Nunhead and Peckham Rye
Community Council Agenda

Date: Monday April 6 2009
Time: 7.00 PM (start of meeting)
Venue: Rye Oak Primary School and Children’s Centre, Whorlton Road, London, SE15 3PD (PLEASE USE THE OLD JAMES STREET ENTRANCE - Map on page 7)

1 Introduction and welcome: Cllr Mark Glover (Chair) 7:00pm
2 Apologies
3 Items of business the Chair deems urgent
4 Disclosure of Members’ interests and dispensations
5 Minutes of last meeting held on February 25 2009
6 Matters Arising from previous meetings – Part 1:
   6a Cleaner Greener Safer Project decisions (2008-2009) 7:10pm
       Eleonora Oliva, Principal Project Manager
       • Multi-Use-Centre (MUC), One O’clock Club, Splash Park
   6b Cleaner Greener Safer Projects past and present 7:25pm
       Eleonora Oliva, Principal Project Manager
7 Deputations / Petitions 7:40pm
8 Community Slot: Peckham Pledge 7:45pm
   Angelo Piccigallo, COVO Connecting Voices
9 Programmes and Activities for 16-18-year-olds 8:00pm
   Trevor Swaby, Area Development Officer
10 Police Update and Q&A 8:05pm
   Officers from the local Safer Neighbourhood Teams will give an update on their area and answer questions
During the break, please visit the information stalls about the:

- Housing Strategy Consultation Feedback
- Proposals for introducing Car Club

---

11 Matters Arising from previous meetings – Part 2:

11a Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP) - update 8.20pm
Michael Carnuccio, Senior Planning & Regeneration Policy Officer

11b Update on the Ivylease Road traffic scheme 8.25pm
Todd Strehlow, Public Realm Projects Manager

11c Further Matters Arising from previous meetings 8.30pm

12 Wardens Update 8.40pm
Chris McCracken, Area Manager Community Wardens

13 Sustainable Communities Act 8.55pm
Claire Webb, Corporate Policy Advisor

14 Planning Enforcement Update 9.00pm
Glen Camenzuli, Team Leader Planning Enforcement

15 Public Questions 9.05pm

16 Members Decisions 9.10pm

16a Local Parking Amendments:
- Lugard Road

Close 9.20pm
For more information please see: www.southwark.gov.uk/YourCommunity or contact:

**Gerald Gohler**  
Community Councils Development Officer  
Tel: 020 7525 7420  
Email: gerald.gohler@southwark.gov.uk

**Nadine James**  
Community Council Involvement Co-ordinator  
Tel: 020 7525 5503  
Email: nadine.james@southwark.gov.uk

### Upcoming Community Council Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday May 6, 2009</td>
<td>St Thomas the Apostle Church Hall, 81 Evelina Road, SE15 (tbc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upcoming Planning Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday April 23 2009</td>
<td>Meeting Room D, Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday May 14 2009</td>
<td>Meeting Room D, Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council Membership
Councillor Mark Glover [Chair]
Councillor Althea Smith [Vice Chair]
Councillor Evrim Laws
Councillor Fiona Colley
Councillor Aubyn Graham
Councillor Susan Elan Jones
Councillor Gordon Nardell
Councillor Robert Smeath
Councillor Dominic Thorncroft

Carers’ Allowances
If you are a Southwark resident and have paid someone to look after your children, or an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities, so that you can attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the Council. Please collect a claim form from the clerk at the meeting.

Deputations
For information on deputations please ask the clerk for the relevant handout.

Exclusion of Press and Public
The following motion should be moved, seconded and approved if the Community Council wishes to exclude the press and public to deal with reports revealing exempt information.

“That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of information as defined in paragraphs 1-15, Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution.”

Transport Assistance for Disabled Members of the Public
Members of the public with a disability who wish to attend Community Council meetings and who require transport assistance in order to access the meeting, are requested to call the meeting clerk at the number below to give his/her contact and address details. The clerk will arrange for a driver to collect the person and provide return transport after the meeting. There will be no charge to the person collected. Please note that it is necessary to call the clerk as far in advance as possible, at least three working days before the meeting.

Wheelchair access
Rye Oak Primary School and Children’s Centre, Whorlton Road, London, SE15 3PD is wheelchair accessible.

For further information, please contact the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council Officer:

Gerald Gohler
Phone: 020 7525 7420
Email: gerald.gohler@southwark.gov.uk
Council Website: www.southwark.gov.uk
Language Needs
If you want information on the Community Councils translated into your language please telephone 020 7525 7187. To inform us of any special needs or requirements, such as transport or signer/interpreter, please telephone 020 7525 7187.

020 7525 7187

Bengali
Kendi dilinizde Toplum meclisleri hakkında bilgi almak için 020 7525 7187’nolu telefonu arayınız. Özel gereksinimlerinizi bize bildirmek için 020 7525 7187’nolu telefonu çeviriniz.

Turkish
Haddii aad doonayso warbixin ku saabsan qoraalka Kawnsalkada Bulshada oo ku turjumahan af Soomaali fadlan tilifoon u dir 020 7525 7187
Si aad noogu sheegto haddii aad leedahay baahi gaar ama wax gooni kuu ah sida gaadiid, af celiyaha dadka indha la’ fadlan tilifooni 020 7525 7187.

Somali
如果你需要有關社區委員會的訊息翻譯成中文，請致電提出要求，號碼：020 7525 7187

Mandarin
欲想通知我們你有的特別需求或需要，例如接送車輛或手語/傳譯員，請致電通知，號碼：020 7525 7187

Portuguese
Se você quiser informações nos conselhos comunitários traduzidas em sua língua por favor ligue para 020 7525 7187. Para-nos informar de quaisquer necessidades especiais ou requisitos, tipo transporte, linguagem dos sinais/intérprete, por favor ligue para 020 7525 7187.

French
Si vous désirez avoir l’information sur les Conseils de la Communauté (Community Councils) traduite en votre langue téléphonez SVP au 020 7525 7187. Pour nous informer de tout besoin ou condition spéciale, telles que le transport ou le signataire / interprète, téléphonez SVP au 020 7525 7187.

Spanish
Si precisa información sobre los departamentos sociales (Community Councils) traducida a su idioma, por favor llame al número de teléfono 020 7525 7187. Si tiene necesidades o requisitos específicos, como es transporte especial o un intérprete, por favor llame al número de teléfono 020 7525 7187.
Lati bēre fun itumọ irohin nipā Council agbegbe re (Community Council) ni ede abini rè, jọwọ pe telifoone 020 7525 7187. Lati jẹ ki a mọ nipā iranlọwọ tabi idi pato, gegebì okọ (mọto) tabi olutumọ, jọwọ pe telifoone 020 7525 7187.

Yoruba
### Minutes to be agreed at the next meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th>Wednesday February 25 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene Primary School, 48 Brayards Road, London, SE15 3RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start time</strong></td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finish time</strong></td>
<td>9.35 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In attendance</strong></td>
<td>Councillors: Glover (Chair), Smith (Vice-Chair), Colley, Jones, Graham, Smeath, Thorncroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
<td>Cllrs Laws and Nardell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apologies received</strong></td>
<td>Cllrs Laws and Nardell for absence; Cllrs Smith and Smeath for lateness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late / Urgent items</strong></td>
<td>Spending decisions on the Community Fund Budget (see item 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members’ interests and dispensations</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Announcements</strong></td>
<td>The Chair announced that he had been informed that St Mary Magdalene CE Primary School had received an ‘outstanding’ rating in their most recent Ofsted report. He congratulated the school on their achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Publicly questions raised**

**ITEM 3 EXECUTIVE DECISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of business the Chair deems urgent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members <strong>AGREED</strong>: The following allocations from the Community Fund (2008/2009):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love Peckham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Peckham Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Pensioners Forum (Silver Festival)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary Magdalene Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(healthy living project for older people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Caribb FC (Diabetes project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION**: Nadine James / Donald Forde to action the above funding allocations.

**ITEM 5 Minutes of the previous meeting:**

Members **AGREED**: that the minutes of the meeting held on January 14 2009 are true and accurate recordings of that Community Council meeting.

**ITEM 6 Matters arising from the last meeting**

**ITEM 6a Cleaner Greener Safer Project decisions**

Members agreed to take this item under Members’ Decisions (item 15) to give members time to read and digest it.

