

Item No. 79.	Classification: Open	Date: 24.2.03	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Motions Submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Chief Executive (Borough Solicitor & Secretary)	

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 3.9: PROCEDURAL ADVICE ON MEMBERS MOTIONS

A Member may not move more than one Motion. All Motions must be signed and seconded and delivered to the Borough Solicitor & Secretary not later than fifteen clear days before the meeting.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 the Member moving the Motion will be asked by the Mayor to move the motion. The Mover may then make a speech directed to the matter under discussion. (This may not exceed five minutes without the consent of the Mayor).

The Seconder 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 open up to debate on the issue and any amendments on the Motion will be dealt with.

At the end of the debate the Mover of the Motion may exercise 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 Members to vote on the Motion (and any amendments).

IMPLICATIONS OF NEW CONSTITUTION

The new constitution allocates particular responsibility for functions to Council Assembly, for approving the budget and policy framework, and to the Executive, 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 reserved to Executive (i.e. housing, social services, regeneration, environment, education etc) can not be decided upon by Council Assembly without prior reference to the Executive. While it would be in order for Council Assembly to discuss an issue, consideration of any of the following should be referred to the Executive:

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

1. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN** (seconded by Councillor Gavin O'Brien)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly.

'Council notes the problem of fly-tipping in Southwark and the limited powers available to local authorities in dealing with this problem.

Council notes further that the Environment Agency, but not Southwark Council, has the power to stop vehicles carrying spoil and to demand to see their waste transfer license.

Council calls on the Government to give local authorities the same powers as it currently gives to the Environment Agency so that councils can effectively tackle this aspect of environmental crime.'

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE

To follow

2. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS** (seconded by Councillor Abdul Mohamed)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'Council Assembly notes with extreme concern that the Housing Department's performance on the Housing Investment Programme as judged by the Government Office for London has fallen from average to below average this financial year and asks the Executive to receive an urgent report outlining how this deterioration will be reversed.'

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF HOUSING

The Council is responsible for producing a Housing Strategy, which together with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and various statistical appendices is usually submitted each year to the Government Office for London (GoL). GoL's assessment of these documents for 2002/03 has recently been received and the authority was judged as being "Below Average", representing a drop of one band from "Average" the previous year. The scoring of the documents are made against the Government's "Fit for Purpose" criteria. This is the first year in which this particular set of criteria has been employed and no authority in London reached the level of producing a "Fit for Purpose" submission.

The "Below Average" assessment is based on performance relative to other London boroughs and is in contrast to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) of Southwark's Housing service which scored 3 out of 4. The CPA is based on a national, rather than regional picture of relative performance.

Discussions have taken place with GoL officials and it is clear that there are no major problems with the Housing Strategy and only more information is required before it is "Fit for Purpose". If this can be achieved within the next six weeks, no updated strategy will be required this year. The HRA Business Plan, however, has inherent weaknesses – for instance the stock condition information is not up to date. Officers are now working to address these concerns (e.g. a new stock condition survey is

now underway) and produce this year's Business Plan in July. However it is considered that the Council has been treated unfairly by GoL, partly it seems because of a lack of clarity about the assessment criteria, and we are appealing against the assessment.

Given that whatever the outcome of this appeal, it is important that efforts are now concentrated on improving performance in the development of the Business Plan, it is not proposed that a separate report is produced for the Executive as the new Business Plan must be completed by July and will be considered by the Executive beforehand.

3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS (seconded by Councillor Richard Porter)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'This Council believes that the current voting system acts as a barrier to participation in local democracy. Unjustified outcomes, such as:

- entrenched one-party dominance.
- greatly exaggerated majorities
- 'losers' winning overall control

feed the belief that voting doesn't make a difference.

In contrast, more representative councils would be more involving of, and more accountable, to local communities.

Council notes the Scottish Executive's proposal to introduce voting reform for local government and the Assembly's consideration of similar reforms in Wales.

Council therefore calls on the government to take steps to introduce a proportional voting system for local government in England.'

