

TAKE **note**

Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council



Nunhead and Peckham Rye

Minutes Agreements Form

southwark.gov.uk/communitycouncil

Minutes to be agreed at the next meeting

Date	Wednesday July 22 2009
Venue	Rye Oak Primary School and Children's Centre, Whorlton Road, London, SE15 3PD
Start time	7:05 pm
Finish time	9:35 pm
In attendance	<p>Councillors: Mark Glover (Chair), Althea Smith (Vice-Chair), Aubyn Graham, Susan Elan Jones, Gordon Nardell, Robert Smeath, Dominic Thorncroft</p> <p>Also in attendance: Cllr Tim McNally, Executive Member for Resources.</p>
Absent	Cllrs Fiona Colley and Evrim Laws.
Apologies received	Cllrs Nardell and Thorncroft for lateness; Cllrs Colley and Laws for absence.
Members' interests and dispensations	None
Late / Urgent items	<p>Acts of vandalism at the last Community Council meeting on June 10 2009</p> <p>The Chair said he needed to address an issue which had caused him serious concern. During the last Community Council meeting at St Mary Magdalene Primary School, a display had been damaged, and the staff display board had been defaced with graffiti.</p> <p>The Chair said that he was very upset by these incidents.</p>

These acts of vandalism were outrageous, especially because the Community Council had been guests of the school and because investing in education was one of the main themes discussed at Community Council meetings. He went on to say that at this stage, he did not know who was responsible for the damage. If he found out, this person or persons would be reported to the police, and would be banned from future meetings. The Chair said that he had written to the head teacher to apologise, to express his disgust at the incidents and to reassure her that officers and members would be vigilant in the future. He said that the school was understandably nervous about hiring out the hall to the Community Council again. He went on to encourage people to let him know straight away, if they witnessed anyone damaging or defacing any premises before, during or after a meeting.

Parking in Peckham Town Centre

The Chair called on Eileen Conn, a resident, to address the meeting about parking in Peckham Town Centre. She said that 18 months ago, 24hrs 7-day-a-week parking charges had been introduced at the council-run car parks in Peckham Town Centre. However, the residents-only parking imposed by the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) ended at 6:30pm and only operated six days a week. This led to potential shoppers being discouraged from coming to Peckham Town Centre, because of the charges. The current arrangements also caused residents problems in terms of finding parking after 6:30pm and on Sundays.

Eileen Conn asked Members to support a deputation of local traders and residents to the Executive to protest about car parking charges in Peckham Town Centre.

The Chair said that unregulated parking was a safety issue, and that free parking could be used as an incentive to get people to shop in Peckham. He went on to say that the Community Council had sent several motions calling on the council to look at this issue. It was important to increase the footfall in Peckham, in order to encourage shops to come to the area. The extra revenue generated by the newly introduced parking fees in Peckham was only £40,000 a year. This money could be used to stimulate the economy in Peckham, and to help stop the dislocation of businesses away from Peckham. He proposed Members support and join deputation to the Executive.

AGREED: Members agreed to support the planned deputation of local traders and residents to the Executive to protest about car parking charges in Peckham Town Centre.

	<p>Cllr Graham made an announcement regarding primary school places in the East Dulwich and Peckham areas. He said that he had had a large number of enquiries from, and seen a number of parents in his surgery who had experienced difficulties in getting places for their children in the schools in the area. He said he was collecting evidence on these cases in order to help resolve the situation. He encouraged all residents who experienced problems around this issue to contact him.</p>
Announcements	None

ITEM 5	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON JUNE 10 2009
	<p>AGREED: Members agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on June 10 2009 are a true and accurate record of that Community Council meeting.</p> <p>The Chair duly signed the minutes.</p>
ITEM 6	MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS
	<p>Public Toilets on Peckham Rye Common</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Cllr McNally, Executive Member for resources, to the meeting and thanked him for attending to talk about this issue.</p> <p>Cllr McNally introduced Stephen Platts (StP), Head of Property, and Neil Martindale (NM), Portfolio Business Manager, who he had invited along to answer questions on this topic.</p> <p>Cllr McNally explained that Southwark's annual budget was £1.5bn and that this was split into four elements: the general budget, the dedicated schools grant, the housing revenue account and the capital budget. The capital budget was made up of grants, Section 106 money, shared profits and funds generated by the sale of properties.</p> <p>Cllr McNally went on to say that Southwark owned a substantial number of properties: 43,070 in total - 1,720 of which were non-housing stock. He explained that the property team handled the sale and lettings of all properties which were under £500k in value. More valuable assets were decided on by the Executive.</p> <p>The Community Council was likely to interact with the property department in four ways. First, by spending some of the monies that the property department helped raise. The funding for Cleaner Greener Safer (CGS) and the newly agreed, devolved budget of £175,000 for highways and lighting improvements came from money raised by the property section.</p>
Q1	The Chair asked whether the devolved budget for highways and lighting improvements had been agreed, or whether it was still in the proposal stage.
A1	<p>Cllr McNally confirmed that this budget was in place, as he had outlined.</p> <p>Cllr Smith said that residents and Members of the Community Council would hold Cllr McNally to the information he gave at the meeting.</p>

Cllr McNally went on to say that the second way the Community Council interacted with the property department was through the planning process, for example, when there was a change of use that had been applied for. The consultation around the future plans for Nunhead Green, which would commence soon, was an example of this.

