Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Jacq Paschoud of the Mayor

Question

Would the Mayor be willing to hold People's Day in Beckenham Place Park on one occasion as it is the largest open space in Lewisham and in 2015 we will be celebrating 20 years of it being wholly located within the Borough?

Would you agree that raising the profile of this beautiful but maybe less known part of Bellingham and Downham would hopefully encourage residents to use it more extensively.

Reply

People's Day has been held at its current venue for several years which has allowed the Events Team, working with the local community, to develop and test a safe and secure production plan. Moving People's Day would require the development of a new event and production plan, enhanced marketing campaign and resident engagement activity. For those reasons a change of venue for People's Day would have cost implications that could not be covered by the existing budget allocated to the event.

Beckenham Place Park is indeed a fantastic asset that could be used more extensively. The Council is bidding for Heritage Lottery funding to undertake restoration work in the park with the aim of making the space better used, and enabling it to host events in future. If successful these works would take place in 2016/17. It may be possible to revisit the question of holding People's Day there then.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Hall of the Mayor

Question

Will the Mayor give his assessment of the coalition government's financial settlement for local authorities including Lewisham? "

Reply

The coalition government has chosen to place the greatest burden of their austerity programme on those who are least able to afford it. They have made cuts across the public services and in the case of local government made it the scapegoat for their policies. By forcing cuts onto council's like ours, they are attempting to divert blame from Westminster to town halls across the country. They are cutting too much, too quickly and not even doing so fairly.

Places like Lewisham are being hit harder than some of the leafier places in the country where they don't have the same levels of deprivation that we do here in Lewisham. Even Eric Pickles' disingenuous 'spending power' figures demonstrate that Lewisham will see our spending power reduced by £30m over the next two years while our neighbours in Bromley will see their funding increase by £0.7m over the same period. Given the different challenges facing our two boroughs, this cannot be right and fair.

The chair of the Local Government Association, a Conservative councillor, Sir Merrick Cockell said in response to the settlement;-

"The next two years will be the toughest yet for people who use and rely on the vital everyday local services that councils provide. By the end of this Parliament, local government will have to have made £20 billion worth of savings. Councils have so far largely restricted the impact of the cuts on their residents. They have worked hard to save those services that people most value and have protected spending on social care for children and the elderly,

but even these areas are now facing reductions. That impact will only increase over the next two years.

"The current public sector model, with its highly centralised control of budgets and spending priorities, is inefficient and will struggle to function in the context of long-term reductions to public spending. It needs to be replaced with a better and fairer way of funding local authorities which delivers adequate money, distributes it fairly and provides the long-term certainty councils need to plan for future demands.

Here in Lewisham, we continue to try wherever possible to reduce our budget by changing the way we do things, driving harder bargains in the services we contract out, and working in partnership with others to save money without affecting frontline services. And I am determined that we go on protecting the things people value most. But inevitably there will be some tough decisions ahead of us.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Johnson of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Will the Council join with the London Boroughs of Southwark, Lambeth and Enfield as well as Oxford City, Derby City, Sefton Metropolitan Borough, South Hams District, Weymouth & Portland Borough and Wyre Forest District Councils and also Shadow Communities Minister Chris Williamson MP, Caroline Lucas MP, Andrew George MP and Adrian Sanders MP in support of the following proposal to be submitted under the Sustainable Communities Act:

That the government give Local Authorities the power to introduce a local levy of up to 8.5% of the rate on supermarkets or large retail outlets in their area with a rateable annual value not less that £500,000; and require that the revenue from this levy be retained by the Local Authority in order to be used to improve local communities in their area by promoting local economic activity, local services and facilities, social and community wellbeing and environmental protection.

Reply

The prospect of securing additional funding for local benefit is certainly an interesting one. I have instructed officers to contact colleagues in the relevant authorities to enable to Council to explore the idea of a London-wide supermarket levy.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Ibitson of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Elfrida School and the Bellingham Safer Neighbourhood Team have raised concerns about parking outside the school, on the corner of the junction of Elfrida Crescent and Overdown Road claiming that this blocks sight lines and is causing safety concerns about children crossing the road to and from school. They feel that an accident is highly likely. The Safer Neighbourhood Team have suggested that installing bollards on the corners of Elfrida Crescent and Overdown Road by the school would solve this problem effectively. Please can this be investigated?

