



## **COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**

**WEDNESDAY JANUARY 24 2006**

**SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA No. 2**

<b>List of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>No.</b>
<b>8.7 MAUDSLEY CLINIC – REVISED MOTION</b>	<b>1.</b>
<b>AMENDMENTS TO REPORTS AND MOTIONS</b>	<b>3.</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, January 23 2007

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

**REVISED MOTION**

**Note:** As the secretary of state announced the decision regarding the future of the Maudsley clinic after the original motion was submitted, a revised motion to reflect that decision is set out below.

**Moved:**            Councillor David Noakes  
**Seconded:**      Councillor Michelle Holford

Council assembly notes:

- That the government estimates that one in four people will suffer from some form of mental illness at some point in their lifetime;
- That the South London and Maudsley Trust submitted plans to close the emergency clinic at the Maudsley Hospital which currently offers an 'open all hours' emergency service for people with mental health problems;
- That the Lambeth and Southwark Statutory Joint Health Committee referred this decision to the secretary of state for health to make the final decision on the grounds that they did not believe that the closure was in the best interests of local health services;
- That the chief executive of the South London and Maudsley Trust has admitted that there will be an increased reliance on the voluntary sector as a result of this cut;
- That the secretary of state has confirmed the decision to close the Maudsley emergency clinic.

Council assembly believes:

- That the Maudsley clinic is a vital service which helps to save lives and should remain open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year;
- That the closure of the Maudsley clinic will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring emergency health services and especially on the accident and emergency department of King's College Hospital;
- That whilst the proposed changes to the community services are noted, these alone will not be a sufficient replacement for the loss of the emergency provision;
- That the current proposal for a new designated space adjacent to the A&E department of King's College Hospital is inadequate to replace the current provision, even when combined with the extension of the community service;
- That there are significant questions still to be answered about the proposed new King's A&E service, including the funding of staff, the waiting area for patients, the area provided for the service, security and overnight accommodation.

Council assembly recognises the impact that the strategic health authority's financial adjustments and "top-slice" of the PCT budget increases has had on the South London and Maudsley health trust and calls for this policy to be reviewed

Council assembly congratulates the many individuals and organisations who have campaigned to keep the Maudsley Clinic open and the South London Press for helping to organise the campaign and notes that support for the campaign has been cross party and included local MPs.

Council assembly therefore resolves to ask the executive to support the campaign to keep the Maudsley emergency clinic open 24 hours per day. Council assembly asks the leader to write to the secretary of state for health seeking an urgent meeting with her to ask her to reconsider her decision and keep the clinic open.

---

**ITEM 6.1 REPORT – PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT OF THE SOUTHWARK DRAFT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (THE SOUTHWARK PLAN) POLICY FRAMEWORK** (see pages 13 - 33)

---

**AMENDMENT A**

**Moved:** Councillor Gordon Nardell

**Seconded:** Councillor Barrie Hargrove

In the report of the strategic director of regeneration at paragraph 37 (Policy 1.4), line 13, **delete:**

“however the policy is not too restrictive”

Line 17, after “mixed use schemes” insert:

“However, there is a risk that the revised wording may be too restrictive in one respect. The policy at item 367 (page 53 of the marked up Final Draft UDP at original Appendix A) reads in its revised form:

On employment sites outside the POLs and PILs and where criteria 1-4 above do not apply, a change of use from an employment use to suitable mixed or residential uses will be permitted.”

Around the borough there are numerous small sites in current employment use which, although outside the POLs and PILs and not complying with criteria 1 – 4 (fronting to a classified road, located in a PTAZ, etc – see Appendix A page 52), are capable of supporting viable employment use, on the small scale dictated by the size of site, without causing undue harm to local amenity. These sites contribute to the local economy, in particular providing accommodation for SMEs. These sites sometimes present problems for residential development: their small footprint tends to lead applicants to propose high densities, and it can be difficult to achieve design standards on matters such as distance to windows of existing habitable rooms without building to excessive height.

On the proposed policy wording, it will remain open to the decision-maker in an individual case to decline to release a site from employment use on the basis that “material considerations indicate otherwise”. The supporting wording at item 368 (amplified by the commentary at Appendix G) provides some basis for such decisions by emphasising the contribution such sites make to the local economy. However, to enable such decisions to be properly justified on appeal in appropriate cases, it is considered that the supporting reasons should make specific reference to this issue.