Stephen Platts (StP) explained that the Community Council would be involved in the consultation around Nunhead Green, as it was considered a key site. This was also the reason why the property department would conduct a consultation exercise with the community about which uses of the land they would like to see. The views expressed by Members and residents would be fed back into the development brief, and the property would have to be developed within the conditions set out in this brief. StP emphasised that this was not going to be done for all properties which were up for sale. An exception was being made on this occasion, because the property was considered to be so prominent in the area.

Cllr McNally went on to say that another way of Community Councils being involved in decisions about the council's properties, was the sale of assets valued at more than £500,000. These would automatically be sent to the Executive, at which point local people would have the opportunity to make their views known – either through their ward councillors or by sending a deputation to the Executive.

Cllr McNally said that the fourth way Community Councils could have a say on property related matters was to invite Executive Members or officers from the property section to attend Community Council meetings.

StP explained that the property section operated in a statutory framework which required it to get the best value for the council's assets and to maximise the returns on lettings and sales. He went on to say that the statutory framework allowed some flexibility for local policies.

He went on to explain that the management of the council's properties was devolved down from the Executive to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods, and then to the properties department. For further information on how the sales of properties were managed, he referred attendees to the Asset Management Plan on the Southwark website. Adopted by the council's Executive, this document gave information about the council's approach to lettings and the disposal of commercial properties. The council's approach was not just about maximising the revenue generated, but also about encouraging a healthy business environment which met the needs of commercial tenants. For example, after consultation with some of the commercial tenants the council had recently introduced a system of paying for rents in monthly instalments, rather than on a quarterly basis. This would help the cash flow of businesses hit by the economic downturn. StP then explained the process of making a letting. He pointed out, however, that consulting on individual lettings would be impractical and totally inappropriate, as it would require businesses to reveal commercially sensitive information. However,

	the views of the community would be taken into account.
Q2, Q3, Q4	Cllr Smith thanked Cllr McNally and StP for the information they had provided, and asked why they had not addressed a possible community use for the former toilets on Peckham Rye Common. In terms of the redevelopment of Nunhead Green, she asked why the Community Centre could not be reopened, and what the council was doing generally about community use of its facilities.
Q5	Mick Barnard, a resident, enquired about the status of the land around the former toilets. Did it, in fact, have protected common land status?
Q6, Q7	<p>Eileen Conn asked why the property department had not taken into account other council policies, such as the Community Asset Transfer Policy and the Community Cohesion Strategy. She said that she was very happy for the council to try to maximise its receipts from the sale of its properties, but the council should take into account its own policies. She asked StP to explain how the council's management of its assets tied in with these policies. The former toilets were a community asset and should be treated as such.</p> <p>She also enquired what information had been given by the housing department to the property section about the status of the land surrounding the buildings. She asked why the 'common land' status of the land, which meant there were legal constraints on what could be done with it, had not been communicated to the property section.</p>
A4	StP responded that community use was important to the council. The council had just adopted a policy governing its voluntary and community sector (VCS) estate, which was also available on the council's website. This policy set out the council's approach to its VCS estate, and included a provision for charging voluntary sector organisation market rents. StP said this approach, which had been consulted on with Community Action Southwark, would aid transparency. In future, there would only be grant-based contributions from the council, rather than support through reduced rents. He went on to say that the majority of Southwark's 1600 voluntary sector organisations were not in council-owned accommodation at preferential rents, but were already renting on the open market. It was felt that by giving a few groups a preferential rent, this would give an unfair advantage to these groups.
A6	In terms of the query about community asset transfers, StP said that this, too, was covered by the same VCS estate policy. Southwark was one of the first councils in the country to have an asset transfer policy. Application forms for this would go up on the council's website. StP explained that for the council to agree to transfer a property, there would have to be a

