

Item No. 8	Classification: Open	Date: 28th January 2004	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Motions	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Chief Executive (Borough Solicitor & Secretary)	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 3.9, the Member moving the motion may 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 THE CONSTITUTION

The 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

(NOTE: In accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 3.9 (5) & (6) (Prioritisation and rotation by the political groups) the order in which motions appear in the agenda may not necessarily be the order in which they are considered at the meeting).

1. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS** (seconded by Councillor David Bradbury)

This motion is referred to this meeting for consideration from Council Assembly on 26th November 2003, in accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 1.13(6). The motion and the officer comment are reproduced below.

That Council Assembly requests the Leader of the Council to support moves to formally establish the ALG Scrutiny Network as a committee of the ALG.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOROUGH SECRETARY AND SOLICITOR

Given the diversity of roles that members play under new constitutional arrangements, it would seem appropriate that the ALG provides support to both Executive and Scrutiny members, within its present budgetary framework.

2. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES** (seconded by Councillor Ian Wingfield)

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

This Council believes that regeneration of the entire Elephant and Castle area is vital for the economic success of Southwark, and that a successful masterplan will have London-wide implications in terms of economic and social development.

This Council further believes that a regeneration scheme of this size must have the backing of a majority of those tenants and residents who are currently residing in the area, to ensure legitimacy for the project and to instill maximum confidence in the process.

Council recognises that the Heygate estate and the views of its residents are critical to the future of the regeneration scheme.

Council notes the ballot held on the Aylesbury estate held in December 2001.

Council notes that only a fifth of Heygate residents have thus far fed their views to the Council on the future of their homes.

Council believes that those sampling and polling exercises which have recently been undertaken are not necessarily representative of the views and wishes of a majority of Heygate residents, and further, that they are an insufficiently accurate means of consulting residents about the future of their homes.

To that end, Council believes that in order to secure confidence in the Elephant and Castle regeneration scheme, Southwark Council should hold an all-resident ballot on the Heygate estate, allowing every tenant and resident to either approve or disapprove of the Council's planned estate demolition as part of the masterplan.

Council therefore requests the Executive to urgently investigate requirements for a full ballot on required demolition of the Heygate estate and report back to Council Assembly as soon as is practicably possible.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION

Comments to follow

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

3. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MARK PURSEY** (seconded by Councillor Nick Stanton)

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

Council notes with disapproval that the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group has been found by the Standards Board for England of using council resources for political gain.

Council notes that Cllr Wingfield was investigated by the Standards Board for two separate offences. In December 2002 he wrote to all Tenants and Residents Associations in Southwark at the council's expense. In the same month, Cllr Wingfield used Council resources to send a Brunswick Park 'Winter Report' to those living in his ward. Both mailings were designed to affect support for the Labour Group,

Council notes that the Members' Code of Conduct clearly prohibits members from using council resources for political purposes and that both investigations by the Standards Board found that "Cllr Wingfield therefore failed to comply with this protocol.....in breach of the code of conduct".

Council notes the advice of the District Auditor that "the most appropriate course of action ... could include seeking a voluntary repayment of the money spent by the Council..." .

Council therefore calls on Cllr Wingfield to make a public apology to Southwark residents.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND SECRETARY

Comments to follow

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

4. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE** (seconded by Councillor Kenny Mizzi)

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

That this Council notes the details set out below of Southwark Housing's policy on charging leaseholders for the replacement of doors and windows as part of major works:

Where Southwark Housing decide that replacement of doors or windows in a particular leasehold flat is unnecessary as the leaseholder has already replaced them at his or her own expense the cost saving is spread over the entire contract instead of being allocated to that leaseholder's invoice.

This policy means that where a leaseholder has replaced windows or doors to a good standard, with the Council's permission, he or she can then be charged almost the entire cost of replacing them again, plus professional and management fees – even though they are not actually replaced as part of the major works programme.

