

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON**

**MINUTES**

**of the meeting of the Council  
held on 27 April 2009  
starting at 7.00 pm**

**Members**

**The Worshipful the Mayor  
(Councillor Brendan Hudson)**

**The Deputy Mayor  
(Councillor Dave Callaghan)**

**Councillors:**

Margaret Ali	Lyn Gleeson	Jonathan Pritchard
Sheila Andrews	Bruce Glithero	Roger Roberts
Richard Bailey	Stuart Gordon-Bullock	Barry Russell
Sean Brennan	Joan Hartfield	Paul Scully
Tony Brett Young	Eric Howell	Jenny Slark
Moira Butt	Kirsty Jerome	Colin Stears
Richard Butt	Paddy Kane	Sue Stears
Cliff Carter	John Kennedy	David Theobald
Ian Chapman	John Keys	Roger Thistle
Margaret Court	John Leach	Graham Tope
Tim Crowley	Abigail Lock	Simon Wales
Ruth Dombey	Janet Lowne	Myfanwy Wallace
John Drage	Jayne McCoy	Peter Wallis
Christopher Dunlop	Paul Newman	Graham Whitham
Terry Faulds	David Pickles	Marion Williams
Peter Geiringer	Hamish Pollock	

**ABSENT** Councillors Colin Hall, Pamela Picknett, Helen Senior, Tony Shields and Misdaq Zaidi.

**378. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 2 MARCH 2009**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**379. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Colin Hall, Pamela Picknett, Tony Shields and Helen Senior.

**380. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**a) Audit Commission Publication – "Summing up: A Review of Financial Management in Local Government 2005-2008"**

The Mayor reported that the Council was one of one five authorities, and the only London Borough, to feature in the above Audit Commission publication. The Council was mentioned as a notable practice case study for Value for Money.

**b) Councillor Colin Hall**

The Mayor reported that Councillor Colin Hall had won an award for his contribution to local transport in London and in particular for his role in the Smarter Travel Sutton initiative. That project also collected an award for Travel Information and Marketing.

**c) Fairer Deal for Council Tenants**

The Mayor reported that Ms Jean Crossby, Chair of the Sutton Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations had handed in a petition at 10 Downing Street on 25 March, demanding a fairer deal for Council tenants. Ms Crossby had been accompanied by Councillor Sean Brennan and the borough's two MPs. The group also had met Housing Minister Iain Wright, as part of a campaign against the government's "rent claw back". Councillor Sean Brennan had also previously written to the Secretary of state, Margaret Beckett on this matter. At the beginning of April the Government had announced that rent increase guidelines were to be reduced in half with the government footing the bill.

**d) Cheam, Wallington and Sutton Division of Girl Guiding UK**

The Mayor reported that the Cheam, Wallington and Sutton Division of Girl Guiding UK had gained some prestigious Jack Petchey awards. He had congratulated them on this achievement.

7.08pm

**381. ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

**a) Questions from members of the Public**

One question and supplementary question was asked by a member of the public and a reply given as set out in Appendix A to these Minutes.

**b) Questions from Councillors**

Five questions and supplementary questions were asked by five Councillors and replies given as set out in Appendix B to these Minutes.

**382. PETITIONS**

**a) Traffic Calming Measures - All Saints Road, Sutton**

Councillor Ruth Dombey presented a petition signed by 182 persons in the following terms:

We the undersigned express our disappointment that the traffic calming measures proposed by Sutton Council will not go ahead and the funding has been returned to Transport for London.

We support the plans to slow down speeding vehicles in the vicinity of All Saints Benhilton Primary School and call upon the Council to begin negotiations with transport for London all over again so that a traffic calming scheme can be agreed as soon as possible,

The petition was referred to the Sutton Local Committee for consideration and report.

**b) Heavy Vehicles in Church Hill Road, Cheam**

Councillor Chris Dunlop presented petition signed by 216 persons in the following terms:

We the Residents of Church Hill Road do Petition and Demand that the Borough of Sutton Council introduce measures immediately to stop heavy vehicles using the roads as a short cut to the By Pass and out of service buses, other than the 93 buses.

