

QUESTION No. 1

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Harris
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Does the Council expect the government's adoption of the Sir Justice Jackson Review of Civil Litigation Costs to have a significant affect on our overall legal costs?

Reply

The Government has not yet adopted the recommendations in this review. Whilst the government intends to implement most of the recommendations, this will not happen until Parliamentary time allows because most of the changes will need new legislation to have effect.

The changes to be implemented relate more to the funding of litigation by private claimants rather than the Council itself. Premiums on "after the event" (ATE) insurance, paid by the losing party, are to be abolished and success fees on Conditional Fee Arrangements (CFA) in future will be paid by the CFA funded person, even where they succeed in litigation. Also, legal fees will be related to the damages awarded to a successful litigant rather than to how much work the lawyer has actually undertaken in winning the case.

Currently a payment into court by way of settlement offer will mean that the person paying in will not have any liability for costs after the payment in if it is not accepted and the amount awarded does not exceed the payment into court. In future if the recommendations are implemented there will be an added sanction (equivalent to 10% of the value of the claim) which will be payable by litigants who do not accept a reasonable offer that is not beaten at trial.

There is to be a new test of proportionality in costs assessments to act as a long stop and so control costs that are clearly disproportionate to the value, complexity and importance of a claim.

The tenor of the recommendations is to discourage the use of lawyers in litigation in what the government sees as relatively minor matters by increasing exposure to possible legal costs and to bring protracted litigation to an end as soon as possible.

Generally, the changes will have most impact on lawyers that carry out personal injury work and work under CFA's with success fees and ATE insurance. Save in the largest cases, costs awarded currently to the Council do not generally reflect the work undertaken by its lawyers. So, the Council should not see any significant change in civil litigation costs and may even see a reduction should the reforms be implemented and the number of cases brought against the Council as a result decreases. However, it will not be possible to measure that impact with any certainty unless and until the reforms are put into practice.

Supplementary Question No. 1

Action

Councillor Harris

I would be grateful for specific details of how reductions in after the event insurance recoverability and a cap on CFA uplift will affect our overall legal costs, based on figures from last year, and details of specific cases from civil litigation claims.

ED Res.

Councillor Maslin

Thank you, Councillor Harris. I think that is the kind of question that requires a written answer.

QUESTION No. 2

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Hall
of the Mayor**

Question

What assessment has the Mayor made of the Localism Bill and the strategic implications for Lewisham?

Reply

The Localism Bill proposes to devolve decision making and power to councils and neighbourhoods. However, there has been substantial debate through the various stages of the Bill, many seeking to effect changes. Further stages of Parliamentary debate continue and the current speculation is that the Bill will complete its passage through Parliament by November 2011.

It is too early to assess what the implications might be for local government since there continue to be debate around important points of detail affecting as they do; community right to buy, community right to challenge, neighbourhood planning and reform of social housing. Even when the Bill becomes an Act, it is likely to require secondary legislation and guidance to clarify the finer points.

Supplementary Question No. 2

Firstly, I would like to thank the Mayor for coming here today. I know it is the Local Government Conference, but we did resolve to have our Council meetings on a Wednesday and it is a bit difficult for some Members, I do appreciate that.

I can understand the answer. It says 'it is too early to assess what implications there might be for local government with the Localism Bill'. This

is perfectly understandable with all the changes, u-turns and the massive clauses that there are, so I would like to ask the Mayor with all its clauses, possibilities for secondary legislation, diktats and nasty little clauses, can the Mayor describe this Bill as real localism?

The Mayor

I do not think I can do better than quote George Jones, Professor of Local Government at the London School of Economics and a very long term observer and supporter of local government who said, 'It should not be called the Localism Bill. It is a centralism bill because it contains so many powers conferred on the Secretary of State to interfere in local affairs.' I understand the phrase that has been adopted by the Secretary of State is 'guided localism', which I have to say I find quite bizarre, so I am not filled with enthusiasm and optimism. However, the parliamentary process is not over and there are many parliamentarians who do understand the importance of localism and I trust that they will be listened to over the coming months. I believe it is being discussed in the House of Lords this very week and some improvements may well emerge from that House.

QUESTION No. 3

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What recent assessment he has made of the state of repair of the 'Welcome to Lewisham' signs and any action he intends to take to improve them?

Reply

A survey of the signs has been carried out and arrangements are being made to complete repairs where needed. Options for replacing the signs are being considered although funding has not yet been identified.

QUESTION No. 4

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Johnson
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

While your desire to retain weekly refuse collections is perfectly understandable, is it acting as a barrier to funding initiatives that would significantly improve Lewisham's poor recycling rate - such as the introduction of a weekly collection for food waste?

Reply

Weekly refuse collections, in Lewisham, do not act as a barrier to fund initiatives, such as a weekly food waste collection service. In many boroughs, without Lewisham's advantage of a waste incineration facility, diversion from more expensive landfill would act as a financial incentive to collect food waste separately.

Without this financial imperative, Lewisham can approach the issue of food waste disposal from a broader perspective. For example, a recent Defra paper on Waste Economics and Policy states that for every tonne of food waste treated through incineration, 89kg of CO₂ emissions are saved, whilst a tonne treated by Anaerobic Digestion produces 162kg of CO₂ and landfill produces 450kg of CO₂.

Supplementary Question No. 4

Lewisham now has the lowest recycling and composting rate in the whole of London. Are you embarrassed by that?

Councillor Wise

I am afraid not much embarrasses me anymore, Councillor Johnson. One thing I would like to say, I do appreciate that compared to other boroughs, mainly outer London boroughs, that our recycling rate looks very poor, but I think we have to take into account that the leafy, rural and outer London areas will always fare better because they collect garden waste and most inner London authorities do not.

I think it is not taken into consideration that we also have the lowest landfill rate compared to many authorities at 9%, so I do not think we can just pick a figure out of the air and compare it to anybody else without looking at the bigger picture, but thank you for your question.

QUESTION No. 5

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Jacq Paschoud
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

How much of the reported £94.5 million funding for Decent Homes has been guaranteed by the government?

Reply

Allocations for 2011/12 and 2012/13 are committed expenditure.

Allocations for 2013/14 and 2014/15 are provisional.

2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	Total
£11,000,000	£14,500,000	£24,000,000	£45,000,000	£94,500,000

Confirmation of the 2013/14 and 2014/15 allocations will be dependent on successful delivery by Lewisham Homes in 2011 -13, the continuing availability of capital resources for the programme, and policy decisions of Government and the Mayor for London.

Supplementary Question No. 5

In light of it, is she as surprised as me to read in literature from the Liberal Democrats – I have a copy here in case of any doubt about what I am talking about – stating that £94.5 million has been confirmed by the Minister of State?

Councillor Wise

I am a little surprised, Councillor Paschoud and thank you very much for your question, because most of us will appreciate that the funding is over four years and only the first two years have been confirmed. The last two years, 2013/14 and 2014/15 have not been confirmed and I have that from the mouth of Grant Shapps, the Housing Minister himself. He will not confirm that back-loaded funding, which adds up to £69 million, will be delivered of that £94.5 million, because it depends on the economic climate at those later dates and I think the Treasury will have a say in that matter.

I think this coalition government has treated sixth round ALMOs, of which Lewisham Homes is one, very poorly, but we will endeavour to make sure that they do their Decent Homes work with the money that they have at their disposal.

QUESTION No. 6

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Bonavia
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

Can the Cabinet Member for Customer Services provide a report on the progress of the Mayor's plan to set a list of criteria to which LBL shall have regard when considering whether to approve applications to hold events on Blackheath and other green spaces managed by Glendale on behalf of LBL?

Reply

I am pleased to inform Cllr Bonavia that the parks events policy paper is ready for consultation and officers have forwarded the paper to be distributed to the Blackheath Joint Working Party and to the Blackheath Ward Assembly. Feedback and comments are requested for the 15th July. The paper contains events assessment criteria for discussion by the BJWP and clear guidelines for applicants when booking events on the heath.

The Group manager for Green Scene will attend the ward assembly on 5th July and the Green Space Regeneration Manager will attend the Blackheath Joint working party on 21st July to receive feedback and discuss comments already received. It is also intended to place the paper on the Council's website for comment.

QUESTION No. 7

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Jeffrey
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What representations has the Deputy Mayor had from residents regarding the possible future use of the Ladywell Centre site as a cinema? What assumptions are the Council currently making about the future use of the site?

Reply

The Planning Policy Team released the Lewisham Town Centre Area Action Plan further options report (The AAP) for public consultation in April and May 2011. As part of the response to this consultation, eight local residents sent in representations requesting that the Ladywell leisure centre site be considered for redevelopment as a cinema following its proposed closure in 2013 (following the opening of the new Loampit Vale leisure centre).

The AAP further options report identified three options for the redevelopment of the Ladywell leisure centre site. The preferred option is Option 2 – redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including retail and residential uses. This option promotes suitable town centre uses on this accessible site and maximises a key opportunity to help support the vitality and viability of the southern part of the town centre. The preferred option, while promoting retail and residential uses, seeks to retain some flexibility as more detailed design and feasibility work is required.

Planning Policy are currently reviewing the consultation responses with a view to creating an AAP draft plan by autumn 2011.

Supplementary Question No. 7

Councillor Jeffrey

Simply, can I ask that the option about using the Ladywell Leisure Centre as a cinema be actively considered in a way that perhaps it has not been so far? We do lack a cinema in Lewisham and I know there are a great many local filmmakers who would appreciate the possibility for having a cinema as well as those people who want to go and see films, but we need to encourage the creative aspects of our population.

Mayor

I am aware that in discussions in particular around Lewisham town centre efforts have been made in the past to try to attract a cinema operator to become involved. There was interest, but partly because of changes in market conditions that development has not advanced as quickly as we might have hoped. I do not think that I could say that we could guarantee anything on that, not least because there is a film called *Field of Dreams*, 'build it and he will come'. The risk is, of course, that you build a cinema and they do not come and that, I think, is at the heart of this. Nevertheless, I will ask our planners to be aware of this when we get to the point of deciding what sort of brief we need for that site.

QUESTION No. 8

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Foxcroft
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

How many apprenticeships have been offered by the Council and partner organisations since 2009? (please break the figures down by organisation and by date).

Reply

Since 2009, a total of 129 apprenticeship opportunities have been created through the Lewisham apprenticeship scheme by the council and partner organisations.

Below is a breakdown of the apprentice positions and where they have been established over the years:-

- London Borough of Lewisham (48)
- Lewisham Homes (27)
- Lewisham College (13)
- Creative Process (12)
- Lewisham Healthcare NHS Trust (10)
- Millwall Community Scheme (5)
- Teachsport (5)
- Phoenix (Mullaley 5)
- L+Q (2)
- Ravensbourne Project (1)
- WideHorizons Outdoor Education Trust (1)

The Council is continuing to work with partners to create additional apprenticeship opportunities for our citizens.

Supplementary Question No. 8

Councillor Foxcroft

Can you give an assurance that getting young people and NEETs into work in this borough will continue to be a priority?

Councillor Maslin

Yes, I can indeed give that assurance that the Council is committed to doing all it can to alleviate youth unemployment within, of course, the resource constraints that have been placed upon us by this coalition government.

QUESTION No. 9

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Peake
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What lessons have been learned since the last two winters from the disruption caused by heavy snowfalls, particularly on the steep roads in Forest Hill? In what ways has the Council's Winter Service Plan been revised and what will be done differently in the event of similar weather this winter?

Reply

Discussions have been carried out with the Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents' Association regarding problems with access to the steep roads in Forest Hill. The Council's contractor, Conway, has agreed to trial the use of snow chains on the gritting lorries and the use of 'slush blades' to assist with snow clearance. However they have encountered problems with snow chains elsewhere, as the chains clogged quickly and performance was limited. Conway did trial the use of a 'slush blade' in Bromley last winter. This would move slush or loose snow, so would save time when clearing prior to salting. It has a rubber blade so would deflect over speed humps or cushions. Despite their obvious benefits, there would still be problems with parked cars etc. They also require extensive modifications to gritting lorries. As these are not included in the Council's contract with Conway, the Council would have to reimburse Conway with the cost of the modification works.