Reply

The issue of school parking and dangerous driving behaviour by parents has been raised with the road safety team through the school travel plan programme.

As a result of this, a decision has been made to finance the request for traffic bollards at the corners of Overdown Road and Elfrida Crescent through the TFL school travel plan funding in April 2014.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Gibson of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Question

Given the appalling recent cases of child sexual exploitation involving vulnerable and looked after children in Rochdale, Oxford and other Local Authorities, what steps is Lewisham taking to ensure the safety of looked after children in our borough and those from this borough, and will they work closely with local police and schools on this and produce a publically available plan to show their strategy in this area?

Reply

Lewisham has taken steps to respond to cases of child sexual exploitation, which includes looked after children in this borough, as well as those placed out of borough by Lewisham. Key professionals, such as teachers, care providers, youth workers and the police have been made aware of the indicators of child sexual exploitation and they have received training on effective intervention.

When a child is thought to be sexually exploited, a multi agency strategy meeting is convened and a plan is put into place to identify, prosecute or deter exploiters through police action. The intervention plan tries to minimise harm for victims and to promote the development of self-esteem and understanding of healthy relationships. These plans are reviewed regularly to see if they are working for a particular child.

Lewisham piloted the 'Pan London Child Sexual Exploitation Protocol' that has now been rolled out across London.

A key component of the protocol is the introduction of monthly Multi Agency Sexual Exploitation meetings to identify locations and networks of perpetrators so that multiagency strategies can be developed to tackle sexual exploitation.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Ingleby of Councillor Wise

Question

What are the replacement costs in the Borough per tree for existing trees on or near pavements that have to be removed because of storm damage or other natural causes of decay? What is the average cost or typical unit costs per tree or per street or area for pollarding work?

Reply

Each street tree costs £340.00 to replace. This includes the cost of the tree and sundry items, such as a tree guard, watering pipe and the construction of the planting pit.

The average cost of pollarding a street tree is £375.00.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Curran of the Deputy Mayor

Question

What is the up to date situation regarding the Greyhound pub in Sydenham?

Reply

Unfortunately the deed of variation has yet to be agreed between all the parties. The Planning Agreement cannot be varied without the participation of all the relevant parties. All parties with a legal interest in the land will be required to sign the Deed of Variation in order to bind the land so that the outstanding obligations in the original planning agreement continue.

Officers are continuing to discuss with the developer the delay in order to bring this matter to conclusion. In any event, the developer has been put on notice that if the agreement is not reached shortly the matter would be referred back to the first available Planning Committee C.

Priority 1

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Question

Recent figures show that only 39.5% of children in Lewisham that are eligible for free school meals achieved 5 A*-C (including English and maths) in 2012/13. What action does the Council intend to take to specifically improve educational outcomes for these children in the borough's secondary schools?

Reply

The figures released on 13 February 2014 on the Department for Education Performance Tables website show that in Lewisham, in 2013, 44.5% of disadvantaged pupils (eligible for the Pupil Premium) achieved 5 A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths. This compares with 40.9% nationally.

Even though we compare favourably with the national figures, the gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils is still too high and all schools are clear that this is a key issue for all of them. All schools have a number of strategies in place to support their own cohort of disadvantaged pupils, which include after school booster classes, weekend revision sessions, residential revision centres, small group tutoring, 1:1 monitoring and on-line packages. Schools are also focusing on pupils eligible for Pupil Premium from Y7, so that outcomes will improve over time.

The School Improvement Team focuses on the gap between outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and other pupils in termly monitoring visits and reviews schools' plans to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. The team also supports schools to match effective strategies to the pupils, with tailored support programmes to address each school's needs, which range from support for teaching and learning across all subjects to subject-specific consultancy support for individual teachers to sharing good practice across a number of schools.

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Hall of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Could I be provided with a statement of any progress to achieve improvements to the frequency of the Bellingham to London train services?

Reply

The Council have made representations on a frequent basis through our Public Transport Liaison meetings to which all the transport operators who have services in the Borough are invited, including Network Rail, Southeastern Rail, Southern Rail, London Overground and TfL.

We have always supported increasing the frequency of the service on the Catford Loop line both by increasing the frequency on existing routes and by having at least some of the Victoria bound services stop at the stations within this Borough.

