

<b>Item No.</b> 6.1	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 28th January 2004	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council Assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Report Back on Consideration of Motions Referred from Council Assembly	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Executive	

## **1. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Lisa Rajan, seconded by Councillor Richard Thomas and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That Council recognises that:

- (i) genetic modification of crop plants is a rapidly advancing new branch of science and technology;
- (ii) there is still scientific debate about the safety of Genetically Modified (GM) crops;
- (iii) the commercial growing of GM crops present, legal, social and ethical problems that have not yet been properly addressed;
- (iv) there is widespread public concern about GM products and many people are concerned that there is a risk that they might be unwittingly exposed to them.

That the Council therefore declares that Southwark Council will, as far as is possible, control the growth of GM crops and the use of GM food and feed.

That the Council therefore commits itself to:

- (i) Provide GM-free goods and services for all areas where the Council has a direct responsibility, such as education and social services;
- (ii) Request the Secretary of State for the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to provide legal protection for this borough as a GM-free area, in line with Article 19 of 2001/18/EC or under any relevant powers;
- (iii) Ensure that no GM crops are grown on land over which it has control;

- (iv) Agree in principle to adopt a GM free policy which, when contracts are let or if and when they become renewable, will ensure that GM food, ingredients, derivatives are eliminated;
- (v) Instruct officers to report to the Executive on implementing such a policy. This report should include consideration of any legal, financial and practical implications of such a decision.”

We agreed the motion.

## **2. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – FIREWORKS**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Barrie Hargrove and seconded by Councillor Dominic Thorncroft:-

“That Council notes that following Royal Assent given to a Private Members Bill to restrict the sale and misuse of Fireworks, new laws will be available to reduce their noise, nuisance and anti-social use. It therefore requests a report back from officers on setting out plans to fully implement in the London Borough of Southwark this new law in time for the lead up period to November 5 2004.”

We agreed the motion.

## **3. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL TAXATION**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 2<sup>ND</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Richard Thomas, seconded by Councillor Graham Neale and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That Council notes that the Republic of Ireland has had some remarkable success with its levy on plastic bags - the levy led to a 90% reduction in the use of bags (about 277 million fewer than usual).

Council further notes that the Irish Government recently announced that it is to introduce a 'tax' on chewing gum, polystyrene food wrappers and cash machine receipts too - the money raised is to be used to fund a national clean-up.

Council applauds such efforts to support local authorities' attempts to clean up the local environment.

Council calls on the government to introduce measures similar to those adopted in Ireland - particularly if the money raised from levies will directly help councils in their fight against grime.”

We agreed the motion.

**4. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – MUSCATEL PLACE, CAMBERWELL**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Ian Wingfield, seconded by Councillor Alison Moise and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That this Council Assembly requests that the Council Executive agrees to the introduction of double yellow lines in Muscatel Place forthwith and that the Council bear the full cost.”

We agreed the following:

1. That the decision of Council Assembly be noted.
2. That the decision of Camberwell Community Council be noted.
3. That officers be instructed to investigate the provision of double yellow lines and possible funding options.
4. That Camberwell Community Council receive a further report in January 2004.

**5. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Denise Capstick, seconded by Councillor Eliza Mann and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That Council notes:

- The Government’s plans to give limited operational and financial freedom to foundation hospitals;
- That foundation hospitals would create an unnecessary divisive element in the NHS and lead to a two-tier system;
- The decision over which hospitals are allowed to become foundation hospitals will be taken by ministers based on how the hospital meets political targets rather than their ability to treat patients;
- The proposals may lead to staff poaching because the new hospitals will have the freedom to pay staff extra;
- The proposals for public ‘membership’ are still very unclear and the foundation hospitals will not have to have the new patient forums, which the Government itself created when it abolished community health councils;
- That hospitals are being made to consult on bids for foundation status before the relevant legislation is agreed by Parliament – thus pre-empting decisions made by locally elected representatives.