**ITEM 6b Parking Charges in Peckham Town Centre**

Members and residents read the written response provided. The Chair said that the response given did not answer the original query made at the meeting in January. He went on to say that the parking charges were imposed from the centre, and called for the parking charges in Peckham Town centre to be removed.

The Chair proposed to draft and send a motion to the next meeting of the Council Assembly on April 8, calling for the car parking charges in Peckham to be removed for the next the financial year. He explained that one big store had already left Peckham Town Centre, and that members were working with the Town Centre Management group to attract another large store to replace the one that had closed. However, companies deciding whether they wanted to come to Peckham would look at the footfall. Parking charges decreased this footfall, and would therefore make it harder to attract a large retailer into Peckham. Furthermore, the existing charges would only displace parking onto the roads and lead to fewer people shopping in the area.
A resident welcomed the suggestion to remove all car parking charges, but said that it was the new weekend and evening charges which had caused the biggest problem and the most inconvenience to local residents. In response, the Chair proposed the motion should have two parts, one about weekend and evening parking charges, and one about all car parking charges, in case one of the parts was lost in the debate.

Cllr Thorncroft suggested the Community Council should ask the council’s Executive about their parking policy more generally. He remarked that the council’s contractors were behaving in a punitive way towards motorists. He asked what the council’s objectives were in terms parking: did it view parking as a revenue raising device, or was it using parking to serve the interests of Southwark residents. He said that there needed to be a wider discussion about the best way forward regarding parking charges.

Trevor Udennis (TU), Area Management Team Leader North, explained that charges for the three car parks in Peckham had been reviewed in 2007. He said that since that time charges had not increased and currently stood at 70p per hour. He continued by saying that compared with neighbouring boroughs charges in Peckham Town Centre were low. He went on to say that out-of-hours car parking charges had been suspended in the period before Christmas in order to boost the footfall in Peckham Town Centre. TU explained that the revenue from the car parking charges was built into existing budgets. If car parking charges were removed, these costs would have to be met another way, for example by an increase in council tax.

Q1 The Chair asked what how much revenue would be lost, if car parking charges were scrapped. He went on to say that the council had recently been given £6m for economic regeneration, so money could be taken from that budget to make up for the shortfall.

A1 TU responded that he did not know how much money was raised by the parking charges, but promised he would bring this information to the next meeting. TU further explained that the revenue from the car parking charges was used to pay for improvements to parking, replacing the previous voucher system, improvements to street furniture, the introduction of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and parking discounts for low emission vehicles. He went to say that these works cost £180,000, and that the parking charges went towards paying for these.

Cllr Thorncroft expressed his concerns about the fact that these funds had already been spent, and that the council was now trying to recover this expenditure from motorists. He said he was alarmed at the council’s anti-motorist bias, and called for a wider debate about a balanced approach to parking.
A resident supported what members had said and suggested the motion should include a question about how the council proposed to increase the footfall in Peckham Town Centre. This would boost the local economy, and thereby benefit local people.

Tim Guest, of the Peckham Town Centre Management group, said that effectively, charges had gone up because there were now evening and out-of-hours charges which had not existed before. This did amount to an increase and had caused problems for shops and commuters. Cars being displaced by the introduction of these charges had led to parking issues for people attending churches in the area. He expressed his desire for something to be done about this.

Cllr Colley expressed her disappointment with the car parking charges in the evening and on weekends. She enquired how much revenue these new charges had actually generated, and supported the idea of sending a motion to the Council Assembly.

Cllr Jones expressed her displeasure at the situation, and reminded the meeting that the Executive Member responsible for parking had attended a Community Council meeting the previous year, and had not been able to explain the reasons behind the council’s actions on parking. She went on to say that the charges had been imposed without any consultation and that they would lead to an increase in double parking. She criticised the council for getting its priorities wrong and said she suspected the council used some of the revenue for its £4m communication and public relations budget. She also said that the Community Council and Peckham area residents had been treated with contempt by the council.

TU explained that the revenue was mainly used for the maintenance of the car parks and other local traffic schemes and enforcement. He went to say that 70p an hour was value for money compared with neighbouring boroughs like Lambeth.

Cllr Graham reiterated that no consultation with the Community Council had taken place, and that people had not known changes were being introduced. This had caused a lot inconvenience to residents. He enquired whether TU had any usage figures, and whether the council was meeting its targets in terms of the usage of the three car parks. He continued by saying that Choumert Grove car park was very popular, but that local people were being priced out of coming to Peckham Town Centre by the charges. He called again for better consultation.

TU said he would bring figures about this to the next meeting.

**ACTION:** Housing and Environment Lead Officer to produce a report for the next meeting on how much revenue would be lost, if free out-of-hours and weekend parking was introduced in the car parks in the Peckham Town Centre (included in this report should be the usage figures for the Peckham Town Centre car parks).
The Chair asked TU or any colleagues presenting the updates at the next meeting to be better prepared.

He called for the responsibility for local car parking charges to be devolved to the Community Council. He said that local members and residents knew best what the parking related issues were, for example health and safety concern around on street parking. He called again for a removal of the current car parking charges in view of the current economic downturn.

Members **AGREED** to draft and take a motion to Full Council about car parking charges.

**ACTION:** Chair to draft a motion to be taken to Council Assembly on April 8 2009 urging the council to look at:

- the removal of car parking charges in Peckham Town Centre during weekday evenings and on weekends
- scrapping charges in the main car parks in Peckham completely, in light of the current economic downturn
- what measures the council is currently taking to stimulate the economy in Peckham, and to attract people into Peckham Town Centre

**ITEM 6c  Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN)**

Kevin Powell (KP), Street Care Enforcement Officer, introduced his presentation about Fixed Penalty Notices. He told the meeting that FPNs were issued for dumping domestic and commercial waste, dog fouling, obstructing traffic, littering and fly-posting.

He outlined that his team worked in partnership with wardens, housing and area management. KP went on to explain that if residents took their waste outside on days when this is not allowed, they breached the Environmental Protection Act 1990. He explained that his team also did educational work with residents in problem areas, so that they did not breach the law out of ignorance.

KP then outlined the review/appeals process that businesses or residents may want to pursue once against a Fixed Penalty Notice had been issued. When an appeal was received, the team leader would make a final decision based on the evidence (photographs, material samples from the site) collected by the environmental officer who had issued the FPN. The decision would then be communicated to the resident. If the appeal was upheld the FPN would be waived and this would be the end of the matter. If the appeal was not upheld, the resident would have seven days to pay. After this time, if no payment had been received, the resident would be invited to be interviewed under caution or prosecution proceedings could be started.

KP then outlined some of the enforcement tools his section uses. These included specialised CCTV vans, mobile cameras, cameras in the vests of council operatives and two-way radios. He went on to give details about enforcement actions to stop people dropping chewing gum, fast food
wrappers and cigarettes on the pavement.

He also drew attention to the fact every household in the borough was entitled to a number pre-booked, free bulky rubbish collections a year, so that there was no need to fly-tip.

The Chair invited questions from the floor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A resident enquired about whether council officers were authorised to film and take photographs as KP had outlined and how that this would tie in with data protection legislation.</td>
<td>KP responded that these activities were authorised under the appropriate legislation, and that the cameras would not be used for intrusive purposes. They were for gathering evidence only.</td>
<td>The resident then produced pictures of black rubbish bags piled up on a curve on the Brimmington Estate. He said that the council’s contractors, Veolia, piled these up around the estate and regularly forgot to pick them up. This amounted to fly-tipping, was unsightly and attracted rats. Cllr Colley asked the resident if the problem had got worse, which he confirmed. Cllr Colley invited the resident to speak to her during the break. The Chair said that this issue would be followed up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION:** Housing and Environment Lead Officer to report back on the problems with rubbish collections on the Brimmington Estate at the next meeting.

**ITEM 6d**  
**Further Matters Arising from previous meetings**

The Chair made the meeting aware of the written responses to the following issues raised at previous meetings:

**Dog Control Orders**
There were no questions from the floor on this item.

**Barriers on Consort Estate**
Trevor Udennis said that officers had looked around on the estate, but had not been able to identify the barriers the resident had talked about.