We have also frequently complained about the disproportionate proportion of the disruption that occurs South of the Thames when the service comes under stress, which are attributed to the unsatisfactory joint franchise arrangement.

As part of the franchise re-letting process, the Council have responded to make these same points and await the outcome of the re-letting process.

There have also been responses by particular station user groups along the line which have all made similar comments which we have forwarded to the Department for Transport expressing the Councils strong support for those points.

Priority 2

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Ibitson of the Deputy Mayor

Question

The road surface in Aldermoor Road, SE6, has been in a poor state and very unsightly for many years. Please could consideration be given to resurfacing it?

Reply

The Resurfacing Programme for 2013/14 has been fully allocated and did not include Aldermoor Road. The Programme for 2014/15 is due to commence on the 1st April 2014. Aldermoor Road has a high priority and should therefore be resurfaced by Summer 2014.

Priority 2

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Gibson of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Will Lewisham commit to support fully segregated cycle lanes, as seen in the Netherlands, for cyclists and lobby TfL for their introduction on TfL roads in our Borough?

Reply

With the release of the Mayor of London's 'Vision for Cycling in London' (2013) Came a substantial financial commitment (£980 million) to improve provision for cyclists in London.

Lewisham has fully engaged with all levels of this regional policy and is currently working with TfL and Sustrans to deliver 2 Cycle Superhighways and a network of Quietway cycle routes running through the borough. Our objective is to work fully with these external agencies for the benefit of our borough residents.

Segregated cycle lanes are one of a number of solutions that are looked at when designing cycle lanes. Lewisham does support the introduction of segregation where feasible.

An example of this commitment is the decision to ask TfL Cycle Super Highway 4 design team to carry out a feasibility study of a fully segregated cycle lane option along the Evelyn Street length of the route, as requested by Lewisham Cyclists. This is currently being carried out.

We are also acutely aware of the lack of space and capacity that currently exists on Borough and TLRN roads and in certain situations a compromise must be found to be able to deliver provision for all users.

Lewisham will always aim to deliver the best quality provision possible working within the constraints of each individual project and will always seek to consult with the boroughs cyclists on projects that affect them.

Lewisham's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) mirrors this commitment to provide for the borough cyclists with a range of initiatives aimed at improving conditions for cycling. (More details of these initiatives can be found at the end of this document)

Appendix

Notable current and near future Lewisham cycling initiatives' include:

Cycle Super Highways 4 & 5 (CS4/CS5) - Part of the wider TfL Cycle Super Highway programme, both routes are in early stages of design and are proposed to run down the A200 and A2 respectively.

CS4 is to run the length of Evelyn St (A200) and on into Greenwich, there are several designs on the table at present from mandatory cycle track running East and West. Lewisham Cyclists favour a segregated track on the North of Evelyn Street. Early indications suggest construction to start on the route in early 2015.

CS5 is a route that runs along the A2 and originally it was proposed to continue down the A20 to Lewisham Town Centre, however, a section of the route was seen to be unworkable (The Amersham Gyratory and sections of Loampit Vale) and route was shortened to New Cross Gate.

TfL are now re-exploring the possibility of providing a link down to Lewisham Town Centre Missing the Gyratory and heading down Brookmill Road. Lewisham are in early stage talks with TfL over the link to Lewisham. There is no indication currently when construction of this link will happen although it will be the final stage of the complete CS5 construction which is scheduled to be completed early 2016.

The Quietway programme- Drawing on funding from the Mayor of London's financial commitment of £980m to improve all aspects of cycling in London, the Quietway Programme aims to provide quiet back street cycle routes that less confident or new cyclists will be able to use comfortably.

Lewisham has a section of one of the first Quietways to be delivered in London, the route is proposed to run along the new cycle and pedestrian path currently in development along the back of Millwall's football stadium, Surrey Canal Rd, Folkestone Gardens Park, Childers St, Edwards St, Deptford High Street, Crossfield St, Creekside, Half Penny Hatch Bridge)

The Quietway programme is therefore an opportunity to deliver substantial elements of the North Lewisham Links Strategy and measures for this specific route will be in line with the design principles set out in the strategy.

Measures to create the route will include engineering to junctions, paths and

highway, restrictions to motorised traffic may also be employed to change the traffic characteristics of a particular road or street. Current indications are that a basic route layout could be laid down as early as early 2015.