That Council believes that all hospitals should be free of central political control and free from the culture of political targets.

That Council notes with concern that nearby Lewisham Hospital will not be among those hospitals to benefit from being a foundation hospital but that nearby Guys & St Thomas' and Kings College Hospital will.

That Council condemns the Government for not tackling the real problems facing struggling hospitals, such as staff shortages and lack of beds.

That Council calls on the government to bring in proper reforms in the NHS that would devolve power to local people and raise the standard of all hospital hospitals, putting patients' needs first.

That Council resolves to continue to work closely in partnership with Southwark PCT in supporting those hospitals that serve the residents of Southwark."

We agreed the motion.

**6. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – ARTS CENTRE ON THE PECKHAM WHARF SITE**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Aubyn Graham, seconded by Councillor Alfred Banya, subsequently amended by Councillor Jonathan Hunt and seconded by Councillor Graham Neale and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

"That Council Assembly notes the need for an Art Centre to incorporate the facilities of the former North Peckham Civic Centre within the Peckham Square to complement Peckham MediaTech Centre & Library and the Peckham Pulse.

That Council Assembly notes that the Peckham Community Council at its July meeting passed a motion, proposed by Councillor Jonathan Hunt and seconded by Councillor Barrie Hargrove, which includes the following:

Council welcomes the New Peckham Wharf proposal to complement the Peckham Pulse and Library to provide a venue where quality arts activity may be performed; attract people to Peckham; provide a showcase for the vibrant and exciting range of talent that exists in our community; and offer ancillary facilities

Council believes the best option for progressing the proposal is to form a locally-based working party, including representatives from local residents, other interested bodies, such as the LPO, arts organisations and commercial partners, and for it to procure an assessment as to its viability, and to produce a business plan.

Council asked the Executive to:

fund such an assessment and business plan and to provide such assistance and support as this Council may require;

ensure that all money raised from the sale of land should be used for the Wharf project.'

That Council Assembly calls on the Deputy Leader to bring back a report to the next Council Assembly that will detail proposals for the Council's contribution (financial and otherwise) towards an Arts Centre on the Peckham Wharf Site."

We agreed the following:

1. That the motion be noted.
2. That the Executive Member for Education & Culture bring back a report to Council Assembly that will detail proposals for the Council's contribution (financial and otherwise) towards an Arts Centre on the Peckham Wharf Site, following consideration by the Executive on the outcome of consultation on the proposals.

#### **7. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – BUS ROUTES**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Kim Humphreys, seconded by Councillor David Bradbury, subsequently amended by Councillor Michelle Pearce and seconded by Councillor Charlie Smith and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

"That Council notes that there are proposals to develop a bus route from Crystal Palace, past the Kingswood Estate, through Dulwich Village and onto Dulwich Hospital, East Dulwich and Camberwell. Council Assembly welcomes the principle of the route which will link College Ward, and in particular, the Kingswood Estate with East Dulwich and Camberwell. Council further notes that the proposed route currently suggested goes down many residential roads and crosses the South Circular at a dangerous junction (Alleyn Park/Gallery Road junction with Dulwich Common). Accordingly Council Assembly requests the Executive to instruct officers to work with Transport for London (TfL) to devise proposals that are both safe, using existing routes as much as feasibly possible and utilise the least intrusive types of vehicles.

That Council further asks the Executive to instruct officers:

- a) To make representations to Transport for London in favour of reviewing the No 227 bus (Bromley North - Crystal Palace) with a view to extending it to cover the Dulwich route;
- b) To liaise closely with TfL on the cost benefit ratios involved in the various options for covering the route in order to report back fully to members;

- c) To explore, if necessary, whether the route could be made viable by some amount of subsidy from potential partners, e.g. Sainsbury's, the Health Authorities, Southwark Alliance.”

We agreed the motion.