COMMENTS FROM THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR & SECRETARY

As the motion indicates, decisions regarding the voting methods in force in any election are decided by its Government, and are primarily political choices. There are no specific legal or election issues to support one choice over another.

Were any change to be proposed there would be widespread consultation and the views of the Electoral Commission and Returning Officers in the country would be sought on practical issues and in particular on likely impact on voter turnout.

4. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KENNY MIZZI (Seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'In light of the Council's poor record in managing sickness absence, Council Assembly requests the Executive to instruct Officers to produce a report setting out

measures to be taken to improve productivity and staff morale by better management of sickness absence.'

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Management of sickness absence has been a key internal corporate priority for over 18 months. Progress is regularly reported to Executive as part of the quarterly performance management reports; in December there was a specific report on the progress of the improvement plan.

The Council currently is projecting a small improvement in non-schools sickness rate. Whilst we are still awaiting comparative data (via Association of London Government) from other London Boroughs, the indications are that the Council's position is below average, but are at a similar level to other equivalent Local Authorities (inner London and Metropolitan Councils). Schools are not obliged to provide this data and Southwark, like many other Authorities, has difficulty collecting it. The Director of Education and Atkins have a project underway to bridge this data gap. With Schools data the Council is likely to improve its position to above average. 2002/3 data with comparisons should be available from June 2003.

The Council has in place leading edge policy and procedure on the management of sickness absence. This is supported by a performance management scheme for staff, which emphasises the importance of attendance.

In summary, over the last 18 months the following has taken place:

- Establishment of Corporate strategy and dept plans (2002/3 audit of plans to be carried out at end of March)
- Communication of the Council's priority and approach to staff
- Renewed Occupational Health contract (from 1/4/2003) with increased capacity to respond to referrals
- Council-wide health fairs held supplemented by departmental fairs some focused on stress
- Quick Best Value review to establish any policy / procedure shortcomings and blockages over management application, including investigation of other Local Authority practice.
- Renewed mandatory manager training on sickness management and risk assessment.

In the last 3 months special corporate and departmental human relations focus has been placed on the management of long-term cases. This has included a joint conference, with Occupational Health, on the 30 "worst" cases. Some early success has been experienced; most have been resolved (return to work, redeployment or termination) and the remainder have a clear short-term action plan. Because of the cumulative nature of the statistics, this will not be apparent until next financial year. It is worth noting that a number of dismissals have occurred over the past few months, relating to high sickness absence, with 5 cases awaiting appeal at the Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

Key additional activities for the next year are:

- ❖ Continue to focus on the individual cases of high sickness; produce practice notes for continuous learning
- ❖ Complete the mandatory manager training, emphasising the need for rigorous deployment of Council policy / procedures

- ❖ Renew departmental sickness plans, monitor departmental activity to pick up trends and ensure early warning of slippage
- ❖ Introduce further preventive initiatives and health promotion
- ❖ Publicise actions and results to all staff in promotion of an attendance culture

5. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY (seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

‘That Council Assembly regrets the overspend on communications and customer relations of £150,000 in 2002/03, as reported in the Budget papers to Council Assembly on 24th February (page 1673), and instructs the Chief Executive to circulate to all members as soon as practicable (and in any event no later than 25 April 2003) a report on why this was allowed to arise; who was responsible; what was the money spent on; what steps are being taken to prevent a repetition, and other relevant information.

COMMENTS FROM THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE – IMPROVEMENT & DEVELOPMENT

The projected overspend at period 9 was £150,000 as stated. This has now been brought down as a result of management action to an estimated £50,000. This derives from two main sources. The first has been the need to fund interim management arrangements during the year to cover for maternity leave for the Head of service. The second main element is due to overspend on consultation activity during the year. In essence, this is due to a demand beyond what was budgeted for at the start of the year. Examples of this include the consultation library and the innovative training for staff involved in the Race Impact Assessments. All these overspends are being contained within the strategic services budget and are being actively managed.

6. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS (seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

‘Council Assembly notes with alarm the Government’s sudden decision to abolish the Local Authority Social Housing Grant as from 1st April 2003 and calls on the Executive to come up with proposals, including increased Capital Receipts, on how to meet any shortfall both for 2003/2004 and future years’.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF HOUSING

Over recent years the Council’s Local Authority Social Housing Grant (LASHG) programme has been funded almost entirely from capital receipts. By complying with Government regulations about using at least 50% private funding on ‘regeneration’ schemes in deprived wards it has been possible to recycle 100% of the receipt from the disposal of land or buildings from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) into LASHG schemes.

With LASHG, any such payment made by the Council to a housing association was effectively reimbursed by the Housing Corporation and then set aside to pay off debt. With the demise of LASHG receipts can still be utilised to fund the construction of

new homes by housing associations – but there will be no funding for set aside, though current proposals from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister are for limited transitional payments to be made on the basis of loss of investment income.

3 existing schemes will be subject to the transitional arrangements. It is hoped 2 other schemes with a total 'grant' requirement of £3,356,108 will also be subject to the transitional arrangements provided planning consent can be obtained before the end of June 2003. (Funding from disposals for one of these schemes – Underhill Road – has largely been already identified and earmarked).

Officers have identified a further 3 schemes that would comply with Government regulations to allow 100% of capital receipts to be used, but which are unlikely to obtain planning consent before June 2003. These 3 schemes would require funding in excess of £8m. At present the source of funding for these schemes has not been identified. Use of further capital receipts for these schemes by the Council would not allow debt to be serviced and could be at the expense of other programmes.

Due to changes in the way the Housing Corporation allocates capital to housing associations, it is no longer possible to predict that a certain level of funding will be available in any one local authority area through the Approved Development Programme (currently worth about £25m of investment annually in housing association schemes in Southwark). However, there does remain the possibility of Housing Corporation investment in the 3 schemes in 2004-5; also, increasingly, the prospect that housing associations are prepared to progress with some schemes before an allocation of funding has been confirmed.

7. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BRADBURY (seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'That this Council is concerned at the constitutional and probity implications of voting in Council Assembly without opportunity for debate (and in particular without opportunity for speech by the mover) and requests Standards Committee review Procedure Rules in respect of this, and other procedural matters where change has been suggested, in good time for consideration by all Members of its recommendations well before the May 2003 Constitutional Meeting of Council Assembly, with a view to facilitating an informal discussion on that occasion.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND SECRETARY

The current Council Procedure Rule 1.13 provides that ordinary meetings of the Council Assembly are subject to a guillotine, which falls at 10.00pm. At that time a bell is rung, the Member speaking must immediately sit down, the chair must interrupt the meeting and call for the vote immediately on the item under discussion. The vote must then be taken without further discussion. Any other motions or recommendations not dealt with are deemed to have been formally moved and seconded (together with any amendments). No speeches are allowed on these items and the vote is taken without any further assistance.

The guillotine applies only to Ordinary Council Meetings, and not to the Annual (Mayor Making) Meeting, the Annual (Constitutional Meeting), or to Extraordinary Meetings. Where necessary, it is possible for the operation of Council Procedure Rule 1.13 to be suspended.

The previous Council Standing Order 25 provided for a different mechanism where a guillotine fell either 2.5 or 3 hours after the start of the meeting, excluding time for Announcements, presentations, adjournments and question time. Once the guillotine fell specific items of outstanding business could be dealt with, each of which was allocated a maximum 15 minutes for debate.

At the present time relevant officers are close to fully committed to other work. However, it would just be possible to carry out a limited fast track review of Council Procedure Rules to inform discussion at Constitutional Council on 21 May 2003. Only a small group of issues specific to Council Procedure Rules could be reviewed at this time.