	<p>tangible benefit to the community.</p> <p>Cllr McNally illustrated this with the example of a council-owned building in Dilston Grove, at one end of Southwark Park. The restoration of the building would generate a £2m repair bill for the council. However, the building would now be transferred over to a voluntary arts organisation which would be able to access grants which the council could not.</p> <p>StP said that another example of this was the transfer of the South London Gallery to the South London Gallery Trust which had been able to access Millennium funding.</p>
A3	<p>Neil Martindale (NM) said that he did not know of any restrictions which would prevent the council from letting the land the former toilets stood on; but he was happy to look into this.</p>
Q8, Q9	<p>A resident asked whether ‘the property’ also referred to the metropolitan open land around the building. If so, how much of it formed part of the property which was up for sale. She also asked for clarification on whether the process was in the last stages. If this was the case, the views of the community had not been considered at all in the decision making.</p>
Q10	<p>A resident asked what the cost of security guards patrolling 39B Consort Road had been since the council had evicted SPIKE and the building had become vacant.</p>
Q11, Q12	<p>Cllr Jones said that she was concerned about the new arrangements for renting out council-owned properties to voluntary and community organisations. She said that in some parts of the borough, voluntary sector groups would be priced out of the market by multi-nationals. She said she suspected that the level of council grants would not be increased to make up for the higher overheads, although she hoped it would. She reminded the meeting that Age Concern had recently taken legal action when the terms of their lease had been changed, which would have priced them out of their accommodation.</p> <p>She went on to ask why the Community Council was not generally consulted about the disposal of community assets, like the toilets in this case. She also asked why the proposals had not been advertised in Southwark Life. While she agreed with StP that consultations on individual contracts would be inappropriate, she said there should be a policy on what constitutes a community asset; and that Community Councils should be consulted on these assets.</p>

Q13	A resident supported the comments made by the previous speakers about the status of the land and the lack of information given to Community Councils about the management of council-owned buildings. She went on to say that the council should focus more on the needs of the community, rather than on the needs of the commercial tenants. These might move out after a while, while the community would remain in the area.
A3 & A5	Neil Martindale (NM) said that he was happy to research whether there were restrictions on the use of the land. The decision about the change of use would have to be taken up as part of the planning process. He went on to say that the land around the building which was part of the proposed sale was the footprint around the building.
Q14	The resident asked what was meant by the 'footprint'?
A14	NM responded that the footprint was the area just around the building.
A7 & A10	<p>StP explained that any restrictions on the use of the land due to it being 'metropolitan open land' would be picked up in the planning process. He said that he was happy to look into whether there were any further restrictions on the land, as a consequence of it being 'common land'.</p> <p>In terms of 39b Consort Rd, he said he would have to check and report back. 39b Consort Road was currently under offer from a prospective user who was going to bring the building back into economic use.</p>
	<p>ACTION: Stephen Platts to report back to the next Community Council meeting about the cost of having security guards at 39b Consort Road since the building has been vacant.</p> <p>ACTION: Stephen Platts to report back to the next Community Council meeting about possible restrictions on the disposal of the site in relation to it being metropolitan open land, common land or a statutory park.</p>
A13	StP went on to say that it was a difficult time for both commercial and voluntary sector tenants, and that they should be treated the same. Whether a lease would be awarded, would depend on the prospective tenant being able to prove that they had the ability to pay the rent for the duration of the lease.
A12	In terms of consulting the Community Council on property matters, StP said that these were the exclusive responsibility of the Executive and not in the remit of Community Councils. He said that the property team was happy to attend Community Council meetings, if the buildings in question

	were of particular local interest.
Q15, Q16	The Chair asked Cllr McNally whether there were any plans to create a consultation function on community assets for Community Councils. He also asked Cllr McNally to clarify whether there would be any consultation about the former toilets.
A15	Cllr McNally said that the council was keen to devolve powers to the Community Councils level, and invited the Chair to raise this suggestion at the Chairs' and Vice-chairs' meeting. He also said that decisions about all important buildings in the area would be on the Executive's forward plan which was available on the council's website. Members therefore had enough time to ask him, or a member of the property team to attend the next meeting.
A16	StP said that there would be statutory consultation as part of the planning process, and that he would report back on any possible legal restrictions. Cllr McNally clarified that the consultation he had mentioned earlier was the one which would be conducted about Nunhead Green.
	Cleaner Greener Safer (CGS) Fund 2009/2010
Q17	Mick Barnard asked why the £10k of CGS funding, which Members had allocated to fundraising for the Multi-Use Centre, had been found to be ineligible. He asked what the difference was between this proposal and the feasibility study which had been funded previously.
A17	Rebecca Towers (RT) said that the Strategic Director of Finance had advised that this project could not be paid for out of the capital budget, and was therefore not admissible. She said she would write back to the Community Council to clarify the situation. ACTION: Rebecca Towers to report back to the next Community Council meeting on why the £10,000 awarded for fundraising activities for the Multi-Use Centre were deemed ineligible.
	Mick Barnard, a resident, read out the following statement: <i>"Officers continue to propose an option based on inaccurate and misleading information. I believe there has been a breach of the council's constitution, and a failure to carry out the instructions of Community Council Members. But despite making an official complaint, Southwark council officers refuse to investigate, saying that they do not have a procedure for doing so. However, the leader of the council disagrees with</i>

them and has said so in writing at the last full council. I am, therefore, formally requesting that members of this Community Council, as advised by the local government ombudsman and the complaints manager, agree a process for investigating the matter.”

