

Council Assembly

Wednesday 9 July 2025

7.00 pm

Council Offices, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Supplemental Agenda no. 2

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
3.2. Public question time		1
	Two public questions have been received.	
4.1. Community evidence		2 - 4
	Three submissions to present community evidence were received.	
5. Deputations		5 - 8
	Two deputation requests agreed to be in order were received.	
8. Amendments		9 - 18
	Five amendments have been received.	

Contact

Virginia Wynn-Jones on 020 7525 7055 or 020 7525 7222 or email: virginia.wynn-jones@southwark.gov.uk; andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk; constitutional.team@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

Date: 7 July 2025

Meeting Name:	Council Assembly
Date:	9 July 2025
Report title:	Public Question Time
Ward(s) or groups affected:	All
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	Not applicable
From:	Proper Constitutional Officer

1. QUESTION FROM NATHANIEL GREGORY TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN AIR, STREETS AND WASTE

What is the plan for expanding bicycle access and safety in Southwark?

2. QUESTION FROM HELLEN CRISTINA BENAVIDES OROSZ TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY

Phone snatching is getting worse across our borough, particularly around London Bridge, Blackfriars Road, and Bankside. What actions is the council taking to tackle this issue?

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Chidilim Agada, Head of Constitutional Services
Report Author	Virginia Wynn-Jones, Principal Constitutional Officer
Version	Final
Dated	4 July 2025

Meeting Name:	Council Assembly
Date:	9 July 2025
Report title:	Community Evidence on the Themed Debate
Ward(s) or groups affected:	All
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	Not applicable
From:	Proper Constitutional Officer

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Introduction

1. The council assembly business panel agreed that the theme for council assembly in July 2025 should be “Keeping Southwark Safe: Fighting crime and the causes of crime.”

Community evidence on the theme

2. The deadline for community evidence was 11.59pm, 3 July 2025.
3. The following requests have been received by the deadline for consideration by this meeting and they are listed 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.
5. If the community evidence is not dealt with by council assembly, the matter shall be referred without debate to the relevant cabinet member who shall, after consideration, respond with an open reply to the sender.

Submissions

1. Quince Garcia, Roadworks Media

The community evidence requests states:

“I am the director of Roadworks Media, a Community Interest Company that runs workshop programs to train, deliver work experience and mentor young people impacted by disparaging issues. The workshop provides a safe space for young people to express themselves, heal from trauma and be given career and education support for the change they adopt to become productive members of society. Our

aim is to deliver skills that are transferrable or that can be used to work in the media and film industry.

I would like to speak about:

- How I use my lived experience to set up and run Roadworks Media
- What Roadworks Media is delivering at Southwark Youth Justice Service
- Why Roadworks Media has the capability to empower young people impacted by disparaging issues.”

2. Nancy Trullo, United Hearts

The community evidence requests states:

“We will share the impact of our community work in Burgess Park and surrounding areas, highlighting our preventive initiatives, psychosocial and legal support for victims, and the strategies we implement to promote community safety with a gender-based approach.

United Hearts is an independent, non-religious and non-partisan organisation whose main objective is to provide comprehensive support to victims of violence, with a focus on women, children, and vulnerable groups. We are deeply committed to building a safer, more equal, and violence-free community.”

3. Lucia Adams

The community evidence requests states:

“I would like to share my experiences as a local of working with the council and other agencies to address crime in Burgess Park and its surrounds. This came about after I experienced a spate of crimes in Burgess Park. Following this, I along with a number of other locals mounted a campaign advocating for a number of steps to be taken, including the setting up of a multi-agency task force, which includes community organisations, to develop an action plan. This was initiated in Autumn of 2024 and work is ongoing.”

