Peckham Community Council
Agenda

DATE: Wednesday 10 September 2003  TIME: 7:00 pm
PLACE: Unity Building, 37 Peckham High Street, London SE15

1. Introduction and welcome [Chair]
2. Disclosure of Members’ interests and dispensations

Matters relating to previous meeting

3. Confirmation of minutes of the meeting on 2 July 2003
4. Update on issues raised at the previous meeting

Open Community Session

5. Licensing consultation list
   - Request for interested members of the public to add their names to the licensing consultation list for Peckham

6. Policing in Peckham
   - Sector Inspector Peter Salter will provide a brief presentation on policing matters in Peckham and will participate in a question and answer session.

7. Peckham Pulse (See attachment 3)
   - Question and answer session
8. **Cleaner, Greener, Safer Programme**

- Update on the capital funds spent so far of the £375,000 allocation for environmental and community safety improvements in Peckham. Brief outline of remaining proposals.

- Open session to discuss how to spend the remaining £350,000. Opportunity for members of the public to indicate their preferred scheme.

9. **Break and officer surgery – 8:00 pm**

- An opportunity to talk with officers on individual areas of concern (tea and coffee available).

**Members’ Decisions – 8.15pm**

10. Cleaner, Greener, Safer Programme

- Community Council to decide any further allocations of funding.

11. Appointments to School Governor’s Boards in the Peckham Community (See attachment 4)

- Two appointments to be considered.

**Closing Comments by the Chair – 8.55pm**

**Upcoming meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 October 2003</td>
<td>Unity Building, 37 Peckham High Street, London SE15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12 November 2003</td>
<td>Unity Building, 37 Peckham High Street, London SE15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 ATTACHMENT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title :</th>
<th>Litter Bin implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to     :</td>
<td>All Community Council’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of     :</td>
<td>Gill Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Strategic Director of Environment &amp; Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date          :</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

As outlined at the first cycle of Community Council’s Southwark Council is committed to improving the environment and to ensuring that the borough becomes ‘cleaner and greener’.

A key aspect of addressing the cleaner, greener agenda is to deliver a top quartile performance for borough cleanliness. To this end we identified the following deficiencies that we needed to address;

- Lack of enforcement against those who commit enviro crimes
- Poor performance by the previous cleansing contractor
- Failure to liaise with schools and community groups on education programmes to reduce the amount of litter on our streets
- Lack of litter bins - Currently the Council has approximately 1,800 litter bins placed across the borough. This compared to other boroughs, which are in the upper performance quartile, is far too low.

**Delivering the change**

To date the Council has undertaken the following to deliver the required change.

- Reorganised its client and waste management department to reflect the emphasis on deterring all forms of envirocrime by increasing the amount of staff allocated to enforcement activities.
- Launched an exciting new integrated cleaning contract that covers streets and estates.
- Created three new posts with a specific role to work with voluntary and community groups and schools to address the issue of waste minimisation, litter and raise awareness of the problems the council faces in trying to improve our environment
- Purchased a further 1,200 new litter bins

As part of the first cycle of meetings Community Council’s were asked to provide suggestions on locations for up to 100 litter bins per area.
The suggestions made by Community Councils have been considered against a set of key locations identified as not only suitable for litter bins but also as locations where litter bins would make the most impact. The key locations are provided below;

- Schools/routes into schools
- Areas of heavy pedestrian usage
- Community shopping areas
- Bus stops
- Train/Tube Stations
- Shopping precincts
- Crossovers
- Entrances to parks and open spaces

Appendix 1 provides a list of suggested locations from the first Community Council meeting and details the suggestions that have been agreed within the context of the key locations identified above.

**Implementing the bins**

As you may have already seen some litter bins have been installed and it is anticipated that as far as is practicable all bins will be installed by the end of October 2003.

In addition, to the locations suggested by Community Council’s, officers from the Waste Management Service are in the process of identifying any further gaps in provision to ensure the remaining litter bins are utilised in the most effective way taking into consideration areas of greatest need within the context of the key location criteria.

**Appendix 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Date Installed</th>
<th>Date to be Installed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Specific location to be considered prior to installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Grove</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>in front of takeaway/shops and nr under bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Way</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bins assigned to streets only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Rd Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting House Lane nr shops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith Rd nr school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Council Tree Planting Requests

Further to the Chief Executive’s initial report, dated April 22nd 2003, £100,000 has been allocated from the £3.914 million EIP programme for tree planting as part of a corporate effort to green the Borough.

The list below details roads where demand for new trees has been identified by residents and user groups during consultation exercises at the 8 Community Council forums held since April this year. Before new sites are selected from these roads all vacant tree pits and those with dead/declining trees are to be replaced. This currently totals over 300 individual sites throughout the Borough at a cost of approximately £33,000. On-going maintenance is to be met from within existing budgets.

Match funding of £12,500 has been secured with Trees for London (TreefL) for all planting in Borough and Bankside together with 20 trees in the Walworth area. This is to involve direct community involvement in tree planting activities.

Match-funding is also being sought with Groundwork Southwark for planting within Burgess Park. Additional funds are available from within the Parks budget for approximately 80 trees.

Following discussions with Transport for London a bid is to be made to replace all vacant sites along Red Routes.

The remaining funds provide for approximately 245 new sites to be bid for by the Community Councils. Overall, there are a further 766 potential sites identified following Community Forum feedback and requests received in writing over the last 3 years. The majority of these have been surveyed and recorded on a database for future action once funds are available.

The sites chosen in each CC area are therefore prioritised according to the number of requests received for each road and the number of trees already present both within the road and the general area.

