000
Vietnamese Day Centre	£52,000
Goose Green Day Centre	£0
Age UK Stone's End**	£41,500*
Southwark Cypriot Day Centre	£40,000
Black Elders' Project	£15,500*

*Includes £15,500 awarded jointly to Age UK and Black Elders' Project

**In addition, the council has awarded to Age UK a capital grant of £131,296 in March 2013, for the refurbishment of their day service building at Stone’s End

These organisations may also receive other funding from the council, for example, Age UK is receiving £107,000 over two years to fund Southwark Safe and Independent Living Service, and was also awarded a £68,000 community support grant by the council.

All organisations are now operating with their new funding models.

21. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR JONATHAN MITCHELL

Can the cabinet member for health, adult social care and equalities give a clear and present position on the council’s public health priorities?

RESPONSE

I am delighted that the local authority has taken on responsibility for public health; it creates opportunities for use to embed health in everything we do as a council, and help tackle the causes of ill-health.

In Southwark we have large health challenges: we have high levels of cardiovascular disease,

lung disease, cancers, diabetes, liver diseases, and sexual ill-health. There are large disparities in life expectancy – up to a decade between people living in more deprived parts of the borough and people living in more affluent parts. Working with the health and wellbeing board we are prioritising tackling these health inequalities through the strategy agreed at the board in July:

- **Giving every child and young person the best start in life:**

For example, we are addressing the issue of obesity through work with schools, health visitors and school nursing services. Reducing teenage pregnancy is also a key focus of our services for younger people.

- **Building healthier and more resilient communities and tackling the root causes of ill-health:**

For example, we are addressing the causes of circulatory disease, diabetes and cancer through our council funded smoking cessation service, tobacco control, and the health check programme. Sexual health and mental health issues are also addressed within this priority.

- **Improving the experience and outcomes of care for our most vulnerable residents and enabling them to live more independent lives:**

For example, through our substance misuse services we are promoting the health and wellbeing of drug users, and supporting people with mental health problems to maintain their independence through our work with South London and the Maudsley Mental Health Trust (SLAM).

It is disappointing that the government's funding of public health in Southwark is lower per head than the government's own assessment of the funding per-head that is required for the borough, and lower per head than boroughs with far lower levels of health need, such as Kensington and Chelsea.

We are further developing our understanding of population needs and the public health interventions that will most effectively address them through the JSNA (joint strategic needs assessment) process.

22. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID HUBBER

What is the timeline for the new centre of excellence opening at Cator Street?

RESPONSE

The full timeline is given in the cabinet report 'Centre of Excellence for older adults with dementia and complex needs' agreed at cabinet on 17 September 2013, which is available on the council website.

23. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GETTLESON

What is the council doing to tackle sexual health issues across the borough?

RESPONSE

Southwark has high rates of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and HIV. For example, in 2012, 2,584 chlamydia diagnoses and 850 gonorrhoea diagnoses were made, and diagnosed HIV prevalence is 11.7 per 1000 Southwark residents.

To help tackle these challenges we are prioritising sexual health within the public health budget.

We are commissioning a range of sexual health services with a total budget of £7.8 million through joint arrangements with Lambeth and Lewisham. The services include:

- Open access sexual health clinics at Guys & St Thomas's Trust (GSTT) and Kings College Hospital
- Open access reproductive and sexual health services provided through GSTT community services and Brook at several sites across Lambeth & Southwark.
- Primary care sexual health provision through General Practice (e.g. HIV testing, chlamydia screening) and local pharmacies (e.g. Emergency Hormonal Contraception).

Local achievements include:

- The highest chlamydia screening coverage rate in the country
- Late diagnosis of HIV is at a lower rate than in many London boroughs
- Teenage pregnancy rates have decreased by around 50% since 2001.

Current initiatives for improving local sexual health include:

- Development of a refreshed sexual health strategy informed by an updated sexual health and HIV needs assessment
- Initiation of a local STI and HIV prevention programme targeted at high risk groups and based on local needs.

24. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL KYRIACOU

Given the high number of smoking-related deaths in the borough, what pressure has the cabinet member for health and adult social care put on the cabinet member for resources and finance and the leader of the council to end the council's £5 million investment in tobacco firms through its pension fund?

RESPONSE

I am very concerned about the high number of smoking-related deaths in the borough, and the council does a great deal to help reduce smoking through tobacco control and smoking cessation services, including promoting this month's Stoptober. The health and wellbeing strategy priorities include work to address smoking.

On the pensions fund, I have been discussing with the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety which options are available to the council regarding tobacco investment in the pension fund.

Decisions on individual investments are not made by the leader or cabinet members.

The council's pensions advisory panel has equal representation of members and officers on it. Each of the three main political parties has equal representation on the panel. The panel is in turn advised by professional investment advisors.

At the last meeting of the pensions advisory panel on 18 September 2013, those professional advisors reported on ethical and responsible investment matters. Their view on excluding any industry from the fund based on moral considerations was that this was “hard to justify under the fiduciary responsibility that is required of institutional investors such as the LGPS (Local Government Pension Scheme)”, and the advisers referred to the *Cowan v Scargill* (1985) trusts law case, which found that pension funds had a duty to put the financial interests of its beneficiaries first.

However I am pleased to note that the meeting on 18 September 2013 asked for further work to be undertaken to explore whether an ethical investment policy that was compliant with *Cowan v Scargill* could be pursued. This work would enable the pensions advisory panel to consider the adoption of ethical investment principles when the council’s statement of investment principles is reviewed next year as part of the process surrounding the triennial actuarial review.

This approach was agreed by all those at the meeting, including the Liberal Democrat and Labour representatives.

I would encourage all three parties to ask their representatives on the pensions advisory panel to support possible options that could lead the adoption of ethical investment principles in the council’s statement of investment principles.

25. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR PODDY CLARK

What is the role of the older people’s access and information team? How many staff positions exist within this team? How does the council promote this resource to older people and other potential users in the borough?

RESPONSE

The role of the older people’s access and information team, the “contact adult social care” team, is to provide a single point of access and information for people needing advice and information about adult social care.

Among other things, the team staffs a new “one number” social care phone line – 0207 525 3324 – which we launched earlier this year. It replaced the previous arrangements in which there were numerous different phone lines and potentially confusing access routes for obtaining advice and support. Calls are answered by service experts who are able to advise people on-the-spot, and also direct them to further help and support – for example to partner agencies who can provide specialist advice including Riverside, Rightfully Yours and Southwark Carers. These are “open access” community support services funded by the council (£700,000 per annum) available to all the 22,000 older people in the borough and their families, as well as other residents needing social care advice.

The official launch of the council's "one number" took place earlier this year and was promoted in the Southwark Life Magazine (distributed to every household in the borough), GPs, hospitals and daycentres. We have good links with health, housing and the corporate call centre, who refer people on to us when appropriate. The phone line has taken over 20,000 calls so far, helping residents and carers to remain living as independently as possible within their communities.

The team also provides an emergency crisis and safeguarding adults response to ensure vulnerable residents remain safe in the community.

The team has 24 staff members

26. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR CLEO SOANES

What progress has the council made on meeting its commitment to halving the cost of meals on wheels?

RESPONSE

I am delighted that we have delivered on our pledge to half the price people pay for meals on wheels, six months ahead of schedule. When we came in as an administration, Southwark's vulnerable, frail, housebound residents had suffered a rise in meals on wheels prices, to £3.41 a meal. In contrast, this administration has reduced the price people pay – by subsidising the cost – over the last three years, and, this month did a further price reduction, taking the price to £1.71 – half the price compared to May 2010.

27. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR DAN GARFIELD

What steps is the council taking to prevent the worst excesses of the coalition government's welfare reforms of people with disabilities?

RESPONSE

The Liberal Democrat/Tory coalition government has hit people in this borough hard, with its welfare reforms.

It is appalling that the Liberal Democrat MP for Bermondsey and Old Southwark voted for the 'bedroom tax', particularly since there are more people hit by the bedroom tax in his constituency than in any other constituency in the country.

But Southwark Council is providing help to people most affected by those reforms. Our 'Rightfully Yours' service provides advice and guidance to people about benefits. The council is proactively assisting those most in need and in particular contacted disabled households to ensure they get the help they need.

Earlier this year we set up a 'hardship fund', worth £800,000, to help people affected by the government's welfare reforms – as part of Southwark emergency support scheme. Half of this fund is specifically to provide support for those households where the level of disability prevents temporary or full time employment.

People applying to the hardship fund have received a range of services, from financial assistance, to advice and further support such as discretionary housing payment, applications for personal independence payments, exemptions from the bedroom tax and carers or mobility support payments. We continue to work with those most affected and those requiring support receive the most appropriate assistance.

In addition, at last months cabinet we agreed that where people with disabilities have had significant adaptations to their homes, we would pay the bedroom tax to avoid the need to move. We agreed to look at each case on its merits with other housing options being explored where appropriate.

Also, adult social care can support disabled people whose social care needs have increased as a result of benefit loss as part of social care support. For example; supporting disabled people to gain and maintain employment, money management support, signposting to specialist advice services. We are anticipating there may be extra demands resulting from the government's current disability benefits reforms: its transition from disability living allowance (DLA) to personal independence payment (PIP), which starts for a small number of

clients from this month. It is anticipated that many people on lower level DLA will lose benefits due to those government reforms, and this may knock on to service demand, so this will be monitored.

28. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR SUNIL CHOPRA

Would the cabinet member tell me what progress has been made on Southwark's Older People's Centre of Excellence?

RESPONSE

September's cabinet report set out progress and a timetable for completion. Cator Street has been chosen as the site, following engagement with the design consultation group, comprising user representatives, Southwark's Pensioner's Forum, the Alzheimer's Society, Age UK, the Southwark Pensioners Centre, NHS partners, staff and other key stakeholders. A number of design features suggested by the working group have been incorporated into the design, including: a dedicated sensory and therapeutic garden; a covered walkway and internal "loop" for those users who may wander safely both inside and outside; multi-purpose flexible activity and dining rooms, which can be opened into larger spaces as needed; reduced complexity in the cloakroom, reception and lobby areas and an increased number of accessible WCs.

29. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR CHRIS BROWN

Does the cabinet member agree with the leader of the opposition that "there is no evidence to show that extending free school meals to every child will significantly reduce obesity?"

RESPONSE

No, I do not agree with the leader of the opposition. I also disagree with previous statements made by the leader of the opposition in 2011 in Southwark News when the leader of the opposition described Labour's free healthy school meals as "a bribe they offered because they were desperate to be elected" – though I note, only a few months before next year's council elections, that the Liberal Democrats have u-turned and now say they support the policy. I also disagree with the local Liberal Democrat MP who described the policy as "wasting ... money" in a letter to his constituents this summer – a matter of weeks before his party announced their new policy of universal free school meals for certain year groups. I also disagree with the statement in a Liberal Democrat leaflet calling the policy a 'bad choice'.

When the Liberal Democrats left the administration in 2010, they left Southwark with the highest level of child obesity in the country. Since we introduced universal free healthy school meals in Southwark primary schools, parents have said children are eating more healthily at school and are asking for healthier food at home.

