

Item No. 16.	Classification: Open	Date: 18 September 2018	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Motions referred from Council Assembly	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Council Assembly	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the cabinet considers the motions set out in the appendices attached to the report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Council assembly at its meeting on Wednesday 14 March 2018 agreed several motions and these stand referred to the cabinet for consideration.
3. The cabinet is requested to consider the motion referred to it. Any proposals in a motion are treated as a recommendation only. When considering a motion, cabinet can decide to:
 - Note the motion; *or*
 - Agree the motion in its entirety, *or*
 - Amend the motion; *or*
 - Reject the motion.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.10.6, the attached motions were referred to the cabinet.
5. The constitution allocates responsibility for particular functions to council assembly, including approving the budget and policy framework, and to the cabinet for developing and implementing the budget and policy framework and overseeing the running of council services on a day-to-day basis.
6. Any key issues, such as policy, community impact or funding implications are included in the advice from the relevant chief officer.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Council agenda	Report on the council's website	Virginia Wynn-Jones Constitutional Team 020 7525 7055
Link: http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=132&MId=6173&Ver=4		

APPENDICES

Number	Title
Appendix 1	Stronger, safer, more resilient communities
Appendix 2	Corporate parenting in Southwark
Appendix 3	Rising crime in Surrey Docks
Appendix 4	Modern slavery
Appendix 5	Saving the RV1 bus
Appendix 6	Securing a Bricklayers Arms tube station
Appendix 7	Taking action on short term letting
Appendix 8	Jamaica Road gridlock

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Chidilim Agada, Head of Constitutional Services		
Report Author	Virginia Wynn-Jones, Principal Constitutional Officer		
Version	Final		
Dated	21 August 2018		
Key Decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included	
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No	
Director of Law and Democracy	No	No	
Strategic Director of Children's and Adults' Services	No	No	
Cabinet Member	No	No	
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		21 August 2018	

APPENDIX 1

STRONGER, SAFER, MORE RESILIENT COMMUNITIES

1. Council assembly notes:
 - a. That Southwark's communities add great value to our borough, and make Southwark a place which we can all be proud of
 - b. That despite cuts from this Conservative government, Southwark Council continues to provide financial support to community groups, voluntary organisations and faith groups through the community capacity grants programme
 - c. The council's Voluntary and Community Sector Strategy which aims to deliver a thriving voluntary and community sector which meets the needs of our residents
 - d. The role played by faith groups in creating strong and resilient communities, and the development of a Faith Strategy which will be launched later this year
 - e. The zero-tolerance to hate crime approach taken by the council
 - f. That youth violence continues to be a problem in Southwark and across London
 - g. That the council is working with communities, the police, and other partners to tackle youth violence, violence against women and girls, and other issues which harm our communities
 - h. Southwark Labour's manifesto commitment to work with our communities to find local solutions that help young people stay away from knives and launch a Positive Futures Fund to support groups that provide inspiring opportunities for young people
2. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:
 - a. Build on the work done on the Women's Safety Charter and develop and deliver a Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy to tackle all forms of gender-based violence in our communities
 - b. Fulfil Labour's manifesto pledge and establish a Positive Futures Fund to empower communities to provide inspiring opportunities for young people which help them to stay away from knives and not become involved in youth violence
 - c. Continue to work with groups and partners in the community to tackle extremism and support those who may be at risk of radicalisation, recognising that the best solutions to these problems can often be found in the community
 - d. Continue to work with and for Southwark's communities to ensure that they are strong, safe and resilient.

APPENDIX 2

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.

APPENDIX 3

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. That under a Labour administration, action has been taken by Southwark Council to tackle anti-social behaviour, and the number of arrests using CCTV footage has increased thanks to the work of the council's award-winning CCTV team.
 - d. That under the previous Liberal Democrat administration, CCTV coverage was cut and anti-social behaviour powers were not used most effectively.
2. Council assembly further recognises:
 - a. The reduction in police officers and community support officers across London thanks to the cuts imposed by this Conservative government and the previous Liberal Democrat/Conservative Coalition.
 - b. The reduction in police officers across Southwark from 957 to 706.5 officers, including 546 police constables since 2010.
 - c. The reduction in Safer Neighbourhood Teams for each ward from 6 members to 3.
3. Council assembly is aware that:
 - a. Tower Hamlets Council have hired additional police officers.
 - b. The Tower Hamlets scheme is still in at an early stage and the success of these arrangements is still to be determined.
 - c. Whilst the Mayor of London will provide a free officer for every officer that the council pays for, the cost to Tower Hamlets Council will be £3m per year once they have all the officers they have agreed to purchase in place.
 - d. That thanks to cuts from this Conservative government and the previous Liberal Democrat/Conservative coalition, the council's budget has been halved since 2010, and is continuing to reduce year on year.
4. Council assembly recommends that Southwark Council:
 - a. Investigate, alongside other options, hiring extra police officers to patrol Southwark's neighbourhoods.
 - b. Continue to work with the police and the Borough Commander to prevent, detect and respond to crime and anti-social behaviour in Southwark.
 - c. Consider installing extra streetlights and CCTV cameras in hotspot areas for violent crime.