The relative allocation of both new and vacant sites is also determined by the significant variation in geographical area and road density within the eight community council regions.

The construction of new pits can commence in October and all trees planted by the end of February 2004, well within the suitable planting season.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Vacant Sites</th>
<th>New Sites</th>
<th>Total Vacant &amp; New</th>
<th>Remaining Requested New Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough &amp; Bankside</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead &amp; Peckham Rye</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 (20)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>311</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>556</strong></td>
<td><strong>769</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(figures in brackets refer to trees planted by Trees for London)

1. **Peckham - surveyed sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Location/Number</th>
<th>Shortlisted for planting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Way</td>
<td>22 sites</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culmore Rd</td>
<td>Brimmington Park</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geldart Rd</td>
<td>7 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Rd</td>
<td>6 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Grove</td>
<td>10 sites</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody Rd</td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naylor Rd</td>
<td>10 sites</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutcroft St</td>
<td>1 site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow St</td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire St</td>
<td>3 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studholme St</td>
<td>8 sites</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Av</td>
<td>Section 106 agreed</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Way</td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 54 new sites, 41 vacant sites. Potential 46 additional sites.
ATTACHMENT 3

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND AGREEMENTS FOR PECKHAM PULSE

Fusion:
• Manage the swimming pools, soft play facility, Health Suite and other general areas
• 10 year lease of above, defined areas, till 2010
• Condition of the lease includes responsibility for routine maintenance, excluding plant and structure (Council)
• Receive an annual revenue grant, which has been agreed for the next three years including 2003/04
• Performance targets, reviewed annually, include total visits and visits by high priority groups (including youth and disabled people)

Holmes Place plc:
• Manage the fitness gyms and studios and spa and sunbed suites
• 10 year lease of above, defined areas, till 2008
• Condition of the lease include responsibility for routine maintenance, excluding plant and structure (Council)
• Receive an annual management fee, on a sliding reducing scale and pay Council an agreed share of annual income
• Performance targets, reviewed annually, include total visits and visits by high priority groups (including youth and disabled people)

Planning Solutions:
• Manage the café and other catering services at the Pulse
• 10 year lease of above, defined areas, till 2008
• Condition of the lease include responsibility for routine maintenance, excluding plant and structure (Council)
• Pay an annual rent to the Council
• Performance targets currently being reviewed

Health Providers (including statutory and voluntary):
• Manage the health consultation suites
• Provide a range of primary health care services and complimentary therapies
• Pay an annual rent to the Pulse
ATTACHMENT 4

APPOINTMENT OF LEA REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNORS

1. **Purpose**

1.1 To consider the appointment of representatives to serve as LEA governors.

2. **Recommendations**

2.1 That the Community Council appoints individuals to serve as School Governors.

The attached appendix lists:-

(i) Any governors wishing to be appointed for a further term of office at their current school and who have sustained their membership through appropriate attendance at governing body meetings during their previous term.

(ii) Current vacancies in primary schools within the Community Council’s area. Any specific requirements by the schools concerned are listed.

(iii) Applications from new candidates for governorship, selected from the applications received by the Governor Development Service (GDS) in accordance with any expressed preference by the candidate, stated skills requirement or recommendation by a specific governing body and/or proximity to the school in question.

3. GDS will provide at least two candidates for each vacancy where sufficient applicants are available. Members who wish to view the entire list of applicants currently held in advance of the meeting are invited to contact Kathy Brabston in GDS on 020 7525 5109.

4. **Factors for consideration**

4.1 The Council previously made governors’ appointments using the following working principles:-

i. Nominees should be sought from as wide a field as possible. All potential nominees will be asked to complete a self nomination form. Those seeking re-nomination are also asked to complete the form.

ii. Self-nomination forms should be signed by someone willing to support the nomination. Where a self-nominee is not already known to the appointing panel or to officers of the LEA, the Governor Development Service will establish personal contact with the individual before the nomination is submitted to the panel.

iii. Appointments should be made according to at least one of the following criteria:
- The applicant has given evidence of interest and involvement in the social and/or educational community in Southwark.

- The applicant’s skills and experience would benefit the school [particularly were a school is in special measures etc].

- The applicant is specifically requested by a governing body, particularly where there are no other suitable nominees.

- Any preferences expressed by the applicant to serve as a governor of a particular school or in a specific geographical area.

Report author: David Lister
Acting Head of Governor Development
John Smith House
144-152 Walworth Road
London
SE17 1JL

Contact
020 7525 5109

Dated: 28.8.03
LEA GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS - PECKHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL

For consideration on 10 September 2003

1. Candidates for REAPPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Governor Vacancies [1 per school]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School’s requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Park, Marmont Road, SE15</td>
<td>None expressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Francis, Friary Road, SE15</td>
<td>Would like Mrs Rodgers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Applicants

Mr R Krishna-Murty

Mrs B M Rodgers – Would like St Francis and her application is supported by the Governing Body.

Mr H Nkrumah

Application forms attached.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PECKHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP
Councillor Graham Neale Chair
Councillor Barrie Hargrove
Councillor Jonathan Hunt
Councillor Billy Kayada
Councillor Richard Porter
Councillor Tayo Situ

MEMBERS ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND THIS MEETING

DATE OF DISPATCH: Tuesday, 2 September 2003

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.”

DEPUTATIONS

Deputations can only be made by a person or people resident or working in the borough. The deputation shall not concern approval or otherwise of a current planning or licensing applications but may address any other issue within the direct responsibility of the Council.