This Council notes that this policy is unfair, unreasonable and is a clear disincentive to leaseholders to improve housing stock in Southwark.

Council Assembly therefore requests the Executive to instruct officers to draw up a report and revised policy which allocates the cost savings associated with windows and doors that do not need replacement on a fairer and more reasonable basis so that leaseholders are not penalised for replacing doors and windows with the Council's permission. The revised policy should be practical and should not require excessive administration.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF HOUSING

Comments to follow

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

5. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY (seconded by Councillor Andy Simmons)

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

Council Assembly

(1) Notes the decision of the Executive on 16th December 2003 to dispense with the Parks Ranger service

(2) Notes that this decision was made without due consultation and in the face of borough-wide concerns from Friends of Parks groups.

(3) Notes the continued high satisfaction ratings given by Southwark residents of the Parks Service MORI polls, opposes current Executive plans to end the Park Rangers service and therefore calls on the Executive to revisit their decision of the 16th December.

(4) Further notes that this is one of a series of recent decisions made by the Executive where relevant stakeholders have been unhappy with the degree of consultation.

(5) Calls for a Scrutiny investigation to look at the processes and factors leading to reports appearing before the Executive without adequate consultation.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE

The decision taken on 16th December agreed to create community wardens for parks but also initiated a consultation process to help shape this new service. This consultation with all relevant stakeholders (including friends of parks) is currently taking place and the results will be incorporated in the design of the new parks service.

The proposals arise, however, in recognition of a number of factors which have come to light in surveys and in dialogue with park users. Satisfaction with the Parks Service is high but there are also continuing public concerns about anti-social behaviour, visibility of staff and safety (both real and perceived). The purpose of creating a parks division of the community warden service is to try and address these concerns, effectively, with a properly trained service who can develop a relationship with all users of parks and use enforcement powers in the last resort. This service will benefit from support and training from the Community Warden Service, which is both popular and growing.

The service will report on a day-to-day basis to the manager in each Major Park and will be complemented by a newly created Outreach Team and Ecology Officer who will lead on education and biodiversity issues.

It is expected that a good number of staff who currently work within the ranger service will apply for positions within the new service (retaining valuable experience and local knowledge) and arrangements are being made to facilitate this process. The purpose is to address the outstanding concerns of park users and make Southwark's Parks safer, cleaner and even more popular than they currently are.

This consultation will be used to shape the new service.

Note: If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

6. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN (seconded by Councillor Stephen Flannery)

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

Council notes the Government's Higher Education Bill, and its provision for new university 'top-up' fees.

Council considers the Government's plans to be a 'poll tax on learning' that will burden students with mortgage style debts of up to £33,000, which many students will still be paying back when they retire. This makes a mockery of the Government's claim to be widening opportunities.

Council notes that up-front tuition fees for Scottish students at Scottish universities have long been scrapped.

Council believes that to invest in our country's future we must invest in our young people.

Council calls on the Government to ditch its plans for top-up fees since they would mean that many of Southwark's brightest students would no longer be able to afford a university education.

Council calls on the Leader to write to Southwark's three MPs calling on them to oppose the Government's proposals at every opportunity.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Education and Skills Secretary Charles Clarke published reforms on the 8th of January to higher education.

The main components of the Bill are as follows:

From 2006 :

£1500 a year HE grant (increased from £1000 a year) and £1200 fee grant only for the poorest students

Where a university decides to charge £3000 for their course, any students in receipt of maximum state support (i.e. £2,700), will receive financial support of at least £300 from the university.

The Government supports in principle moving to combine the £1500 a year maintenance grant with the £1200 fee grant, giving students a single grant of £2700 a year. The Government will produce a discussion paper and hold a seminar before the Second Reading of the HE Bill.