Priority 2

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Jacq Paschoud of the Cabinet Member for Resources

Question

What is being done by the Council to inform vulnerable groups such as people with learning disabilities or mental health service users of their rights to engage in the democratic process by being on the electoral register and voting? What efforts are being made to ensure these residents and those who assist them understand the support they can receive to enable them to vote?

Reply

People with learning disabilities and mental health service users are entitled to be entered on the electoral register and to vote.

The Electoral Registration Officer is under a duty to conduct an annual canvass and sends at least two forms to each residential property. If no response is received, a manual visit ensues. The ERO database flags up some properties where it is known that there will be a number of people with a disability (residential care homes) and writes to the manager of these establishments in the course of the canvass. The ERO will and does accept registration forms from these managers on behalf of the residents.

The ERO also provides copies of the Electoral Commission Easy Guide to Voting and at election time liaises with voluntary sector organisations supporting people with learning difficulties and /or mental health issues urging them to encourage participation. For the European and local elections in May 2014, the ERO will again distribute easily understood material for their use.

Our presiding officers and poll clerks are specifically trained and encouraged to assist people with any disability, within the regulatory constraints placed on

them. We provide assistance to voters including tactile voting devices, large sized ballot papers, and makaton guides to voting. There is a comprehensive training programme which covers the need to support voters with any disability.

The introduction of individual registration (IER) in 2014 will do away with household registration and thus the ERO's ability to accept a household registration form signed by one person on behalf of a number of others. Unless "passported" under transitional provisions, potential electors will have to register by providing their national insurance number and date of birth. They will have to sign their application personally. Their details will have to match the database held by the Department of Work and Pensions. There is to be an exception process but this has not yet been finalised by the Cabinet Office.

It is very likely that this new process will be more complicated for all electors and may cause particular difficulty for those with learning difficulties and mental health service users. We are in the process of developing a communications strategy to coincide with national initiatives being led by the Electoral Commission to promote registration under IER. This will seek to balance the need to encourage registration overall and to encourage those groups who may be particularly difficult to reach. It will be launched after the European and local elections.

Priority 2

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Ingleby of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services

Question

When a Licensing application is made in the Borough, over what radius and to what quantity are leaflets or notices distributed or posted to notify local residents of the application?

Reply

We do not circulate leaflets or notifications of licensing applications. The Licensing Act 2003 sets down how applications must be advertised which includes blue notices describing the application displayed on the outside of the premises for 28 days, a public notice outlining the details of the application must also be placed in a local newspaper. All ward Councillors are advised by e-mail and the application appears on the Council website.

The legislation now allows for anyone to make a representation regardless of vicinity or location which would make it inappropriate and costly to set any radius or attempt to contact local people beyond the requirements of the Act.

Priority 2

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Curran of the Mayor

Question

Will the Mayor give an update on the situation regarding both Convoys Wharf and his meeting with the Mayor of London on the subject?

Reply

The Mayor of London 'called in' the planning decision back in November 2013 following a request from the developer, Hutchison Whampoa, meaning he is now the decision maker and not the Council.

Following a reasonable period, to allow the Mayor of London time to assess what steps he would next take, I wrote to him in January to request a meeting to discuss the planning application for Convoys Wharf.

The Mayor's reply stated that, having had regard to the GLA Planning Code of Conduct, his officers have advised him that he must exercise caution in order not to inadvertently risk prejudicing his decision making role on the application. He therefore suggested that the most appropriate arrangement was for me to meet with Sir Edward Lister, his Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning.

I met Sir Edward Lister earlier this month and stressed the importance of the range of concerns expressed in the Council's formal response to the Mayor made by Strategic Planning Committee in January. These include the importance of community infrastructure to the local area and I have urged the Deputy Mayor to make sure the developer includes GP facilities, a primary school and funding for additional secondary school capacity, jobs and training for local people and open space.

I also explained our concern that the current planning application does not reflect the historical significance of the site. The site is the location of the former Deptford Royal Dockyard, which was founded by Henry VIII. It was the place where Sir Frances Drake was knighted by Elizabeth I, and was the location of Charles II great ship building programme. The site housed John Evelyn at Sayes Court and his magnificent gardens, which, centuries later, inspired the establishment of the National Trust.