An application for a deputation to be heard shall be submitted in writing to the Borough Solicitor and Secretary. Any written representations or petitions associated with a deputation should ideally be submitted at the same time as the request for a deputation and no later than three clear working days before the meeting.

Members have discretion whether or not to receive the deputation.

INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Terms of Reference
The roles and functions of Community Council are detailed in Article 10 of the Southwark Council Constitution. A copy of the Terms of Reference can be obtained by contacting the Community Council Officer named below.

Access to information
You may request copies of minutes and reports on this agenda.

Carers’ Allowances
If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, and 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.

Wheelchair access
Wheelchair access is available at the main entrance of the Unity Building.

No smoking
Please note that under the Council Procedure Rule 1.1(i), smoking is not allowed at any meetings of Committees or Sub-Committees of the Council.

For further information please contact:
Geoff Whelan (Community Council Officer) - 020 7525 7187
If you want information on the Community Councils translated into your language please telephone 020 7525 0640

To inform us of any special needs or requirements, such as transport or signer/interpreter, please telephone 020 7525 0640
PRESENT

Councillor Graham Neale – Chair, Councillor Barry Hargrove, Councillor Jonathan Hunt, Councillor Richard Porter, Councillor Tayo Situ

Community Attendees (See attached list)

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The meeting was convened at 7:05pm.

The Chair welcomed the community to the Peckham Community Council and highlighted the housekeeping rules, and the availability of evaluation and complaint forms.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Billy Kayada.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Councillor Porter stated that he was good friends with Ms Molloy, who had put in a request for a deputation regarding broken fences on Glengall Road (Unwin Estate), and would not be voting on the issue, when it was discussed, even though Ms Molloy’s deputation was not going ahead as planned.
MATTERS RELATING TO PREVIOUS MEETING


The Chair requested that the minutes from the last two meetings be confirmed.

Councillor Hargrove disapproved of the wording used in the last paragraph of the minutes for 4 June in that the phrase “the woman” was inappropriate.

The Chair suggested that references to “the woman” should be struck out from that paragraph and replaced with the words “the questioner”. The Council agreed with this approach, the minutes for 4 June were amended accordingly and the Chair signed them off.

The Chair requested that the minutes from the 23 April 2003 meeting were confirmed. There were no objections to this request and the minutes were signed off.

OPEN COMMUNITY SESSION

Traffic Petition for a zebra crossing on Meeting House Lane

The Chair invited Mrs JP Browne to make the petition on behalf of herself and other residents of Harry Lambourne House.

Mrs Browne outlined that the residents of Harry Lambourne House were requesting that a pedestrian crossing be installed on the western end of Meeting House Lane, near the intersection with Asylum Road and the yard behind King’s Grove.

Mrs Browne outlined that it was extremely difficult for residents of Harry Lambourne House, who are senior citizens, to cross the road at the speed required to make it across safely. Their ability to do so, she said, was made more difficult because they were also often using trolleys when they were crossing the road.

The Chair produced photographs of the intersection that Mrs Browne was discussing and asked her to confirm the correct intersection that she was referring to.

Mrs Browne confirmed that was the intersection she was referring to, and outlined exactly where she would prefer the crossing to go.

The Chair asked that Chris Mascord from the Traffic and Transport Department make note of where Mrs Browne indicated her preference for a crossing would be. He then asked for suggestions from Chris as to how Mrs Browne’s request could be progressed.
Mr Mascord suggested that the petition be dealt with in either of two ways:

1. by investigating a signalised crossing by putting in a bid in the Borough Spending Plan for funding, or
2. by putting in a zebra crossing funded by the Council if funding from Transport for London through the Borough Spending Plan was not granted.

Mr Mascord took responsibility for following up this issue. He explained that bidding for the Borough Spending Plan was a process by which the Council had the opportunity to bid for funding from Transport for London for certain types of traffic and transport schemes.

Councillor Hargrove asked what the timetable for installing the crossing requested would be.

Mr Mascord outlined that before the timing could be finalised, funding would first need to be secured from Transport for London. He outlined that the borough’s bids would need to be prepared by 21 July 2003 and would be submitted to Executive on 29 July. It was further outlined that Transport for London were likely to provide the Council with a response in about October or November of this year, after which time the crossing could be installed by about Christmas time.

Alternatively, Mr Mascord mentioned that a zebra crossing, funded by the Council, would be a quicker option and could be completed within a few months.

The Chair asked Mrs Browne which option would be preferred. Mrs Browne said that her preference would be for the option that was the quickest.

The Chair asked Chris Mascord whether a signalised crossing would have a facility for people with visual disabilities. Mr Mascord said that a signalised crossing could include that facility.

Members expressed a general interest in supporting Mrs Browne’s request and in getting the Traffic and Transport Department to begin work to try and obtain funding for a crossing.

The Chair asked whether the Council would like to make a formal motion on the matter at that point in the meeting. The motion was deferred until later in the meeting.

**Deputation regarding the Unwin Estate**

Councillor Hargrove mentioned that there would be no deputation regarding the Unwin Estate at the meeting, given that the deputee, Ms Molloy worked nights as a paramedic and was unable to attend the meeting because she had important community work to do.

Councillor Porter said that he had spoken to Ms Molloy about the issue and could discuss her requests with the meeting if they would like to discuss the issue now.
The Chair suggested that the issue be discussed as a part of the workshops that were to occur later in the evening.

**Update on the New Peckham Wharf Development**

David Johnson from the Property Department was invited to give an update on the development. He outlined that the development related to the last part of the completion of Peckham Square on the site that was occupied by Whitten Timber. The development would include apartments, commercial space, a performance venue, a plasma screen at the top of the building as well as a camera obscura.