**ACTION:** Environment and Housing Lead Officer to identify the barriers in question with the aid of the resident who had originally raised the query at the previous Community Council meeting.

**Recycling Facilities at Sainsbury’s in Dog Kennel Hill**
The Chair informed the meeting that a letter had been sent to Sainsbury’s who had not responded.
**ACTION:** Chair to write to Sainsbury’s again in order to express the concerns of members and residents about the state of the recycling facilities.

**Hairdressing waste on Rye Lane and Blenheim Grove**
The Chair informed the meeting that he and several council officers had visited hairdressing establishments in Peckham Town Centre. He explained that one of the problems was that the managers of these establishments hired out the chairs to individual hairdressers, so all the workers needed to be spoken to individually. The Chair said that one week after the visit, he had noticed marked improvements, but that the waste had then reappeared. The Chair said that they would keep an eye on the situation.

**Evelina Road Walking Audit**
The Chair read out a written response from Chris Gibney about the Evelina Road Walking Audit:

> “Since the Community Council meeting the audit documents have been available online, however; there has been no additional feedback received from members or other attendees. We are, therefore, progressing the Evelina Road project as per the recommendations and priorities set out in the Walking Audit Report and will be bidding to achieve funding for these measures at the start of the financial year 09/10.”

**ITEM 7  Deputations / Petitions**
There were no deputations.

Mick Barnard apologised to the meeting for his conduct during the deputations slot at the last meeting.

**ITEM 8  Community Slot:**
**Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP)**

Michael Carnuccio (MC), Senior Planning & Regeneration Policy Officer, introduced this item and drew people’s attention to the report in the agenda pack. He went on to explain the reasons for putting together the PNAAP and what it would be used for.

He said the PNAAP would change the planning policies for Peckham and Nunhead, and would control things like:

- the look and function of the town centre, including the mix of shops and other activities
- what is built on different sites
- the size and design of new buildings
- the amount and type of new homes built and where they go
- the impact of new development on the environment and traffic
- the community facilities needed to support the community
MC also introduced the written answers for two items, which had been raised at the previous meeting, regarding public toilets and retail saturation policy.

The meeting then split into three ward specific workshops to discuss items for the PNAAP.

**ITEM 9 Police Update and Q&A**

The Chair introduced the written report by PS Warren from the Nunhead Safer Neighbourhoods Team, and explained that Police had not been able to attend on the night due to operational reasons.

**ACTION:** Gerald Gohler to re-invite Sgt Cox and to request a feedback report on his area for the next meeting, including an update on the BT phone boxes.

**ITEM 10 Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP) Feedback**

Michael Carnuccio (MC) and his team gave a quick overview of the suggestions people had made in the workshops. These related to:

- the mix of shops (variety, and protect variety)
- transport links and traffic flows
- pedestrianisation
- uses for vacant buildings and plots of land
- improvements to the public realm - enhancing and protecting public spaces
- more youth facilities (incl. an arts centre)
- new housing developments must have community infrastructure
- protecting conservation areas and character of the area generally
- more trees
- allotments
- allow sustainable development only (for example green roofs, aiming for code level 6). (For a full list please see TakeNote.)

The meeting heard that people’s suggestions would inform an ‘Issues and Options’ paper which would be consulted on from March 30 to May 25. This would include public events to which all were invited. After May 25 the team would put together a preferred options paper which took into account everybody’s views.

The Chair asked for MC and his colleagues to come to the next meeting and to present the ‘Issues and Options’ paper.

**ACTION:** Michael Carnuccio to give an update on the ‘Issues and Options’ paper, which will be published as part of the consultation, at the next Community Council.
The Chair also asked for the following points to be included in the list of suggestions: opening up the forecourt of Peckham Rye Station and making central Peckham a conservation area. The Chair explained that the latter proposal would stop planning applications which contained poor design or proposed using poor quality material. The Chair also asked for the ‘options paper’ to contain some ‘out-of the box’ thinking regarding green spaces and environmental measures.

MC said that the suggestion of a Central Peckham Conservation Area and green links would be picked up in the ‘options’ paper.

Cllr Colley asked for the ‘options paper’ not to contain rigid, ‘either, or’ lists of options. She explained that this had happened in a similar paper presented at the Rotherhithe Community Council which had not been well received by Rotherhithe residents.

MC responded he would take these comments on board.

**Item 11 Traffic Schemes: Rye Lane - Ivydale Road**

Todd Strelow (TS) introduced the presentation about the traffic schemes and first outlined the scheme in Rye Lane.

TS presented the report on the northern-most part of Rye Lane, from Hannover Park to Peckham High Street. He explained that this part of Rye Lane was in need of complete reconstruction, both in terms of the road surface and the pavements. TS highlighted the poor state of the road surface, the uncoordinated nature of the street furniture, problems with the cycle paths and the lack of trees. The proposed works would include: retaining the lighting columns, tidying up the street furniture and planting up to eight trees. Cycle paths and the general road lay-out would also be improved. TS explained that consultation with local and borough-wide stakeholders would continue, and that the building work would commence by summer 2009.

The Chair added that the works on trees in Rye Lane would be financed through the Community Council’s Cleaner Greener Safer fund, and urged TS to proceed quickly with the scheme, as this had been in planning for a long time.

Erica Blennerhassett (EB) introduced the proposed schemes at the junctions of Rye Lane with Heaton Road, and with Nigel Road, which she said had been the scene of a number of accidents over the last few years. The schemes would address safety the concerns by cyclists and pedestrians by optimising the signal times, among other things. The schemes also included widening the pavements and providing more green spaces. EB informed the meeting that the consultation and stakeholder walk-abouts would be held in the spring, and invited all those interested to attend. She continued by saying that these schemes would be delivered by autumn 2009.

The Chair said that he was pleased this work was going ahead, as he had first campaigned for these crossings six years ago.
TS then introduced the report about the proposed changes to the Nunhead 20mph zone which included changes to the area around Nunhead cemetery including Ivydale Road. He highlighted some of the issues in the 20 mph zone: continued speeding in Ivydale Road and Linden Grove, buses damaging parked cars and issues around the junctions. The speed camera on Linden Grove only flashed, if cars drove by at more than 30 mph, although it was located in the 20mph zone. TS then explained the proposed traffic pinch-points and narrowing of the road in front of the entrance to Nunhead cemetery. He told the meeting that the consultation process on these proposals had generated a response rate of 15% which was higher than normal. The results of the consultation were still in the process of being analysed. However responses were broadly in support for all the measures proposed, with the exception of the pinch-point proposals to which there had been a sizeable minority of objections. In light of these objections, the pinch-point proposals would be reviewed, and the objections received which would be taken on board.

The Chair welcomed all the schemes, and said he was glad they were happening.

At this point a resident from Limesford Road presented the Chair with a petition signed by 25 residents. She explained that she represented the residents in her street. The undersigned were very concerned about the eight proposed pinch-points in Ivydale Road, which were likely to prompt drivers to drive down Inverton Road and Limesford Road to avoid delays and tailbacks. There would be similar problems for residents in Athenlay Road. She went on to say that this was not solely an issue for residents, but also for pedestrians using the southerly entrance of Nunhead cemetery. These included families with children, older people and people with impaired mobility. She expressed her concerns about the increase in traffic and called on the council to produce new proposals which took into account the impact on residents in the side roads.

The Chair thanked the resident for her petition and asked for questions from the floor.

A resident commented that the proposals presented by TS seemed sensible, and that drivers were unlikely to use Athenlay Road as an alternative route to avoid tailbacks. He said the measures were overdue because traffic calming was needed, as there were schools and nurseries in the area, and single and double-decker buses ran along the local roads.

Q5 A resident asked for clarification about the speed camera in Linden Grove being set to a 30mph limit in a 20mph zone, and asked whether FPNs would be issued to people parking in the street illegally, and to those who used it as a short cut from Rye Lane.