Following the severe winters, a Winter Service Practitioners Group has now been set up. This group meets regularly to exchange advice on best-practice and is attended by TfL and most London Boroughs, including Lewisham. Advice gained from these meetings will be incorporated in the next revision of the Council's Winter Service Policy and Plan.

Supplementary Question No. 9

Councillor Peake

I would like to ask a couple of things. The answer is not completely clear that says that Conway has agreed to trial the use of snow chains and the use of slush blades. Can you confirm that they will be trialling the use of that, because a bit later on the answer is discussing the problems with that, so can you confirm that those two things will definitely be used?

Also, I see the next revision of the Winter Service Plan is coming. Could you tell me when it will come and ensure that it is emailed to the ward members in Forest Hill in particular? I am sure other people may be interested in it as well.

The Mayor

I am not sure I caught quite all of that, but I suspect the trialling has to await further falls of snow, but my understanding is with the contractor that it is the business of if the snow chains do not work trying this other way of doing it.

On your second point, I will endeavour to ensure that officers do provide you with that information when it is available and I can assure you that the issue of snow on roads in Forest Hill is something which does gain my attention on a regular basis.

Action

ED Regen.

QUESTION No. 10

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Clutten
of the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People**

Question

How many individuals and groups have now come forward with proposals for free schools within the Lewisham borough? Could you please give details of how the council is working with these groups to discuss the potential validity of their plans?

Reply

To date 16 individuals or groups have approached the Council with ideas for free schools in Lewisham.

In all cases an offer to meet with officers has been made, and in the majority of cases, taken up, in order both for the Council to understand the proposal, and for the proposer to understand better the Lewisham context. The Council has also responded to any requests for further information, for example data on demographics, demand for places, and educational standards. Officers have explained the Council's plans particularly for the expansion of primary provision in relation to particular sites, and the general difficulty in finding suitable sites for new schools in Lewisham.

In no cases have detailed plans been subsequently shared with the Council which are sufficiently developed, not least in relation to potential sites, to inform further discussion on their merits, for example in helping to meet the Borough's need for additional high quality primary places.

QUESTION No. 11

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Daby
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

Can the Cabinet Member for Community Services provide details of the government cuts to Adult Education? What is the total expected percentage cut in Lewisham's funding?

Reply

Grant funding levels from the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) have dropped by 18% since 2006/07. The SFA has announced that over the period of the spending review, 2011/12 - 2014-15, Adult Skills funding will reduce by a further 25%. Specific details of Lewisham's settlement have not been provided but a 25% reduction in the relevant funding elements would represent a reduction in funding of approximately £625,000 for Lewisham.

This is based on the current level of funding for 2011/12 of £3,897,929 made up of the following funding streams:

Adult Safeguarded Learning - £1,873,761

Adult Skills - £1,397,747

First Steps- £440,364

Additional Learning Support - £186,057

In addition, the SFA has announced that there will be major reform of the Adult Safeguarded Budget, the largest stream. This is the budget that provides funding for non-accredited learning and changes will be implemented in September

2012.

For 2011/12, the SFA has reduced the funding for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes. These classes had previously received a higher funding amount per taught hour. This additional funding will now be removed from September 2011/12 and further reduces the funding available to CEL.

SFA has also announced major changes to funding eligibility as there is an expectation that individuals will make a greater contribution towards the cost of their learning. Concessionary fees will now only be available to learners who are on an employment seeking benefit, i.e. job seekers allowance or employment support allowance. It is not known what impact this will have on projected learners numbers or fee income in September.

In response to these cuts CEL has kept the 50% concessionary rate for older learners (aged 65 years and over) so that these learners will pay £2 per hour rather than £4. There has been a significant amount of lobbying of John Hayes, the Minister for Business, Innovation and Skills to review the cuts for learners as part of the changes in the Disability Living Allowance.

QUESTION No. 12

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Folorunso
of the Cabinet Member for Community Safety**

Question

Can you let me know if Lewisham Metropolitan Police uniformed staff will be affected by budget reductions?

Could you also provide ranks of officers whose post will be deleted?

Reply

As I understand it, the MPS have submitted the proposals for managing the reduction in budget through the Policing Plan 2011-14. The officer and PCSO numbers are being managed in a controlled way as part of the MPS Territorial Policing Development Programme. The aim is to maintain a strong focus on delivering policing services as efficiently as possible to mitigate the impact of the reductions that are required.

Under these proposals there will be no reduction in the number of PC's and PCSO's within Safer Neighbourhood Teams. However, changes are being made to supervisory roles where sergeants may be responsible for more than one team. If the proposals are accepted on the 30 June 2011 it is likely that there will be a reduction of 4 SNT sergeants across the borough.

Supplementary Question No. 12

Councillor Folorunso

Can you name some of the wards that are likely to be affected?

Councillor Onuegbu

Right, thank you. Please take this list with a pinch of salt. Although four wards have been identified, we will not know for sure until the MPAs' meeting, which will take place on the 30th, so I am afraid you have to wait until after the 30th to know definitely if those wards that have been identified will be the ones.

The wards which are under consideration are: Catford South and Whitefoot, Downham and Grove Park, Blackheath, Lee Green, Crofton Park and Ladywell. However, please, we do not know for sure until after the meeting on the 30th.

QUESTION No. 13

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

Following the increase in the cost of parking permits are you considering any changes in the CPZ ? Will you introduce hourly visitor passes and look at ways easing the burden on carers and other regular visits to homes within CPZs?

Reply

There are no plans at present to alter the CPZ times in Blackheath. Visitor vouchers are charged by half day (5 hours) or full day. The half day tariff is charged at £2.80 the same price as the two hour pay and display tariff. Which equates to five hours parking for the price of two for resident's visitors, when parking in resident bays.

Alternatively, pay and display parking can be used if visiting for less than one hour.

QUESTION No. 14

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Curran
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

When does LB Lewisham envisage the finalisation of the sale of land behind 98 Sydenham Road (adjacent to Girton Road car park) Sydenham, London SE26 5JA to Temple Stone London Ltd?

Reply

Council Officers agreed to declare the land surplus to the Council's requirements at a meeting in April 2010, and contractual terms for the land sale were agreed with the prospective purchaser recently, after protracted negotiations.

A report seeking formal authority for the disposal of the land is currently being prepared by officers and will shortly be submitted to the Executive Director for Resources, acting under delegated authority, for formal disposal consent.

It is anticipated that the land sale will complete shortly thereafter.

Supplementary Question No. 14

Councillor Curran

I do not normally raise items of constituency casework, as it were, or ward casework, but each of the questions I have raised tonight have their genesis from more than six years ago and I have a feeling that one more email or telephone call is not going to make much difference. I have been worried that in four years time I will still be dealing with these issues, that is why I raise them in this way and, to a degree, they do represent a little bit of a corporate failure. I am very glad that having brought it to your attention they are now

saying there is going to be a solution to this, but I would ask the Mayor, if he is answering for the Deputy Mayor on this point, if he would have a word with the relevant departments so that I will not have to raise it again at a subsequent Council meeting.

The Mayor

I am happy to ask the director of the relevant department to ensure that this is dealt with speedily.

Action

ED Regen.

QUESTION No. 15

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor De Ryk
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

How many lunch clubs are funded by the Council and what criteria do you use to grant funding?

Reply

The Localities Fund has given support to the following lunch clubs across the borough

Locality Fund 2010-11

- Bellingham ward: Bellingham Lunch Club £1,759.15 (SAGE Ageing Well)
- Bellingham ward: BEGO Xmas Party £920 (Bellingham Community Project)
- Blackheath ward: Heathside & Lethbridge over 60s Luncheon club Christmas lunch and outing £1,200 (Quaggy Development Trust)
- Lee Green ward: Senior Citizen Christmas lunch £1,060 (Lee Senior Citizens Social Club)
- Telegraph Hill ward: Sector J Pensioners Christmas dinner £125 (Sector J Pensioners Club)

Localities Fund recommendations are based on ward members' identification of local need. The proposals are usually then endorsed through the local assembly.

Small Grants budget 2010-11

The following lunch clubs were funded from the 2010/11 Small Grants budget:

- South London Turkish Elders who meet in Catford
- Turkish Elders who meet in Sydenham

The criteria for small grants are attached.

In addition, some transitional funding was given to the Heathside and Lethbridge luncheon club when the neighbourhood management programme funding came to an end and the local assemblies were in their infancy. The estate was undergoing considerable change and it was recognised that the Quaggy Development Trust would need time to seek alternative sources of funding for the programme of activities.

The transitional funding has now come to an end and the luncheon club would need to seek funding from the small grants programme or the local assembly.

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS 2010/2011

Lewisham Council has a vision of making Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn, and this drives the local change agenda.

The Council recognises that changing and modernising Lewisham requires involvement from all sections of the community. The voluntary and community sector has a key role in developing partnerships for inclusive communities. The Council is committed to working with and supporting a vibrant, innovative and effective voluntary and community sector and the unique role of voluntary and community groups in enabling local people to articulate their needs and to develop services to meet those needs.

The Council is inviting applications for funding from voluntary organisations for 2010/2011. Local Authority expenditure levels are not yet known and it may be that the overall level of funding available is less than previous years. The Council cannot therefore guarantee that organisations funded in previous years will be funded in 2010/2011. Funding will depend on the overall funding available and the strength of individual applications in meeting the funding criteria. It is expected that decisions on applications will be taken in March 2011.

Organisations applying for funding will be assessed against general, key service and operational criteria. **PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOUR APPLICATION SHOWS HOW YOU CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS THESE CRITERIA.**

KEY CRITERIA

In allocating funding, officers ensure that the grants programme is directed to organisations that demonstrate the willingness and capacity to make cost effective contributions to the corporate priorities identified in the Community Strategy. Applicants meeting the general criteria will be assessed against how they contribute towards these ten priorities which are:

1. crime: reduce crime and the fear of crime and make Lewisham a safer place.
2. health: sustain and improve the health and well-being of local people.
3. education: raise educational attainment, skill levels and employability.
4. enterprise and business growth: foster enterprise and sustainable business growth, including the creative industries.
5. cultural vitality: develop cultural vitality – building on Lewisham's distinctive cultures and diversity.
6. regeneration: secure sustainable regeneration of Lewisham as a place – its housing, transport and environment.

7. welfare dependency: reduce welfare dependency, promote independence and increase the life chances of vulnerable members of the community.
8. engage local communities: help local communities to develop their own capacity for mutual support and independent action and ensure the centrality of community involvement in public service decision-making processes.
9. ensure equity in service delivery: design diversity into local institutions and design out discrimination.
10. improve effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of local public services: optimise investment in infrastructure and improve the stewardship of assets.

Using the Community Strategy priorities outlined above, the criteria for grant aid will be assessed against the following considerations:

- Is delivering services representing interests which meet one of more priorities in Community Strategy priorities 1-7 'Improving the well-being of Lewisham'?
- Is delivering second-tier support and development to the sector in keeping with priority 8 in the Community Strategy, 'Develop and engage local communities'?
- Is delivering important services outside of the statutory sector remit, contributing to priorities 9 and 10 in the Community Strategy, 'Improving public sector performance and delivery'?

As a prerequisite for receiving grant aid, organisations will also need to demonstrate

- compliance with the Council's conditions of grant aid;
- the viability of the organisation;
- the promotion of good value and quality;
- evidence that funding applied for could not have been accessed elsewhere;
- ensuring active promotion of equality of opportunity and social inclusion.

