

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Item No. 8. | Classification: Open | Date: July 20 2005 | Meeting Name: Council assembly |
| Report title: | | Motions | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | | All | |
| From: | | Chief Executive (Borough Solicitor) | |

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10, 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 3.10 (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 IAN WINGFIELD** (seconded by Councillor Alison Moise)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council recognises the success of the 'wet centre' facility in the St Giles Trust Centre, Camberwell SE5 open for two days a week in assisting street drinkers in receiving medical, social and pastoral services and in reducing crime levels.

Council therefore requests that to build upon this success the council executive should consider the following:

- That until the overview & scrutiny committee has reported (see below) the council continue the funding of the wet centre in conjunction with the PCT, NRF, SSP and other bodies
- That the council supports an increase in the operational period of the wet centre from 2 days to 5 days per week

Council thereby requests that the overview & scrutiny committee should examine the following:

- The costs and benefits of an alcohol control area and a wet centre in Camberwell to residents, businesses, emergency services and other organisations
- The likely impact of the new licensing legislation in Camberwell in comparison to other authorities with alcohol control areas (ie Westminster, Lambeth, Lewisham, Camden)
- The growing night-time economy in Camberwell and its effect both on the local environment and the daytime economy
- The effect of the possible introduction of a 'saturation' licensing policy for the issuing of licenses in Camberwell
- The maximisation of 'better business' practice to encourage more diversification in Camberwell and what effect it will have for planning policy in regulating specific business concentration

Note: If the motion is agreed, any proposals will be submitted to the executive and the overview and scrutiny for consideration.

COMMENTS FROM THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF PERFORMANCE AND STRATEGY

Wet centre

The purpose of "wet slots" at St Giles was to:

- Enable containment of the street drinkers two days a week and thereby provide respite for community
- Provide a venue whereby the identities and support needs of this group could be mapped
- Provide this group with choices to change their behaviour or face the consequences of increased enforcement focus

- To initiate the process of re-introducing this client group to support services closer to their home environment and away from Camberwell

These initial needs have been now been met and the services provided to the street drinker population now need to reflect more intervention activity. This decision has been taken in consultation with St Giles who are in the process of reviewing their day centre services and wish to move to a brief intervention model and away from the intensive services that a wet centre type model would entail. From 2005/2005 ODPM grant funding has been reduced to support only the Brief Intervention Model. This is consistent with the Homelessness Strategy that directs grant funding specifically toward homeless prevention interventions. They favour the wind down of the “wet slots”. The closure of the “wet slots” is not the end of support services for this group in Camberwell. Since April 2005 Camberwell Neighbourhood Renewal following advice from Community Safety is funding an Outreach Tenancy Support service (via St Giles) for 12 months. This will ensure individual caseworker support for these individuals in their home environment (be that Southwark or Lambeth) and then to link them with services local to them. This agenda fits with the nature of the client group.

To continue and to extend this to five days a week will counteract the benefits the centre has provided. It will become a contributor to the street drinking problem in Camberwell by continuing to hold and provide a venue for non-resident clients to the area.

Overview and Scrutiny

If the Overview and Scrutiny committee wishes to examine the issues noted in relation to the Camberwell area it will be for the OSC to decide and information can be provided to OSC as requested.

2. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DORA DIXON FYLE (seconded by Councillor Robert Smeath)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

- The important political progress being made at national and international level on development and debt relief and congratulates the Make Poverty History group, local community campaigners, faith groups and others.
- That on the May 4, 2004 the executive pledged its support for the Fairtrade Foundation and also pledged to report annually on progress made with implementing all parts of the resolution.

However, 15 months later, council notes with sadness that the executive has so far failed to deliver on any of the points contained in the resolution.

- That the following London boroughs have achieved Fairtrade status – Lambeth, Lewisham, Croydon, Kingston, Camden, and soon Greenwich.
- Now calls for urgent action in order that Southwark achieves Fair-Trade status by allocating responsibility for progression of the Fairtrade Town initiative to a steering group or sub-committee, to include at least one member of the council

and or a group of staff and a wide group of invited community stakeholders and interested groups and individuals.

