

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

(ORDINARY MEETING)

WEDNESDAY 17 OCTOBER 2012

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1. QUESTION FROM MR PATRICK YORKE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Does the council fully abide by the agreements with "Five Estates plan" under the Peckham programme not to undertake to sell or dispose of its responsibility of Rosemary Gardens neighbourhood office, Sumner Road, SE15 to any interest outside the community partnership which legally still resides with the community of Peckham?

RESPONSE

The council has researched this matter and has not discovered any legally binding agreement that would prevent the disposal of 170 Sumner Road. The Five Estates Plan and Peckham Partnership have been superseded by newer planning policies. Redevelopment of this site for residential use is within the scope of current planning policy subject to the full application process.

More generally, we recognise the concern locally about the lack of community facilities and this is a matter that the council will look at carefully as it considers the future of the old Sumner workshops site.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Thank you Madam. On behalf of the community, I welcome the council to this new facility that was appointed for the people of Peckham. It is a magical development for the whole of Southwark, and we should champion our cause for that development. For this reason I am here for the community for this question being put.

The history of Peckham pertaining to this development within the Five Estates programme is well-documented. It has got a historic approach but of late what the community within Peckham's Five Estates programme have been experiencing is the eroding of community facilities, without adequate consultation and involvement.

The question that I am putting now to the council is why is it that, up to date, the community has not been involved in any removal of these services, of the community facilities for Rosemary Gardens, from us, and to date we have our capital equipment within the facility, but what I have learnt is that there's going to be a facility at the Sumner site? Can we put this on hold or can we have access to the Cator Street education unit before the disposal, because the community is now being ostracised for development for our youth, for which

everyone here supports and champions the cause for the development of Peckham?

RESPONSE

I'd like to thank Mr Yorke for his supplemental question. Clearly, then, we're aware that, as you rightly say, that there is I think a lack of community facilities in the Peckham area, and that has been something that has always been part of the Peckham programme, and some of those services in response. I identified that what we would like to do is look at the development on the site of Sumner workshops and what can be done with those facilities, on that space in terms of a new development; whether that includes a community space to help make good that deficiency, which I think we all recognise.

The Rosemary Gardens housing office, or Sumner Road, whatever you want to call it, I think probably will never be a good site for a community resource; obviously it has always been a housing office. So I don't think that is the right site. I think what we do need to do is to be working with you to find alternative locations for your activities nearby. I'm happy to look at whether Cator Street is a temporary facility, whether there are other places and look at the equipment that is in there, we need to look at that to make sure you can have access to that.

2. QUESTION FROM MR JEFF KELLAND TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

What number of penalty charge notices issued by ACPOA on behalf of the council under the Traffic Management Act 2004 for the last year for which records are available was a representation received and what percentage were conceded as wrongly issued by parking when first challenged by residents?

RESPONSE

In 2011/12 the parking service's contractors issued 98,747 penalty charge notices (PCN) for various parking and moving traffic offences. The council received a representation in relation to 15,829 of these PCN's (16.03%) and of these 1,607 (1.63%) were cancelled due to an error on the part of the contractor.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

The error rate in the issue of the tickets at 1.6% perhaps is something that even the most fastidious dictator would be happy with from an electoral situation. Could you tell me or can you advise me, I don't expect you to have the figure, how many of those 14,000 representations were appealed up to the parking appeals service and how many were upheld at that stage?

RESPONSE

I thank Mr Kelland for his follow up question. Before I answer, just to go back a little bit, about five or six years ago the council did not appeal, did not respond when appeals went to the appeals service and something like 95% of appeals were upheld at that stage. During those years we complained a lot about that and consequently the council has tightened up quite a lot on how it responds to

appeals with the result that we have a much lower percentage of success appeals. So that is the situation in terms of the approach the council has, just a bit of historical context, but I am very happy to get that information for you. I know that partly behind your question there is a situation you are aware of that happened a while ago and I am happy to look into that and the detail of that as well, thank you Mr Kelland.