

<b>Item No.</b> 8.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> December 7 2005	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Motions	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		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 council, 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 council (i.e. housing, social services, regeneration, environment, education etc) cannot be decided upon by council assembly without prior reference to the council. While it would be in order for council assembly to discuss an issue, consideration of any of the following should be referred to the council:

- 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 WILLIAM ROWE** (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 assembly notes the increasing frustration and disappointment expressed by residents at the performance and responsiveness of the Dulwich area housing office.

Council assembly therefore requests the executive to instruct officers to investigate the causes of the perceived unsatisfactory performance of the area housing office and provide the additional support to remedy them so that residents see a noticeable improvement in performance as early as possible in the new year. Officers should report back to the first executive meeting in January 2006 and to ward members by January 2006.

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

**COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR HOUSING**

The Dulwich area housing office is monitored using a range of performance indicators. The lists below show their performance in October and/or cumulatively to the end of October against some of those indicators. In each case Dulwich was either the best or one of the best performing area housing offices.

Percentage of correspondence answered in 10 days (October 05)	91%
Percentage of members' enquiries answered in 10 days (October 05)	93.8%
Percentage of telephone calls answered in 5 rings (October 05)	92%
Rent Collection	(cumulative)
Void turnaround (from void date to letting) (cumulative)	28 days
Percentage of repairs appointments made and kept (October 05)	95.7%
Percentage of repairs completed in time-scale (October 05)	98.00%
Number of squats (October 05)	0

To supplement this data other key areas of performance are monitored at regular contract monitoring meetings at which Dulwich residents are represented by the chair and vice-chair of the area housing forum. Both representatives have expressed satisfaction with cleaning and grounds maintenance and repairs and maintenance contract performance at recent meetings. In addition there has been recent praise from Croxted Road tenants and residents associations (T&RA) for the management of its major works contract and from a visiting leasehold valuation tribunal board for the "well maintained" Sydenham Hill Estate. Recent analysis of call waiting (for visitors to the area office has shown that all visitors are seen within 5 minutes (and most instantly.)

The Dulwich area manager has already arranged a further series of meetings with local (T&RAs) and ward members in the next two months where he will canvass specific details of any "increased frustration or disappointment" with the service provided which will be reported back in the first instance to the Dulwich area housing forum with an action plan to address any concerns raised.

**2. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS** (Seconded by Councillor Graham Neale)

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

That this council:

- Reaffirms its support for the resource programme to procure a long-term, fully-integrated, multi-million pound waste management solution and development of new waste management facilities on the Old Kent Road;
- Believes the resource programme is vital for Southwark to achieve its commitments to recycle half and recover energy from three quarters of its waste by 2020;
- Notes that a failure to complete the resource programme would expose the council to serious financial risk due to the impact of financial penalties under the landfill allowance trading scheme (LATS) regime;
- Welcomes the government support for the programme with the single largest private finance initiative (PFI) credit to a unitary authority for a waste contract (£34.5 million) and the support of the Greater London Authority (GLA);
- Notes that the resource programme has reached a stage where significant investment will shortly be made by bidders for the PFI contract and by the council in relation to site acquisition;
- Is concerned that the business case for the resource programme has been impacted by the issuing of the Mayor's proposal to centralise waste disposal and planning across London through the establishment of a London Single Waste Authority (LSWA);
- Calls on the leader of the council and the chief executive to seek urgent assurances and indemnities from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Mayor of London to protect Southwark's capital investment and ensure the continuation of the resource project.

**COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

Since the executive gave approval to the resource programme to commence procurement on March 8 2005, the private finance initiative (PFI) procurement has progressed well. The council consulted fully with government and the Mayor of London before issuing its contract advertisement. Over 160 delegates attended the council's market interest day and the council received a good market response to its pre-qualification and initial statements of proposals stages. The procurement has been commended by the private public partnerships programme receiving a green light status – we understand this is the first PFI project to achieve this standard. Good progress was also being made in relation to the acquisition of the gasworks site on the Old Kent Road and in public consultation on the programme.

The Mayor of London's proposal has required the council to revisit its business case, which is for an integrated solution (both waste collection and disposal) and is therefore potentially affected by the mayor's wish to centralise waste disposal and planning functions.