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Chidilim Agada, Head of Constitutional Services		
Report Author	Virginia Wynn-Jones, Principal Constitutional Officer		
Version	Final		
Dated	4 July 2025		
Key decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Officer title		Comments sought	Comments included
Assistant Chief Executive – Governance and Assurance		No	No
Strategic Director of Resources		No	No
Cabinet Member		No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team			4 July 2025

Meeting Name:	Council Assembly
Date:	9 July 2025
Report title:	Deputation Requests
Ward(s) or groups affected:	All
Classification:	Open
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	Not applicable
From:	Proper Constitutional Officer

RECOMMENDATION

1. That council assembly considers whether or not to hear deputations from the groups 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 (if the matter is not dealt with by council assembly, the matter shall be referred without debate to the relevant cabinet member who shall after consideration, respond with an open reply to the sender); *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 requests have been received:

1. Bells Garden TRA

The deputation request states:

“We wish to address the issue of the proposed resumption of the in-fill developments in the Bells Gardens and Lindley estates in collaboration with private developers. In particular we are concerned about:

- Imminent loss of the temporary community centre, breaking a firm promise from the council that the amenity would be maintained throughout development.
- The new development being pursued by the council officer in charge with no briefing to councillors and no consultation of residents.
- Potential changes to the development plan that remove hard-won benefits provision for local residents, especially those in housing distress.”

2. Manor Estate TRA

The deputation request states:

Manor Estate Tenants & Residents Association have been active for over 50 years and have been the voice of our estate in many different formats over that time.

Our representatives would like to ask some questions about building works on our estate.

I would like to talk about:

Tenda Road.

Stood empty now for at least 2 years after completion.

Problems with the build and work stopping were noticed in October 2019.

1. What ‘remedial work’ has happened on the build, as we were told that was the reason for initial delay back in 2022?
2. Why has it not been signed off as completed and rented out?
3. What will be the confirmed lettings policy for it as changes seem to have been made since we had consultation that started over 10 years ago.

4. Communication with estate about works stopped in 2022/2023, when we received the last newsletter on the block build. This needs to be better for future delays on buildings.

Pope House

On 19 July 2022, a crack appeared in brick work on side of building. Since then we have been given limited information about what is happening.

Our neighbours are concerned over the building & having lived with scaffolding for the last 3 years with no work seeming to be going on and the impact of parking spaces being taken up the work area.

1. What structural surveys have been done to date and when can the TRA review them?
2. What has caused the delay in getting work done, it's been 3 years with 1 side of the building having scaffolding and only NOW has the rest of the block been scaffolded?
3. How long is the project going to take to complete and what work will be happening?
4. Confirmed parking allowances for the block as some neighbours have confirmed they have been given tickets for where they have been told they can park, so communication has not been clear to everyone in Pope House or parking enforcement.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputation Request File	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Virginia Wynn-Jones 020 7525 7055
Council Assembly Procedure Rule 2.6, Southwark Constitution	Constitutional Team 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Virginia Wynn-Jones 020 7525 7055

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Chidilim Agada, Head of Constitutional Services		
Report Author	Virginia Wynn-Jones, Principal Constitutional Officer		
Version	Final		
Dated	4 July 2025		
Key Decision?	No		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER			
Title		Comments sought	Comments included
Assistant Chief Executive – Governance and Assurance		No	No
Strategic Director of Resources		No	No
Cabinet Member		No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team			4 July 2025

AMENDMENTS

ITEM 3.2: THEMED DEBATE – KEEPING SOUTHWARK SAFE: FIGHTING CRIME AND THE CAUSES OF CRIME

(see pages 19-24 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT A

Proposed by: Councillor Victor Chamberlain

Insert:

1. c. That despite these goals, crime in Southwark remains unacceptably high, with the latest statistics showing a crime rate 11% higher than the London average, and 31% higher than the national average.
1. d. That phone snatching remains a top concern for residents, which incidences in Southwark currently 42 times higher than the national average.
1. e. That incidences of phone snatching hit an all-time high in May 2025, with 515 devices being reported stolen in Southwark, with many more likely going unreported.

Delete:

1. d
1. e. i

Insert:

1. e. iv. That this investment of £2m amounts to four times less money than was proposed in the Liberal Democrat budget amendment, which would have provided £2m this year alone, to go towards CCTV infrastructure, safe space gazebos, and more.
1. e. v. That the Liberal Democrat budget amendment, had it been passed by Council Assembly, would have doubled the number of community safety wardens – whose numbers are a fraction of what they were when Labour took over the running of the Council 15 years ago.