These vehicles have continually caused unnecessary noise, added pollution and damage to our property must stop.

Church Hill Road is a Residential Road.

The petition was referred to the Cheam North and Worcester Park Local Committee for consideration and report.

### **383. MOTION : VOTE OF THANKS TO THE MAYOR**

In accordance with notice given, Councillor John Leach moved and Councillor Sue Stears seconded the following Motion:

“That the Council place on record its grateful thanks to Councillor Brendan Hudson for his service as Mayor of the London Borough of Sutton during the past municipal year, for the able, courteous and impartial manner in which he has conducted the proceedings of the Council, and for his continuing devotion at all times to the welfare of the Borough.”

[In accordance with Standing Order 11.22 it had been decided that the Motion should be dealt with at this meeting.](#)

In their speeches, Councillors John Leach and Sue Stears mentioned that, during his year in Office, the Mayor had attended over 400 engagements and organised fifteen charity events. In doing so, he had raised over £35,000 for his Charity – The Royal Marsden's Wolfson Children's and Adolescent Unit at The Royal Marsden Hospital. The Mayoral theme for the year had been “Civic to Clinic” and as part of that the Mayor had held 20 receptions for employees from all sections of the National Health Service in Sutton. Other significant events had included the Freedom of the Borough Ceremony for the Olympian wheelchair athlete David Weir and a dinner at the House of Commons.

Councillor Paul Scully also paid tribute to the Mayor, on behalf of the opposition group, for the fair-minded way in which he had chaired Council meetings.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was adopted.

The Mayor returned thanks for the kind words from Councillors John Leach, Sue Stears and Paul Scully. He referred to the huge range of different engagements that each Mayor undertakes, visiting all areas of the Borough. Particular mention was made of his first visit to a synagogue and a mosque, the Holocaust Memorial Day event, the receiving of the Borough's Olympic Flag, meeting representatives from the Council's twin towns on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Sutton Town Twinning Association and bestowing the Honorary Freedom of the Borough upon David Weir. Other memorable events included the themed weeks, especially Take Part Take Pride and visiting geriatric, maternity and children's wards at St. Helier Hospital on Christmas day with the Mayor of Merton Council. The Mayor finished by stating that he would thank specific people at the annual Council meeting and that it had been a pleasure to serve the people of Sutton for the past year.

### **384. MOTION : SUPPORTING THE ARMED FORCES**

In accordance with notice given, Councillor David Pickles formally moved and Councillor David Theobald formally seconded the following Motion:

"Following the recent unacceptable events in Luton by certain sections of our community against Her Majesty's armed forces, this Council sends its full support to all the troops and their families residing in the London Borough of Sutton in their difficult job maintaining the peace in Iraq and Afghanistan"

In accordance with Standing Order 11.22 the motion was referred for debate later in the Council meeting.

### **385. MOTION : FAIR COUNCIL LEISURE PROVISION**

In accordance with notice given, Councillor Chris Dunlop formally moved and Councillor Stuart Gordon-Bullock formally seconded the following Motion

"This Council notes: -

1. The important role of Council provided leisure provision as a contributor to the quality of life, health and wellbeing of London Borough of Sutton residents.
2. That some residents feel that there are inequalities in the geographical distribution of Council provided leisure facilities within the borough.
3. That Cheam Leisure Centre, in Malden Road, Cheam, is included as a potential site for development in the 'Site Development Policies Preferred Options' document, which was approved at The Executive (16/02/2009) for public consultation.
4. That the development-use proposals, in the above document, do not include leisure provision for the Cheam Leisure Centre site.

This Council resolves to: -

1. ensure that leisure provision in the western half of the borough is safeguarded;
2. ensure that the Cheam Leisure Centre site, if developed, retains substantial leisure provision to serve the residents of the local area, matching current provision.

In accordance with Standing Order 11.22 the motion was referred for debate later at this Council meeting.

