

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Deputations received for this meeting

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

Procedure at the meeting

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

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

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Deputation requests on the themed debate

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

1. Deputation from the London Wildlife Trust

The deputation request states:

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

2. Deputation from Friends of Nursery Row Park

This deputation request states:

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

3. Deputation from the Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park Dog People

The deputation states:

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

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

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

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

4. Deputation from Friends of Burgess Park

The deputation request states:

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

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

The deputation request states:

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

Other deputation requests received by the deadline

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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

AUDIT TRAIL

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