Replace:

1. e. viii. With

The Council's enforcement on fly-tipping remains inadequate, with just 1.9% of fly-tipping cases being issued a fixed penalty notice (FPN), down from 2.4% the previous year. Southwark now stands as the eighth worst borough in London for fly-tipping, up from ninth the previous year, and with more than twice as many cases as neighbouring Lambeth.

Replace:

1. f. iii with

The spring statement gave no additional funding to the Metropolitan police, which had led to fears of policing numbers falling, not rising.

The national Liberal Democrat commitment to return to real community policing, and a statutory guarantee to have every burglary attended and fully investigated

In 1. g. v, **delete** “Rotherhithe” and **replace** with “Surrey Docks”

Insert:

1. g. vii. Council additionally notes that responsibility for the failure to secure a police hub in Rotherhithe lies solely with Labour politicians who have let the community down

Delete:

1. g. vi

Replace:

1. j. iv. With

That despite these measures, phone snatching remains an epidemic in Southwark, particularly in the north of the borough where it has become an unacceptably regular occurrence.

Insert:

1. k.ii The repeal of the vagrancy act follows a years’ long campaign by Liberal Democrat, Layla Moran MP

Replace:

1. k. v. with

The Labour administration of Southwark Council has overseen a disappointing reduction in the youth services budget in real terms – in particular in 2016-2018 when the budget dropped by almost 50% across just 2 years. This has directly undermined other work being done on youth offending.

Insert:

2. g. Ensure genuine resident engagement in community safety by:
 - i. Holding regular meetings with community groups and ‘friends of...’ groups regarding the tackling of anti-social behaviour in parks.
 - ii. Hiring additional Park Liaison Officers to use all available powers to facilitate a visible presence in parks across Southwark in order to deter anti-social behaviour.

- iii. Directing Park Liaison Officers to use all available powers to disperse groups engaging in anti-social behaviour in parks in order to minimise disruption to local communities.

Insert:

- 2. h. Implement the plan proposed by the Southwark Liberal Democrats to begin to restore the number of community safety wardens to their previous numbers by doubling the number of wardens currently employed,

Renumber all paragraphs and sub-paragraphs accordingly.

ITEM 6.2.2: MEMBERS' MOTIONS – Southwark Stands Against Welfare Cuts
(see pages 35-36 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT B

Moved: Councillor Maria Linforth-Hall

Seconded: Councillor Emily Tester

Update the name of the Motion to:

Scrap the Welfare Reform Bill

In (2) **delete** “will” and **replace** with “planned to”

In 2.d **delete** “will” and **replace** with “would have”

In 2.d **delete** “qualify” and **replace** with “qualified”

At end of 3 after “notes with concern”, **insert** “the impact of the reforms as initially announced”

After 3 **insert**

4. Council Assembly notes:

- a. Since the submission of this motion, the Government has been forced into an embarrassing climbdown, resulting in a mess of a bill that is not fit for purpose – pieced together at the last minute, not designed with the compassion and care it should have been.
- b. That at least one of our Southwark Labour MPs fully and vocally backed the initial brutally damaging reforms, which were then watered down at the last minute to avoid government defeat
- c. The bill as it now exists, even after the concessions, still represents extremely damaging cuts to the welfare system, and creates worrying gaps in support that will leave many Southwark residents worse off.
- d. Disability charities like Scope remain deeply concerned about the cuts to the health element of Universal Credit, warning that nationally, 700,000 future UC claimants will receive £3000 less support each year than claimants do now
- e. The bill as it now exists will strip carers and the ones they care for of vital support whilst putting more barriers up to work, not fewer.

- f. All five Southwark Labour MPs supported the revised version of the bill

Delete 4a and 4b

Insert in 4:

- a. The chaos surrounding this bill shows that Labour still aren't listening, and not delivering the change that people are crying out for.
- b. That there are alternative, fairer ways to plug the financial gap the chancellor faces, namely:
 - a. Growing the economy with an ambitious trade deal with Europe, with a new bespoke UK-E customs union, which could grow the economy by 2.2% and raise at least £25 billion a year.
 - b. Asking the big banks, social media giants, and online gambling companies to pay their fair share of tax.
 - c. That the government needs to scrap the bill entirely, and start again on a cross-party basis to bring people back into work

Insert at end of 5b:

“And to back the Liberal Democrat plan to scrap the bill, start again, and create a system that is fit for purpose – co-designed with disabled people and with cross-party work to bring people back into work.”