Mick Barnard said that the ombudsman and the council’s complaints department had told him in writing to raise this matter at the Community Council.

The Chair said he understood that Mr Barnard had put in a stage 3 complaint about this matter. He said it would therefore not be appropriate to debate the matter at the meeting, and asked Mr Barnard to use the appropriate complaints procedures.

Cllr Nardell said that it seemed to him that some confusion had arisen. He said that his understanding of the correspondence was that Mr Barnard’s complaint about the lack of an adequate complaints system would have to be addressed through the ombudsman process. The Community Council, however, was the right forum to raise the underlying complaint about the allocation of the CGS funding.

The Chair agreed with Cllr Nardell, and asked Mick Barnard to pursue the former matter through the ombudsman.

Containers on Peckham Rye Park

Rebecca Towers (RT) called on Wendy Heller (WH) from the council’s children’s services department to answer this question, as the containers were the responsibility of that department. WH said the number of containers would be reduced, but that the issue of the playroom would have to be sorted out first.

The Chair asked the resident and WH to resolve any further issues around this matter during the break.

In terms of all other matters arising, the Chair referred attendees to the written updates which were part of the agenda pack.

ITEM 7**COMMUNITY FUND 2009/2010****EXECUTIVE
DECISION**

AGREED: Members agreed to allocate the following amounts of Community Fund monies to the projects listed below:

Name of Organisation	Name of the project/activity	
Southwark Caribb Football & Sports Academy	Diabetes Awareness Day	£750
Cossall TRA	Community Cohesion Event	£750
South East Muslim Assoc. (SEMA)	Community Cohesion Event	£500
Creative Partners	Afrinasance	£500
Peckham Christian Centre	Outing and BBQ	£500
The Surgery	Nunhead Windows	£500
Atwell Estate TRA	Fun Day and BBQ	£500
Growing Southwark	Growing Cossall - Community Project	£1,000
Peckham Power Company	Draught Busting Days	£500
The Beam Artists	An exhibition of art by disabled artists	£500
Mundania Road Residents	Street Party	£215.53
Dulwich Paradiso Film Society	Film screenings for older people in Nunhead	£741.00
Southwark Day Centre for Asylum Seekers	Women's Dance/Movement Sessions	£500
Friends of One Tree Hill	Series of events/workdays in the Community	£600
Peckham Skate Team	Peckham Rye Skate Park Summer Skate Jam	£600

	Name of Organisation	Name of the project/activity	
	Nunhead Community Forum Older People's sub committee	A Celebration of Age	£500
	Friends of Goose Green	Continued development of the group	£500
	Astbury Road Area Residents Association	Garden development	£500
	Rye Hill TRA	Local Community Fun Day	£500
	St Mary Magdalene Church	Holiday Club for 5-11 year olds	£500
	COVO Connecting Voices	Movement & well-being workshops for the elderly	£600
	Westminster House Youth Club	Week of summer activities for young people	£500
	Vietnamese Women's Group	Black History Month - Fun day	£500
	Southwark Turkish Education Group (STEG)	Traditional and educational learning	£500
	Papa Mandela London Project	Celebratory event	£500
	Peckham Shed Inclusive Youth & Children's Theatre Company	After the Storm	£750
	Association of Sierra Leonean Scouts Abroad (ASLSA UK)	Football Club - 6 aside football Gala	£500
ITEM 8	<p>CLEANER GREENER SAFER (CGS) FUND 2008/2009</p> <p>Rebecca Towers (RT) introduced and summarised her report which had been circulated as part of the agenda pack. In the report she answered the following questions about this project which had been raised at previous Community Council meetings:</p> <p>1. "What action has been taken to advance the Multi-use Centre?" RT explained that no action had been taken, because the decision on</p>		

whether the project should proceed with a single-site or a multi-site layout had not been taken.

2. “Which potential funders have been approached?”

RT told the meeting that the Football Foundation had been approached and had been very positive; the other organisation which she had approached, Harris Academy, had not been.

3. “Has any Section 106 money been looked at?”

RT explained that there was currently no development in the area that would generate the Section 106 money required. She suggested, however, that Members may want to add this project to the Section 106 Project Bank.

4. “What are the obstacles to the project progressing?”

RT explained that the obstacle was the decision about how the project was going to be delivered: as a multi-site or as a single-site development.

5. “What consultation has taken place?”

RT referred attendees to page 7 of her report for a list of consultees and the methods used.

6. “Can the POW huts be preserved?”

RT told the meeting that they could not.

RT recapped the current situation and explained the three options her report presented:

- Option 1 – Do Nothing
- Option 2 – Proceed with a single site Multi-use Facility
- Option 3 – Proceed with a multiple site option, a phased approach

The Chair thanked RT and said that her paper was very useful. He reminded Members and residents that tonight’s discussion was about making a strategic decision on the direction of this project, and repeated the options in RT’s report. He reminded the meeting that the decision was going to advise the Executive about which option the Community Council preferred.