This could involve a whips meeting in the first week of April, and a report to Standards Committee on 23 April 2003 setting out options on specific issues of concern raised by this motion and by the whips. Other areas where change to the Council Procedure Rules has been suggested, which could be looked at in a fast-track review include:

- The place in the order of business of Questions (specifically to formalise the practice adopted at recent Council Assemblies of taking Questions at the beginning of the meeting so that they are not affected by the guillotine).
- Allow motions and amendments to be accepted by e-mail (this would be more efficient administratively).

8. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE (seconded by Councillor David Bradbury)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'Council notes that the substantial investment in ICT and in the Corporate Call Centre approved in the 2003/4 budget are major financial commitments and have the power, if well planned and implemented, to improve the Council's service delivery and efficiency. Council also notes that if these developments are not well planned and implemented they could result in service failures, inefficiency and huge waste of resource.

Council therefore requests the Executive to instruct Officers to produce a clear programme of detailed timely and regular scrutiny by both Executive and Scrutiny members of the planning, specification, business redesign and implementation of the key elements of the ICT and Corporate Call Centre projects.

COMMENTS FROM THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE – IMPROVEMENT & DEVELOPMENT

It has always been the intention to produce a costed implementation plan for the Executive with regular monitoring. Officers are currently developing a detailed, costed, project plan for the modernization of Council services (customer access, ICT investment and e-government). A project office is being set up. A senior project officer (formally from Westminster City Council) and three professional project managers have been recruited. They will be joined by existing project managers within the Council to provide a pool of support to the various strands of work. A report is being prepared that will suggest a range of scrutiny activity to support this

programme, so that scrutiny has a role 'up-stream'. This will be discussed with the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee in the next couple of weeks. In addition there will be monthly reports to Chief Officer Team (both budget and milestone reports) and to the Executive Member. It is proposed in addition to this there should be quarterly monitoring reports to the Executive.

9. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CAROLINE PIDGEON (seconded by Councillor Mark Pursey)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'This Council:

- Condemns Mayor Ken Livingstone's demand for a 97p per week increase to the average Council Tax bill, supported by Labour GLA members, despite strong opposition from the London Assembly Liberal Democrats.
- Notes that since Mayor Livingstone took office, his demand on the precept has doubled, but there are no clear signs that he has delivered value for this extra money.
- Expressed the wish that this money will be reflected in better public services including extra police to make boroughs like Southwark a safer place and continued improvement in South London's public transport.
- Notes the proposals to introduce a 50p income tax rate on individual incomes over £100,000 a year and to use part of the proceeds to cut Council Tax bills by £100, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats.
- Notes that the Council Tax is one of the most unfair taxes: people pay proportionately less as they get richer. The average bill for 2003/04 will be more than £400 higher than when Labour came to power in 1997, and this year's increases will be the biggest ever.
- Notes plans to abolish the unfair Council Tax and replace it with a fair local tax based on income, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

In 2003/04, the Greater London Authority (GLA) has increased its Council Tax by 29.1% - or £50.12 for the Band D average. This follows a 15.2% increase in 2002/03 and a 22.7% increase in 2001/02. Taken together, the GLA has increased its Council Tax by 82.5% (£101.42) since its inception in 2000/01.

Under the constitution of the GLA, the Mayor proposes a budget to the Assembly. To change the Mayor's budget proposals the Assembly must vote in favour of specific amendments to the proposals with a two-thirds majority. In practice, the Mayor has discussed his proposals with Members of the Assembly beforehand. He has made changes to his proposals and the Assembly has always accepted them. In 2003/04, the Mayor reduced his budget proposals by £32.2m.

Although the GLA's Band D Council Tax increased by 29.1% in 2003/04, its budget requirement only increased by 9.4% (£232m). Part of the reason for the very large

increase in the GLA's Council Tax can therefore be seen to arise from the gearing effect (i.e. that a 1% increase in spending leads to a 3% increase in Council Tax).

