

Council Assembly

Wednesday 25 November 2015

7.00 pm

Council Offices, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Supplemental Agenda No.3

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
2.2.	Public question time	1
	To consider one question from the public.	
3.1.	Community evidence	2 - 3
	Community evidence has been received from the following group:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">InSpired to Work.	
3.2.	MOTION ON THE THEME	4
	To seek the meetings consent to an alteration to the motion.	
4.	Deputations	5 - 8
	Deputation requests have been received from the following:	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none">A group of local residents about the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) advisory forumArnold Estate tenants and residents associationSouthwark Youth Council regarding youth servicesRotherhithe and Bermondsey youth community council members / Odessa Youth Club Members regarding youth servicesSouthwark Trades Union Council regarding youth service cutsA group of young people from the Peckham area regarding youth services.	
9.	Amendments	9 - 16

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

Date: 24 November 2015

Item No. 2.2	Classification: Open	Date: 25 November 2015	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Public Question Time	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

1. QUESTION FROM LIAM CROSBY TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, MODERNISATION AND PERFORMANCE

Globally \$2.6 trillion has been divested from fossil fuels on environmental and financial grounds. Soutwark Council invests 60m in fossil fuels, including 1.5m in a tar sands company. Will the council listen to 600+ petitioners asking them to protect pensioners, people, and the environment by reviewing investments in fossil fuels?

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	24 November 2015

Item No. 3.1	Classification: Open	Date: 25 November 2015	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Community Evidence on the Themed Debate	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Introduction

1. On 24 March 2015 the council assembly business panel met to agree the themes for 2015/16 meetings of council assembly. The panel agreed that the theme for November 2015 council assembly should be 'employment and local economy'.

Community evidence on the theme

2. The deadline for community evidence was midnight, Thursday, 19 November 2015.
3. The following requests have been received by the deadline for consideration by this meeting and they are list in the order received below:
4. Which community evidence shall be considered and the length of each submission will be established by way of a programme motion at the start of council assembly. Community evidence shall be conducted under the existing rules for public participation.

Submissions

1. InSpired to Work

Tracy Franklin, the director of InSpire, would like to make a presentation on their InSpired to Work council funded employment programme for young people aged 18-25.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Constitution	160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Constitutional Team constitutional.team@southwark.gov.uk 020 7525 7228

APPENDICES

No.	Title
None	

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager	
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	24 November 2015	
Key decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Law & Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance & Governance	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	24 November 2015	

Item No. 3.2	Classification: Open	Date: 25 November 2015	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Alteration to Motion on the Theme: Employment and local economy	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR IAN WINGFIELD, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS, EMPLOYMENT AND CULTURE

To seek the consent of the meeting to an alteration to the motion as follows:

In point 8 after “encourage the take up of apprenticeships”, add a new bullet point:

- Continue working collaboratively with the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to secure employment for the borough’s most vulnerable residents, and recognise the role of volunteering in Southwark for leading to employment opportunities.

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Cabinet member’s motion	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Andrew Weir 020 7525 7222

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	24 November 2015

Item No. 4.	Classification: Open	Date: 25 November 2015	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Deputation Requests	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Proper Constitutional Officer	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear a deputation from the group(s) listed in paragraph 5 of this report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Council assembly procedure rule 2.6 (11) states that no more than three deputations shall be considered at any one meeting. However the meeting can decide to suspend this rule in order to hear more or vary the order.
3. When considering whether to hear the deputation request, council assembly can decide:
 - to receive the deputation at this meeting or a future meeting; *or*
 - that the deputation not be received; *or*
 - to refer the deputation to the most appropriate committee/sub-committee.
4. A deputation shall consist of no more than six people, including its spokesperson. One member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting for no longer than 5 minutes. The deputation spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by him or her shall be invited to ask a question of the leader or relevant cabinet member. After this time councillors may ask questions of the deputation for up to 5 minutes. At the conclusion of the questions, the deputation will be shown to the public seating area where they may listen to the remainder of the open section of the meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Deputation requests

5. The following deputation request has been received:
 1. **From a group of local residents about the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) advisory forum**

The cabinet on 2 June 2015 heard a deputation on the same subject from the similar group of residents. This deputation was previously listed on the agenda for the council assembly on 25 March 2015 and the meeting resolved not to receive it.

This deputation request states:

“The Local Government Ombudsman has set up the LGO Advisory Forum and invited a number of former complainants to become members of that forum. I myself am a participant in the LGO Reference Group and have just submitted my first contribution. The remit of the forum is to establish "what the LGO does well" and "what the LGO needs to improve most". The deputation hopes to persuade Members that Southwark Council might consider taking a similar approach to the Local Government Ombudsman and set up its own Advisory Forum along the same lines as the LGO Advisory Forum with regard to the Council Complaints Policy and associated Procedures. The deputation would like to take this opportunity to explain how, why and when the LGO process began, what has been achieved so far and how this could help Southwark Council to deliver on certain elements contained in its promises of "Fairer Future Principles" and "Fairer Future for all Vision" and the "Our Values" element of the "Council Plan". Additional information can be found on the Local Government Ombudsman website which contains the minutes of the LGO Advisory Forum's last meeting on 21 November 2014.”