GENERAL CRITERIA

Your application must:

- be for activities or services that mainly benefit people who live within the London Borough of Lewisham
- be from a voluntary organisation
- include a constitution clearly setting out aims and objects
- include a written equal opportunities policy
- where appropriate, include a child protection / vulnerable adult policy
- demonstrate clear financial management procedures and arrangements which allow the management committee to ensure the effective use of resources

We will not fund:

- × individuals
- × projects that do not mainly benefit people living within the borough of Lewisham
- × worship or activities that promote the views of a religious organisation (although religious groups may apply for non religious activities)
- × activities that promote the views of a political party
- × commercial or business related activities
- × spending that has already taken place

OPERATIONAL CRITERIA

Applicants meeting the general and key criteria will then be assessed against the operational criteria detailed below:

- the organisation's efficiency and effectiveness in providing its services
- whether the organisation's services duplicate council or other Lewisham based services
- how the services relate to other similar activities
- how effectively the organisation measures its performance and successes
- whether volunteers are involved and if so whether they provide 'added value' in the delivery of the organisation's services
- whether the organisation is able to attract funds from other sources and if so how successful has it been
- how well the organisation is able to support and manage both paid and unpaid staff
- its ability to effectively measure the performance and success of the project both quantitatively and qualitatively

QUESTION No. 16

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Fletcher
of the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People**

Question

Did the Children and Young People Directorate send in a submission to the Wolf review of vocational education for 14-19 year olds? What advice is the Directorate giving to schools in light of the Wolf report's findings that many young people are doing vocational courses that do not prepare them sufficiently for a job or further study and that vocational qualifications should be removed from league tables? If this were to happen what impact will this have on Lewisham's position in national league tables?

Reply

The Lewisham 14-19 Strategic forum did not make a single response to the Wolf review of vocational education for 14-19 year olds. Instead, we supported schools and colleges in making individual submissions to the review. The Wolf report is right to stress that schools and colleges only offer those qualifications which are useful to young people in finding a job or future study. The 14-19 Strategic Forum has welcomed the review.

In relation to advice to schools, the Wolf Review and the Government's response to it have been discussed with Lewisham providers through the 14-19 Forum, Secondary Heads Strategic Group, and the 14-19 Policy and Programme Steering Group.

Although Wolfe's recommendations have been accepted by the Government in full it is unlikely that any changes in legislation will be enacted before September 2012.

In anticipation of future changes to the status of some pre-16 vocational qualifications, we are continuing to support schools and colleges in reviewing

their curricula. The 14-19 Partnership is ensuring the right balance of KS4 courses is available across the Borough to Lewisham students. Schools and Colleges will consider individually and within the Partnership what constitutes a broad KS4 offer, and what qualifications they adopt outside the core curriculum.

If the proposals of the Wolf review were enacted and current eligible vocational qualifications were removed from national league tables, it is likely that it would have a beneficial effect on Lewisham's position in the league tables.

Supplementary Question No. 16

Councillor Fletcher

Please could the Cabinet Member expand further on the last paragraph of her response? In particular, why the withdrawal of vocational qualifications from national league tables is likely to have a beneficial effect on Lewisham's position.

Councillor Klier

In your question, you posed the question to me about the change in vocational qualifications and the number of vocational qualifications that students can study before they are 16. You asked if the change were to happen what impact would this have on Lewisham's position in national league tables. My answer was that it would have a beneficial effect, i.e. we think that we use the BTEC route to gaining five A-Cs less than many councils. Indeed, I was talking to the Member for Children and Young People from another borough in London, who said he was working very hard in his borough to try to introduce more of the, shall we say, academic subjects into his schools, even though they had very high A-C pass rates.

QUESTION No. 17

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Brooks
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

What steps has the Council taken to ensure Lewisham Homes has carried out its statutory duties under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 in respect of all the council blocks it manages?

Reply

The Council has taken the following action to ensure Lewisham Homes has carried out its statutory duties under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 in respect of all the council blocks it manages.

The Council has received the Lewisham Homes Health and Safety policy and is undertaking action to confirm it is up to date and that the measures they have in place, including specialist advice, are suitable and sufficient to discharge their duty effectively.

Through its Housing Clienting Team the Council is monitoring the Lewisham Homes Fire Safety Action Plan and policy for managing fire safety. This includes regular monitoring of how risks are managed, their approach to risk assessments, fire safety works and the actions they are taking in relation to the fire enforcement notices and deficiency notices they have received from the Fire Authority.

QUESTION No. 18

Priority 1

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

What work has the cabinet member undertaken to investigate the sufficiency of GP coverage within the borough?

Reply

In addition to it being raised by Councillor Feakes, the issue of GP coverage has previously been brought to my attention by officers supporting the local assemblies. I have therefore been in contact with health colleagues and I have been assured that there is sufficient GP coverage across the borough.

There are currently 48 GP practices in Lewisham, including one walk in centre. I have been informed that all roads in Lewisham are covered by a GP practice. I have been further informed that, at this time, all practice lists are open for patients to register and that any resident can of course attend the walk in centre without an appointment and without being registered at that centre.

Supplementary Question 18

Councillor Feakes

Thank you to the Cabinet Member for her response. I was wondering whether the Cabinet Member is aware that the furthest point from any GP surgery within zone three lies within Forest Hill ward and I was wondering whether she

would agree to meet with me to discuss making sure that there is sufficient coverage in terms of geography let alone population for the Forest Hill area.

Councillor Best

Action

Yes, quite happy to meet, Alex. I am aware that there is no GP surgery in Forest Hill, but of course being the Councillor for Sydenham I am aware of where the surgeries are, the nearest one being Wells Park Road. This is adjacent to Forest Hill ward in that it is on our ward boundary. However, yes, let us follow it forward. I do feel we have good coverage and of course we have the benefit of the walk in. Although it is in New Cross, it does mean that our residents can literally walk in from eight until eight 365 days a year.

**ED Comm.
Serv.**

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Griesenbeck
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

- (1) What is the income from CPZ fees in Lewisham by ward?
- (2) How much of this money is invested in transport-related projects in the London Borough of Lewisham?
- (3) Is any money from CPZs spent outside the London Borough of Lewisham?
- (4) What are the projects which CPZ money is invested in?
- (5) How much CPZ money is invested in which ward?

Reply

- (1) The CPZ income is not calculated by ward it is calculated by CPZ. The overall surplus from parking income 2009/10 was £681,559. The figure for year 2010/11 is not yet available.
- (2) All the parking income surplus is statutorily ring-fenced for spend on highway improvements.
- (3) Money from CPZs is not spent outside of the London Borough of Lewisham.
- (4) Income received from CPZs is invested in projects such as Traffic Management Schemes, footway/carriageway improvements and lighting.

- (5) CPZ Investment is not undertaken on a ward basis. An holistic approach is undertaken when spending the surplus from the parking account and many of the schemes will cross ward boundaries.

QUESTION NO. 20

This question has been withdrawn by Officers.

QUESTION No. 21

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Harris
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Does the Council have any guidelines around investing in authoritarian regimes whether through our prudential borrowing or pensions investments; if not, is this a policy that could be developed?

Reply

When investing the pension fund's cash the primary consideration must be the maximisation of return with social, ethical and environmental issues being secondary to this.

Within this context the Pension Fund's current Statement of Investment Principles encourages managers to "refrain from investing in organisations engaged in unethical practices, provided that there are suitable alternative investments, which will not in the long term result in a loss of Fund performance." The political instability which is associated with authoritarian regimes will obviously be a factor which managers consider when assessing the long term commercial viability of investment in such countries.

Supplementary Question No. 21

Councillor Harris

Being that authoritarian regimes are more unstable, can we be proactive on this and make efforts with our fund managers to make ethical choices that reflect the risks inherent in investing in places like Belarus, Syria or Iran?

Councillor Maslin

Yes, I think up to a point you have phrased your question very well. I think the key thing to understand is that the fund is there to benefit the beneficiaries of the scheme. It is not there for the Council to pursue its foreign policy by another means. However, clearly there is investment risk where there is insecurity because, plainly, there is a risk that you cannot get your money out and I want to assure everybody that our fund managers are very keen on pursuing the security of the investment and principles of good governance. If I can give an example, at a recent meeting of the Pensions Investment Committee our commodities fund managers made the point that they would not invest in a particular company that was heavily involved in Kazakhstan and had recently got into some trouble getting rid of members of the board precisely because they had serious concerns about governance.

QUESTION No. 22

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Bonavia
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

Can the Cabinet Member for Community Services explain what steps have so far been taken by the Council to obtain a new tenant for the premises formally occupied by the Blackheath Village Library?

Reply

Following the decision taken by the Mayor at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on the 11 May, officers have been in discussion with Heath House School who wish to have the existing lease of the library assigned to them. Solicitors have been instructed and the final terms are currently being negotiated.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Older People**

Question

Please provide an update on the implementation of the Mayor's manifesto commitment to set up a Positive Ageing Council?

Reply

In response to the Mayoral pledge in 2010 to set up a council for older people, the Positive Ageing Council was launched in May 2011.

The Positive Ageing Council operates as a forum for older people to raise issues that affect them locally and nationally. It is also a place to celebrate getting older in Lewisham. Its aim is to create a network for older peoples' groups to share learning and experiences, and link groups together.

A smaller steering group of 20 older local people was also formed at the launch who will work with elected members, who will be supported by council officers, to take an active lead in the running of the Positive Ageing Council. Representatives of the steering group will sit on various Council partnership boards to represent the Positive Ageing Council.

A constitutional change will be recommended to the council to enable the Positive Ageing Council to take key matters of importance to older people to Mayor and Cabinet for review.

Future Council strategies will also be taken to the Positive Ageing Council to ensure that the needs of older people in Lewisham are represented in all service areas of the Council.

At the Positive Ageing Council launch in May 2011, older people in Lewisham were asked to put forward their top three local topics of concern that they would like to Positive Ageing Council to focus on in the first year these were:

- 1) The isolation of older people impacted on by Lewisham Council services and decisions such as : controlled parking zones in the areas they live, a lack of information or promotion about the services and activities available to older people in their local area, and the closure of third sector older people's services due to funding cuts.
- 2) Transport issues affecting older people: dial a ride and taxis to hospital, pensioners experiences of buses / TFL.
- 3) The experiences of the care of older people: in care homes, in hospital / doctors surgeries and visiting agency home carers.

The Steering Group will be reviewing this feedback in the summer and deciding how to take these topics forward. The first steering group meeting is scheduled for 23 June. The next Positive Ageing Council event will happen at the Civic Suite on 8 September.

Supplementary Question No. 23

Councillor Whittle

Thank you to Councillor Fitzsimmons for that response. As one of the youngest boroughs in London I hope she will be able to assure me that the Positive Ageing Council will continue to prioritise intergenerational working and continue to work closely with the young Mayor and his advisers.

Councillor Fitzsimmons

I can assure you that this is already very much in being. We plan about seven or eight different intergenerational events in the next few months, so we are very keen and so is the Young Mayor and all his team. They are working very closely with us.

QUESTION No. 24

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Foxcroft
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What assessment has the Council made of the potential increase in planning powers outlined in the Localism Bill?

Reply

The Council has been keeping up to date with the various announcements on the Localism Bill which impact on planning and has been responding to government consultation on related matters. It is clear that there is still a good deal of detail to be worked out on how neighbourhood forums will promote Neighbourhood Development Plans for their areas but the Council has already learnt a lot about how to work with local residents and groups on a Ward basis. It is therefore good to see that we can take that experience forward so that our communities have a key role in working with the Council to promote the right development in the right place.

However, there are still some aspects of change in relation to planning which cause concern, including the proposal to remove the need for consent for a change of use from commercial uses to housing. In a London context, this appears highly inappropriate with small offices and businesses likely to be lost due to the higher land value of residential use. In such cases, where we do not feel that changes to planning powers are in the interest of residents and businesses in the borough, we will continue to lobby for a different approach.

Supplementary Question No. 24

Councillor Foxcroft

Has the Mayor had any indication of the new planning rules envisaged in the Bill and the introduction of the neighbourhood plans will, as Eric Pickles puts it, 'deliver a shot in the arm for local democracy'?

The Mayor

I think the short answer to that is no. I have to say that I have had a couple of conversations over the last few months with two parliamentarians who were, until very recently, senior figures in local government, one of whom will be very well known to members of the previous council she was my deputy, but another was someone who was a council leader on the other side, i.e. sitting on the government benches. Both of them expressed frustration in that they had been unable to persuade ministers to listen to people who have experience of the planning system. Now, I do not think I am making a party political point here. I think there are real concerns that the planning aspects of this Bill will simply not work in the way that ministers appear to believe they will and, as I said in answer to an earlier question, I hope that our colleagues in the House of Lords are going to have a go at some of this and try to get some commonsense into it.

QUESTION No. 25

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Johnson
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

Following your positive response to my previous question on the possibilities tightening up the borough's planning policies on the protection of back gardens, can you give me an update on any progress that has been made?