The council and the applicants for the PFI contract now require assurances from the government and the Mayor of London to progress the programme.

A positive statement was made by the parliamentary under-secretary for environment in the house of commons regarding the government's wish to continue the resource programme.

Discussions have taken place with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Government Office for London, the Mayor of London, the Greater London Authority and the Association of London Government.

Environment and community support scrutiny sub-committee agreed a programme of scrutiny of the resource programme in June 2005 and reviewed the programme's community engagement plans on July 25 2005. This followed reviews of the resource programme's business case by overview and scrutiny committee in January 2005 prior to the commencement of procurement.

Until such time as assurances are forthcoming from the government and the Mayor of London the resource programme has been suspended with efforts being focussed on obtaining the necessary undertakings.

**3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES** (Seconded by Councillor Charlie Smith)

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

Council assembly condemns the proposed increases of 33% in hot water and heating charges to Southwark's tenants and residents.

While council assembly recognises increases in wholesale gas and electricity prices, council assembly believes the proposed increase to be excessive.

Council assembly believes such an increase to be an affront especially to those residents living on certain estates who have had to endure regular breakdowns and failures of the heating and hot water systems in recent years.

Council assembly calls upon officers to bring forward a new and comprehensive report as a matter of urgency which will be made available to members and tenant council outlining how the 33% increase was arrived at, and what additional increases were proposed and why they were deemed to be insufficient.

Council assembly calls upon the executive to re-examine the proposal of a 33% increase on heating and hot water charges, taking note of the overwhelming dissatisfaction with the new charges on the part of tenant council and individual tenants and residents associations.

Council assembly further requests the executive to closely examine innovative ways of supplying heating and hot water systems including application for government grants to fund feasibility studies to explore renewable energy schemes such as solar photovoltaic panels, wind turbines, solar water heating, ground source heat pumps, biomass and small scale hydro systems, and requests that a report be brought back to council assembly as quickly as practicably possible.

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

## COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR HOUSING

To follow

4. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KIM HUMPHREYS** (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.**

Council assembly desires that generally, and in particular with regard to the council's communications policies, the activities and functions of community councils in particular and of the overview and scrutiny committee (OSC) and its sub-committees are, within existing resources, given greater emphasis; and accordingly calls for the necessary action, beginning with consultation by the communications team with the chair and vice chair of OSC and of each community council and a subsequent report to be brought forward by the executive.

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

## COMMENTS FROM ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (IMPROVEMENT & DEVELOPMENT)

To follow

5. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES GURLING** (Seconded by Councillor Jane Salmon)

**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 minimize the adverse impact on those living and working near the border.

Council further notes the Mayor of London's recent indications that he is considering extending the residents' discount zone (i.e. creating a buffer zone) in areas of Kennington.

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 in neighbouring Lambeth, Southwark residents are continuing to lose out.

Council urges Transport for London (TfL) to take this opportunity to reconsider establishing a buffer zone for residents in Southwark who have already been affected for almost three years.

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 Southwark and who are based just outside the congestion-charging zone.

Council therefore requests that the executive member for environment and transport and the relevant officers in our transport division work with London Assembly members to present a strong case to the Mayor of London and TfL regarding the prospect of allowing communities close to the boundary to benefit from a graduated residents' discount. As a package of public transport incentives for the area the proposals should also include the extension of the central Zone 1 to include both Kennington and Bermondsey tube stations.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

The Mayor of London has instructed Transport for London (TfL) to give further consideration to the feasibility of introducing two additional small extensions to the residents' discount zone, in Kennington (the area bounded by Harleyford Road, Kennington Oval, Harleyford Street, Kennington Park Road, Kennington Road, and the existing zone boundary), and in north Battersea (the area bounded by Westbridge Road, Parkgate Road, Albert Bridge Road, and the River Thames).

The council's recent representations as part of the western extension consultation, renewed our request for a buffer zone, highlighting that some areas of Southwark, particularly north of Tooley St and east of Tower bridge, are as segregated from areas of Southwark outside the zone as are areas that have been given buffer zone status in Kensington and Chelsea.