There is strong evidence that eating a healthy diet reduces the risk of obesity in children.

Parents have told us that, since we introduced universal free healthy school meals, they have noticed their children: requesting more fruit and vegetables at home; being less picky in their eating at home; and asking to cook some of the healthy school meals recipes at home. Parents also told us they were saving money – some said they were using their savings to buy healthier food for meals at home, or to buy books for their children. Also, staff have reported better behaviour, concentration levels and attainment in pupils.

30. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR THE RIGHT REVD EMMANUEL OYEWOLE

Would the cabinet member update me on Southwark's plans for Black History Month?

RESPONSE

Black History Month is a month long programme of local events to celebrate and commemorate the achievements of black men and women.

For 2013, Southwark Council is focusing in particular on exploring the heritage and history of Southwark's African, Caribbean and diaspora communities by bringing people together to share their stories, history, culture and customs.

There are a wide range of events across the borough including authors Malorie Blackman and Dorothy Koomson at Southwark's libraries; Southwark comedian Ava Vidal at Canada Water Culture Space; an exhibition of Nigerian monarchs by photographer George Osodi at Bermondsey Project Space; a Zumba taster class as part of the adult learning programme at Thomas Calton Centre; African story time at Bethwin Playground; a family day at the Rye Oak children's centre; an 'inspire to achieve' motivational session for young black people using history to inspire, which will take place at London South Bank University; Caribbean ancestry research sessions at John Harvard Library; and many more events and activities for local residents across the borough.

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

How many three and four year olds did not take up the 15 hours free early education offer in 2012/13? What is the council doing to support parents to take up their entitlement?

RESPONSE

All children aged three or four years old are entitled to receive a maximum of 15 hours of free early education per week, until they reach compulsory school age. From this September we have extended the offer to eligible two year old children who may not otherwise benefit from early learning at this age.

In 2012/13, 6970 three and four year old children took up their entitlement to 15 hours of free early education in Southwark. The Department for Education estimates that this represented 88% of eligible children. On this basis an estimated 7920 children were eligible and therefore up to 950 children did not take up the offer.

While all parents are entitled to 15 hours of free early learning for their three and four year old children, there is no requirement to take up the offer and some parents choose not to take up a nursery place at three. In addition some fee paying independent schools choose not to offer the free hours so children attending these settings would be included in the 950 children shown as not taking up free places.

Nevertheless, Southwark is keen to maximise take up, which increased from 83% in 2012 to 88% in 2013. A major marketing campaign is currently underway, including publication of leaflets and posters circulated to schools, nurseries, libraries, health centres and other community venues, and a bus stop advertising campaign. Southwark is also recruiting a team of free early learning outreach officers with a specific remit to help parents take up their entitlement for two, three and four year old children.

32. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

How many £1,000 cash incentives have been paid to community groups for suggesting suitable individuals or families to adopt children? What organisations have received cash incentives and how much in each case?

RESPONSE

One cash incentive payment of £1000 has been paid to a school. The cash incentive is paid at the point that adopters are approved. There are a number of families currently being assessed that may result in community groups receiving a payment.

33. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR PATRICK DIAMOND

Would the cabinet member tell me, in the light of the case of Daniel Pelka, what steps the council is taking to make sure similar situations do not occur in Southwark?

RESPONSE

We are continuing to provide strong, focused and improving services to protect vulnerable children across the borough, with the safeguarding of children remaining a top priority. Safeguarding is a shared area of responsibility for all who come into contact with our children and families. Our values for ensuring that our families and communities are safe, have the necessary tools to empower, educate and achieve positive changes in their lives and for their well-being are enshrined in our services.

A number of new and existing measures are in place to ensure that children at risk of harm do not go unnoticed from the various agencies that come into contact with them, including:

The multi-agency Southwark safeguarding children's board, which has a statutory duty to ensure that local services work well together to keep children and young people in Southwark safe from harm and abuse. The board meet regularly to coordinate the work of partners working with children and their families so that they can protect them effectively and to also promote the welfare of children. Current priorities for the board are: how we can work more effectively together to identify and tackle neglect and the identification and support for children and families at risk of sexual exploitation. The board also holds all agencies to account for the effectiveness of their services through an annual safeguarding audit.

The multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH), operational since 23 September 2013 aims to improve information sharing and analysis between agencies to better safeguard the welfare of our children, ensuring that all safeguarding activity and intervention is timely, proportionate and necessary. The team comprises professionals from a wide range of statutory and non-statutory agencies, including social care, police, early help, housing and health who will look at all safeguarding concerns and identify risk. The single front door approach will enable all referrals to children's social care to be screened by MASH, building up a more complete picture of a child and the family's circumstances.

We have a strong tradition of multi and single agency training to ensure that staff are up to date on learning from previous serious case reviews, including working with families that are hard to engage. This is being further supported by a conference on neglect in January 2014.

34. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR GAVIN EDWARDS

What steps is the cabinet member taking to deliver a state of the art one o'clock club for Peckham Rye?

RESPONSE

I have been working closely with local councillors, officers and other stakeholders to drive forward proposals for the new One O'Clock club.

Consultation with local residents and interested parties is due to start later this month.

35. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER

Does the cabinet member agree with the leader of the opposition that free school meals are "bribe" that is offered by those "desperate to be elected"?

RESPONSE

No. In fact, the policy is aimed at realising the potential of our communities and ensuring a fairer future for all our residents, especially with over 34% of children in the borough living in poverty and the council's aspirations to reduce childhood obesity.

I am pleased that national government are catching up with what this administration has been doing to secure a fairer future for all the children of Southwark.

36. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR ROWENNA DAVIS

Would the cabinet member tell me what proportion of Southwark primary school children have secured a place at a local school and what steps is she taking to ensure that Southwark has the places necessary to meet future demand?

RESPONSE

I am very pleased that every child that applied for a Southwark primary school has been successful in receiving one of their six preferences.

We received 3,411 reception place applications this year, with 82.2% (2,804) children receiving their first preference school – this increase of nearly 5% from last year's figures is also 1% higher than the London average.

There has been a 1.7% increase in the number of children receiving a school of their preference with 95.9% (3,272) of applicants being offered one of their six preferences compared to 94.2 per cent in 2012.

I refer you to the council's primary investment strategy agreed at cabinet in order to see our plans.

37. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR NICK DOLEZAL

What steps is the council taking to improve the rates of fostering and adoption in the borough?

RESPONSE**Fostering**

There is national pressure on local authorities to recruit more foster carers as the number of looked after children continues to increase.

This is why we have commissioned recruitment expertise to bring in more foster carers for children in the borough. The recruitment agency has been tasked with recruiting a minimum of 50 foster carers that have the skills and qualities to meet the diverse needs of our looked after children.

The recruitment agency will offer a more streamlined and efficient process, that ensures quality placements, driving up our fostering households from 166 to 216 over the coming year.

Southwark's recruitment manager will contribute to the recruitment process by attending all events and participating in skills to foster training. She will also have responsibility for the quality assurance process for reports to the council's fostering panel.

As we know that the financial support offered to prospective foster careers is not only a means to ensure that they can meet the financial demands of fostering but it can also act as an incentive to encourage more foster carers to come forward. We are also currently in the process of reviewing the fostering allowance rate with a view to bring it in line with neighbouring authorities.

Adoption

Our target is to achieve 40 adopters each year, and we are pleased that six months into the year we have 35 potential adopters being assessed; an improvement from the 19 adopters recruited last year. Our broader campaign in partnership with cross council colleagues is to recruit adopters from families where we have 40 children in need of homes.

We are utilising a number of innovative measures to encourage more families to adopt our children, including local and national press, our refreshed website, the £1,000 community reward and a forthcoming partnership with Lambeth and the Evangelical Alliance.

38. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN HAYES

What action is the cabinet member taking to bring the Old Bellenden School site back into use, and what further plans will she take to ensure that Southwark continues to have the school places necessary in the future?

RESPONSE

We are working in partnership with Dulwich Hamlet Junior School, an outstanding school to bring the Old Bellenden School site back into use, with new places available.

There was much public support from stakeholders at the recent public meeting held last month.

The plans to develop Old Bellenden are a part of the council's primary investment strategy which has put in place steps to ensure sufficient places to meet local demand over the coming years.

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

According to the Southwark website, if an area is deemed suitable for a table and chairs licence "a consultation will be carried out by Southwark Council's highway licensing team to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to local residents and business owners". Could the cabinet member list a) all the premises in Cathedrals Ward that have been issued tables and chairs licenses, and b) details of the consultation process undertaken for each site?

RESPONSE

Current licences issued in Cathedral Ward which includes table and chairs are listed below:

- Blue Eyed Maid, Borough High Street
- Slug & Lettuce, Borough High Street
- Wagamama, Clink Street
- Cafe Brood, Green Dragon Court
- Vapiano, Southwark Street
- Dr Inks, Stamford Street
- Wright Brothers, Stoney Street
- Crussh, Sumner Street
- Starbucks, Sumner Street
- Byron, The Cut
- The Gym, Waterloo Road
- Vapiano, Southwark Street
- Tapas Brindisa, Southwark Street

When an application is received the initial step is to display a public notice. This is placed on an item of permanent street furniture, for example a lamp column, and left for 28 days. This informs any passers that an application for a street furniture or tables and chairs highways licence has been received. During that time, the officers visit the site to assess the application including taking measurements and considering how the request will impact on other highway users. Any letters or emails received as a response to the public notice are taken into consideration at the end of the 28 days before the final decision is made. This decision can be a full approval, or an agreement that better suits the area to which the licence has been requested, or a rejection if it is felt that no additional street furniture can be sustained.

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

How many fines have been issued to drivers this year for driving the wrong way down Kipling Street? How many of these fines have been appealed? What is the council doing to finally resolve the issue of poor signage?

RESPONSE

1 January 2013 onwards	Kipling Street
Total penalty charge notices (PCNs) issued	2968
Number of representations received by the council	449
Percentage of representations received by the council	15%

1 January 2013 onwards	Kipling Street
Number of appeals to Parking and Traffic Appeals Service (PaTAS)	34
Number (percentage) of appeals to PaTAS	1%

These figures are lower than the average for representations and appeals.

Although the signage is as required by law, some drivers clearly do not understand it. We will be amending the signage to make it even clearer and monitor driver behaviour before undertaking further enforcement if necessary.

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

Please list the top 20 streets in the borough that have suffered the most reported fly-tipping in the past 12 months, including the number of incidents reported in each case.

RESPONSE

Our system for recording details of fly-tipping is designed to enable us to log reports and respond quickly. We can also draw out borough wide data to measure our performance. The system does not allow us to do a street by street breakdown and so we cannot provide the data in the way the member requests.

Our fly-tipping teams each have a dedicated part of the borough that they work in and know well. Operationally, they know the areas which are particular hot-spots and therefore monitor these more closely so we can deal with fly tipping when it occurs. If any councillor has any particular spots which they believe are not being given due attention or are being missed, then please let me know so that I can urgently investigate them.

42. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ROBIN CROOKSHANK HILTON

Can the cabinet member please give provide a full comparison price breakdown for all four proposed Barbara Hepworth replacement artworks in Dulwich Park?

RESPONSE

It would not be appropriate to provide a price comparison for all proposed Barbara Hepworth replacement artworks as an award has not yet been made. As you will know a steering group was commissioned to work alongside the Contemporary Art Society to manage the artist commissioning process.

Each artist was given the same budget at which to propose a replacement artwork for the park, and whether or not one artist has provided a cost less than another for the replacement neither counts for or against that piece of work.

A decision on the chosen proposal will be announced this month.

43. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR REBECCA LURY

Liberal Democrats in Southwark have claimed that fly-tipping has tripled in the last three years. Would the cabinet member confirm whether this is accurate?

RESPONSE

Reporting of fly-tipping comprises of two elements; fly-tips that are reported by the public via the contact centre and fly-tips that are identified and proactively cleared by the council's cleaning service.

Contrary to suggestions of fly-tipping incidents tripling in the last three years, the number of fly-tips reported by the public has in fact remained fairly stable. For example, during 2009/10, an average of 325 fly-tips were reported monthly by residents and during 2012/13, this dropped slightly to 293 per month.

However for the same period the figures for fly-tips proactively cleared by our street cleaning service have increased considerably owing in part to more precise reporting of fly-tips found and partly due to a greater focus on known hot spots by the cleaning service rather than there being a greater volume of fly-tips present on our streets and estates.

The service continue to make great strides in keeping our streets clean of fly-tipped waste, with 98% of reported fly tips being cleared within 24 months for the last twelve months.

44. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MICHAEL SITU

In addition to the investment that the council is making to parks, would the cabinet member tell me what additional external funding has the council secured and which parks will benefit?

RESPONSE

The total amount of funding secured for parks across the borough since 2011, from both external and internal sources is £14,122, 000, of which £7,518, 000 is external.

I am pleased to let you know that we have successfully secured external funding for the 8 park projects listed below, through the London Legacy Fund for QEII parks. The grants of £10,000 for each park will fund projects that support and encourage more people to get involved in sport, play or active recreation.

- Brimington Park - Entrance improvements and the installation of 2 table tennis tables.
- Burgess Park - Installation of compost toilet with a timber building at food growing area.
- Dulwich Park - Improvement to Harold Kneebone lodge making it Equalities Act 2010 compliant for bowls provision users, improve entrance, and install new notice boards.
- Nursery Row Park - Start up a new active play programme for local children and install new play equipment.
- Peckham Rye Park - Install new fencing, plants for the fernery, and new interpretation signage.
- Russia Dock Woodland - Install new natural play equipment
- Southwark Park - Improvements to the paved area at Ada Salter Gardens and the installation of a new artificial cricket pitch.
- Warwick Gardens - Planting to increase the biodiversity in the area and interpretation signage.

We have also received a further grant of £25,000 from the SITA trust. This has been awarded to Kingstairs Gardens to fund disabled roundabout and natural play equipment.

See below table for a further breakdown.

Project	external funding source	internal funding LBS £		Total Funding £	year
Nelson Square	-	s106	£ 110k	£ 110k	2011
Nelson Square	-	s106	£ 135k	£ 135k	2013/14
Pasley Park	-	s106	£ 170k		
		cgs	£ 15k	£ 185k	2011
Cathedral Square	-	cgs 45k s106	£132k	£ 177k	2011
Dog Kennel Hill	-	s106	£ 101k		
		cgs	£ 11k	£ 112k	2012
Burgess Park	Creation Trust £4m, GLA £2m	£6m	capital £2m	£8m	2012
St Mary's Church Yard	-	s106	£ 300k	£ 300k	2012
Durand's Wharf / GMH Park	LMCT Olympic Legacy	£ 23k	-	£ 23k	2012
Burgess Park / Tabard's Grds	LMCT Olympic Legacy	£ 23k	-	£ 23k	2012
Mint Street	-	s106	£ 342k	£ 342k	2012
Surrey Sq. Park	Big Lottery communities spaces	£ 42k	-	£ 42k	2012
Peckham Rye Park	Big Lottery communities spaces	£ 40k	-	£ 40k	2012
Peckham Rye Park	Olympic Legacy (changing rooms)	£ 200k	-	£ 200k	2012
Nunhead Green	GLA Outer London fund	£ 37k	-		
	GLA Pocket Parks	£ 30k	s106 £ 76k	£ 143k	2012/13
Camberwell Green	-	s106	£ 270k	£ 270k	2012/13
Burgess Park BMX	British cycling	£ 100k			
	London Marathon	£ 75k			
	Mayor of London facilities fund	£ 121k	capital £ 486k		
	Olympic legacy fund	£ 150k	s106 £ 168k	£1.1m	2013
Birmingham Park	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Burgess Park	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Dulwich Park	MCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
King's Stairs Garden	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Nursery Row Park	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Peckham Rye Park	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Russia Dock Woodland	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Southwark Park	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
Warwick Gardens	LMCT QEII	£ 10k	-	£ 10k	2013
King's Stairs Gardens	SITA Fund	£ 25k	-	£ 25k	2013
Marlborough Playground	GLA Pocket Parks	£ 40k	s106 £ 180k	£ 220k	2012/14
Pelier Park	-	s106	£ 129k	£ 129k	2013
Kennington Open Space	-	s106	£ 158k	£ 158k	2013
Various parks (see attached)		cgs	£ 366k	£ 366k	2012/13
		cgs	£ 365k	£ 365k	2013/14
St. James Churchyard	-	cgs	£ 50k		
		s106	£ 65k	£ 115k	2012/13
St. John's Churchyard	-	s106	£ 194k	£ 194k	2011/13
St. Mary Magdalen Churchyard		s106	£ 156k		
		cgs	£ 50k	£ 206k	2011/12
Southwark Park (athletics)	London Marathon	£ 150k			
	Sport England	£ 145k	s106 £ 160k		
	Mayor of London facilities fund	£ 227k	LBS Olympics fund £ 370k	£1.052m	2014/15
Totals		£7,518,000	£6,604,000	£14,122,000	

*LM

45. QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR WILMA NELSON

Will the cabinet member give an update on the current situation at Maydew House, Rotherhithe?

RESPONSE

Improvements to the Abbeyfield Estate regeneration programme will cost an estimated £20.2 million. This is part for the enhanced refurbishment of Maydew House, Damory House and Thaxted Court. The works will be forward funded from the HIP (Housing Investment Programme). £7.2 million of the capital will be raised through the sale of approximately 50 voids to reimburse the HIP. The scheme will deliver 72 social rented units, 22 intermediate units and 50 private for sale units in the Maydew House tower block.

Damory House and Thaxted Court will receive enhanced refurbishment works and all three blocks will have an external landscaping upgrade. Qualifying residents have been given the option to return to the block on completion of the works.

Following comprehensive consultation with residents in 2010, cabinet agreed that Maydew House needed to be emptied in order to carry out major repair works to the block. A rehousing programme started in September 2010 with 94 secure tenants and five leaseholders. In June 2011, a resident steering group was established, and the future of the estate was decided following an options appraisal study with residents. In March 2012, cabinet agreed that an enhanced refurbishment programme with a part retention/part disposal of Maydew House was the way forward. It was agreed that the programme of works for all three blocks would commence once vacant possession of Maydew House had been achieved. In September 2012, Cabinet agreed to the application of a compulsory purchase order (CPO) to acquire all interests in Maydew House.

Council officers are currently reviewing the programming timetable for the works to all three blocks and Maydew House is one of the blocks that will benefit from connection to the South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) energy from waste facility and will soon be getting heating and hot water supplied via new underground pipes. Modifications to the boiler house are underway to allow connection and these should be completed by 22 October 2013. Residents should not experience any loss of utility during this time.

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

Will the council put mobile CCTV cameras on the Keeton's Estate to help tackle ongoing problems with drug dealing and phone thefts?

RESPONSE

Our anti-social behaviour (ASB) team work closely with the police to deal with crime and anti-social behaviour. We have been proactive against ongoing problems, including securing anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) in 2012, and obtaining prosecution against perpetrators of harassment.

Adjacent to the estate on Jamaica Road is Bermondsey underground station. This is a crime hotspot for robbery and snatch theft and the perpetrators can, and do escape down side roads around the estate. The police are continuing to target these crimes with covert operations and the council will be assisting by installing a three camera deployable system on Keetons Road by the end of October.

The cost to date for CCTV and installation of the new system total is approximately £18,000.

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

When does the council intend to fulfil its pledge to provide increased security measures including CCTV and door entry systems for the Osprey Estate?

RESPONSE

This administration has made a significant investment in improving security on the Osprey Estate in Rotherhithe. This includes the installation of a nine camera CCTV system which is due to be completed this month. This system connects the cameras to the main CCTV control room for recording and monitoring. These works cost £17,608.

In addition the council is also investing in an upgrade to the door entry systems on the estate. These works are due to commence in early January 2014 for completion in mid-March.

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

How many council employees or employees of contracted out service companies are on zero hour contracts? What if any plans does the council have to end this practice?

RESPONSE

As a cabinet, we are concerned with zero hours contracts where these have not been a free choice of the employee, and in particular where they do not ensure a minimum level of earnings for lower paid staff. We are making clear progress on this issue in respect of our homecare services where this issue is most acute.

The council does not require contractors to inform us on their use of zero hour contracts, and so the council does not have specific details on zero hours employment for all of its existing contracts and sub contracts.

We are, however, aware of a number of such employment arrangements managed through homecare contracts, as a consequence of the procurement strategy for this service agreed in 2008.

There are approximately 500 homecare workers contracted out in our adult services, 440 of whom are estimated to be on zero hour contracts.

In April of this year, cabinet announced it would be working with Unison to consider the feasibility of the implementing the Unison ethical homecare charter, which

includes moving away from zero hours contracts. Recommendations arising from this work will be presented to cabinet in November

In relation to children's services, zero hour contracts are used for contracted out carers supporting families with disabled children, though we have no figures as to how many. In addition, Southwark's adult education service had 29 tutors on zero hour based contracts employed as at June 2013.

For other contracts, procurement guidelines are being amended to ensure that the council has a full understanding of any proposed zero hour employments contracts involved, and the council will wish to take full consideration of these issues as part of its evaluation process.

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

How much has the council spent on hotels for council staff in each of the past three financial years (2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 to date)? What is the most expensive individual room bill paid in 2013, and for which hotel was it paid?

RESPONSE

The use of hotels for council staff is generally associated with training or conferences. The council records the cost of these events rather than coding the cost of hotels separately. For this reason, it is not practicable to identify the total spend on hotels or the most expensive hotel/room.

The council is committed to spending every penny as if it were from our own pockets. We therefore issue guidance to staff about when it is reasonable to use hotels and managers will apply this principle when approving any hotel spending.

50. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR COLUMBA BLANGO

Please list each of the hotels used by the council to house temporary homeless or statutory homeless residents in the current financial year, including the number of nights of accommodation supplied and the total cost to the council in each case.