Q6 A resident enquired about tactile markings and raised tables at pedestrian crossings.
| Q7   | Another resident asked what type of the pedestrian crossings there would be on Rye Lane near Nigel Road, and asked for the junction of East Dulwich Road and Peckham Rye to be equipped with cameras to stop driver making illegal turns. |
| Q8   | Tim Guest said that the Peckham Town Centre Management Group applauded the proposals for the crossing on Rye Lane. He reminded the meeting that Tesco had recently opened a retail outlet in Cooperative House. This would increase the footfall in the area and would need to be taken into account. |
| Q9   | Cllr Colley welcomed the Ivydale Road scheme, especially in view of the problems with speeding cars on Linden Road which residents had complained to her about in the past. She asked whether TS could clarify what the objections to the pinch-points were, and whether they related to a particular part of the area. She supported the objections made by residents in Limesford Road and asked whether pinch-points could be put in on Inverton Road or Mertins Road to make using these roads a less attractive option for drivers trying to avoid Ivydale Road. |
| A5   | In response to the query raised about the speed camera, TS said that the 20 mph was enforceable, but the camera would only take pictures of cars going faster than 30 mph. He went on to say that the 20mph zone should be self-enforcing because of the pinch-points and other physical barriers. Linden Grove being in a 20mph zone, but not having any physical traffic calming measures was an anomaly, but the proposals would address that. The camera would probably be removed after the measures came in, because it would not longer be necessary. TS said he would talk to the safety camera partnership about putting it somewhere else. In terms of cut-throughs from Rye Lane and issuing Fixed Penalty Notices for this, TS said FPNs were issued for moving violations, but were more likely to be parking related. |
| A6   | In response to the question about raised tabled and tactile markings, TS said that these would definitely be included in the schemes as part of the crossings. |
EB responded to the enquiries about Nigel Road and the new Tesco. She said the crossing near Tesco would not be like the ones on Nigel Road and that the preferred option for this would be to install a zebra crossing. This would allow good eye contact between pedestrians and drivers, thereby making it safer than other types of crossings. Regarding East Dulwich Road, a review of traffic movements was currently being conducted. This would be investigated further. EB explained that the options were: for a camera to be put in, or for the junction to be changed, so that it would be impossible to make an illegal turn.

With regard to the branch of Tesco, EB said that the increased footfall would be taken into account. Better access to the building would be worked towards in consultation with the building management and the occupants.

In terms of the Ivydale Road scheme, TS said that they tried to achieve a reduction in traffic and traffic speed for the neighbourhood as a whole. He said that the knock-on effects on adjacent roads were a prominent theme in the consultation feedback. The traffic team would be reviewing how the entire zone worked and were happy to look at the other streets, especially Limesford Road.

Cllr Colley asked for the revised plans to be brought back to the next meeting.

**ACTION:** TS to circulate the revised plans and consultation documents on the Ivydale Road scheme to the next Community Council.

TS confirmed this and went on to say that other issues raised in the consultation were increased noise and pollution, and the loss of parking spaces in roads were pinch-points were to be inserted. This loss amounted to 1.5 spaces on each side of the road. TfL had raised issues around the maneuverability of the street for their buses.

Cllr Glover enquired about what the next steps for the Ivydale Road scheme were.

TS responded that the plans would be implemented in late spring/early summer and that people could give their feedback in the meantime. TS invited residents to contact the council officers responsible for each scheme. Their contact details were clearly marked in the reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12</th>
<th>Planning Enforcement Update and Q&amp;A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The meeting noted the report submitted by Dennis Sangweme, Group Manager - Planning Enforcement, who had sent his apologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no public questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13</th>
<th>Warden Update and Q&amp;A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Backhurst (RB), Area Manager Community Wardens, introduced the warden update. She told the meeting that following the last Community Council meeting, wardens had been tasked to engage with schoolchildren on Queens Road and to monitor problem behaviour. They had spoken to the children about littering, had liaised with staff in the school and had attended the school assembly. Wardens would continue to monitor anti-social behaviour, most of which took place after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Thorncroft suggested a meeting be arranged with the teachers to get their perspective and to include them in the wardens’ anti-littering work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Ruth Backhurst to arrange meetings with teachers in the schools in order to engage them in the team’s anti-littering work, and to invite members along to these meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Cllr Graham asked whether the wardens also patrolled around Harris Girls’ Academy, as he had received complaints from residents in that area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>RB responded that both Harris Girls’ Academy and Peckham Academy were being patrolled by wardens daily. Wardens had a presence there after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Cllr Graham said that the objectionable behaviour occurred especially after school when the children went to the shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RB said that wardens tried to make sure that the children were not too noisy and unruly and did not engage in anti-social behaviour after they left the school’s premises. Wardens also ensured the safety of the children, which was why they were also present at bus stops after school. Any issues that came up would be dealt with by the wardens at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chair informed the meeting that no response from Des Waters, Head of Public Realm, had been received regarding the query about park rangers raised at the last Community Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> The Chair to write again to Des Waters, Head of Public Realm, about the concerns raised about park warden staffing levels, and the restructure and resources allocated to that service; and to report back to the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14</th>
<th>Public Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no public questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 15  Members’ Decisions

There were no members’ decisions to be made.

The chair reintroduced item 6a ‘Cleaner Green Safer (CGS) Funding Decisions’.

The Chair expressed his frustration with the report that had been circulated by the Cleaner Greener Safer team, as it did not contain detailed options and in-depth information about their advantages and disadvantages. He said that he had specifically asked for this at the last meeting. He expressed his frustration at this lack of information due to which he did not feel in a position to make a decision. He also criticised the fact that the option presented by Mick Barnard at the last meeting had not been included or discussed. The Chair went on to say that the item would have to be brought back to the next meeting as a separate agenda item. He suggested to agree the recommendation about Torridge Gardens presented in the report.

A resident said that the CGS report contained inaccuracies in the options discussed.

Mick Barnard, a resident, suggested pages 39-40 of the original feasibility study should be consulted, and said the table contained errors, so that study’s preferred options were flawed. He said that the feasibility study would need to be looked at again.

Cllr Graham said that he was keen to see outcomes and suggested voting for the One O’clock Club and the Splash Park to go ahead. He suggested members give an indication that they were not keen on Homestall Road as the site for the changing facilities.

Cllr Colley also expressed her frustration at not having enough information to make a decision, especially since this item had been coming back to the Community Council since late 2008. She told the meeting that while a full and proper debate was needed, there was also a need to get on with the projects. She reminded the meeting that the Community Council’s CGS contribution was only a part of the funding and once this was approved the real work of trying to secure more funding would have to start. She called for a fuller report to be brought to the next meeting.

The Chair asked members to clarify whether there were any options which could be discarded at this stage.

Cllr Graham said that the meeting would need to give the officers writing the new report an indication of what they would like to see in it. He reiterated his suggestion for the Splash Pool and One O’clock Club to go ahead, and that changing facilities on Homestall Road were not workable.

The Chair said he would also like to go ahead with the Splash Pool, however, members needed more details to make an informed decision. They would require the evidence and arguments for and against the
options to be clearly laid out in the report to the next meeting. He apologised to residents for not being in a position to make the decision at this meeting, but promised that as soon as an appropriate report was produced by officers, members would make the decision.

**EXECUTIVE DECISION**

**Members AGREED:** that the available Cleaner Greener Safer Funding for Torridge Gardens - £20,000 - be used as set out in the report (for planting which also include works for breaking the existing tarmac and building planting beds).

**ACTION:** Eleonora Oliva to action the above decision.

**Multi-Use-Centre (MUC), Splash Pool, One O’clock Club**

**ACTION:** Eleonora Oliva to produce a detailed and well-evidenced report (listing the advantages and disadvantages of the individual options) for the next Community Council meeting. A draft report to be presented to the next agenda setting meeting on March 4 2009.

Cllr Graham raised the issue of a replacement for the post of Peckham Programme Manager.

Cllr Glover expressed his concerns that the post be filled, and retained at the same grade. He said he was concerned about a possible drop in resources for the Peckham area in light of the Town Hall moving to the north of the borough. He did not want to see the post being transformed from a dedicated senior manager to someone who was covering all eight Community Council areas.

Cllr Colley informed the meeting that an interim Head of Area Services, Barbara Spittle, had been appointed. She went on to say that there were plans to merge Russell Profitt’s old section with the Community Involvement and Development Unit (CIDU). There would be a review and possibly a new structure. She also said that there would not be any definitive information on this for a few months yet.

Cllr Smith said that Barbara Spittle was a consultant who would be writing the review. She said that the department would be downsized and suggested that the Community Council should be presented with this report in order to comment on it.