It is considered that any further buffer zones for residents discounts should be based on a different and consistent rule, to be applied all the way round the charging zone either on a new boundary route or for a specified distance outside the zone. It is considered that deciding each 'buffer' extension on the basis of a range of local facilities to be reached by car, that may be more accessible inside than outside the zone, is somewhat arbitrary.

It is considered that both Kennington and Bermondsey tube stations are much closer to the core of Central London than a number of other stations. With the growth of the central London functions toward the south, it is considered that there is a strong case to include Kennington and Bermondsey within Zone 1 and this could be extended to cover Canada Water, Rotherhithe and indeed Wapping, Shadwell and Whitechapel.

Accordingly, the executive member for environment and transport will liaise with relevant London assembly members and officers of the regeneration department to make representations to the mayor on a consistent pattern of graduated concessions for residents just outside the congestion charging zone and to include Kennington, Bermondsey, Canada Water and Rotherhithe in Zone 1. Furthermore, regeneration officers will be instructed to approach the London Borough of Tower Hamlets on the possibility of making joint representations to include similar stations (e.g. Wapping, Shadwell and Whitechapel) to the north of the Thames.

### **6. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DORA DIXON-FYLE (Seconded by Councillor Peter John)**

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

Council assembly notes with concern

- The finding of the local government ombudsman, Mr. Jerry White, who found that Southwark Council to be guilty of 'maladministration causing injustice' in the case of 'Mr. Kelly', a victim of antisocial behaviour.
- The relatively small number of antisocial behaviour orders obtained by Southwark Council – 19 as reported to the Home Office by March 31 2005, compared with 79 in Camden and 35 in Westminster over the same period.
- The results of recent local crime surveys which revealed concerns among respondents about antisocial behaviour; in particular noise nuisance, drug dealing, gangs of youths and nuisance from the riders of 'mini motos' and who feel that the council is not doing enough to address their concerns.

Council assembly therefore calls on the executive to:

- Take a more proactive approach to issuing anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) and acceptable behaviour contracts (ABCs)
- Use the council's existing powers to publicly name the recipients of ASBOs where appropriate
- Improve the standard of investigative work at Southwark anti-social behaviour team (SASBU), and improve communications between case officers and complainants
- Develop closer joint working between the housing department, community safety unit, and the antisocial behaviour unit, to prevent the failures described by the ombudsman

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

#### **COMMENTS FROM ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PERFORMANCE & STRATEGY)**

To follow

#### **7. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR TOBY ECKERSLEY (Seconded by Councillor William Rowe)**

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

This Council is extremely concerned at the comment by the respected local government commentator Tony Travers in the Local Government Chronicle of November 3 2005:

*"The GLA is to be given enhanced responsibilities for such provision as transport, waste, planning, housing, learning and skills and the arts"*

and requests the executive to submit a report to the next council assembly with up to date developments on this matter together with a statement of the executive's policy in respect of where responsibility should lie for the discharge of the functions listed above in the quotation from Mr Travers.

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

## **COMMENTS FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

### **Introduction**

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) announced a review of the Greater London Authority (GLA's) powers and responsibilities on September 6. A consultation document is due to be published by the end of the year and the council will respond formally to that consultation in due course. In response to the ODPM's announcement and in advance of any formal consultation, the Mayor of London has published proposals for the additional powers that, in the view of the mayor, should be given to the GLA group. The mayor's proposals are also independent of the work undertaken jointly by the GLA Assembly and the Association of London Government (ALG), in the Commission on London Governance, which reported its interim findings in June 2005. The key areas covered by the mayor's proposals are, waste, planning, housing and skills and some of the functions currently undertaken by the Government Office for London. At this time it is not possible to say how the mayor's proposals will be picked up in the ODPM's consultation. However, the position on the mayor's proposals is set out here:

### **Waste**

The council has conducted a neutral review of the waste proposal documents in association with the directors of environment for London. This review highlights deficiencies in the information currently available that cast doubt on the case for any major structural change to waste disposal and highlights the potential for blight of investment in waste management in London. In the light of the deficiency of information available, but recognising the need for greater strategic coordination of waste functions in London, waste disposal officers recommend that the council's position should be enhanced powers being provided to the mayor in relation to ability to the overseeing of contractual arrangements and the ability to designate sites for waste management in London following a meaningful consultation with boroughs.