The remaining increase in the GLA's budget can be explained by decisions to increase spending on the Mayor's priorities, notably the Metropolitan Police and Transport for London. These are the budget increases for the main constituent parts of the GLA:

- The Metropolitan Police budget will increase by £170.1m (8.3%) in 2003/04.
- The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) budget will increase by £33.9m (10.1%).
- The Transport for London budget will increase by £22.0m (61.5%).
- The "Core" GLA budget will increase by £6.0m (12.0%).

A full breakdown of what these budget increases will deliver is given in the Mayor's budget papers. These are available on the GLA website.

The ALG has criticised the GLA for not making sufficient efficiency savings, particularly in the Metropolitan Police budget. For instance:

- Consistently high levels of police overtime despite a large increase in police numbers
- Growth within the "Core" GLA budget (including 38.7 new posts) without the corresponding savings that the Mayor promised in his budget guidance.

Council Tax is a relatively regressive tax because it does not take into account the ability to pay. The poorest members of the community are protected by the Council Tax Benefit so the greatest burden tends to be on those just above benefit levels. An income tax is a progressive tax which would bear more heavily on those with higher incomes. With Council Tax revaluation of properties by 2007 this unfairness will be magnified for people living in London. Some changes will have to be made to the current method of raising tax locally to protect ordinary people.

The average national Council Tax in 1997/98 was £554.97. It is estimated that the 2003/04 average national Council Tax will be £895.51, an increase since 1998/99 of £340.54, an increase of 38%. (Source: CIPFA Council Tax Survey, 5 March 2003).

10. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD (seconded by Councillor John Friary)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'Council notes the negative approach taken by the Liberal Democrat administration to the voluntary sector in Southwark demonstrated by:

- Cutting funding Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), which had followed good practice by prudently maintaining sufficient reserves to ensure long-term survival.
- Putting some organizations with Service Level Agreements on three month rolling funding making it impossible to plan or secure services for staff in the future.
- Failing to recognize that while funding of the voluntary sector may often not meet a statutory requirement, it is not an 'optional extra' and plays a key role in delivering the priorities and vision as set out by this Council. In particular

the voluntary sector has an important role in the reduction of poverty and the involvement of the community in meeting priorities – for example in reducing crime and improving the community in Community Councils. The voluntary sector supports many of the most vulnerable in our community and attracts alternative funding to meet Council priorities.

The Executive is therefore urged to revisit the compact with the Voluntary sector discussed at the Executive on 22nd October 2002 and to give higher priority to recognition of the sector in improving the lives of the people in Southwark.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The recommendations for funding for Advice & Legal Services grant-aided groups were based on a formula approach introduced following a Best Value review and over a period of months of extensive consultation and negotiation with the sector. The proposal to reduce the cushioning to the CAB was based therefore on the introduction of this formula as well as the level of reserves and the ability of the organisation to sustain a partial reduction.

The CAB holds a substantial level of reserves equivalent to in excess of 3 months salaries and running costs. The organisation contests that this level is held due to the fact that late payments from funders can lead to serious cashflow problems.

The issue of some organisations being put onto 3 month rolling funding relates to a number of Social Services groups. At the present time a review of day care services is underway and until such time as this review is complete and the potential impact on day care providers is known, the Executive was not asked to take any decisions in relation to levels of funding to these groups. It was proposed that funding for organisations providing day care be extended quarterly until such time as the review is completed.

The Council recognises and values the contribution of the voluntary & community sectors to community involvement and social cohesion. This is demonstrated by the investment of £7.7 million to over 200 groups throughout the borough. The Council is also a key party in taking forward a local Compact, the overall objective of which is to develop understanding and consensus around the contribution of all relevant stakeholders.

11. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT SMEATH (seconded by Councillor Sarah Welfare)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

Council Assembly agrees to receive a report on the results of the feasibility study investigating options for a new Secondary School in the East Dulwich/Nunhead area, prior to its consideration by the Executive.

Note: If this motion is agreed, Council Assembly, may debate the issue but it would need to refer any views or recommendations to the Executive for decision, as the matter is an executive function.

COMMENT FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Education, Youth and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee have been reviewing the issues and options for secondary school provision in the East Dulwich/Nunhead area. They have taken evidence from the EDEN campaign and Waverley School.