RESPONSE

To ensure the welfare and protection of our homeless residents we cannot publish the list of the hotels which we use. I have provided a list of the information asked for below with the names of the hotels deleted.

The spreadsheets attached detail the current financial year (1 April 2013 to 8 October 2013) of all hotel bookings made by the council to accommodate those who are either statutory homeless or in housing need [table 1], or instances where existing Southwark tenants have been placed in emergency accommodation in circumstances where they are unable to occupy their home address [table 2].

The bookings are listed for each individual room, or single premises and provide the total number of nights used and the cost. Groupings are under the relevant B&B/Hotel provider.

In the current financial year, the cost of providing hotel/B&B accommodation has so far been £1,688,323. (£1,413,000 homeless/in housing need [table 1] & £275,000 for existing tenants [table 2])

Tables 3 and 4 give the equivalent information for the full financial year 2009/2010. The cost for the full year was £3,346,283.88 (£1,639,000 for homeless placements [table 3] and £1,706,000 for existing tenants [table 4]).

It is important to note that 2009/10 figures included the placements for emergency accommodation of a sizeable number of tenants affected by the fires at Lakanal House and Sumner Road.

The tables also show the cost of acquiring the accommodation from the providers. For all the homeless/housing needs placements, the cost of acquiring the accommodation is offset by levying charges which the customer is liable to pay. When existing tenants are placed in emergency accommodation, the cost is offset by claiming dual HB (provided the client is eligible).

Table 1: Statutory homeless/in housing need 1 April 2013 to 8 October 2013

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	29	62.00	1798.00
			1798.00
	60	59.00	3540.00
	153	62.00	9486.00
	50	75.00	3750.00
	68	59.00	4012.00
	15	59.00	885.00
	142	72.00	10224.00
	8	72.00	576.00
	65	72.00	4680.00
	105	62.00	6510.00
	7	60.00	420.00
	58	72.00	4176.00
	29	72.00	2088.00
	22	72.00	1584.00
	191	72.00	13752.00
	163	72.00	11736.00
			77419.00
	172	27.00	4644.00
	90	38.00	3420.00
	114	27.00	3078.00
	14	27.00	378.00
	50	27.00	1350.00
	1	38.00	38.00
	38	27.00	1026.00
	10	27.00	270.00
	129	27.00	3483.00
	28	38.00	1064.00
	30	38.00	1140.00
	36	38.00	1368.00
	66	27.00	1782.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	46	38.00	1748.00
	28	39.00	1092.00
	9	27.00	243.00
	16	38.00	608.00
	22	27.00	594.00
	34	48.00	1632.00
	48	27.00	1296.00
	188	27.00	5076.00
	48	38.00	1824.00
	32	38.00	1216.00
	23	27.00	621.00
	9	75.00	675.00
	93	72.00	6696.00
	7	38.00	266.00
			46628.00
	1	45.00	45.00
	3	35.00	105.00
			150.00
	25	45.00	1125.00
	30	32.00	960.00
	30	45.00	1350.00
	30	60.00	1800.00
			5235.00
	33	45.00	1485.00
	19	45.00	855.00
	23	60.00	1380.00
	20	45.00	900.00
	16	45.00	720.00
	111	75.00	8325.00
	22	60.00	1320.00
	112	70.00	7840.00
	93	90.00	8370.00
	15	60.00	900.00
	7	60.00	420.00
	2	90.00	180.00
	129	75.00	9675.00
	76	80.00	6080.00
	92	120.00	11040.00
			59490.00
	24	26.50	636.00
	31	28.00	868.00
	27	28.00	756.00
	63	28.00	1764.00
	83	28.00	2324.00
	56	28.00	1568.00
	8	28.00	224.00
	75	28.00	2100.00
			10240.00
	63	40.00	2520.00
	85	35.00	2975.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	20	50.00	1000.00
	2	40.00	80.00
	86	35.00	3010.00
	33	35.00	1155.00
	43	45.00	1935.00
	74	65.00	4810.00
	91	59.00	5369.00
	15	65.00	975.00
	100	65.00	6500.00
	93	55.00	5115.00
			35444.00
	15	65.00	975.00
	28	62.00	1736.00
	23	58.00	1334.00
	83	72.00	5976.00
	28	82.00	2296.00
	21	98.00	2058.00
	47	95.00	4465.00
			18840.00
	36	50.00	1800.00
	13	40.00	520.00
	13	40.00	520.00
	105	90.00	9450.00
	1	40.00	40.00
	13	40.00	520.00
	118	50.00	5900.00
	106	40.00	4240.00
	56	45.00	2520.00
	126	40.00	5040.00
	12	45.00	540.00
	152	40.00	6080.00
	100	50.00	5000.00
	112	40.00	4480.00
	4	60.00	240.00
	111	100.00	11100.00
	88	80.00	7040.00
			65030.00
	23	35.00	805.00
	32	35.00	1120.00
	24	35.00	840.00
	118	35.00	4130.00
	47	26.00	1222.00
	120	35.00	4200.00
	22	35.00	770.00
	22	35.00	770.00
	1	26.00	26.00
	56	35.00	1960.00
	63	35.00	2205.00
	9	35.00	315.00
	12	35.00	420.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	41	35.00	1435.00
	30	35.00	1050.00
	21	50.00	1050.00
	132	26.00	3432.00
	47	35.00	1645.00
	9	35.00	315.00
	15	26.00	390.00
	10	26.00	260.00
	108	35.00	3780.00
	22	35.00	770.00
	53	50.00	2650.00
	1	35.00	35.00
	4	35.00	140.00
	58	35.00	2030.00
	137	35.00	4795.00
	45	35.00	1575.00
	32	35.00	1120.00
	83	35.00	2905.00
	23	35.00	805.00
	56	35.00	1960.00
	14	26.00	364.00
	27	35.00	945.00
	69	35.00	2415.00
	15	35.00	525.00
	28	26.00	728.00
	33	35.00	1155.00
	31	50.00	1550.00
	161	35.00	5635.00
	50	50.00	2500.00
	14	35.00	490.00
	91	35.00	3185.00
	4	55.00	220.00
	56	35.00	1960.00
	77	26.00	2002.00
	54	35.00	1890.00
	26	35.00	910.00
	69	26.00	1794.00
			79193.00
	69	54.00	3726.00
	85	46.00	3910.00
			7636.00
	63	29.00	1827.00
	35	39.00	1365.00
	34	29.00	986.00
	23	60.00	1380.00
	74	29.00	2146.00
	9	39.00	351.00
	15	75.00	1125.00
	80	39.00	3120.00
	24	29.00	696.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	54	39.00	2106.00
	32	29.00	928.00
	79	29.00	2291.00
	69	49.00	3381.00
	167	29.00	4843.00
	84	29.00	2436.00
	99	29.00	2871.00
	23	39.00	897.00
	55	38.00	2090.00
	8	29.00	232.00
	35	35.00	1225.00
	133	39.00	5187.00
	1	29.00	29.00
	7	29.00	203.00
	8	29.00	232.00
	24	29.00	696.00
	141	39.00	5499.00
	87	29.00	2523.00
	3	29.00	87.00
	96	29.00	2784.00
	94	29.00	2726.00
	48	29.00	1392.00
	1	39.00	39.00
	127	29.00	3683.00
	22	39.00	858.00
	122	29.00	3538.00
	51	39.00	1989.00
	54	60.00	3240.00
			71001.00
	19	70.00	1330.00
	8	70.00	560.00
	36	70.00	2520.00
			4410.00
	20	50.00	1000.00
	12	54.00	648.00
	35	60.00	2100.00
	57	57.00	3249.00
	22	50.00	1100.00
	22	57.00	1254.00
	7	48.00	336.00
			9687.00
	5	56.00	280.00
	84	50.00	4200.00
	72	50.00	3600.00
	37	57.00	2109.00
	7	60.00	420.00
	5	56.00	280.00
			10889.00
	12	38.00	456.00
	22	40.00	880.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	47	42.00	1974.00
	22	40.00	880.00
	16	38.00	608.00
	21	40.00	840.00
	32	38.00	1216.00
	108	38.00	4104.00
	21	46.00	966.00
	30	38.00	1140.00
	38	45.00	1710.00
	4	47.00	188.00
	57	45.00	2565.00
	14	38.00	532.00
	11	38.00	418.00
	54	45.00	2430.00
	15	47.00	705.00
	35	46.00	1610.00
	27	42.00	1134.00
	29	42.00	1218.00
	8	40.00	320.00
	27	42.00	1134.00
	67	38.00	2546.00
	67	38.00	2546.00
	35	83.00	2905.00
	4	38.00	152.00
	108	45.00	4860.00
	26	47.00	1222.00
	100	38.00	3800.00
	21	38.00	798.00
	7	35.00	245.00
	99	42.00	4158.00
	27	44.00	1188.00
	1	44.00	44.00
	11	47.00	517.00
	55	38.00	2090.00
	53	38.00	2014.00
	41	45.00	1845.00
	55	38.00	2090.00
	38	40.00	1520.00
	20	45.00	900.00
	13	47.00	611.00
	18	40.00	720.00
	38	40.00	1520.00
	46	38.00	1748.00
	105	38.00	3990.00
	66	38.00	2508.00
	7	94.00	658.00
	102	45.00	4590.00
	4	46.00	184.00
	46	38.00	1748.00
	21	40.00	840.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	96	58.00	5568.00
	29	38.00	1102.00
	42	53.00	2226.00
	12	26.00	312.00
	11	45.00	495.00
	21	45.00	945.00
	70	45.00	3150.00
	100	57.00	5700.00
			101083.00
	41	53.00	2173.00
	114	55.00	6270.00
	3	56.00	168.00
	35	58.00	2030.00
	84	55.00	4620.00
	120	68.00	8160.00
	66	53.00	3498.00
	61	58.00	3538.00
	17	53.00	901.00
	172	58.00	9976.00
	34	53.00	1802.00
	21	95.00	1995.00
	23	105.00	2415.00
	105	97.00	10185.00
	57	105.00	5985.00
	18	97.00	1746.00
	191	97.00	18527.00
	191	135.00	25785.00
	40	135.00	5400.00
	22	135.00	2970.00
	191	130.00	24830.00
	120	138.00	16560.00
	4	83.00	332.00
	8	88.00	704.00
	14	145.00	2030.00
	33	42.00	1386.00
	191	135.00	25785.00
	114	45.00	5130.00
			194901.00
	16	49.00	784.00
	50	56.00	2800.00
	51	58.00	2958.00
	30	56.00	1680.00
	36	49.00	1764.00
			9986.00
	45	24.50	1102.50
	41	24.50	1004.50
	155	32.00	4960.00
	127	32.00	4064.00
	29	32.00	928.00
	21	32.00	672.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	1	32.00	32.00
	39	32.50	1267.50
	32	32.00	1024.00
	130	24.50	3185.00
	2	24.50	49.00
	188	26.00	4888.00
	22	32.50	715.00
	28	24.50	686.00
	66	24.50	1617.00
	17	24.50	416.50
	56	32.00	1792.00
	17	24.50	416.50
	51	32.50	1657.50
	101	32.00	3232.00
	17	24.50	416.50
	155	24.50	3797.50
	21	24.50	514.50
	161	32.00	5152.00
	25	32.50	812.50
	22	32.50	715.00
	169	24.50	4140.50
	89	24.50	2180.50
	93	24.50	2278.50
	137	32.00	4384.00
	56	24.50	1372.00
	88	24.50	2156.00
	4	24.50	98.00
	100	24.50	2450.00
	50	32.00	1600.00
	89	32.00	2848.00
	52	32.50	1690.00
	135	24.50	3307.50
	135	24.50	3307.50
	114	24.50	2793.00
	45	32.50	1462.50
	65	24.50	1592.50
	21	32.50	682.50
	65	32.00	2080.00
	33	24.50	808.50
	40	32.50	1300.00
	56	32.00	1792.00
	81	24.50	1984.50
	26	26.00	676.00
	125	32.50	4062.50
	14	32.00	448.00
	170	24.50	4165.00
	1	32.50	32.50
	62	32.00	1984.00
	68	24.50	1666.00
	24	32.00	768.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	118	32.00	3776.00
	60	26.00	1560.00
	7	24.50	171.50
	40	32.00	1280.00
	62	32.00	1984.00
	114	24.50	2793.00
	77	24.50	1886.50
	117	24.50	2866.50
	86	24.50	2107.00
	20	32.00	640.00
	105	24.50	2572.50
	156	24.50	3822.00
	58	32.00	1856.00
	9	32.50	292.50
	30	32.00	960.00
	121	24.50	2964.50
	2	24.50	49.00
	7	24.50	171.50
	98	24.50	2401.00
	33	24.50	808.50
	25	24.50	612.50
	56	32.00	1792.00
	179	24.50	4385.50
	63	32.00	2016.00
	54	32.00	1728.00
	30	24.50	735.00
	11	32.50	357.50
	43	32.00	1376.00
	173	24.50	4238.50
	60	24.50	1470.00
	100	32.00	3200.00
	1	32.00	32.00
	7	24.50	171.50
	35	65.00	2275.00
	41	24.50	1004.50
	14	24.50	343.00
			165926.00
	35	32.00	1120.00
	5	32.50	162.50
	4	24.50	98.00
	15	32.00	480.00
	101	32.00	3232.00
	16	32.50	520.00
	47	32.00	1504.00
			7116.50
	54	56.00	3024.00
	78	56.00	4368.00
	148	56.00	8288.00
	68	75.00	5100.00
	18	72.50	1305.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	99	75.00	7425.00
	63	70.00	4410.00
	110	75.00	8250.00
	1	75.00	75.00
	1	70.00	70.00
	72	105.50	7596.00
	48	110.00	5280.00
	30	130.00	3900.00
	55	130.00	7150.00
			66241.00
	41	33.00	1353.00
			1353.00
	42	100.00	4200.00
			4200.00
	2	48.00	96.00
	40	35.00	1400.00
			1496.00
	34	26.00	884.00
			884.00
	28	75.00	2100.00
	16	77.00	1232.00
	14	65.00	910.00
	191	65.00	12415.00
	80	75.00	6000.00
	78	90.00	7020.00
	88	85.00	7480.00
	31	90.00	2790.00
	53	80.00	4240.00
			44187.00
	90	50.00	4500.00
	31	90.00	2790.00
	16	60.00	960.00
	13	60.00	780.00
	10	110.00	1100.00
	76	60.00	4560.00
	30	70.00	2100.00
	15	80.00	1200.00
	15	60.00	900.00
	23	60.00	1380.00
	70	50.00	3500.00
	21	57.00	1197.00
	89	35.00	3115.00
	84	35.00	2940.00
	6	43.00	258.00
	68	35.00	2380.00
	14	50.00	700.00
	63	50.00	3150.00
	5	54.00	270.00
	87	50.00	4350.00
	15	50.00	750.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	8	60.00	480.00
	41	70.00	2870.00
	22	60.00	1320.00
	112	50.00	5600.00
	12	38.00	456.00
	36	50.00	1800.00
	24	60.00	1440.00
	6	60.00	360.00
	55	60.00	3300.00
	16	70.00	1120.00
	13	100.00	1300.00
	27	70.00	1890.00
	82	50.00	4100.00
	6	60.00	360.00
	9	40.00	360.00
	28	50.00	1400.00
	36	60.00	2160.00
	50	90.00	4500.00
	4	40.00	160.00
	2	50.00	100.00
	70	50.00	3500.00
	2	80.00	160.00
	89	80.00	7120.00
	62	40.00	2480.00
	49	40.00	1960.00
	7	40.00	280.00
	105	40.00	4200.00
	57	28.00	1596.00
	26	28.00	728.00
	49	28.00	1372.00
	58	28.00	1624.00
	30	28.00	840.00
	9	28.00	252.00
	69	40.00	2760.00
	95	40.00	3800.00
	28	28.00	784.00
	126	40.00	5040.00
	147	50.00	7350.00
	57	28.00	1596.00
			125398.00
	84	27.00	2268.00
	26	27.00	702.00
	175	27.00	4725.00
			7695.00
	187	72.00	13464.00
			13464.00
	13	40.00	520.00
	191	50.00	9550.00
			10070.00
	175	50.00	8750.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
			8750.00
	14	55.00	770.00
	29	60.00	1740.00
	132	60.00	7920.00
	48	60.00	2880.00
	57	60.00	3420.00
	47	60.00	2820.00
	70	60.00	4200.00
	83	60.00	4980.00
	43	57.00	2451.00
	8	60.00	480.00
	109	57.00	6213.00
	72	57.00	4104.00
	128	60.00	7680.00
	133	60.00	7980.00
	14	60.00	840.00
	97	67.00	6499.00
	63	70.00	4410.00
	48	70.00	3360.00
	63	65.00	4095.00
	1	70.00	70.00
	33	70.00	2310.00
	24	70.00	1680.00
	45	85.00	3825.00
	114	55.00	6270.00
	64	85.00	5440.00
	70	55.00	3850.00
	79	60.00	4740.00
	40	60.00	2400.00
	51	70.00	3570.00
	6	60.00	360.00
			111357.00
	9	26.00	234.00
	56	26.00	1456.00
	28	26.00	728.00
	88	35.00	3080.00
	30	32.00	960.00
	80	35.00	2800.00
	100	26.00	2600.00
	43	26.00	1118.00
	115	26.00	2990.00
	99	26.00	2574.00
	70	26.00	1820.00
	107	26.00	2782.00
			23142.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	79	45.00	3555.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	187	48.00	8976.00
	1	45.00	45.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
			12662.00
	7	30.00	210.00
	1	75.00	75.00
		TOTAL	£1,413,286.50

