

<b>Item No.</b> 5.2	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 11 July 2018	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council Assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Members' Motions	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Proper Constitutional Officer	

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The councillor introducing or “moving” the motion may make a speech directed to the matter under discussion. This may not exceed five minutes<sup>1</sup>.

A second councillor will then be asked by the Mayor to “second” the motion. This may not exceed three minutes without the consent of the Mayor.

The meeting will then debate the issue and any amendments on the motion will be dealt with.

At the end of the debate the mover of the motion may make a concluding speech, known as a “right of reply”. If an amendment is carried, the mover of the amendment shall hold the right of reply to any subsequent amendments and, if no further amendments are carried, at the conclusion of the debate on the substantive motion.

The Mayor will then ask councillors to vote on the motion (and any amendments).

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

The constitution allocates responsibility for particular functions to council assembly, including approving the budget and policy framework, and allocates to the cabinet responsibility for developing and implementing the budget and policy framework and overseeing the running of council services on a day-to-day basis. Therefore any matters that are reserved to the cabinet (i.e. housing, social services, regeneration, environment, education etc) cannot be decided upon by council assembly without prior reference to the cabinet. While it would be in order for council assembly to discuss an issue, consideration of any of the following should be referred to the cabinet:

- to change or develop a new or existing policy
- to instruct officers to implement new procedures
- to allocate resources.

**Note:** In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.10 (7) & (8) (prioritisation and rotation by the political groups) the order in which motions appear in the agenda may not necessarily be the order in which they are considered at the meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council assembly procedure rule 1.14 (9)

1. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KATH WHITTAM** (Seconded by Councillor Jasmine Ali)

### **Corporate Parenting in Southwark**

1. This motion seeks to build on the good work that Southwark is doing with children in our care and young people leaving care. Last year we received a good rating from Ofsted, secured innovation funding to enable young people in care to reconfigure our care leaving services, and waived council tax fees for all care leavers.
2. This year, in our forward plan, we have guaranteed an education placement or apprenticeship for all children and young people preparing to leave care.

### **Background**

3. At the same time we have witnessed a national scrutiny spotlight being put on children's social care. The Children and Social Work Act 2017 has released updated statutory guidance to improve corporate parenting. This was followed by the launch of the Education Committee's scrutiny of foster care which was in turn swiftly followed by the release of government commissioned Foster Care in England Inquiry authored by Martin Narey and Mark Owers.
4. The government's response to the scrutiny reports has yet to be released – but we can anticipate a shift to improve services along the lines of permanence as opposed to fragmented responses to families requiring care services into adoption, SGOs and foster care.
5. At the same time the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS) have launched its Brighter Future campaign which has exposed a £2 billion deficit in children's social care. In Southwark we hosted the launch of a suite of reports entitled Care Crisis.

### **Individual councillors as corporate parents**

6. The role that this council plays in looking after children is one of the most important things that we do. Just like all other local authorities, we have a unique responsibility to the children that we look after. It is in this context that local authorities are referred to as the 'corporate parent' of these children and young people, and the critical question that we should ask in adopting such an approach is 'would this be good enough for my child?'
  - a. Council assembly recognises that children in care are more likely to succeed in education or employment if someone is interested in their progress.
  - b. Council assembly will build on its strong ethos of corporate parenting by inviting all councillors to participate in this role, not only those on the Corporate Parenting Committee
  - c. Council assembly calls on cabinet to develop a scheme to engage councillors with looked after children, including monitoring their progress and encouraging written contact in the form of cards to acknowledge

birthdays, faith festival dates and dates of exams, results of exams and education or job interview results

- d. Council assembly encourages councillors to volunteer to be a part of this initiative, recognising that this is a serious commitment to a potentially vulnerable child.