2. From Arnold Estate tenants and residents association

The deputation request states:

“A motion is to be tabled at this meeting about planned works to the Arnold Estate and we would like to make a deputation along the following lines:

- The Arnold was left until the very end of the last WDS programme.
- We were initially offered both new kitchens and bathrooms where they were of a certain age or below an acceptable standard; this was subsequently reduced to either (possibly due to being one of the last estates in this round therefore there was not enough money in the budget).
- Other estates have had far more extensive refurbishments than WDS. The Arnold has no major works since at least 1993 and some kitchens and bathrooms have not been replaced or refurbished for over 30 years
- Councillor Livingstone told us that within the next plan we would have up to 5 maximum years to wait for the missing kitchens or bathrooms (but he hoped we might not be the last in the queue)
- Not only are we last in the ‘queue, this plan is for the next 8-10 years rather than 5.
- Some of the other estates with work planned sooner have had extensive refurbishment more recently than us e.g. <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s32994/Report%20-%20Funding%20for%20environmental%20works%20to%20Vauban%20and%20Neckinger%20Estates.pdf> and is the Dickens in the Year 1 list too - haven't they just been done?
- The Arnold has not benefitted from any Section 106 money - unlike other estates. We have also not been eligible for the British Gas insulation programme.
- People feel the Arnold has been badly neglected for a very long time. We are about to start major works that fall short of making much in the way of visible improvements.
- Although scaffolding is to be erected to the front of all blocks in order to replace asphalt walkways, we are not getting railings or facades painted. These have not been painted since 1997 and paint is flaking off down to the metal. Since the scaffolding will be the major cost for these works, doesn't it make sense for the council to use the opportunity to do other work that requires scaffolding at the same time? Leaseholders who we

have spoken to are in favour of this as it makes sense economically over the long run – one would hope the council sees the rationale for this too.”

Thank you for the opportunity to make these points.”

3. From Southwark Youth Council regarding youth services

The deputation request states:

“We would like to present a deputation to the council assembly on Wednesday 25 November as follows:

- The council are currently considering making a 73% cut to the Youth and Play service budget. Southwark Youth Council are concerned that this will leave many young people vulnerable, as they will lose not only their youth/play service, but also the supportive relationship they have with these workers, they would like councillors to hear their views on this subject.
- Southwark Youth Council firmly believe that as the official democratically elected voice for Southwark young people, with over 6000 votes cast, they should have been informed and consulted about these proposals and that this omission makes a mockery of the notion of youth democracy and Southwark Council’s commitment to “hearing” the voice of young people.”

4. From Rotherhithe and Bermondsey youth community council members / Odessa Youth Club Members regarding youth services

The deputation request states:

“Rotherhithe & Bermondsey youth community council members / Odessa Youth Club Members would like to present a deputation to the council assembly on Wednesday 25 November on the points below:

- The impact of the Youth Service cuts to young people and how this will affect the community i.e. anti-social behaviour, crime, boredom and loss of opportunity to learn life skills.
- The long term benefits for young people in having a safe place to go to and having support from a professional Youth Worker that they can trust and develop a positive relationship with.
- The voice of young people in the democratic process which empowers them to become future members of society that can make a difference to their community.
- Mint St Playground being built at a cost of 2 million. Why can’t the council use some of this money to reduce the cuts in the Youth Service?”

5. From Southwark Trades Union Council regarding youth service cuts

The deputation request states:

“Southwark Trades Union Council would like to present a deputation to the council assembly on Wednesday 25 November as follows:

- Southwark Trades Union Council is concerned that the council's proposal of 73% cuts to the Youth and Play service budget will result in a large number of compulsory redundancies for staff. In addition the cuts will leave many young people vulnerable, as they will lose not only their youth/play service, but also the supportive relationship they have with these workers. This will have a hugely detrimental impact on local communities as young people are left without adequate safeguarding and prey to dangerous elements on the streets.
- Southwark Trades Union Council requests that the council reconsiders these proposals, rejects this devastating budget cut, and uses further council reserves to save the youth and play service."