Mr Johnson outlined further that Baylight Properties had been appointed as the developer for the project, after a public consultation and tender process was conducted.

Mr Johnson mentioned that the question of what to do with the performance space in the middle of the development was an issue that has yet to be resolved. One suggestion on how to deal with the space was that a trust could be established, which would employ a manager and staff for the space to manage and maintain it and to let it out to performance groups.

However, Mr Johnson explained that there was a funding problem in establishing and running the trust, given that the cost of doing so would be ongoing on a yearly basis. He estimated that the cost would range between £500,000 - £1,000,000 per year.

In addition to this, the Council would be required to pay for the lighting, heating and fit out of the performance space, as this was not included as an item that the developer tendered for.

Mr Johnson outlined that another option for the performance space was to have a London Orchestra permanently occupy the performance space. He specified that the Council is currently in discussions with the London Symphony Orchestra (LSO). The LSO and the Council are currently looking at what the LSO’s involvement will bring to the borough, and David requested that community members hold off on judging any proposals until the details for this option have been confirmed.

The Chair called for any questions from the meeting.

David Kitchen from the Peckham Settlement mentioned that he had attended the consultations on this development and noted that at that time there was a concern that the development would obscure the lovely view that can be seen from Peckham library. He asked whether the Peckham Wharf development would actually affect the view from the library in the end.
David Johnson responded stating that the view would not be lost from the top floors of the library. He mentioned that the proposed building is not much taller than the existing building, but it is slightly taller.

Krystina Stimzkovich from the Southwark Arts Forum asked about what had happened to the original proposal to install a multimedia centre to complement the performance space.

Mr Johnson confirmed that this is another suggested use for the area that has been earmarked for the performance space.

Peter Barter outlined that the community media component was intended as a youth facility to assist young people in enhancing their television and broadcasting skills.

Chris outlined that this was still being considered as a part of the plan.

Mr Johnson confirmed that that the multimedia centre was still being considered.

Andy Mitchell from the Southwark Arts Forum spoke next, and outlined that he was working with the Peckham Partnership to support the performing arts space. He mentioned that he required final figures for the development from David Johnson before he could prepare a development and business plan for the space.

He also asked when the money for the development will be released so that work on a business plan can begin.

Mr Johnson’s response outlined that the dimensions of the building were already available. He outlined that the divisions for the walls, the roof, and the main internal partitions had already been decided, but the Council was required to pay for the fit out of the building, which had not yet been finalised.

He also mentioned that the costings for the project were difficult to provide at this stage given that they were still being negotiated with the developer, but he indicated that he would be happy to discuss these issues with Mr Mitchell.

Mr Mitchell then asked what had happened to the idea of putting a café/bar in the performance space, with the aim of turning the space into an area of “critical mass”. He wanted more information on the size of the space that had been allotted for the performance space, which he thought was not clear.

Mr Johnson’s response outlined that there was some flexibility on this issue, and that it was up to groups like the Southwark Arts Forum to put forward proposals on what they would like to see in the performance space. He outlined that the inclusion of a catering unit of some sort would be an essential feature of the facility but the detail would need to be determined after further studies are carried out.
Mr Johnson commented further, stating that at this stage the nature of the commercial space may change and that the Council Executive was yet to determine whether the proceeds from the sale of the land for the site would go directly to the construction and fit out of the building and the performance space. He outlined that the main problem with the performance space was obtaining the capital cost to run the venue on a continual basis.

Councillor Hunt asked Mr Johnson to clarify whether the land for the development site was currently owned by the Council and was being sold to the developer. He asked whether the revenue raised from the sale of the land would be used by the Council to pay for the development of the apartments and for the basic structure of the development.

David Johnson confirmed that this was the case.

Andy Mitchell then queried whether the proceeds from the sale of the land could be used to pay for the fit out of the building, including the performance space.

Councillor Hunt then asked whether the proceeds from the sale of the land were actually going into the Council’s “back pocket”.

David Johnson responded stating that how the proceeds from the sale of land could be spent was a political decision, which would be left up to the Council itself to decide upon.

Krystina Stimzkovich outlined that she thought that the new performance space at the wharf was intended to replace the civic centre on Old Kent Road, and if this was the case, she suggested renting out or selling the civic centre to pay for the performance space.

Mr Johnson stated that there was no direct connection between the development of the performance space and the civic centre, especially since the original intention for the performance space was to create a commercial development with a bowling alley and shopping facilities, but there was little developer interest in this idea. He stated that the civic centre was currently let, but he was not aware of the details and that it would be possible to sell the centre to finance the performance space, although the idea had not yet been entertained.

Councillor Hargrove asked David Johnson if he was an employee of the Council, or whether he was a consultant.

Mr Johnson stated that he was an employee of the Council and not a consultant.

Councillor Hargrove asked for clarification as to whether Baylight Properties was reneging on the commitments that it had made to the project in order to outbid the other interested developer, Urban Capital, during the consultation phase.
Mr Johnson outlined that Baylight Properties was still keen to proceed with the development but the issue of what was to be done with the middle part of the development needed to be decided first.

Andy Mitchell raised the point that the 1998 Arts Plan for the Civic Centre outlined that there was an increasing need for a performance space and suggested that the civic centre be sold. He suggested this as an avenue that should be explored further.

Michael Bukola from Urban Catalyst then asked whether the Council was developing the idea of putting a hotel at the development which would offer discounted accommodation for creative practitioners with the intent of inducing creative clustering in the Peckham area.