I pressed the case for proposals which would include an expanded Sayes Court Garden and the Build the Lennox project. The developer's current approach to Sayes Court fails to provide a meaningful green link between the site of the Gardens with the remains of Sayes Court House. The Council believes that the opportunity to link these two historically significant spaces cannot be missed.

We understand that the application is likely to be determined at the end of March.

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Community Services

Question

What are the most recent statistics for levels of child obesity across Lewisham, compared with other London boroughs and national averages?

Reply

Information on obesity in children is obtained from the National Child Measurement Programme, a statutory public health function of local authorities. The programme involves the measurement of the height and weight of all children in Reception and in Year 6 in schools. The most recent results are for 2012/13; these were published on 11th December 2013. In 2012/2013, the prevalence of obesity in children in reception year and in children in year 6 in Lewisham schools was 10.7% and 23.3% respectively.

For each of these year groups, prevalence of obesity was significantly higher in Lewisham than in England as a whole; the corresponding national figures were 9.3% in children in reception and 18.9% in year 6. Lewisham figures were not, however, significantly different from the corresponding figures for London as a whole. Amongst Lewisham's statistical neighbours, prevalence of obesity is significantly higher in Reception children in Southwark (14.2%), Greenwich (14.1%) and City and Hackney (13.2%) schools than in Lewisham schools, and significantly higher in children in Year 6 in Southwark schools (26.7%). None of Lewisham's statistical neighbours has a significantly lower prevalence of obesity in either of these year groups.

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Hall of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Can the Cabinet Member provide details of the members of the planning department's design panel and their terms of reference?

Reply

The Panel's present terms of reference were adopted as part of a new approach to major planning applications, considered by Mayor and Cabinet at its meeting on 10 April 2013 in a report on Planning Service Improvements for Development Management.

The terms of reference set out the purpose of the Panel which is to provide expert and independent design advice on significant new developments across the borough, to assist and encourage developers to achieve high standards of design in their proposals. The Panel's agenda is expected to cover all major development proposals, but also cover associated projects like masterplans and public realm proposals.

Following a competitive application process, membership of the Panel is made up of a pool of more than thirty specialists. Most are architects but other built environment specialists are also included. The Panel meets approximately every four weeks and draws five or six members from the pool for each design review. The Panel is chaired by Keith Williams, Director of Keith Williams Architects and the Deputy Chair is Urban Designer, Ben Van Bruggen. The costs of the Panel are broadly covered through pre-application fees that are now increasingly being charged to developers.

Full details of the Panel's terms of reference as well as member biographies can be found at:

http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/conservation/Pages/Design-Review-Panel.aspx

Priority 3

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Gibson of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Question

What plans does Lewisham have to increase capacity in Lewisham's primary schools?

Reply

We have met our statutory duty to ensure that there is a school place for all children whose parents or carers request a place in a Lewisham school. This has been achieved since 2008 through a programme of permanent expansions at 11 schools, and partial enlargements at 38 schools. Further provision will open in 2014 and 2015. Plans have been and will continue to be developed within the context of available capital funding. Unfortunately, the Coalition Government has given Lewisham an inadequate allocation to achieve the necessary expansion. To 2017, we estimate that we have a £27m shortfall.

We remain committed to the provision of high quality places in appropriate locations across the borough.

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Curran of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services

Question

What is the current situation regarding insulation and energy saving measures implemented in Lewisham for households, businesses and the Council itself?

Reply

From 2010/11 to 2012/13 Lewisham Council delivered a wide range of insulation and energy saving programmes benefiting more than 8,000 Lewisham households and bringing in over £2.5m external investment.

In 2013 the Government brought in the Green Deal and the Energy Company Obligation (ECO) which are now the primary sources of funding for energy saving measures in domestic properties.

In 2013 the Council entered into a four year agreement through our Energy Efficiency Installations Framework designed to allow the borough to continue to benefit from energy efficiency funding. The first phase of works under the Framework is now underway, insulating 1,100 Lewisham Homes' properties categorised as 'hard to treat' cavity wall homes. This is expected to bring in £1m funding that will cover the cost of the works.

The Framework has enabled these works to proceed despite changes to ECO funding brought in by energy suppliers at the end of 2013. The Council is working with its partners to develop further phases of insulation and other energy efficiency works in Lewisham during 2014 including an offer for residents of all housing tenures.