### **Planning**

The mayor is seeking a range of new powers, including the power of direction over local plans, the power to call in applications, forward spatial planning of a range of public service related infrastructure, more direct involvement in section 106 agreements and the ability to set building regulations for London. In general, the case made for these powers is not strong and many of the proposals militate against the council's role in allowing for local conditions to be considered and for boroughs to be responsive to local concerns. For example, it would be unworkable for any body other than the local authority to lead on the negotiation of section 106 agreements.

### **Housing**

The mayor is asking for responsibility for decisions - not just recommendations - on housing investment allocations. Better co-ordination of London-wide solutions to London's housing problems is needed, but there are concerns about the proposed devolution of housing powers to the mayor. Local housing authorities (not the GLA) have the statutory housing duties such as dealing with poor quality ('unfit') housing, homelessness and allocation of social housing and greater control over housing investment (not less) is needed to meet these statutory duties. The proposed



arrangements could direct investment away from boroughs such as Southwark, which are outside the key growth areas, principally Thames Gateway.

### **Powers of Government Office for London (GOL) (Crime and Drugs)**

The mayor has proposed that GOL's crime and drug's division functions be transferred to the GLA group. There is a need to work closely with government departments at the regional level. However, there is also a need to ensure that the governance and performance management arrangements for community safety are streamlined and made more coherent. This should be done in consultation with boroughs.

### **Skills**

The mayor is proposing rationalisation of learning and skills councils into a regional skills organisation accountable to the mayor. There is a risk of there being tension between locally developed targeted approaches to delivery and support (e.g. Southwark works) and the role of any new pan London organisation with an employment and enterprise remit. The current structure for addressing skills issues is not ideal in that it makes cross-borough working both difficult and sometimes competitive. Greater co-ordination at both a borough level and regional level would be valuable. However, the proposal for a pan London organisation lacks detail and there needs to be further consultation with boroughs.

## **8. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT SKELLY (Seconded by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon)**

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

Council assembly notes the conclusions of the recently published Association of local Government (ALG) research entitled 'Breaking Point - Examining the disruption caused by pupil mobility' and in particular:

1. Schools with mobile children face additional demands that translate into additional costs for extra administrative, teaching and other support. The impact of these additional demands can be critical for some schools and their pupils.
2. High mobility is not evenly distributed between schools. There are underlying factors which cause high pupil turnover to be heavily concentrated in specific geographical locations and in specific schools.
3. High mobility in schools with high levels of educational disadvantage reduces equality of opportunity for all pupils in that school.
4. Under funding already results in a high level of unmet educational need in schools with large numbers of children with multiple deprivation. High levels of pupil mobility compound the pressures these schools face and help perpetuate under-achievement for all children attending that school.
5. Improvements in pupil achievement may continue to be compromised without a better understanding of the relationship between pupil mobility, deprivation and English language acquisition and the role of a more cohesive investment strategy in offering genuine equality of opportunity to all children.

Council assembly believes therefore that 'tackling the implications of pupil mobility should be a key funding priority for the government. Multiple disadvantage and pupil turnover are major determinants in reducing life chances for mobile pupils and other

deprived children who compete for teaching support and whose education is constantly disrupted by classroom instability and joins with the ALG Chair Sir Robin Wales in his declaration that 'real opportunities to lift children out of poverty must be supported by additional teaching capacity. This means ensuring that schools with multiple deprivation and high pupil turnover receive sufficient funding to make equality of opportunity a reality.'

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

#### **COMMENTS FROM DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION**

To follow

#### **9. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT SMEATH** (Seconded by Councillor Aubyn Graham)

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

Council assembly notes with serious concern the damage caused to council property following squatting and the apparent anti-social behaviour of some squatters.

In particular council assembly notes concerns regarding the actions of squatters on the Coopers Road estate, Wooddene and East Dulwich estate

Council assembly additionally notes the fires at Marchant Court, Roseberry Street Children's Home and Waverley School lower site, which have all been subject to squatting.