Cllr Smeath said that the consultant should come to the Community Council to present her thinking around this review and to hear the views of the Community Council.

Cllr Colley said she endorsed this suggestion, and said that the Peckham Programme was very important and that its work was not always appreciated. She said she was keen for the work that the Peckham Programme had done not to be lost.
A resident suggested the Chair liaise with the Chair of Peckham Community Council, as this issue also affected that area.

The Chair said this would be done.

**ACTION:** Chair to invite the Interim Head of Area Management to the next Community Council to present her thinking around the options for a new structure of this department, and to hear the views of the Community Council. The Chair to coordinate this with the Chair of the Peckham Community Council.

The meeting ended at 9.35pm
## Summary of the decision or action

The following is a summary of the decisions and actions taken at this meeting.

The item number relates to the agenda item number where possible.

Clarification or queries on any points should be raised in the first instance with Gerald Gohler on 020 7525 7420.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Summary of the action</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM 3</td>
<td>Items of business the Chair deems urgent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE DECISION</td>
<td>AGREED: The following allocations from the Community Fund (2008/2009):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love Peckham £1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of Peckham Park £1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwark Pensioners Forum (Silver Festival) £1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene Church (healthy living project for older people) £1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwark Caribb FC (Diabetes project) £250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total £4,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION: Above funding allocations to be actioned.</td>
<td>Donald Forde / Nadine James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM 5</td>
<td>Minutes of the previous meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREED: that the minutes of the meeting held on January 14 2009, including the above amendments, are true and accurate recordings of that Community Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM 6A</td>
<td>Cleaner Greener Safer Project decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE DECISION</td>
<td>Torridge Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREED: that the available Cleaner Greener Safer Funding for this item - £20,000 - be used as set out in the report (for planting which also include works for breaking the existing tarmac and building planting beds).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION: Eleonora Oliva to action the above decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use-Centre (MUC), Splash Pool, One O’clock Club</td>
<td>ACTION: a detailed and well-evidenced report (listing the advantages and disadvantages of the individual options) to be produced for the next Community Council meeting. A draft report to be presented to the next agenda setting meeting on March 4 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 6B</th>
<th>Parking Charges in Peckham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>A report to be produced for the next meeting on how much revenue would be lost, if free out-of-hours and weekend parking was re-introduced in the car parks in the Peckham Town Centre (included in this report should be usage figures for the Peckham Town Centre car parks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>A motion to be drafted and to be taken to Council Assembly on April 8 2009 urging the council to look at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the removal of car parking charges in Peckham Town Centre during weekday evenings and weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o scrapping charges in the main car parks in Peckham completely, in light of the current economic downturn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o what measures the council is currently taking to stimulate the economy in Peckham, and to attract people into Peckham town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleonora Oliva

Paul Cowell

Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 6D</th>
<th>Further Matters Arising from previous meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>Environment and Housing Lead Officer to identify the barriers in question on the Consort Estate with the aid of the resident who had originally raised the query at the previous Community Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>Report back on the problems with rubbish collections on the Brimmington Estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>Chair to write to Sainsbury’s on Dog Kennel Hill again in order to express the concerns of members and residents about the state of the recycling facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cowell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cowell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS 8+10</th>
<th>Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>an update to be given at the next Community Council on the ‘Issues and Options’ paper which will be published as part of the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnuccio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 9</th>
<th>Police Update and Q&amp;A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>to re-invite Sgt Cox and to request a feedback report on his area for the next meeting, including an update on the BT phone boxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gohler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 11</th>
<th>Traffic Schemes: Rye Lane - Heaton Road - Sternhall Lane - Ivydale Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>revised plans and consultation documents on these schemes to be circulated to the next Community Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strehlow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 13</th>
<th>Community Wardens Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>The Chair write again to Des Waters, Head of Public Realm, about the concerns raised about park warden staffing levels, and the restructure and resources allocated to that service; and to report back to the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION:</td>
<td>Ruth Backhurst to arrange meetings with teachers in the schools in order to engage them in the team’s anti-littering work, and to invite members along to these meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM 15</td>
<td>Members Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Chair to invite the Interim Head of Area Management to the next Community Council to present her thinking around the options for a new structure of this department, and to hear the views of the Community Council. The Chair to coordinate this with the Chair of the Peckham Community Council.</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information included in this form, together with the attached notes, form the minutes from the above meeting and have been agreed as a true and accurate recording of that meeting. Any necessary amendments shall be detailed in the **Summary of Actions and Decisions** held at the Town Hall by the relevant Community Councils Development Officer.

Chair ___________________________________________ Date ____________________________
Peckham Pledge

Background
The idea of developing a pledge for Peckham came from Cllr Mark Glover who thought it would be a good idea to have discussions with young people particularly in schools, about the negative attitudes and behaviour they experience or observe in their local community and what could be done to change these attitudes for the better.

COVO Connecting Voices was commissioned to deliver consultation/workshops in 10 schools, including 9 mainstream primary schools and 1 special school in which the parents of autistic children were consulted on their behalf.

The aim:
- For the children to reflect on their own behaviour as well as the attitudes of people in their local community
- For children to make a pledge as young citizens striving to improve their behaviour while encouraging others to join them.

The process:
The children were asked to share their experiences of positive and negative behaviour they witness or display in the streets through a brainstorm exercise in which all the children participated.

A discussion was opened to define ‘What is a pledge?’ by sharing examples of people making pledges in a variety of situations. We further explored ‘What is a pledge?’ and how important it is to keep it when one is made. The children then shared what can come in the way of breaking a pledge and what can help you keep it. Time was given for each student to write their individual pledges on a card to be kept by the children and taken home.

From the ten schools, 6 pledges were selected. The first two pledges relate to verbal and physical violence that the children felt very personally about, causing the majority of anxiety and fear. The other four pledges were selected because the children witness types of behaviour on a daily basis and felt very passionate about the changes needed.

What next:
A group of children will come to the next Community Council meeting on the 6th of May to present the six pledges and ask the Councillor and the people present what they would be able to do to support their pledges.
Feedback on out-of-hours and free weekend parking in Peckham
The parking service collects the income generated from local car parks on a daily basis. There is currently no accurate way of knowing the number of cars in any car park for specific time periods. The parking service would need to employ an individual to count cars during specified time slots to provide the information requested.

The most accurate information is based on an approximation of £43,000 per year cost to the parking service if free out of hours and weekend parking was introduced throughout the car parks in the Peckham area.

This approximate costs works out as £120 per day or £840 per week.

Feedback on barriers on Consort Estate
Environment and Housing Officers visited the Consort Estate but were unable to identify the barriers in question. To take this issue forward Officers need to speak to the person who raised this issue.
Report to Nunhead & Peckham Rye Community Council

Refuse Collections on the Brimmington Estate

The Council (through its contractor, Veolia) provides a bag collection for refuse on 30 estates in Southwark, serving approximately 20,000 households. The Brimmington is one such estate.

Bag collections for refuse are far from ideal but are sometimes the only option available because of a lack of storage space for wheeled bins, or difficulties in accessing the properties. The collections are expensive, as they take place twice a week. Bags have to be presented before 7am, and are collected between 7am and 6pm. In many cases, residents place the refuse bags outside their homes the evening before collection, where they remain overnight and can be prone to attack by foxes and vermin. In some areas, cupboards or hangers are provided for the bags to be stored.

Three teams of collectors work on bag collections each day. They take the bags from outside people’s homes and gather them at collection points, from where they are loaded into a dustcart at a later time. Loading the bags directly into a dustcart is not normally a viable option, as the collectors are often working at a considerable distance from the kerbside when gathering bags. If they worked out of a dustcart, the dustcart and driver would be sitting idle for significant periods of time, and in many cases would be obstructing local traffic. The method used means that a single dustcart can collect all the bags collected by the three crews.

On the Brimmington Estate, refuse was at one time collected by Southwark Cleaning. The collection was transferred to the Refuse Service in the autumn of 2007, six months prior to the service being contracted out to Veolia.