6. From the group of young people from Peckham area regarding youth services

This is a deputation from a group of young people who use youth services in the Peckham area. The deputation request states that they wish to personally raise the issue of the youth service cuts, as residents and users of the service.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputation Request File	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228
Council Assembly Procedure Rule 2.6, Southwark Constitution	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Lesley John 020 7525 7228

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager	
Report Author	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	24 November 2015	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Director of Law and Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director Finance and Governance	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	24 November 2015	

AMENDMENTS

ITEM 3.2 – MEMBERS MOTION ON THE THEME: EMPLOYMENT AND LOCAL ECONOMY (see pages 1 - 3 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Hamish McCallum

Delete all and insert:

1. Council assembly:
 - 1) believes that access to training and employment in order to create more opportunities in the life of an individual and fully realise their potential is a fundamental liberty.
 - 2) welcomes the work of the previous coalition government to increase the number of apprenticeships in the United Kingdom.
 - 3) further welcomes that Labour in Southwark is following the example set nationally and the commitments outlined in the Liberal Democrat manifesto to prioritise apprenticeships locally.
 - 4) notes that there is a chronic shortfall in Southwark residents with construction qualifications and that this is a huge missed opportunity if we are to meet local demand for social housing both in the short- and long-term and ensure these new homes are maintained to an excellent standard.
 - 5) regards the council's abject failure to engage with Lewisham Southwark College over the past two years and its move to set up a rival further education institution as both deeply disappointing and disadvantageous to residents.
 - 6) congratulates the college on its efforts to improve as recognised by Ofsted in their latest inspection report, but recognises there is more for the college to do and that the best way the council can help is to engage.
 - 7) further notes the impact of childcare costs on many residents', especially women's, ability to improve their skills and return to work and therefore regrets that despite the council spending local taxpayers' money on the Childcare Commission, no progress has been made on implementing its recommendations more than eight months after their publication.
 - 8) notes that adult education providers in Southwark are working in silos to identify and attract their students before recommending them to employers. This is becoming problematic and a strain on their resources.
 - 9) acknowledges that further education providers have been encouraged by the council to work with local Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs).

However, these providers are often unclear as to how they should contribute to these SMEs and in what capacity.

2. Council assembly therefore calls on the cabinet to:
 - 1) work more closely with all local education providers and employers to improve the quality of apprenticeships in the borough.
 - 2) work with organisations such as Southwark Works and the Construction Trust to address the shortfall in construction qualifications locally.
 - 3) urgently take its place on the Board of Governors of Lewisham Southwark College and work in partnership to improve standards and the employment and training prospects of young people in Southwark.
 - 4) welcome the new Principal of Lewisham Southwark College, Carole Kitching, and now support the college in its work to improve.
 - 5) understand that the council alone does not have the solutions and should work better with the borough's employers, training providers and residents to reach holistic resolutions.
 - 6) ensure rapid implementation of the recommendations of the Childcare Commission and explore what further steps the council can take to increase childcare provision in the borough to meet demand and new legislative requirements, and so reduce the barriers for parents returning to work.
 - 7) lead on getting the right young people into the correct specialisms and prevent those at risk of becoming NEETS from falling out of the system by establishing a strategic forum which engages with representatives from Southwark Works, the Construction Youth Trust, Morley College and other relevant organisations.
 - 8) create a strategic plan for further education providers which explicitly outlines the needs and requirements of local SMEs as well as the benefits to all parties involved – particularly young and adult learners.

ITEM 5.2.1 – MEMBERS MOTIONS: ARNOLD ESTATE WARM, DRY AND SAFE WORKS PROGRAMME (see page 5 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT B

Moved: Councillor Lucas Green
Seconded: Councillor Eleanor Kerlake

After point 1 **delete** points 2 and 3 and **insert**:

2. Notes that although the kitchens and bathrooms programme was brought forward to April 2015, the warm, dry and safe works on the Arnold Estate started before that, so it was not possible to bring the kitchens and bathrooms programme into the scope of the work.
3. Notes that the council is spending £303.9m on housing investment works during 2015/16, which is significantly more than the council has ever spent before in a year.
4. Regrets however that the impact of the Chancellor's post-election decision to impose rent reductions on councils and housing associations without compensation, which will result in a net loss of £62m to the HRA over the next four years, unfortunately means that the council has to slow the proposed major works programme from that originally envisaged.
5. Notes that no decision has yet been taken on when the kitchens and bathrooms work will take place at the Arnold Estate, as all proposals from 2017/18 onwards are currently being consulted on and a final decision will not be taken until March 2016, and therefore asks that Cabinet consider carefully the views on the programme set out by the tenants and residents of Arnold Estate carefully before taking its decision in March.
6. Calls on the cabinet to ensure that despite the significant financial challenge, the kitchens and bathrooms programme is still delivered to all council properties, including the Arnold Estate.

AMENDMENT C

Moved: Councillor Ben Johnson
Secunder: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

Add new paragraph 4 to end:

- Council assembly believes that all Southwark Council tenants are entitled to a new kitchen and bathroom.