### **386. APPOINTMENT OF COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE ON THE CHEAM NORTH AND WORCESTER PARK LOCAL COMMITTEE**

**Resolved:** That Barry Ivens (substitute John Weir) be appointed as a Community Representative to serve on the Cheam North and Worcester Park Local Committee until the annual meeting of the Council in May 2010.

7.51pm

### **387. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **(a) The Construction & Operation of the Sutton Life Centre**

Councillor John Kennedy raised a point of order under Standing Order 13.1 which was responded to by the Chief Executive and Interim Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

Councillor Graham Whitham moved and Councillor Richard Butt seconded the following Motion:

"That the matter be not debated tonight."

On being put to the vote, the Motion was lost on a show of hands.

Councillor Sean Brennan moved the reception of Minute 298/09.

Following debate, the recommendations in Minute 298/09 were adopted on a show of hands.

A poll vote was demanded when there voted

For the recommendations in Minute 298/09 (29)	Councillors Margaret Ali, Sheila Andrews, Richard Bailey, Sean Brennan, Tony Brett Young, Dave Callaghan, Ian Chapman, Margaret Court, Ruth Dombey, John Drage, Lyn Gleeson, Bruce Glithero, Joan Hartfield, Kirsty Jerome, Paddy Kane, John Keys, John Leach, Abigail Lock, Janet Lowne, Jayne McCoy, Hamish Pollock, Roger Roberts, Jenny Slark, Colin, Stears, Sue Stears, Roger Thistle, Graham Tope, Simon Wales and Myfanwy Wallace.
Against the recommendations in Minute 298/09 (19)	Councillors Moira Butt, Richard Butt, Cliff Carter, Tim Crowley, Chris Dunlop, Terry Faulds, Peter Geiringer, Stuart Gordon-Bullock, Eric Howell, John Kennedy, Paul Newman, David Pickles, Jonathan Pritchard, Barry Russell, Paul Scully, David Theobald, Peter Wallis, Graham Whitham, Marion Williams.
Abstained (1)	The Mayor, Councillor Brendan Hudson

The recommendations in Minute 298/09 were adopted.

**(b) Motion: Fair Council Leisure Provision**

Further to Minute \*\*\*/09, Councillor Chris Dunlop moved and Councillor Stuart Gordon-Bullock seconded the following Motion:

“This Council notes: -

1. The important role of Council provided leisure provision as a contributor to the quality of life, health and wellbeing of London Borough of Sutton residents.
2. That some residents feel that there are inequalities in the geographical distribution of Council provided leisure facilities within the borough.
3. That Cheam Leisure Centre, in Malden Road, Cheam, is included as a potential site for development in the ‘Site Development Policies Preferred Options’ document, which was approved at The Executive (16/02/2009) for public consultation.
4. That the development-use proposals, in the above document, do not include leisure provision for the Cheam Leisure Centre site.

This Council resolves to: -

- 1 ensure that leisure provision in the western half of the borough is safeguarded;
- 2 ensure that the Cheam Leisure Centre site, if developed, retains substantial leisure provision to serve the residents of the local area, matching current provision.

In doing so, Councillor Stuart Gordon Bullock declared a personal interest in that he had learnt to swim in Cheam Baths.

Councillor Graham Tope moved and Councillor Lyn Gleeson seconded the following amendment which sought to change the Motion as indicated:

“This Council notes: -

1. The important role of Council provided leisure provision as a contributor to the quality of life, health and wellbeing of London Borough of Sutton residents.
2. That some residents feel that there are inequalities in the geographical distribution of Council provided leisure facilities within the borough.
3. That Cheam Leisure Centre, in Malden Road, Cheam, is included as a potential site for development in the ‘Site Development Policies Preferred Options’ document, which was approved at The Executive (16/02/2009) for public consultation.
4. That the development-use proposals, in the above document, do not include leisure provision for the Cheam Leisure Centre site.