**Note:** If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration.

**2. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAN WHITEHEAD** (Seconded by Councillor Jane Salmon)

**Rising crime in Surrey Docks**

1. Council assembly recognises:
  - a. The dramatic rise in violent crime across London.
  - b. The spread of violent crime – especially knife crime – across most wards in Southwark Council.
  - c. The fact that Surrey Docks has seen the fastest rise in violent crime in the borough, approaching 40% in the last year.
  - d. The fact that assaults and GBH (grievous bodily harm) are becoming more common in Surrey Docks, rising 63% and 83% respectively last year.
  - e. The serious rise in robberies in Surrey Docks over the past two years, including a 6% rise last year.
  - f. The persistent threat from burglaries in the ward. There are several hundred break-ins every year, and in the last 12 months burglaries went up by almost 90%.
2. Council assembly further recognises:
  - a. The reduction in police officers and community support officers across London.
  - b. The reduction in police officers across Southwark from 957 to 665 – a 30% drop – since 2010.
  - c. The reduction in Safer Neighbourhood Teams for each ward from 6 members to 3.
  - d. The reduction in Community Wardens from 31 to 19.
  - e. The withdrawal of Southwark Police into ‘reactive’ policing. Long-term and pro-active investigations into gangs and organised crime have been heavily reduced.
  - f. The severe cuts to youth services, leading to the closure of youth clubs and the loss of youth workers.
3. Council assembly is aware that:
  - a. Tower Hamlets Council have hired 39 police officers.
  - b. Extra police now patrol housing estates in Tower Hamlets.
  - c. Tower Hamlets have been able to direct these officers to deal with residents’ priorities.
  - d. These successful deployments have helped in tackling anti-social behaviour and drugs.

- e. More than 155 arrests have been made by these new officers, 387 stop and searches, and regular weapons sweeps for knives and guns – as well as cash acquired from crime.
- f. The Mayor of London will provide a free officer for every officer a council pays for.
- g. This has kept the cost of Tower Hamlets scheme relatively low – at £1m per year.

4. Council assembly recommends that Southwark Council:

- a. Hire extra police officers to patrol Southwark’s neighbourhoods.
- b. Create a dedicated unit to carry out proactive investigations into violent crime in the borough.
- c. Direct this unit to focus initially on knife crime, recognising that Southwark now has the highest rate of knife crime in London.
- d. Allow the Borough Commander to determine how resources are allocated within the unit – whether that be extra detectives, analysts, surveillance equipment, or other technology.
- e. Install extra streetlights and CCTV cameras in hotspot areas for violent crime.

**Note:** If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration.

**3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN DENNIS** (Seconded by Councillor Victoria Olisa)

**Modern slavery**

1. Council assembly notes:

- a. Though slavery was abolished in the UK in 1833, there are more slaves today than ever before in human history. Figures from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) suggest that there are more than 40 million people in modern slavery across the world, with nearly 25 million held in forced labour.
- b. There were 3,805 victims of modern slavery identified in the UK in 2016. A rising number but still well below the 10,000 and 13,000 potential victims estimated by the Home Office.
- c. Modern slavery is happening nationwide. Traffickers and slave masters use whatever means they have at their disposal to coerce, deceive and force individuals into a life of abuse, servitude and inhumane treatment. This can include sexual and criminal exploitation.

2. Council assembly believes:

- a. That action needs to be taken to raise awareness of modern slavery and the fact that it is happening all over the UK.
- b. That the current support for victims is not sufficient and needs to go beyond the 45 days they are currently given by the government.
- c. That councils have an important role to play in ensuring their contracts and supplies don’t contribute to modern day slavery and exploitation.

3. Council assembly calls on cabinet:

- a. To adopt the Co-operative Party's Charter against modern slavery to ensure our procurement practices do not support slavery.
- b. To consider the wider impact of modern slavery on the borough, and work to ensure that all forms of modern slavery are eliminated in Southwark.

**Note:** If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration.

**4. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR VICTOR CHAMBERLAIN** (Seconded by Councillor Adele Morris)

**Saving the RV1 bus**

1. Council assembly notes:
  - a. The doubling of wait times for an RV1 bus.
  - b. The fact that there are now just three RV1 buses every hour.
  - c. The rushed decision to cut the service on 10 February 2018, publicised just 14 days before the changes went ahead.
  - d. The complete lack of consultation prior to the cut.
  - e. The complete reliance on data to make the decision.
  - f. The use of data addled by a year-long diversion at London Bridge station.
  
2. Council assembly recognises that:
  - a. The RV1 bus provides a vital service to elderly residents, who made almost 60,000 journeys with bus passes and 45,000 with Freedom Elderly passes last year – even with the route on diversion.
  - b. The bus is heavily used by students, disabled residents, and commuters from Covent Garden, Waterloo, Blackfriars, Borough, London Bridge, and North Bermondsey.
  - c. The suggestion from TfL that residents use the Jubilee Line instead of the RV1 completely ignores issues of accessibility, affordability and overcrowding.
  - d. The RV1 is one of the only zero-emission routes in London, operated by a fleet of hydrogen-powered buses.
  - e. 1,000 Southwark and London residents signed a petition condemning the RV1 cuts and the failure to consult.
  - f. To this date there has still been no consultation with residents – despite a significant public petition.
  - g. There is cross-party opposition to the cuts, including from the leader of the council.
  