- Agreeing to make Fairtrade products available in council meetings
- Agreeing to look into making Fairtrade products available in all other parts of the Council
- Monitoring all other points in the resolution agreed by the executive in May 2004 and reporting annually on progress to full council

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

COMMENTS FROM THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PERFORMANCE AND STRATEGY)

The executive supported a motion to secure Fair Trade status at its meeting on May 4 2004. The Council is currently working towards meeting the five objectives established by the Fair Trade Foundation and is listed on its web site as a borough working towards accreditation.

Examples of progress made so far to secure Fair Trade status includes Café' Direct products being made available at all Community Council meetings, promoting Fair Trade principles at the neighbourhood level such as the Fairtrade fair as part of the 'taste the flavas of Peckham' festival and switching to Fairtrade coffee/tea suppliers by some business units in the Council.

In addition, the Head of the Strategic Procurement is able to report on a review of the options for promoting Fair Trade in the Council and the preparation of a 12 month plan of action, to be reviewed by the Executive in the autumn, the key actions of which are;

- To ensure that Fair Trade tea and coffee are served at all council meetings/buildings.
- To determine the current availability of Fair Trade products within Southwark.
- To investigate ways in which Fair Trade products could be available more generally within the council.
- To enlist the support of suppliers to the campaign.
- Raise awareness of and so stimulate demand for Fair Trade products.
- To Work with local workplaces and community groups to persuade them to commit to using Fair Trade products
- To seek out further potential retail and catering outlets
- Assemble a portfolio of evidence of meeting the five goals and submit it to the Fair Trade Foundation.

3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR AUBYN GRAHAM (seconded by Councillor Paul Bates)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

The concerns being raised by small and BME business, including stallholders who are likely to be affected adversely by the Elephant and Castle regeneration programme.

Welcomes the commitment from the London Development Agency to undertake a review of how other town centre developments have managed the impact on local businesses and to assess the specific impact on local businesses in Elephant and Castle with a view to identifying mitigation and support measures; identifying business growth potential of particular clusters such as the Latin American quarter and identifying options for incubators and workspace for micro-businesses and start-ups.

Whilst noting the existing council commitment to provide advice to affected businesses, council does not believe this support goes far enough to ensure that viable small and BME businesses are able to remain and thrive in the Elephant & Castle area or to ensure that the area retains its distinctive, vibrant and diverse culture.

Council requests:

- The executive to ensure that any regeneration of Elephant & Castle will include small business units and adequate space for stall holders, at least up to the numbers of stalls now available.
- The executive to take all reasonable steps to provide financial support for small and BME business in the area adversely affected by this regeneration programme and for re-location where this is inevitable.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION

The Council's position in relation to the Elephant and Castle has been for at least the last 7 years to plan for the redevelopment of the area comprising the Heygate Estate, the Elephant & Castle Shopping Centre and various surrounding sites and areas of public highway. It is a long overdue scheme of development that is strongly supported and eagerly awaited by the overwhelming majority of local people.

In February 2004 the Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Elephant. It provides guidance to achieve a coordinated redevelopment of the area providing a total of over 5000 new homes and create a new town centre that can provide the retail, leisure and public services demanded by local people. It forms the basis of the procurement exercises, currently underway, to select housing and commercial development partners with whom the council can bring these plans into effect.

The guidance proposes an approximate eight-fold increase in total town centre floorspace. The nature of the scheme is specifically directed at the incorporation of small, local, independent businesses that reflect the demands of the surrounding diverse populations. It is a street-based plan, including a much-enlarged market square. This deliberately avoids the large-scale retail mall that we all know from numerous examples across the country does not meet the needs of local and BME businesses. A prospective commercial developer seeking a partnership with the Council prior to 2002 proposed just such a scheme. The current adopted plan rejects such a model and instead gives a strong commitment to supporting local enterprise.