This Council resolves to: -

1. ensure that leisure provision in the western half of the borough is safeguarded;
- ~~2. ensure that the Cheam Leisure Centre site, if developed, retains substantial leisure provision to serve the residents of the local area, matching current provision.~~
2. note that a report on the Leisure Facilities Strategy is due to come to the Executive on 8 June, which is likely to recommend, amongst other important decisions on the Strategy, that Cheam Leisure Centre be replaced by a new leisure centre with a target date of 2015, in and serving the catchment in the western area of the Borough, subject to available funding and planning considerations.
3. agree that the appropriate time to debate this important matter, in the context of the wider Leisure Facilities Strategy, will be when the Report to the Executive is published;
4. note it is intended that Cheam Leisure Centre remain open and operating in its present building at least until 2015 and that there will be plenty of time for public debate on the location and nature of future provision in the west of the Borough before any decisions need to be taken.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was adopted on a show of hands.

The Motion, as amended, was adopted.

### **388. CLOSURE MOTION**

On the Motion of Councillor Sean Brennan, seconded by Councillor Ruth Dombey, it was

**Resolved:** That, in accordance with Standing Order 14.8 all items remaining to be dealt with at this Council meeting be approved subject to the opposition leader being able to express dissent on them.”

The following Minutes and Motions were adopted:

<b>Minute Number</b>	<b>Subject</b>
141	Annual Review of the Constitution – Recommendations (i), (ii), (iii) and (vi)
297	Children and young People’s plan 2009/10
	Motion: Supporting the Armed Forces

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

Mayor: .....

Date: .....

This page is intentionally left blank

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON  
COUNCIL MEETING : 27 APRIL 2009  
QUESTIONS STANDING ORDER 8.7  
QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**1. Question asked by Mr Daniel Snowdon of 747, London Road, North Cheam, Sutton, SM3 9DL to the Chair of the Executive**

There seems to be more and more concern about exclusions from schools, and I would like to know whether Sutton's experience reflects this trend, and how the borough is coping with the issue?

**Reply by Councillor Tony Brett Young, Executive Councillor for Children, Young People and Learning Services**

Thank you Mr Snowdon for your question. The answer to your question is that Sutton had 38 permanent exclusions in the academic year 2007/8 and so far in 2008/9, there have been 32. Each of the young people excluded is well provided for at The Limes College or other appropriate establishment. We work closely with schools to identify pupils who are in danger of being excluded, and provide support to help keep them in school where that is possible.

Head teachers and the Local Authority officers also meet monthly to discuss exclusions to ensure pupils are appropriately placed, and that their needs can be properly met. Where appropriate, pupils in danger of being excluded are given a respite placement at The Limes and are then eased back into their school.

**Supplementary Question asked by Mr Snowdon**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you for that answer. In which case, could the Lead Councillor inform me if the borough has adequate facilities for its excluded pupils and if not, what it is doing about it?

**Reply by Councillor Tony Brett Young**

Thank you Mr Snowdon. The Limes College can meet the needs of 100 pupils and I am pleased to say that as a result of its recent Ofsted inspection, it's gained a Grade 2 Judgement. That's good overall with some outstanding features and I think that's something we can be very pleased with. Those outstanding features were for care and guidance. The aim of The Limes College is to support young people either back to school or onwards into higher education, so that they are independent, positive contributors to society. On your point about facilities, unfortunately the accommodation at The Limes is not purpose-built and this does present the staff and management committee with some challenges. The Council is seeking to rectify this situation by using, or applying for, appropriate grants such as the SEN 14/19 Capital Funding for which £3m has been allocated, Government Co-Location Funding for which we have submitted a bid for £6m and Tranche 1 for Building Schools for the Future programme, where Sutton is in the top 30 local authorities and has been invited to submit a Readiness to Deliver statement. Mr Mayor, the appropriate funding would allow much needed work at The Limes College and would provide enormous benefits to the College itself and to its students and we would be able to improve the curriculum on offer and expand the range of activities available to the students.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Thank you for your answer Councillor Brett Young. Can I ask then in answer to your question, with regards to us being in tier 1 for BSF, with regards to the pump priming we might have to do for it, to put up roughly £2.5m to possibly get round about £50m worth of funding. Why then at the moment we are not prepared to do that, when we are prepared to match the Life Centre money?