Renumber all paragraphs and sub-paragraphs accordingly.

ITEM 6.2.2: MEMBERS' MOTIONS – Southwark Stands Against Welfare Cuts
(see pages 35-36 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT C

Moved: Councillor Stephanie Cryan

Seconded: Councillor Ian Wingfield

Delete 2) a-d and **replace** with:

2) Council Assembly notes:

- a. The regrettable consequences of austerity on Southwark's most vulnerable residents, instigated by the Conservative - Liberal Democrat collation, which has had deleterious and long-lasting effects on our residents living with disabilities and health conditions, including children. Policies such as the Bedroom Tax and Benefit Cap pushed vulnerable people into poverty and homelessness.
- b. That the previous Labour government took a million children out of poverty and reduced homelessness by more than two-thirds.
- c. That the £22 billion black hole in the public finances left by the Conservative Government has resulted in tough decisions having to be made.
- d. That despite tough decisions, the Labour Party is committed to fixing the broken welfare system, and that tackling poverty and inequality has always been central to the Labour Party's mission.

Delete 3) a-c and **replace** with:

3) Council Assembly welcomes:

- a. The work of the Southwark Labour administration to provide welfare support to those most in need across our borough:
 - i. We have delivered the country's most comprehensive free healthy school meals programme across our nursery, primary and secondary schools, and in the school holidays. Furthermore, Southwark Labour has led the way nationally, by providing free school meals universally to primary school children since 2013, and by extending free school meal provision in secondary schools with £3.2m of investment for children who need it most.
 - ii. In 2024 alone, the Southwark Cost of Living Support Fund distributed more than £40 million to families in immediate need. Since the start of the Cost of Living

Crisis in 2021, the Council has reached over 100,000 Southwark residents, those on the lowest incomes and most vulnerable to the impacts of rising costs.

- iii. Offering a package of cost-of-living support that includes help for residents on low or insecure incomes and dealing with problem debt
 - iv. The Holiday Food and Fun programme funded nearly 70,000 free meals for children aged 4-6 in 2024
 - v. The distribution of Rose Vouchers, to help families buy fresh fruit and vegetables
 - vi. The Pension Credit take-up campaign, which supported eligible residents in applying for Pension Credit, enabling them to benefit from the Winter Fuel Allowance
 - vii. The Southwark Energy Savers Scheme, which provides energy-saving advice and support to residents struggling with rising energy bills and the cost of living crisis
- b. The role that Labour MPs have played:
- i. Voting for the amended Welfare Reform Bill, recognising the impact that the original bill would've had on those claiming PIP
 - ii. The work done by MPs Florence Eshalomi and Helen Hayes, in scrutinising the government's welfare plans and securing changes, so that no one currently in receipt of the health top-up of universal credit, will lose out
- c. The proposed Timms Review to examine eligibility for PIP, and the changes now secured around the implementation timetable to take account of that review which will be co-produced with disabled people.

Delete 4) a-b and **replace** with:

4) Council Assembly recognises:

- a. That the Labour government inherited a mess from the Tories but that over the last year, important steps have been taken to invest in the NHS and get waiting lists down and put money back in people's pockets through a significant increase in the national minimum wage.
- b. That the current welfare system needs a thorough review, to take account of emerging health challenges, address high levels of worklessness amongst young people, and to tackle child poverty and homelessness.
- c. That the government has committed to investing £1bn in vital back to work support;

- d. That despite this, there have been significant concerns raised by disabled people and anti-poverty organisations about proposals that were put forward around PIP eligibility, and the health-related top-up to Universal Credit.