In relation to the businesses who are commercial tenants within the shopping centre, the council has maintained close working relations with them and their association to

plan for the achievement of vacant possession by 2010. Regular formal meetings have taken place over the last two years. Working closely together, the council, traders and shopping centre landlord have produced a business kit for all shopping centre businesses that contains vital information to assist them in their preparations for final shopping centre vacation by 2010. In order to protect trade in the interim, the three parties have run a number of major promotions that have ensured a continuing draw.

As the motion notes, we are sponsoring the availability of professional assistance to all businesses through Business Extra and have also agreed the appointment of independent legal and chartered surveying advice to businesses collectively. The purpose of this is help businesses, which have no legal or contractual relationship with the council, to secure the very best deals available on terms that meet their specific requirements.

Through planning agreements we are already negotiating the provision of new business space that will mean local trading floorspace is developed from the outset, i.e. in advance of the demolition of the shopping centre. By this means we can make sure that businesses are offered suitable premises into which to move and, as a consequence, that local people continue to have uninterrupted access to the services that they offer.

It is self evident that individual businesses will have varying requirements and we need to be able to respond flexibly within the powers and influence available to us as a local authority to create the best possible prospects for individual business continuity and for the expansion of local trading and business opportunities. This is an area where we believe that the council and the LDA should be able to work together with business tenants and licensees and their landlords to assist in the transition from the current building to a new town centre that offers strong opportunities for business development in a greatly improved environment.

4. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANDY SIMMONS (seconded by Councillor Fiona Colley)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

- The distinctive character of the Nunhead Green area
- The strong feeling of local residents that this character should be preserved
- The threat to the character of unsympathetic planning applications

Council urges the planning committee to urgently take steps to establish a conservation area for the Nunhead Green area.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION

The Nunhead Green area has been considered for designation by the design and conservation team in the past and officers agree that it is desirable to preserve and

enhance its character. The service plan for 2005/6 has now been set and the designation of Nunhead is not included. This work could be added, but it would have to come after the designation of the Peckham Town conservation area and the Sunray Gardens conservation area, given the limited resources of the team and the current service plan commitment to these areas

5. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS** (seconded by Councillor Lewis Robinson)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

- With disappointment the continuing inability of Transport for London (TfL) to carry out adequate consultation on proposed bus route changes, and where representations are made, reach solutions which local communities feel are acceptable, the introduction of bus stands on Friern Road being just one example of many in the borough.
- Whilst the number 12 bus is an important service linking Dulwich to central London, the introduction of bendy buses on unsuitable roads in Dulwich, and the bus stands on Friern Road, has had a considerable adverse impact on traffic flow and the local community.

Council thereby:

Calls on the executive to instruct the council's transport group to investigate the following proposals, already proposed by local residents and councillors regarding the number 12 bus:

- Conducting our own feasibility study (working with Lewisham transport officers) of the viability of running the service through to Forest Hill.
- A traffic and amenity study of the effects of the bus stands on Friern Road and Lordship Lane.
- Negotiate with TfL the use of a smaller bus in the late evenings to minimize current disturbance to residents on this 24/7 route.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE

London Buses' procedures for consultation on bus route changes have been considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and at the Transport Consultative Forum. This matter is now being taken up by the London Assembly's Transport Committee and, taking into account the conclusions of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Council will make submissions to that committee. In general, the statutory obligations on London Buses to consult on matters such as route changes limit their responsibility although it is noted that they are increasing their efforts to consult by, for example, sending representatives to community councils when requested. For matters such as changes to the highway and the positioning of bus

stands to facilitate bus operation on all borough roads it falls to the Council to carry out consultation.

Consultation on changes to the bus stands at the terminus of the number 12 route was carried out by Southwark Council. The results of this consultation have been reported to London Buses. Residents have concerns about the proposal to make part of Friern Road one-way and it is not recommended that this is carried out.

