

Council Assembly (Ordinary Meeting)

Wednesday 17 October 2012
7.00 pm

Walworth Academy, 34 - 40 Shorncliffe Road, London SE1 5UJ

Supplemental Agenda No.3

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
9.	Amendments	1 - 6

Contact

Lesley John on 020 7525 7228 or 020 7525 7222 or email: lesley.john@southwark.gov.uk;
andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk; constitutional.team@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 16 October 2012

AMENDMENTS

ITEM 3.3 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS ON THE THEME: MOTION 1 - APPRENTICESHIPS AND WORK PLACEMENTS (see page 4 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Peter John
Seconded: Councillor Ian Wingfield

In Motion 1, **delete** all and **insert:**

1. Council assembly recognises the importance of providing real opportunities for young people in Southwark if we are to have fair and resilient communities and a thriving local economy.
2. Council assembly believes that when the economy is in recession and youth unemployment is high, it is the role of government at both national and local level to take action.
3. Council assembly notes that opportunities for young people mean more than just employment opportunities. Many young people in Southwark want to go to college and university and the council should do everything it can to support that ambition.
4. Council assembly notes the increase in the number of long-term young unemployed people in Southwark and regrets the complacency of the government regarding youth unemployment. It also regrets the government's disastrous decision to treble tuition fees and scrap educational maintenance allowance and notes the negative impact this is already having on the number of people applying for university.
5. Council assembly recognises the value of schemes like the Foot in the Door project run by Southwark Works since 2008 with funding from Southwark Council. Council assembly welcomes the experience which the work placements provide and which leads to permanent paid jobs but notes the project is currently part of a review of the council's economic wellbeing strategy. The aim of the review is to highlight youth unemployment as a major area of focus and will also determine the priorities for allocation of limited resources to support the council's aims for employment and enterprise.
6. Council assembly therefore notes that while the council is reviewing its economic wellbeing strategy it should work to promote other schemes that are creating apprenticeship opportunities for Southwark's young people.
7. Council assembly therefore welcomes this Labour administration £3million youth fund which is supporting:
 - Talented Southwark scholars through university by paying all of their tuition fees
 - Paying an educational maintenance supplement to 1000 young people so that they can stay on in further education

- Creating 1,500 job opportunities for young people in the borough.
8. Council assembly calls on councillors on all sides to support the youth fund and consider what more can be done to support employment opportunities for young people and to enable young people to access further and higher education.

ITEM 3.3 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS ON THE THEME: MOTION 2 - OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, INCLUDING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT (see page 5 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT B

Moved: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Bowman

In Motion 2, **delete** paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 and **insert:**

4. Council assembly notes that youth unemployment has been rising consistently for over a decade, and young people in Southwark face more competition than ever in finding meaningful employment. Council assembly therefore welcomes the huge increase in apprenticeships since 2010, which have more than doubled in Southwark between 2009/10 and 2010/11, giving residents more opportunities to gain high quality work experience, skills and qualifications.
5. Council assembly believes that our young people must have the basic skills to take on apprenticeships and is concerned that the administration of this council is more interested in expensive political gimmicks than on investing in what really makes a difference - literacy and numeracy skills, work experience placements and improving links with local employers.
6. Council assembly therefore calls on councillors on all sides to consider how £3 million can be better spent on improving educational skills and providing work experience to ensure all young residents of the borough are able to reach their full potential.

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 1 - SOCIAL HOUSING IN MIXED COMMUNITIES (see page 15 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT C**Moved:** Councillor Michael Situ**Seconded:** Councillor Kevin AhernIn Motion 1, **insert** before paragraph 1:

Council notes that not only is the current administration investing £326 million to ensure every council home in Southwark is warm, dry and safe by 2016, it is also building 1000 new council homes in Southwark over the next 8 years - more than have been built in all of London in the last 10 years. It regrets that the previous administration failed to build enough council housing, had an unworkable and unfunded decent homes programme which left many Southwark residents without decent homes and by the end of their time in office left Southwark with 7,800 fewer council homes.

Delete paragraph 2 and **insert**:

Council also notes the reaction of the leader to the report on his blog: “the blanket policy proposed by the paper of selling-off all council properties above a certain value is flawed and would undoubtedly lead to the removal of genuinely affordable social housing from certain areas.”

In paragraph 3 **add**:

That is why this council opposes the government’s housing benefit cap, opposes the introduction of affordable rent at 80% of market rent, opposes the ending of secure tenancies, opposes the slashing of the social housing budget by £3.9 billion and is building 1000 new council homes in Southwark over the next 8 years.

After paragraph 3 **insert** new paragraph:

Council is concerned that the government’s housing benefit cap will further social segregation in the borough and agrees with the comments of Simon Hughes MP when he told the BBC in January “As it currently stands, the benefits cap will break up families... there are bottom lines in politics and that one is making sure that those with least finances and the most mouths to feed, and the most needy are protected.” However it regrets that only 5 months later Simon Hughes ignored his own warning and voted to cap housing benefit for families in Southwark. Council also regrets that Simon Hughes MP praised George Osborne for slashing the budget for social housing by 60% or £3.9 billion saying “This is the right decision to deal with the deficit.

Delete paragraphs 4 & 5.

In paragraph 6 after "which has been made possible by" **delete** all and **insert**:

the council's decision to accept "in lieu" payments from developers rather than requiring them to deliver on-site "affordable housing" where that "affordable housing" is anything but affordable. It notes that on one site in the north of Southwark a person would have had to be earning in the region of £80,000 to be able to afford the payments on the affordable housing which would have been delivered under the scheme. Council believes it is better to take a payment from that developer - equivalent to over £100,000 per habitable room that they should have delivered - so that we can build genuinely affordable council housing with rents closer to £100 per week.

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 2 - TUITION FEES APOLOGY (see pages 15 - 16 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT D

Moved: Councillor Graham Neale

Seconded: Councillor Rosie Shimell

In Motion 2, **delete** all and **insert**:

1. Council assembly notes:
 - (1) that the previous Labour government introduced tuition fees for students in 1998, despite Tony Blair stating before the 1997 election that “Labour has no plans to introduce tuition fees for higher education.”
 - (2) that Labour subsequently introduced university ‘top up’ fees in 2004, despite the party’s 2001 election manifesto stating “We will not introduce top-up fees”.
 - (3) the previous Labour government initiated the Browne review into tuition fees, and that Labour’s Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills at the time, Peter Mandelson, has since written that “When I [set up the Browne review] in November 2009 I assumed, as the Treasury did, that the outcome would have to include a significant increase in tuition fees. I felt that they would certainly have to double in order to offset the deficit-reduction measures that we too would have implemented had we won the election.”
2. Council assembly therefore resolves:
 - (1) to call on the leader of the council to apologise to residents of Southwark for his party’s shameless hypocrisy on tuition fees, and to concentrate on improving the lives of young people in Southwark including keeping the borough’s nurseries open rather than engaging in cheap political point scoring.

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (AMENDMENTS)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2012/13**

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

ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED	Copies	To	Copies
All Councillors	1 each	Others	1
Group Offices	2	Shahida Nasim, Audit Commission, Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
Alex Doel, Labour Group Office	1		
William Summers, Liberal Democrat Group Office	1		
Local Studies Library	1		
Officers	3		
Eleanor Kelly	1		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Sonia Sutton, Mayor's Secretary	1		
Constitutional Officer			
25 copies to Lesley John, 2 nd Floor, Hub 4, 160 Tooley Street	25		
		Last Updated: October 2012	
		Total:	96