

<b>Item No.</b> 11	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> May 19 2009	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Motions Referred from Council Assembly	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Legal and Democratic Services	

### RECOMMENDATION

1. That the executive considers the motions set out in the appendices attached to the report.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Council assembly at its meeting on Wednesday, April 8 2009 agreed a number of motions and these stand referred to the executive for consideration.
3. The executive is requested to consider the motions referred to it. Any proposals in a motion are treated as a recommendation only. The final decisions of the executive will be reported back to the next meeting of council assembly. When considering a motion, executive can decide to:
  - Note the motion; *or*
  - Agree the motion in its entirety, *or*
  - Amend the motion; *or*
  - Reject the motion.

### KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. In accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.9(6), the attached motions were referred to the executive. The executive will report on the outcome of its deliberations upon the motions to a subsequent meeting of council assembly.
5. The constitution allocates responsibility for particular functions to council assembly, including approving the budget and policy framework, and to the executive for developing and implementing the budget and policy framework and overseeing the running of council services on a day-to-day basis.
6. Any key issues, such as policy, community impact or funding implications are included in the advice from the relevant chief officer.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Motions submitted in accordance with council assembly procedure rule 2.9 (6).	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Lesley John Constitutional Team 020 7525 7228

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Number	Title
Appendix 1	Cross River Tram
Appendix 2	Youth Provision
Appendix 3	Bus Route 42
Appendix 4	A Borough-Wide Food Strategy
Appendix 5	Council Housing for Southwark
Appendix 6	Surrey Canal Road Station
Appendix 7	Fuel Poverty Bill

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	
<b>Report Author</b>	Lesley John, Constitutional Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	20.4.09	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Chief Officer	Yes	Yes
<b>Executive Member</b>		
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>		11.5.09

**Cross River Tram**

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on the cross river tram was proposed by Councillor Paul Noblet and seconded by Councillor Caroline Pidgeon. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

**Recommendation**

1. That council notes the continuing cross-party support in Southwark for the cross river tram and reiterates its disappointment that the Mayor of London has chosen not to support the project by removing a commitment to develop the project from the Transport for London business plan.
2. That council believes that the tram would increase access to employment for people from some of London's most deprived areas, support the regeneration of Elephant and Castle, Aylesbury and Peckham and provide construction jobs, while providing a clean, green transport solution for one of the few areas in central London without a tube line.
3. That council assembly welcomes the decision to kick-start the East London Line extension 2B, which with the cross river tram would transform transport options in Southwark.
4. That council further notes the chancellor's announcement in his 2008 pre-budget report of £20bn in fiscal stimulus to be brought forward before April 2010.
5. That council notes that the leader of the council wrote to transport minister Lord Adonis, seeking funding for the cross river tram from this fiscal stimulus and that the response said that the cross river tram does not currently qualify for money from the pre-budget report fiscal stimulus, where existing funding is brought forward, because spending on the project is not currently part of Transport for London's business plan: It further notes, however, that the response also said: 'Should the Mayor [of London] decide to fund the project, we would be happy to discuss with him the possibility of delivering it expediently.'
6. That council assembly therefore calls on the executive to write to the Mayor of London asking him to make the cross river tram project part of Transport for London's business plan.
7. That council assembly calls on the executive to write to the Chancellor asking him to review the decision to only bring forward existing funding in the fiscal stimulus, and make provision for the funding of the tram as part of the fiscal stimulus package.
8. That council assembly notes the executive member for regeneration's assertion at the January council meeting that he would "continue [to seek] funding sources for the project, be they public or private, through a variety of forums such as Cross River Partnership.
9. That council assembly calls on the executive member for regeneration to continue to seek such funding sources in his role as chair of the Cross River Partnership and update members on his current progress before council's annual meeting.

## **Comments of the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods**

In November 2008, the Mayor of London announced that he was unable to support unfunded projects and withdrew funding to progress the cross river tram to transport and works act approval.

Alongside the announcement, the Mayor also stated that there would be an investigation of alternatives to the tram. This work will continue through 2009, however terms of reference have yet to be agreed. Officers are lobbying that any alternatives proposed respond to both the transport, economic and regeneration needs of the borough.

