

AMENDMENTS

ITEM 3.3 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS ON THE THEME: MOTION 1 - PUTTING RESIDENTS’ WELFARE FIRST (see page 4 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT A

Moved: Councillor Richard Livingstone

Seconded: Councillor Martin Seaton

Delete paragraphs 1 and 2 and “However” from paragraph 3.

Delete paragraph 4 from “and regrets the fact that...”

Delete paragraph 5.

Add new paragraphs:

- Regrets the fact that reports of a fivefold increase in people claiming discretionary housing payments have been dismissed as “alarmist” by the local Liberal Democrat MP. It also regrets that he has refused to meet with local organisation such as Cooltan Arts to discuss the impact of the reforms and that he missed the “Frontline Welfare” event despite being specifically asked to attend.
- Believes that a cross-party welfare reform group would be unworkable as opposition councillors refuse to accept overwhelming evidence regarding the impact of their government’s welfare reforms.

ITEM 3.3 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS ON THE THEME: MOTION 2 - WELFARE REFORM
(see pages 4 - 5 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT B

Moved: Councillor Eliza Mann
Seconded: Councillor Poddy Clark

Delete all and insert:

Council assembly:

1. Recognises that the annual welfare benefits bill in the UK is £116.1bn, equivalent to 17% of all government expenditure.
2. Understands that reform of the nation’s welfare system is overdue, and would be a necessary element of any government’s agenda in the current economic climate.
3. However, recognises that many Southwark residents are being affected by the welfare reforms, and believes that the council has a vital role to play in protecting particularly its most vulnerable residents from excessive financial burdens through effective use of its discretionary powers and funding.
4. Also believes it is vital that residents are properly informed about the extent of the reforms, who they will affect, and what support is available to them, and regrets the fact that there has been a certain amount of misunderstanding and misinformation about some of the reforms.
5. Therefore calls on cabinet to establish a cross-party welfare reform working group as soon as possible, including opposition councillors and relevant council officers, through which the council can objectively assess the effects of welfare changes in Southwark, ensure that the council is using its staff and resources to help the most vulnerable, and collectively lobby the government.

(Notes:

1. If Motion 1 is carried Amendment B would fall as it is the same as Motion 1.
2. If Motion 1 falls Amendment B would require 16 signatures (council assembly procedure rule 1.11(2) six month rule)).

AMENDMENT C

Moved: Councillor Michael Mitchell
Seconded: Councillor Lewis Robinson

Delete paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5.

In paragraph 4:

- (i) **delete** "these changes" in line 1 and **insert** "the welfare changes"

- (ii) **delete** "avoid the bedroom tax" in the second bullet point and **insert** "assist with meeting the needs of overcrowded households".

In paragraph 6:

Delete third bullet point and **insert** as new bullet point

"consider whether the above lobbying would be more effective if (a) the council ceased subsidising the better-off through the 'free school meals for all primary school pupils policy and (b) if the council by its decision of 28 November 2012 was not forcing some benefit recipients to suffer a 15% reduction in council tax support by refusing to take up a transitional government grant to limit such loss to 8.5% compared with their previous council tax benefit entitlement."

Renumber paragraphs accordingly.

(Note: If Amendment B is carried Amendment C would fall)

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 2 – SURREY DOCKS BROWN BRICK (see pages 7 - 8 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT D

Moved: Councillor Barrie Hargrove

Seconded: Councillor Dan Garfield

Paragraph 4 after “Acknowledges that the Council’s...” **insert** “longstanding”

Delete paragraphs 7 and 8 and **insert:**

“Calls on Cabinet to recognise the important character of the area.”

“Welcomes the work being done in partnership with the community council to address these issues.”

**ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 3 – EAST DULWICH AND RYE LANE
CROWN POST OFFICES** (see page 9 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT E

Moved: Councillor Rosie Shimell
Seconded: Councillor Jonathan Mitchell

Delete all and insert:

Council:

- Welcomes the government’s commitment to the Post Office network.
- Regrets the previous Labour government’s programme of 2,500 Post Office closures and the fact that both Labour MPs in Southwark voted in favour of these closures in Parliament.
- Is concerned that the East Dulwich Crown Post Office is spending £1.48 for every £1 of commission and currently making a large loss.
- Recognises that introducing retail partners for the service may have benefits for residents including increased opening hours.
- However believes that any changes to Post Office services in Southwark should only be undertaken after full and genuine consultation with local councillors and residents, and must not lead to a depreciation in service for residents and local businesses.
- Calls on cabinet to seek assurances from the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State with responsibility for Post Offices that any successful franchisees for Crown Post Offices will be strongly encouraged to pay their staff the London Living Wage.