#### **8 MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – LOCAL DEMOCRACY**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Alfred Banya, seconded by Councillor Alison Moise and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That Council Assembly congratulates all those who participated in the activities organised during the recent ‘democracy week’. In particular the students from Sacred Heart School and Peckham Academy who took part in a successful debate in the Council Chamber. This has led to Harriet Harman, MP for Camberwell & Peckham feeding their comments to the Electoral Commission as part of the consultation on lowering the voting age.

That Council Assembly calls for an annual all party event for local democracy which will involve children from Southwark Schools, teachers, Southwark Youth Forum representatives, Southwark Youth Council Representatives, MPs and Councillors to debate issues of concern to young people, and the Southwark Community TV should be invited to arrange a live web-cast of the event to promote Southwark Council and its young people.

That Council Assembly requests the Executive to prepare a report on a range of future events including the above proposal and to present it to the Council Assembly at the earliest opportunity.”

We agreed the following:

That consideration of this motion be deferred to the next meeting of the Executive to enable the Registration Officer to report back on the implications of the motion.

#### **9. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor Stephen Flannery, seconded by Councillor Anne Yates, subsequently amended by Fiona Colley and seconded by Councillor Charlie Smith and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“Council notes that despite the shortage of three and four bedroom units in Southwark, such units rarely feature in affordable housing agreements secured by the Council with developers.

Council therefore instructs officers to report to the Executive at the earliest opportunity on how to ensure that developers provide a higher proportion of affordable family units.”

We agreed the following:

1. The Executive notes:
  - i) that officers’ advice in the past has been against adopting a quota of 50% affordable housing for new residential developments;
  - ii) the decisions of Ratification Committee that officers undertake further work to look at this issue
  - iii) that the Liberal Democrats called on the Council to require developers to provide up to 50% affordable housing on new residential developments.
  - iv) the significant increase in the number of affordable housing units now being offered on the Bermondsey Spa development as a result of lobbying by local councillors and Executive Members;
2. The Executive further notes that despite the shortage of three and four bedroom units in Southwark, such units rarely feature in affordable housing agreements secured by the Council with developers.
3. The Executive therefore instructs officers to report to the Executive at the earliest opportunity on how to ensure that developers provide a higher proportion of affordable family units.

#### **10. MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 3.9 – PRIVATE AND STATE SCHOOLS**

At the meeting of the Executive held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003 we considered the following motion referred from Council Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003, which had been moved by Councillor William Rowe, seconded by Councillor Kenny Mizzi and referred to the Executive for consideration:-

“That the Executive is requested to note the report on growing links between private and state schools in the *Economist* magazine on 18th October 2003.

The Executive is requested to instruct officers to;

- a. Carry out a brief benchmarking exercise to compare Southwark’s education administration costs with those of the Church Schools Company which are reported by the *Economist* to be 3% of total cost.
- b. Report back to members on any conclusions from the benchmarking exercise which would allow a greater proportion of education spending to be directed to schools.
- c. Consider the types of links between successful private sector schools and state schools referred to in the *Economist* article (for example

sponsorship of City Academies) and report back on possibilities for taking advantage of such types of links in Southwark

We agreed the following:

1. That the comments of the Strategic Director of Education and Culture in respect of the appropriateness of carrying out a benchmarking exercise in the circumstances proposed in the motion be noted.
2. That the Executive welcomes the Executive Member for Education & Culture's attempts to build links with independent schools.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Executive Agenda and Minutes 2 <sup>nd</sup> December, 2003	Constitutional Unit, Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395
Executive Agenda and Minutes 16 <sup>th</sup> December, 2004	Constitutional Unit, Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Everton Roberts 020 7525 7221

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Deborah Holmes, Borough Solicitor & Secretary	
<b>Report Author</b>	Paula Thornton / Everton Roberts, Constitutional Team	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	16th January 2004	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	No	No
Chief Finance Officer	No	No
<b>Executive Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> January 2004	