Council assembly is therefore invited to insert the following wording at the end of item 373:

“Conversely, in considering proposals for the release of employment sites outside the POLs and PILs, the council will bear in mind that an individual site, even if not satisfying criteria (i) to (iv), may be capable of supporting continued B use without undue impact on

local amenity. That is likely to be a consideration of particular importance where such sites are locally scarce or where an alternative proposed use would have an impact on amenity similar to or greater than the continued B use.”

Subject to this point, revised policy 1.4 is not considered too restrictive”

[Paragraph 37 then continues as tabled: “...and officers do not consider...”  
etc]

**AMENDMENT B**

**Moved:**            Councillor Richard Livingstone

**Seconded:**       Councillor Fiona Colley

Paragraph 1: **delete** all after “set at:” and **insert**:

	<b>Number of band D equivalent properties</b>
For the parish of St. Mary Newington	13,189.34
For the parish of St. Saviour’s	1,167.03
For the whole of the borough excluding the parishes of St. Mary Newington and St. Saviour’s	78,869.76
<b>For the whole of the borough</b>	<b>93,226.13</b>

Insert new paragraphs 2-7 (and then renumber subsequent paragraphs):

2. Council notes that, despite the 2% under-performance by Liberata in the in-year collection rate for 2006/07, the estimated final collection rate for the year is 95.5%. This is only 0.5% below the 96% rate recommended by officers for 2007/08.
3. Council also notes that the decline from the higher in-year collection rate in previous years and the improvement in collection in most other London authorities over the same period represents a poor record by the previous and current administrations.
4. Council notes that a planned collection rate of 96% would be the fifth lowest in Inner London.
5. Council recognises that a reduction in the collection rate for 2007/08 would create pressure for cuts in expenditure or increases in council tax.
6. Council therefore believes that if in-year collection in 2007/08 was to target, a planned final collection rate of 97.5% for 2007/08 is achievable. It therefore agrees to maintain the planned collection rate at 97.5%. The figures set out in paragraph 1 are based on maintaining this level.
7. Council asks the executive to consider how to take further steps to improve the collection of council tax in 2006/07 and subsequent years, including how future contracts can be strengthened to ensure improved rates of collection.

8. Calls on the regeneration and resources scrutiny committee to investigate the failure to meet collection targets.

---

**ITEM 8            MOTION 1 – VIOLENT CRIME STRATEGY (see pages 170 - 172)**

---

**AMENDMENT C**

**Moved:**            Councillor Jeff Hook  
**Seconded:**        Councillor Caroline Pidgeon

Paragraph 2:

- **delete** first “notes” and **insert** “deplores”.
- **Delete** second “notes” and **insert** “regrets”.
- After “London for such crime.” **insert** “Notwithstanding the above, council welcomes the very visible MPS activity in these wards especially during peak pub and club hours.”

Paragraph 3:

- after “(PCSO’s)” **delete** all after “and others” and **insert** “, Southwark community wardens and other professional enforcement teams do in tackling crime.”

Paragraph 4:

- move to become new paragraph 6.

Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7:

- **delete** all and **add** new paragraphs 4 and 5 as follows:
  4. Council notes that tackling violent crime is a priority within the SSP crime and drugs strategy and notes the development of a more meaningful violent crime “action plan” to manage the delivery of its programme in this area.
  5. Council believes practical measures are needed to deal with violent crime in Southwark and notes projects currently underway to improve street lighting and provision of deployable CCTV cameras across the borough.

Paragraph 8:

- becomes seventh paragraph - **delete** ‘also calls for’ and **insert** “welcomes the new proposed licensing policy that introduces”

Paragraph 9:

- becomes eighth paragraph.



- **Delete** “supports efforts to” and **insert** “assembly calls upon the executive member for community safety”.
- **Insert** after ‘government’, “the borough commander”.
- **Delete** all after “in Southwark’s” and **insert** “at crime hot spots in Southwark.”

Motion, therefore, to read:

### **Violent Crime Strategy**

Council notes the research carried out by Victim Support London that states Southwark has the highest level of gun crime in London and the annual performance report of the Safer Southwark partnership which ranks Southwark second worst amongst comparable boroughs in London for violent crime.

Council deplores the recent serious violent events in East Walworth and Camberwell Green and regrets that these two Southwark wards are ranked in the worst five in London for such crime. Notwithstanding the above, Council welcomes the very visible MPS activity in these wards especially during peak pub and club hours.

