

Item No. 7.1	Classification: Open	Date: 4 July 2012	Meeting Name: Council Assembly
Report title:		Report back on motions referred to cabinet from council assembly	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Cabinet	

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAM SERGEANTS

Cabinet on 25 January 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 29 November 2011 which had been moved by Councillor Catherine Bowman and seconded by Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly regrets the loss of five safer neighbourhood team sergeants in Southwark which is a direct result of the government's 20% cut in the police grant. Council assembly further regrets the decision by the Mayor for London to make these cuts irrespective of the level of crime in any borough.
2. That council assembly notes that MPs from all parties had an opportunity to vote against this 20% cut in funding if they wanted to preserve police numbers in Southwark. It welcomes the fact Harriet Harman and Tessa Jowell voted against this cut, but regrets that Simon Hughes, once again, abstained.
3. That council assembly notes that the council's budget allocated £5.5 million in contingency funds and that the figure of £9.5 million is incorrectly calculated. Council assembly further notes that the quarter 2 revenue monitoring report considered by cabinet on 22 November indicates that £2.6 million of this contingency fund may need to be used to offset pressures in departmental budgets this year.
4. That council assembly believes the council has demonstrated its ability to protect people from the worst excesses of the government; for instance, by introducing a £3 million youth fund as a direct response to the cut to educational maintenance allowances and the trebling of tuition fees.
5. That in the circumstances, council assembly urges the government to reverse its reckless cut to the Metropolitan Police's budget and calls on Mayor Boris Johnson to maintain police numbers in Southwark.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – MOTION ON THEMED DEBATE: ENVIRONMENT

Cabinet on 20 March 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 25 January 2012 which had been moved by Councillor James Barber and seconded by Councillor Paul Noblet and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly believes that even in times of austerity protecting our natural environment is one of the most important issues for the borough and must remain a key priority for the council.
2. That council assembly believes this is recognised by all political parties and so calls on councillors to work together to suggest innovative ways for the council and Southwark residents to tackle carbon emissions and protect our natural environment.
3. That council assembly notes that the majority of emissions from transport in Southwark are from road vehicles and welcomes the council's transport plan which aims to reduce the impact of transport on air quality by encouraging sustainable travel choices within the borough.
4. That council assembly believes that the council should set an example in energy efficiency and welcomes the fact that it has delivered on its promise to reduce carbon emissions in council buildings by 8.5%.
5. That council assembly welcomes the introduction of food waste recycling to all street-based properties in the borough and notes the impact this is already having in areas involved in the scheme where recycling has increased to 51%.
6. That council assembly calls on members to consider these issues and discuss:
 - How the council can encourage more sustainable travel, especially safe cycling and walking
 - How the council can promote energy efficiency, not just in buildings owned by the council, but in all properties
 - Given the huge reductions in the council's budget this year and in the coming years, how the council can protect the public realm, Southwark's parks and green spaces.
7. That council assembly notes the stated aim of the coalition government to be the "greenest government ever" and calls on members to consider how Southwark can use government funding to support green investment and green jobs in our borough.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – CHANGES TO NHS SOUTHWARK

Cabinet on 20 March 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 25 January 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Neil Coyle and seconded by Councillor Mark Williams and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly recognises and appreciates the excellent work done by doctors, nurses and other health workers in Southwark.

2. That council assembly believes the government's Health and Adult Social Care Bill is creating uncertainty in the NHS at a time when budgets are already tight and regrets that Southwark PCT will be required to hold back £21 million, which could be spent on patient care, to pay for the government's reorganisation.
3. That council assembly believes the government's top down reorganisation lacks direction and is an unnecessary distraction to Southwark's NHS staff at a time when they want to focus on patient care.
4. That council assembly also notes that the number of people in Southwark waiting more than 18 weeks from referral to treatment has increased by 168% since May 2010 – the largest increase in London.
5. That council assembly believes the government's decision to abolish waiting time targets has led to this increase in Southwark and now means fewer than 90% of Southwark patients are being treated within 18 weeks.
6. That council assembly believes giving patients' certainty about when they will be treated is fundamentally important to their health and that low waiting times are a benchmark for excellence in the NHS.
7. That council assembly welcomes the opposition of Harriet Harman and Tessa Jowell to the government's NHS reforms and notes Simon Hughes's comments on 8 December that there had been a "particular issue" in Southwark regarding waiting times. It hopes that instead of blaming hardworking NHS staff in Southwark Simon Hughes will take their side and oppose the government's NHS reforms.
8. That council assembly rejects David Cameron's assertion that there was a "real problem" with nursing in UK hospitals and believes that if the Conservative/ Liberal Democrat government really wants to help nurses in Southwark to focus on patient care, it should listen to what nurses are saying and drop this unnecessary health bill.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – SAVE CHAMBERS WHARF

Cabinet on 20 March 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 25 January 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Peter John and seconded by Councillor Claire Hickson and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly notes the unquestionable importance of a clean River Thames, but notes the purchase of Chambers Wharf by Thames Water and that it is the company's preferred construction site in Southwark for a "Super Sewer" junction.
2. That council assembly notes that 150 residential properties, two schools with over 1000 students and the Thames Path are situated very near to the Chambers Wharf site.
3. That council assembly regrets the impact Thames Water's plans could have on the local community and notes that construction will take at least seven years,

three years of which will be 24 hours a day for 7 days a week. This will not only lead to an increase in noise pollution but to increased heavy vehicle traffic on the local roads, which are not only narrow but also where the schools are located posing a real danger to school children and local residents.

