

Item No. 8.	Classification: Open	Date: February 22 2006	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 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 AUBYN GRAHAM (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.

Peckham Rye Park

Council assembly is concerned that no capital has been identified to replace the changing rooms on Peckham Rye park although plans are well in advance to demolish them and build new facilities.

Council assembly calls on the executive member for culture, youth & sport to give assurances that funding will be identified for both the canteen and changing rooms on this park so that both are completed at the same time.

Comments from the Strategic Director Environment & Leisure

The council recognises the significant value of young people's football on Peckham Rye and the need for changing facilities. The needs have already been fully identified and consulted on and a detailed bid has been prepared and submitted as part of the preparation for the council's capital programme and budget which will be considered by the executive. In the meantime, officers are working with the teams who play on Peckham Rye actively to seek out provide alternative funding streams. An exploratory meeting is scheduled in the very near future with the Football Foundation for this purpose. The teams currently use the "prisoner of war huts" in the car park as changing facilities. Whilst these are better than nothing they are not entirely fit for purpose and would cost more than the provision of a new purpose built changing room to convert. Whilst the hut that the teams currently use will have to be demolished for the building of the café, officers are undertaking to make one of the other huts as safe and comfortable as resources allow so that this can continue to be used as a temporary changing room whilst funding for the new changing facility is being sought.

2. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MARK PURSEY (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.

Church Commissioners

Council assembly notes:

- the importance of affordable housing in south London and that Octavia Hill estates in Walworth, Waterloo and Vauxhall have provided affordable housing since the 19th century.
- that this housing was built with the express purpose of providing homes for those on low incomes.

Council assembly further notes that the total return on the church commissioner's residential property portfolio rose by nearly 22% in 2004, with a gross income of £15.6 million, according to their annual report.

Council assembly therefore condemns plans by the church commissioners to sell off this key affordable housing to private landlords, with the inevitable effect of an increase in rents to the market level.

Council assembly believes that the result of sale to a private landlord could be to undermine the communities of those living on the estates as well as forcing many onto Southwark's homeless list.

Council assembly welcomes the representations made by the leader of the council and our local MPs Simon Hughes and Harriet Harman to persuade the church commissioners to sell the estates to a social landlord rather than private companies.

Council assembly calls on the church commissioners to agree to sell the properties to a social housing provider.

Comments from the Strategic Director Housing

Following publicity about the proposed disposal by the church commissioners of their properties at the Octavia Hill estate in Walworth, officers from the housing department have been seeking information from the church commissioners.

The Octavia Hill Estate in Walworth comprises 618 properties; the church commissioners are disposing of 1132 units in total, including properties in Lambeth and Westminster. The breakdown of occupiers at the Walworth estate is as follows:

- Rent Act protected tenancies – 205
- Assured tenancies - 149
- Assured shorthold keyworkers – 43
- Assured shorthold – 196
- Void – 25

In 2001, the church commissioners agreed a policy of applying a ratio to relets of 20% affordable (keyworkers) to 80% market rent. The officers of the church commissioners have made clear that the properties are held as an investment, and that they do not regard themselves as a social landlord. The specific responsibility is held by the assets committee of the commissioners, who have an obligation to maximise the benefit to the church. The commissioners have previously disposed of Octavia Hill stock as recently as last year, in Stoke Newington, Maida Vale and Waterloo.

The church commissioners decided on the February 3 2006 to dispose of the freehold of all 1132 properties to a consortium of Genesis Housing Group and Grainger Trust. Management will be undertaken by Pathmeads Housing Association, a part of the Genesis Group and a registered social landlord.

Before the decision was made, officers had tried to obtain more information about the proposed disposal both from the church commissioners and from the Housing Corporation. The Housing Corporation do not have any supervisory responsibilities for the church commissioners and had not been approached by them about the proposed disposal. The church commissioners representatives were made aware of the council's concerns about a radical change to a large holding of affordable housing in the borough, in terms of the implications for residents and the strategic responsibilities of the council. Officers will continue to pursue these matters with the church commissioners and the prospective purchasers and seek assurances about the future management arrangements.