Table 2: Existing Southwark tenants 1 April 2013 to 8 October 2013

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	87	62.00	5,394.00
			5,394.00
	30	62.00	1,860.00
	82	72.00	5,904.00
	161	72.00	11,592.00
	191	100.00	19,100.00
	85	72.00	6,120.00
	191	98.00	18,718.00
	110	85.00	9,350.00
	109	72.00	7,848.00
			80,492.00
	68	27.00	1,836.00
	39	27.00	1,053.00
	62	53.00	3,286.00
	3	38.00	114.00
	13	38.00	494.00
			6,783.00
	191	85.00	16,235.00
			16,235.00
	53	90.00	4,770.00
			4,770.00
	175	60.00	10,500.00
			10,500.00
	101	45.00	4,545.00
	191	75.00	14,325.00
			18,870.00
	86	26.00	2,236.00
			2,236.00
	8	49.00	392.00
	34	29.00	986.00
	8	29.00	232.00
	41	29.00	1,189.00
	4	39.00	156.00
			2,955.00
	191	90.00	17,190.00
			23,100.00
	69	57.00	3,933.00
	23	50.00	1,150.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	5	50.00	250.00
			5,333.00
	7	84.00	588.00
	124	47.00	5,828.00
	2	45.00	90.00
	55	38.00	2,090.00
			8,596.00
	22	58.00	1,276.00
	100	97.00	9,700.00
	50	135.00	6,750.00
	49	150.00	7,350.00
	191	165.00	31,515.00
	14	38.00	532.00
			56,591.00
	5	24.50	122.50
	88	24.50	2,156.00
	15	24.50	367.50
	26	32.00	832.00
	182	32.00	5,824.00
	137	24.50	3,356.50
			12,658.50
	21	100.00	2,100.00
	16	100.00	1,600.00
			3,700.00
	191	70.00	13,370.00
	8	60.00	480.00
	7	40.00	280.00
	45	40.00	1,800.00
			15,930.00
	57	30.00	1,710.00
			1,710.00
	25	50.00	1,250.00
	4	45.00	180.00
			1,430.00
	84	60.00	5,040.00
			5,040.00
	57	43.00	2,451.00
			2,451.00
		TOTAL	£75,036.50

Table 3: Statutory homeless or in housing need financial year 2009/2010

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	113	71.50	8079.50
	97	61.50	5965.50
	30	51.50	1545.00
	14	71.50	1001.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	10	71.50	715.00
	128	81.50	10432.00
	27	61.50	1660.50
	223	61.50	13714.50
	16	61.50	984.00
	61	58.00	3538.00
	23	71.50	1644.50
	359	71.50	25668.50
	169	91.50	15463.50
	314	61.50	19311.00
	21	81.50	1711.50
	159	91.50	14548.50
	365	61.50	22447.50
	141	71.50	10081.50
	2	91.50	183.00
	106	91.50	9699.00
	7	120.00	840.00
	28	100.00	2800.00
	22	81.50	1793.00
	142	71.50	10153.00
	1	81.50	81.50
	264	120.00	31680.00
	170	91.50	15555.00
	28	90.00	2520.00
	79	81.50	6438.50
			240254.50
	133	31.50	4189.50
	22	31.50	693.00
	146	31.50	4599.00
	52	41.85	2176.20
	7	41.85	292.95
	58	41.85	2427.30
	7	41.85	292.95
	65	41.85	2720.25
	33	50.15	1654.95
	29	31.50	913.50
	31	31.50	976.50
	16	50.15	802.40
	3	31.50	94.50
	143	41.85	5984.55
	182	31.50	5733.00
	20	31.50	630.00
	4	41.85	167.40
	262	31.50	8253.00
	47	41.85	1966.95
	190	31.50	5985.00
	1	31.50	31.50
	191	31.50	6016.50
	21	50.15	1053.15
	64	41.85	2678.40

