



## **COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**

**WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 13 2006**

### **SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA No. 2**

<b>List of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>No.</b>
<b>2. MINUTES OF COUNCIL ASSEMBLY JUNE 28 2006 – AMENDED APPENDIX 3</b>	<b>1.</b>
<b>4. SOUTHWARK COMMUNITY CARE FORUM DEPUTATION REQUEST – COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF OFFICER</b>	<b>5.</b>
<b>4B REVISED MOTION ON DEPUTATION – SOUTHWARK COMMUNITY CARE FORUM</b>	<b>8.</b>
<b>7. MOTIONS – COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF OFFICERS</b>	<b>10.</b>
<b>AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS</b>	<b>17.</b>

**NOTE:** Please note that the above reports have not been circulated seven clear working days in advance of the meeting (council procedure rule 1.2 (1)). Therefore, in accordance with access to information procedure rule (5), the Mayor will be asked to accept the items as late and urgent.

Circulated: Tuesday, September 12 2006

For further information please contact Lesley John/Cameron MacLean 020 7525 7228/7236

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY  
(ORDINARY)**

**WEDNESDAY JUNE 28 2005**

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS ON REPORTS**

**ITEM 7.1 - STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2005/06**

**(Revised questions 4, 9, 10 & 12)**

**4. QUESTION ON PROVISIONS FOR BAD DEBTS – PAGE 38 - FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

Why has the council increased provisions for bad debt for housing benefit overpayments by 25.8%? How much housing benefit was overpaid in each of the last 4 years?

**RESPONSE**

The council's approach to calculating all its main bad debt provisions follows advice received from Price Waterhouse Coopers in response to recommendations made by the District Auditor in 2002/03. The District Auditor also reviews the level of bad debt provisions during each annual audit. The increase in bad debt provision is largely explained by the overall increase housing benefit overpayments, although other factors are taken into account as well, such as the nature and age profile of the debt.

The amount of housing benefit overpaid in each of the last 4 years is shown below:

<b>FINANCIAL YEAR</b>	<b>HB OVERPAYMENTS (£)</b>
2002/03	4,227,122.70
2003/04	3,898,263.08
2004/05	3,803,432.95
2005/06	5,297,745.75

Please note that the level of housing benefit overpayments is determined by a combination of claimant error (egg failure to notify changes in circumstances or failure to disclose savings) and local authority error.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PETER JOHN**

Page 14 of the report under 'control exception' states that further development is needed in dealing with fraud, can you enlarge on that?

**RESPONSE**

I have asked officers to bring this to the District Auditor's attention so this aspect of fraud control can be dealt with in the management letter. The government has dispensed with the requirement that claimants make annual re-application.

**9. QUESTION ON INCOME FROM RENTED COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES -  
FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE**

In light of the falling income from renting out of commercial properties, can figures be provided to show the number of properties rented out in 2004/05 and 2005/06, together with figures for vacant properties in both years?

**RESPONSE**

**Income from commercial properties**

Within the short timescale, it has not been possible to provide details of the number of properties rented out in both years and the number of vacant properties, but I will arrange for this information to be circulated shortly.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD  
LIVINGSTONE**

I would not only like to thank the executive member for his response, but given some of the responses in the earlier question time I am quite grateful I have got some of his good humour to answer my question. I appreciate the timescale maybe very difficult to come up with the answer to my particular question. I would at this point also like to thank officers for their hard work in assisting the executive member in bringing together answers to these questions at fairly short notice. As many members will recall there have been plenty of issues over the last year or so and indeed beyond that of small businesses that rent premises from the council finding the increases in rents to be very onerous and indeed putting some out of those properties. It does appear that if there has been a reduction in the income from these properties as a result of the policy of market rents, there may well be a case to review that policy in certain areas. I would hope that the figures that are produced for this actually look at that issue because I think there is a real problem that we have in the borough at the moment, where we are having small businesses pushed out of their premises. We have a local community suffering because of the loss of some of those businesses and at the same time we also appear to be making less income from these premises as well. I would hope that some of those questions and answers could help point us in the direction of reviewing some of our policies around the rent of the commercial properties.

**RESPONSE**

Thank you Councillor Livingstone. It is nice to hear from your commercial approach to this. Of course if you are a property owner and you raise your rents too much the result would be that nobody wants to come forward and rent your property, you are going to get falling income. Therefore you have to revise that policy and that would be a commercially based assessment and that would be very much in line with what we should have regard to. When we get the information all interested can contributing to policy making on this.