Council welcomes the delivery of neighbourhood policing teams and the work that the police, police community safety officers (PCSOs), Southwark Community Wardens and other professional enforcement teams do in tackling crime in Southwark.

Council notes that tackling violent crime is a priority within the SSP crime and drugs strategy and notes the development of a more meaningful violent crime “action plan” to manage the delivery of its programme in this area.

Council believes practical measures are needed to deal with violent crime in Southwark and notes projects currently underway to improve street lighting and provision of deployable CCTV cameras across the borough.

Council notes the contribution of lawful and well-managed bars and clubs to the life and economy of Southwark.

Council assembly welcomes the new proposed Licensing Policy that introduces stricter control on nightclub, planning and licensing applications and firmer action on badly managed clubs and pubs. Council assembly supports residents who exercise their power to call for the review of licenses under the new licensing act, and welcomes their having the power to do so.

Council assembly calls upon the executive member for community safety to lobby the government, the Borough Commander, the Metropolitan Police Authority and other local agencies to targets resources at crime hot spots in Southwark.

Council calls for a report on these practical measures to be brought to the executive within three months.

---

**ITEM 8      MOTION 2 – SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES BILL & POST OFFICES** (see pages 172 - 173)

---

**AMENDMENT D**

**Moved:**        Councillor Richard Thomas

**Seconded:**    Councillor Kim Humphreys

After "Council assembly notes ...December 13 2006" **add**:

“That the Bill successfully secured a second reading on Friday January 19 2007 by 175 votes to 17 and that Simon Hughes MP was one of those who supported it.

Council assembly regrets that Harriet Harman MP and Tessa Jowell MP failed to support the Bill and the government has indicated its opposition to it.”

In “Council assembly requests the executive”, **delete** “forthcoming” and **replace** with “remaining”.

In the same section, **delete** the section in brackets.

**AMENDMENT E**

**Moved:**        Councillor Robert Smeath

**Seconded:**    Councillor Peter John

After “Council assembly notes:”

**Delete** bullet point 1 “The plans...” to “Legal aid cases” inclusive and **replace** with:

“The plans by the government led by Lord Falconer and by Vera Baird MP, for changes to the funding regime for legal aid cases”

**Delete** bullet point 3 “That the...” to “statute book” inclusive and **replace** with:

“The increased number of offences on the statute book is responsible for about a third of the increased costs to legal aid, as demonstrated the Cape and Moorhead “Demand Induced Supply” study, 2004. Extra legislation, such as the Domestic Violence Act, has been a vital step forward in protecting some of the most vulnerable people in the UK. At the same time, lawyers profit from legal aid cases has also risen - another contributor to the rise in costs”

**Delete** bullet point 4 “That spending...” to “since 1997” inclusive and **replace** with:

“That spending on civil legal aid dropped initially by 20%, but has now increased again. As Simon Hughes MP stated in his parliamentary speech on the subject (Hansard, 11 Jan 2007: Column 176WH) “The legal aid budget has increased from £1.5bn to just over £2bn.”

**Insert** bullet points:

- Simon Hughes MP’s claim that in 1997, the legal aid budget stood at £2bn (in 2005/6 money) and in 2005/6 the budget was £2.1bn.
- That legal aid costs €5 per person in France and Germany. Scandinavian countries spend between €10 and €30 per head. The UK pays €60 per head, or £100 per taxpayer, on legal aid.
- That to ensure value for money for the taxpayer, the government proposes to stop paying practitioners by the hour, which can favour the inefficient, and instead to pay per case.
- That many firms working on cases where fixed fee regimes already operate are undertaking a great many more cases and expediting them more rapidly with the effect that fewer firms does not necessarily mean fewer cases being adequately dealt with.

**Delete** bullet point 5 “that nine” to “fall of 43%.” inclusive.

After “Council assembly believes:” -

**Delete** bullet point 1 “that higher costs” to “new funding regime” inclusive and insert:

- Cases in London are generally similar in costs and lengths than in other urban areas, in fact there are many providers in London who handle cases more cheaply than would be charged under the new fees.
- During the consultation period for this legislation, the government recognised that there are differences in the way that services such as criminal advice works in urban and rural areas. Noting this, Southwark councillors must still always be alert to the impact of any new legislation, particularly if they are worried that it would disproportionately effect London

Bullet point 2 after “providing important role models for their communities.” **Add:**