David McAlpine from MTW Consultants gave a presentation about the history and the development of the project, and the work that had gone into the initial report. He also listed the options contained in the original report.

The Chair asked Members for their opinions and reminded them that they should discuss the issue at a strategic level.

Cllr Smeath welcomed the fact that the report drew together all the information, which had previously been requested. He said that he preferred the single-site to the multi-site option, because it would create a powerful single development in the park and stop people from having to move between changing facilities and the pitches.

<p>Q18</p>	<p>A resident said that she was confused about why there had been six options in the consultant’s report and only three in the report present by RT.</p>
<p>A18</p>	<p>RT said that the initial six options had been worked out by the consultant and referred to the options for locating the different facilities. The three options in her report were options on how to proceed. They were the highest scoring options from the feasibility study, plus the “do nothing option”.</p>
	<p>A resident criticised the term ‘Peckham Rye’ being used throughout RT’s report. She said that care should be taken to distinguish between Peckham Rye Common and Peckham Rye Park.</p> <p>RT apologised for this oversight.</p>
	<p>A resident said that Harris Academy should not be allowed to use any pitches other than the ones at Homestall Road. If they started using the pitches in the park, the overuse would lead to these pitches being ruined.</p> <p>Mick Barnard said that option 3 in RT’s report should not be on the table.</p> <p>The Chair asked Mick Barnard to outline the reasons for his preference.</p> <p>Mick Barnard said that the initial idea was to create a community centre which would foster community cohesion, because people from all backgrounds and different generations would be using it together. He said that a split-site option would be contrary to the council’s community cohesion policy, and that it would be more expensive to develop separate sites. He went on to say that option 6 of the initial consultant’s report should also have been an option in RT’s report, as it would be cheaper.</p> <p>RT said that all the costs listed in her report were estimates only, as accurate costings could only be done once the designs had been worked out in detail.</p>
<p>Q19</p>	<p>The Chair enquired about the current pattern of use of the changing facilities in Homestall Road and in the park.</p>
<p>A19</p>	<p>RT responded that at Homestall Road, there was an agreement in place with Athenley Football Club who had exclusive rights to use this site which contained one junior and two mini-football pitches, and a portacabin for cover. In Peckham Rye Park, there were two senior, two junior and two mini pitches, and the adventure play ground with a building for community use. There were currently eight changing facilities in four portacabins near the new cafe. The current One O’clock Club was in a dilapidated state with a small outside play area.</p>

Q20	The Chair asked for clarification on the current patterns of use of the existing sites. Did people move in between the split sites to change at one and then did their activities on another?
A20	RT said that there were some temporary changing facilities at the cafe which people used and then walked the short way to the pitches in the park. All clubs except Athenley Football Club would be using these pitches; Athenley would be using the Homestall Road site only.
Q21	<p>Cllr Nardell reminded the meeting of the public commitment Harris Academy had given not to use the pitches in the park. It was therefore not surprising that Harris Academy was not keen to sponsor the redevelopment, because they would not be using the pitches in the park.</p> <p>Cllr Nardell also asked what would happen to the CGS funding that had previously been allocated to the Multi-use Centre project, and why the fundraising project had been deemed to be ineligible.</p>
A21	RT said that the £10,000 for the feasibility study had been spent, but that the funds for the architect and the fundraising had not. In terms of the ineligibility of the fundraising project, RT said that officers had advised Members initially that it could be funded from CGS monies, but that this was a grey area and the Strategic Director of Finance had subsequently decided it was not eligible after all.
	Cllr Nardell expressed his concern about the fact that the Director of Finance seemed to have blocked the allocation of the funds. He said that officers could only advise councillors that they were about to make a decision which risked being unconstitutional or risked being in breach of the rules. The decision would have to be brought back to Members for discussion, because officers did not have the power to override Members.
	<p>Stephen Douglass said that it had been decided that this was revenue spending and therefore not eligible for CGS funding. He added that the decision would be brought back to the Community Council.</p> <p>Cllr Nardell reiterated that officers must only advise members and not override them; an appropriate report from the Strategic Director of finance had to be submitted.</p> <p>A resident said that the most important thing was to get the facilities in place very soon.</p> <p>Mick Barnard said that only option 2 in RT's report provided facilities for older people and for disabled children, while option 3 did not. A sensory room for disabled children and a meeting room for older people would not be provided under option 3.</p>