**Youth Provision**

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on youth provision was proposed by Councillor Althea Smith and seconded by Councillor Peter John. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

**Recommendation**

1. That council assembly notes that in the Liberal Democrats' 2006 election manifesto the party pledged to carry out a full audit of youth facilities in the borough. Council notes that in July 2007, the executive agreed a report entitled 'Activities for Young People – Things to do, places to go, someone to talk to in Southwark' which reported the results of the audit that had been undertaken.
2. That council assembly notes that the audit informed the creation of the Children and Young Peoples Partnership's Things to do priority areas and resulted in a rebalancing of spending on youth services and facilities across Southwark, compensating for historic under-investment in parts of the borough.
3. That council assembly notes that in last year's joint area review the council's youth services were given only an 'adequate' or two star rating.
4. That council assembly notes that in the 2008 residents' survey, youth facilities were the services that residents thought were most important and also the services that they were most dissatisfied with. It notes that the same was true in the 2006 residents survey and that despite massive government grants for children and young people and significant capital investment in youth facilities by the council, residents' satisfaction with youth facilities has not significantly improved.
5. That council notes that as a result of the government's failure to take account of the significant additional pressures placed on the council's budget by the recession, the executive was forced to identify £17.3m of savings in the 2009-10 budget. Council notes that £381,000 (4.5%) of the savings were from the youth service budget, and that this amount equates to approximately 0.3% of the budget for 11-19 year old and youth services division.
6. That council notes that the £381,000 savings identified from youth services will be generated from the modernisation and integration of the division and will not involve cuts in front-line services in the youth service. Council further notes that £150,000 of new funding was allocated to the youth service from the WNF programme for work-based learning sites.
7. That council acknowledges that Southwark has unacceptably high levels of teenage conceptions and child obesity and recognises these are key shared strategic priority for Young Southwark, the primary care trust and the executive. Council notes the coordinated activities undertaken by these agencies to address these problems, including:

- a) The roll out of a healthy schools accreditation which has seen 65% of Southwark Schools attain Health Schools status.
  - b) The recent "Team Around the Issue" event on March 11, where officers came together to discuss approaches to the 5 priority areas, including childhood obesity.
  - c) The Teenage Pregnancy Summit on March 23 2009 which looked at new approaches to tackling this issue.
8. That council assembly notes that Southwark's levels of young people not in employment, education or training (NEETs) were the third highest in London in 2007, but notes that the number of Southwark young people in NEET has fallen from 875 in 2004 to 395 (54.8% fall) as a result of coordinated work by the council, including:
- a) Targeted work with those with poor attendance at end of Year 11 (e.g. 5 hot spot schools targeted and being support).
  - b) Development of Foundation 2 Work programme in Southwark College where 40 young people NEET have been enrolled since Jan'09 and therefore off the NEET register.
9. That council assembly notes the children's services and education scrutiny sub-committee's youth provision review, which was discussed by the executive in December last year. It notes that at that meeting, the executive agreed to ensure that the findings of the review would be taken into account in the current review of youth services across the borough. Council notes that officers checked this course of action with the chair of children's scrutiny and agreed with him that the executive would report back as part of that review process in April 2009.
10. That council assembly notes that the youth service is currently being reviewed and restructured, with a view to meeting government demands for an integrated and targeted youth support service. Council notes that the restructure is aimed at streamlining management structures and will not affect front-line staff or services.
11. That council assembly expresses concern that residents' satisfaction with youth facilities remains low and that teenage pregnancy, obesity and the number of young people not in education, employment or training remain serious challenges for the borough.
12. That council therefore endorses the review of youth services offered by the council which is currently being undertaken and calls on the executive to report back to council assembly on the outcome of the review, given its overwhelming importance to all members.

### **Comments of the Strategic Director of Children's Services**

To follow.

## Bus Route 42

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on bus route 42 was proposed by Councillor Toby Eckersley and seconded by Councillor James Barber. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation

### Recommendation

1. That council assembly believes that the extension of the route of the 42 bus from North Dulwich to Sainsbury's via East Dulwich Grove to Sainsbury's on Dog Kennel Hill would benefit Village, East Dulwich and South Camberwell wards.
2. That council assembly notes the cross party work over many years to promote the proposed new route.
3. That council assembly welcomes the planning consent obtained by Sainsbury's to accommodate the turn-round on their premises providing a proper terminus for this route with facilities for drivers and standstill space for the buses as presently the buses terminating in Sunray Avenue cause noise and inconvenience to residents.
4. That council assembly regrets the previous delays by Transport for London(TfL), and welcomes a recent undertaking to review the business case.
5. That council assembly notes the widespread support for the extension evidenced by the responses to the recent Village ward councillors' questionnaire and the interest shown by "Southwark News".
6. That council assembly therefore requests the executive to ensure that the council as a whole promotes the extension with vigour and that the executive member for environment writes to London Mayor Boris Johnson requesting that the re-routing proposal be given high priority.

### Comments of the Strategic Director of Strategic Director of Environment and Housing

Currently the Sainsbury's turnaround area is only used by the low frequency P13 which runs from Streatham via Dulwich and Lordship Lane through Bellenden to Peckham and thence to Sainsbury's at New Cross Gate..