For all students:

The student loan will be increased to meet the basic living costs of the average student. Final year full time students studying away from home will now see their loan increase by £340 in 2006/7;

Upfront tuition fees from 2006 for all students will be abolished. Graduates will only pay when they earn over £15,000 a year (increased from £10,000 at present), at a rate paid for through the tax system like national insurance and pension contributions;

Variable fees will be capped at £3000, rising only with inflation. The Government will not raise the cap in real terms through the next Parliament. The Government will establish an independent review, working with OFFA to report to Parliament based on first 3 years of their operation;

For graduates:

The average student will expect to repay their loan in around 13 years. Those who choose to take lower paid jobs, those in and out of work and those who take time out to raise a family will have any amount outstanding after 25 years wiped out.

For Universities

All universities will be able to vary fees from £0 to £3000 for any course. Variability can be between courses within universities not simply between universities – universities will be free to decide.

A university bursary system. To provide the minimum £300 bursary for courses of £3000, no university would have to use more than 10% of its additional fee income .

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

This motion is referred to this meeting for consideration from Council Assembly on 26th November 2003, in accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 1.13(6). The motion is reproduced below, together with an updated officer comment.

That this Council notes the proposed European Constitution being prepared by the European Convention will have huge implications for Southwark Council. The Constitution will give the European Union “shared competence” over home affairs, transport, energy, social policy, economic and social cohesion, consumer protection and the environment, meaning overall more legislation and guidance binding on local government will be decided at a European rather than a national level.

That given the Government has used referendums to approve other constitutional change affecting local and national government, including establishing regional assemblies and directly-elected mayors, this Council believes that the people of Southwark should be able to have their say on these constitutional changes in a referendum.

This Council therefore resolves to make a formal written submission to the Prime Minister, supporting calls for a national referendum on the proposed European Constitution.

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Catherine Bowman

Seconded: Councillor Mark Pursey

In first paragraph:

Replace ‘will’ with ‘may’ in both instances.

Replace ‘meaning’ with ‘which could mean that’.

After ‘level’ **add** ‘and that local, regional and national Government may have more say in issues currently decided at European level.’

In second paragraph

After ‘their say on’ **replace** ‘these’ with ‘any major’

In third paragraph, first line **delete** ‘resolves’ and **insert** ‘requests the Chief Executive’.

In third paragraph, third line:

After ‘Constitution’ **add** ‘If the outcomes of the Convention involves major constitutional changes’.

Amended motion reads:

That this Council notes the proposed European Constitution being prepared by the European Convention may have huge implications for Southwark Council. The Constitution may give the European Union “shared competence” over home affairs, transport, energy, social policy, economic and social cohesion, consumer protection and the environment, which could mean that overall more legislation and guidance binding on local government will be decided at a European rather than a national level and that local, regional and national Government may have more say in issues currently decided at European level.

That given the Government has used referendums to approve other constitutional change affecting local and national government, including establishing regional assemblies and directly-elected mayors, this Council believes that the people of Southwark should be able to have their say on any major constitutional changes in a referendum.

This Council therefore requests the Chief Executive to make a formal written submission to the Prime Minister, supporting calls for a national referendum on the proposed European Constitution if the outcome of the Convention involves major constitutional changes.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Members will be aware that December’s EU Summit in Brussels failed to reach a consensus on the proposed European Constitution. There was deadlock over a number of issues, but most significantly over the weighting of Member States’ votes in the Council of Ministers.

The Irish Presidency of the EU is now responsible for progressing talks on the draft Constitution.

The proposed European Constitution was drawn up by a Convention which had been working over the past 18 months, composed of Ministers, backbench MPs, and MEPs from the 25 current and future EU member states. It was chaired by former French President Valery Giscard-D’Estaing.

The draft text was formally presented to the EU Summit in Thessaloniki in June 2003, which agreed that an agreement should be reached in time for the outcome to be known before the next European Parliament elections in June 2004. Given the deadlock in December, the Irish presidency has refused to put a new time span on the negotiations.