Reply

The response to the Council question in March 2011 stated that the UDP policy HSG 8 'Backland and In-Fill Development', that deals with this issue, is currently retained and is under review as part of the preparation of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (DPD).

As a formal planning document the Development Management DPD has to go through a number of statutory processes. This involves a review of the existing UDP policy, collection of relevant evidence and consultation on options for change. Then a final plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for an Independent Examination, following that the Council can adopt the new Development Plan.

Consultation on options for change will now take place in the Autumn. When the further options report is published it will contain, amongst other policy options, a revised approach to backland and in-fill development and include reference to garden development.

It is anticipated that the policy options will include a criteria based approach that will focus on protecting the neighbourhood character; the residential amenity of both existing and proposed residential properties; traffic and parking issues and landscape and nature resource issues.

Supplementary Question No. 25

Councillor Johnson

I would like to thank the Deputy Mayor for his positive response to my question. I do look forward to revised and, hopefully, strengthened policy on development and protection of back gardens.

Given how close to the heart this is of many of the local amenities societies and local residents groups, can I ask the Mayor is it possible that some initial feedback can be received from the local groups on these proposals on the way forward prior to the official consultation in the autumn?

The Mayor

I will endeavour to pass the question on to the Deputy Mayor and to the Head of Planning, who will be much better placed than I am to do that. It seems a sensible course of action, but I do not want to pre-empt their response.

Action

ED Regen.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Jeffrey
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

- (a) What is the extent of Lewisham's exposure to Southern Cross care homes?
- (b) What are the latest plans to ensure that all elderly and vulnerable residents are protected if Southern Cross becomes financially unviable?

Reply

a) What is the extent of Lewisham's exposure to Southern Cross care homes?

Southern Cross, a national care home provider, recently announced losses of over £300m. As a result, the organisation reported that it intended to underpay the rent to its landlords by 30% for four months starting 1 June to September 2011. In addition, Southern Cross announced that there will be home closures and job losses of around 3,000 members of staff. Southern Cross state that job losses will not come from within the managerial or care staffing structure but the organisation has yet to clarify from which areas the job losses will come. Southern Cross met with Landlords and Ministers on 17 June 2011 to discuss its recovery and restructure plans. This work is being led by KPMG.

In Lewisham, Southern Cross Healthcare operates two care homes: Alexander Care Centre (owned by NHP Group) and Beechcroft Nursing Home (owned by Bondcare). Lewisham is the primary referring local authority to these homes, although there are a few residents in the homes from other boroughs.

In addition, a number of placements have been purchased by Lewisham in other homes owned by two of the landlords affected by the Southern Cross rent reductions. Information on these placements is as follows:

Barchester Healthcare: 4 placements in borough, 7 placements out of borough;
Four Seasons Healthcare: 5 placements out of borough.

The risks of immediate cessation of operations in Lewisham can be summarised under two key areas. First, the impact upon the Council's statutory duties to provide care for vulnerable residents with assessed need and, secondly, the cost pressures for the Council in re-providing these beds.

As of 1 June, there were 55 vacancies in local nursing and residential care homes in the borough. This would not be enough to accommodate all the clients currently in Beechcroft and Alexander. The greatest risk to the Council would be in the provision of nursing care beds. Currently there are only 25 nursing vacancies in borough and very few in neighbouring boroughs as they too are looking to source any available beds. This means that Lewisham would be compelled to look further afield to accommodate all existing clients. The situation regarding residential beds is not quite as acute as that for nursing beds.

b) What are the latest plans to ensure that all elderly and vulnerable residents are protected if Southern Cross becomes financially unviable?

So that Lewisham can continue to meet its statutory duty to provide care for vulnerable residents with assessed needs, officers are actively working on a number of levels to ensure that the council has contingency plans in place should it need to take action to protect those residents placed in establishments run by Southern Cross.

Officers have undertaken an analysis of placements to ascertain the number of residents that Lewisham has placed in and out of borough. Discussions have also taken place with other boroughs that have placements with Southern Cross so contingency plans can be shared.

Discussions have also taken place at the Residential and Nursing Providers Forum and Domiciliary Care Providers' Forum to agree proposed recovery plans, should they require implementation.

Contact has been made with a number of care homes in the borough who have vacancies. Should the need arise, they have indicated that they would give the Council first choice of any vacancies.

In relation to the two Southern Cross homes in the borough, regular contract monitoring visits are being conducted. Four such visits have been made during June. Contract Monitoring Officers interviewed residents, relatives and staff to gather feedback on the quality of care and any adverse working conditions arising as a result of the current situation. The observations by Contract Monitoring Officers and Lay Visitors indicated that both Alexander and Beechcroft staff are continuing to provide good nursing and residential care, despite the

highly publicised discussions surrounding the financial standing of Southern Cross Healthcare. Contract Monitoring Officers will continue to observe working practices and examine relevant documentation and ensure that appropriate action is taken to prevent any decline in quality standards.

I would like to reassure all Members that we have place robust procedures for working with our providers that is part of our culture of joint roles and responsibilities in securing the safety and well being of all vulnerable residents.

Supplementary Question No. 26

Councillor Jeffrey

Can I thank the Cabinet Member for a full response and just ask that Members be kept informed of any subsequent developments on this?

Councillor Best

Yes, of course. As you know, this discussion is happening on a national level. There is an awful lot of to-ing and fro-ing to try to seek a solution. I would really like to reassure everyone this evening that we have robust procedures in place for working with our providers. We want to make sure that we can continue those joint roles and responsibilities, because it is so important to reassure vulnerable residents. Therefore, I will, of course, keep everyone fully informed.

QUESTION No. 27

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Clutten
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What is the current situation regarding the re-categorisation of pot holes across the borough? Please also provide a details list of all those that have been reported since May 2010 and how many of these have been permanently repaired?

Reply

The Council's defect threshold for repair of pot holes is unchanged. The Council's Highway Maintenance Code of Practice defines a pot hole as "a hole in the carriageway surface caused by failure of the surfacing material, more than 100cm² and more than 50mm deep".

Approximately 8800 pot holes have been repaired since May 2010. It is not possible to determine how many of those have been permanently repaired. However the Council's Carriageway Resurfacing Priority System includes the cost of pot hole repairs as one of the factors that determines a road's place on the Priority List, so roads with numerous pot holes are likely to be high on that list.

A detailed list of reported potholes is not readily available.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

Who are the members of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board. When the Board is fully established how many members will be elected councillors or representatives of local patients?

Reply

The members of the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board are:

Sir Steve Bullock, the Mayor, who chairs the board
Chris Best Cabinet Member for Community Services
Aileen Buckton and Frankie Sulke, the Executive Directors for Community Services and for Children and Young People
Martin Wilkinson, the Managing Director of the Lewisham Business Service Unit (BSU), NHS SE London
Dr Helen Tattersfield , GP, Chair of the Lewisham Primary Care Federation and (Vice Chair)
Dr Simon Parton, GP, Local Medical Committee (LMC)
Dr Danny Ruta, Joint Director of Public Health
Tim Higginson, Chief Executive, Lewisham Healthcare Trust (LHT)
Steve Davidson, Service Director, South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust
Martin Howie, Director, Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL)
Val Fulcher, Chair of the Lewisham Local Involvement Network (LINK)

The formal establishment of Lewisham's Health and Wellbeing Board will not take place until the Health and Social Care Bill has completed its passage through Parliament. Final membership will of course reflect statutory requirements.

QUESTION No. 29

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Curran
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

Will the LB Lewisham instal a gate at the (non-public) access entrance to from behind the shops at 94-98 Sydenham Road with keys for traders to prevent recurrence of frequent flytipping?

Reply

The Council does not own the shops in the entire terrace of 80 to 104 Sydenham Road or the land between the shops and the car park and therefore will not be installing a gate to the access entrance.

Supplementary Question No. 29

Councillor Curran

I am a little perplexed by the answer given to this one. Again, it relates to an issue that has been running for many years. The answer says, 'The Council does not own the land between the shops and the car park at Girton Road' and, in fact, in answer number 14 the Council says it is selling a piece of that land to one of the shopkeepers. Therefore, I think that needs to be clarified and I would be grateful if the relevant officer can explain who does own which bit of land or if no one claims ownership.

The Mayor

I share your puzzlement. I was also slightly surprised that the answer was, I thought, relatively dismissive. I know that at other authorities they have found ways of installing alley gates, as they call them, in order to deal with these issues, so I will undertake to ask the officers to come back with further information on this.

Action

ED Regen.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Fletcher
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

Increasingly sophisticated methods are being used by insurance companies to assess flood risk. These address not just the risk of rivers overflowing but also the risk of surface water flooding and flooding from groundwater, which have become increasingly common in recent years. Has any work been done to look at this issue in Lewisham, assess the risks to Council owned properties and to monitor those parts of the borough where this is a problem?

Reply

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 – most of which came into force on 1 April 2011 and the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 have placed a range of new duties and responsibilities on local authorities, the Environment Agency and other partners. The principal duty for Lewisham Council, with its new status as a ‘Lead Local Flood Authority’ will be to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a local flood risk management strategy (LFRMS) which covers flood risk from surface water run-off, groundwater, and ordinary watercourses (including lakes and ponds).

Since 2006, the GLA ‘Drain London’ Project - with funding from Defra - has been working to help London boroughs manage and reduce surface water risk by improving knowledge of the surface water drainage systems and identifying areas at greatest risk of flooding.

The aim was to find ways to tackle the problem of surface water flooding in London by establishing ownership of London’s drainage assets, assessing the condition of these assets and securing a better understanding of the risk from surface water flooding so that boroughs and the GLA could better plan to manage and improve drainage assets and mitigate the risk from this type of flooding.

The main outcome for the Drain London Project is that each London borough will have a Surface Water Management Plan that will contain a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and a Flood Risk Management Plan. Lewisham is also involved in the Drain London Partnership and is part of Group 6 which involves the boroughs of Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley. Halcrow - an international company which specialises in planning, design and management services for developing infrastructure – are consultants for the 'Drain London' Project and have worked with officers from each of these boroughs to prepare their Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments and Surface Water Management Plans.

Lewisham's Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Plan will be used to inform the local Flood Risk Management Strategy and the future update of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and other high level documents, such as the Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP).

Supplementary Question No. 30

Councillor Fletcher

It is pleasing to see that work is being done on the issue of the potential of surface water flooding and I just wondered if the Mayor knows of the timetable for the introduction of the Surface Water Management Plan given, I think, just this week there have been warnings of the possibility of surface water flooding in south London.

The Mayor

I think this is one that needs a written answer, I will get you that.

Action

ED Regen.

QUESTION No. 31

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Brooks
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

How many housing blocks owned by Lewisham Council or who's management is connected to Lewisham Council, do not have an up-to-date fire risk assessment as required by the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005?

Reply

There are no housing blocks owned by Lewisham Council that do not have an up-to-date fire risk assessment.

Both Lewisham Homes (ALMO) and Regenter B3 (Brockley PFI) have reported that they are up to date with their fire risk assessments on housing blocks.

QUESTION No. 32

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor De Ryk
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Please state how many credit cards are held by each Directorate, and which officers are authorised to use them. Please give the outstanding balances on the cards for each of the past 4 years per directorate?

Reply

Lewisham Council issues Purchasing Cards to certain employees to ensure that we purchase goods, supplies and services in the most efficient manner. They are treated as controlled stationery and when issued are limited in scope depending on service area (accessing cash is not allowed). Each card transaction needs a requester and approver to ensure that good financial management is maintained. The monthly statements are checked by members of the procurement team to ensure probity and that the Council's financial procedures are followed. Currently, prior to using the purchasing card proposed expenditure of any level that relates to hospitality, staff travel, attendance at conferences, management development training, IT equipment or office furniture, and all expenditure over £5000, has to be accepted by the Departmental Expenditure Panels (DEP's).

The numbers of card holders in the various directorates is shown below :-

46 – Children & Young People
24 - Customer Services
34 - Community Services
8 - Regeneration
23 - Resources

Total = 135

Authorised officer names are covered by the Data Protection Act

There were no balances on cards as they are all paid automatically by Direct Debit.