	<p>RT responded that the council's children's services department had put together a wish list of what they would like in the new one o'clock club which included a sensory room. She then called on Wendy Heller (WH) from children's services to talk about the planned facilities at the new One O'clock Club. RT also said that the funding for the One O'clock Club was secure, so that it and the play facilities around it could go ahead immediately. The funding for the rest of the facilities would take more time.</p> <p>WH informed the meeting that the One O'clock Club had no sensory room for disabled children at its current site, but that there were plans for this to be included in the redevelopment. The current site was used for three hours in the afternoon, but children's services were keen for the new facility to be opened up in the morning to extended school or other youth services. WH also said that she had concerns about a single-site, open access Multi-use Centre hosting children's services and activities. She said that in terms of security and safety, a split-site solution would be better, as it would allow for the children's safety to be managed more easily.</p>
Q22	<p>Cllr Smeath asked what would happen to the money for the One O'clock Club, if the single-site option was chosen.</p>
A22	<p>RT responded that choosing option 2 would mean that the One O'clock Club would have to wait until the Multi-use Centre had been built, which in turn could only happen once all the necessary funding had been secured.</p>
	<p>Cllr Graham proposed the Community Council adopt option 3. He said that it was the best option, because it would not cause any more delays, and because it addressed the issues around managing the safety of the children using the One O'clock Club.</p> <p>The Chair seconded this proposal.</p> <p>RT drew attention to the clause in option 3 which gave details about the reallocation and redistribution of previously agreed funding.</p>
EXECUTIVE DECISION	<p>AGREED: Members agreed to endorse "Option 3 – proceed with multiple site option, a phased approach", as set out in the report presented by Rebecca Towers.</p>
EXECUTIVE DECISION	<p>AGREED: Members agreed to allow £125,000 originally granted for the remediation of the old paddling pool and a new water/natural play facility to be diverted to fund the One O'clock club rebuild and outside space (therefore giving a total of £195,000; the water/natural play project will be funded through Playbuilder (£100,000)), as set out in the report presented by Rebecca Towers.</p>

<p>ITEM 9</p>	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS (IF ANY)</p> <p>Bill Guest, a resident, presented a deputation to the meeting about the state of Keston Road and explained that the road was pot-holed and looked patchy. He called on the council to put improvements in place. He also said that the council had now put the road on a list of works to be done in the future. However, he questioned when this would happen, in view of the fact that the council had no money. He asked whether Members could give any advice about how residents could keep Keston Road at the forefront of the council’s considerations.</p> <p>The Chair said that the devolved budget for improvements to highways and lighting, and which would be discussed under item 11, may be used to address this issue. He said that Members would keep this deputation in mind when they next decided on funding to be given out.</p>
<p>ITEM 10</p>	<p>POLICE UPDATE AND Q&A</p> <p>PS Warren (from the Nunhead Safer Neighbourhood Team – SNT) gave an update about the priorities and activities his team had been involved in.</p> <p>He said that the Nunhead SNT had recently closed down two supply addresses which would now remain closed for at least three months, and had dealt mostly with anti-social behaviour in the Queens Road area.</p> <p>He also gave a quick update about the other SNT teams in the Community Council area. He said that the Peckham Rye SNT had recently been policing youth events at the Harris Academy and the Peckham Festival at which they had engaged in some relationship building with the young people attending. The Lane SNT had been working mostly around the Peckham Rye Estate, and had successfully detected a cannabis factory in one of the side roads off Rye Lane.</p> <p>He closed by reminding attendees about fire safety, in light of the recent fire in Camberwell. He advised attendees to check their smoke detectors regularly, to have an escape route planned and to make sure this was unencumbered.</p> <p>He also said that during the recent spell of hot weather, people had left their windows open. He urged people to close and lock all their windows before leaving their flats, because burglaries traditionally went up during spells of hot weather.</p>
<p>ITEM 11</p>	<p>ROADS AND STREETSCENE</p> <p>Highways and Lighting</p> <p>Steven Douglass (SD) introduced this item about the proposed Highways Capital Allocation Scheme for Community Councils. (For more information, please see TakeNote.)</p>

	<p>The Chair asked for Keston Road to be included in the consultation feedback.</p> <p>SD said that this would be done.</p>
	<p>Transport for London (TfL) Bids / Transport Improvements</p> <p>Simon Philips (SP) introduced this item and explained the consultation for this year's local, TfL-funded transport projects (see also TakeNote).</p> <p>On top of the local projects, there would also be borough-wide projects which the TfL-funding was going to be used for. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel plans – schools, hospitals and workplaces • Promoting walking and cycling • Car clubs and electric vehicles • Training • Road safety campaigns • Speed reduction measures • Monitoring and surveys <p>SP also announced an unrelated consultation on local safety improvements on Rye Lane, at the junctions with Heaton Road and Nigel Road. He invited residents to contact him, if they wanted to contribute to the consultation (for contact details, please see TakeNote).</p> <p>The Chair welcomed this scheme, saying that local counsellors had campaigned for these improvements for several years.</p>
ITEM 12	PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE
	<p>Dennis Sangweme (DS) and Tom Buttrick presented this item. DS said that Tom Buttrick would be the officer responsible for planning enforcement issues for the Nunhead and Peckham Rye area from now on.</p> <p>In terms of the former factory building in Nutbrook Road, DS said that a full stop notice and an enforcement notice had been served. He also invited all residents who supported the council's actions to write to the Planning Directorate to support the council's view that the venue was unsuitable for holding church services.</p> <p>He also said that the planning enforcement team had put together the first draft of a briefing note to help residents assess when they should contact Planning Enforcement about an issue. He asked Eileen Conn and other interested residents to have a look at this, and to make further suggestions which would be worked into the final document. This document would then be distributed to residents.</p>