**Reply by Councillor Tony Brett Young**

Thank you Councillor Crowley. Let me make it clear, if I may that we have not as I have heard you claim before and you seem to be implying tonight we have not used money that we could have used for the BSF programme to pay for the Life Centre. That seems to be the thrust of what you have said in the past. As you should know that it is simply confusing revenue money and capital money. Council officers and I are currently working extremely hard to see how we can take advantage of the Government BSF grant offer to improve a number of our schools including The Limes College.

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON  
COUNCIL MEETING : 27 APRIL 2009  
QUESTIONS STANDING ORDER 8.6  
QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

**1. Question asked by Councillor David Theobald to the Chair of the Executive**

Could the lead Councillor please inform the Chamber this evening of the current position concerning the review of the risk assessments for the SEN transport arrangements?

**Reply by Councillor Tony Brett Young, Executive Councillor for Children, Young People and Learning Services**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Theobald. All risk assessments for the new arrangements for SEN pick up points have been carried out as appropriate. That is in accordance with clear guidance from the Department of Children, Schools and Families. Let me assure the member that every assessment was then considered in great detail in advance of implementation. To ensure that the safest possible route was recommended for each child, several risk assessments were completed for some individual routes. For example, in some cases pick-up points were moved to places where it was felt it would be safer. In others pick-up points were relocated so that groups waiting at particular stops would not be too large. The needs of parents as well as their children were taken into account and this again meant that some pick-up points were amended.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Paul Scully**

Thank you very much for the answer. Can I ask then, if there are any and how many children have been removed from the process of the pick up points and retaining door to door facilities following the risk assessments?

**Reply by Councillor Tony Brett Young**

The answer to that Councillor Scully is that one young person was removed from the number. There were a total of 87 considered, although there were up to three assessments for some individual people to find the best route. All parents and carers had the right of appeal and of those 27 exercised this right. An independent panel considered those assessments and, as I say, one youngster was removed from the number.

**2. Question asked by Councillor Stuart Gordon-Bullock to the Chair of the Executive**

To ask the Executive Councillor for Leisure whether he is satisfied that essential safety standards are being maintained in Sutton Council's libraries?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope, Executive Councillor for Libraries, Leisure and Community Safety**

Well thank you Mr Mayor. The answer is yes as far as I can be. The Library Service in conjunction with officers from the Council's Construction & Property Team, as well as Health and Safety staff undertake essential health and safety work throughout the year. There are systems and procedures in place, together with checks and inspections to ensure that the required health and safety standards are met.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Stuart Gordon-Bullock**

An incident took place in Worcester Park library recently when a resident sat in a Council provided chair and it collapsed because it was not bolted adequately to the frame. It resulted in his shirt being torn, a large gash on his back and injury to his back when he fell to the ground. Is the Lead Councillor aware that there is no defence under the criminal law to maintaining equipment in a safe state and what steps does he propose to issue an apology and to ensure that there is no repetition?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Well Mr Mayor, if Councillor Gordon-Bullock would like to give me the name and address of the person concerned I would be very happy to personally send an apology. I was not aware of the incident and I am very sorry, as all of us will be, to hear about it. I was asked a general question about health and safety standards and maintenance in our libraries but I could have given a very long reply, probably giving Councillor Gordon-Bullock information he already knows because he takes a very particular interest in it, on all the training our staff receive, on the qualifications that they get, on the inspections that are currently going on. I'm very sorry to hear about the incident that he describes and as I said at the beginning, if he would let me know or if I could have the details of the person concerned, I would be very happy to issue the apology that he suggests.