ITEM 5.2.2 – MEMBERS MOTIONS: END CUTS TO POLICING IN LONDON (see pages 5
- 6 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT D

Moved: Councillor David Hubber

Seconded: Councillor David Noakes

Add new paragraph 11 and re-order remaining paragraphs accordingly:

11. That the council consult residents on any proposed changes to its own community warden scheme.

Add to new paragraph 13:

“..., including retaining at least one dedicated PCSO in each of the 21 wards across Southwark, as well as keeping the existing structure.”

Add to new paragraph 14:

“..., including the option of not reducing the council tax precept next year to ensure PCSO numbers can remain at current levels in Southwark by raising extra funding for the Metropolitan Police.”

ITEM 5.2.3 – MEMBERS MOTIONS: GREATER LONDON PARK CITY CAMPAIGN (see pages 6 - 7 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT E

Moved: Councillor Renata Hamvas

Seconded: Councillor Sunny Lambe

After point 2 **delete** points 3 - 6 and **insert**:

3. Notes that Southwark has a large number of parks and green spaces we can be immensely proud of, including a record number of Green Flag parks, and that resident satisfaction with Southwark parks is very high.
4. Notes that parks in Southwark already have the planning protection required to ensure that they are not under threat.
5. Notes that Southwark is a leading borough in London for parks and green spaces and that the council is continuing to invest in parks open spaces, while many local authorities are scaling back investment because of budget cuts.
6. Welcomes the council's work to ensure that standards in Southwark parks continue to improve against a very difficult backdrop of central government cuts.
7. Notes that there is no real detail on the potential benefits and risks of a Greater London National Park City for local authority parks and it is not yet clear what the implications of the proposals would be on Southwark's parks and open spaces.
8. Calls on the cabinet to ensure that at a time of ever-growing budgetary pressure, the council focuses on protecting investment in Southwark's parks and green spaces, continuing to improve standards and fulfilling the manifesto promise to increase the number of Green Flag parks in the borough.

ITEM 5.2.4 – MEMBERS MOTIONS:EXTEND THE 42 BUS ROUTE (see page 7 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT F

Moved: Councillor Damian O'Brien

Seconded: Councillor Eliza Mann

Add new bullet point to end of paragraph 3:

Council assembly further notes that Transport for London has already announced a consultation on the extension of the 42 bus route to Sainsbury's East Dulwich for next month, including whether a double-decker is supported by both passengers and local residents.

ITEM 5.2.5 – MEMBERS MOTIONS: TRADE UNION BILL (see pages 7 - 8 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT G

Moved: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

Seconded: Councillor David Noakes

Insert new paragraph 3 and re-number remaining paragraphs accordingly:

3. Council assembly further notes that human rights groups Liberty, Amnesty International and the British Institute of Human Rights have all condemned the Bill as an attack on the basic right to protest and that the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development has branded this law an 'outdated response that could have potentially counter-productive consequences.'

ITEM 5.2.6 – MEMBERS MOTIONS: TRANSATLANTIC TRADE AND INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP (TTIP) (see pages 8 - 9 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT H

Moved: Councillor Anood Al-Samerai

Seconded: Councillor David Noakes

In paragraph 2 **insert** after “in-house”:

“...unless clear safeguards are provided – the absence of...”

In paragraph 3 **delete** “Labour” (after ‘Council assembly notes that’) and **insert** “MEPs from different political groups.”

In paragraph 3, first line, **delete** “moved by Labour MEPs” (after Council assembly welcomes...’ and **insert** “calling”.

Insert new paragraph 4 and re-number remaining paragraphs accordingly:

“Council Assembly also notes the calls in the European Parliament to get the controversial ISDS replaced by a transparent and accountable form of investor protection that protects the right of governments to regulate in the public interest.”

In paragraph 4 **delete** full stop and **insert** at end:

“...and notes the concerns already expressed by the Local Government Association, including:

- clear and specific safeguards for services delivered by councils, including education and social services;
- the continued right for councils to determine their own service delivery models now and in the future;
- the continued right for national governments and councils to set public policy and standards in all fields: health, safety, environmental protection, labour law, data protection and consumer protection.”

**COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)
(SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/16**

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

ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED	Copies	To	Copies
Councillors (1 copy each)	55	Others	1
Electronic Versions (No hard copy) Councillor Anood Al-Samerai Councillor Maisie Anderson Councillor Fiona Colley Councillor Karl Eastham Councillor Gavin Edwards Councillor Jon Hartley Councillor Sarah King Councillor Michael Situ		Elizabeth Olive, Audit Commission Ground Floor, Tooley Street	
Group offices	2		
Aine Gallagher, Labour Group Office	1		
Niko Baar, Liberal Democrat Group Office	1		
Officers	3		
Eleanor Kelly	1		
Doreen Forrester-Brown	1		
Ian Millichap	1		
(Copies to Lesley John, 2 nd Floor, Hub 4, Tooley Street)	15		
		Total:	76
		Last Updated: October 2015	