3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MICHELLE PEARCE (Seconded by Councillor Charlie Pearce)

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

Welcome to Dulwich Signs

Council assembly notes that many residents of Dulwich and Herne Hill have expressed concerns over the recently installed 'Welcome to Dulwich' signs. In particular, that:

- the bright pink colour of the signs are out of keeping with the area
- the signs were rejected unanimously at the consultation stage by Dulwich community council, and yet were still installed
- the signs are located far from the centre of Dulwich, and may confuse travellers
- residents of Herne Hill have expressed their view that 'Welcome to Dulwich' signs are inappropriate for an area which has a strong local identity distinct from Dulwich
- that the community council expressed a strong view that it would prefer to spend the money allocated for the signs on the cleaner, greener, safer programme instead

Given these concerns, council assembly calls on the executive to remove the 'Welcome to Dulwich' signs forthwith.

Comments from the Strategic Director Environment & Leisure

The installation of boundary signs has been a long held ambition for the council and was agreed by the executive on April 13 2004. A lot of work went into the design in an effort to come up with something that both signposted "Southwark" and the community council areas. The designs were discussed at a meeting of the chairs of the community council on July 22 2005 last year and there was general agreement to the design.

Subsequently Dulwich community council passed a resolution opposing their installation, however the borough solicitor advised that the decision of the executive took precedence as the overall programme of signing the borough was a strategic decision.

To minimize any street cluttering where possible the signs were installed on lamp columns and at the same time a general decluttering of the borough was undertaken which has to date led to the removal of over 4000 items of redundant street furniture, signs, etc.

However, given the level of member and community response to the Dulwich signs, these signs were removed in the second week of February. There will now be further community consultation on what, if anything, should replace them.

4. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF HOOK (Seconded by Councillor Lisa Rajan)

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

New Cycle and Pedestrian Bridge

Council assembly welcomes proposals for a new cycle and pedestrian bridge to span the river Thames from Rotherhithe to Limehouse as part of the 2012 Olympic and paralympic legacy.

Council assembly notes:-

- that cycling promotes healthy living and fitness and is environmentally friendly;
- that the new bridge would both boost cycle use in Southwark and provide a vital improvement to the transport infrastructure of south east London;
- that the bridge would provide access to jobs and services north of the river for local residents;
- that the press has described the project as a “huge boost for cyclists and for all who care about sport, the environment and London.”

Council assembly therefore calls on the executive member for environment and transport to write in support of the project to the Mayor of London, and to work with Sustrans to approach all relevant funding bodies to ensure its success.

Comments from the Strategic Director Regeneration

Sustrans have prepared proposals for a network of high quality walking and cycling routes to connect a large part of London with the Olympic venues and are seeking the support of the Mayor of London. An essential part of the scheme to connect a large part of south London would be a new traffic-free river crossing at Rotherhithe. If achieved, the scheme has the potential to encourage a major shift towards sustainable transport modes in large areas of Southwark.

Southwark is preparing to look at the project's implications for sustainable transport as part of the multi-modal review being planned for the wider Rotherhithe area. It has also been identified as one of the borough's aspirations in the local implementation plan shortly to be submitted to the Mayor. Officers are looking into the feasibility of the bridge with both Sustrans and Southwark Cyclists.

The leader of the council has recently written to the Mayor of London expressing support for the project.

5. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR IAN WINGFIELD (Seconded by Councillor John Friary)

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

Transport in South London

This motion was submitted with the signatures of 16 Members, since it is similar to a motion rejected at the last council assembly.

Council assembly believes that south London has historically suffered from a lack of public transport links, especially compared to areas north of the river, and that areas such as Camberwell, Dulwich & Peckham have been particularly affected.

Council assembly further believes that decent transport links are vital to the economic and social development of an area; especially those that provide better and easier access to central London.

Council assembly welcomes the proposals announced by the Mayor of London on October 12 2004 for a £10 billion, five-year investment programme to give London a 21st century transport system that includes a ground-breaking agreement between the government and Transport for London (TfL), and welcomes the new TfL London Rail Partnership agreement that has been set up between TfL, London Rail and the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) to help secure significant improvements in train services.