**3. Question asked by Councillor Barry Russell to the Chair of the Executive**

To ask the Executive Councillor for Leisure why the swimming pool at Westcroft, having been closed for major repairs, is now closed to have those same said major repairs undertaken again?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope, Executive Councillor for Libraries, Leisure and Community Safety**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I think the first good news is that it is open again today as intended. Mr Mayor, I don't think I could do any better than read out the explanation that was given in the Weekly Information Bulletin to all Councillors on 20 March, which said the main pool and teaching pool at Westcroft will be closed for essential repairs to the pool liners from Monday 6 April until Sunday 26 April. The non-swimming facilities, sports hall, gym, café etc will remain open during this period. This work is being undertaken to replace the pool liner that was installed last year, May 2008, and the cost of these works and any associated loss of income is being borne by BTU Pools, the contractors. BTU Pools are relining the pools with a different product this time, which has been used before and are therefore confident with it. Customers are being informed of the closure. All leisure centre members, play and pay and direct debit will be able to use the facilities at Cheam Leisure Centre and GLL operated leisure facilities in neighbouring boroughs, and it goes on to list where those are.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Barry Russell**

Thank you, Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Tope for that answer. I understand of course, that the pool liner that was installed last year by this company failed and the pool was again closed this Easter, probably so it didn't disrupt school times. The residents and children of the borough who use the Westcroft Centre were unable to for three weeks over Easter. As Councillor Tope correctly said it did open this morning exactly on time. The staff told me it was more than their life was worth, so you've done a good job there, well done to our officers. What I find worrying and probably all find embarrassing is if this Council can't be trusted to

**Appendix B to Council Minutes  
Questions from Councillors  
27 April 2009**

choose a contractor and to sign off a contract where they are using improper materials. What would worry me and I would hope would worry everybody else is if you are going to look to deliver this controversial £8m Life Centre, within time, fit for purpose and operating within a profit, what genuine percentage chance do you think you have got, if you can't get a pool relined, of doing this?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Mr Mayor, can I congratulate Councillor Russell on his ingenuity in linking two totally unrelated subjects. I'm fairly confident that BTU Pools will probably not be a contractor to build the Life Centre. In fact, maybe it will be some reassurance to him that actually it wasn't BTU Pools. It was one of their sub-contractors that was responsible for this and, although it's their business, I am sure they are recovering their costs that they have incurred to the Council from their sub-contractor.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor John Kennedy**

Does Councillor Tope not regret this tendency, this blot on an otherwise illustrious career, an inability it would appear to keep swimming pools open in this borough. What is he going to do to improve, is this some form of political hydrophobia, is he actually going to do something about this?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Mr Mayor, not only am I keeping the swimming pools open but I have this distant recollection that in this very Chamber, not much more than a year ago, Councillor Kennedy himself was predicting the wholesale closure and collapse of leisure centres. Doom and gloom, we are doomed, the leisure centres will close. Mr Mayor, not only have no leisure centres closed, but they are actually all being improved and enhanced.

**4. Question asked by Councillor Eric Howell to the Chair of the Executive**

Can the Executive Councillor for Community Safety confirm how much money this Liberal Democrat-run Council has spent over the last 12 months on the upkeep of CCTV cameras, and how many convictions can be attributed to the CCTV cameras over the same period of time?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope Executive Councillor for Libraries, Leisure and Community Safety**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Two questions there, obviously related. On the financial one first of all. Last year, the year to the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009, the amount spent maintaining the CCTV system was just under £57,000. However, our current CCTV maintenance contract is not co-terminus with the financial year. The agreed contract sum for maintenance for the period October to October, ending next October 09, will be only £17,358.

This significant reduction has been made possible by the prudent investment, by what Councillor Howell insists on describing as the Liberal Democrat Council, in renewing the aging CCTV technology, with state of the art digital equipment. On the second part of the question, police records confirm that in the financial year 08/09 there were 370 offences where police considered CCTV evidence. These included such serious offences as attempted murder, GBH with Intent, Possession of a Firearm, possession of an offensive weapon and cases of ABH and Malicious wounding. The other offences cover a wide variety of crime types, from business robbery, through drugs offences, to criminal damage, showing the usefulness and versatility of CCTV in contributing to detection and prosecution of offenders. From these 370 cases, 177 offences resulted in charges being brought against

individuals; a very significant achievement, as I'm sure Councillor Howell will agree.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Eric Howell**