The expenditure figures for the 4 years :-

2007/8 £374,999.17

2008/9 £637,186.74

2009/10 £947,542.28

2010/11 £825,232.13

Supplementary Question No. 32

Councillor De Ryk

I wonder whether as the credit card expenditure is authorised under the headings supplied the Cabinet Member for resources would be kind enough to supply a written breakdown of the totals in those categories.

Councillor Maslin

Yes, although I think that probably quite a lot of it is on the website under the £500 invoice scheme, which is a very good use of taxpayers' money.

QUESTION No. 33

Priority 2

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People**

Question

What steps has the cabinet member taken to ensure that each of the borough's schools has sufficient numbers of governors with enough breadth of expertise to adequately fulfil the role governing body?

Reply

Governor Services work closely with Chairs of Governors to support them to ensure that they fill all vacancies as soon as possible once they arise.

All new Local Authority governors meet with the Head of Governor Services and a School Improvement Officer to discuss the role and assess suitability before they are put forward to be appointed to the school governing body.

School Improvement Officers work closely with Governor Services and particularly where there is a need to strengthen governing bodies to support them to fulfil their role successfully. This is where the LA or Ofsted identify where governance is less than good or where the school is in need of rapid improvement.

Supplementary Question No. 33

Councillor Feakes

Thank you very much for your answer, but I wanted to ask whether you were aware that clause 37 of the Education Bill currently before the House of Lords proposes to remove the requirement for local authority governors on maintained governing bodies and I was wondering if you are supportive of the efforts I am making to get the clause amended to make sure that LEA governors are kept as part of the mix.

Councillor Klier

Thank you, Councillor Feakes, for promoting me. I do not think I am quite in the position of getting a clause amended, although we can lobby. Your general thrust of these questions about governors is really about their capacity and how well they run their schools. I would pay tribute to most governors as they are the biggest volunteer force in the country and we are indebted to the amount of time they spend on schools. We will see what happens in the Bill.

QUESTION No. 34

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Harris
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

In light of the defamation action funded by South Tyneside Council on behalf of individual members; does Lewisham Council allow for individual members and or officers to be funded using taxpayers' money for taking legal action for slander or libel? And if so, will officers remove this provision from the Council's constitution and working practices?

Reply

Lewisham Council does not fund slander or libel actions by members or officers.

Supplementary Question No. 34

Councillor Harris

A final one on law, can I just get confirmation that under no circumstances council taxpayers' money will be used to fund deformation actions and that our Constitution will reflect this?

Councillor Maslin

The answer is clear: we do not fund slander or libel actions. We have no plans to do so in the future.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Johnson
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

Given the approval of the Libraries Implementation Plan at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 2 December 2009, why was no cost-benefit analysis of the proposals completed prior to the decision to close five of the libraries on 1 March 2011?

Reply

The Mayor's Commission on Libraries and Learning, published in May 2009, recommended that any proposed library building closure should only be considered after a full cost benefit analysis. This recommendation was written in a particular context. The commission recognised that some but not all our library plans had redevelopment plans for the modernisation of the library buildings with no obvious way of attracting redevelopment investment , a building move or co-location might have to be considered. It was agreed that a proposal of this kind which related to a particular building should be accompanied by a cost benefit analysis and a financial modelling tool that lends itself well to the analysis of a building and its usage..

However by Spring 2010, the scenario had changed substantially, presenting the Council with potentially unprecedented challenges. This is why, since the Summer of 2010, the Council needed to radically review the approach to delivering services into the future. While embracing the spirit and vision of the Commission, the Library & Information Service developed a comprehensive plan that delivers substantial savings for the Council while offering the opportunity to maintain quality library services for all residents. It was necessary at this point to undertake a different kind of analysis which balanced the need to maintain a comprehensive and efficient service against the need to make unprecedented savings and to take into consideration the

level of capital and service investment that had already been made in relation to the remaining libraries.

The current plan includes a reorganisation of the service, a reduction of library buildings that the Council manages directly, the development of opportunities to transfer buildings to community groups, and an increase in cross border working.

The aspects of this change programme that pertain to five library buildings (Blackheath, Crofton Park, Grove Park, New Cross, and Sydenham) have been extensively consulted on since the Summer of 2010.

QUESTION No. 36

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Clutten
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

In light of current budget constraints, what new ways for repairing pot holes have been investigated?

Reply

The Council's Highways Maintenance Team receive many offers to trial alternative pot hole repair systems. Several companies have carried out demonstrations at no cost to the Council. Unfortunately none of the repairs demonstrated any benefits over the standard repairs carried out by Conway, although they were all considerably more expensive.

QUESTION No. 37

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

Has the Council been offered £50,000 to create the "look and feel" of Olympics by decorating their streets with flags, banners and bunting for the 2012 Olympic Games ? As Blackheath will be the area closest within the borough to an Olympic event and many attendees will be arriving at Blackheath Station will you consider using some of this funding in Blackheath Village?

What consultation are you planning or how this funding will be spent?

Reply

The Council has indeed been offered funding of £50,000 by the Greater London Authority (GLA) to use on the London 2012 *Look and Feel* programme. The GLA has requested that boroughs use this funding to decorate town centres or parks.

The GLA has asked boroughs to return their plans for the use of the *Look and Feel* funding by the end of July. However an extension to this deadline is being requested by London Councils so that clarification can be sought on how the *Look and Feel* funding can be used and on the costs of official decorations. Once known, the Council will be able to develop proposals on what could be purchased within the budget available and where those decorations might be placed.

The Council is also in discussion with the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) about the 2012 venues, including the venue for the equestrian event at Greenwich Park. Part of these

discussions seek to establish who will be responsible for dressing the designated routes that spectators will take to each venue. In the case of Blackheath this covers the route from Blackheath train station to the Greenwich Park entrance on Shooters Hill Road.

Discussions with LOCOG are also ongoing about the London 2012 Torch Relay. Once the route through Lewisham has been agreed, the Council may also want to consider using some of the *Look and Feel* funding to decorate it.

Supplementary Question No. 37

Councillor Maines

Can I ask that Councillor Best does perhaps consult with Blackheath Society on expenditure of this money? 2012 is their 75th anniversary and they might add some funding towards the money that the Council's receiving to ensure that we do have a fantastic welcome for people arriving in Blackheath to attend the Olympics.

Councillor Best

Thank you very much for asking me to answer. We are very keen on getting the look and feel right. We will have the £50,000 - anyone else who can contribute to that will make our bunting go further. Let me explain that this is branded bunting and other paraphernalia that does have to be returned. Yes, it is quite true that LOCOG wish to keep all their brands in a tight box and that we will have to account for it, so we cannot have any stray bunting, I am afraid. Therefore, we would welcome any conversations, because we have to purchase any additional amount.

QUESTION No. 38

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Curran
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

When will the resurfacing work to the highway in Lawrie Park Road in the vicinity of Cricketer's Walk following Thames Water roadworks in 2008 and other roadworks in the years previous to that?

Reply

An order for the resurfacing of Lawrie Park Road, from Cricketer's Walk to the Borough boundary at Border Road, has been issued to the Council's resurfacing contractor, FM Conway Ltd. A programming meeting has been arranged in June 2011 to enable them to prepare a programme of works. Ward Councillors will be informed of the Lawrie Park Road resurfacing date as soon as it has been confirmed by FM Conway.

The Council's policy is to ensure that works on major roads such as Lawrie Park Road are carried out during July or August when traffic flows are lower.

Supplementary Question No. 38

Councillor Curran

Another long-running issue, dating to 2008 or 2005 depending on who you speak to. I have had previous assurances this work would have begun already, the resurfacing, but I have been to Cricketers Walk myself, stood in the building and when a lorry goes past it feels like it is under mortar attack from the neighbouring borough of Bromley, which is just down the road. It is a very serious problem for these residents in Cricketers Walk and it is damaging

the foundations to buildings in that area. I am grateful for the response; again, I hope that this will be resolved, as the answer says.

The Mayor

I am not sure I can add anything to that. It is clearly in the programme and unless something very unfortunate happens, like it snows in the week that it is meant to be done, I am sure it will be done in July or August, as indicated.

QUESTION No. 39

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Fletcher
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

In view of the recent budget cuts in relation to street cleaning can any more be done to encourage behavioural change to deter people from dropping litter and allowing their dogs to foul the pavements and parks?

Reply

With a reduced street cleansing budget there is a need for us to continue to raise awareness and engage with people to change their behaviour towards dropping litter. This forms a crucial element in the Cleanest Streets Programme that is currently underway which includes a number of initiatives to address this. These include:

- Running four local environmental quality campaigns over the course of the year around dog fouling, food on the go, chewing gum and smoking related litter. These often piggyback national campaigns to gain extra publicity.
- Developing and implementing a rolling programme of works with Community Payback to assist in street cleansing services including cutting back over hanging vegetation, weeding & leafing.
- Encouraging more people to use Love Lewisham, and the recently launched Love Clean London to report environmental issues and provide feedback on activities people have undertaken using the 'I Cleaned London' category.
- Facilitation and co-ordination of community clean up activities with a range of partners and community groups, including participating in the annual Capital Clean Up campaign, which saw the launch this year take place in Lewisham (Sevenoaks Rd) and other activities such as graffiti removal.

- Carrying out a number of education / enforcement action days to assist in the reduction of street litter.
- The annual Clean & Green Schools programme works with 25 schools a year, where litter is one of the themes that schools can choose. This culminates in an annual awards ceremony at the Civic Suite whereby schools are awarded for their efforts to improve their environment.
- Attendance at community events and fares to raise the issue of littering as well as talks to ward assemblies.
- Other events, such as the recent Responsible Animal Ownership days in Lewisham town centre, also talk to people about the responsible disposal of dogs mess.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

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

Question

Lewisham Council wrote to all Lewisham secondary schools and colleges in January 2011 to inform them of the proposals to amend the provision of careers education and guidance from April 2011. The letter advised that the LA will in future focus its resources on the reduction of the number of young people in the borough who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) and that it will no longer supplement the statutory duty of schools to provide general programmes of careers education and guidance. LB Lewisham also informed schools, colleges and Babcock PLC of its intention not to renew or to re-let the contract with Babcock for the provision of Information, Advice and Guidance services from April 2011.

No responses from schools have been received to date from the letter, and no schools or colleges have indicated that they will be unable to meet their statutory duties in this area.

What indication from Lewisham schools and Colleges has there been that shows that they are able to meet their statutory duty ?

Reply

Indications so far are that schools are meeting their current duties to provide careers education and we are confident that over the next year all schools will meet the duty to deliver careers guidance. Through the Careers Coordinators Forum and directly with individual schools, we are supporting schools and colleges in reviewing their current provision of careers education and guidance. This will continue over the coming academic year which the government has indicated is a transition year prior to changes in legislation intended to take force from September 2012.

QUESTION No. 41

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor De Ryk
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Can you explain how the Council organises terms with its suppliers, and what those terms are. How much is currently outstanding 'on account' to suppliers? How much of this amount is owed to local suppliers and on what terms?

Reply

Lewisham's terms and conditions are attached to our purchase orders. The standard is that we pay undisputed invoices within 30 days of receipt.

The current outstanding commitment as at 23 June 2011 is £6.172m, which we would expect to be paid within the agreed standard. The system does not split this total by supplier types or terms, and the balance will fluctuate on a daily basis.

For larger contracts the payment terms and conditions are included within the contract documents, and these mostly mirror the standard, however, on some negotiated contracts (e.g. Private Finance Initiatives) this period varies.

QUESTION No. 42

Priority 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Mayor**

Question

How many of the 'Sorry I missed you' calling cards did you personally deliver?

Reply

Please see the answer to question 71.

Supplementary Question No. 42

Councillor Feakes

Thank you to the Mayor for the comprehensive answer to the written questions as well on this issue. Given that the cards are produced by the Council, I was wondering whether anonymised information from the cards which are physically returned would be available to Members so that they can understand the issues that people have been raising as well.

The Mayor

I will ask the officers who have that information if it can be put into a suitable and understandable format.

Action

ED Res.

QUESTION No. 43

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Harris
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

How many complaints have been made to the Council about the Family Mosaic housing association; how many tenants does Family Mosaic have in our borough, and how does this compare to the ratio of complaints against tenancies received by the Council in regards to Lewisham Homes?

