

SAC



STREATHAM AREA COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7th March, 2007 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Brian Palmer (Chair), Councillor Julian Heather (Vice-Chair), Councillor Clive Bennett, Councillor Mark Bennett, Councillor Sheila Clarke, Councillor Jeremy Clyne, Councillor Ashley Lumsden and Councillor Daphne Marchant

APOLOGIES: Councillor June Fewtrell, Councillor Roger Giess, Councillor John Kazantzis and Councillor David Malley

ALSO PRESENT:

*Action
required by*

1. **MINUTES (17.01.07)**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th January 2007 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ashley Lumsden declared a personal interest in item 7, Streatham Ice and Leisure Centre Funding and Construction as a member of the Leisure Centre.

3. **PUBLIC NOTICE QUESTION (REPORT 338/06-07)**

As Mr. Kevin Rye who submitted the question relating to the state of Barrow Road was not present, there were no supplementary questions from Mr. Rye and the written response from the Customer Relations Manager from Environment, Culture and Community Safety was noted.

In response to questions from the public and Councillors, the Divisional Director Public Realm clarified:

- Barrow Road was currently on a list of roads within the Borough which were to be repaired. The list was extensive and for this reason it could not be guaranteed when Barrow

Road would be repaired.

- It is intended that all Councillors nominate roads and pavements within the Borough for repair, but the Council will have to prioritise these due to a very long list of roads due to be repaired.
- The Council is currently inspecting all roads within the Borough every three months, partly due to reduce possible insurance claims. This is, however, much more frequent than other authorities and Lambeth aspires to reduce the frequency from three to six months, like most other authorities.

RESOLVED: That the written response be noted.

4. **BEACON CARE HOLDINGS (REPORT 355/06-07)**

The Divisional Director for Adult Services apologised for the fact that no officers were present at the last meeting to present the item, and clarified that this was not intentional. He also stated that the points he would raise were from an Adult Services point of view, not a Regeneration and Housing point of view. He made the following points:

- Adult Services have very limited powers to intervene with regards to reducing noise levels, changes in behaviour of residents etc.
- The people being cared for at 64 Leigham Court Road exhibited behaviours that may differ from that of others but that they have rights as well as the residents around them.
- The main issue relating to 64 Leigham Court Road, was the quality of care being carried out. This was regularly inspected by the CSCI and had so far been satisfactory.
- In order to resolve these issues, the use of a mediator may be helpful.

As a response to questions from Councillors and the public, the Divisional Director clarified that:

- The individual care at 64 Leigham Court Road was done properly and that was the main cause of concern. Although the behaviour of the people in the care home was disturbing for other residents in the area, it was important that some kind of understanding for the situation and the needs of the cared for people, was applied. One particular person in care was now in hospital. It is important that everyone's needs and rights are considered, and that intervention is done appropriately. He also assured that regular inspection would be carried out by the Council to ensure that residents placed by Lambeth receive appropriate care.
- Although no examples of mediation in Lambeth were known, the approach had been very useful in another authority. A mediator had been put into work with residents and people living in a care home. This had helped eliminate concerns about people in care homes by other residents. It had also enabled residents and the people in the care home to get on

better. There was no apparent reason why mediation would not be successful in this case.

- Steps which could be taken to resolve the issue, in the event that a mediation did not work, included the normal Council and legal procedures, however, this should not be something that was rushed into.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

5. CENTRAL MANSIONS (REPORT 339/06-07)

The report relating to the name change of the entrance of Central Mansions was noted and it was agreed to change the name of the entrance from Streatham High Road to Prentis Road, as proposed in recommendation 1.

The issue relating to Euro bins was discussed. It was noted that the residents of Central Mansions have had to deal with the lack of bins over a long period of time.

The Chair MOVED and it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the requested change of address be agreed so that Central Mansions is reassigned to Prentis Road. This should reduce the problems currently experienced by the resident. Clear signage would need to be erected on Prentis Road to identify the entrance to the flats. Erection of signage is normally the responsibility of the Freeholder. In this case there are six freeholders, two of whom may not support the address change. It may therefore be necessary for Lambeth Council to arrange for and fund the signage, to a maximum contribution of £250.
- (2) That the Euro bin situation at Central Mansions be inspected by officers.

EDECCS

6. CROSS RIVER TRAM PROPOSAL (REPORT 309/06-07)

The Assistant Director Cross River Partnerships introduced the item saying the 16½ km route was promoted by the Boroughs to Transport for London (TfL) and the Tram is now part of the Mayor's strategy and TfL have a budget of £24 million to take forward the proposal to a Transport and Works Act application. She highlighted the advantages for the proposal:

- Congestion relief on the Northern, Piccadilly and Victoria lines,
- The Tram would be faster and more efficient than buses,
- It would be smooth and quiet,
- The tram would have low emissions. Part of the electricity used by the Tram can be recycled.
- It would attract people out of their cars. Croydon Tramlink

has reduced car journeys by nearly 4 million trips a year.