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you for those figures. If CCTV cameras are working so well, why have the crime figures for Sutton, now sit in a position that is equal fifth with the eleven neighbouring boroughs?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Well Mr Mayor I don't know if Councillor Howell is still the Conservative's spokesperson on community safety, but I'm sure he would know from his own experience that there are far more contributors both to crime and to catching criminals than simply the operation of CCTV. Indeed, CCTV is not there solely to catch criminals. It's there first of all to provide reassurance to our public and I do know from experience that the public are greatly reassured. I can't actually recall ever having a request to remove CCTV cameras. I can remember many, many requests to install them. So it is there for reassurance, it is there to see what is going on and in 370 cases it is there actually to contribute sound evidence which can be used in court to convict criminals when they are caught. So Mr Mayor, I am surprised if Councillor Howell is suggesting that we should reduce our CCTV, but there again perhaps that's the new Conservative party.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Abigail Lock**

Thank you, would the Executive Councillor agree that CCTV can also act as a deterrent to prevent crime as well?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Absolutely right, yes of course it can and does.

**5. Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley to the Chair of the Executive**

Following the Ernst & Young report which shows that this Liberal Democrat Council is likely to retrieve 80% of taxpayers' money frozen in the Icelandic subsidiary bank, Heritable Bank, how does the Executive Councillor for Resources plan to makeup the shortfall?

**Reply by Councillor John Drage, Executive Councillor for Resources**

Thank you Mr Mayor. As Councillor Crowley has indicated the report to creditors from Heritable Bank's Administrators states that, on the basis of the Heritable Bank's loan book being run off over a period up to the end of 2012, they anticipate a pay-out to creditors of 80% of the amount owed.

This is still a projection, which the Administrators state is based on cautious assumptions. They also state that if conditions improve over the period to 2012, the final recovery could be higher. Both these factors give reasonable grounds for anticipating that the final payout may be higher than 80%.

In the meantime, working with the figure of 80%, the potential shortfall of 20% i.e. £1.1m is more than covered by the £1.5m in the Reserve for Treasury and Capital Programme Management that the Council prudently established when the 2009/10 budget was agreed.

**Appendix B to Council Minutes  
Questions from Councillors  
27 April 2009**

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley**

Thank you Councillor Drage for that very re-assuring answer. Will the Liberal Democrat Leader of Sutton Council agree to freeze increases in senior officer pay over £100,000 and Councillors' allowances whilst this £5.5m of tax payers' money is still frozen in the Icelandic bank's subsidiary of Heritable Bank? And if not, why not?

**Reply by Councillor John Drage**

We have set both salaries and Councillor allowances in the budget this Council approved in March, Councillor Crowley.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Jayne McCoy**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I understand that the Independent Audit Commission recently published a report entitled Risk and Return: English Local Authorities and Icelandic Banks. Is there any new information on this report please?

**Reply by Councillor John Drage**

Thank you Councillor McCoy. The Independent Audit Commission's report includes a table showing the exposure of the 127 local authorities that have had funds frozen in Icelandic related banks compared to the size of each authority's gross expenditure and their general reserves. The Audit Commission's table shows Sutton exposure of £5.5m was equivalent to 31% of our general reserves and that this level was modest compared to the levels recorded by many other Councils. Of particular note are the figures for three Conservative run local authorities. Reigate and Banstead's exposure of £15.5m was equivalent to 310% of their general reserve, ten times higher than Sutton's. Barnet's exposure of £27.4m was equivalent to 125% of their general reserves and Hillingdon's exposure of £20m was equivalent to 167% of their reserves. Kent, Norfolk and Surrey County Councils and Westminster City Council are other Conservative Councils who placed amounts between three and nine times greater than the amount Sutton placed with Icelandic related banks. If I had been asleep on the job, as claimed by the Opposition, then I can only conclude that the leading Councillors with responsibility for treasury management in these Conservative run authorities must have died on the job and, in the case of Reigate and Banstead, rigor mortis has set in.