“Whilst the overall regulatory impact assessment (RIA) shows no disproportionate impact from this legislation on BME firms, the government has also committed to perform local Diversity Impact Assessments on a local basis to ensure sufficient supply to all communities. This must be carried out thoroughly in Southwark to address the concerns of BME firms”

Bullet point 3 after “solicitor willing to take on their case.” **Add:**

“But that better value for money and better efficiency from solicitors might in fact have a beneficial effect on access to services, as would a community legal service that is able to offer advice on ‘clusters’ of problems, rather than visiting solicitors who each choose to offer advice only on certain subjects;”

Bullet point 4 **delete** from “That the cost” to “willing to take them on” inclusive and **replace** with:

“That services for people for whom English is not a first language are currently being provided on a fixed fee basis”

Bullet point 5: **delete** from “that black and minority ethnic” to “result of these changes” and **replace** with:

“Whilst the impact assessment predicts that there will not be adverse impact on BME communities from these changes, the government must ensure that the legislation does not unintentionally work to the detriment of BME populations.”

After “Council assembly resolves:” -

**Delete** bullet point 1 and replace with:

“To ask the executive to express the council’s concerns, and any concerns that are received by Members from local groups, to Lord Falconer or Vera Baird, the two ministers leading on this issue.”

Bullet point 2 after “urge them also to have their say,” **add:**

“by providing accurate, non-politicised information”

**Add bullet point:**

- To encourage the government to ensure that their local Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) meets the rigorous standards promised and that any unforeseen disproportionate impact on BME firms is prevented,

Motion to read:

### **Legal Aid**

Council assembly notes:

- The plans by the government led by Lord Falconer and by Vera Baird MP, for changes to the funding regime for legal aid cases
- That changes will involve a move towards national fixed fees on a ‘type of law’ basis with no additional London weighting;
- The increased number of offences on the statute book is responsible for about a third of the increased costs to legal aid, as demonstrated the Cape and Moorhead “Demand Induced Supply” study, 2004. Extra legislation, such as the Domestic Violence Act, has been a vital step forward in protecting some of the most vulnerable people in the UK. At the same time, lawyers profit from legal aid cases has also risen - another contributor to the rise in costs
- That spending on civil legal aid dropped initially by 20%, but has now increased again. As Simon Hughes MP stated in his parliamentary speech on the subject (Hansard, 11 Jan 2007: Column 176WH) “The legal aid budget has increased from £1.5bn to just over £2bn.”
- Simon Hughes MP’s claim that in 1997, the legal aid budget stood at £2bn (in 2005/6 money) and in 2005/6 the budget was £2.1bn.
- That the UK has the best, and most expensive legal aid system in the world. Legal aid costs €5 per person in France and Germany. Scandinavian countries spend between €10 and €30 per head. The UK, and only the UK, pays €60 per head, or £100 per taxpayer, on legal aid.
- That to ensure value for money for the taxpayer, the Government proposes to stop paying practitioners by the hour, which can favour the inefficient, and instead to pay per case.
- That nine legal firms in Southwark have stopped undertaking legal aid cases in the past 12 months due to past changes in the funding regime and that this represents a fall of 43%.
- That many firms working on cases where fixed fee regimes already operate are undertaking a great many more cases and expediting them more rapidly with the effect that fewer firms does not necessarily mean fewer cases being adequately dealt with.

Council assembly believes:

- Cases in London are generally similar in costs and lengths than in other urban areas, in fact there are many providers in London who handle cases more cheaply than would be charged under the new fees.
- During the consultation period for this legislation, the government recognised that there are differences in the way that services such as criminal advice works in urban and rural areas. Noting this, Southwark councillors must still always be

alert to the impact of any new legislation, particularly if they are worried that it would disproportionately effect London

- That black and minority ethnic firms are worried that they may be forced into mergers, which interfere with their identity or that leading lawyers will no longer be able to head up firms, providing important role models for their communities; Whilst the overall regulatory impact assessment (RIA) shows no disproportionate impact from this legislation on BME firms, the government has also committed to perform local Diversity Impact Assessments on a local basis to ensure sufficient supply to all communities. This must be carried out thoroughly in Southwark to address the concerns of BME firms
- That fewer firms undertaking legal aid will have an adverse effect on the residents of Southwark who will find it more difficult to find a solicitor willing to take on their case But that better value for money and better efficiency from solicitors might in fact have a beneficial effect on access to services, as would a community legal service that is able to offer advice on 'clusters' of problems, rather than visiting solicitors who each choose to offer advice only on certain subjects;
- That services for people for whom English is not a first language are currently being provided on a fixed fee basis.
- Whilst the impact assessment predicts that there will not be adverse impact on BME communities from these changes, the government must ensure that the legislation does not unintentionally work to the detriment of BME populations.