London Buses have reported that the present arrangements are operating satisfactorily and the reliability of route 12 has improved since November 2004.

London Buses have informed us that they have thoroughly investigated the option of extending route 12 to Forest Hill as a result of suggestions raised throughout the consultation period. However, having undertaken a cost benefit analysis their conclusion is that there is no business case for this as the link is already provided by routes 176, 185 and 312.

Officers will request a copy of the investigation and cost benefit analysis undertaken by London Buses so that it can be reviewed by council officers and ward members to ascertain if the final decision not to re-route the service to Forest Hill is fully justified. This assessment should be carried out before any decision to commission a further study.

The effects on traffic of the bus stands in Lordship Lane and Friern Road have already been addressed by the stage three safety audit that prescribed recommendations to improve safety, operation of the bus stands and traffic management in the area. Officers will assess the impact on amenity of the bus stands with specific reference to noise issues.

The current evening frequency of the route 12 service is the same as when the route was previously being served by route master buses. However, the new buses have a larger capacity to cope with growing demand for the service.

London Buses have informed the council that the type of bus used on the route is prescribed in the tender document with the service operator. Changing the type of bus at certain times of the day will increase the cost to the operator. Using a smaller bus would also result in an increase in the number of buses accessing the area to meet current capacity requirements which in itself have impacts on traffic, safety and amenity. However, officers will continue to explore with London Buses possible ways in which amenity and safety can be further enhanced.

6. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM ROWE** (seconded by Councillor Toby Eckersley)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

In view of the substantial investment the council has made in ICT and the new customer service centre it should now be possible to achieve substantial efficiency savings in 2006/07. The executive is therefore requested to develop a range of budget options which would reflect these savings and at least one option which would require no increase in Southwark's element of the 2006/07 council tax, regardless of the likely level of central government settlement.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE/CHIEF EXECUTIVE

As part of the business planning and budget framework for 2006/07 through to 2008/09, a range of budget options will be developed. These will address a growth and savings proposals to meet changing circumstances, demands and priorities. Savings proposals will include efficiencies generated as a result of recent investment in ICT and the Customer Service Centre. Where appropriate, these efficiencies will be incorporated in future annual efficiency statements and will be subject to external audit.

In preparing budget plans, all Local Authorities will be required to meet Gershon efficiency targets. It is anticipated that these will be achieved through a combination of improvements in process, productivity, procurement and property. The Council has already committed itself to achieving 'reengineering' savings which will make the customer access programme cost neutral in the medium term. In order to do this Chief Officers are working on a programme to deliver significant savings in 2006/07 and these will be included within the budget options.

Government funding will again play a highly significant part in the Council Tax setting process for 2006/07; 83% of General Fund expenditure in 2005/06 has been funded from this source. Grant settlement will not be known until late November at the earliest and it would not be appropriate to commit to a level of Council Tax to fund services at this time; illustratively, a 1% reduction in grant could result in a 4.7% increase in Council Tax.

As the budget planning cycle for 2006/07 - 2008/09 continues, Southwark's recent achievements should be recognised in setting Council Tax at an affordable level in line with the Medium Term Financial Strategy while providing continued investment in priority services. For example, since 2003/04, Southwark Council Tax (Band D) has consistently fallen below the Greater London average (£844 compared to £908 average in 2005/06); annual increases in each of the last four years since 2002/03 have also been significantly lower than average increases both across London and nationally. For 2005/06, Southwark has the seventh lowest Council Tax in London out of a total of thirty two authorities.

7. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BRADBURY** (seconded by Councillor Kenny Mizzi)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

That although the London Transport User Committee report 'Where Am I?' suggests that it is courteous to notify the owner of private property before attaching street nameplates to their buildings, it is not currently the policy of this Council to do so.