3. Council assembly is disappointed that:
  - a. It took pressure from the Liberal Democrat London Assembly member, Caroline Pidgeon, at Mayoral Question Time to get the Deputy Mayor for Transport to agree to review the service after 6 months. The review is due by 10 August 2018.
  - b. Freedom of Information (FOI) requests were required to discover the basis for this decision.
  - c. FOI responses showed that TfL and the Mayor's office knew the cut was due to go ahead with little or no warning – but pressed ahead anyway.

- d. Concerns were raised, including comments over email that ‘this is going ahead very quickly’ and ‘there will be a stink’.
  - e. There was confusion and division surrounding the decision, revealed by emails that said: ‘Thought this was all up for discussion with the Mayor’ and ‘I thought this was on hold’. And yet the decision was still allowed to go ahead.
  - f. An FOI request submitted by Liberal Democrat councillors for Borough and Bankside on 7 February 2018 went unanswered for more than 3 months (when a response ought to be provided within 3 weeks).
4. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:
- a. Officially condemn the cuts to the RV1 bus service.
  - b. Write to TfL opposing the cuts, requesting a full consultation, and formally asking for the RV1 bus to be restored to full service.
  - c. Take up the novel idea put forward by Caroline Pidgeon to pitch the RV1 bus service to tourists – supported by the Mayor of London and TfL Commissioner Mike Brown – since the route passes dozens of London and Southwark landmarks along the river.
5. Council assembly calls on TfL and the Mayor of London to:
- a. Fulfil the promise in a written response to Caroline Pidgeon to review the RV1 bus cut after 6 months.
  - b. Hold a consultation with residents on the full restoration of the RV1 bus service.
  - c. Introduce more zero-emission buses in Southwark to cut the high concentrations of air pollution in the borough, especially on Southwark Bridge Road, Borough High Street, Tower Bridge Road, Jamaica Road, and the Old Kent Road.

**Note:** If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration.

**5. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAMIAN O'BRIEN** (Seconded by Councillor Humaira Ali)

**Securing a Bricklayers Arms tube station**

1. Council assembly recognises that:
- a. The Bricklayers Arms site is ideal for a tube station.
  - b. There is strong cross-party support for the station in Southwark.
  - c. Close to 3,000 people have signed the petition for a Bricklayers Arms tube station.
  - d. The station has the support of local businesses and community groups – including the Tower Bridge Alliance, Bermondsey Street Area Partnership and Bricklayers Arms Tenants and Residents Association.
2. Council assembly further recognises that:
- a. A station between Elephant & Castle and Old Kent Road would bring tube access to thousands of people in Chaucer, North Walworth and West Bermondsey.

- b. A station at Bricklayers Arms would also provide much-needed relief for the overcrowded Jubilee Line.
- c. A station would also be a vital future-proofing measure, given the rapid expansion in population due to take place in the area – especially under the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan.
- d. There is an historic divide between north and south London in tube access. Zone 1 in the north has 55 tube stops. In the south, we have 7.
- e. Transport for London (TfL) is planning wide gaps between stations on the Bakerloo Line Extension (1.2 miles, comparing poorly with the 0.59 mile average on the rest of the line).
- f. This would be an enormous missed opportunity to narrow the gap between north and south London.
- g. A sparsity of stations on the extension will actually reinforce this gap – and the social and economic inequality that comes with it.
- h. An additional station would be a landmark contribution to the reduction of inequality, bringing clear social, economic and environmental gains for the area.

3. Council assembly is clear that:

- a. To secure an additional tube station at Bricklayers Arms a strong case has to be made to TfL and the Mayor of London on costs.
- b. A station at Bricklayers Arms would increase passenger numbers and revenue for TfL, offsetting the immediate costs to TfL over the long-term.
- c. A station would also bring investment, business, and jobs to the area – that would in the long-term outweigh the upfront costs – but that little analysis has been conducted so far.
- d. A station would reduce demand for cars, taxis and buses, reducing air pollution and cutting congestion. Nearby New Kent Road and Tower Bridge Road have some of the highest nitrogen dioxide levels in London. Last year, they averaged 71 and 91  $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$ . The limit is 40.
- e. Short-termist policy-making tends to lead to higher costs, lower quality, greater inconvenience and less coordination.

4. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:

- a. Submit a formal case to TfL on how to fund a station at Bricklayers Arms, as part of their current round of consultation on the Bakerloo Line Extension.
- b. Produce an analysis of anticipated costs and feasibility for a station that:
  - i) Takes account of the (inflation-adjusted) costs at Southwark, Bermondsey, Canada Water and other new tube stations built in recent decades.
  - ii) Confirms how much cheaper Bricklayers would be than most new stations – given the open land available at the site and that the station removes the need for a ventilation shaft.
- c. Produce an analysis of both the social and economic impact a Bricklayers tube station would have in the local area.
- d. Produce an analysis of the revenue that could be generated from a mixed use site at Bricklayers Arms – estimating the contribution a residential and commercial development above the station could make towards the capital costs of the station's construction.
- e. Make a clear commitment – given the strategic importance of a tube station at Bricklayers Arms – for the council to contribute a proportion of the funding (drawn from the Community Infrastructure Levy, section 106

agreements and/or the capital budget) and offer to gift the land at Bricklayers Arms roundabout to TfL.

5. Council assembly further calls on cabinet to:
  - a. Submit a comprehensive, written case to the Mayor of London on Bricklayers Arms, setting out:
    - i) The council's willingness to contribute funding for the station.
    - ii) The expansion in tube access – the estimated number of residents brought within walking distance of a station.
    - iii) Estimates of the local economic impact – including potential investment, business growth, and job creation.
    - iv) Independent analysis of upfront station costs – comparing recent station construction costs and accounting for savings on a ventilation shaft.
    - v) Independent analysis of long-term station costs – including estimates for population growth, future passenger numbers from a Bricklayers station, and additional bus services required in the absence of a station at Bricklayers Arms.
    - vi) The wider economic, social and environmental importance of long-term infrastructure planning.
    - vii) The rare opportunity that Bricklayers Arms presents to secure a new tube station at a much lower than average cost.

**Note:** If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration.

**6. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MARIA LINFORTH-HALL** (Seconded by Councillor Graham Neale)

**Taking action on Airbnb**

1. Council assembly recognises:
  - a. That national legislation has not caught up with the sharing economy.
  - b. That plenty of Airbnb and short-term let hosts are responsible and make a real effort to encourage their guests to be quiet, tidy and courteous.
  - c. That a sizeable minority of hosts do not make these efforts.
  - d. That some residents – both council and private tenants – are barred from hosting, yet do so anyway.
  - e. That Southwark Council has made it clear to council leaseholders that they are not allowed to host via Airbnb or other home-sharing websites, but that some continue to do so.
  - f. That Airbnb type hosting can lead to security risks, anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance, and other loss of amenity for our residents.
  - g. That some Airbnbs bear no relation to the idea of flat-sharing and are effectively hotels or hostels – sometimes run by owners who live away, sometimes overseas.
2. Council assembly finds it unacceptable that:
  - a. Some Airbnb-type hosts are sharing estate entry codes with guests.
  - b. Multiple reports of anti-social behaviour have been made by residents at the Dodson Estate, Gerridge Court, Cooper Close and other estates across the borough.



- c. Short-term lets have continued in Southwark, despite a series of promises to local residents in March 2017 that Southwark Council would not tolerate tenants or leaseholders renting on a short-term basis.(1)
3. Council assembly agrees that:
- a. Short term letting constitutes a breach of the lease covenants “not to use or suffer the flat to be used for any purpose other than as a private dwelling house” and “not to do or permit or suffer to be done any act or thing which may be or become a nuisance or annoyance to the Council or to the Lessees owners or occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring property.”
  - b. We applaud the leader of the council when he said: “We will take legal action where such cases come to our attention.”(2)
  - c. We look forward to that action, for the protection of our residents and visitors.
4. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:
- a. Take action beyond merely writing standard form letters to every leaseholder and tenant.
  - b. Publicise the ban on Airbnb in council estates – on notice boards, at TRA meetings, with leaflet drops, and via digital channels (both council outlets and community forums), and help to enable residents to feel empowered to combat the use of their communities as profit centres for pernicious landlords.
  - c. Remind HMO (houses in multiple occupation) licence holders of their obligations
  - d. Record and investigate all resident reports of unlicensed hosting.
  - e. Publish quarterly reports on unlicensed hosting that state: how many reports the council has received, from where, what action has been taken, and what the next steps are.
  - f. Create a joint enforcement team (between the council’s housing and the anti-social behaviour departments) dedicated to Airbnb.
  - g. Make clear to leaseholders that they are accountable for the behaviour of their tenants.
  - h. Take pro-active enforcement action against offenders.
  - i. Alert Airbnb and other platforms of users who breach local authority rules.
  - j. Write to Airbnb, discouraging the company or its affiliates from promoting the platform to buy-to-let landlords.
  - k. Introduce a borough-wide licensing scheme for private landlords. Like Newham’s licensing scheme, this could include a requirement for landlords to set out in writing how they plan to reduce anti-social behaviour from tenants, guests and visitors. These include, for example: ‘provision of an emergency 24hr contact number (including out of hours response arrangements)’ and ‘formal arrangements for the disposal of rubbish and bulky waste’. Licence conditions also stipulate that a ‘licence holder must not ignore or fail to take action if he or she has received complaints of anti-social behaviour that concern the visitors to or occupiers of the premises’.
  - l. Recognise that four London boroughs now have a borough-wide licensing scheme in place: Newham, Waltham Forest, Barking and Dagenham, and Croydon. Given the high number of Airbnb hosts in Southwark, it would make sense to include Airbnb-specific conditions in a council application to the Secretary of State to introduce such a scheme in this borough.