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 4 – DOOR ENTRY FOR THE DICKENS ESTATE (see page 9 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT F

Moved: Councillor Ian Wingfield

Seconded: Councillor Mark Williams

After paragraph 2 **insert** new paragraph:

“Council notes that, as is often the case, while new security works are being installed on one block, ASB does not remain static and will travel from block to block. This is evidenced by the request in 2011 from the then opposition spokesperson for housing for new security intercom systems for Burton House, claiming this was the priority for the area.”

Delete paragraph 3.

Insert new paragraphs:

“Council recognises that since this request was made in 2011, incidences of crime and ASB have risen at Tupman House, Bardell House, Micawber House and Wade House.”

“Council therefore welcomes the commitment made by the cabinet member for housing to meet with residents of the estate to discuss their priorities for security works on the estate.”

Paragraph 4 **delete** “Council calls on the cabinet...” and **insert** “Council also welcomes the announcement by Cabinet to...”

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 5 – ROBIN HOOD TAX (see page 10 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT G

Moved: Councillor Mark Gettleson

Seconded: Councillor Paul Kyriacou

Delete all and insert:

Council:

- Believes that a financial transaction tax (FTT), also known as a Tobin Tax, has the potential to raise significant government revenue, but only if implemented globally and with careful thought to any potential knock-on effects.
- However also recognises there are many concerns about how a Tobin Tax could be effectively implemented, and notes that:
 - It was not implemented in 13 years of the previous Labour government
 - In 2002, then Prime Minister Gordon Brown said that a Tobin Tax “has very substantial drawbacks”, “has failed to command the international support that is necessary” and has “big problems attached to it”
 - In 2002, then chief economic adviser and now Shadow Chancellor Ed Balls, said “It’s not at all clear the Tobin tax is stabilising; in fact, it could well be destabilising”
 - In 2008 Gordon Brown also said that a Tobin Tax “has been found by many people who have looked at it not to be implementable”
 - In 2011, Harriet Harman MP said such a tax could only be supported if it was brought in globally, “because if you do it just in Europe, then possibly these companies will just shift out of Europe to the rest of the world”.
- Recognises that implementing such a tax is a decision for national government in cooperation with the international community rather than for local councillors in Southwark
- Therefore calls on councillors in favour of implementing a Tobin Tax to raise this issue with Southwark MPs.

ITEM 5.2 – MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 6 – NORTHERN LINE EXTENSION (see page 10 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT H

Moved: Councillor Neil Coyle

Seconded: Councillor Patrick Diamond

After paragraph 5 **insert:**

“Notes the letter from the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling to TfL which already addresses the above points.”

ITEM 5.2 –MEMBERS’ MOTIONS: MOTION 7 – ON THE SIDE OF DISABLED RESIDENTS (see page 11 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT I

Moved: Councillor Toby Eckersley
Seconded: Councillor Michael Mitchell

In paragraph 4 after "alternative arrangements" **add** "consistent with devolution of decision-making to local elected members".

AMENDMENT J

Moved: Councillor Fiona Colley
Seconded: Councillor Victoria Mills

Delete paragraphs 2 and 3

Paragraph 4, after “alternative arrangements..” **delete** all and **insert:**

“... for a bay to be installed.”

ITEM 8.3 – CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW 2013/14 (see pages 101 – 188 of the main agenda)

AMENDMENT K

Moved: Councillor Jonathan Mitchell

Seconded: Councillor Catherine Bowman

In the main report, **delete** paragraph 57. Renumber subsequent paragraphs.

In 'Appendix E – Revised Member and Officer Protocol', **delete** paragraph 35 and **insert:**

35. In relation to visits to front-line services by members, members should consider advising relevant chief officers in advance of such visits. In the case of unannounced visits to front-line services, members should take care not to disrupt organisations unreasonably. If the visit is of a statutory inspection nature other procedures apply.