Council calls on:

The executive to instruct officers in future where street name plates are to be fitted to buildings that currently do not have them, that the owners will be notified in advance.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE

The wall mounting of Street Name Plates contributes enormously to the reduction of clutter in the environment. Some 40% of the planned signs have been installed at a cost of £135,000. The costs for the remaining installation will be in the region of £200,000. In the past year over 1800 nameplates have been renewed. Wall mounting has allowed us to remove over 300 redundant posts from our streets. A further 2000 nameplates are due to be renewed in the coming year and we estimate that this will result in a further 300 posts being removed.

Street nameplate installations in the borough are in accordance with The London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939. Regulations were made in 1952 under this Act relating to the London County Council area. In 1963 these regulations were applied to the Greater London Council and in 1985 the Local Government Act transferred those duties to individual authorities. These powers give London Boroughs the right to attach to walls and fences of private property without any legal obligation to inform the owners.

If we were to contact property owners in writing or in person individually it is unlikely that any agreement would be obtained at the initial visit. Aside from the question of if the owner were likely to be in favour of having a sign erected to their property, the question of wayleaves (legal agreement) for permission, maintenance etc. is also likely to arise.

To manage this process for what would be a minimum of 300 sites possibly more would effect not only the delivery of the programme but also the aspirations of the council for its streetscape and possible confrontation should any objector follow a legal path.

In terms of costs, it is estimated that giving prior notice to building owners would add 25% to the programme costs.

8. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CAROLINE PIDGEON (seconded by Councillor Bob Skelly)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes that:

- Last month the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) confirmed that from August 1st Southwark Council will resume responsibility for running its education services.
- DfES reported that Southwark's education department has demonstrated ongoing improvement, confirmed by an independent panel.
- The independent panel concluded that Southwark has the necessary management and support to continue to progress.
- The panel also concluded that Southwark is well prepared to meet the requirements of the Children Act, underlining the executive's commitment to children and young people.

Council therefore congratulates the education department and thanks its staff as well as the hard-working teachers and school support staff across the borough for their ongoing dedication.

9. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE (seconded by Councillor James Gurling)

Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion shall be considered by council assembly.

Council notes:

- The official Council response to the *Greater London (Central Zone) Congestion Charging Order 2001*, which was specifically amended to include the suggestion of a buffer zone to minimise the adverse impact on those living and working near the border.
- Further notes the recent press reports that residents in equally divided communities in the west of London are to receive discounted rates.
- Council understands that this reflects the inconvenience to residents living close to the border and the additional cost incurred conducting everyday family, social commercial and community activity.
- Council is disappointed that, whilst this concession is a positive move for some London residents, Southwark residents from Tower Bridge to Kennington are continuing to lose out.
- Council urges TfL to take this opportunity to reconsider establishing a buffer zone for residents in Southwark who have already been affected for the past two and a half years and will be equally as affected as those in the western extension zone border.
- Whilst council appreciates that any arbitrary demarcation line will be unpopular there is a real opportunity to ease the burden which falls unfairly on residents and businesses in the north of the borough and who are based just outside the congestion charging zone.
- Council therefore resolves that TfL and the Mayor of London be invited to discuss with the executive member for transport & environment and the relevant officers in our transport division the prospect of allowing communities close to the boundary to benefit from a residents' discount.

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

**COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION/
STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE**

It has been noted that the Mayor's proposals for the western extension of the congestion charging zone have produced the anomaly referred to. The following comments were included in the council's response to the Mayor's consultation on the detailed arrangements for the western extension to the congestion charging zone in February:

We note that special arrangements are being proposed for residents of Kensington and Chelsea (and Westminster) who are outside the proposed zone. Some of these are within gyratory systems and similar smaller exemptions have already been granted in small areas along the inner ring road for example in Victoria, Kings Cross and even a very small area on the west side of Tower Bridge Road in Bermondsey. However to weaken a clear cut boundary further by designating a significant area of Kensington and Chelsea west of the Earls Court one way system seems unfair to many residents living just beyond the zone in Southwark and most other boroughs on the boundary of the existing zone.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Lead Officer | Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager |
| Report Author | Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer |
| Version | final |
| Dated | 11 July 2005 |