In recent months, complaints have been received about collections on the Brimmington Estate. The Council and Veolia have been looking at ways to improve the service. Veolia have been endeavouring to minimise the time between the bags being taken to the collection points and their being loaded into a dustcart and removed. In January, this was typically 5 to 6 hours. Recently, this has been reduced to between 30 minutes and 2 hours. We have asked Veolia to review the collection schedules for all estates across the borough that have bag collections, in order to try to work to a time table and minimise the length of time for which bags are piled up waiting collection.

There are some further steps that we may be able to take to improve the service on the Brimmington estate. Parts of Blanch Close and Clifton Way have houses at the kerbside. These properties could be served by normal refuse crews that work in the area on the current collection days (Tuesdays and Fridays); the bags could be taken from the doorstep by crews who normally empty wheelie bins, and thrown directly into the back of a dustcart. Replacement bags for these residents would be delivered quarterly instead of twice weekly. The houses at 1-11 King Arthur Close could be served in the same way. However, flats 12-41 King Arthur Close are also on bag collections, and their bags are piled in the Close awaiting collection. The flats at 12-41 have individual refuse storage areas consisting of bag hangers with wooden separation. The Refuse Team have proposed to the Housing Manager that these bag hangers and partitions are removed and replaced with individual wheelie bins, which would be emptied once a week. Housing will be consulting with residents on this proposal, and if it goes ahead, then piling of bags in King Arthur Close, Blanch Close, and part of Clifton Way would stop. We would also
explore the possibility of extending an immediate collection to Stavely Close, where properties are also close to the roadside.

NB: Extra information.

Dear Cllr Colley,

I am writing in response to your e-mail of 9th March to Annie Sheppard and Nick Stanton.

Let me start by saying that a bag collection service of residual waste is far from ideal, but is sometimes the only option available to us because of a lack of adequate storage for rigid containers, or difficulties in accessing properties. Bag collections are expensive, as we have to collect bags from householders twice a week. The bags have to be presented before 7am, so in practice most bags are left out overnight, where they are prone to damage by foxes and vermin. We much prefer, whenever possible, for refuse to be contained in wheeled bins.

We have around 20,000 households on 30 estates who have their residual waste collected in bags twice a week. Three teams of collectors work on bag collections each day. They take the bags from outside people’s homes and gather them at collection points, from where they are loaded into a dustcart at a later time. Loading the bags directly into a dustcart is not normally a viable option, as the collectors are often working at a considerable distance from the kerbside when gathering bags. If they worked out of a dustcart, the dustcart and driver would be sitting idle for significant periods of time, and in many cases would be obstructing local traffic. The method used means that a single dustcart can take all the bags collected by the three crews.

There are some steps that we may be able to take to improve the service on the Brimmington estate.

Parts of Blanch Close and Clifton Way have houses at the kerbside. These properties could be served by normal refuse crews that work in the area on the current collection days (Tuesdays and Fridays); the bags could be taken from the doorstep by crews who normally empty wheelie bins, and thrown directly into the back of a dustcart. Replacement bags for these residents would be delivered quarterly instead of twice weekly.

The houses at 1-11 King Arthur Close could be served in the same way. However, flats 12-41 King Arthur Close are also on bag collections, and their bags are piled in the Close awaiting collection. The flats at 12-41 have individual refuse storage areas consisting of bag hangers with wooden separation. I have suggested to Housing that these bag hangers and partitions are removed and replaced with individual wheelie bins, which would be emptied once a week. Housing will consult with residents on this proposal, and if it goes ahead, then piling of bags in King Arthur Close, Blanch Close, and part of Clifton Way would stop. We would also explore the possibility of extending an immediate collection to Stavely Close, where properties are also close to the roadside.

Unfortunately, for large parts of the Brimmington and other estates across Southwark, there is no viable alternative to the current collection method. However, I have asked Veolia to review all the bag collection schedules with a view to coming up with a timetable for the collectors and the dustcart, and minimising the length of time for which bags are piled up awaiting collection. I believe that significant improvements have been made in recent weeks, and that where bags were regularly being piled up for 5 to 6 hours before the collection, this has been improved to between 30 minutes and 2 hours on the
Brimmington in recent weeks. I would hope to see that level of improvement extended to all estates across the Borough.

Regards,

Nick Chaple
Waste Contract Manager
Background

One Tree Hill (SE23) has been a public recreation area since 1905, and gained Local Nature Reserve status in 2006.

In 2004 the Friends of One Tree Hill raised concerns about the use of One Tree Hill by commercial dog walkers. Issues raised included:

- a large numbers of dogs off leashes “unnerving” other uses of the area and other people walking their own dogs
- dogs “churning up” the meadow area
- dog faeces not being cleaned up

Southwark Council has a duty under the NERC Act 2006 (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act) to put in place appropriate measures to protect local nature reserves, such as One Tree Hill. Currently there are no measures in place on this site.

In order to resolve these issues Southwark Council proposed to implement Dog Control Orders at One Tree Hill.

At the October 2008 Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council meeting LBS received permission to undertake a formal consultation period for a proposal to make a Dog Control Order at One Tree Hill.

The proposal for the Dog Control Order at One Tree Hill was that it would comprise of three orders:

- Dog faeces must be cleaned up by those responsible for the dog/s
- Dogs must be kept on leads
- A maximum number of dogs with one handler (propose six maximum)

Officers have contacted residents by email in the One Tree area that had previously raised concerns about issues regarding dogs (80+).

The public consultation period ran for 28 days from January 22 to February 18 2009.

Details of the Consultation

Public consultation began on 22 January 2009 with a public notice of intention appearing in the Southwark News (announcing the beginning of the consultation period). Following this notices were put up around One Tree Hill, an email was sent out to interested parties, a notice and poster were put up outside Honor Oak Park Station, an item was posted on the Honor Oak Resident Forum blog and there was an announcement on the Southwark Council website. This consultation period ran from 22 January 2009 and to 18 February 2009 and ran for 28 days (as per DEFRA guidance).

The Parks and Open Spaces team received 60 responses to the proposed Dog Control Order
The results of consultation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Number</th>
<th>Agree with order</th>
<th>Disagree Completely</th>
<th>Disagree (not restrictive enough)</th>
<th>No Opinion Given</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cleaning up after dogs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. dogs must be on leads</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. maximum number of dogs 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order 1 (Handlers must clean up their dog’s faeces):
- A majority provided no opinion on this proposed order (39 of 58 respondents).
- 16 people agreed with the order and 3 completely disagreed.
- The three people who disagreed with proposed Order 1 felt that it was a) another regulation that would not be enforced sufficiently, b) there are not enough facilities provided to dispose of dog faeces or, c) there was already a bye law in place that addressed this issue.

Order 2 (keeping dogs on leads):
- A majority provided no opinion on this proposed order (32 of 58 respondents).
- Only three people agreed with the order.
- A large number of people disagreed with the order (23 of 58). The predominant reason given was that dogs would suffer for not being able to run freely and exercise properly. One Tree Hill currently one of a very limited number of areas where they are currently able to exercise off lead. Many (7 respondents) also felt that irresponsible dog owners were spoiling the area for those who were walking one or two dogs, measures should be aimed at irresponsible owners only. It was also mentioned that if order 2 (dogs on leads) was combined with order 3 (a maximum of six dogs per person) that this would be unworkable, as controlling six dogs on leads on the hilly and wooded lands of One Tree Hill would be impossible. A number of respondents (8) suggested that the order should be changed to dogs must be “under control” of the owner at all times, as is currently sign posted on the site.

Order 3 (maximum number of dogs per handler limited to six)
- Order 3 gained the most responses with only 7 respondents not providing any comment.
- Six respondents agreed with the proposal to limit the number of dogs per person to six.
- A small number of respondents (3) completely disagreed with proposed order 3. One because they felt the council should not dictate how many dogs a person may own and exercise; a second person felt that the council should meet the alleged problem of commercial dog walkers more directly by employing a working standards agreement with commercial dog walkers; the third person felt that limiting the number of dogs would push up dog walker prices to unaffordable levels and would also diminish job opportunities as commercial dog walking would become a less viable occupation, affecting a valuable service to the community.
The vast majority of respondents (42 of 58) believed the proposed order is not restrictive enough. Of those who felt it should be more restrictive 36 respondents requested the number be limited to two or three dogs per person.

Many respondents (22) were also concerned that six dogs per person would allow or encourage professional/commercial dog walkers to use the site. There were suggestions that such activities for commercial gain should not be carried on public land, or that professional dog walkers should be licensed or registered, or required to demonstrate an ability to handle six dogs at simultaneously.