4. That council assembly believes construction so close to residents and schools for such a length of time would be a major source of air pollution possibly causing respiratory illnesses, asthma and bronchitis.
5. That council assembly is also concerned that Southwark residents' water bills are likely to increase by £70 per year if Thames Water's proposal goes ahead and, once completed, Thames Water cannot guarantee there will not be sewage smells from the site.
6. That council assembly requests the cabinet to call on Thames Water to find an alternative non-residential site to Chambers Wharf that will have no impact on Southwark residents and welcomes the report of the Selborne Commission which has been set up by a number of riverside London councils to examine alternatives to the Thames Tunnel.
7. That council assembly calls on all political groups in Southwark and local MPs to stand up to Thames Water in opposing Chambers Wharf as a construction site and to respond to the phase 2 consultation. Council assembly also welcomes Simon Hughes MP's calls for a debate on the floor of the House of Commons and calls for all Southwark's MPs to take part in this.
8. That council assembly recognises and formally thanks the Save Your Riverside campaign for all their hard work in raising awareness of the issue and detailing credible technical arguments to challenge Thames Water.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – MOTION ON THEMED DEBATE – OLDER PEOPLE

Cabinet on 15 May 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 28 March 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Michael Situ and seconded by Councillor Kevin Ahern.

1. That council assembly acknowledges that:
 - 10 million people in the UK are over the age of 65 and this will rise to 15.5 million by 2035
 - 3 million are over the age of 80 and this is set to double in 20 years time.
2. That council assembly welcomes and celebrates the fact that we are all living longer and pays tribute to the amazing contribution older people make to Southwark's diverse communities, economy and society as a whole.
3. That council assembly calls on members to recognise this contribution and discuss how more can be made of the opportunities that longer lives bring with particular focus on:

- How the council can recognise the role that people in later life often play in their communities, through volunteering, caring and by playing an active role in neighbourhood life
 - How people in Southwark can take advantage of the wide variety of sporting, educational and social activities available as they get older
 - How the council can promote the greater role that more active grandparents play in their families' lives
 - How the council can work with the NHS and other partners to give older people more choice in the services they receive, enabling them to live healthy lives and stay in their own homes and communities for longer.
4. That council assembly also recognises the council's important role in caring for older people who require care and support.
 5. That council assembly notes that £1.3 billion has already been cut from local council budgets for older people's social care and believes the council should strive to create an adult care system that helps older people to find the support they need, enabling them to live healthy, independent lives in their own communities and homes, rather than retaining a long-term dependency on council services, whilst also protecting our most vulnerable older residents.
 6. That council assembly also recognises that many of the groups in Southwark that provide services to older people have lost their funding through government cuts and so welcomes the council's "innovation fund" which is enabling local organisations to become more self-sustaining going forward.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – UNIVERSAL CREDIT

Cabinet on 15 May 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 28 March 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Richard Livingstone and seconded by Councillor Chris Brown and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly notes that, starting in October 2013, universal credit will begin to replace income support, job seekers allowance, employment and support allowance, housing benefit, working tax credit, child tax credit and support for mortgage interest.
2. That council assembly recognises that universal credit is a household benefit and that the income from universal credit will therefore be critical to the household incomes of thousands of its residents who are both in and out of work.
3. That council assembly therefore believes that the quality of the universal credit 'service' will be important to the lives of its citizens and that the planned reliance on a web based delivery model backed up by remote call centres without the inclusion of a local, easily accessible, face to face service element puts the successful introduction of universal credit at significant risk.
4. That council assembly therefore calls on the cabinet:
 - 1) To approach Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and raise its concerns.

- 2) To develop jointly with DWP local arrangements for the delivery of universal credit and to report back on progress to the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, specifically addressing the resources required and responses to the following basic questions:
 - How will someone apply locally?
 - Where will they apply locally?
 - Where will they take required documents locally?
 - Where will the local 'universal credit' office be and what office accommodation will be required?
 - How will the skills and experience of existing benefits staff be utilised and how many staff will be needed?
 - How does an individual citizen get face to face advice and help if they have a problem?

- 3) To support the Local Government Association in pressing for universal credit to be administered by local authorities.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – POST OFFICES FOR SOUTHWARK

Cabinet on 15 May 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 28 March 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Catherine Bowman and seconded by Councillor Anood Al-Samerai and subsequently amended.

1. That council assembly notes the importance of local post office branches in Southwark for local people, small businesses and the community as a whole.

2. That council assembly regrets the closure of post offices in Southwark in 2002 and 2008. It notes that Essex Council acted to save the post offices in Essex that were under threat in 2008. It further notes that Labour in Southwark campaigned for the Liberal Democrat/Tory council in Southwark to take similar action at the time, but that it chose not to.