The options that have been considered include

- Increasing provision at local mixed secondary schools
- Establishing a new mixed secondary school in the south of the borough
- Exploring a cross-border planning solution with Lewisham Council
- Proposing that Waverley School increases its numbers and changes its status from a girls' to a mixed school

Officers had prepared feasibility studies on these options as follows:

Increasing provision at local mixed schools

Increasing provision at three local mixed schools – The Charter, Kingsdale and Warwick Park - was considered. It was concluded that expansion of the former two would be costly and disruptive, as major building works are underway or just recently completed. Warwick Park has already expanded to meet the anticipated additional need, as the school becomes a City Academy. As it is independent of local authority control the Council could not compel it to expand provision further.

Establishing a new mixed secondary school in the south of the borough

As a result of the expansion of secondary provision in the borough, with the two new City Academies, there is not, using DfES criteria, a Basic Need case for new secondary school provision (projections published in Southwark's School Organisation Plan 2002-2007). The Council does not therefore have access to DfES Basic Need capital support for a new secondary school.

However, there is evidence that there are pupils at primary schools in the area who do not currently go to a Southwark secondary school. The opening of The Charter school encouraged parents to send their children to a Southwark secondary when they would not previously have done so. The same would apply to a new quality secondary school in East Dulwich.

Consideration was given to a site for a new secondary school. The Waverley Lower site is small and does not meet current DfES standards for a new secondary school. The only Council owned sites large enough to support a new secondary school are Metropolitan Open Land, and subject to such protection as effectively rule them out as a practical option.

If a suitable site were available it would be likely to cost a considerable sum to acquire. In addition the costs of building a new secondary school would be over £20 million. If the City Academy route for a new school were to be pursued it would require the identification of a site and a sponsor.

Exploring a cross-border solution with Lewisham Council

It would be theoretically possible to encourage/assist Lewisham to establish a new secondary school on their boundary with Southwark. Lewisham are currently carrying out a feasibility study into the provision of new secondary schools in their borough.

This option would not affect the level of provision within Southwark but could increase the number of places available to pupils living near the boundary with Lewisham.

Proposing that Waverley School increases its numbers and changes its status from a girls to a mixed school

Waverley School is a community secondary school for girls, with an admission number of 180 (six forms of entry). It has no sixth form; therefore it can accommodate a total of 900 Year 7 to 11 pupils. A major building project is currently under way to rationalise the school at its current size on to the main Upper School site.

Figures for GCSE results in 2002 show Waverley achieving 26% 5+ A*- C grades against a borough average of 36%, and 85% 5+ A*- G against a borough average of 87%.

By way of comparison the GCSE results for 2002 at other girls' schools in the borough were as follows:

School	Type	6 th Form?	Percentage of roll achieving	
			5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G
Aylwin	Community	No	29%	88%
Notre Dame High	Voluntary	No	66%	99%
St Saviour's & St Olave's	Voluntary	Yes	59%	98%
Waverley	Community	No	26%	85%
LEA average			36%	87%

In the last two admissions cycles, under 50% of the intake has been 1st preferences. The increasing school places available are likely to reduce the allocation of second, third and other preferences.

In 1998 the Council brought forward proposals to change the character of Waverley School from a girls' school to a mixed school with sixth form. At that time, a survey of Waverley parents showed that 87% were not in favour of the school becoming mixed. Formal objections were received from, among others, the governing body of the school, parents and local faith community leaders. The Secretary of State rejected the proposals.

Waverley School has reiterated that the school would again wholeheartedly oppose any proposal to make the school mixed. They have a strong feeling that the ethos of the school is bound up with providing a single sex education and that uncertainty as to the future nature of the school is destabilising.

On academic results the recently published value added measures show for the 2002 KS3 to GCSE results Waverley's value added score was 101.8, against a Southwark average of 100.3 and an England average of 98.7.