The respondents comprised of both dog owners and those without dogs:

- Dog owners: 25
- Non owners: 26
- Unclear: 7
- Total: 58

**Dog Control Orders – Policy and Process**

The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 gave Local Authorities the power to make dog control orders for a specified area within an authority's jurisdiction.

A dog Control Order supersedes any previous dog control measures in place at a site, including council bylaws, and repeals the Dogs (Fouling of Lands) Act 1996.

If this proposal is agreed, the process will continue as follows:

- Put an order into force if this is considered an appropriate step
- Publish the outcome in the local paper
- Put copies of the order on our website and put up signage on site
- Period of enforcement

The Council believes that a Dog Control Order is the only way to enable the fulfilment of the Council’s obligations under the NERC Act.

The process for implementing a Dog Control Order (should this be deemed to be an appropriate next step) would be resourced through existing staffing.

Subsequent enforcement of the Order would be undertaken by the Wardens who will resource this through existing staffing.

Fines for non-compliance would be set at £50

**Recommendations**

That the Community Council supports the proposal to implement Dog Control Orders at One Tree Hill which will include: an order that dog handlers must clean up after their dog/s, dogs must be kept on leads and that the number of dogs per handler is restricted to three.

Please note that the recommendations still include that dogs must be kept on leads as it would be very difficult to enforce the maximum number of dogs order without this order.
Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council Feedback

Trading Standards – Overcharging in Peckham

- One of Trading Standards enforcement projects/campaign is to combat dishonesty in the retail sale of weighed out produce in Southwark. This involves compliance inspections at retail premises and covert test purchasing to detect short-weighing or pricing irregularities. This contributes towards councils objectives of protecting the economic well being of residents, and to support honest businesses.

- Joint Working with the LBS Community Wardens in 2008-2009 allowed us to undertake greater numbers of test purchasing than previous years. We are seeking to extend our Joint Working plans into 2009-2010, and to involve other relevant stakeholders.

- Following enforcement activity - outlined in the attached press article - follow up test purchases and inspections showed great improvement with no malpractice being found. Further joint working is planned.

- Certain traders' compliance history will soon be reviewed to establish if continuing breaches of trading standards legislation can be dealt with by means of the Enterprise Act 2002. Provisions in this Act allow us to seek undertakings from traders which, if breached, can lead to court action. This is in addition to our standard enforcement actions such as warnings, cautions or prosecution.

- Local feedback and raising the awareness of such issues is vital to empower consumers. We are also evaluating ways to promote proven fair traders such as through a "tried and tested" award scheme and to work with traders to boost businesses through customer confidence and positive publicity.

- For the Lane and Peckham Road there has been approximately 175 inspections since April 1st 2008 under this campaign. Non-compliances (usually a failure to mark prices or sell certain products by weight) that required follow up action (a revisit or notice etc) were found in approx 30% of these. These are not are stable matters - hence the need to look to the Enterprise Act to deal with the few persistently non-compliant businesses.
Types of disabled persons (blue badge) parking bays
The council install two types of disabled bay, on the public highway, in accordance with our parking policies.

1. Origin blue badge bays.
These are installed for residents of the borough as close to their home as possible. The bays will be installed when an application has been made, assessed and the relevant criteria met. This is an ongoing council service and the process is attached. It is noted that any blue badge holder can park in any blue badge bay in Southwark.

2. Destination blue badge bays.
These are installed in proximity to shops and services where there is a demand for such facilities (often where parking space is in high demand). The bays will usually have a maximum stay period of 4 hours to encourage turn over of space and prevent all day parking. These can be investigated where funds are available - as part of a CPZ review, s106 commitments or from successful bids to Transport for London (TfL).

Who decides on where bays are installed?
Once an application for an origin bay has been approved, officers will discuss with the applicant a suitable location to install it.

The community council has the decision making function for approving the installation of origin bays and, in most instances, destination bays.

Officers will then carry out statutory consultation (Traffic Management Order) that legally formalises the position of the bay.

See the attached process chart for more details.

New local parking amendment report
A recent transfer of service means that officers will send one local parking amendment report to the community council on a roughly quarterly basis. This report will contain recommendations for both parking restrictions (ie. yellow lines on junctions) and origin blue badge bays.

Each report will contain detailed drawings showing all parking restrictions in the vicinity to assist member’s decisions

How do we know when they are no longer of use?
We are reliant upon information from the applicant to say that it is no longer required or they are moving away. If anybody thinks that a bay is no longer being used they can report this to the council and we will investigate.
What does the council do when bays are reported no longer in use?
The council will take steps to remove them. Whilst our disabled bays are not allocated to a specific individual they are installed according to an individual’s needs. Therefore once we have established the bay is no longer required, it is removed.

The removal of the bay does require a statutory consultation process to take place.

How many disabled bays are there in the Nunhead & Peckham Rye CC area?

**Origin blue badge bays** – The point of origin disabled parking bay database was set-up in January 1997, prior to the inception of Community Council areas. This was amended in July 2006 with the addition of a field to record Community Council areas. We are therefore only able report on bays by Community Council area from this date as records have not been amended retrospectively; to do so would require resources to amend some 1,036 records.

**Destination blue badge bays** – There are 12 time-limited destination disabled parking bays around Peckham town centre.

Additionally, blue badge holders are permitted to park for up to three hours on yellow lines provided there are aren't any loading restrictions in place and they are not causing an obstruction. In Southwark’s controlled parking zones (CPZs) blue badge holders are also entitled to park on any pay and display or shared-use parking bay free of charge and without time limit.

How do I get a disabled bay installed?

**Origin blue badge bays** - Those persons wanting to apply for a bay outside their house should call 020 7525 2165.

**Destination blue badge bays** – Those persons who have suggestions for destination bays (ie. near shopping parades, leisure facilities or other services) should call 020 7525 2131/7764.

More information on how and where to park can be found at [www.southwark.gov.uk/parking](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/parking).
Disabled persons (Blue Badge) parking bay application process

Application for disabled bay received → Application considered

- Blue Badge holder and in receipt of higher mobility allowance
  → Application passed. Details to database
  - Applicant informed of decision, process and contact
  - Network development informed (signed, dated, scan of form)

- Application considered
  - Blue Badge without higher mobility allowance but over 65 or under 5
    → Letter sent to doctor to ascertain need for bay
  - Doctor does not recommend bay
    → Applicant informed
    → Application failed. Details to database
    - Bay not installed. Project closed
  - Doctor does recommend bay
    → Application informed
    → Suitable location identified
    → Applicant informed of location and approximate dates
    → Details added to local parking amendment database
    → Site visit and discussion to determine bay location
    - Suitable location not identified
      → Report not approved
    - Suitable location identified
      → Local parking amendment report sent to Community Council for approval to progress to statutory consultation (quarterly)
      - Report approved
        → Objection received
        → Permanent Traffic Management Order proposed
        → Permanent Traffic Management Order Made
        → Order raised with LBS Highways for signs/lines work
      - Report not approved
    → Local parking amendment report sent to Community Council for approval to progress to statutory consultation (quarterly)
    - Order raised with LBS Highways for signs/lines work
    → Bay installed. Project closed

Key
- Network Operations process
- External process
- Network Development process

External process

Network Development process

Network Operations process
How would you improve the place where you live?

Local people now have a new chance to improve their local community or area, by asking the government to act.

The Sustainable Communities Act gives people the opportunity to come up with proposals to improve the place where they live.

We want to hear your ideas.
What does the Sustainable Communities Act aim to do?
It encourages local communities to come forward with ideas and proposals to promote the sustainability of their local area – where action is required by central government.

Sustainability is defined in the Act in very broad terms, and can cover anything which could improve the economic, social, or environmental well-being of the area, or promote participation in civic or political activity.

Who can put forward proposals?
Anyone can suggest a proposal, through their council. We expect most proposals will come from community organisations, neighbourhood forums, residents and tenants associations, local strategic partnerships and other partnership bodies.

Are there any specific requirements for proposals under the Act?
Proposals must be ones that need some form of action from central government, such as a change in legislation, a transfer of responsibilities from one public body to another, or additional powers. The proposals must be specific, clearly stating what action we are asking for.