There is currently no grant funding for insulation or other energy efficiency measures for non-domestic properties, although the Green Deal and other 'pay as you save' loans are available to businesses. The Council will look at

ways the Energy Efficiency Installations Framework can be developed to help benefit Lewisham businesses.

Lewisham Council has established an Energy Forum charged with delivering carbon and energy savings across the corporate estate and schools. This is an integral part of the Council's Asset Management Strategy going forward and directly linked to the Corporate Accommodation Strategy that will determine the approach to retention, disposal, investment and management of the corporate and commercial estate. The focus of this work will include monitoring and targeting of high consuming sites, investment in energy saving retrofit works and improving use of buildings to reduce energy consumption and carbon emissions. Insulation works and other energy efficiency measures will be installed as part of this work.

QUESTION No. 19 Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Question

Please list the primary schools that have disabled children on their roll. Please provide current year attending and numbers.

Reply

Data contained within the school census returns, which are completed every term has been used to collate this response. The table below is for mainstream schools.

| Primary School | REC | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 | Yr 6 | Total |
|------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Adamsrill Primary School | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Athelney School * | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| All Saints CE Primary School | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Ashmead Primary School | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| Baring Primary | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 3 |
| Beecroft Garden primary | | | | | | | | 0 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Brindishe Lee Primary School | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Brindishe Green Primary | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | 11 |
| School, | | | | | | | | |
| Childeric Primary School | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 8 |
| Christ Church CofE Primary | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Coopers Lane Junior and | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| Infants School * | | | | | | | | |
| Dalmain Primary School | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Deptford Park Primary School | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Downderry Junior and Infants | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Edmund Waller Junior and | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |

| Infants School | | | | | | | 1 | |
|---|----------|---------|-----|---|----------|----------|---|----|
| Elfrida Junior and Infants | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 5 |
| School | | ' | | ' | ' | 2 | | |
| | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Eliot Bank Primary School | 1 | ' | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 4 |
| Fairlawn Primary School Forster Park Junior and Infants | ! | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| School | | | Į į | 2 | Į Į | ! | ' | |
| | | | | | | | 1 | 0 |
| Good Shepherd RC Primary School | | | | | | | | " |
| Gordonbrock Primary School | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| Grinling Gibbons Junior and | <u> </u> | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Infants School | | | | | _ | _ | ' | ' |
| Haseltine Junior and Infants | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 5 |
| School | | | | _ | ' | | | |
| Holbeach Junior and Infants | | | | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| School | | | | | ' | | | |
| Holy Cross RC Junior and Infant | | + | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| School | | | | | | | | _ |
| Holy Trinity CE Primary School | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| Horniman Junior and Infants | | + | - | | <u> </u> | | | 0 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| John Ball Primary School | 1 | 2 | 1 | + | + | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| John Stainer Junior and Infants | | 2 | | + | + | | | 2 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Kelvin Grove Junior and Infants | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 13 |
| School * | | | | | | | | |
| Kender Primary School | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Kilmorie Junior and Infants | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 3 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Launcelot Primary School | | | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| Lee Manor School | | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 4 |
| Lucas Vale Junior and Infants | | | | | | | | 0 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Marvels Lane Primary School | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| Myatt Garden School | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Our Lady and St Philip Neri RC | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 3 |
| Primary School | | | | | | | | |
| Perrymount Primary School * | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Prendergast Vale College | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Rangefield Junior and Infants | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 3 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Rathfern Junior and Infants | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 5 |
| School | | \perp | | | | <u>l</u> | | |
| Rushey Green Primary School | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 22 |
| * | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Sandhurst Junior School | | | | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| Sandhurst Infants and Nursery | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| Sir Francis Drake Primary | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| School | | | | | | | | |

| St Augustines Catholic Primary | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 3 |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|----|
| School | | _ | | | ļ · | | | |
| St Bartholomews CE Junior and | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 4 |
| Infant School | | | • | _ | | ' | | |
| St James Hatcham CE Primary | | | | 2 | 2 | | | 4 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| St John Baptist CE Primary | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| St Josephs RC Primary School | | | | | | | | 0 |
| St. Margarets Lee CE Junior | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| and Infants School | | | | | | | | |
| St Marys Lewisham CE Primary | | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | | | |
| St Mary Magdalens Catholic | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Primary School | | | | | | | | |
| St Matthews Academy | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| St Michaels CE Junior and | | | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| Infant School | | | | | | | | |
| St Saviours RC Primary School | | | | | | | | 0 |
| St Stephens CE Primary School | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| St. William of York | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| St Winifreds Infant School | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| St Winifreds Junior School | | | | | 2 | 3 | | 5 |
| Stillness Junior School | | | | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| Stillness Infants School | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Tidemill Academy * | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| Torridon Junior School * | | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Torridon Infants School * | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 4 |
| Trinity Primary | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Turnham Primary School | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 3 |

^{* =} Resource bases contained within Primary Schools. The primary resource bases are as follows.