Reply

Housing Associations each have their own complaints procedure that tenants are referred to if they complain to the council. If they are unhappy with how their complaint is being dealt with by the organisation or have been through the full procedure, they can contact the Housing Ombudsman Service.

Family Mosaic have 842 rented homes in Lewisham.

As Lewisham does not deal with Family Mosaic complaints it is not possible to make a comparison of complaints against Lewisham Homes.

QUESTION No. 44

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Clutten
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What has been done to engage newly elected councillors (those elected May 2010 and on) with the Supplementary Planning Document? And specifically what has been done to inform those who are currently sitting on planning committees?

Reply

The Council currently has seven adopted Supplementary Planning Documents ('SPD'), the most recent of which is the Planning Obligations SPD. The Planning Obligations SPD was reported to Mayor and Cabinet in December 2010 and to Full Council in January 2011. Hard copies of the SPD and associated report were circulated to members at that time. Following on from adoption of the SPD, a presentation was given to Planning Committees A and C on the 5th and 19th May 2011 to introduce the document and highlight some of the key issues that may be raised in officer reports and influence decision making. A third session had been scheduled for Planning Committee B, however, based on feedback from the first two sessions, it was considered that a longer more detailed session for all members would be of more value. A member training session has now been scheduled for the 4th July and an introduction to the SPD will be included as part of that session.

QUESTION No. 45

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

How much has the Council projected to receive from the New Homes Bonus over this financial year and next?

Reply

Lewisham has received £705,698 in New Homes Bonus for the financial year 2010/2011 (based on 2009/10 delivery). This figure will be received annually over a 6 year period.

The 2011/2012 figure will not be calculated until October this year and will depend on the number of completions and demolitions that happen, and are recorded, between last October and this October.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

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

Question

In regards to the Mayors NEET programme, what numbers of young people from Lewisham will benefit from this targeted programme?

- (a) How do young people access the programme?
- (b) How many staff are on the Mayors programme?
- (c) What steps will Lewisham be taking to ensure that NEET's and those with SEN continue to receive impartial iag ?

Reply

The Mayor's NEET programme currently supports 75 young people per year. The NEET strategy intends to double the number of young people benefiting from the programme.

- (a) Young people access the programme in two ways:
 - (i) Young people are contacted directly as a result of information from the NEET list, which is regularly updated.
 - (ii) Young people are referred to the programme from partnership Agencies

The Mayor's NEET programme has a success rates of between 80% and 100% per programme in getting participants into education employment and training.

(b) There are two full time members of staff running the programme and three part-time staff. The part-time staff are young adults who have previously been through the programme themselves. Additional sessional youth workers are employed for the residential element of the programme.

(c) Two officers with a SEN specialism are employed within the NEET Reduction Strategy to ensure continued impartial IAG to young people with SEN.

QUESTION No. 47

Priority 4

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

Do 'pirate' radio stations deliver a public good?

Reply

The licensing and regulation of radio stations is a matter for OFCOM and not a council responsibility.

Supplementary Question No. 47

Councillor Feakes

I normally do not get this far down. I am a bit disappointed, to be frank, with the responses given to this and the written question on this issue. Although Lewisham as a Council does not necessarily have the responsibility relating to regulation, I think it does have a natural and, indeed, moral responsibility relating to aerials and antennae put up by pirate radio stations when they are on the blocks owned or controlled by the Council. This has happened recently in my ward and I wanted to get a feel for how seriously and how completely the Council is taking this issue and whether they will expedite removal of the aerial on top of 16-34 Knapdale Close.

Councillor Wise

Perhaps you should have put that as a question rather than asking do they deliver a public good, because you want an objective answer to a subjective question. I was only going to say my experience of pirate radio stations is

Radio Luxembourg and Radio Caroline, which were great vehicles for popular music. Therefore, if you want to put in another question in the future about what we should do about aeriels, etc, then I suggest you do.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Harris
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

To the Cabinet Member for Customer Services, in each of the following years, how much has the Council charged traders for our various administrative costs, against the number of stallholders:

- (i) 2000
- (ii) 2005
- (iii) 2010

And what is the predicted charge for the current financial year?

Reply

In answer to part 1 of the question

- Records for the 2000/2001 period no longer exist.

In answer to part 2 of the question

- Records for 2005/2006 have been archived and are not readily retrievable. The earliest retrievable records are those for 2007/2008 from which the average administrative cost per street trading licence issued is calculated as £72.72.

In answer to part 3 of the question

- For 2010/2011, the average administrative cost per street trading licence issued is calculated as £36.90

In answer to part 4 of the question [predicted cost for 11/12]

- For the current financial year [2011/2012], the predicted average administrative cost per street trading licence issued is £38.38.

Supplementary Question No. 48

Councillor Harris

I am delighted to see that the administrative charges for street trading licences are falling. Can we just confirm that we will do all we can to make sure that traders do not have over-burdensome licence costs?

Councillor Wise

We can only do what we can in that respect, Councillor Harris, but I will see what can be done.

QUESTION No. 49

Priority 5

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Brooks
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

On May 3rd 2011, the cost of a resident's parking permit doubled. The cash hall was closed on May 2nd for a scheduled bank holiday, and also on April 29th for the additional public holiday to celebrate the wedding of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge. Why was the planned closure of the cash hall on April 29th not communicated to residents in Lewisham Life magazine?

Reply

The cash hall has never been open on a bank holiday. Planned closures are advertised locally in the cash hall at least a month in advance rather than relying on Lewisham Life where the timing of editions may not be appropriate.

It should be noted that the cash hall will close permanently on the 8 July 2011 as part of the Council's budget savings. Customers will still be able to pay by cash at the 200 PayPoints and 20 Post Offices in the borough. A communications plan is in place to warn customers about the change.

QUESTION No. 50

Priority 5

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What input did the cabinet member give into the proposal included in Transport for London's Sub-Regional Transport Plan to extend the DLR from Lewisham to Catford and on to Forest Hill?

Reply

TfL have developed 5 Sub –Regional Transport plans, which includes proposals to address the transport needs of London for the next 20 years, in the light of the expected population growth and economic development forecasts in the London Plan. The plans were published shortly before Christmas 2010.

The East Region Sub-Regional Transport Plan included a number specific challenges identified by TfL in the Sub Region which are:

- Maximising the benefit of committed investment
- Improving connectivity to, from and within key locations
- Reducing physical barriers to travel
- Supporting the efficient movement of freight
- Addressing public transport , crowding, congestion and reliability.

The Transport Plan recognises that more transport investment will be needed in future years, to offer potential solutions to the challenges faced, by the Sub Region.

This scheme was one of a number of further enhancements of the Dockland Light Railway (DLR), considered by TfL which could contribute to improve connectivity and congestion relief. The Plan, while pointing out that extending the DLR south of Lewisham has various benefits, more work will be required on the tricky alignment needed to bring DLR out of Lewisham towards Catford. Clearly this will need to be the subject of future study by TfL and consideration by the Council.

Current funding constraints means the priority will need to be given to maintaining the existing DLR network and providing essential upgrades where necessary . Any new extensions are unlikely to obtain funding until after the current TfL business Plan period ends in 2017/18, and this is likely to be a longer term transport aspiration.

While these are very much longer term options, TfL have set up a regular officer sub Regional Panel, and engagement with elected members takes place through the Thames Gateway London Partnership, via the Transport and Connectivity standing Committee, where members are invited to attend from all part of the sub-region.

QUESTION No. 51

Priority 6

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Brooks
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

Please give a break down of the stall ownership, Sq ft, and rent of all residents in Catford Mews.

Reply

Units in Catford Mews are let on a licence basis and unit holders pay licence fees. The table below gives an anonymised breakdown of the units, their weekly or monthly licence fee, notice period and the current status of the unit.

A breakdown of the square footage of individual units is not kept, as these are internal subdivisions within the overall retail space of Catford Mews and may be subject to change. The gross internal area is 23,532sq ft.

UNIT	LICENCE FEE	NOTICE PERIOD	CURRENT STATUS
A	£345.50 per week	One week	
B	£64.88 per week	One week	VACANT
C	£37.85 per week	One week	
D	£281.19 per week	One week	Arrears
E	£118.96 per week	One week	VACANT
F	£462.00 per month	One month	
G	£100 per week	One week	VACANT
H	£102.75 per week	One week	
I	£519.08 per month	One month	
J	£519.16 per month	One month	
K	£129.79 per week	One week	VACANT

L	£129.79 per week	One week	
M	£64.99 per week	One week	Arrears
N	£75.70 per week	One week	VACANT
O	£89.25 per week	One week	Arrears
P	£380 per month	One week	VACANT
Q	£91.93 per week	One week	
R			VACANT
S	£162.21 per week	One week	
T	£519.00 per month	One month	
U	£519.08 per month	One month	Arrears
V	£162.23 per week	One week	
W	£216.28 per month	One month	Arrears
X	£216.33 per month	One month	VACANT
Y	£54.07 per week	One week	Arrears
Z	£59.48 per week	One week	
AA	£220 per month	On month	Arrears
BB	£194.67 per week	One week	VACANT
CC	£76.77 per week	One week	
DD	£307.08 per month	One month	
EE	£153.57 per week	One week	Arrears
FF			VACANT
GG	£167.64 per week	One week	Arrears
HH	£529.91 per month	One month	
II	£367.72 per month	One month	
JJ	£932 per month	One month	
KK	£250 per week	One week	VACANT

QUESTION No. 52

Priority 7

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Brooks
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

After the fire at Marine tower in Deptford:

- (a) How many families indicated they required counselling?
- (b) How many families were given counselling?
- (c) Have all the families in temporary accommodation now been rehoused?

Reply

- a) Lewisham Homes report that no families indicated that they needed counselling. The bereaved family were offered counselling via the Police and were also supported by the Sri Lankan community. Lewisham Homes spent time with the family assisting with their needs following the incident. They also spent time assisting the families most affected by the fire offering re-housing and other support.
- b) No families specifically requested counselling and none were referred for counselling.
- c) Twenty families were housed temporarily on the night of the fire, all were promptly rehoused. One tenant relinquished her tenancy to move into private rented accommodation.

QUESTION No. 53

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

How have recent changes to the remuneration of Council managers changed the ratio of the lowest to highest paid in the council, and if the council will bring forward plans to set a target to further improve the ratio over the next 3 years?

Reply

There has been no change to the ratio.

The Mayor, as part of his budget considerations, proposed that an independent panel be established to examine, among other things, senior pay and the ratio of remuneration levels between the lowest and highest paid staff.

QUESTION No. 54

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

What plans does the Council have to roll out cycle awareness training to its HGV drivers and the nature and content of that training?

Reply

Cycle awareness training forms part of a mandatory Certificate of Professional Competence qualification. Our drivers are each required to attend at least 35 hours training during each five year period in order to maintain their Certificate of Professional Competence.

In addition to this, Lewisham has installed audible 'Turning Left' indicators, safety barriers between the front and rear wheels and warning signs to cyclists at the rear of our trucks, advising cyclists not to overtake trucks on the inside.

QUESTION No. 55

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

What changes in air quality have been noted on New Cross Road since the Kender Triangle 'Streets for People' work began and if I could have the raw data?

Reply

The work on Kender Triangle 'Streets for People' is an ongoing project and improvements to the area are still taking place. However, the changes to the road layouts along Queens Road and New Cross Road were implemented in October 2010.

LBL has an automatic monitoring station in place on New Cross Road (opposite New Cross Gate station) as well as diffusion tubes to measure monthly averages of nitrogen dioxide concentrations at a number of locations around the borough. The closest diffusion tube to the Kender Triangle is located at the junction of Hatcham Park Road and New Cross Road while we also have triplicate tubes at the New Cross monitoring station so that we can compare results from the two monitoring methods.

As air quality tends to show seasonal trends, it is better to compare a month's data from one year to the same month in the next rather than comparing month by month. Also, it is better to analyse general trends over time as air quality is affected by many variables. For example, the meteorological conditions experienced in south-east England in April and May resulted in unusually high levels of particulates for this time of year. Therefore, it is still rather early to be looking at the effects on air quality as a result of this project.