The campaign for the 42 to enter Sainsbury's predates the new facility.

In October 2008 council officers and ward members met with officers from TfL who committed to review the business case for a service extension in 2009.

A successful business case has been made to extend the service to Goose Green Roundabout which requires one extra bus to maintain service frequency and the current good service reliability. However this extension has not been implemented due to the lack of a suitable layover. The extension to Sainsbury's requires a second vehicle to maintain frequency and reliability and as yet TfL have not managed to balance the additional cost against increased service users. Ward members have been active in canvassing local residents and in approaching the PCT for information as to how the Dulwich Hospital proposals could generate additional passengers.

On April 9 2009 officers responded to TfL's initial consultation on the service review programme for 2010/2011 and included the following regarding the 42:

*“There is ongoing disappointment that, other than for the low frequency P13, it has not proved possible to find a service to make use of the bus standing area provided at Sainsbury’s on Dog Kennel Hill and thus improve access to this recently expanded facility. It is considered that there is potential for the 42 and 484 to provide complimentary links. In the case of the 42 by extending the route from its current terminal in Sunray Avenue past Dulwich Hospital and for the 484 to be diverted on its journey along Dog Kennel Hill, both these routes currently appear relatively short. This review should also consider whether rerouting the 42 could provide relief to the 343 and a link from the north of the borough to the town hall. This could generate additional passengers which would enable the extension to Sainsbury’s to be funded”*



## A Borough-Wide Food Strategy

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on a borough-wide food strategy was proposed by Councillor Jenny Jones and seconded by Councillor Richard Thomas. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motions stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

### Recommendation

1. That council assembly:
  - a) Notes the vitality, vibrancy and diversity of Southwark's food industries and cultures.
  - b) Notes that the production, processing and manufacturing, transport, storage and distribution, sale, purchasing, preparation, consumption and disposal of food within and beyond Southwark has significant implications for health, environmental, economic, social/cultural and security issues across the borough.
2. That the council notes the value of allotments to the production of sustainable and healthy and local food in the borough, and asks the executive to adopt the following action:
  - a) Improve the quality of information available to residents, by improving the council's website.
  - b) Look for ways to increase the borough's allotments, as some of the allotments in the borough are on waiting lists only.
  - c) Engage with the London Food Board to look at practical ways in which food can be grown sustainably.
  - d) Provide an undertaking that the council will not close any allotments, and ensure rents are affordable by the many, not the few."
3. That this council therefore invites the executive to undertake the development of a borough wide food strategy with a view to:
  - a) improving the health and reduce the health inequalities of people living and working in Southwark
  - b) reducing poverty and deprivation
  - c) reducing the negative environmental impacts of Southwark's food system
  - d) supporting a vibrant food economy
  - e) celebrating and promoting Southwark's food culture
  - f) enhancing Southwark's food security
  - g) Encouraging health eating in schools.
4. That council assembly asks the executive to report back to council assembly within 6 months on progress in developing the strategy.

## **Comments of the Strategic Director of Environment and Housing**

We recognise and value Southwark's food culture and industry and we are already delivering the key points for the Mayors strategy. We are now a fair-trade borough, have a healthy schools programme, support markets and traders, offer advice, support local food production and have a range of annual food festivals.

However I do agree that it would be advantageous to create a formal food strategy as proposed, but with further emphasis on delivering health benefits to residents by promoting access to affordable foods, tackling obesity and encouraging healthy eating for families. I would also like to stress the environmental impact that food production, transportation and consumption can have within the borough and ensure that our strategy is sustainable in the widest sense.

I am perusing the adoption of a new markets strategy to ensure that their vibrancy, commercial success and contribution to Southwark's economy is secure, and although the council does not own or directly manage allotment spaces, we do offer them strict protection under our planning regulations. I will be looking for further areas and projects to encourage allotment usage and local food production.

## **Council Housing for Southwark**

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on council housing for Southwark was moved by Councillor Nick Statnon and seconded by Councillor Kim Humphreys. The motion was agreed and stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