**10. QUESTION ON BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CORPORATE MODERNISATION PROCESS - FROM COUNCILLOR OLA OYEWUNMI**

Please provide further information on the working balances put aside for business process improvements and the corporate modernisation process. Can you confirm that this is all directly related to housing?

**RESPONSE**

These are listed in the table below. As the HRA is a ring-fenced account, monies accounted for within it may only relate to the council's provision of landlord services, and so the working balances identified must by definition be housing-related.

<b>BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS</b>	£
Human Resources, Recruitment and Training & Development	412,650
Income Collection and Financial Management and Governance	391,500
Customer Care & Satisfaction	524,239
	<b>1,328,389</b>
<b>CORPORATE MODERNISATION</b>	
Customer Service Centre	240,980
	<b>240,980</b>

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR OLA OYEWUNMI**

Thanks Mr Mayor and my thanks to the officer for the response. My supplementary question is in future will there be no call on the HR to fund activities such as establishment of community councils as it was in the past?

**RESPONSE**

I don't believe there are any such plans and I would not favour them. There has to be a clear distinction between the housing revenue account and the other activities of the council, which would include community councils.

**12. QUESTION ON SUMMARY OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND FINANCING – PAGE 55 - FROM COUNCILLOR ALISON McGOVERN**

Given the concerns about leisure facilities in the borough, please explain the £2m reduction in environment and leisure capital spending in 2005/06.

**RESPONSE**

Capital expenditure in 2004/05 included the purchase of a site for £5.8m to facilitate the waste project at the Old Kent Road. Excluding this, capital expenditure on other items increased by £3.8m compared to last year.

Officers are currently working on options for leisure centres and will be presenting these to executive in due course.

**SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR ALISON McGOVERN**

I would like to thank the executive member for the answer. I would like to focus my supplementary question on the second paragraph of the answer, which states that officers are currently working on options for leisure centre and will be presenting these to the executive in due course. That seems to have been the position for rather a long time now – again getting any more information than that has been rather like drawing blood from a stone. I would specifically like to ask how wide-ranging this work on different options is, specifically to the options looking into management organisations other than fusion. We have had various dates presented to local communities around leisure centres, specifically Camberwell which I represent, and those dates seems to have been put back time and time again. The executive will forgive me if I push rather hard on when they expect to have more financial details to present to councillors and the wider community and I do hope that we can share in any information that is available.

**RESPONSE**

The member is quite right to push on this. I am advised that the only precise proposals have been received from only one organisation so far but the director of finance has increased his efforts to ensure that we have the right information about whether that approach is really providing value for money. In other words there is a possibility of it becoming more wide-ranging. I am sure by the run of the executive member sitting right next to me that further information on this should be available for all members in September.

<b>Item No.</b> 4.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> September 13 2006	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council Assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Southwark Community Care Forum and Downtown Area Residents Deputation requests – Comments Of Chief Officers	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Chief Executive (Acting Borough Solicitor)	

### **DEPUTATION REQUEST FROM THE SOUTHWARK COMMUNITY CARE FORUM**

The Southwark Community Care Forum have stated they wish to address council assembly on the following matters:

- (i) The Children and Young People’s Plan and Early Years Vision and the role and participation of the voluntary sector;
- (ii) The current situation of voluntary sector early years providers, including vacancy levels of each nursery, finances and other issues relating to occupancy levels; and,
- (iii) How the council can assist the sector towards attainment of the vision for children in terms of funding and capacity building support.

### **Comments of the Strategic Director Health and Community Services**

1. Provision for childcare and early education in Southwark has changed significantly over the past three years. There are now in excess of 110 private, voluntary and independent child care centres and 400 independent child minders registered with Southwark Council. This expansion of services is consistent with the Government’s vision for Early Childhood Services, which is to build a thriving market in childcare, offering parents a choice of high quality places. It also reflects the council’s commitment to work with the private, voluntary & independent sector (PVI) in ensuring the best possible provision for our young children.
2. The maintained sector has also expanded provision and many schools are now offering nursery education for three- and four- year-olds, reflecting the government’s requirement that all children within this age group must be able to access 12.5 hours of education provision for 38 weeks each year. The expansion of children’s centres, which is integral to the government’s strategy, is also delivering additional childcare places and providing a wider range of support services to children and families.