Delete 5) a-c and **replace** with:

5) Council Assembly resolves to:

- a. Ask that the Council continues to provide support to residents who need it most:
 - i. Continuing to provide Short Breaks to children with SEND through the Thrive-to-25 programme
 - ii. Continuing to lend a helping hand to families during school holidays in providing free healthy meals through initiatives such as Holiday Food and Fun
 - iii. Continue to provide free healthy school meals in nursery, primary and secondary schools, including the Department of Education's pilot free breakfast clubs currently running in some Southwark primary schools
 - iv. Continuing to provide financial assistance to those receiving domiciliary care
- b. To write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, to set out our priorities for Welfare Reform, including the abolition of the two-child limit in Universal Credit and permanent re-pegging of the Local Housing Allowance.
- c. To engage with the Timms Review and ensure that the voices and experiences of disabled Southwark residents are heard in that process

Renumber all paragraphs accordingly

ITEM 6.2.4: MEMBERS' MOTIONS – Implementation of a Tourist Tax (see pages 39-40 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT D

Moved: Councillor John Batteson

Seconded: Councillor Richard Livingstone

Delete 1) e

Delete 1) f

Amend 2) c from

“A tourist tax could potentially raise millions of pounds in revenue for Southwark”

to

“A London-wide tourist tax could, by some estimates, potentially generate hundreds of millions of pounds in revenue for the capital”

Delete 2) d

Delete 3) a-c and replace with:

3. Council Assembly resolves to:

- a. Utilise our strong relationships with Business Improvement Districts in order to understand the potential impact of a tourism levy on businesses, particularly those in the hospitality sector.
- b. Support the call to implement a London-wide tourism levy through accommodation costs.

Renumber all paragraphs and subparagraphs accordingly.

ITEM 6.2.5: MEMBERS' MOTIONS – Limiting the spread of damaging gambling premises in the Blue (see pages 40-42 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT E

Moved: Councillor Rachel Bentley

Seconded: Councillor Hamish McCallum

Insert after 1 b:

- 1 c. Notes the provision of affordable workspace that has been part-funded by local CIL allocations from other wards.

Insert after 1e:

- 1 f. Calls for the council to include, as part of the Blue Lettings Strategy:
 - i. a commitment to consult with residents and businesses about what businesses and services they wish to see in their area;
 - ii. Commit to supporting businesses not just opening within the Blue, but offer continued support as they operate in a climate of rising costs and other financial pressures.

Insert after 1i:

2. Calls on the council to:

- a. Formally make representation to the Government about the crippling effect on the local economy that the employers' National Insurance Contribution rise has had, and urge them to reverse it.
- b. Consider its business rate and commercial lettings policy to ensure that any rises are just and proportionate, and do not threaten the viability of local businesses.
- c. Work with third party lessors to ensure that high quality, community oriented businesses are not threatened by steep increases in rent costs.
- d. Roll out a Green Enterprise Partnership (GEP) scheme, mirroring the successful GEP scheme in Liberal Democrat run Sutton, which gives business rate incentives to local businesses who are making commitments towards sustainability.

Renumber all paragraphs and sub-paragraphs accordingly.

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN) (FULL LIST)
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2025/26

NOTE: Original held by Constitutional Team; all amendments/queries to
Virginia Wynn-Jones Tel: 020 7525 7055

ONE COPY TO ALL UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED		Copies	To	Copies
Councillors (1 each) Councillor Jasmine Ali Councillor Naima Ali Councillor Renata Hamvas Councillor Maria Linforth-Hall Councillor Darren Merrill Councillor Leo Pollak Councillor Sandra Rhule Councillor Martin Seaton Councillor Andy Simmons Councillor Cleo Soanes Councillor Kath Whittam Councillor Kieron Williams Electronic Versions (No hard copy) All other councillors	12		Press Southwark News South London Press Group Offices Arthur Holmes, Labour Group Office Oliver Bradfield, Liberal Democrat Group Office Officers Althea Loderick Clive Palfreyman Doreen Forrester-Brown Rhona Cadenhead Chidilim Agada Aled Richards David Quirke-Thornton Hakeem Osinaike Darren Summers Vishal Seegoolam Constitutional Team (Copies to Virginia Wynn-Jones, 2 nd Floor, Hub 2, Tooley Street)	 by email by email by email by email by email by email 1 by email by email by email by email by email by email by email 7
			Total:	20
			Last updated: May 2025	