Mr Johnson said that this was a good idea, but there had been little developer interest in the notion. He stated that the idea would be more likely to come to fruition if a tram service was built to cover the Peckham area.

Michael Bukola asked whether the accommodation he spoke of could be offered as a parallel to residences being developed at discount prices.

Mr Johnson said that this was a good idea and that the Council was trying to establish Peckham as a centre for the arts, and in doing so would try to provide accommodation for artists. However he was uncertain as to whether this would be feasible as a part of the wharf development, or as a part of a different development.

He stated that other opportunities for Peckham were also being looked at, which would involve installing the accommodation on the back of a residential development in the area.

Councillor Situ asked whether the Council had considered the cost for the use of the services and whether they would be affordable for members of the public.

Mr Johnson replied, stating that this issue was being considered and that there was no point in establishing the venue if it was not going to be affordable, however there is a continuing problem of how to run the venue with limited funds. He said that the Council would need to ensure affordability in setting up the facilities.

Krystina Stimzkovich from the Southwark Arts Forum stated that she was also on a Wharf Steering Group. She commented on the discussions that had been taking place with the National Philharmonic Orchestra.

Ms Stimzkovich stated that the Orchestra was keen to become involved with the project and the trust, but were reluctant to be the sole provider for the venue. Its preference was to be a part of a consortium to fund the space.

Councillor Hunt asked for further explanation of how the trust would be set up.
Mr Johnson stated that a steering group would be set up to undertake this function.

Andy Mitchell outlined that the trust would run on a commercial basis and would subsidise certain activities and areas regarding the performance space.

Councillor Hunt asked whether the trust would include the LPO?

Andy Mitchell said that it would.

Councillor Hunt asked whether it was now a question of needing the money to set up the trust.

Andy Mitchell suggested that there were avenues for funding that were currently available and have money that may be used towards this cause.

Councillor Hargrove asked whether local tenant’s organisations were involved in the discussions currently being held.

Krystina Stimzkovich asked whether Councillor Hargrove was actually referring to local organisations that work in the arts.

Councillor Hargrove clarified that he was specifically referring to local tenant’s organisations.

Andy Mitchell said that there was scope for local tenant’s organisations to be involved with the project and that their participation would be encouraged.

Councillor Hunt suggested that Councillors discuss this issue again later during the formal decision making part of the meeting.

**Children’s Services and the Development of Children’s Centres**

The Chair invited Sara Willis and David Wallis to deliver a presentation on this topic. Sara outlined that £4.1 million capital funds and £1.4 million in revenue funds have been earmarked for expenditure in 2004 to 2006 as a part of the National Childcare Strategy. She outlined that the Council was considering installing two child care centres in Peckham, one of which may be put in the Woodene Estate, after consultation on the issue.

The Chair then called for questions from the public.

Althea Smith from ACORN and the ACORN Neighbourhood Forum commented that Wooddene is a part of the Acorn Estate and asked why no consultation had been done in the area about opening a child care centre there.

Sara Willis stated that the presentation at the Peckham Community Council meeting was the beginning of the consultation process and that wider
consultation would be taking place before any decisions were made. However Ms Wallis offered to take Ms Smith’s details and make sure that she was well informed during the consultation process.

Ali Balli commented that he had been working with Harriet Harman on closures of Peckham Nurseries and was glad that this issue was now progressing.

He asked the following questions:

1. why is the funding being earmarked for child care services and how long would it take for any money to be spent, or for any results to be obtained?
2. why has there been a withdrawal of grants to child nurseries as a part of the anti-poverty strategy?

David Wallis responded outlining that the pool of funding came from new government money allocated to the borough, which the Council has the opportunity to bid for by 15 October this year. The Council would be informed about the success of the bid this year, and any child care centres bid for would need to be completed by 2006.

Mr Wallis explained that the Council would be putting a paper to Executive after visiting community forums at the first Executive meeting in September.

Regarding Mr Balli’s second question, David Wallis explained that the decision to withdraw grants was a part of the National Childcare Strategy, and was working in coordination with the Working Families Tax Credit scheme, which was difficult to implement initially, hence the reason why grants were maintained in the first year, but cut in the second year of the scheme.

Mr Wallis explained that according to this theory, tax offsets offered to families would be offset against Council grant payouts, and that the Executive was monitoring this arrangement closely to make sure that no nurseries were lost.

David Kitchen from Peckham Settlement stated that the Peckham Settlement had a strong interest in working in partnership with Woodene Estate and had already approached Sara Willis with a view to doing just that.

He stated that the Peckham Settlement was pleased that grants were tapering because less than 20 percent of people using the Peckham Settlement child care facilities were actually able to access the tax scheme, therefore nurseries couldn’t increase fees without risking losing customers.

**Cleaner, Greener, Safer Program**

Dave Strevens gave a presentation on how the money from this program could be used to improve the local environment and to fix problems with street lighting, or the lack of street lighting.

The Chair then asked for questions from the audience.
Daniel Dougherty outlined that most lighting in the area is right next to trees, so visibility from those lights were bound to be reduced. Mr Dougherty also pointed out that there had been 5 attacks and one shooting on Commercial Way. He requested that CCTV be installed in the area.

Stephanie Lodge noted that there was a problem with 2 duplicated lights on Peckham High Street near St James’ School. She asked why there was a duplication in the first place.

Dave Strevens offered to take this question back to officers in the Council for further investigation.

Colin Hunte asked what had happened to the idea of implementing bollard schemes.