This page is intentionally left blank

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON  
QUESTIONS ASKED DURING DEBATE  
UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.1**

**Minute 298 - The Construction and Operation of the Sutton Life Centre**

**1. Question asked by Councillor Paul Scully, in the absence of Councillor Tony Shields, to the Leader of the Council**

Can the Executive Councillor for Community Safety, Leisure and Libraries name the tens of thousands of people who have asked this Liberal Democrat-run Council for the controversial £8million Sutton Life Centre, and were the details of the cost made available to them?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope, Executive Councillor for Libraries, Leisure and Community Services**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I am really disappointed that Councillor Shields hasn't come to hear the answer to his question because he does seem to enjoy them so much. Mr Mayor, I calculate that if I were to name just the first 10,000 it would actually take something like 14 hours. I conclude that this is yet another attempt by the Conservatives to deny any debate on this. I am going to refuse that Mr Mayor. I want to get on with the debate. What I actually said at the last Council meeting, we have all got it in the book, was to point out that people bring us problems. They don't bring us solutions; they expect us to find the solutions. There are thousands, probably tens of thousands of people, who have raised concerns about anti-social behaviour, who believe that there are not enough youth facilities in this borough, who believe that we should be doing far more to prepare young people and indeed older people for the world of work, that there is much more we can do on inter-generational work and so on. Mr Mayor, there are tens of thousands of people who believe that. We are providing the solution and instead of silly procedural nit picking and really daft questioning, I'm not surprised he is too ashamed to come and ask it for himself. Let's get on and have the debate.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor Paul Scully to the Leader of the Council**

Actually Councillor Tope it wasn't that Tony Shields didn't want to come to ask his question. He found out this afternoon that his father is dying, so he is in Hastings. So I hope you will withdraw your disparaging remarks.

It's pointless asking for the names and addresses of the 10,000 people, so that we can check with them. But can Councillor Tope instead outline the research and evidential basis on the need for the citizenship section of this project, including how anyone has learnt, ever learnt not to take drugs, not join gangs, not get involved in anti-social behaviour without the benefit of an immersive simulation experience?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I am not entirely sure what an immersive simulation experience is, Mr Mayor, I just assume that it is some strange practice the Conservatives get up to in private. Mr Mayor, I do of course and I'm sure we all do send our good wishes to Councillor Shields; that's the point at which I end. Mr Mayor, we have had in this borough for many years, very, very successful junior citizenship schemes. This is actually the origin of this and we do know for certain that participation in those schemes has actually saved lives. It has grown from that original idea. We have seen similar schemes in other parts of the country, I'm sure it will be referred to in the debate, in Milton Keynes and we have grown on that basis. I can't believe that the Opposition Leader is actually suggesting that a

**Questions asked during debates  
Appendix C to Council Minutes  
27 April 2009**

citizenship scheme, which is only one part of the Life Centre, is actually a bad thing. He can't surely be suggesting that. I say it yet again. Let's get on and have the debate and we'll hear what the positive alternatives are, the concerns that we have for dealing with all the issues I just referred to.

**Supplementary Question asked by Councillor John Kennedy**

Mr Mayor, I want to believe everything that Councillor Tope says and maybe he can have a go at convincing me. I want to believe he really does know that there are tens of thousands of people that have asked him for this. Just convince me by also reminding me of the identities of the tens of thousands of people who asked for the green garden waste not to go ahead, the freeze on Council Tax and to keep Cheam baths open. These figures are bandied around for expenditure, vast expenditure by the Council but there is very little real evidence. The core and the crux of the problem tonight is it is all based on of a lack of evidence and a convincing story from Councillor Tope. Who are these people? Where have these petitions come from?

**Reply by Councillor Graham Tope**

I'm not quite sure what the question was there, but Councillor Kennedy committed himself to try harder to believe me. If he will do that; I'll try harder to convince him. We may both be destined for failure.