### Working Tax Credits

3. As part of the government's strategy to support low income families with the cost of childcare, working tax credits (WTC) were introduced to assist parents who wish to join the workforce. This system allows families with a combined income of up to £25,000 to claim up to a maximum entitlement of £140 per week. Families continue to be eligible up to an earnings limit of £55,000, although their entitlement reduces as income increases.
4. Access to this subsidy has further expanded the options for families as WTC is calculated on the basis of the cost of the childcare. Opting for cheaper provision will not necessarily be more economical for families as the WTC will reduce accordingly.
5. The government's national policy assumes that where parents are not working they are responsible for the care of their children up until they turn 3, when every child becomes eligible for 12.5 hours. Southwark does however provide support for a range of additional services for families and children including one o'clock clubs and play groups. The suite of services for families and children will be further expanded through the children's centres and PVI nurseries will be able to access this support.
6. The government has had significant issues with the administration of WTC. There is however an indication that the system has improved substantially and that parents are regaining confidence in accessing their entitlement.

### Places for Vulnerable Children

7. The council has statutory responsibility for supporting vulnerable children and placement of a child must primarily be based on addressing the child's needs. A key element in the development of children's centres has been to expand the range of services for vulnerable children and their families. The concentration of services within children's centres so that they are better placed to support vulnerable children and families is one of the tensions in delivering the government strategy, as at a local level we aim to ensure that the PVI sector are integral to this strategy.
8. The nine community nurseries that are grant-funded by the council have provided services to some of our most vulnerable communities for many years. This year they have received over £600,000. However as the range of provision has expanded they are inevitably subjected to the same market forces that are now at play. Parents are encouraged to explore alternatives in terms of childcare and are rightfully exercising their choice.
9. Community nurseries are currently supported by a full-time officer whose role is to assist with business planning and sourcing other funding streams. This dedicated support has been provided over a number of years. They are also supported by the early years advisors who work with all centres to strengthen the provision of the foundation stage curriculum.

### The Way Forward

10. The emphasis in the past three years rightly has been on expanding the number of places. However, there is evidence there are now sufficient places

and the service priority should now be improving the quality of provision. An important element in addressing this priority is ensuring that we have a level playing field for all providers.

11. The executive member for children's services and education, along with a senior officer in the department, has met with those responsible for running the community nurseries and agreed a strategy for reviewing how the council commissions them to provide high quality childcare and education services to young children. Following this a consultant has been engaged to consider the future arrangements for providing early years services across all sectors including schools. This consultant is reporting regularly both to the executive member and the strategic director for children's services on possible solutions with a particular emphasis on the role of the voluntary and community sector. The outcome of this will inform decisions for the 2007 financial year onwards.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Deputation Request File	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Cameron MacLean 020 7525 7236

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager
<b>Report Author</b>	Cameron MacLean/Lesley John, Constitutional Officers
<b>Version</b>	Final version
<b>Dated</b>	8.9.06

---

**ITEM 4B      MOTION ON A DEPUTATION REQUEST BY SOUTHWARK  
COMMUNITY CARE FORUM** (see page 2)

---

**MOTION BY COUNCILLOR VERONICA WARD**

Seconded by Councillor Kirsty McNeil

Please note, that in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 3.7(x), debate on this motion is limited to 15 minutes. The mover of the motion may speak for a maximum of three minutes and the seconder and any other speakers shall be allowed a maximum of two minutes.

**Note:** The motion below is an amended version of the motion published with the main agenda in that a new first paragraph has been added to the motion (see italics).

**Primary Care Provision**

*Council assembly notes the urgency of the funding situation in relation to the survival of a number of community nurseries, previously reasonably financially secure. Council assembly welcomes the review of early years provision following the emergency motion of council assembly of June 28.*

Council assembly notes that earlier in the year Copleston Children's Centre announced that it would be closing at the end of July owing to funding difficulties that remained unresolved. Other community nurseries, including Bermondsey community nursery, are facing similar difficulties and may also have to make decisions to close, losing the experience, expertise and community involvement which has built up excellent provision over many years in this borough especially in the past when less affordable child care was available.

Council assembly also welcomes the huge investment in early years by the present government making it possible for the first time to ensure that many more children have opportunities to develop their full potential and parents to be confident that high quality child care is available to them.