Dave Strevens responded stating that this was still possible depending on the proposals that were made at the meeting.

David Kitchen highlighted that proposal 5 from the list of pre-prepared schemes should be altered to include the widening of the path on the way to Safeways so that people do not walk by the bus garage.

Dave Strevens offered to pass these details onto officers to follow them up.

Patricia Ajayi outlined that the workshops would allow people the opportunity to comment on matters like the ones being discussed.

Councillor Hargrove reiterated that ideas would be workedshopped at the meeting. He asked Dave Strevens how the capital works and lighting schemes were being funded and whether they were from the same pool of money.

Mr Strevens replied outlining that there were two separate funding streams for each category of expenditure.

Councillor Situ asked what was being done regarding the problem of cyclists on the pavement.

Dave Strevens replied that the Police Community Support Officers and wardens have not been taking action on this issue, and it was up to the government accredited warden schemes to deal with cycling problems in each individual area.

Krystina Stimzkovich mentioned that there was a problem with Willowbrook Road and the amount of accidents there. She outlined that there was no crossing on that road either.

The Chair noted her concerns but explained that the issue had been raised at a previous meeting and is being dealt with.
Boundaries of Peckham Community Council

The Chair then invited Mary to speak about this issue given that she raised it at the last meeting. She outlined that she thought that the Peckham Community Council is not properly representative of Peckham, firstly because the boundary does not include all of what is considered by the people to be “Peckham”, and secondly because the meetings did not have a strong community turn-out.

Mary stated that she was concerned about decisions being made that affected the Peckham community, even though the community was not involved.

The Chair thanked Mary for her comments and asked that she assist the Peckham Community Council in mustering up local support by bringing friends along to the meeting and letting people know that the meetings were on.

Councillor Hargrove asked Mary to recap the issue that she raised at the last meeting about the boundary between Peckham Community Council and Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council. He mentioned that at the last meeting Mary raised the issue of how she was technically within the boundary for the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council, given that she lived on Astbury Road, even though she considered herself to be a part of the Peckham community.

Mary reiterated that she shouldn’t have to go to the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council meetings and outlined that she did not understand the divisions between the community council areas.

Councillor Hargrove thanked Mary for her contribution and outlined that he sympathised with her viewpoint, however he also pointed out that if she went to the Peckham Community Council meetings she may be disadvantaged because the Peckham Community Council could not make decisions regarding her local area.

The Chair outlined that Peckham Community Council is working with the Camberwell, Walworth and Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Councils where there is boundary overlap issues, but unfortunately boundaries need to be drawn. The Chair outlined that communication between the councils should be fostered and encouraged.

Althea Smith reiterated Mary’s point that Peckham issues were perhaps not best dealt with in the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council area.

Councillor Hargrove suggested that the Peckham Community Council should request that the Astbury Road / York Grove and Brimmington Estate areas of 'East Peckham' be incorporated into Peckham Community Council at the upcoming review of community councils to be undertaken by the Executive in September.
Councillor Situ stated that proper adjustment to the area should be made with proper consultation.

Councillor Hargrove recommended that a motion be passed on this issue, outlining what was said, but the vote was deferred until later in the evening.

Patricia Ajayi was then invited to explain how the workshops would be run on the evening and the meeting adjourned.

**Workshops**

At 8:40 the meeting was adjourned for workshops and an officer surgery. The meeting was reconvened at 9:00pm.

Patricia Ajayi reported the feedback from the workshops to the meeting. Firstly, regarding the lighting, she reported that:

- many areas in Peckham currently meet the Southwark lighting standard, but there may be a possibility to upgrade lighting so it is above standard.
- the following areas required improved lighting:
  1. St Georges Way, opposite Burgess Park
  2. Burgess Park. Patricia also reported community concerns about litter bins in the Burgess Park area. More bins were requested and there was feedback outlining that there is a problem with rats and foxes going onto the estates nearby. There was also a general query as to what happened to the poison bait put up in the area.
  3. Gloucester Grove
  4. Grenard Close
  5. Meeting House Lane
  6. Leo Street
  7. Astbury Road

The Chair noted that some of the areas referred to above did not fall within the boundaries of the Peckham Community Council and informed the meeting that the relevant community councils would be contacted about the areas.

Secondly, regarding ideas for capital expenditure on improving the environment, Adrian Newman reported the following feedback from the workshops:

- Of the pre-prepared proposals for capital expenditure, the community’s preferences were for:
  1. A community garden at St John’s Church
  2. Better lights (smart lighting) at Jowett Street play park (currently under construction)
3. Upgrading the shop fronts for the parade of shops west or east of Queen’s Road. Re-paving and fencing off areas to prevent anti-social behaviour.

4. Peckham High Street, entrance to Dunstall House, corner of Marmont Road. Construction of an extension to the entrance to bring a new secure front door in line with the main building line. Re-position BT phone box and border-off remaining open land as far as the footpath boundary. This will remove the space currently available for loitering and urination. With less people hanging around at the door the opportunities for unauthorised access are reduced.

5. Peckham High Street - gateway project to improve pedestrian lighting, reduce clutter through rationalisation of unnecessary signage and railings, improve traffic flow.

6. Town Centre Strategy - Lighting, signage and basic shop-front work for new Safe Community Centre

- The community also suggested the following environmental improvements to the area:

  1. Turning the canal path into a joint cycle-pedestrian path.
  2. Widening the Safeways path near Kelly Avenue and the bus garage.
  3. Revising the bin policy on Peckham High Street – there is a problem with flies being attracted.
  4. Upgrading the Peckham Pulse to avoid young people from damaging and climbing its infrastructure.
  5. Investigating how to manage the rubbish at the corner of Lisford and Jocelyn Streets.
  6. Improving the fences around the 3 travellers’ sites in Peckham.