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	10	71.50	715.00
	58	31.50	1827.00
	64	41.85	2678.40
	150	31.50	4725.00
	3	31.50	94.50
	171	41.85	7156.35
	6	41.85	251.10
	14	41.85	585.90
	39	31.50	1228.50
	11	41.85	460.35
	35	41.85	1464.75
	7	31.50	220.50
	1	31.50	31.50
	169	31.50	5323.50
	48	41.85	2008.80
	64	41.85	2678.40
	147	31.50	4630.50
	13	50.15	651.95
	36	50.15	1805.40
	61	31.50	1921.50
	60	41.85	2511.00
	35	31.50	1102.50
	49	41.85	2050.65
	1	71.50	71.50
	22	71.50	1573.00
	249	31.50	7843.50
	5	31.50	157.50
	5	30.15	150.75
	18	31.50	567.00
	26	53.00	1378.00
	95	41.85	3975.75
	105	50.15	5265.75
	11	41.85	460.35
	36	41.85	1506.60
	299	31.50	9418.50
	243	31.50	7654.50
	208	31.50	6552.00
	13	41.85	544.05
	1	81.50	81.50
	121	31.50	3811.50
	32	31.50	1008.00
	26	100.00	2600.00
	8	51.85	414.80
	1	41.85	41.85
	210	31.50	6615.00
	41	31.50	1291.50
	198	31.50	6237.00
	4	31.50	126.00
	9	31.50	283.50
	3	41.85	125.55

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	200	31.50	6300.00
	14	52.15	730.10
	99	31.50	3118.50
	56	31.50	1764.00
	152	31.50	4788.00
	43	41.85	1799.55
	40	50.15	2006.00
	29	31.50	913.50
	3	31.50	94.50
	259	31.50	8158.50
	142	31.50	4473.00
	50	31.50	1575.00
	9	80.00	720.00
	22	61.50	1353.00
	28	41.85	1171.80
	174	31.50	5481.00
	247	31.50	7780.50
	30	41.85	1255.50
	310	31.50	9765.00
	1	41.85	41.85
	204	31.50	6426.00
	5	31.50	157.50
	2	31.50	63.00
	9	41.85	376.65
	273	31.50	8599.50
	1	41.85	41.85
	61	41.85	2552.85
	146	31.50	4599.00
	48	30.00	1440.00
	162	31.50	5103.00
	36	41.85	1506.60
	41	71.50	2931.50
	12	71.50	858.00
	3	31.50	94.50
	77	81.50	6275.50
	2	31.50	63.00
			280588.20
	36	44.00	1584.00
	7	33.00	231.00
	4	27.00	108.00
	3	45.00	135.00
	2	111.55	223.10
	51	37.95	1935.45
	65	39.00	2535.00
	43	26.00	1118.00
	56	33.00	1848.00
			9717.55
	102	29.00	2958.00
	32	29.00	928.00
	115	53.00	6095.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	74	29.00	2146.00
	2	53.00	106.00
	118	30.00	3540.00
	31	38.00	1178.00
	1	39.00	39.00
	24	29.00	696.00
	48	39.00	1872.00
	1	39.00	39.00
	4	53.00	212.00
	81	29.00	2349.00
	166	29.00	4814.00
	65	39.00	2535.00
	4	38.00	152.00
	4	53.00	212.00
	155	29.00	4495.00
	26	29.00	754.00
	193	29.00	5597.00
	31	39.00	1209.00
	21	38.00	798.00
	144	29.00	4176.00
	44	53.00	2332.00
	7	30.00	210.00
	14	68.00	952.00
	15	39.00	585.00
	62	29.00	1798.00
	25	53.00	1325.00
	5	53.00	265.00
	10	53.00	530.00
	60	110.00	6600.00
	21	29.00	609.00
	13	39.00	507.00
	28	29.00	812.00
	1	40.00	40.00
	6	39.00	234.00
	29	39.00	1131.00
	5	38.00	190.00
	80	53.00	4240.00
	240	29.00	6960.00
	25	39.00	975.00
	115	29.00	3335.00
	16	39.00	624.00
	175	29.00	5075.00
	11	38.00	418.00
	86	29.00	2494.00
	23	53.00	1219.00
	6	39.00	234.00
	279	29.00	8091.00
	21	40.00	840.00
	67	70.00	4690.00
			104215.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	32	110.00	3520.00
	162	100.00	1620.00
	82	120.00	9840.00
	27	60.00	1620.00
	1	40.00	40.00
	226	140.00	31640.00
	23	85.00	1955.00
	171	85.00	14535.00
	159	65.00	10335.00
	31	53.00	1643.00
	177	81.50	14425.50
	1	53.00	53.00
	66	53.00	3498.00
	38	85.00	3230.00
			97954.50
	4	43.00	172.00
	15	43.00	645.00
	25	53.00	1325.00
	37	33.00	1221.00
	3	63.00	189.00
	18	53.00	954.00
	19	33.00	193.00
	44	33.00	1452.00
	5	323.07	1615.35
	29	53.00	1537.00
	155	63.00	9765.00
	4	33.00	132.00
	15	73.00	1095.00
	30	63.00	1890.00
	38	63.00	2394.00
	45	53.00	2385.00
	4	33.00	132.00
	24	53.00	1272.00
	66	43.00	2838.00
	14	53.00	742.00
	36	73.00	2628.00
	42	63.00	2646.00
	123	33.00	4059.00
	27	63.00	1701.00
	64	53.00	3392.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	184	33.00	6072.00
	74	43.00	3182.00
	10	63.00	630.00
	172	33.00	5676.00
	31	31.50	976.50
	7	43.00	301.00
	12	63.00	756.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	15	41.85	627.75

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	47	43.00	2021.00
	6	43.00	258.00
	8	43.00	344.00
	9	33.00	297.00
	8	33.00	264.00
	188	33.00	6204.00
	6	43.00	258.00
	16	53.00	848.00
	20	33.00	660.00
	14	33.00	462.00
	17	43.00	731.00
	11	73.00	803.00
	79	53.00	4187.00
	10	43.00	430.00
	58	43.00	2494.00
	31	43.00	1333.00
	62	33.00	2046.00
	49	33.00	1617.00
	84	43.00	3612.00
	30	33.00	990.00
	10	83.00	830.00
	23	33.00	759.00
	192	33.00	6336.00
	232	33.00	7656.00
	155	33.00	5115.00
	16	53.00	848.00
	72	43.00	3096.00
	157	33.00	5181.00
	7	33.00	231.00
	3	43.00	129.00
	21	33.00	693.00
	6	43.00	258.00
	124	33.00	4092.00
	240	33.00	7920.00
	81	24.50	1984.50
	41	24.50	1004.50
	14	63.00	882.00
	25	73.00	1825.00
	10	53.00	530.00
	35	33.00	1155.00
	1	63.00	63.00
	209	33.00	6897.00
	105	33.00	3465.00
	25	33.00	825.00
	185	33.00	6105.00
	20	24.50	490.00
	81	33.00	2673.00
	2	53.00	106.00
	1	63.00	63.00
	15	53.00	795.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	200	33.00	6600.00
	68	43.00	2924.00
	196	33.00	6468.00
	38	33.00	1254.00
	27	33.00	891.00
	69	43.00	2967.00
	56	33.00	1848.00
	27	33.00	891.00
	3	43.00	129.00
	281	33.00	9273.00
	16	63.00	1008.00
	71	33.00	2343.00
	5	43.00	215.00
	22	53.00	1166.00
	111	33.00	3663.00
	2	43.00	86.00
	72	33.00	2376.00
	48	43.00	2064.00
	149	33.00	4917.00
	23	33.00	759.00
	277	33.00	9141.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	274	33.00	9042.00
	28	33.00	924.00
	38	33.00	1254.00
	44	33.00	1452.00
	136	43.00	5848.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	86	33.00	2838.00
	9	41.85	376.65
	5	33.00	165.00
	2	53.00	106.00
	113	53.00	5989.00
	72	43.00	3096.00
	6	33.00	198.00
	5	63.00	315.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	6	43.00	258.00
	78	53.00	4134.00
	16	73.00	1168.00
	9	53.00	477.00
	16	53.00	848.00
	118	33.00	3894.00
	173	33.00	5709.00
	303	33.00	9999.00
	14	33.00	462.00
	10	43.00	430.00
	290	33.00	9570.00
	293	33.00	9669.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	149	33.00	4917.00
	51	33.00	1683.00
	177	33.00	5841.00
	28	43.00	1204.00
	162	33.00	5346.00
	3	43.00	129.00
	7	43.00	301.00
	29	33.00	957.00
	26	43.00	1118.00
	29	43.00	1247.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	50	33.00	1650.00
	114	43.00	4902.00
	54	53.00	2862.00
	44	53.00	2332.00
	72	33.00	2376.00
	28	24.50	686.00
	3	43.00	129.00
	18	43.00	774.00
	198	33.00	6534.00
	117	33.00	3861.00
	14	53.00	742.00
	93	43.00	3999.00
	114	33.00	3762.00
	76	33.00	2508.00
	15	63.00	945.00
	253	33.00	8349.00
	58	33.00	1914.00
	31	53.00	1643.00
	41	53.00	2173.00
	3	63.00	189.00
	27	43.00	1161.00
	14	43.00	602.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	39	43.00	1677.00
	92	33.00	3036.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	24	43.00	1032.00
	212	33.00	6996.00
	16	63.00	1008.00
	1	63.00	63.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	42	33.00	1386.00
	21	63.00	1323.00
	27	53.00	1431.00
	58	43.00	2494.00
	136	33.00	4488.00
	1	43.00	43.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	28	43.00	1204.00
			409159.25
	4	63.00	252.00
	28	93.00	2604.00
	239	53.00	12667.00
			15523.00
	57	35.00	1995.00
	56	33.00	1848.00
	49	29.00	1421.00
	6	40.00	240.00
	37	56.00	2072.00
	2	28.00	56.00
	35	28.00	980.00
	19	35.00	665.00
	14	45.00	630.00
	3	34.00	102.00
	2	22.00	44.00
	1	22.00	22.00
	20	120.00	2400.00
	2	60.00	120.00
	22	57.00	1254.00
	133	53.00	7049.00
	12	70.00	840.00
	1	57.00	57.00
			21795.00
	108	53.00	5724.00
	184	60.00	11040.00
	156	60.00	9360.00
			26124.00
	107	24.50	2621.50
	74	24.50	1813.00
	95	24.50	2327.50
	45	24.50	1102.50
	198	24.50	4851.00
	62	24.50	1519.00
	119	24.50	2915.50
	58	24.50	1421.00
	147	24.50	3601.50
	124	24.50	3038.00
	71	24.50	1739.50
	90	24.50	2205.00
	96	24.50	2352.00
	229	24.50	5610.50
	60	24.50	1470.00
	75	24.50	1837.50
	167	24.50	4091.50
	15	24.50	367.50
	25	24.50	612.50
	224	24.50	5488.00
	26	25.50	663.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	21	24.50	514.50
	23	24.50	563.50
	15	24.50	367.50
	66	24.50	1617.00
	7	24.50	171.50
	48	24.50	1176.00
	161	24.50	3944.50
	89	24.50	2180.50
	55	24.50	1347.50
	236	24.50	5782.00
	64	24.50	1568.00
	140	24.50	3430.00
	79	24.50	1935.50
	119	24.50	2915.50
	20	24.50	490.00
	141	24.50	3454.50
	224	24.50	5488.00
	187	24.50	4581.50
	163	24.50	3993.50
	124	24.50	3038.00
	9	24.50	220.50
	50	24.50	1225.00
	174	24.50	4263.00
	61	24.50	1494.50
	127	24.50	3111.50
	25	24.50	612.50
	276	24.50	6762.00
	52	24.50	1274.00
	1	24.50	24.50
	131	24.50	3209.50
	216	24.50	5292.00
	38	24.50	931.00
	27	24.50	661.50
	61	24.50	1494.50
	19	24.50	465.50
	36	24.50	882.00
	56	24.50	1372.00
	111	24.50	2719.50
	145	24.50	3552.50
	38	24.50	931.00
	119	24.50	2915.50
	11	24.50	269.50
	276	24.50	6762.00
	168	24.50	4116.00
	9	24.50	220.50
	207	24.50	5071.50
	48	24.50	1176.00
	50	24.50	1225.00
	148	24.50	3626.00
	14	24.50	343.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	47	24.50	1151.50
	34	24.50	833.00
	161	24.50	3944.50
	122	24.50	2989.00
	10	24.50	245.00
	98	24.50	2401.00
	96	24.50	2352.00
	107	24.50	2621.50
	169	24.50	4140.50
	14	24.50	343.00
	112	24.50	2744.00
	16	24.50	392.00
	38	24.50	1311.00
	19	24.50	465.50
	146	24.50	3577.00
	75	24.50	1837.50
	35	24.50	857.50
	71	24.50	1739.50
	156	24.50	3822.00
	108	24.50	2646.00
	102	24.50	2499.00
	28	24.50	686.00
	56	24.50	1372.00
	25	24.50	612.50
	45	33.00	1485.00
	145	24.50	3552.50
	1	24.50	24.50
	66	24.50	1617.00
	38	24.50	931.00
	75	24.50	1837.50
			221460.00
	4	24.50	98.00
	259	24.50	6345.50
	38	24.50	931.00
			7374.50
	7	53.00	371.00
	14	53.00	742.00
	70	33.00	2310.00
	29	33.00	957.00
	17	33.00	561.00
	8	33.00	264.00
	40	44.00	1760.00
	13	33.00	429.00
	7	33.00	231.00
	2	39.00	78.00
	60	33.00	1980.00
	31	33.00	1023.00
	27	33.00	891.00
	1	116.00	116.00
	3	63.00	189.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	1	73.00	73.00
	6	72.45	434.70
	1	69.00	69.00
	3	38.00	114.00
	43	28.00	1204.00
	144	95.00	13680.00
	30	100.00	3000.00
	14	323.07	4522.98
	24	110.00	2640.00
	1	35.00	35.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	2	63.00	126.00
	1	44.00	44.00
	12	53.00	636.00
	28	44.00	1232.00
	27	33.00	891.00
	12	37.95	455.40
	58	33.00	1914.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	6	33.00	198.00
			43330.08
	7	110.00	770.00
	24	95.00	2280.00
			3050.00
	42	24.50	1029.00
	181	30.00	5430.00
	80	30.00	2400.00
	97	30.00	2910.00
	9	70.00	630.00
	43	30.00	1290.00
	254	30.00	7620.00
	89	30.00	2670.00
	68	30.00	2040.00
	176	30.00	5280.00
	28	30.00	840.00
	176	30.00	5280.00
	27	30.00	810.00
	81	30.00	2430.00
	39	30.00	1170.00
	167	30.00	5010.00
	278	30.00	8340.00
	173	30.00	5190.00
	3	24.50	73.50
	6	60.00	360.00
	222	30.00	6660.00
	5	30.00	150.00
	202	30.00	6060.00
	351	30.00	10530.00
	322	30.00	9660.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	322	30.00	9660.00
	331	30.00	9930.00
	148	30.00	4440.00
	124	29.00	3596.00
	343	30.00	10290.00
	328	30.00	9840.00
	5	81.50	407.50
	62	30.00	1860.00
	45	30.00	1350.00
	15	30.00	450.00
	54	30.00	1620.00
	1	50.00	50.00
	9	30.00	270.00
			147626.00
	54	35.00	1890.00
	90	35.00	3150.00
	94	35.00	3290.00
	70	35.00	2450.00
	28	35.00	980.00
			11760.00
		TOTAL	£1,639,931.58