APPENDIX 4

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.

APPENDIX 5

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.
 - g. The cross party support for returning to the former timetable of the RV1 bus, including the commitment in the 2018 Southwark Labour manifesto to campaign to reinstate the frequency of the RV1 bus service.
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 further notes:
 - a. That the Deputy Mayor for Transport has agreed to review the service after six months (by 10 August 2018) following Mayoral Questions from London Assembly Members Caroline Pigeon and Florence Eshalomi.
 - b. That Labour London Assembly Member Florence Eshalomi has written to both the Mayor and TfL about the changes to the RV1 bus, and also discussed this with Heidi Alexander, the newly appointed Deputy Mayor for Transport.
4. Council assembly calls on cabinet to:
 - a. Continue to campaign for the RV1 bus to return to six services an hour.
 - 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. Encourage the Mayor and TfL to explore the suggestion to market the RV1 bus as a route serving multiple tourist attractions since the route passes dozens of London Southwark landmarks along the river.

5. Council assembly calls on TfL and the Mayor of London to:
 - a. Review the changes to the RV1 bus service 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.

APPENDIX 6

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.
 - e. Before the last election, Southwark Labour's manifesto made a commitment to Campaign for three new tube stations on the Old Kent Road, including one at the Bricklayers Arms.
 - f. The leader and the cabinet member for growth, development and planning have written to the new Deputy Mayor for Transport, Heidi Alexander, to press the case for a tube station at the Bricklayers Arms, and have invited her to visit the site to see for herself the potential of the location.
 - g. That, following pressure from Southwark Council, TfL are undertaking a detailed cost-benefit analysis and design study that looks at the different options for the tube station at Bricklayers Arms.
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. Maintain their commitment to make contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) toward the Bakerloo Line Extension.
- b. Produce a detailed study working with the London Borough of Lewisham and TfL to look at funding options.
- c. Investigate commissioning an independent analysis of TfL's findings and decision when announced in July.
- d. Continue to lobby the Mayor of London, the Deputy Mayor for Transport, and TfL for a station at Bricklayers Arms, and launch a new 'Back the Bakerloo' campaign, working with the local community to demonstrate to TfL the widespread support for the Bricklayers Arms station.

APPENDIX 7

TAKING ACTION ON SHORT TERM LETTING

1. Council assembly recognises:
 - a. That national legislation has not caught up with the sharing economy.
 - b. That plenty of 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 home-sharing websites, but that some continue to do so.
 - f. That short term letting can lead to security risks, anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance, and other loss of amenity for our residents.
 - g. That some short-term lettings bear no relation to the idea of flat-sharing and are effectively hotels or hostels – sometimes run by owners who live away, sometimes overseas.
 - h. That the housing crisis in London is worsened by the proliferation of short term lets on council estates.
2. Council assembly finds it unacceptable that:
 - a. Some Airbnb-type hosts are sharing estate entry codes with guests.
 - b. Reports of anti-social behaviour related to short term lets have been made by residents across the borough.
 - c. That despite the hard work of Southwark Council, including writing to all leaseholders as outlined in (1), short-term lets have continued in Southwark council properties.
3. Council assembly agrees that:
 - a. Short term letting of council properties 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) and applaud the cabinet member for housing management and modernisation for her work on this issue, and recognise that Southwark was among the first local authorities to take this stance on short-term lets.
 - 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. Continue to notify leaseholders when short term lets have been identified in their properties and discourage them from letting on a short term basis.
- d. Continue to 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. Make clear to leaseholders that they are accountable for the behaviour of their tenants.
- g. Take pro-active enforcement action against offenders and intervene early to prevent enforcement from being necessary where possible.
- h. Alert short term letting platforms of users who breach local authority rules.
- i. Continue to work with TMOs and TRAs across the borough to identify potential short term lets on estates.

(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>

APPENDIX 8

JAMAICA ROAD GRIDLOCK

1. Council assembly notes:
 - 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. That TfL has not introduced Variable Message Signs on Jamaica Road. There are roughly 3,000 of these across England – but not on one of its most congested roads.
 - f. That the cabinet member for environment, transport management and air quality has raised the issue of congestion on Jamaica Road with the new Deputy Mayor for Transport, Heidi Alexander.
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 (NO₂) consistently sits above the legal limit (a maximum of 40µg/m³). Very often it reaches 60-70µg/m³. Around some stretches of the road it is 90-100µg/m³.
 - c. At the Abbey St junction NO₂ 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, NO₂ 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. Consider introducing 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 zero emission 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. Work with TfL to continue to explore proposals to fund the Bermondsey-Rotherhithe Santander bike hire expansion.
 - b. Consider installing a PM2.5/PM10 (Particulate Matter pollution) automatic monitoring station on Jamaica Road, as a part of Labour's manifesto commitment to tackling poor air quality and air pollution.
 - c. Promote existing apps and website where residents can check air quality and pollution levels in real time.