Council assembly notes that research by the National Day Nurseries Association has indicated that as local authorities take forward their child care and family strategies, they are not involving the voluntary and private sectors. This, the research notes, is contrary to the principle of a mixed economy of childcare favoured by the government. Clause 8 of the Child Care bill stipulates that councils may not develop their own childcare facilities alone unless there are no other appropriate organisations to do so. Southwark Community Nursery Network has been warning this council for the past four years that community nurseries will not survive unless they are given the opportunity to be equal partners in the developments now underway. It seems that these warnings have not been heeded. Council assembly therefore calls upon the executive to ensure that the review now underway:

- Includes an examination of the role community nurseries can play in developing early years provision in the Borough and plans that provision accordingly
- Recognises that high quality child care costs money and that a small independent community nursery run by the local community cannot take

advantage of economies of scale and will therefore need adequate financial support to continue to make the positive contribution to early years that has been so highly valued by those parents and children who have used Southwark's community nurseries in the past.

<b>Item No.</b> 7.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> September 13 2006	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Council assembly
<b>Report title:</b>		Motions – Comments From Chief Officers	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Chief Executive (Acting Borough Solicitor)	

**1. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LISA RAJAN** (seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet)

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

**Downtown Area Development**

Council assembly notes that the planning committee rejected an application from Barratt Homes for a development on Downtown Road and Salter Road on August 16 2005 on the grounds of density, height, massing and overdevelopment of the site.

Council assembly also notes the success of the Downtown Defence Campaign in bringing together support from the local community, local councillors, and local London Assembly Member to oppose the development.

Council assembly welcomes the outcome of the recent public inquiry in which the independent inspector upheld the council's decision to reject the planning application.

Council assembly therefore notes with regret the decision of the Secretary of State for communities and local government to overturn the decision of the planning committee and impose the development on the Downtown Area.

Council assembly notes with concern that this action further erodes the powers of local communities and locally elected representatives to make decisions about their local area.

Council assembly asks the leader of the council and/or executive member for regeneration to write to the secretary of state requesting that (a) the government respects local decisions and the views of independent bodies such as the Planning Inspectorate, and (b) she withdraw her direction on the Downtown decision.

Council assembly also instructs the acting borough solicitor to seek urgent legal advice as to the possibility of a judicial review of the decision.

## **Comment from Strategic Director of Regeneration and Acting Borough Solicitor**

1. The appeal relates to a development of 252 dwellings in seven separate buildings, plus a new health centre and two community buildings, with associated car parking and landscaping. Planning permission had been refused by the Planning Committee in August 2005, and a public inquiry held in April 2006. In the period between the Planning Committee and the Inquiry, the scheme was slightly amended to reduce the number of residential units from 268 to the final figure of 252 dwellings.
2. The Inspector's report recommended that the appeal be dismissed, on the grounds that Block A/B (close to Russia Dock Woodland) would cause harm and be contrary to some of the provisions of the development plan. The secretary of state, in her decision dated August 8 2006, agreed that harm was caused, but concluded that the benefits of the proposal, in terms of the delivery of housing, particularly affordable housing, the community benefits and the overall design were material considerations sufficient to outweigh the harm to the development plan. She therefore allowed the appeal, and granted planning permission subject to conditions and a Unilateral Undertaking under S106.
3. As part of the council's appeal procedures decisions that go against the council are assessed to see what implications there might be for implementing the council's development plan policies and if a challenge of the decision through judicial review is appropriate. Accordingly, in this case the acting borough solicitor has already instructed counsel to advise on the secretary of state's decision and in particular: to advise the council about the prospect of success of a legal challenge against the secretary of state's decision dated August 8 2006.
4. Counsel has been instructed that the council is particularly concerned about the following matters:-
  - The secretary of state's setting aside of important development plan policies;
  - The weight that seems to have been given by the secretary of state to the pursuit of (affordable) housing and community benefits;
  - The effect of this decision on the council's development control processes including future negotiations with developers.
5. Key factors for members in deciding what action to take are:
  - The secretary of state has made and issued the decision and is not empowered by law to withdraw the decision.
  - The right of appeal under Section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 would, if successful, result in the High Court quashing the decision of the secretary of state and remitting it to her for reconsideration. The court has no jurisdiction to consider the merits of the planning application.
  - The secretary of state would still need to take into account only relevant considerations in reaching any decision. These would not include any further representations made by members about matters of general policy. The secretary of state could confirm her previous decision but would have to justify it.