Council assembly resolves:

- To ask the executive to express the council's concerns, and any concerns that are received by Members from local groups, to Lord Falconer or Vera Baird, the two ministers leading on this issue
- To ask the executive to make local groups who have an interest in these matters aware of the changes and the potential effect on them and to urge them also to have their say by providing accurate, non-politicised information.
- To encourage the government to ensure that their local Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) meets the rigorous standards promised and that any unforeseen disproportionate impact on BME firms is prevented.

**AMENDMENT F**

**Moved:**            Councillor Alison McGovern  
**Seconded:**        Councillor Chris Page

**Insert** after paragraph 4:

“Council assembly welcomes the powers given to local authorities to take serious action on the environment, many of which were introduced in the governments’ Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act. Council assembly regrets the actions of those MPs who voted against this act at second reading.”

**Insert** points:

51. Take urgent action to rectify the fact that fewer than 200 people have benefited in the past year from the Warmfront and Coldbusters schemes intended to provide home insulation for vulnerable households and improve energy efficiency.
52. To take urgent action to rectify the fact that only 57 people have enquired about Solar for London in Southwark and of these only 3 have had solar panels installed.

**Add** final paragraph:

“Council assembly recognises the importance of making targets such as these effective, and calls upon the executive to agree report back to executive on a 6 monthly basis on progress on these points”

---

**ITEM 8      MOTION 8 – POST OFFICES** (see pages 181 - 182)

---

**AMENDMENT G**

**Moved:**        Councillor John Friary

**Seconded:**    Councillor Paul Bates

After “Council assembly notes”:

Bullet point 3 **delete** from “that the government” to “them in business;” inclusive and **replace** with:

“That the government introduced the Post Office Card Account in 2003 which has given basic banking facilities to over 4.7 million benefit recipients giving them a convenient and secure way of receiving benefits.”

Bullet point 4: **delete** “closure of” “has led to the closure of other” “and the disintegration of” and **insert** “Help support” before “local shops”

**Insert** bullet point:

- That even after the proposed restructuring the Post Office will remain the largest retail network in the country with more branches than all the major banks combined.

**Delete** bullet point 5 and **replace** with:

“That the contract for the POCA runs until 2010 and that the government has begun the process of tendering for a new contract”

**Delete** bullet point 6 and replace with:

“That millions of people have taken advantage of more convenient ways of paying car tax, TV licenses and of accessing other services and that change in the way people access services is a modern reality, and often desirable. But that this presents a challenge to the post office network to change to meet those new needs.”

In paragraph 4, after “Council assembly believes that the recently announced closure programme is unnecessary and asks the executive to seek to persuade the government to”:

Paragraph No. 1: **delete** all and **replace** with:

“Ensure that the branch restructuring program meets the rigorous criteria set down in the report released in December, that 99% of people in deprived urban communities should live within 1 mile of a post office, that 99% of the entire UK population should live within 3 miles of a post office and that 95% of the urban population should live within 1 mile of a post office.”

Paragraph No. 3: **delete** all and **replace** with:



“Continue to provide investment and greater freedoms for the post office network to innovate to meet new needs, and adapt to the changing means by which people access services.

Paragraph No. 5: **delete** “invest” and **replace** with “continue to invest”.

**Delete** all from “Council assembly welcomes the decision of the government to withdraw” **to** “benefit recipients who wants one.” and **insert**:

“Welcomes the government’s decision to tender for a new contract for POCA beyond 2010, and that the new contract will guarantee that eligibility for the card accounts will be at minimum on the same basis as the current contract.

Council assembly calls upon the government to look at ways to increase the number of banks who offer banking facilities through the post office and the range of facilities available. Council assembly further calls upon the government to look in detail at ways of expanding eligibility for POCA.”

**Delete** all from paragraph beginning “Council assembly asks the executive to call on the government to avoid“ to “paid directly into bank accounts” and **insert**:

“Calls upon the government to continue pressure on the banking industry to open banking facilities to those currently excluded. To support the government’s long term goal of helping deprived Post Office Card Accounts holders to move from these very basic substitutes for full bank accounts to full bank accounts which will amongst other things help poorer people to begin to build a financial history allowing them to access a greater range of financial services and helping break down barriers to social inclusion.”