Primary Schools

- Athelney
- Coopers Lane
- Kelvin Grove
- Perrymount
- Rushey Green
- Tidemill Academy
- Torridon Juniors
- Torridon Infants

Primary Need

- Autism
- Hearing Impairment Unit
- Autism
- Physical
- Hearing Impairment Unit
- Speech, Language and Communication Needs
- Autism
 - Autism

The two Haberdashers' Aske's primary phases have not yet completed their census return but they are expected.

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Gibson of the Cabinet Member for Deputy Mayor

Question

What funding is available or space in the contract with Skanska to request additional street lighting on roads in the Borough where it is poor?

Reply

The Contract with Skanska specifies that all existing street lighting in the borough will be designed to the appropriate standard, and there are various checking processes in place to insure that this requirement is achieved. Therefore once the investment programme is complete there should not be any locations where the lighting is poor.

Where there are locations that do not currently have street lighting there is a provision within the Contract to provide additional lighting columns.

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Question

How many incidents of children in care going missing for more than 24 hours have been recorded in each of the past four years? How many children are currently missing from care, and for how long have they been missing in each case?

Reply

Incidents of Looked After Children missing from care for more than 24 hours:

| Year | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Incidents | 116 | 83 | 85 | 83 | 367 |
| Number of | 30 | 18 | 27 | 13 | 88 |
| Looked | | | | | |
| After | | | | | |
| Children | | | | | |

The above table shows the numbers of children going missing in the last 12 months has reduced. In 2013 for example the 83 missing periods relate to 13 young people having multiple episodes.

Some of these young people have a long established pattern of absconding including prior to their admission to care.

Currently there is one Looked After Child who has been missing for 43 days. This child has been regularly reviewed under our Missing Procedure. We are working closely with the police to locate the young person and form a plan for their return. During this absence the young person has been in contact with both their extended family and their Social Worker.

Priority 5

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Gibson of the Deputy Mayor

Question

What strategy is in place to protect and promote the heritage of the historic Deptford area in light of proposed developments in that area?

Reply

Deptford is within the Regeneration and Growth area as defined by the Council's Core Strategy and is an area identified as one of the prime locations for new development. The Core Strategy recognises that in Deptford the historic environment has a vital part to play in creating a sense of place in new development. It notes that heritage assets are a valuable resource contributing to regeneration objectives by attracting business investment, preserving a sense of place and history, and reinforcing civic pride. It also states that new development will need to ensure that conservation areas and other heritage assets will continue to be preserved and enhanced.

The protection of the borough's heritage generally is also promoted through other planning policies including Core Strategy Policy 16 which covers conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment.

The Council also has a number of specific measures in place to protect and promote Deptford's Heritage and officers work closely with English Heritage to ensure that the character of Deptford and its heritage assets are suitably protected.

Five conservation areas cover different parts of Deptford (Deptford High Street, St Paul's, Deptford Creekside, Deptford Town Hall and Brookmill Road). The first two are presently being reviewed and updated and the associated conservation area review will go out for public consultation shortly.

There are numerous nationally and locally listed buildings in Deptford, ranging from the Grade 1 listed St Paul's Church in Deptford to others along the riverside which reflect Deptford's maritime heritage.

Deptford High Street and New Cross Road have also both been the subject of conservation-lead grant schemes to repair and restore historic buildings. Action is also being taken to bring those listed buildings "at risk" as a result of their neglect back into a sound state of repair.

The Council also ensures that the importance of heritage issues is highlighted in its negotiations on proposed developments. This has been demonstrated by its current support for the Sayes Court Garden and Lenox projects and approach to achieving an appropriate relationship of new buildings with historic buildings and spaces in relation to the Olympia Building, former Master Shipwrights House and site of John Evelyn's House at Convoys Wharf.