If you have an idea then please let us know. There is a short form to fill in that needs to be submitted by April 27

The form and more information can be found on our website: www.southwark.gov.uk/YourCouncil/consultations/sustainablecommunities.html

e-mail sca@southwark.gov.uk

or write to Sustainable Communities, Corporate Strategy Southwark Council, Townhall Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB
| **Sustainable Communities Act – ideas form** |
| **Deadline for proposals April 27 2009** |

Name/group/organisation submitting proposal:  

Contact address:  

Email:  

Telephone:  

Summary of proposal (maximum 200 words):  

*e.g.*:  

*What will government need to do? How will it help your local community?*

---

If you believe the proposal requires a transfer of functions from one public body to another please indicate what you believe these bodies to be:
Please submit this proposal form to Southwark Council:

Post to: Sustainable Communities
2nd Floor Corporate Strategy
Townhall, Peckham Road
London, SE5 8UB

Email to: sca@southwark.gov.uk
Summary and purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Nunhead & Peckham Rye Community Council with an update on progress of planning enforcement issues since the last report on the 25th of February 2009.

2. Please note that this report is for information purposes only. The determination of planning enforcement investigations and conduct of enforcement appeals is delegated to officers under the Southwark Constitution 2008. Part 3F Note (a). Members are advised that they do not have a decision making function in relation to Enforcement Cases.

3. Case Updates

3.1 Site at 1-4 Holly Grove, Peckham, London SE15 5DF: - Summary of the Planning Appeals

i. The Planning Inspectorate has agreed to the requested change in the appeal procedure. Therefore the appeal will now be heard by way of informal hearing. This procedure allows interested third parties to attend the informal hearing and make representations on this appeal.

ii. The Inspectorate has received a number of representations from residents on this appeal and these have been forwarded to the case officer.

iii. You will notified of the date and venue for the informal hearing closer to the date. Officers are following up with the Inspectorate to get a date set for the informal hearing.

iv. The appeal documents are available at the Council Offices if you wish to view them.

3.2 12A Station Way, London (R n B Nightclub) SE15 4RX

i. Enforcement Notice was served on 15th October 2008 for unauthorised change of use from restaurant to night club. This notice required the cessation of use as a night club before 15th February 2009.
ii. The enforcement notice has been appealed by the operator of the night club. This appeal is on grounds (f) and (g) and is to be heard at a Public Inquiry on the 28th May 2009.

iii. Officers are currently preparing proof of evidence in defence of the enforcement notice including gathering witness statements from third parties to refute the fact that the night club has been operation for more than 10 years at this site.

iv. As such, any residents with information on the historic operations of these premises should come forward and contact Mathew Cullen, the Officer dealing with this case.

3.3 COOPERS WORKS, 19-23 STERNHALL LANE, LONDON, SE15 4NQ

i. 4 X Breach of Condition Notices were served on 1st October 2008. These Notices were with respect to failure to
   - Submit and implement details of refuse storage
   - Submit and implement details of hard landscaping (including car park surfacing)
   - Submit and implement details of boundary treatments
   - Submit and implement details of cycle storage.

ii. The Compliance date for these notices was 1st January 2009. An invalid application has been received to discharge the planning conditions subject of the BCNs. In any case, the details submitted are not sufficient to discharge the above conditions.

iii. Site visits have confirmed that there has been no change to the car parking area of the site and the development is still in breach.

iv. London Borough of Southwark is currently preparing a case to report and prosecute the Blank Ant Company at the Magistrates Court for the offence of failing to comply with the requirements of these Breach of Condition Notices.

v. Cllr Nardell has urged Officers to explore a negotiated resolution to this matter before prosecution. Accordingly, Planning Enforcement Officers have liaised with other Development Management Teams and have agreed to request an application for variation of the approved scheme for the car park to allow the installation of 9 car parking spaces in lieu of 14 car parking spaces as originally approved. This application will also include details of boundary treatment, cycle storage, hard landscaping, and provision of access to commercial unit at rear.
3.4 **Takeaway Shops in Queens Road, SE15**

i. Planning Contravention Notices were served on 167, 171 and 177 Queens Road to obtain more information on the details and history of the use of the premises.

ii. 177 Queens Road (Golden Noodles) have responded to their Planning Contravention Notice. From the information provided, it has been determined that a change of use from A3 to A5 has occurred. A retrospective Planning Application for the change was submitted to the Council and is waiting validation. Residents and members will be consulted as soon as the application is validated.

iii. Responses to the Planning Contravention Notices sent to 167 and 171 Queens Road have not yet been received. These responses are due by the 26th of March 2009.

3.5 **207 RYE LANE, LONDON, SE15 4TP**

i. A stop notice was served and took effect on 05/02/09. The notice requires the cessation of the unauthorised use at the above site as a Use Class B1 bakery and the removal of two baking ovens and one mixer.

ii. It appears that the bakery has secured new accommodation.

iii. An application ref. no. 08-AP-3105 was received by the Council for the Continued use of the ground floor as a bakers shop (Use Class A1), alterations to shopfront to enable creation of a self-contained flat on the upper floors (Use Class C3) and retention of an enclosure to rear service yard and 2 extract flues to the rear of the building.

iv. The commercial baking component of the business has now ceased and equipment has been moved off site as required by the Enforcement Notice. There have been no further complaints about early morning deliveries or pick-ups. It appears that the operator is now complying with the Enforcement Notice and the Stop Notice.

3.6 **New Cases**

i. **Unit 5 Bellenden Road Business Centre, SE15 4RF** – Breach of conditions 3 & 4 of granted planning permission 08/4P/0395. **Logged for investigation.**

ii. **Rear garden of 18/20 Belfort Road (adjacent 46 Frobisher Place)** - It appears that the works are to clear, make good and landscape the rear...
garden of no. 18. These works are not considered operational
development for the purposes of section 55 of the 1990 Act and therefore
do not require planning permission. Adjoining residents concerned about
the works trespassing on to their land and the removal of the boundary
wall. This appears to be a civil matter between adjoining land owners in
which the Council as the local planning authority cannot be involved.
Residents advised to seek a civil resolution if legal trespass is proven. No
breach – to be closed.

Delegated Officer   Gary Rice   Head of Development Control
REPORT AUTHOR      Dennis Sangweme  Group Manager – Planning Enforcement
Contact Officer    Dennis Sangweme

Community Council  Nunhead & Peckham Rye
Reports
Papers held at:    Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street
                   SE17 2ES    [tel. 020 7525 5403]

Email: dennis.sangweme@southwark.gov.uk
RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. It is recommended that the local parking schemes detailed in the appendices to this report are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. This report presents a proposal for a local parking amendment schemes, which is a matter reserved to community council for decision.

3. The origins and reasons for the proposal are discussed in the main body of the report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Lugard Road (0809Q4013)

4. An application has been received by the network operations team for the installation of a disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay. The applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons parking bay.

5. The network development team has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the network and ascertain the appropriate location for the disabled bay.

6. It is recommended that this disabled bay be installed No.100 Lugard Road.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

7. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the PEP and associated Local Implementation Plan (LIP)

8. The proposals will support the council’s equalities and human rights policies and will promote social inclusion by:

• provide origin disabled bays to assist residents with mobility improvements

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

15. The policies within the Parking and Enforcement Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).
RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

16. All costs arising from implementing the proposals, as set out in the report, will be fully contained within the existing local parking amendment budget.

CONSULTATION

17. No informal consultation has been carried out.

18. Should the community council approve the item, statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. A proposal notice will be erected in proximity to the site location and a press notice will be published in the Southwark News and London Gazette. If there are objections a further report will be re-submitted to the community council for determination.

19. The road network and parking manager has been consulted on the proposals and has no objections.

20. No consultation or comment has been sought from the borough solicitor & secretory or the chief finance officer.
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Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council
Monday April 6 2009
Public Question Form

Your name:

Your mailing address:

What is your question or comment?

You can return the form in advance of the meeting or at the start of the meeting to either Nadine James or your local Councillor.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euan Cameron, UNISON Southwark Branch</th>
<th>COPIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy Fielding, GMB/APEX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Milne TGWU/ACTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony O’Brien, UCATT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>COPIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dated:** Friday March 27 2009