3. That council assembly notes that 48% of the £1.34 billion of 'new money' announced by the government for investment in the post office to aid the privatisation of Royal Mail is existing subsidy and that the four year package of funding is £360m less than the last Labour government's funding package of £1.7bn in 2006.

4. That council assembly notes that under the government's network transformation plans thousands of post offices will be closed and replaced with counters in shops, off licences and petrol stations – known as 'Post Office Locals'. Locals will not provide:
 - international parcels and parcels weighing over 5kg and 6kg respectively
 - Parcel Force Express Services parcels
 - manual cash deposits and withdrawals
 - change giving service to small businesses
 - post office financial services and insurance products
 - manual bill payment services

- passport, car tax and DVLA services
 - on-demand foreign currency
 - payment by cheque.
5. That council assembly notes the widespread concern about the effects of network transformation has led to 75 MPs, including five Liberal Democrats, to call for a moratorium on the plans, and the Business, Innovation and Skills select committee will be holding an inquiry in May.
 6. That council assembly notes the comments of the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety in 5 January's Southwark News, welcoming the Southwark Liberal Democrats' "Damascene conversion" and committing the council to working "with the post office to look into whether it is possible to combine post office services with other facilities".
 7. That council assembly calls on the cabinet to follow through with this commitment and report back on progress in not more than six months.
 8. That council assembly notes the previous Liberal Democrat and Tory administration's decision to relocate Bermondsey One Stop Shop and welcomes the decision to locate alternative facilities at 11 Market Place in The Blue.
 9. That council assembly condemns Southwark Liberal Democrats' proposal to delay the introduction of these facilities at The Blue which could potentially result in a period where those services would be unavailable in the north-east of the borough.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – SOUTH LONDON LINE REPLACEMENT

Cabinet on 15 May 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 28 March 2012 which had been moved by Councillor Renate Hamvas and seconded by Councillor Mark Glover.

1. That council assembly notes that the South London Line is a well-used regular train service linking Victoria and London Bridge. Thousands of Southwark residents use it on a daily basis, as it serves Denmark Hill, Peckham Rye, Queens Road, Peckham Station, South Bermondsey and London Bridge from early morning until late evening seven days a week.
2. That council assembly regrets that this service is due to be cancelled later this year when the East London Line spur from Surrey Quays to Clapham Junction is opened. There will be a reduced service from Peckham Rye, Queens Road and South Bermondsey to London Bridge. As a consequence of the cancellation of the South London Line, Southwark residents will no longer have a train connection to Victoria in the evenings and early mornings and half the current service at other times.
3. That council assembly notes that the service that will remain if no replacement is offered is the Victoria to Dartford service that starts at rush hour and finishes in the early evening. The Victoria to Dartford service is already unfit for purpose. Southwark residents are walking to New Cross to get southbound trains in the morning as the service starts too late. Also, residents cannot access by train, a

key connection with the Docklands Light Railway/train hub at Lewisham outside Monday to Saturday peak hours. For two years, the First Capital Connect service has been diverted to Victoria in the evenings. The level of use of this service and the soon to be axed South London Line has shown there is great demand for an evening service to Victoria from the Southwark stations.

4. That council assembly believes the new East London Line is a welcome addition to transport links for Southwark residents. It is however, very much a supplement rather than a substitute to existing routes, as Clapham Junction is geographically a very different destination to Victoria. It is understood that due to routing challenges, with the increased line use that changes to the current service may be necessary. However, suitable substitutes need to be in place.
5. That council assembly supports the proposal for the Victoria to Dartford service to become a full, early morning until midnight seven-day a week service (two trains per hour in each direction), complementing a full First Capital Connect Sevenoaks to Bedford service via Blackfriars. Additional service would be provided during peak hours (similar to the current Victoria to Dartford service) with two trains per hour between Victoria and Bellingham. This would result in maintenance of the current train frequency at Denmark Hill and Peckham Rye to and from Victoria and an increase of two trains per hour at Nunhead. Two trains per hour would still be lost from Queen's Road Station; however, Nunhead Station is 10 minutes walk from Queen's Road.

We noted and agreed the motion.

MOTION FROM MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURE RULE 2.10 (6) – GAY MARRIAGE

Cabinet on 15 May 2012 considered the following motion referred from council assembly on 28 March 2012 which had been moved by Councillor David Noakes and seconded by Councillor Abdul Mohamed.

1. That this council acknowledges the role of individual parliamentarians, of all parties and no parties, and successive governments since the early 1990's to introduce legislation to provide equal rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in the UK.
2. That this council notes and welcomed the introduction of civil partnerships for same-sex couples by the last government.
3. That this council supports the current government's proposals to consult on how to enable same-sex couples to have a civil marriage and the subsequent introduction of legislation in this parliament to make this a reality.

We noted and agreed the motion.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Cabinet agenda and minutes – 24 January, 20 March and 15 May 2012.	Constitutional Team, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Manager	
Report Author	Paula Thornton, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 June 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	21 June 2012	