Also, there have been other initiatives in the local area such as the improvements to Fordham and Macmillan Parks and the additional pedestrian signage which is aimed will encourage more journeys to be made on foot instead of by motor vehicles.

However, I now provide the raw air quality monitoring data for the two sites mentioned. The diffusion tube data is shown in the tables below:

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Hatcham Park Rd 2010	61.1	57.1	--	99.6	46.4	40.3	53.5	52.5	48.2	43.4	46.0	52.8
Hatcham Park Rd 2011	49.1	52.1	39.7	38.0								
New X Rd (1) 2010	72.2	--	58.5	67.4	67.3	61.0	62.7	90.5	93.8	51.8	90.2	83.7
New X Rd (1) 2011	71.1	65.61	73.14	85.2								
New X Rd (2) 2010	74.4	--	59.5	69.2	63.9	62.4	62.0	84.7	88.4	72.7	86.6	72.1
New X Rd (2) 2011	87.4	86.0	85.0	102.9								
New X Rd (3) 2010	69.9	--	57.1	64.2	58.1	64.2	59.6	101.3	93.4	74.4	89.0	85.2
New X Rd (3) 2011	86.5	81.8	105.3	83.7								

The automatic monitoring data is available from the following website:
www.londonair.org.uk

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What data is available on the road traffic accidents that have occurred on Queen's Road and New Cross Road since the Kender Triangle 'Streets for People' work began and if he would provide previous data for comparison?

Reply

Since the introduction of the scheme at the beginning of November 2010, stats are only available up to and including 28th February 2011 i.e. 4 months of data:

- Queens Road: 0 personal injury accidents recorded
- New Cross Road: 3 personal injury accidents recorded all classified by the police as "slight".

In the 3-years up to and including October 2010, i.e. 36 months of data:

- Queens Road: 7 personal injury accidents recorded. One classified as "serious", 6 classified as "slight".
- New Cross Road: 24 personal injury accidents recorded. One fatal, 4 classified as serious", 19 classified as "slight".

QUESTION No. 57

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

What plans are there to improve and increase hanging baskets, flower troughs and trees around the New Cross Road and Queens Road area and if she will involve local community garden groups in any projects?

Reply

Following the recent large scale budget reduction exercise, funding for hanging baskets and street planters is no longer available.

This is regrettable as I know that they make a real difference to the look of the borough during the summer months and are enjoyed by both residents and visitors alike.

However residents will still be able to enjoy hanging baskets and planters in many areas of the borough as a number of projects have been paid for by individual ward assemblies or have been provided directly by local community groups and businesses.

As regards new tree planting, a total of 78 new trees have been planted in New Cross ward since 2009. Unfortunately both New Cross Road and Queens Road are managed by TfL so we are unable to plant any street trees along these roads.

If any local community groups are interested in providing floral displays they can obtain advice and guidance from officers in the Council's Green Scene Service Group.

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What options have been considered for alleviating parking problems in Pepys Road?

Reply

The only option available to alleviate intrusive parking is the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

It is the Council's policy only to implement parking controls where there is a clear majority from residents in support of this action. The Council undertook a borough wide consultation to identify areas where parking problems existed. The responses to this consultation formed the borough's CPZ programme.

From the responses received from Pepys Road residents, 58% did not want parking controls introduced. As a result of this consultation, Pepys Road was not included in the borough's CPZ programme.

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

What definition of (1) Mutual (2) Co-operative (3) Social enterprise, the Council's officers are working to.

Reply

These are broadly the definitions that the Council and others are working to. Some of these terms have legal status and their definition is more exact than others which define purpose rather than legal form.

MUTUAL

In a public sector context, mutuals are businesses that are owned by their members. They can operate as employee owned, co-operative or wider social enterprises. They can include or participate in a variety of commercial arrangements, including joint ventures with government or other parties.

CO-OPERATIVE

Co-operatives are businesses that are fully or majority owned by their members – who may be employees, consumers, others in the community or a mix of these. Co-operatives work on one member, one vote – rather than one share, one vote – and sign up to an agreed set of values and principles.

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

A social enterprise is any business or service with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners.

QUESTION No. 60

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

For how many weeks has 32a New Cross road has been unoccupied in the last 2 years and what efforts are being made to get tenants in?

Reply

This property has been empty for 78 weeks over the last 2 years.
62 of those weeks were due to squatting

It is currently still squatted and Lewisham Homes are taking legal action to regain possession.

This is under internal investigation by Lewisham Homes.

QUESTION No. 61

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

What examples from other councils of community run libraries has she had assessed?

Reply

Lewisham's model is different in that it sought to transfer the responsibility of library buildings (not library services) to third parties, while the Council retains the responsibility for the library service provision. Indeed, Lewisham is unique in having developed this model.

Other approaches include:

- Authorities paying community groups, charities or social enterprises, to deliver statutory services at sites of their own choosing – e.g. Hereford's Peterchurch Library and Shropshire's Cleobury Country Centre at Cleobury Mortimer.
- Communities establishing their own services where the authority is withdrawing funding – e.g. Buckinghamshire's Little Chalfont, Chalfont St Giles and West Wycombe, in Northumberland's community libraries, and in Cambridgeshire's Local Access Points.
- Authorities encouraging and working with communities to continue to deliver services where the authority is withdrawing funding – e.g. North Yorkshire's Grassington, Bainbridge and George & Dragon libraries.

We looked at all these models but concluded that we would prefer to build on our own outreach library model which has already been established on Pepys Estate, Honor Oak Estate and in Bellingham. The major reason for this was for us to be able to retain the outreach services as part of the authority's library service, ensuring that we could continue to offer professional library support and a planned exchange and circulation of stock.

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

What consideration has been given to increasing the allocation of memory to Councillor's e-mail mailboxes?

Reply

The default limit for Members is set at 100Mb, routinely raised to 300Mb and, last year, Officers considered that it may be helpful, where a request is received, to raise the limit yet further to 500Mb. As a consequence many Members now enjoy a 500Mb limit.

Ten long-serving Members, who began using the email system before limits were introduced, have mailboxes in excess of 500Mb. Officers are examining ways of assisting these Members to reduce storage through 'offline' archiving. The limits are designed to conserve space so that Officers will not need to purchase additional costly storage capacity.

Very large individual email boxes can also become unstable and, at a certain point, will fail to function altogether. There is then a risk of data loss for the user

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People**

Question

What activities will be available for 5-8 year olds this summer on the Honor Oak Estate?

Reply

There will be an exciting range of activities for 5-8 year olds this summer on the Honor Oak Estate.

Firstly, The Honor Oak Adventure Playground (AP) provides play activities for children and young people from the age of 5 upwards.

Honor Oak AP is a well established facility which has been delivering play and educational activities for over 25 years, and its continuity has ensured it is a major hub for the local community. It provides access to large Adventure Play structures – swings, climbing frames, connecting platforms, walkways and bridges. The indoor building caters for activities such as table tennis, pool, cookery, arts and crafts and small group work; it also has a well resourced and utilised carpentry workshop where young people can learn new and varied practical skills. The primary focus of this year round facility is to provide active play and informal education in a caring but challenging environment. Honor Oak AP has a long history of working in partnership with voluntary, statutory and community based organisations, both local and inter-borough.

In addition, there are also unsupervised sporting facilities, including Football, Volleyball, Cricket, Rounders and Mini-tennis nearby.

QUESTION No. 64

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Whittle
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

What sanctions can the council take against landlords who will not work with the council to deal with the anti-social behaviour of their tenants?

Reply

In general terms there are no real sanctions the Council can use against Private Sector Landlords who are not dealing effectively with tenants who are causing anti social behaviour. In cases of anti social behaviour caused by noise nuisance the Environmental Enforcement team can take varying forms of action depending on the severity of the nuisance. However, in these instances action is usually taken against the Tenant rather than the Landlord.

Where the Council has placed tenants in the private rented sector through schemes such as the private sector leasing scheme the Council has greater influencing powers and can ultimately terminate the lease if the Landlord is not co-operating.

QUESTION No. 65

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

What discussions has Lewisham Council recently had with Transport for London (TfL) to discuss the future of the empty properties on Brownhill Road, which were are currently owned by Transport for London and first purchased by the Department of Transport in 1987? Can you provide some indication as to when a decision will finally be made as to the future of these properties and ensure that the scandalous situation of these properties remaining empty for so long is finally resolved?

Reply

No recent discussions have taken place with TfL on the future of the empty properties on Brownhill Road. Officers will contact TfL regarding the future of these properties.

QUESTION No. 66

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

The Mayor of London recently stated that improving the Courthill Road junction would not now take place until late 2012, so there appears to have been a delay of 6 months or even more from his original statement. What representations have been made by Lewisham Council to ensure this scheme is not delayed?

Reply

TfL have been in liaison with Council Officers on the development of the current proposals, the last meeting was in May. Lewisham Council needs to decide, in the near future, whether to support these proposals. Thereafter, TfL will progress with the necessary internal approvals and a full public consultation should be later this year.

TfL are currently finalising the modelling proposals and these should pass their internal processes for approval by November 2011.

As the proposals are on the TfL's junction, the programme for the implementation is within their control.

QUESTION No. 67

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Deputy Mayor**

Question

The Catford Dog Stadium closed in 2003, it has now become an eyesore. What actions have you taken since last May when you became Deputy Mayor responsible for regeneration to find a scheme that will provide the much need new housing and revitalisation on this site?

Reply

The Catford Stadium site is owned by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and has full planning consent, granted by the Council in January 2009, for a residential development with 589 new homes, commercial space, and a new community centre. The consented scheme comprises 13 apartment blocks, rising to a maximum of 8 storeys in height, and offers 248 parking spaces and 649 cycle spaces.

The HCA are currently procuring a new development partner for the scheme through their Delivery Partner Panel (DPP), after the previous development arrangements with Countryside Properties and Hyde Housing Association became stalled as a result of the economic downturn. The HCA advise that the current timetable for appointment of a partner is Summer 2011.

As a key stakeholder for the development and bearing in mind the Council's wider plans for the regeneration of Catford town centre, we are working closely with the HCA to assist in the procurement process and ensure that the Council's aims and objectives continue to be reflected in the new development management arrangements for the site. We will seek to continue this positive working relationship with the HCA once a partner is appointed, as well as working with the appointed partner directly.

QUESTION No. 68

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Maines
of the Cabinet Member for Community Services**

Question

What is the total number of adults placed in residential homes by Lewisham Council? Is there a right of inspection by elected members to residential homes in Lewisham or that Lewisham purchase places in?

In view of the recent controversy about the conditions and treatment of some residents in care homes, would it help build confidence in homes if a strengthened inspection regime were to exist?

Reply

The total number of adults placed in care homes by Lewisham in borough as at 20 June 2011 is as follows:

Nursing

ELDERLY ADULTS	CLIENT NUMBER
PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	159
PLACEMENTS OUT OF BOROUGH	120
YOUNGER ADULTS	
PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	3
PLACEMENTS OUT OF BOROUGH	27
MENTAL HEALTH	

PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	0
PLACEMENTS OUT OF BOROUGH	10

Residential

ELDERLY ADULTS	CLIENT NUMBER
PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	204
PLACEMENTS OUT OF OROUGH	93

YOUNGER ADULTS

PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	4
PLACEMENTS OUT OF BOROUGH	35

MENTAL HEALTH

PLACEMENTS IN THE BOROUGH	49
PLACEMENTS OUT OF BOROUGH	30

Learning Disability

In Borough Registered Residential Care Homes (directly commissioned): **23**

In Borough Supported Living Services (directly commissioned): **160**

Out of Borough Registered Care Homes: **164**

Is there a right of inspection by elected members to residential homes in Lewisham or that Lewisham purchase places in?

Those care homes with whom the council has a contract in place are receptive to working with partners to ensure that they deliver high quality care for Lewisham residents. Currently elected members are able to visit care homes by invitation. However, I am talking to officers to consider how the role of elected members in relation to care homes in Lewisham could be enhanced.

In view of the recent controversy about the conditions and treatment of some residents in care homes, would it help build confidence in homes if a strengthened inspection regime were to exist?