Table 4: Existing Southwark tenants financial year 2009/2010

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	134	71.50	9581.00
	365	61.50	22447.50
	126	71.50	9009.00
	165	61.50	10147.50
	307	51.50	15810.50
	45	61.50	2767.50
	126	130.00	16380.00
	92	100.00	9200.00
	232	81.50	18908.00
	78	71.50	5577.00
	263	53.00	13939.00
	33	81.50	2689.50
	196	61.50	12054.00
	4	81.50	326.00
	62	71.50	4433.00
	29	91.50	2653.50
	124	70.00	8680.00
	126	91.50	11529.00
	12	81.50	978.00
	101	91.50	9241.50
	244	53.00	12932.00
	354	71.50	25311.00
	228	81.50	18582.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	120	91.50	10980.00
	209	71.50	14943.50
	365	70.00	25550.00
	105	100.00	10500.00
	224	71.50	16016.00
	85	120.00	10200.00
	23	100.00	2300.00
	365	90.00	32850.00
	27	81.50	2200.50
	83	39.00	3237.00
	230	110.00	25300.00
	50	120.00	6000.00
	157	91.50	14365.50
	18	81.50	1467.00
	1	81.50	81.50
	334	91.50	30561.00
	159	71.50	11368.50
	300	91.00	27300.00
	174	70.00	12180.00
	26	120.00	3120.00
	51	110.00	5610.00
	80	107.00	8560.00
			517867.00
	279	93.00	25947.00
	31	31.50	976.50
	102	41.85	4268.70
	47	71.50	3360.50
	312	81.50	25428.00
	365	71.50	26097.50
	80	50.15	4012.00
	15	41.85	627.75
	70	60.00	4200.00
	29	60.00	1740.00
	3	51.50	154.50
	245	71.50	17517.50
	73	31.50	2299.50
	75	41.85	3138.75
	75	71.50	5362.50
	268	90.00	24120.00
	91	50.15	4563.65
	82	31.50	2583.00
	14	61.50	861.00
	6	50.50	303.00
	2	41.85	83.70
	93	31.50	2929.50
	136	91.50	12444.00
	22	31.50	693.00
	11	41.85	460.35
	16	60.00	960.00
	7	31.50	220.50

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	80	41.85	3348.00
	7	31.50	220.50
	70	31.50	2205.00
	27	41.85	1129.95
	119	31.50	3748.50
	18	61.50	1107.00
	31	31.50	976.50
	101	31.50	3181.50
	53	31.50	1669.50
	43	31.50	1354.50
	132	31.50	4158.00
	20	41.85	837.00
	114	110.00	12540.00
	229	107.00	24503.00
	80	71.50	5720.00
	96	41.85	4017.60
	26	41.85	1088.10
	208	71.50	14872.00
	300	85.00	25500.00
	95	107.00	10165.00
	143	110.00	15730.00
	1	50.15	50.15
	315	91.50	28822.50
			342296.70
	133	66.00	8778.00
	16	106.00	1696.00
	4	40.00	160.00
	2	53.00	106.00
	80	60.00	4800.00
	150	60.00	9000.00
	66	53.00	3498.00
	1	53.00	53.00
			28091.00
	160	65.00	10400.00
	46	53.00	2438.00
	75	53.00	3975.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	20	38.00	760.00
	7	29.00	203.00
	146	29.00	4234.00
	2	29.00	58.00
	111	39.00	4329.00
	180	29.00	5220.00
	257	53.00	13621.00
	188	29.00	5452.00
	345	29.00	10005.00
	34	40.00	1360.00
	77	92.00	7084.00
	94	85.00	7990.00
	65	85.00	5525.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	94	135.00	12690.00
	31	140.00	4340.00
	57	85.00	4845.00
	22	106.00	2332.00
	53	53.00	2809.00
	22	81.50	1793.00
	27	106.00	2862.00
	66	41.85	2762.10
	1	53.00	53.00
	20	53.00	1060.00
	290	53.00	15370.00
	21	53.00	1113.00
	259	53.00	13727.00
	80	53.00	4240.00
	113	80.00	9040.00
	217	53.00	11501.00
	110	53.00	5830.00
	114	78.00	8892.00
	100	65.00	6500.00
	1	68.00	68.00
	2	39.00	78.00
	71	53.00	3763.00
	23	107.00	2461.00
	96	120.00	11520.00
	17	107.00	1819.00
	18	106.00	1908.00
	7	65.00	455.00
	14	85.00	1190.00
	67	85.00	5695.00
			223413.10
	181	65.00	11765.00
	66	39.00	2574.00
	271	85.00	23035.00
	22	110.00	2420.00
	104	110.00	11440.00
	365	110.00	40150.00
	26	120.00	3120.00
	254	120.00	30480.00
	130	107.00	13910.00
	40	110.00	4400.00
	100	107.00	10700.00
	45	85.00	3825.00
	44	39.00	1716.00
	65	85.00	5525.00
	15	65.00	975.00
	1	85.00	85.00
	164	53.00	8692.00
	1	53.00	53.00
	125	150.00	18750.00
	91	65.00	5915.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	70	47.00	3290.00
	22	39.00	858.00
	3	65.00	195.00
	143	107.00	15301.00
	97	120.00	11640.00
	11	60.00	660.00
			231474.00
	9	43.00	387.00
	12	86.00	1032.00
	12	63.00	756.00
	60	33.00	1980.00
	36	63.00	2268.00
	3	53.00	159.00
	36	53.00	1908.00
	13	63.00	819.00
	11	73.00	803.00
	53	63.00	3339.00
	3	53.00	159.00
	40	63.00	2520.00
	13	53.00	689.00
	63	33.00	2079.00
	20	43.00	860.00
	285	33.00	9405.00
	309	33.00	10197.00
	20	33.00	660.00
	45	43.00	1935.00
	3	33.00	99.00
	100	43.00	4300.00
	3	43.00	129.00
	40	33.00	1320.00
	10	76.00	760.00
	87	63.00	5481.00
	5	63.00	315.00
	59	43.00	2537.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	3	63.00	189.00
	4	43.00	172.00
	273	93.00	25389.00
	2	106.00	212.00
	27	76.00	2052.00
	51	33.00	1683.00
	139	33.00	4587.00
	247	73.00	18031.00
	5	53.00	265.00
	164	63.00	10332.00
	59	129.00	7611.00
	67	33.00	2211.00
	14	33.00	462.00
	1	43.00	43.00
	7	53.00	371.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
	49	63.00	3087.00
	134	43.00	5762.00
	37	86.00	3182.00
	1	33.00	33.00
	21	33.00	693.00
	5	33.00	165.00
	8	43.00	344.00
	124	33.00	4092.00
	118	33.00	3894.00
	139	33.00	4587.00
	24	33.00	792.00
	10	53.00	530.00
	217	53.00	11501.00
	36	43.00	1548.00
	118	33.00	3894.00
	5	43.00	215.00
	26	33.00	858.00
	35	63.00	2205.00
	9	53.00	477.00
			178398.00
	30	63.00	1890.00
	2	93.00	186.00
			2076.00
	12	40.00	480.00
	17	93.00	1581.00
	33	39.00	1287.00
	103	120.00	12360.00
	5	53.00	265.00
	82	95.00	7790.00
			23763.00
	218	106.00	23108.00
	55	80.00	4400.00
	50	95.00	4750.00
	41	65.00	2665.00
	13	125.00	1625.00
	5	140.00	700.00
	126	175.00	22050.00
	40	90.00	3600.00
			59298.00
	39	49.00	1911.00
	51	24.50	1249.50
	7	24.50	171.50
	17	24.50	416.50
			3748.50
	2	24.50	49.00
			49.00
	29	116.00	3364.00
	1	97.00	97.00
	4	110.00	440.00
	31	95.00	2945.00

NAME (Note: The names of hotels have been deleted for reasons of confidentiality)	TOTAL NO OF NIGHTS	TOTAL COST PER NIGHT	OVERALL COST
			6846.00
	119	95.00	11305.00
	3	49.00	147.00
			11452.00
	7	60.00	420.00
	17	50.00	850.00
	10	70.00	700.00
	6	50.00	300.00
	5	90.00	450.00
	54	60.00	3240.00
	3	50.00	150.00
	25	100.00	2500.00
	63	50.00	3150.00
	365	120.00	43800.00
	89	100.00	8900.00
	40	120.00	4800.00
	104	80.00	8320.00
			77580.00
		TOTAL	£1,706,352.30

51. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY FROM COUNCILLOR NORMA GIBBES

Would the leader update me on what steps Southwark has taken to protect fire services in the borough?