<p>Q23</p> <p>A23</p>	<p>A resident complained about the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and anti-social behaviour by patrons of the Bar Story cafe/bar in Blenheim Grove • Street drinking in front of the off-licence at 16 Blenheim Grove • Noise and anti-social behaviour by some patrons of the snooker hall/social club at the entrance of Peckham Rye station <p>DS said that these were environmental issues rather than Planning Enforcement issues and that he would pass them on to the appropriate team.</p>
	<p>ACTION: Paul Cowell to report back to the next Community Council meeting on what action has been taken about the following complaints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and anti-social behaviour by patrons of the Bar Story cafe/bar in Blenheim Grove • Street drinking in front of the off-licence at 16 Blenheim Grove • Noise and anti-social behaviour by some patrons of the snooker hall/social club at the entrance of Peckham Rye station
	<p>A resident complained about the noise generated by deliveries to the Netto store during the night which disturbed the residents of Alpha Street.</p> <p>The Chair asked the resident to speak to her local ward councillors about this.</p>
<p>ITEM 13</p>	<p>COMMUNITY WARDENS UPDATE</p> <p>John Uzodinma (JU) introduced the written update which was part of the agenda pack, and went on to say that the local Community Wardens had been issued with six bicycles, cycling vests and fluorescent jackets. The bikes would help wardens cover more ground so that they would be able to attend incidents more quickly. The bikes complimented the foot patrols they conducted.</p> <p>He also informed the meeting that the wardens had asked for permission from TfL to get on buses in order to tackle anti-social behaviour there. This had been agreed in principle. JU also said that wardens were running reassurance patrols in Sceaux Gardens, especially at Marie Curie House.</p>
<p>Q24</p>	<p>Cllr Graham said that he regularly observed stalls and shops illegally trading on the pavement on Peckham Rye, and asked whether the Community Wardens were reporting these incidents.</p>
<p>A24</p>	<p>JU said that the wardens were reporting these incidents, and that they did so by passing on the names and addresses to the enforcement team.</p> <p>The Chair asked for the next warden update to include information on how the wardens work with the Town Centres and shops in the area; how many</p>

	environmental issues they report and whether they follow up on these reports to ensure that they have been dealt with.
	ACTION: Ruth Backhurst to report back to the next Community Council meeting on how the wardens work with the Town Centres and shops in the area; how many environmental issues they report and whether they follow up on these reports to ensure that they have been dealt with.
	Cllr Graham added that the wardens should be more proactive; it should not be councillors pointing out these issues.
ITEM 14	PUBLIC QUESTIONS
Q25	A resident raised the issue of people engaging in anti-social behaviour around Goose Green.
	The Chair asked the wardens to report back on this.
	ACTION: Ruth Backhurst to report back on anti-social behaviour around Goose Green.
	The Chair said that he had had reports of children playing on or by the side of the railway tracks between Peckham Rye and Denmark Hill. He said he would ask officers to look at the fences separating the tracks from the surrounding area, as this was a grave risk both to the children and to the safety of the trains. ACTION: Chair to contact the relevant council officers about the damaged fence along the railway tracks between Peckham Rye and Denmark Hill.
Q26	Cllr Smith said that she had had reports about dog fouling and thefts in and around Camberwell New Cemetery. People visiting the cemetery had asked for these to be investigated.

	<p>ACTION: Paul Cowell to report back on the safety issues at Camberwell New Cemetery in response to reports of thefts and dog fouling in and around the cemetery.</p>
ITEM 15	<p>MEMBERS' DECISIONS</p> <p>School governors</p>
EXECUTIVE DECISION	<p>AGREED: Members agreed to reappoint the two applicants for the vacancies at Rye Oak Primary School: Peter Firkin John MacGregor</p> <p>ACTION: Pam Rayment to implement the above decision.</p>
	<p>Parking Reports</p> <p>AGREED: Members approved the four items recommended in the report, subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures.</p> <p>ACTION: Tim Walker / Paul Gellard to action above decision.</p>
ITEM 16	<p>Chair's Closing Comments</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.</p>
	<p>The meeting ended at 9:35pm</p>

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.