Priority 5

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services

Question

What is the current status of the Housing Matters consultation? Does the Council still aim to change the type of organisation of Lewisham Homes, despite tenants opposing this in the first round of consultation?

Reply

On 4 December 2013 Mayor and Cabinet noted the progress of the Housing Matters programme and the next steps for the consultation.

This report noted that residents had mixed views about the possibility of evolving Lewisham Homes, with no strong views in favour or against the proposal. The latest element of the consultation found that 33 per cent thought it was a good idea to evolve Lewisham Homes into a new organisation, 31 per cent were unsure, and 35 per cent did not think it was a good idea, a result could be summarised by stating that residents are open minded to the idea of change, but not particularly enthused one way or the other.

There are many other factors for consideration in addition to residents' views, including the availability of a debt write-off and the potential to attract new funding for Decent Homes work and new-build homes, and the current uncertainty around these financial factors mean that at this time it is not appropriate to develop firm options for consultation with residents. Instead a full assessment of these financial issues is underway.

To support that assessment, Lewisham Homes will continue the consultation by undertaking a more locally based conversation with residents. This will focus on three things: the ways in which residents can participate in the delivery of services and influence the decisions that affect them; the services that residents receive and how they can be improved; and the ways in which investment should be targeted locally to improve homes and places.

The conversation will generate two important sources of information which in turn can inform future choices. First it will generate a much more local perspective on the need for housing investment, and the ways that homes, estates and places generally should be improved. This will enable local "action plans" to be developed to set out to the Council the sorts of improvements that residents wish to see in each place. Second, in combination, the investment requirements set out in these plans will help to guide the Council in its decision making about the most appropriate form for any future evolution of Lewisham Homes to take.

This conversation will take place over the spring and summer of 2014 and the results of this and the financial assessment will be reported to Mayor and Cabinet in due course.

QUESTION No. 24 Priority 6

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooksof the Cabinet Member for Resources

Question

Taking into account the fact that the Coalition has just introduced a cap on payday loans, and that numbers of Lewisham staff visiting payday loan websites are very high, will the Council reconsider my suggestion in September that payday loan websites should be blocked from Council computers?

Reply

An analysis of how many staff access payday loan sites was undertaken for a Council question in November 2013. The period of analysis was 1/9/2013 to the 31/9/2013. See the table below for the results. It can be seen that 34 members of staff access payday loan sites during the period. This is not excessive and in many cases relates to officers accessing sites as part of their research work and in order to support vulnerable clients. We will continue to monitor usage, but at this time we are not proposing to place restrictions on access.

ACCESS BY STAFF TO SELECTED WEBSITES

| WebSense Appliance reporting – 1 September 2013 to 30 September 2013 | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| URL | Total Number Users | Total Number Hits | | | | | |
| www.wonga.com | 16 | 456 | | | | | |
| www.quickquid.co.uk | 5 | 258 | | | | | |
| www.wizzcash.com | 1 | 26 | | | | | |
| www.paydaysuk.com | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| www.moneyshop.tv | 3 | 5 | | | | | |
| www.epayday.co.uk | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| www.albemarlebond.co.uk | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| www.oakam.com | 2 | 5 | | | | | |
| www.lewishampluscu.co.uk | 6 | 95 | | | | | |
| Total | 34 | 846 | | | | | |

Priority 7

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Deputy Mayor

Question

Could I please be provided with details of who are currently tenants in councilowned retails units? Does the Council rent out its units to pay day lenders, those who own betting shops, and pawnbrokers?

Reply

The individual details of all current tenants in Council retail units are considered private information between the Council and its tenants and not publically available.

The Council does not generally rent out its properties to pay day lenders, betting shops or pawnbrokers. However, our records show that at present there is one betting shop, in Evelyn Street.

Priority 8

COUNCIL MEETING 26 FEBRUARY 2014

Question by Councillor Brooks of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services

Question

Many of Lewisham Homes' properties have carbon monoxide detectors. How many have gone past their 2013 service date without being serviced? How many have been reported faulty during 2013? What is the average waiting time for replacement?

Reply

No carbon monoxide detectors have gone past their service date. The equipment is an electrical fixture fitted with an indicator light and test button and, as such, residents are asked to carry out the test on the detector.

Our records show that there were zero repairs raised against CO detectors in 2013, however, if reported we would respond immediately.