

Item No. 7.1	Classification: Open	Date: April 8 2009	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Report back on motions referred to executive from council assembly	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Executive	

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2.9 (6) – CROSS RIVER TRAM

Executive on February 17 2009 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on November 5 2008 which had been moved by Councillor Barrie Hargrove and seconded by Councillor Chris Page and subsequently amended:

1. That council assembly notes that the Mayor of London has not agreed to fund the construction of the Cross River tram yet but notes that he is being constrained by the previous Mayor, Ken Livingstone, to a 10 year budget for transport works in London which makes no provision for its funding.
2. That council assembly notes the cross-party belief that the Cross River Tram project is vital to the future development of Southwark.
3. That council assembly notes that in recognition of this support, the executive member for regeneration recently led a cross-party deputation of assembly members and councillors to seek the Mayor's support for the tram and that the leader and deputy leader of the council met with Deputy Mayor Sir Simon Milton last week to make the case for the tram.
4. That council assembly believes that as funding for the construction of the Cross River tram is not within Transport for London's (TfL) budget for the period to 2016, support for the scheme from the Department for Transport - as well as from the Mayor - is crucial if the scheme is to be delivered and notes that the MP for North Southwark and Bermondsey has tabled a motion in parliament to this effect.
5. That council assembly calls on the executive to continue its efforts in lobbying the Mayor for the scheme, using every available avenue of influence and to begin lobbying the Secretary of State for Transport.
6. That council assembly therefore calls on the executive member for regeneration to write to Mayor Boris Johnson, asking him to include funding for the Cross River tram in his forthcoming Economic Recovery Action Plan.
7. That council assembly further calls on the executive member for regeneration to:
 - a) Organise a 'mass lobby' of parliament to draw attention to the importance of the scheme for Southwark and south London in general;
 - b) Write to his colleagues in Lambeth, Westminster and Camden seeking their support for the mass lobby and asking them to publicise it in their area;

- c) Seek funding for a poster van or other publicity vehicle to drive from Southwark to Parliament Square, via City Hall, to raise awareness of the mass lobby;
- d) Write to Southwark's MPs asking them to sign the Early Day Motion on the Cross River Tram and to make themselves available to meet constituents attending the mass lobby.

We noted the motion and the subsequent events which were set out in the comments from the strategic director of regeneration and neighbourhoods.

The executive member for regeneration reported that he had written to colleagues in Camden, Lambeth and Westminster asking for continued support.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2.9 (6) – LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING SETTLEMENT

Executive on February 17 2009 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on January 28 2009 which had been moved by Councillor Nick Stanton and seconded by Councillor Tim McNally and subsequently amended:

1. That council assembly notes that in December 2007, the government announced its three year funding settlement for local government, imposing a real terms funding cut of £35 million on Southwark and forcing the council to reduce its expenditure by more than 10% between 2008 and 2011.
2. That council assembly notes that as a result the executive was forced to make £5 million service cuts, including closing the Livesey Museum, reducing access to social care services and increasing charges for meals on wheels, despite finding back office savings and efficiencies in the region of £30 million.
3. That council assembly notes that since that funding settlement was announced, the executive has been leading a fair funding campaign, seeking to secure changes to the government's funding methodology and to get a fairer deal for Southwark, and that this campaign has focussed on:
 - a) The use of outdated population projections based on 2004 estimates which, according to the Office for National Statistics, may be up to 10,000 people short, costing Southwark some £18 million.
 - b) The use of a flawed formula for apportioning social care funding, which without the protection of the grant 'floor' would cost Southwark some £26 million, and which ensures that the council receives the minimum, below inflation, funding increase.