1. That council welcomes the announcement by the Prime Minister in a speech in January 2009 that: "...if local authorities can convince us that they can deliver quickly and cost effectively more of the housing that Britain needs, and if local authorities can build social housing in sustainable communities that meets the aspirations of the British people for the 21st century, then we will be prepared to give you our full backing and put aside any of the barriers that stand in the way of this happening."
2. That council believes that Southwark is a local authority which has proven its ability to build sustainable communities and to deliver quickly and cost effectively and notes that there are three barriers to the council building new council homes:
  - a) the fact that the council is unable to access grant from the homes and communities agency (HCA) to support the cost of building new homes.
  - b) the high interest rate applying when the council borrows money under current prudential borrowing rules, which set the effective interest rate at an average of historic rates, rather than the current public works loan board (PWLB) rate.
  - c) uncertainty over the future of housing revenue account (HRA) subsidy during the joint CLG/Treasury review, which has not yet issued any proposals.
3. That council notes with concern that despite past commitments and promises from senior Labour politicians, including the current Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, about the 'fourth option' and council home building, these three barriers have remained in place.
4. That council therefore calls on the government to use the next budget to make provision for Southwark and other councils to access grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and to amend borrowing rules to take account of current low interest rates, thereby allowing us to build new council homes.
5. That council calls on the executive to write to the Prime Minister with immediate effect seeking a clear and unequivocal guarantee that his January announcement will be followed by genuine action, rather than repeating the empty promises of the past, which have left so many across the country trapped on housing waiting lists.

### **Comments of the Strategic Director Regeneration and Neighbourhoods**

To follow.

### **Surrey Canal Road Station**

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on Surrey Canal Road station was proposed by Councillor Barrie Hargrove and seconded by Councillor Richard Livingstone. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

#### **Recommendation**

1. That council assembly welcomes the joint funding of £60 million from the Department for Transport and £15 million from Transport for London (TfL) to complete Phase 2 of the East London Line Extension (ELLX).
2. That council assembly notes that funding for a new station at Surrey Canal Road, just over the border in Lewisham, has not yet been secured as part of the scheme. It notes the considerable local demand in South Bermondsey and North Peckham for a new station there and the strong regeneration case for the station.
3. That council assembly calls upon the leaders of all the political groups to write jointly to the Mayor of London and the Transport Secretary urging them to fund this vital piece of public transport infrastructure as part of the planned Phase 2 works. It calls on the executive to work with the Mayor of Lewisham to effectively lobby for the new station.
4. That council assembly notes the strong support for a station at Surrey Canal Road from Millwall FC and calls on the leaders, in their letter to the Mayor, to request that TfL officers meet with Millwall representatives to discuss the proposals and ways to involve the club.
5. That council assembly calls upon the leader of the council to also support Lambeth Council in any bid made for a Brixton ELLX stop, for a better linked inner south London.

#### **Comments of the Strategic Director of Environment and Housing**

In February 2009, the funding package for the delivery of the East London Line through to Clapham Junction was announced. Within this announcement, it was stated that construction of a new station at Surrey Canal Road would be considered as part of a regeneration scheme and will be dependant on a value for money study. This study will be prepared in conjunction with both Lewisham and Southwark and has recently commenced.

Through the boroughs continuing involvement in the East London Line Group (ELLG), officers continue to lobby for improvements to the line and services. In 2008, Lambeth Council rejoined the East London line group and this has been the catalyst for a renewed focus of the ELLG to lobby for a Brixton High Level station of which the group have been supporting.

## **Fuel Poverty Bill**

At council assembly on Wednesday April 8 2009 a motion on the Fuel Poverty Bill was proposed by Councillor Ian Wingfield and seconded by Councillor Susan Elan Jones. The motion was subsequently amended and the amended motion stands referred to the executive as a recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

1. That this council notes that 418 MPs supported the Warm Homes Act during its passage through Parliament.
2. That council further notes that a recent high court judgment ruled that the targets in the Warm Homes Act 2000 were not targets but merely “aspirations”.
3. That council believes that urgent action is needed to help the 4 million people living in fuel poverty in the UK.
4. That council therefore supports David Heath MP’s Fuel Poverty Bill (introduced into Parliament with cross-party support on January 21 2009) which seeks to reinstate the statutory duty to end fuel poverty and focuses on increasing the energy efficiency of the housing stock of the fuel poor. It also requires energy suppliers to provide social tariffs to vulnerable customers in the short-term.
5. That council is therefore disappointed to note that on Friday March 20, the bill failed to proceed beyond second reading as a result of a lack of support in parliament, with only 91 MPs voting for the bill to proceed to its next stage.
6. That council notes that the Labour climate change minister, Joan Ruddock MP spoke against the bill, the Labour chief whip voted against the bill and that 58 Labour MPs who signed an early day motion (EDM) supporting the bill – including 4 with constituencies in London – failed to attend and support the bill.
7. That council further notes that neither of the borough’s Labour MPs attended parliament to vote for the bill to proceed and therefore calls on the executive to write to the MP for Camberwell and Peckham, urging her to use her position as Leader of the House to make parliamentary time available to debate this crucial bill.

### **Comments of the Strategic Director of Environment and Housing**

To follow.