Council assembly also welcomes plans to extend the East London Line as a railway to Clapham Junction via Peckham and up to Islington and plans for a cross-river tram to link north and south London from Camden down to Peckham via the Elephant and Castle. Council assembly believes that these plans are integral to the successful regeneration of the centre of the borough.

However, council assembly notes with regret that although the Mayor's transport investment programme 2005/6-2009/10 includes over £24 million to progress the cross river tram project, neither this nor phase II of the East London Line extension is as yet fully funded. Council assembly further regrets the shelving of the proposed East London Line extension through Dulwich towards Wimbledon.

Council assembly also acknowledges that the local implementation plan (LiP) and borough spending plan (2006/07) should include the findings of the Camberwell community council's transport needs report of July 13 2003 - April 16 2004. This includes the transport recommendations contained in its annual report dated 2005 which calls for a tram, a tube link and train station, better pedestrian routes & cycle routes and the continued need for accessible bus provision.

Council assembly therefore calls upon the leader of the council to write jointly (as appropriate) with Camberwell, Dulwich and Peckham councillors:-

1. to the Mayor of London, calling upon him to consider adding a new branch of the cross river tram serving Camberwell;
2. to the Mayor of London calling upon him to re-consider at the earliest opportunity the development of the proposed East London Line extension through Peckham and Dulwich to Wimbledon;

3. to the secretary of state for transport, the head of the SRA, and the managing director of TfL London Rail reiterating the need for a mainline station in Camberwell;
4. to TfL and the Mayor of London emphasising the regeneration and economic development benefits that a new tube station and extension of the Bakerloo Line would bring to Camberwell.

Council assembly also calls upon the executive to make it clear, in line with the wishes of the Southwark transport consultative forum, that the transport links to Camberwell, Dulwich and Peckham are to be the council's top priority for funding proposals, and requests the executive to ensure that Southwark council's transport policy team develop an integrated transport plan of action for Camberwell, Peckham and Dulwich by working closely with the community councils, TfL, SRA, TfL London Rail and London Buses.

Comments from the Strategic Director Regeneration

The Cross River Tram is critical to the delivery of economic development, social inclusion and regeneration in key areas of the borough, including the Elephant and Castle, Walworth, the Aylesbury and Peckham. In recognition of these positive benefits the council also advocates the extension of the tram to Camberwell and Peckham through the Cross River Tram steering group.

Southwark maintains a strong involvement in the East London Line Group through which it advocates the implementation of phase two of the East London Line extension. Through this group, the council will continue to argue for phase two to involve extension through East Dulwich and North Dulwich to Wimbledon.

The council is working with our transport partners on these major projects for their consideration and inclusion in the government's 2007 spending review to ensure the best possible outcome for Southwark is achieved.

The council's local implementation plan (LIP) has been developed in firm consultation with the community and is a comprehensive borough wide assessment giving a strategic view of transport difficulties and opportunities that exist within Southwark. The LIP sets out the council's key strategic aspirations, including the provision of a rail station at Camberwell, extension of the Bakerloo line to Camberwell and the extension of the Victoria line to Herne Hill.

To best reflect the requirements of the community, some of the founding sources of information are issues raised via individual correspondence, the transport consultative forum and through the annual borough spending plan consultation with community councils (as detailed below).

The local implementation plan underwent six weeks of public consultation, from November 14 2005 to December 23 2005. As part of the consultation, transport planning officers attending community councils throughout November and December 2005 and held workshops at Walworth and Camberwell community council meetings.

The information gained from the consultation period, including that from the community councils, will help to shape the final local implementation plan.

Each year when developing the borough spending plan, transport planning officers attend all community councils seeking input and ideas for potential projects. These ideas and proposals are then further developed by officers for submission to Transport for London as part of the borough spending plan. The total funding allocated to

Southwark for the 2006/07 financial year is £4.384 million. This includes a direct allocation of £3.874 million and partnership allocations of £510,000.

All projects that are unsuccessful in receiving funding are placed in a project bank and are reviewed on an annual basis.

6. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL BATES (Seconded by Councillor Abdul Mohamed)

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

Parking Enforcement

Council assembly notes long-standing complaints from residents and ward councillors about parking enforcement in and around Liverpool Grove, Portland Street and Westmoreland Road.

Council assembly notes numerous complaints about double-parking on Westmoreland Road, alleged illegal use of parking permits, parking on double-yellow lines and vandalism of pay and display machines.

Council assembly also notes the concerns of residents of Fielding Street about commercial organisations using residents' parking bays,

Council assembly notes with concern the perception of inconsistencies of parking enforcement by wardens in each of the residential areas listed above and notes the officers' attempts to resolve the problems in each case.

Council assembly believes that despite officers' best efforts in some areas, parking enforcement in parts of Faraday ward continues to be generally haphazard and inconsistent.

Council assembly therefore calls on the executive to commission a report into parking problems in the four streets listed above and how to overcome them.

The report should assess the consistency of approach in enforcement, and outline strategies to ensure more rigorous adherence to parking restrictions. The report should also look into:

- installation of CCTV to prevent vandalism;
- 'quality checking' and increased monitoring of issued parking fines;
- patrolling levels on Westmoreland Road and Fielding Street;
- clearer information on parking restrictions for nearby commercial organisations and the prevention of illegal use of residents bays;
- clarity of policy to enable wardens to better carry out their work.

Comments from the Strategic Director Environment & Leisure

The parking section is aware of issues relating to three of the four streets mentioned Liverpool Grove, Westmoreland Road, and Fielding Street. The parking section is not aware of any issues relating to Portland Street. The action being taken to tackle these problems is as follows:

Westmoreland Road

The problem in Westmoreland Road is that a mini cab firm and retail business continuously double park. As soon as a parking attendant approaches the vehicles are driven away and then re-parked. Pay and display machines are also vandalized.

From November 2005 to January 2006 Westmoreland Road has received 246 visits amounting to 50 hours 36 minutes patrolling which is a high level, 69 penalty charge notices (PCNs) were issued. The parking section has changed the location of pay and display machines in order to make them more difficult to vandalise but this has failed. The machine has also been subject to covert surveillance also without success to date. A blitz on fraudulent disabled badge use resulted in two badges being seized.

The parking section is now introducing loading and waiting restrictions at the junction of Westmoreland Road and Camberwell Road to the junction of Red Lion Road which will alleviate the need to provide five minutes observation time and allow instant penalty for the parking offence. Negotiations are taking place with Transport for London to increase the parking attendant patrols from the bus lane to Westmoreland Road and the pay and display machine is being re-located to the junction of Camberwell Road/Westmoreland Road where there is more pedestrian traffic.

If this proposal is unsuccessful the service will consider replacing the current pay and display system with free parking for 20 minutes and no return for 2 hours.

Liverpool Grove

The problem in Liverpool Grove is double parking while drivers go to the cash point machine. The current parking restriction allows five minute observation but cash point visits are normally shorter than this. Parking attendant patrols have been increased in the last 3 months to tackle the situation with 1299 visits from November 2005 through to January 2006 which amounts to 299 hours 11 minutes of patrol time and has resulted in 391 PCNs.

The service is now moving to digital imaging, where all contraventions will be captured by photograph and this will allow the service to issue instant PCNs as a result.

Fielding Street

The problem in Fielding Street is that the signs are repeatedly illegally removed from resident bays in the vicinity of Fielding Street and Empress Street.

CCTV monitoring has taken place which has resulted in vehicles being removed. The street has had 479 visits from November 2005 through to January 2006 amounting to 100 hours and 11 minutes of patrol and resulting in the issue 109 PCNs. A CCTV camera is being erected and on the north side of the bridge missing sign plates are being replaced and three further signs erected.

Portland Street

We know of no issues relating to this street. However, from November 2005 through to January 2006 Portland Street received 494 visits amounting to 132 hours and 20 minutes of patrol and resulting in the issue of 162 PCNs.

As problems are being acted on, and improvements being monitored a report to the Executive is not considered necessary at this point in time.

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	Cameron MacLean, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	10.02.06