Like all the previous EU treaties (Single European Act 1986, Maastricht 1991, and Amsterdam 1997) each EU member state will then have to ratify it any new Constitution. Some countries normally do this by a referendum; others including the UK have always done it by an Act of Parliament.

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

8. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ALFRED BANYA (seconded by Councillor Barrie Hargrove)

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

This Council is committed to high standards for its Street Wardens schemes and therefore welcomes the Government's invitation to Local Authorities to apply for its Wardens Quality Standards Award, which assesses organisational performance and plans relating to:

- * achieving the results the scheme has signed up to;
- * leadership of the scheme including a vision of the area's potential; and a strategy for its improvement;
- * management performance including communication and open decision making;
- * financial management;
- * staff management including training;
- * working with the community to ensure all benefit equally from warden support regardless of disability, race, religion, gender, sexuality or age.

To show its commitment to high standards, this council requests the Executive to ensure that the London Borough of Southwark makes an application for the Wardens Quality Standards Award.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE

The Council is currently in the process of significantly expanding its Warden Service. Once this expansion is complete the Council will have the largest warden service in the country. Consequently quite obviously our focus has been on scheme development and recruitment. With this as our priority it would be a diversion of energy to make an application for Quality Standard at this time. Our Community Warden Service Manager - who is a Regional Champion with the Neighbour Warden Unit (ODPM) - has discussed this approach with the NWU. Schemes are being developed to meet the Quality Standard criteria. In eight months the Council will apply for the Quality Standard for the whole service.

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

9. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CAROLINE PIDGEON (seconded by Councillor David Hubber)

This motion is referred to this meeting for consideration from Council Assembly on 26th November 2003, in accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 1.13(6). The motion and the officer comment are reproduced below.

Council notes the Mayor of London's proposals for five 'super boroughs'.

Council condemns such proposals and agrees that super boroughs would:

- Dilute any sense of local identity that already exists in a city like London;
- Be very costly to establish given the massive re-organisation that would be required.

Council agrees that there should be more devolution of power - not less - and that such devolution to community councils has proved successful in Southwark.

Council resolves to write to the Mayor of London asking him to ditch his proposals immediately.

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Andy Simmons
Seconded: Councillor John Friary

Delete all and insert:-

Council notes the GLA's review of local government organisation in London and the Mayor of London's comments on the possibility of five 'super Boroughs'.

Council believes that local government organisation should place the needs of local residents firmly at its heart.

Council notes and welcomes the government's support for decision making at the local level.

Council notes the new powers and flexibilities offered to local authorities and the potential for serving residents more effectively by joint working. For example joint services between the existing boroughs offer great potential for better serving local residents.

Council in particular notes the potential for joint work between Southwark and Lambeth in the Herne Hill and Camberwell areas.

Council notes the substantial savings that a move to super-Boroughs could provide in terms of Executive allowances and officer salaries but rejects the 'super-Borough' approach as this has not been shown to put local residents at its heart.

Council supports the development of local decision making but asks the Finance and Economic Development Scrutiny Sub-Committee to receive a report on the cost-effectiveness of the current Community Councils and how substantial savings could be made from the current £1 million cost as part of the 2004/05 budget setting process.

Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the chair of the GLA panel and the Mayor for London to express these views.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

At its meeting on 10th September, the London Assembly's Business Management and Appointments Committee considered a report on 'Local Governance in London'. The Committee agreed to make recommendations to the Assembly in respect of the proposed establishment of an Inquiry into London's Local Governance. The report can be viewed on the GLA website at:

www.london.gov.uk/assembly/appsmtgs/2003/bmacsep10/bmacsep10item14.rtf

On 15th October the London Assembly agreed in principle to conduct an inquiry into local governance in the context of London's public sector as a whole on the basis of the following preliminary framework and on the understanding that detailed terms of reference would be developed and refined in due course:

- I. to consider electoral systems and governance arrangements;

- II. to consider patterns of commissioning and provision that will best achieve the effective and economic delivery of public services to the community including options for local authority consortia;
- III. to consider the availability of resources for these services from all sources including existing and possible new funding streams;
- IV. to consider relationships with other public sector agencies, including the Government Office for London and the quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations in London, and co-terminosity of their areas; and
- V. to consider local authority boundaries, their areas of interest and means for councils/councillors to engage more effectively with local communities.