Paragraph beginning “Council assembly asks the MPs for Southwark”; **delete** “lobby ministers to save the post office from gradual demolition and to” and **insert**:

“to oppose any proposals to downgrade or undermine the Post Office network and to support efforts to modernise the network to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in order to”

Motion, therefore, to read:

### **Post Offices**

Council assembly regrets the loss of three post offices in North Southwark and Bermondsey, seven post offices in Dulwich and West Norwood and two post offices in Camberwell and Peckham between 1999 and 2006, representing almost one in three of the total services available.

Council assembly notes:

- That on the December 14 the government announced plans for post office 'restructuring' that they expect to lead to the closure of a further 2500 post office branches by 2009;
- That 4000 post office branches have been closed nationwide since the government came to power in 1997;

- That the government introduced the Post Office Card Account in 2003 which has given basic banking facilities to over 4.7 million benefit recipients giving them a convenient and secure way of receiving benefits.
- That smaller post offices around the country help support local shops, businesses and local communities.
- That even after the proposed restructuring the Post Office will remain the largest retail network in the country with more branches than all the major banks combined.
- That the contract for the POCA runs until 2010 and that the government has begun the process of tendering for a new contract.
- That millions of people have taken advantage of more convenient ways of paying Car Tax, TV licenses and of accessing other services and that change in the way people access services is a modern reality, and often desirable. But that this presents a challenge to the Post Office network to change to meet those new needs.
- The plans by Royal Mail to close the Herne Hill sorting office leading to delays in postal delivery times, the loss of local knowledge among postal delivery workers and inconvenience for local residents who have to pick up mail from a sorting office.

Council assembly further notes the social importance of post offices to the well being of both communities and individuals in Southwark.

Council assembly believes that the recently announced closure programme is unnecessary and asks the executive to seek to persuade the government to:

1. Ensure that the branch restructuring program meets the rigorous criteria set down in the report released in December, that 99% of people in deprived urban communities should live within 1 mile of a post office, that 99% of the entire UK population should live within 3 miles of a post office and that 95% of the urban population should live within 1 mile of a post office.
2. Remove the Royal Mail restrictions on the post office to open up further business opportunities for the network;
3. Continue to provide investment and greater freedoms for the post office network to innovate to meet new needs, and adapt to the changing means by which people access services.
4. Carry out a review of which additional government functions could be carried out through post offices;
5. Continue to invest in the post office network.

Council assembly further believes that the interests of residents are best served by the retention of the Herne Hill sorting office.

Welcomes the government's decision to tender for a new contract for POCA beyond 2010, and that the new contract will guarantee that eligibility for the card accounts will be on the same basis as the current contract.

And council assembly further calls upon the government to look at ways to increase the number of banks who offer banking facilities through the post office and the range of facilities available. Further calls upon the government to look in detail at ways of expanding eligibility for POCA.

Calls upon the government to continue pressure on the banking industry to open banking facilities to those currently excluded. To support the government's long term goal of helping deprived Post Office Card Accounts holders to move from these very basic substitutes for full bank accounts to full bank accounts which will amongst other things help poorer people to begin to build a financial history allowing them to access a greater range of financial services and helping break down barriers to social inclusion.

Council assembly asks the MPs for Southwark to oppose any proposals to downgrade or undermine the Post Office network and to support efforts to modernise the network to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in order to protect this vital service for the people. Council assembly further asks the MPs to report back to this council on their actions and asks the overview and scrutiny committee to undertake a scrutiny investigation into the impact of the closure of the Herne Hill sorting office.

Council assembly further asks the executive to urge Royal Mail to reconsider plans to close the Herne Hill sorting office.

#### **AMENDMENT H**

**Moved:** Councillor Fiona Colley  
**Seconded:** Councillor Richard Livingstone

**Insert** after "Council assembly notes":

"Plans put forward to sell off more than half of Royal Mail shares and its effective privatisation.

**Insert** after "Believes":

"Council assembly believes that privatisation of the Royal Mail would mean decisions on the future of facilities including the Herne Hill sorting office would be made in the interests of shareholders and not residents."

**Insert** in "Resolves":

"Council assembly resolves to ask the executive to lobby local MPs to oppose any plans to privatise the Royal Mail."