Council assembly calls on the overview and scrutiny committee to receive an urgent report covering the cause and costs of these issues and which will additionally outline urgent new steps to be taken to tackle the current problems and ways to avoid future recurrences.

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

#### **COMMENTS FROM ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PERFORMANCE & STRATEGY)**

To follow

#### **10. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN FRIARY** (Seconded by Councillor Ian Wingfield)

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

Council assembly notes the dismay of both Camberwell community council and local residents with regard to the continued delay by the council to reach a decision about how to ensure much needed investment in Camberwell Leisure Centre.

Council assembly believes this building to be important to Camberwell as a leisure centre.

Council assembly notes Camberwell community council's own report to the executive, now adopted as the community council's own strategy, which envisages the development of the leisure centre as key to regeneration in Camberwell. Council assembly notes that at present the building is in a poor state of repair and is deteriorating.

Council assembly calls upon the executive to make an urgent decision about future investment for this centre so that work can begin both to ensure the continuation of current facilities and to start developing this centre as a resource to the residents of Camberwell, including urgently needed facilities for the young people of Camberwell.

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

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE**

All the leisure centres in the borough are suffering from over two decades of lack of investment. The reality with Camberwell is that it has probably been neglected for over thirty years and allowed to fall into an advanced state of disrepair. The legacy that we are faced with is leisure centres that will need in the region of £25 million in investment to make them fit for purpose and turn them into the sort of facilities that people in Southwark expect and deserve.

Investment in Camberwell cannot be seen in isolation from the other centres. The council is in the process of negotiating a very significant investment programme, which will attempt to address its inherited problem of under-investment. This is in conjunction with an external partner (Fusion) who, in turn, has to satisfy its board and also lending institutions that the deal that they are working on represents an acceptable level of risk. The council too, has to be satisfied that the risks it may be taking on are tolerable and meet the auditing regulations that the Council is bound by.

#### **11. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC THORNCROFT (Seconded by Councillor Any Simmons)**

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

Council Assembly

##### (1) Notes

- Council assembly's support on July 20 2005 for urgent action to be taken to establish a conservation area for the Nunhead Green area;
- That officers have indicated that the likely timescale for establishing a conservation area is April 2006;
- That planning applications continue to be worked up by landowners in the area.

(2) Reiterates council assembly's request that urgent action is taken by the planning committee to establish a conservation area.

(3) Asks that planning committee receive a report on the issue by the end of January 2006.

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

## **COMMENTS FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR REGENERATION**

The Nunhead Green area has been considered for designation in the past and officers agree that it is desirable to preserve and enhance its character. The service plan for 2005/06 does not include work on the designation of Nunhead as a conservation area. In the current work stream there are proposals to designate Peckham Town and Sunray Gardens, which are being progressed.

At the planning committee meeting on November 15, it was agreed not to designate the St. Mary Conservation area and, therefore, Members asked if it were possible to divert the resource that would have carried out this work to work on the Nunhead Green area. This is scheduled for consideration at the planning committee meeting on November 29.

Work could start on an initial survey of Nunhead Green in the early new year, with a view of delineating the boundary and putting together a draft appraisal by April 2006. It needs to be recognised that the team must respond to ongoing work, including public inquiries scheduled for the new year, which can impact on timescales.

### **12. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS ROBINSON (Seconded by Councillor David Bradbury)**

**Please note that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.10 (3), this motion stands referred to the next meeting of the executive.**

Council assembly notes recent initiatives undertaken by the police and other responsible authorities to tackle the longstanding problems of anti social behaviour and youth crime on the Rotherhithe peninsula and Surrey Quays.

Council assembly is however extremely concerned at recent reports of renewed anti social activity and conflict by gangs and youths in the area. Council assembly notes the continuing requests and strong support amongst local residents for higher visibility patrolling, and the reopening of Rotherhithe police station overnight.

Council assembly requests the Safer Southwark Partnership to bring forward a report to the council executive by 31st January 2006 on measures to tackle these ongoing problems.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Member Motions	Town Hall Peckham Road London SE5 8UB	Constitutional Team 020 7525 7228

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager
<b>Report Author</b>	Cameron MacLean, Constitutional Officer
<b>Version</b>	Final
<b>Dated</b>	November 28 2005