

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	