- The significance for economic development along the route,
- The potential 66 million passengers a year,
- The halving of journey time along the route, and
- The Tram would be part of the Oyster system and journeys will cost the same as a bus ride.
- The system would be fully accessible due to wide doors and step free entry.

She finished by saying that there had been consultation on the route options which finished earlier this year and there would be an announcement on the route later this year.

In response to questions from the public and Members the Assistant Director Cross River partnerships highlighted:

- That as well as the Brixton to Waterloo route there were also originally aspirations to continue to Clapham and Streatham, recognising the relatively poor public transport in Streatham, but in 2002 it was decided to fix the end points as those in the current proposals and move forward now with the option to get the scheme extended later. The London Borough of Lambeth has been clear throughout of its support for the extension of the tram route to Streatham.
- The current proposal does not include a tram depot in Brixton.
- Previous feasibility studies showed that a proposed link to Clapham then Streatham would not work.

In response to questions from the public and Members Councillor Paul McGlone, the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise, stated:

- The tram would have a regenerative effect,
- An offer had been made to house the depot in Brixton
- That the old depot in Streatham had been protected, and
- The southern part of the route could start construction before the Olympics.

MOVED by Councillor Lumsden and SECONDED by Councillor Palmer and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:

To reaffirm that the Cross River Tram reaches Streatham as soon as possible.

7. STREATHAM ICE AND LEISURE CENTRE FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION (REPORT 356/06-07)

Members from all parties expressed disappointment at the lack of an officer to introduce the item and respond to queries. In the absence of an officer the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise introduced the item saying there would be a nine month delay with the scheme but it was a prize well worth hanging onto. In

response to questions he clarified that:

- The Council are standing by their current position.
- The part of Transport for London (TfL) in the delay has been over-egged and they too have to safeguard public money.
- He stood by the right of Councillors and stakeholders to be involved in the project as it went forward, particularly once the agreement with Tesco and the Section 106 agreement are signed.
- The delay will be a considerable cost to Tesco with a small portion of the extra cost falling to the Council but it will allow Tesco to get certainty over the cost of the whole scheme.

Various Leisure Centre and Ice Rink users expressed concern at the impact of the delay upon the condition of the facilities. Additional concern was expressed about the impact of the hiatus in announcing the contractors taking over the management of the Leisure Centre upon the quality of the service being provided, the retention of staff and the future viability of the service.

Guillotine

At 9.00pm the Guillotine fell and it was:

RESOLVED: That the meeting be extended for up to a further 30 minutes to conclude the remaining business.

MOVED by Councillor Ashley Lumsden and **SECONDED** and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:

In view of the urgency Officers write out urgently to Streatham Area Councillors with details of the following:

EDECCS

- The history of the Streatham Ice Rink and Leisure Centre.
- The Council's interim management plan for Streatham Leisure Centre.
- The interim management plan for the ice rink.
- Why is there a nine month delay in the project and how will the time be made up?
- A clear statement of the Council's contribution to the project.
- A clear analysis of the critical path for the development.
- A statement on the non-negotiable elements of the deal for the Council.
- A clear understanding of the planning permissions in place, those expected to be needed and the Section 106 document.
- Details of how the parties interact.

And that a report containing all this information be submitted to the next meeting and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Culture be invited to that meeting. Officers to attend the next meeting.

8. PROPOSED COMMUNITY AND SEXUAL HEALTH CENTRE AT STREATHAM HILL CLINIC (REPORT 340/06-07)

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

9. **FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION IN STREATHAM (REPORT 341/06-07)**

RESOLVED: To note the report

10. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE (REPORT 342/06-07)**

In response to questions from Members the Town Centre manager clarified that:

- She would be in a position to report the exact amount being passed to Transport for London (TfL) for the High Road works at the next meeting.
- That in transferring or accruing funding to TfL that a stronger form of agreement is used than a letter of understanding.
- The release of the Section 106 money had been agreed at 17.00 that day to allow the works to proceed at Coburg Crescent.

RESOLVED: To note the report.

The meeting ended at 9.22 pm

CHAIR
STREATHAM AREA
COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 25th April, 2007

Date of Despatch: Thursday, 15 March 2007

Contact for Enquiries: Andrew Tattersall

Tel: 020 7926 0024

Fax: (020) 7926 2755

E-mail: atattersall@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk

The action column is for officers' use only and does not form a part of the formal record.