6. Officers are considering counsel's advice. Making an application for review of the decision is strictly time limited and must be made by September 19 2006. Under the council's scheme of delegation, it is for the strategic director of regeneration to decide whether to lodge an appeal.
  7. Irrespective of whether any legal challenge is made it remains open to members to make representations about the extent to which the case illustrates the failure of the planning system to allow local elected authorities to strike a fair balance between competing interests in accordance with its judgment about what is best for its area. Such representations could refer to Southwark's successful record in securing additional housing including high proportions of affordable housing and indicate that overriding local decisions makes it more difficult to sustain the confidence of local people that such outcomes will be achieved with fair regard to local factors.
2. **MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR SUSAN ELAN JONES** (seconded by Councillor Ola Oyewunmi)

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

#### **Adult Entertainment Club**

Council assembly congratulates the community groups, schools, faith groups, tenants associations, businesses and local residents who successfully opposed the opening of a lap dancing club in Peckham.

Council assembly notes that the campaign, led by local councillors, was a resounding success which effectively communicated the strength of feeling against 'adult' clubs in Peckham. It gained the support not just of local residents but also of MPs and Assembly members. The applicant listened to the concerns and accordingly withdrew his application.

Council assembly notes that had the application proceeded, it would have been possible for local ward councillors to represent their constituents in this matter at licensing committee. Local councillors were ready and willing to do this. Residents would have needed to make a written application to the council so that this could happen. Local councillors had made active contact with local residents, worked with them to make them aware of the procedure, and were ready to help them submit the correct requests.

Council assembly notes the contrast between this and the recent application for a lap-dancing club in Tooley Street, where local councillors did not inform local residents of the proposal to have a lap-dancing club in their ward, did not represent concerned constituents at licensing committee, and did not organise any campaign on behalf of the local community.

Council assembly calls upon all members to liaise with local residents over controversial applications of this kind and make full use of the licensing committee rules which state that ward councillors can represent constituents if asked to do so in writing.

## Comments of the Strategic Director Environment & Leisure

1. It is the case that the applicant for the Peckham premises was prepared to withdraw his application in the light of opposition from the community and this represents a positive response from the applicant in respect of community concerns.
2. The council however does believe that there is a remaining problem with the Licensing Act 2003 in its current state, with respect to the limitations that apply to the role of local elected members. Had the application in Peckham not been withdrawn the licensing committee would have been under a duty to consider the application in exactly the same way and applying the same rules as it did for the Tooley Street application.
3. In order to try and address this concern the council is taking a pro-active approach at a local, regional and national level to try and change the legislation. Currently, in conjunction with the recently launched mid-term review of the council's licensing policy, counsel's opinion has been sought on the extent to which the Council's position regarding the licensing of adult entertainments may be strengthened under current law. This opinion is being drafted and will be fed into the revised draft policy that will come back to the council assembly late this year. Remaining perceived deficiencies will be taken up initially with the Association of London Government.
4. In addition officers continue to review ward councillors' role in the licensing process to ensure that councillors can utilise this role as effectively as possible. Under the 2003 Act, the current position is that the Council (or Councillors representing the Council), as the Licensing Authority, is not able to canvas local individual residents' views on license applications or elicit or encourage any particular view on an application. Ward Councillors, in their community leadership capacity, are able to use their office to assist with disseminating information concerning current applications to their constituents. Therefore councillors are being sent details of all premises applications within their ward where residents can make a representation and details of all applications received are being placed on the Council's website at [www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing).
5. This easy access to licensing applications is intended to help ward councillors take a pro-active role in the licensing process. However, as set out above the role is still limited and the council will be lobbying to get this changed. It is still the case that Ward Councillors may not make a representation themselves except as an individual living in the vicinity of the premises. Ward Councillors are able to represent residents, who have made a representation, or make a representation on their behalf, where they have residents' written consent and the representation is as the resident would have made it. These representations must be made under the grounds of one or more of the licensing objectives, which for alcohol and entertainment are the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance, the protection of children from harm and must be made within the 28 day consultation period.
6. Ward councillors may then speak at licensing sub-committee on behalf of residents where a representation has been accepted within time and each individual resident represented has given written consent.