Item number	Summary of the action	Action by
ITEM 4	<p>ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT</p> <p>AGREED: Members agreed to support the planned deputation of local traders and residents to the Executive to protest about car parking charges in Peckham Town Centre.</p>	
ITEM 5	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</p> <p>AGREED: Members agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on June 10 2009 are a true and accurate record of that Community Council meeting.</p>	
ITEM 6	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS</p> <p>Public Toilets on Peckham Rye Common</p> <p>ACTION: report back to the next Community Council meeting about the cost of having security guards at 39b Consort Road since the building has been vacant.</p> <p>ACTION: report back to the next Community Council meeting about possible restrictions on the disposal of the site in relation to it being metropolitan open land, common land or a statutory park.</p> <p>Cleaner Green Safer Fund 2009/2010</p> <p>ACTION: report back to the next Community Council on why the £10,000 awarded for fundraising activities for the Multi-Use Centre were deemed ineligible.</p>	<p>Stephen Platts</p> <p>Stephen Platts</p> <p>Rebecca Towers</p>

ITEM 7	Community Fund 2009/2010		
EXECUTIVE DECISION	AGREED: Members agreed to allocate the following amounts of Community Fund monies to the projects listed below:		
	Name of Organisation	Name of the project/activity	
	Southwark Caribb Football & Sports Academy	Diabetes Awareness Day	£750
	Cossall TRA	Community Cohesion Event	£750
	South East Muslim Assoc. (SEMA)	Community Cohesion Event	£500
	Creative Partners	Afrinasance	£500
	Peckham Christian Centre	Outing and BBQ	£500
	The Surgery	Nunhead Windows	£500
	Atwell Estate TRA	Fun Day and BBQ	£500
	Growing Southwark	Growing Cossall - Community Project	£1,000
	Peckham Power Company	Draught Busting Days	£500
	The Beam Artists	An exhibition of art by disabled artists	£500
	Mundania Road Residents	Street Party	£215.53
	Dulwich Paradiso Film Society	Film screenings for older people in Nunhead	£741.00
	Southwark Day Centre for Asylum Seekers	Women's Dance/Movement Sessions	£500
	Friends of One Tree Hill	Series of events/workdays in the Community	£600
	Peckham Skate Team	Peckham Rye Skate Park Summer Skate Jam	£600

Name of Organisation	Name of the project/activity	
Nunhead Community Forum Older People's sub committee	A Celebration of Age	£500
Friends of Goose Green	Continued development of the group	£500
Astbury Road Area Residents Association	Garden development	£500
Rye Hill TRA	Local Community Fun Day	£500
St Mary Magdalene Church	Holiday Club for 5-11 year olds	£500
COVO Connecting Voices	Movement & well-being workshops for the elderly	£600
Westminster House Youth Club	Week of summer activities for young people	£500
Vietnamese Women's Group	Black History Month – Fun day	£500
Southwark Turkish Education Group (STEG)	Traditional and educational learning	£500
Papa Mandela London Project	Celebratory event	£500
Peckham Shed Inclusive Youth & Children's Theatre Company	After the Storm	£750
Association of Sierra Leonean Scouts Abroad (ASLSA UK)	Football Club - 6 aside football Gala	£500

<p>ITEM 8</p> <p>EXECUTIVE DECISION</p> <p>EXECUTIVE DECISION</p>	<p>Cleaner Greener Safer (CGS) Fund 2008/2009</p> <p>AGREED: Members agreed to endorse “Option 3 – proceed with multiple site option, a phased approach”, as set out in the report presented by Rebecca Towers.</p> <p>AGREED: Members agreed to allow £125,000 originally granted for the remediation of the old paddling pool and a new water/natural play facility to be diverted to fund the One O’clock club rebuild and outside space (therefore giving a total of £195,000; the water/natural play project will be funded through Playbuilder (£100,000)), as set out in the report presented by Rebecca Towers.</p>	
<p>ITEM 12</p>	<p>PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE</p> <p>ACTION: Report back to the next Community Council meeting on what action has been taken about the following complaints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and anti-social behaviour by patrons of the Bar Story cafe/bar in Blenheim Grove • Street drinking in front of the off-licence at 16 Blenheim Grove • Noise and anti-social behaviour by some patrons of the snooker hall/social club at the entrance of Peckham Rye station 	<p>Paul Cowell</p>
<p>ITEM 13</p>	<p>COMMUNITY WARDEN UPDATE</p> <p>ACTION: Report back to the next Community Council meeting on how the wardens work with the Town Centres and shops in the area; how many environmental issues they report and whether they follow up on these reports to ensure that they have been dealt with.</p>	<p>Ruth Backhurst</p>
<p>ITEM 14</p>	<p>PUBLIC QUESTIONS</p> <p>ACTION: Chair to contact the relevant council officers about the damaged fence along the railway tracks between Peckham Rye and Denmark Hill.</p> <p>ACTION: Report back on anti-social behaviour around Goose Green.</p> <p>ACTION: Report back on the safety issues at Camberwell New Cemetery in response to reports of thefts and dog fouling in and around the cemetery.</p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>Ruth Backhurst</p> <p>Paul Cowell</p>