It was further agreed that:

- Consideration of the constitutional arrangements be deferred to allow further exploration with the Association of London Government (ALG) of the opportunities for joint working on the basis that the inquiry would –
 - a) from the outset, admit an open agenda, with no individual right to veto options for consideration, and
 - b) aim to produce a range of options for wider public debate and further consideration ;
- The Assembly request Len Duvall to lead the discussions with the ALG on behalf of the Assembly, with a view to his appointment as Chair of the inquiry, and report back on progress to the Business Management and Appointments Committee and, to the Assembly, with detailed proposals for the structure and terms of reference of the inquiry;
- The Assembly authorise preliminary work to prepare for the inquiry, including identifying and accessing relevant data that already exists, and commissioning appropriate research and other work to put together a suitable base of material for the inquiry to progress to further phases of assessing and filtering the data, and identifying key issues and questions at the earliest stage, as a prelude to evidence sessions;
- For the purposes indicated in paragraph V above, expenditure be authorised up to an initial limit of £30,000, as necessary by virement within the existing Assembly and Secretariat budgets; ALG officers be asked to explore other sources of funding for both 2003/04 and 2004/05; and appropriate provision be made for the project in the scrutiny programme budget.

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

10. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD (seconded by Councillor Michelle Pearce)

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

This Council calls upon the Executive to ensure that the Greendale path and cycle way are put onto a regular environmental maintenance programme so that litter, abandoned cars and graffiti are regularly and promptly removed, and the footpath kept clear of nettles and brambles.

Council also requests the Executive to secure a report within the next six months which makes recommendations on options for the long term future of Greendale with the aim of restoring the open spaces in Council ownership to public or community use.

Council further requests that the views of local community groups and tenant/resident associations are taken into consideration in the report and that the report be submitted to the Camberwell and Dulwich Community Councils for comment before final decisions are taken by the Executive.

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE

The Greendale Path and Cycle Way are cleaned by Southwark Cleaning twice per week. However, access difficulties associated with the physical layout has meant the cleaning has not been as thorough as we would like.

A 'deep clean' of the area has been organised which will encompass litter, graffiti and weed encroachment. As a result local residents should see a marked improvement in the general appearance of the site. Once this work is complete, the cleaning arrangements currently in place for the area should be sufficient to maintain the improvements.

Weekly checks on the area for abandoned vehicles are taking place and should again make a marked difference to the problem and improve the general 'feel' of the area.

It is recognised that Greendale is a potentially valuable community resource which has been run-down for decades. The lease agreement struck in the 1990's with Dulwich Hamlets FC made no adequate provision for improvement and development of the site as a community sports facility. Recent failed plans at redevelopment have meant that there has been a long period of uncertainty and the condition of the site has deteriorated further to a very bad level. Officers have had exploratory talk with Dulwich Hamlets and consultative meetings with other potential stakeholders. These will continue in order for officers to produce a report which proposes options for return of the site for community sporting and recreational purposes.

The Regeneration Department will be asked to produce a report, within the next six months to assess the options for long term solutions to the problems associated with this area that will allow the local community to use and enjoy this open space. Such a report will, of course, seek the views of local people and this consultation will include both Camberwell and Dulwich Community Councils.

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

11. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MARK GLOVER (seconded by Councillor Sarah Welfare)

This motion is referred to this meeting for consideration from Council Assembly on 26th November 2003, in accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 1.13(6). The motion and the officer comment are reproduced below.

Council notes

1. That the communications strategy report presented to the Executive on the 4th of November highlighted a major increase in resource for the councils PR function.
2. That one of the stated objectives of the communications strategy is to promote the individual members holding an Executive position.