7. Members will be pleased to note, however, that a different position exists under the Gambling Act 2005, being the next major piece of legislation falling to the council as licensing authority. DCMS Guidance on this Act, which is expected to come into effect in September 2007, specifically accepts that "interested parties can be persons who are democratically elected such as councillors...". Further information on the elected member's role will be given to all members in due course.
8. Returning to the Licensing Act 2003, members will wish to know that the implications for the Council in extending public consultation arrangements beyond that which is set down in statute, are also being considered under the current licensing policy review. This situation will also be reported back to council assembly late this year.

### **Comments of the Acting Borough Solicitor**

9. In paragraph 4 above, council assembly is advised that ward councillors may, in their community leadership capacity, inform constituents of licensing applications and, at the request of constituents, represent any concerns about the application to the Licensing Committee.
10. Members are however advised that they should take care to ensure that any publicity they may give to a licence application is both factual and impartial. This is because, under the member's code of conduct, a member could be accused of using their position to improperly secure a disadvantage for the licensing applicant if the publicity from that member could be construed as seeking objections to the licensing application.
11. Members are therefore reminded to seek advice from the borough solicitor's office in any cases of doubt.

### **3. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DENISE CAPSTICK** (seconded by Councillor Michelle Holford)

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

### **Health Service Cuts**

Council assembly notes and condemns the severe funding cuts of £20 million to health services across Southwark.

These cuts include:

- £8 million cut to King's College Hospital NHS Trust
- £8 million cut to Guy's & St Thomas' Hospital Foundation Trust
- £4 million cut to South London & Maudsley (SLAM) NHS Trust

At the same time social services across the country are already under pressure.

Council assembly notes that these cuts come despite much promoted real increases in funding.

Council assembly believes that the NHS is over centralised with too much national target setting, which prevents clinicians from working in the best interests of the patient and diverts money from local priorities.

Council assembly notes that of the 31 London Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) nearly one third are predicting a deficit for the 2005/06 year and Southwark PCT is having its resources cut to bail out indebted PCTs elsewhere in London.

Council assembly further notes that concerns have been raised that changes to the national payment-by-results system financially penalise acute trusts, such as Guy's & St Thomas' and King's College Hospital, for being more cost-effective in reducing specific waiting lists, such as hip replacement surgery.

Council assembly notes with concern the evidence of the Royal College of Psychiatrists to the House of Commons Health Select Committee, which states that disinvestment in mental health services results in "damaging cuts to Adult Mental Health, Older Adult Services, and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services."

Council assembly therefore disagrees with the Secretary of State for Health's claim that the NHS is enjoying "its best year ever" and requests that the executive member for health & adult care writes to the Health Secretary asking her to halt the proposed cuts to our local health services. Furthermore, council assembly requests that the executive asks the secretary of state to revisit the policy that allows strongly performing trusts to be penalised by the actions of under performing ones.

Council assembly also calls on the Joint PCT/executive board to work with Southwark's local Members of Parliament to put forward Southwark's case to the Health Secretary at the MPs' upcoming meeting.

### **Comments of the Strategic Director Health and Community Services**

1. Over the past 4 years of its existence the PCT has achieved financial balance. As a result of top slicing and changes to the way in which PCTs are funded to buy hospital care (payment by results), Southwark PCT has been required to put in place a challenging cost improvement programme to ensure that it achieves financial balance in 2006/07, and contributes to the overall NHS deficit recovery plan. This is despite receiving growth in 2006/07 of 8.3%, representing £31m.
2. The effect of these changes, and changes in the volume of service required to meet local need, are that the PCT would be in deficit by £22m by the end of the financial year if no action were being taken.
3. The PCT has therefore put in place a series of measures in order to ensure that it is able to achieve financial balance. These include measures to increase the care that is provided in primary and community care settings, thus reducing the need for hospital care. There are also measures to reduce expenditure on mental health services and on the PCT's own internal management and service costs. Details of these measures are available in regular reports to the PCT Board which are publicly available on the PCT's website.