Expansion of Waverley School from its current size to eight forms of entry would require the addition of a considerable amount of extra accommodation, which, using DfES cost indicators, could cost at least £3 million. If it were not possible to enlarge the school on the Upper school site then the Lower school could be considered. This would require major adaptations to make the accommodation suitable for continued

school use, which could be similar to those that would be incurred in new building at the Upper school.

Any proposals to change Waverley School from a girls' to a mixed school, or to add a sixth form, would be prescribed alterations that would require the publication of statutory notices, following local consultation.

12. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES (seconded by Councillor Alfred Banyan)

Please note that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by Council Assembly

'This Council welcomes the Government's commitment to a 'cultural change' to halt domestic violence in the UK. The announcement by the Home Secretary, the Rt.Hon David Blunkett MP, that an extra £14 million will be spent over the next three years to combat domestic violence and that tougher laws will be introduced to deal with abusers are especially welcome. However, this Council is concerned that in its announcement the Government confined its references to the majority male on female domestic violence rather than a more holistic approach to the subject. For instance, the issue of homophobic and same sex domestic violence is virtually ignored in most national debate and media coverage on the matter. Council recognises the work of Broken Rainbow Forum in trying to bring such types of domestic violence into the limelight. Council therefore agrees that in its responses to the Government's consultation exercise the Council will mention such forms of domestic violence that require equal attention'.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Domestic violence is an issue of major local concern. Compared to other London boroughs, Southwark suffered:

- the highest number of offences flagged by the police as domestic violence in London in 2001/2
- a rate of domestic violence per 1000 population which ranks as the second highest in London in the current year.

An analysis of domestic violence victims conducted by Southwark police over a six month period (March to Sept 2002) included gender analysis which showed that 19% of victims were male, of these 5% were victims of male partners. The overwhelming proportion of domestic violence victims however were female victims of male partners.

It is well documented that domestic violence is highly underreported to the police and other agencies. This will also apply to same sex domestic violence, if not more so. The true level of domestic violence is estimated to be at least four times higher than reported levels.

The Council fully supports the increased national government focus on domestic violence and welcomes the Government announcement of the publication of a public consultation paper on domestic violence in Spring 2003. This paper will aim to build on the proposals included in the recent Criminal Justice White Paper, 'Justice for All' and to generate a comprehensive response from the public, voluntary sector and others, to ensure the widest possible agreement on what needs to be done to prevent and deal with domestic violence and to bring perpetrators to justice.

It is expected that a draft Bill will be published later in the year. The Governments intention is that new legislation should ensure that we have effective, modern legislation.

The Council will be responding to the consultation and will encourage other groups and forums to respond as well. In responding to the consultation the Council need to consider the impact of domestic violence across all members of the local community.

Domestic violence is identified as a key area of work for the Safer Southwark Partnership through the hate crime strand of the Crime and Disorder Strategy. The key priority is to develop a borough wide strategy. The strategy will include a mapping of local need and whether or not services meet need and local standards (minimum standards). A key element of this work will be to agree a definition for domestic violence.

However the term domestic violence is defined, the overriding concern needs to be about the quality of the response received by victims from service providers.

Key services locally for all victims of domestic violence are:

- Police Community Safety Unit
- Victim Support Southwark
- Housing Community Safety Unit and
- Southwark Anti-Social Behaviour Unit

Of these Victim Support Southwark provides a dedicated service with a specific brief to work with victims of same sex domestic violence service. There are no other services at borough level specifically provided for same sex domestic violence, although there are at a London wide level.

The Council and the Safer Southwark Partnership hope to be able to derive maximum local advantage from the resources recently announced by the Home Secretary to tackle perpetrators and will seek to apply any resources that are made available across all areas of domestic violence.

Lead Officer: Ian Millichap, Constitutional Support Manager
Report Author: Kevin Flaherty, Constitutional Support Officer

Background Papers
Original Motions

Held At
Room 315,
Town Hall, Peckham Road,
London SE5 8UB

Contact
Kevin Flaherty
020 7525 7236