Council condemns the politicisation of the Council's communications function and is also dismayed at the financial investment made for improving the Council's public relations when it is simultaneously reducing investment in social services.

Council recommends

1. That the Executive removes the objective in the report to promote the individuals holding the Executive posts.
2. That the Finance and Economic Scrutiny Committee is instructed to carry out a scrutiny into the function of the new posts of departmental Communication Managers and the new communications strategy.

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Peter John

Seconded: Councillor Paul Bates

Insert after end of point 2

Council further notes that

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee called in the communications strategy report on the 10th November 2003.
2. The Executive Member for Communications and Performance Improvement agreed to the removal of the stated objective of promoting individual members holding an Executive position as part of that strategy on 17th November 2003.

Therefore

Council condemns the **add in 'attempted'** politicisation of the council's communications function **add in 'by the Executive'** and is dismayedetc

Delete all after 'social services'

COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The aim of the Communications Strategy is to improve external communications with stakeholders, locally, regionally and nationally. In doing so the strategy aims to achieve two general outcomes: Firstly the Council aims to keep residents well informed about the local services the council provides and the ways in which they can have a say about decisions that impact on their daily lives. Secondly, the Council hopes to gain recognition for its performance from key opinion formers and people of influence in national government and related circles.

The aim of the strategy is to promote the communication objectives of the Council, not individuals or party groups. The promotion of individuals holding Executive posts is not an element of the strategy, and was not included in the strategy considered and agreed by the Executive on 4th November. The Officer cover report was poorly phrased in this respect and was not reflected in the draft strategy presented to the Executive. The Communications Team and the Borough Solicitor will be working closely together to ensure the Communications Strategy is properly understood and operates within legal parameters.

The vision and five policy priorities agreed by the council and the Southwark Alliance will form the strategic communications framework.

During the CPA assessment last year, communications was identified as an area for improvement and the strategy was requested in response to that. As a result, council-wide capacity was reviewed and five departmental communications managers were appointed. All were in post by 1 October 2003. Their brief is to strengthen overall communications (both internal and external), provide professional support within all service areas, and by working very closely with each other and the rest of the central communications team to ensure efficient use of limited Council resources resulting in better value for money and elimination of waste.

The Council has historically been unable to satisfactorily identify overall media spend and has thus been unable to verifiably ensure value for money or identify potential areas of waste. One of the first tasks for each communications managers has been to undertake an audit of all communications activity in their respective departments. This will be completed by 30 November 2003. The audit includes the identification of overall spend on communications. Once this figure has been identified the Council will be in a much stronger position to plan and co-ordinate its communications resources effectively and achieve better value for money.

The Council's communications activities are governed by clear legislation. In local councils up and down the country, the communications team works closely with the leading members from the administration of the day to promote council services and policies. Southwark is no exception, and our executive members are supported by the communications team as key democratically elected spokespeople for the council. Such support has equally been provided to the Scrutiny function culminating in the publication of the annual report for Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Note: If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

12. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY (seconded by Councillor David Bradbury)

Please note that in accordance with Council Assembly Procedure Rule 3.9 (3), this motion shall be considered by the Executive and will be referred without debate.

That the Executive is requested to ensure that the Council issues a response to the recent Government White Paper on airport development to include, as a minimum, expressions of concern as to:

- a. The material increase in aircraft noise over the Borough and South London if the number of glidepaths to Heathrow is increased from two to three.

- b. The absence of criteria relating to noise nuisance for permitting the construction of a third runway at Heathrow from 2016; and
- c. The absence of proposals to ensure more effective limitation of noise nuisance in the final hour of the 'night flights' regime, between 5am and 6am.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Member Motions	Town Hall Peckham Road London SE5 8UB	Kevin Flaherty Constitutional Team 020 7525 7228

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager
Report Author	Kevin Flaherty, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	16.1.04