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

## **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>	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer
<b>Version</b>	Final Version
<b>Dated</b>	8/9/06

**AMENDMENT A**

**Moved:**            Councillor Nick Stanton  
**Seconded:**        Councillor Lewis Robinson

**Delete** paragraphs 3 and 4 and **insert:**

“Council assembly also notes the fundamental anomaly created by the government’s Licensing Act, which makes it more difficult for elected members to attend hearings and represent the views of their constituents, whether supporting or opposing applications and the legal advice given to members that they are prevented from canvassing for objections. The necessity of having to obtain written authority from residents is an unnecessary obstacle placed in the way of elected members by the legislation and council assembly therefore calls upon the government to introduce amending legislation as soon as possible to remove this provision from the Act, so that licensing applications would stand on an equal footing with planning applications.”

**AMENDMENT B**

**Moved:**      Councillor Aubyn Graham

**Seconded:**      Councillor Fiona Colley

**Delete** paragraph 5:

“Council assembly believes that the NHS is over-centralised with too much national target setting, which prevents clinicians from working in the best interests of the patient and diverts money from local priorities.”

In the penultimate paragraph, after “Council assembly” **delete** “disagrees with the Secretary of State for Health's claim that the NHS is enjoying ‘its best year ever and’ ”.

**AMENDMENT C**

**Moved:**        Councillor Kim Humphreys

**Seconded:**    Councillor Tim McNally

**Delete** last paragraph and **insert:**

Council assembly notes that a previous administration introduced the policy to charge for the installation of secure door entry schemes and to reverse that policy for the Portland & Nelson estate would be inequitable for tenants and residents across the borough.

Council assembly notes the comments of the strategic director of housing that he will continue to bid for any other resources that might become available for community safety initiatives to supplement its investment programme.

Council assembly notes the comments of the strategic director of housing that door entry systems are not part of the government's decent homes criteria and asks the executive member to press the government to provide additional resources to fund security measures on housing estates.

---

**ITEM 7      MOTION 5 – UNITED NATIONS MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS** (see pages 26 - 27)

---

**AMENDMENT D**

**Moved:**        Councillor Dominic Thorncroft  
**Seconded:**    Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle

**Delete** paragraph 2 and **insert**;

Council assembly notes that the present government has made significant progress towards reaching the MDG target and that, specifically:

- Overseas aid via the UK government has been doubled since 1997
- up to 100% of bilateral debt owed to the UK by the poorest countries has been written off
- the Commission for Africa has been established and bilateral aid to Africa has been increased by £1 billion
- government is committed to reaching MDG target of 0.7% of GDP spent on overseas aid by 2013

Council assembly notes that the present government has made significant progress towards reaching the MDG target and that, specifically:

- Overseas aid via the UK government has been doubled since 1997
- up to 100% of bilateral debt owed to the UK by the poorest countries has been written off
- the Commission for Africa has been established and bilateral aid to Africa has been increased by £1 billion
- government is committed to reaching MDG target of 0.7% of GDP spent on overseas aid by 2013

**Delete** paragraph 4 and **insert**:

4. Council assembly also notes the work that Southwark Council has undertaken to alleviate poverty locally and internationally, including a strong commitment to becoming a fair-trade borough.

**Add new paragraphs 5, 6, 7:-**

5. Council Assembly also recognizes and acknowledges that it is Diaspora and migrant communities within Southwark who are making the biggest contribution to poverty reduction within their country of origin through the money remittances they send back to family and friends – money which is used substantially for health and education expenses.
6. Council Assembly further notes that, according to evidence given by Diaspora groups to MP's on the House of Commons International Development Select Committee at Southwark Town Hall in April 2004, Sierra Leoneans in Southwark borough alone are sending at least £10 million in money remittances back to Sierra Leone each year.

7. Council Assembly recognizes that the total volume of remittances sent back by all migrant and Diaspora groups in Southwark could total as much as £80 million each year.

**'Council Assembly calls' section, add new paragraph 3:-**

3. Council assembly requests that the executive considers organizing a conference
  - to recognize and celebrate the contribution made by migrants and their families in the UK by means of the remittances which they send back to their countries of origin;
  - to bring together minority ethnic communities, Diaspora groups, councillors, DFID officials and other policy makers to explore how the impact of remittances can be maximised for development purposes in Africa and elsewhere (e.g. through private/public match funding programmes and UK tax relief on remittances sent for development purposes, etc).