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is responsible for the overall regulation of care homes. The Commission's inspectors are responsible for carrying out both unannounced and announced visits to registered establishments, including care homes. CQC is reviewing its inspection regime and the Council is working closely with CQC to ensure that this dovetails with the Council's contract monitoring activities in and out of borough. I have already asked the Executive Director for Community Services to write to CQC to clarify its plans for strengthening the inspection regime.

In Lewisham, placements in care homes are only made to those homes with whom the Council has entered into contracting arrangements. The Council has a number of block contracts for some nursing beds and the remainder are purchased through spot arrangements.

Within the contract, Clause 17: Information Sharing Protocol, Monitoring and Performance Review states that:

The Contractor shall:

- *permit any person authorised by the Council on production of an official means of identification to enter at any reasonable time, on reasonable prior notice, to inspect the Care Home;*

In addition, the Council has a team of Contract Monitoring Officers who monitor care homes. The aim of the monitoring is to ensure that the services delivered by the Care Home Providers are being carried out in line with the Contract and Specification, are providing the highest quality and adhere to the principles of value for money. Evidence is also gathered from other sources including social work reviews, host boroughs where residents are placed in out of borough homes, the Providers' Forum, Lewisham's Local Involvement Network, relatives and carers services.

A positive addition to above has been the introduction of a Lay Visitors Scheme for Care Homes in the borough. This group of trained volunteers work independently alongside the Contract Monitoring Officers to review the quality of care being experienced by residents in residential and nursing homes in the borough. Officers will continue to work with the Lay Visitors and other stakeholders to ensure the delivery of high quality services.

In my role as Cabinet Member for Community Services I have also met with officers to discuss the implementation of the new Pan London Safeguarding Adult Procedures. These new procedures introduce a more robust approach to the safeguarding of adults across London.

I believe that, in addition to ensuring robust monitoring and inspection regimes are in place, there is a need to build a culture in which all professionals, service users and members of the community recognise their joint roles and responsibilities in securing the safety and well being of all vulnerable residents.

QUESTION No. 69

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Customer Services**

Question

Please give the number of illegal antenna identified in the borough in each of the past four years and give the number which have been successfully removed in each year?

Reply

The licensing and regulation of radio stations is a matter for OFCOM and not a council responsibility.

QUESTION No. 70

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Please state the areas of competence within which the council can pass a by-law (or similar) and briefly describe the necessary procedure. Please list the by-laws currently in effect in the borough.

Reply

There are a number of powers that Local Authorities may use to make byelaws that cover a wide range of areas. For example, byelaws relating to open spaces may be made pursuant to the powers contained with the Public Health Act 1875 and Open Spaces Act 1906 and those relating to the general good rule and government pursuant to the powers contained within the Local Government Act 1972.

Currently the procedure to be followed in making byelaws is set out in S236 of the Local Government Act 1972 regardless of what powers are used to make them. They are required to be made under seal of the Council and notice of the Council's intention to apply for their confirmation has to be advertised in one or more local newspapers, however, they cannot have effect until confirmed by the confirming authority. This is usually the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, although, for example, in respect of byelaws relating to common land eg Blackheath, this is the Secretary of State for the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

In addition those government departments responsible for confirming byelaws have guidelines, including model byelaws, that local authorities are expected to follow and further details can be found on their respective websites.

However the procedure for making byelaws is expected to change shortly. S129 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, which was brought into effect in 2010, now enables regulations to be made that would enable local authorities to make byelaws without the need to obtain confirmation from the relevant Secretary of State. DCLG have confirmed that an announcement in respect of this provision is imminent.

Currently the Council has two sets of byelaws in effect in the Borough. The 1980 Pleasure Ground Byelaws and the byelaws relating to Blackheath made by the Greater London Council dating back to 1932. Both sets are currently under review.

QUESTION No. 71

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Resources**

Question

Last year the council produced an A6 calling card headed 'Sorry I missed you' inviting the public to let the Mayor know "what's good about living around here and how you think your local area could be improved." Please state how many of the cards were produced; how many were distributed and by whom; what were the costs of production and distribution; when they were distributed; and how many were returned. When will the data from this exercise be available to members?

Reply

10,000 cards were produced in July 2009 at a cost of £1097. The intention behind the cards was that they would be made available at public events and meetings where the Mayor was engaging with local citizens (particularly for people who wouldn't get the opportunity to speak directly to the Mayor at the event). As such, there have been no distribution costs incurred. The Council remains keen to explore as many avenues as possible to give our residents the opportunity to engage with the Council, comment on our services or have their say about local issues.

The cards were made available on an ongoing basis from July 2009 at appropriate events or external meetings. As the card offers the Mayor's public email address, it is not possible to gauge or evaluate total levels of correspondence received to date resulting directly from the card (as citizens may have decided to email in, rather than return the card).

Finally, the format and subject matter associated with the card ensured that they were not limited to a specific period of time so they will be used over the

remainder of this administration. In line with the progression of the Council's approach to engaging with residents (reducing the number of issues of Lewisham Life being a case point), renewed consideration is being given to how best these cards can be used moving forward. One option for extending the scope of the cards could be that they are made available to other Councillors for use at future events, surgeries or at local assemblies.

QUESTION No. 72

Written Reply

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

COUNCIL MEETING

29 JUNE 2011

**Question by Councillor Feakes
of the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People**

Question

Please state the number of each type of governor place in each of the borough's schools and give the current number of vacancies for each type.

Reply

In the table below we have given details of the different types of governors and indicated in brackets how many there are of each type.

The types of governors in our schools with the total complement in brackets are:

STAFF: Staff Governors (281)

LA: Local Authority Governors (208)

PARENTS: Parent Governors (383)

COMM: Community Governors (219)

FOUND: Foundation Governors (220)

In total, across the borough, there are :-

- 5 staff governor vacancies (2% of the total number of staff governors)
- 9 LA governor vacancies (4% of total number of LA governors)
- 36 parent governor vacancies (9% of total number of parent governors)
- 19 community governor vacancies (9% of total number of community governors)
- 13 foundation governor vacancies (6% of total number of foundation governors)

VACANCIES (total)	5	9	36	19	13
	STAFF	LA	PARENTS	COMM	FOUND
ABBNEY MANOR	(3) 1	(2)	(1)	(7)	---
ADAMSRILL	(4)	(3)	(6) 1	(4)	---
ADDEY & STANHOPE	(3)	(2) 1	(4)	---	(11)
ALL SAINTS CE	(3)	(1)	(3)	---	(9)
ASHMEAD	(3)	(3)	(4)	(3)	---
ATHELNEY	(4)	(2)	(4) 1	(2)	---
BARING	(4)	(3)	(5)	(3)	---
BONUS PASTOR CATHOLIC COLLEGE	(3)	(2) 1	(4) 1	--	(11) 1
BRENT KNOLL	(3) 1	(3)	(5)	(3)	---
BRINDISHE FEDERATION	(5)	(3)	(6)	(3) 2	---
BROCKLEY IEB (N/A)					---
CHELWOOD NURSERY	(3)	(2)	(2) 2	(3)	--
CHILDERIC	(3)	(2)	(4) 2	(3) 1	---
CHRIST CHURCH CE	(3) 1	(1)	(3)	---	(9) 1
CLYDE NURSERY	(3)	(2)	(4) 1	(3)	---
*CONISBOROUGH	(4)	(4) 1	(6) 6	(4) 1	---
COOPERS LANE	(5)	(3)	(6) 1	(3)	---
CROSSWAYS SIXTH FORM	(2)	(3)	(5) 1	(5) 1	---
DALMAIN	(4)	(3)	(5)	(4)	---
DEPTFORD GREEN	(5)	(3)	(5)	(3)	---
DEPTFORD PARK	(3)	(3)	(5) 1	(3) 2	---
DOWNDERRY	(3)	(3)	(6)	(3) 1	---
EDMUND WALLER	(4)	(4)	(6)	(4)	---
ELFRIDA	(4)	(3)	(5)	(4) 1	---
ELIOT BANK	(4)	(3)	(5)	(3)	---
FAIRLAWN	(4)	(3)	(6)	(4)	---
FOREST HILL	(4)	(4)	(6)	(4)	---
FORSTER PARK	(4)	(3)	(6) 1	(4) 2	---
GOOD SHEPHERD CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(1)	---	(7) 2
GORDONBROCK	(4)	(3)	(5)	(4) 1	---
GREENVALE	(3)	(3)	(5) 4	(3)	---
GRINLING GIBBONS	(3)	(2)	(4)	(3)	---
HASELTINE	(3)	(3)	(5) 2	(3)	---
HOLBEACH	(3)	(2) 1	(5)	(4)	---
HOLY CROSS CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(3)	---	(9) 1
HOLY TRINITY CE	(3)	(2)	(2)	---	(9)
HORNIMAN	(3)	(2) 1	(5)	(3) 1	---
JOHN BALL	(4)	(3)	(6)	(4)	---
JOHN STAINER	(3)	(3)	(4)	(3)	---
KELVIN GROVE	(4)	(3)	(5)	(3)	---

	STAFF	LA	PARENTS	COMM	FOUND
KENDER	(3)	(3)	(4) 1	(3)	---
KILMORIE	(3)	(2)	(4) 1	(3) 1	---
LAUNCELOT	(4)	(3)	(6)	(4)	---
LEATHERSELLERS FEDERATION	(3)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(6)
LEE MANOR	(4)	(3)	(5)	(4)	---
LEWISHAM BRIDGE	(4)	(3)	(5) 1	(3) 1	---
LUCAS VALE	(3)	(3)	(5) 1	(3)	---
MARVELS LANE	(4)	(3) 1	(6)	(4) 1	---
MEADOWGATE	(3)	(2)	(4) 1	(3)	---
MYATT GARDEN	(4)	(4) 1	(6) 1	(4)	---
NEW WOODLANDS	(3)	(2)	(4) 2	(3)	---
OUR LADY& ST PHILIP NERI CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(1)	---	(7)
PENDRAGON	(3)	(2)	(4) 1	(3)	---
PERRYMOUNT	(3)	(2)	(3)	(2)	---
RANGEFIELD	(3)	(3)	(4)	(3)	---
RATHFERN	(4)	(3)	(5) 1	(4)	---
RUSHEY GREEN	(4)	(4)	(6)	(4)	---
SANDHURST INFANTS	(4)	(3) 1	(5)	(3)	---
SANDHURST JUNIORS	(4)	(3)	(6)	(4)	
SEDGEHILL	(4)	(4)	(6) 1	(4) 1	---
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	(3)	(3)	(4)	(3)	---
ST AUGUSTINE'S CATHOLIC	(4)	(1)	(2)	--	(9)
ST BARTHOLOMEWS CE	(3) 1	(1) 1	(3) 1	---	(9)
ST JAMES HATCHAM CE	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(8)
ST JOHN BAPTIST CE	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(8) 1
ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(2) 1	---	(8) 1
St MARGARET'S, LEE C/E	(3)	(1)	(3)	---	(9) 1
ST MARY MAGDALEN CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(1)	---	(7) 1
ST MARY'S CE	(3)	(2)	(3)	---	(10) 1
ST MICHAEL'S CE	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(8) 1
ST SAVIOUR'S CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(3) 1	---	(9)
ST STEPHEN'S CE	(3)	(1)	(1)	---	(7)
ST WILLIAM OF YORK CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(9)
ST WINIFRED'S INF CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(8)
ST WINIFRED'S JUN CATHOLIC	(3)	(1)	(2)	---	(8) 1
STILLNESS INFANT	(4)	(4)	(6)	(4)	---
STILLNESS JUNIOR	(4)	(3)	(6) 1	(4) 1	---
SYDENHAM	(4)	(4)	(7)	(5)	---
TIDEMILL	(3)	(3)	(5)	(3) 1	---
TORRIDON INFANT	(3)	(3)	(5)	(3) 1	---
TORRIDON JUNIOR	(3)	(3)	(5) 1	(3)	---
TRINITY	(4)	(1)	(3) 2	---	(10) 1
TURNHAM	(2)	(1)	(3)	(1)	2

	STAFF	LA	PARENTS	COMM	FOUND
					partnership
WATERGATE	(3)	(3)	(5)	(3)	---
TOTAL	281	208	383	219	220