Councillor Porter noted that a lot of proposals were made and these ideas should be fully costed over the summer.

The Chair suggested that a final decision be put off on the issue of how to spend the funds until the September meeting.

Krystina Stimzkovich asked whether the Council would be willing to make a decision on the top priorities from the pre-prepared list of proposals.

The Chair then requested a re-cap of the top two priorities from that list.

Adrian Newman recapped accordingly, stating that:

1. The community garden at St John’s Church would install a community garden in the concrete courtyard that currently exists outside the Church.
2. The smart-lighting at the soon to be opened Jowett Street play park, adjacent to the canal, would combat the darkness in that area.

Russell Profitt stated that this should be subject to consultation with the residents in the area.
The Chair inquired as to whether the pre-prepared projects were fully costed.

Councillor Porter replied that they were, and also mentioned that he had a separate project costed for the replacement of fences on the Unwin Estate, Glengall Road, where residents on the estate were asking for fences to be replaced with a brick wall to stop youths from driving their mopeds into the fences and vandalising them.

The Chair suggested that Members approve the top two priorities, subject to consultation being conducted for the Jowett Street project.

Councillor Hargrove indicated that he was willing to support the safety measures on Glengall Road.

The Chair suggested that there were issues regarding costing for that project.

Councillor Hunt agreed and requested that officers report on this at the next meeting after hearing the deputation on the subject, which would hopefully go ahead.

Michael Bukola asked how the Council is dealing with existing projects such as the Peckham Pulse leisure centre. He asked what was being done to prevent the demise of the Pulse, since he thought that the regular maintenance of the centre was diminishing.

The Chair stated that an officer would write to Fusion following up Mr Bukola’s query.

Tony Urquhart from the Southwark Travel Action Group stated that the group would be willing to cost projects and provide these costings to Councillors.

The Chair accepted the offer and requested that such costings be provided to Members as soon as possible.

Althea Smith pointed out that the costings for projects prioritised as 1 and 2 from the pre-prepared list had already been undertaken.

The Chair suggested that a vote on the issue be deferred until later in the evening.

Stephanie Lodge stated that she thought that the Peckham Pulse project was not properly planned.

The Chair suggested that this could be a topic to be discussed at the next meeting.

Councillor Hargrove invited David Eatwell from ACORN to discuss the issue of fencing on Glengall Road.
David Eatwell indicated that Housing would be willing to accept any funds it could be given.

Patricia Ajayi suggested that Members determine which projects they would like costed and then which projects they would like to progress with immediately.

The Chair put forward the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Hargrove and agreed by Members:

The Community Council agreed, in consideration of the community’s views, to fund the following projects under the Cleaner, Greener, Safer program:

1. to redevelop the small-medium community garden behind the hall at St John's Church, installing the garden in the concrete area.
2. To install smart lighting at Jowett Street/Canal Walk near the play park being installed, subject to consultation with locals and local organisations being undertaken first.

Councillor Hargrove raised the issue of the fences on Glengall Road again, supporting the replacement of the fences on the Unwin Estate. He outlined that the proposal for replacing the fences in question with a brick wall had been costed at £22,000.

The Chair questioned how many gardens were bound by the fences in question.

Dave Eatwell said that the fences bound 8 gardens.

The Chair commented that this project is only going to benefit 8 families, and asked whether the fences could be repaired rather than replaced with a wall.

Councillor Porter replied that a costing had been drawn up for fixing the fences, which was cheaper than replacing the fence with a wall, but mopeds were driven into the fences before and they were damaged. A brick wall would make sure that this did not happen again.

Councillor Situ outlined that he would be willing to second the motion, given the safety considerations involved for residents living on the Unwin Estate.

Councillor Hunt stated that he would like to hear the deputation before deciding on the issue, and that he thought other options could be canvassed, including replacing the fence with a part wall, part fence. Councillor Hunt indicated that he may be willing to vote with the majority on this issue, however.

Russell Profitt suggested that there were a number of projects for costing that could be brought back to the September meeting, keeping in mind that one of the criteria for the Cleaner, Greener, Safer program is value for money.
Councillor Porter stated that residents of the Unwin Estate would like the issue of the fences dealt with before the summer is over because the anti-social behaviour in the area gets worse over the summer period.

The Chair asked Dave Eatwell whether the leaseholders on the Unwin Estate would be required to contribute to the replacement or upgrade of the fences on the Unwin Estate.

Dave Eatwell responded stating that 2 of the 8 fences in question were privately owned and that Council improvements to the fences could not be charged for. So, if the fences were replaced with a brick wall, the Council would not be entitled to charge the leaseholders for this upgrade.

Councillor Hargrove indicated that he was in favour with replacing the fences with a wall.

Althea Smith asked whether the funds would also be used to replace the walls in surrounding estates also.

Councillor Hargrove tabled a motion to support the replacement of the fences with a brick wall, which was seconded by Councillor Situ.

The Chair and Councillor Hunt voted against the proposal. Councillor Porter refrained from voting due to the personal interest he disclosed at the beginning of the meeting. The Chair cast the deciding vote against funding the project at that stage.

Members noted that they would be willing to discuss the issue again at the next meeting. Councillor Hunt stated that he would like to hear the deputation at the next meeting before making a decision on the matter. Councillor Hunt indicated that he would also like a more detailed report on the matter from officers.