**Amended motion will therefore read:-**

1. In council assembly notes the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as agreed by the UN in its Millennium Declaration in 2000:
  1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
  2. Achieve universal primary education
  3. Promote gender equality and empower women
  4. Reduce child mortality
  5. Improve maternal health
  6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
  7. Ensure environmental sustainability
  8. Develop a global partnership for development
2. Council assembly notes that the present government has made significant progress towards reaching the MDG target and that, specifically:
  - Overseas aid via the UK government has been doubled since 1997
  - up to 100% of bilateral debt owed to the UK by the poorest countries has been written off
  - the Commission for Africa has been established and bilateral aid to Africa has been increased by £1 billion
  - government is committed to reaching MDG target of 0.7% of GDP spent on overseas aid by 2013
3. Council assembly notes Southwark Council's successful partnership work, through the Local Government International Bureau, with Koidu Town Council in Sierra Leone and the benefits it has provided to both communities.
4. Council assembly also notes the work that Southwark Council has undertaken to alleviate poverty locally and internationally, including a strong commitment to becoming a fair-trade borough.
5. Council Assembly also recognizes and acknowledges that it is Diaspora and migrant communities within Southwark who are making the biggest

contribution to poverty reduction within their country of origin through the money remittances they send back to family and friends – money which is used substantially for health and education expenses

6. Council Assembly further notes that, according to evidence given by Diaspora groups to MP's on the House of Commons International Development Select Committee at Southwark Town Hall in April 2004, Sierra Leoneans in Southwark borough alone are sending at least £10 million in money remittances back to Sierra Leone each year.
7. Council Assembly recognizes that the total volume of remittances sent back by all migrant and Diaspora groups in Southwark could total as much as £80 million each year.

**Council assembly therefore calls on the Executive to:-**

1. Request that officers work closely with the UK Local Government Alliance for International Development to promote the work that Southwark is undertaking to eradicate poverty and to learn from other local authorities on action they are taking locally, nationally and internationally.
2. Call on Members and officers to take part in the “STAND UP Against Poverty, Stand Up for the Millennium Development Goals” event on Monday October 16, which aims to set an official Guinness World Record for the largest number of people to stand up against poverty in 24 hours to raise awareness of the MDGs.
3. Calls on officers to organize a conference:
  - to recognize and celebrate the contribution made by migrants and their families in the UK by means of the remittances which they send back to their countries of origin;
  - to bring together minority ethnic communities, Diaspora groups, councillors, DFID officials and other policy makers to explore how the impact of remittances can be maximised for development purposes in Africa and elsewhere (e.g. through private/public match funding programmes and UK tax relief on remittances sent for development purposes, etc)

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (SUPPLEMENTAL)  
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2006/2007**

**NOTE:** Original held by Constitutional Team; all amendments/queries to  
Lesley John/Cameron MacLean Tel: 020 7525 7228/7236

<b>ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED</b>	<b>Copies</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Copies</b>
<b>All Councillors &amp; Political Assistants</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>External</b> (see envelopes provided)	<b>5</b>
Alex Foulkes, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant			
Anna Sales, Labour Group Political Assistant		1. Ms Wendy Golding	
		2. Mr. Mark Roelofsen	
<b>Libraries (1 each)</b>	<b>6</b>	1. Mr. Bola Ogun	
Albion / Camberwell / Dulwich / Newington		3. Ms Jean Sackur	
Peckham / Local Studies Library		4. Mr. George Foulkes	
		5. Mr. Geoffrey Banister	
<b>Press</b>	<b>3</b>		
Southwark News			
Evening Standard			
South London Press			
<b>Chief Officers</b>	<b>9</b>		
1. Annie Shepperd, Chief Executive			
2. Keith Broxup, Strategic Director Housing			
3. Chris Bull, Director Health & Community Services			
4. Gill Davies, Strategic Director Environment & Leisure			
5. Paul Evans, Strategic Director Regeneration			
6. Bill Murphy, Strategic Director Customer & Corporate Services			
7. Romi Bowen, Strategic Director Children's Services			
8. Duncan Whitfield, Finance Director			
9. Alison Delyth, Director of Education			
	<b>3</b>		
<b>Senior Officers</b>			
1. Sarah Naylor, ACE, Performance & Strategy			
2. Glen Egan, Borough Solicitor (Acting)			
<b>Other</b>	<b>20</b>		
1. Constitutional Officer	<b>1</b>		
2. Sonia Sutton, Mayor's Secretary			
		<b>Last Updated: August 2006</b>	
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>110</b>