(1) Southwark cracks down on short term holiday lets with warnings to local leaseholders: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk/news/2017/mar/southwark-cracks-down-on-short-term-holiday-lets-with-warnings-to-local-leaseholders>

(2) Homes not hotels: council to take action on Airbnb-style lets: <http://www.london-se1.co.uk/news/view/9324>

**7. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ELIZA MANN** (Seconded by Councillor Hamish McCallum)

**Jamaica Road gridlock**

1. Council assembly is exasperated by:
  - a. The continued failure of Transport for London (TfL) to make any serious attempt to reduce congestion on Jamaica Road.
  - b. The fact that congestion on Jamaica Road is actually getting worse – with traffic up 19% this year.
  - c. Tailbacks along Jamaica Road that now begin before 3pm.
  - d. The likelihood that a tolled Silvertown Tunnel and Blackwall Tunnel will drive even more traffic to a toll-free Rotherhithe Tunnel – creating more backups along Jamaica Road.
  - e. The fact that TfL has not even taken the simple step to introduce Variable Message Signs on Jamaica Road. There are roughly 3,000 of these across England – but not on one of its most congested roads.
2. Council assembly is aware that:
  - a. Congestion on Jamaica Road has left the area with some of the worst air pollution in London.
  - b. Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) consistently sits above the legal limit (a maximum of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>). Very often it reaches 60-70µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Around some stretches of the road it is 90-100µg/m<sup>3</sup>.
  - c. At the Abbey St junction NO<sub>2</sub> was 50% above the limit last year. At Rotherhithe Tunnel it was almost 150% over.
  - d. At St James' primary school near Jamaica Road last year, NO<sub>2</sub> was above the legal limit in every month but one.
3. Council assembly requests that cabinet call on TfL to:
  - a. Make the decongestion of Jamaica Road an urgent priority.
  - b. Set a timetable and targets for traffic reduction on Jamaica Road.
  - c. Following the grant of a Development Consent Order in May 2018 to build Silvertown Tunnel, urgently consider a rush-hour toll on Rotherhithe Tunnel.
  - d. Invest the revenue from a Rotherhithe Tunnel toll in better infrastructure on Jamaica Road and Lower Road to reduce congestion and pollution.
  - e. Finally introduce Variable Message Signs on roads leading to Rotherhithe Tunnel, warning drivers about queue lengths – or indeed alerting them when the tunnel is closed.
  - f. Make key changes to its plans for Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4), removing the cycle crossing at West Lane junction, adding plans for Lower Road, extending the proposed route into Greenwich, and consulting on an option for one-way segregated lanes on both sides of Jamaica Road – similar to CS2 on Whitechapel Road – rather than merely consult on a two-way

- superhighway on the north side. If CS4 is to cut congestion, TfL needs to be more ambitious.
- g. Introduce electric buses on the 1, 47, 188, 199, 225, 381, C10, P12, N1, N199 and N381 routes along Jamaica Road to reduce air pollution.
4. Council assembly calls on the Mayor of London to:
    - a. Reconsider the decision not to increase the number of carriages on the Jubilee Line.
  5. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:
    - a. Write to TfL formally proposing to fund the Bermondsey-Rotherhithe Santander bike hire expansion.
    - b. Install a PM2.5/PM10 (Particulate Matter pollution) automatic monitoring station on Jamaica Road, in addition to those currently operating at Old Kent Road and Elephant & Castle.
    - c. Introduce 'smog signs' – especially outside the primary schools and secondary school by Jamaica Road – electronic displays that warn the public about pollution levels in real time, not just in a report several months later.

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Member Motions	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Andrew Weir 020 7525 7222

#### **AUDIT TRAIL**

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Chidilim Agada, Head of Constitutional Services
<b>Report Author</b>	Virginia Wynn-Jones, Principal Constitutional Officer
<b>Version</b>	Final
<b>Dated</b>	22 June 2018