RESPONSE

We are maintaining our position against cuts to our fire service. Southwark has had the second highest number of high rise fires, deaths and injuries over the last five years, and this sad statistic puts us well above the London average. Despite this, the Mayor of London has chosen to make deep cuts to the numbers of fire fighters we have in the borough: closing Southwark fire station and reducing the number of fire-fighters based in the borough by a third.

We feel that this decision is wholly flawed and this is why we are continuing to fight to keep our residents safe. Along with six other boroughs, we have now made an application to seek a judicial review against his decisions and for any action to implement the proposed cuts to be stayed in the mean time.

Our claim makes clear that the Mayor paid insufficient regard to key characteristics of our borough; the number of highrise buildings, the high proportion of vulnerable residents, significant areas of deprivation and areas of high density.

It is clear that we need to continue to make apparent our objection to the loss of Southwark station, the increased response times that will result for our borough and in respect of the cuts to crews. Our hope is that the Mayor, Commissioner and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority take heed of the concerns we have raised.

52. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND VOLUNTEERING FROM COUNCILLOR ALTHEA SMITH

How are we continuing to pick up the legacy and momentum post Olympics 2012 throughout the council?

RESPONSE

The council has made an enormous effort to continue the momentum generated by residents across the age spectrum during, what was an amazing Olympic year. 10 local sport projects with the £2 million pound legacy fund are now under way. Dulwich and Camberwell leisure centres are now refurbished and the Elephant and Castle leisure centre will be complete by the end of 2014.

Southwark residents have contributed one of the highest number of volunteers for the 2012 Games, with over 1,000 people. The volunteer strategy 2013-2018 incorporates the 2012 legacy of residents, who selflessly gave their time to be games makers, stewards and ambassadors by merging some of our existing programmes and creating opportunities for local people. Our key priorities are to support and drive a volunteering legacy and to support Southwark's volunteers.

The leader, chief executive, Councillor Livingstone and myself attended a volunteer award ceremony at Millwall last month for Olympic and Paralympics volunteers. At half time they received a round of applause from the Millwall faithful. Until that point they had won only one game this season. The final score was Millwall 3 Blackpool 1.

An event to recognise the achievements of Southwark children and young people is scheduled for Monday 28 October at Canada Water Library. Olympic torchbearer Kevin Steward, who has visited 14 primary schools to talk about to share his experience will be one of the guests. They will include recognition of the gold medal winners from Team Southwark at the London Youth Games earlier this year and the young volunteers for local organisations. The young Olympic volunteers, to launch the new sport and physical activity strategy for the borough, will attend. There will also be a handover of signed Olympic and Union flags to representatives of the British Olympic Association, the British Paralympic Association, and the Brazilian Embassy.

53. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE, SPORT AND VOLUNTEERING FROM COUNCILLOR MARTIN SEATON

What is the council doing to ensure that the health and well-being of its residents links with the cultural sector?

RESPONSE

Many of the large and small creative organisations and projects in Southwark offering art, dance, music and drama, work with young people in Southwark both through schools and community projects. The libraries run reading programmes linked to well being. The cultural strategy agreed by cabinet on 16 July 2013 sets out actions points which both support the sector and set out how the council can support creative organisations to link with communities.

The wide range of art opportunities in Southwark helps people to explore their own identity and cultural values through festivals, events exhibitions, film making and showing casing local talent and involvement in making art. Exploring culture and heritage is an important part of the work of the Cuming Museum, history library, library events and activities.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER
QUESTIONS ON REPORTS

Item 7.1: Children and Young People's Plan 2013-2016

**1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES
FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN**

Southwark has been named as one of the councils placing more than 80% of children in care in 'far-flung' care homes [more than 20 miles away]. What is the explanation for this approach?

RESPONSE

Southwark Council takes the care of our looked after children extremely seriously and we are very vigilant about monitoring their care.

We have one of the largest populations of looked after children in London and in fact the actual number of children referred to in the report as being placed far from the borough is just 10 children, or about 2% of our entire looked after children population. The vast majority of Southwark children are put in family placements either in, or close to the borough, and for the few that are moved further afield there are very good reasons for doing so. Some have very complex needs which require specialist placements which are not available nearby, while others are moved for their own personal safety. We only use homes that are rated as Outstanding or Good by Ofsted and every decision we take is in the best interests of the child involved.

The figures used by the DfE to create this report are 12 Southwark children in care homes, 10 of these are outside London (hence the 80%). This represents 2% of our entire looked after children population which currently stands at 567 children.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER
QUESTIONS ON REPORTS

Item 8.1: Representation to proposed Northern Line Extension

1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

The report states that the council will provide oral evidence at the public inquiry if TfL fails to address its concerns about the project. Specifically which of the council's requirements must be met to avoid this scenario? Does the council demand that a certain maximum noise level must be agreed not to be surpassed by the construction work, and if so, what is that level?

RESPONSE

The council maintains concerns with the dis-application of sections 56, 56A, 58, 58, 73A, 73B 73C and 78A and Schedule 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. This would compromise the council's ability to perform its duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 work and fulfil its duty under the Highways Act 1980 without incurring additional cost.

Regarding the noise of construction works, the work site for the ventilation shaft is in the London Borough of Lambeth, who will be responsible authority to issue the section 61 Control of Pollution Act 1974. Discussion will need to be undertaken how the work in practice with LB Lambeth and TfL to ensure that the noise levels are acceptable to the residents within the borough, through an agreement.

2. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

What is the council doing to ensure that the proposals offer benefits to local residents, rather than just the inconvenience associated with the construction work? Is the council calling for compensation to be offered to residents whose houses and living conditions are likely to be affected by the proposed works?

RESPONSE

The authority has raised concerns with the impact of construction in the amenity (specifically the environmental impacts) of residents, workers and visitors to the area. A letter from Transport of London dated 22 August 2013 TfL states that the "Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Scheme" will be applied sympathetically and having regard to the merits of individual cases. The "Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Scheme" is included as a planning condition. This includes items such as assessment and monitoring, and where necessary appropriate compensation. These management controls are consistent with other TfL schemes such as Crossrail.

3. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE

Does the council support TfL's proposal for the location of the permanent shaft, or is the council seeking further justification from TfL on the matter? Has the council challenged TfL's assertions that moving the permanent shaft would require sharp turns for trains and would also remove the option of using gallery tunnels to reinforce the ground in the Kennington area?

RESPONSE

The permanent ventilation and intervention shafts are provided to ensure safety and comfort within tunnels once the underground railway is operating. The office of Rail regulation Railway safety Principles and Guidance Part 2a indicates that an intervention and access point should usually be provided every kilometre along an underground railway.

The function of the particular shafts drives the broad location of each shaft. At each of the proposed sites and alternative site locations which were identified, they were appraised in terms of a number of criteria, to establish the preferred sites. The criteria include:

- Constructability and availability of a suitable worksite;
- Efficiency of ventilation and distance of the shaft from centre line of route alignment;
- Acceptability to the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) in terms of the distance between the above – ground access at the shafts to the running tunnels;
- Amount of temporary or permanent land take and property acquisition
- Amount of disruption to trees and ecology;
- Distance to the closest sensitive receptors (e.g. residential properties) to avoid construction and operational air quality and noise impacts
- The presence of heritage and townscape constraints; and
- Suitable parking space in proximity for maintenance and emergency vehicle parking.

The council has considered the information presented by TfL regarding the location for the permanent shaft and the work by Ramboll Ltd, Lambeth Council's adviser on technical matters which considered a similar situation for the permanent shaft in Kennington Green.

Having reviewed both sets of information the council does not think that there is any further progress that can be made in challenging TfL's decision to site the permanent shaft at this location.

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

Is the council privy to the views of Ramboll Ltd, Lambeth Council's adviser on technical matters, on the perceived need to locate the permanent shaft at Kennington Park House, and if so, what is Ramboll's view? Has Southwark Council considered commissioning its own technical advisers?

RESPONSE

The Ramboll Ltd reports are available via Lambeth council's website. Officers from both councils have been working closely and having considered the technical requirements, including safety, planning, transport and environmental (including the facilitation of gallery tunnelling to remove the requirement for the construction of a tunnel in Harmsworth Street) considerations, have concluded that the location of the permanent shaft is the most appropriate taking all things into consideration. Given the level of close working with Lambeth Council and the technical expertise available it was not considered necessary to commission further technical advice.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**(ORDINARY MEETING)****WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER****QUESTIONS ON REPORTS****Item 8.2: Constitutional Review 2013/14****1. QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIM McNALLY**

Has any review of the value for money that the deputy cabinet members provide for their allowances taken place since the posts were introduced? In the past month, how many hours have each of the deputy cabinet members spent on duties relating to their respective portfolios, and on what specifically was this time spent?

RESPONSE

Our deputy cabinet members (DCMs) are doing important work for the council. Councillor Williams is currently reviewing how we can improve the standard of private rented housing in the borough, Councillor Merrill has been working closely with officers to ensure that residents receive the best levels of customer service from our new in-house contact centre, and Councillor the Rt Revd Oyewole has been further strengthening the council's links with faith communities in the borough. As a point of comparison, DCMs receive a band 1a special responsibility allowance (SRA). This is the same band as, for example, the opposition whip or the deputy leader of the opposition.

It is right that we should scrutinise DCMs and that members be satisfied that they are delivering for the borough in the same way that any members with an SRA should. We therefore proposed this year that the overview and scrutiny committee should be able to interview deputy cabinet members in the same way as cabinet members. I understand that OSC are currently considering how they want to do this. This will give members an opportunity to question them about their work and the value they bring.