Councillor Hargrove pointed out that a report had already been provided by ACORN.

Summary of decision:

1. The Community Council agreed, in consideration of the community views, not to fund the replacement of the broken fences on the Unwin Estate, Glengall Road, at that time.

2. The Community Council accepted that the issue could be reconsidered at the next meeting subject to a report and further information being available, after the deputation on this issue could be heard.

Venues

The Chair noted that from the report attached to the agenda for the meeting, there were three clear options for the venue for the next meeting.
Russell Profitt suggested that the next 2 meetings be held at the Wickway Centre.

Councillor Situ suggested spreading the meetings across different venues across Peckham so that they would be widely accessible to the Peckham community.

Councillor Hargrove asked what the situation was regarding the availability of Bells Gardens Community Centre.

Patricia Ajayi responded stating that the update on the venue was that it appeared to be available, it had capacity for 150 people and had good disabled access.

Althea Smith stated that the acoustics at Bells Gardens were a problem.

Krystina Stimzkovich asked what was being done to improve the acoustics at that venue given that it was a Council building.

A member of the community commented that if the venue kept changing people would not be willing to come to the meetings.

The Chair moved that the next three meetings be held at the Bells Gardens Community Centre, with the Unity Centre as a second option if the first option was not available.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Situ and agreed by the remaining Members.

**Voting on Other Issues**

**Peckham Wharf development**

The following motion was agreed regarding the Peckham Wharf:

The Peckham Community Council passed the following motion:

The Community Council thanked the council officers and representatives of the community for their reports, comments and contributions to the discussion on the proposed New Peckham Wharf community performing arts centre.

The Council welcomed the New Peckham Wharf as a much needed and overdue amenity, to complement the new library and Peckham Pulse, in providing a venue where quality arts activity may be performed; in attracting people to Peckham; in providing a showcase for the vibrant and exciting range of talent that exists in our community; and in offering ancillary facilities.

The Council pledged to offer all possible assistance and support to the project, in partnership with local residents and organisations.
Council believes the best option for progressing the project is to form a locally based working party, including representatives from interested bodies, such as representatives of the local community, Peckham Voluntary Sector, the LPO, the Southwark Arts Forum and other arts organisations and any commercial partners, and for it to commission a professional assessment as to its viability, and to produce a business plan.

The Council asks the Borough Council Executive to fund such an assessment and business plan and to provide such assistance and support as this Council may require.

The Council asks the Borough Council Executive, to ensure that all proceeds raised from the sale of the land for the development, go to the Peckham Wharf project.

The motion was introduced by Councillor Hunt, seconded by Councillor Hargrove and supported by Councillor Situ. Councillor Porter abstained from voting as a member of the Executive. The Chair also abstained from voting. The motion was agreed.

**Boundaries of Peckham Community Council**

Councillor Hargrove then introduced the following motion:

The Peckham Community Council agreed, after considering the community’s views, that the interests of residents in Astbury Road, York Grove and Brimmington Estate will be better represented with the Peckham Community Council area, rather than the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council area, of which it is currently part. The Peckham Community Council therefore resolved to make this view known to the appropriate Council body in time for the six monthly review of Community Councils.

Councillor Hunt suggested that the words “will be better represented” be replaced with the words “may be better represented”.

Councillor Hargrove refused to accept the change.

Councillor Hunt outlined that he suggested the change because no consultation had been undertaken on the issue to prove whether or not better representation would actually be forthcoming as a result of the change.

Councillor Hargrove then tabled the following motion:

The Peckham Community Council agreed, after considering the community’s views, that the interests of residents in Astbury Road, York Grove and Brimmington Estate may be better represented with the Peckham Community Council area, rather than the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council area, of which it is currently part. The Peckham Community Council therefore
resolved to make this view known to the appropriate Council body in time for the six monthly review of Community Councils.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Hunt and agreed by the remaining Members.

Other Business

Councillor Porter suggested that in future motions be tabled before a meeting so that Members can evaluate them properly.

Councillor Hargrove responded stating that this would prevent motions being raised from the floor, but in 95 percent of the cases it would not pose a problem.

Traffic Petition

The Chair moved the following motion, which was unanimously agreed by the Members:

That the Peckham Community Council would ask officers to enable a crossing at the Western End of Meeting House Lane, near King’s Grove, by:

1. pursuing a bid for funding to Transport for London, through the Borough Spending Plan, for a signalised crossing, which can also be used by people with visual impairments; or, where funding is not provided;
2. installing a zebra crossing without signals.

Street-lighting

The Council then passed the following motion regarding street lighting:

The Community Council agreed, after consideration of community views, to endorse the suggestions to improve lighting in the following areas and to recommend them for improvement under the Cleaner, Greener, Safer Program:

1. St Georges Way, opposite Burgess Park
2. Burgess Park
3. Gloucester Grove
4. Grenard Close
5. Meeting House Lane
6. Leo Street
7. Astbury Road
Other Business

The Chair requested that officers report back to the Council well before the September meeting (by August) with feasibility studies and costings of new proposals suggested under the capital scheme from the workshops. The Chair indicated that he would like Members to be able to consider proposals during the August recess, so that they will be ready to make decisions in September.

Bill Murphy stated that officers would do their best to do this, but may be constrained by the fact that they are required to report back to 8 community councils.

The Chair closed the meeting by thanking everyone for coming. The date for the next meeting was announced for 10 September 2003 at 7pm. The Chair also informed the meeting that there were brochures on becoming a school governor for primary schools available at the back of the hall if anyone was interested in doing so.

The meeting closed at 9:45 pm.
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