4. That council assembly further notes that the country is now on course for a recession and that by the end of 2008:
 - a) Unemployment was at 1.864 million, its highest since 2000, after 10 months of successive rises.
 - b) The pound had reached a record low valuation against the euro, losing a quarter of its value since the beginning of the year.
 - c) House prices had fallen by over 10% during the course of the year.
5. That council assembly notes that the economic downturn has already had a severe impact on the council's finances, with the cut in interest rates alone costing over £4 million in lost interest from deposits and the reduction in revenue from land searches predicted at over £0.5 million.
6. That council assembly notes in addition that as the recession takes effect, the demand for a wide range of council services – from more people seeking benefit advice to an increase in the number of people using council leisure facilities, rather than private gyms – is likely to increase.
7. That council assembly therefore notes with dismay that despite this worsening situation and the overwhelming evidence that the existing formula is flawed, the Local Government Minister John Healey announced on November 26 that the council's funding would not increase by more than 1.75% and wrote to the leader of the council stating there are “no current plans to review” the funding formula.
8. That council assembly notes that the resulting funding shortfall will make it impossible for the council to produce a balanced budget without undertaking further cuts to frontline services.
9. That council assembly therefore calls on the leaders of all parties represented on Southwark Council to write to the Secretary of State for Local Government, condemning the government's failure to increase its funding for Southwark, questioning the continued use of flawed formulae and information, and calling on her to urgently review this situation with a view to increasing Southwark's funding settlement.
10. That council assembly further notes:
 - a) That in December 2008, NHS London and London Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) agreed to a medium term financial strategy which included a 1.3% budget top slice from all PCTs in an effort to pay off the historic debts of 11 Hospital Trusts and 1 PCT.
 - b) That at the same meeting, and for the same purpose, PCTs agreed to forgo the reimbursement of monies owed to them from the last top slice, of 3%, agreed in 2006.
 - c) That as a result of these decisions, Southwark PCT stands to lose in the region of £20m from its budget over the next two years.
 - d) That the Southwark PCT board voted against these proposals in December, proposing instead to provide a 0.4% contribution.

11. That council assembly believes that the top slice penalises prudence while rewarding poor financial management and makes no regard for relative health inequalities and therefore supports the PCT board in its decision to oppose it.
12. That council assembly opposes this further cut in public sector funding for Southwark, in the current financial climate.
13. That council assembly welcomes the steps taken by Simon Hughes MP to challenge the top slice and condemns the apparent inaction of the borough's two Labour MPs to oppose a decision which has such damaging repercussions for Southwark health services and their failure to use their positions in the cabinet to lobby for its reversal.
14. That council assembly urges the PCT to continue its opposition to the 1.3% top slice and calls on the executive to write directly to the Secretary of State, calling on him to review this decision and seek alternative sources of funding to clear London NHS debts.

We noted the motion and comments of the finance director.

The executive member for health and adult care reported that he had written a letter to the Secretary of State on February 2 2009.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2.9 (6) – AN OLYMPIC LEGACY FOR CAMBERWELL

Executive on February 17 2009 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on January 28 2009 which had been moved by Councillor Lewis Robinson and seconded by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon and subsequently amended:

1. That council assembly notes that the successful Olympic handover ceremony at Camberwell Green last year, jointly organised by Southwark Council events team and the SE5 Forum and the intention to repeat such an event on "Olympic Day" this year.
2. That council assembly notes that the council's participation in the governments free swimming programme for over 60s and under 16s and welcomes the funding provided for the next two financial years.
3. That council assembly notes that the council's application to the government's free swimming capital modernisation fund for £1.5million capital to match fund the council's £1.5million already allocated to refurbish the swimming facilities at Camberwell Leisure Centre, and that, if successful, works could begin in the next financial year.
4. That council assembly further notes that despite a highly competitive application process, the council have now been invited to submit their "stage 2" application for Camberwell, and thanks the work done so far by officers and the contribution made by the Camberwell Baths campaign, Friends of Camberwell Leisure Centre, SE5Forum, Camberwell Society, Lyndhurst, Brunswick Park and other primary schools, local businesses and tenants and residents groups

5. That council assembly believes that the refurbishment of the swimming facilities at Camberwell Leisure Centre would be an appropriate "*Olympic Legacy*" for Camberwell, restoring a historic and well loved public facility in one of the most deprived areas of South London for future generations.
6. That council assembly also believes that in the current financial climate a successful application to the government's free swimming capital modernisation fund represents the best opportunity to achieve this ambition, and that the ability to mobilise works quickly will play a small but important part in fighting the economic downturn in Southwark.
7. That council assembly invites Southwark representatives of all political parties to reaffirm or make clear their support for this application, and to make the case for Camberwell where appropriate.
8. That council assembly requests the executive member leads cross-party representations to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to resolve the revenue funding status for free swimming which expires in April 2011, to give local authorities certainty for financial planning.

We agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2.9 (6) – COMMUNITY MICRO-GENERATION IN SOUTHWARK COUNCIL

Executive on February 17 2009 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on January 28 2009 which had been moved by Councillor Graham Nardell and seconded by Councillor Andrew Pakes and subsequently amended:

1. That council assembly recognises that reduction of carbon emissions from domestic energy consumption is a key goal in tackling climate change, and that the council's climate change strategy must include promoting a step change energy efficiency and decentralised energy production for existing dwellings, alongside the policies and measures the council has already adopted in relation to new build.
2. That council assembly believes that community-based energy efficiency and micro-generation schemes have an essential role to play as part of that strategy. They can also help relieve fuel poverty at a time of high energy costs and financial uncertainty.
3. That council assembly therefore welcomes the establishment of Peckham Power as the first such group initiative in the borough following its successful launch conference on November 22 2008 with the support of officers and members. We note its aim of acting as a co-operative enterprise, run by and for local residents in Peckham and Nunhead, to help people – no matter what their income – to generate and use energy sustainably; and to provide advice and skills to people who want to install, maintain and develop local energy generation and efficiency measures, including retro-fitting solar thermal and photovoltaic systems to existing housing stock. We wish to see this and other local initiatives thriving around the borough.

4. That council assembly therefore invites the executive to prepare and consult on proposals to promote community-based energy efficiency and micro-generation schemes throughout the borough, including:
 - a) Start-up advice, assistance and funding to enable local groups to form.
 - b) Advice and assistance for securing grants and other financial assistance from government, the European Union and other sources.
 - c) Ongoing advice and assistance on organisational, technical and financial issues.
 - d) Exploring ways of enabling existing dwellings in regeneration areas to benefit from low carbon initiatives associated with new-build, such as the Elephant & Castle multi utility services company (MUSCo).
5. That council recognises that by 2050, 80-90% of homes in the borough will be between 100-150 years old and that the most efficient way to reduce CO2 emissions in order of effectiveness is: insulation - pipe work, insulation - roof, insulation - under floor, insulation - external walls, high quality double glazing, solar water for south facing roofs, heat exchangers.
6. That council assembly therefore invites the executive to prepare and consult on the provision of Green Mortgages by the council, either directly or via community groups, which could enable the rapid roll out of such techniques and a dramatic reduction in the borough's carbon emissions.
7. That council assembly requests the executive to report back to council assembly within 6 months on the measures it has put in place.

We agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2.9 (6) – SUSTAINABLES COMMUNITIES ACT

Executive on February 17 2009 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on January 28 2009 which had been moved by Councillor Adele Morris and seconded by Councillor Nick Vineall:

1. That council assembly believes that local authorities and their communities know best on the solutions to local problems and so should determine how to promote thriving communities.
2. That council assembly supports the bottom up process set out in the Sustainable Communities Act designed to allow local authorities and their communities to drive the help that central government gives in reversing community decline and promoting thriving, sustainable communities.

3. That council assembly notes that the act became law in October 2007 with full cross party support and that this was a result of a 5 year campaign run by a coalition of over 90 national citizens organisations called Local Works.
4. That council assembly notes that the act gives local authorities the power to:
 - a) Make proposals to government on the action government must take to reverse community decline and promote sustainable communities.
 - b) Argue for a transfer of public money and function from central to local control.
5. That council assembly notes that the act defines the sustainability of local communities broadly, encompassing all aspects of economic, social and environmental well being.
6. That council assembly welcomes the leader's intention to work with overview and scrutiny, the local strategic partnership and the local community to develop proposals for submission under the act and to consult the local community on these proposals.
7. That council assembly calls on the leader to ensure that members of all parties are involved in preparing proposals and encouraging participation by local people in the consultation process.

We agreed the motion.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Executive agenda and minutes – February 17 2009	Constitutional Team, Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	
Report Author	Paula Thornton, Constitutional Team	
Version	Final	
Dated	March 25 2009	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Legal and Democratic Services	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		March 25 2009