

# **COUNCIL MINUTES**

(ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING)

WEDNESDAY 29 JANUARY 2014



## PRESENT

The Mayor Councillor Frances Stainton  
Deputy Mayor Councillor Adronie Alford

### Councillors:

Michael Adam	Tom Crofts	Andrew Johnson
Colin Aherne	Charlie Dewhirst	Donald Johnson
Nicholas Botterill	Belinda Donovan	Andrew Jones
Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler	Gavin Donovan	Alex Karmel
Andrew Brown	Rachel Ford	Mark Loveday
Joe Carlebach	Marcus Ginn	PJ Murphy
Michael Cartwright	Peter Graham	Caroline Needham
Elaine Chumnerly	Steve Hamilton	Harry Phibbs
Iain Coleman	Wesley Harcourt	Max Schmid
Georgie Cooney	Lisa Homan	Greg Smith
Stephen Cowan	Robert Iggulden	Mercy Umeh
Oliver Craig	Lucy Ivimy	Rory Vaughan

## **26. MINUTES**

7pm – **RESOLVED:**

The minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 23 October 2013 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

## **27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Helen Binmore, Daryl Brown, Alex Chalk, Ali De Lisle, Jane Law, Sally Powell, Matt Thorley and Peter Tobias.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Joe Carlebach and Oliver Craig.

## **28. MAYOR'S/CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor congratulated Councillor Alex Karmel and Councillor Jane Law on the birth of their daughter Charlotte.

The Mayor announced the sad news that Keith Simpson's (Assistant Mayoral Officer) Mother had passed away and noted any messages of condolences could be sent to the Mayor's Office.

The Mayor asked that a minute silence be held in respect of the death of Nelson Mandela, one of the greatest people of our time.

## **29. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Mark Loveday declared an other significant interest in respect of agenda item 6.4 Petitioning High Speed 2 (HS2) Hybrid Bill, as he was Chair of the Consultative Committee for HS2 for the section between Kilburn and Ealing. He also declared an other significant interest in respect of Special Motion 7 Cutting Crime in Ravenscourt Road, as he was a resident and owner of a property in the ward, which was the subject of the motion. He considered that they did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussions and vote thereon.

Councillor Steve Hamilton declared an other significant interest in respect of Special Motion 1 Sullivan Primary School, as he was an LEA appointed Governor at Sullivan Primary School. He considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion and vote thereon.

Councillor Cooney stated that the legal advice she had been given was that she does not have any interest to declare but in the interest of transparency she would like to mention that she knows a lot of people who were involved with schools, some of whom were friends. For example, she knew Councillor Steve Hamilton, who was a Governor at Sullivan School, whom she had worked with for four years. She had known Arabella Northey, who was a founding member of Fulham Boys School, for many years. The position of Fulham Boys School was not a material consideration for this decision. There was a long list of members of Governing bodies plus teachers whom she had trained whilst she had lectured on the OCR Level 5 – Teaching Understanding Learners with specific learning difficulties who she may still see occasionally. She did not consider that she had any interests to declare under the Code of Conduct relating to Special Motion 1 Sullivan Primary School.

## **30. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Under Standing Order 15(e)(xii), Councillor Loveday moved to suspend Standing Order 12(a) so that at least one question from each of the topics submitted would be asked. This would include up to the completion of Public Question No. 6, in the event that if it had not already been answered.

The motion was put to the vote:

FOR	22
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

30.1 Question 1 - Mr Adam Connell

7.12pm - The Mayor called on Mr Adam Connell who had submitted a question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Nicholas Botterill) to ask his question. The Leader responded. Mr Connell asked a supplementary question which was also answered.

30.2 Question 2 - Mr Robert Largan

7.16pm - The Mayor called on Mr Robert Largan who had submitted a question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Nicholas Botterill) to ask his question. The Leader responded.

30.3 Question 3 - Mr Rowan Ree

7.22pm - The Mayor called on Mr Rowan Ree who had submitted a question to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Residents Services (Councillor Greg Smith) to ask his question. The Deputy Leader responded. Mr Ree asked a supplementary question which was also answered.

30.4 Question 4 - Mr Larry Culhane

7.26pm - The Mayor called on Mr Larry Culhane who had submitted a question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Nicholas Botterill) to ask his question. The Leader responded. Mr Culhane asked a supplementary question which was also answered.

30.5 Question 5 - Ms Emily Genochio

7.33pm - The Mayor called on Ms Emily Genochio who had submitted a question to the Cabinet Member for Education (Councillor Georgie Cooney) to ask her question. The Cabinet Member for Education responded. Ms Genochio asked a supplementary question which was also answered.

30.6 Question 6 - Ms Wendy Aldridge

Ms Wendy Aldridge was unable to attend the meeting. A written response would be sent to Ms Aldridge following the meeting.

30.7 Question 7 - Ms Rosie Wait

7.35pm - The Mayor called on Ms Rosie Wait who had submitted a question to the Cabinet Member for Education (Councillor Georgie Cooney) to ask her question. The Cabinet Member for Education responded. Ms Wait asked a supplementary question which was also answered.

30.8 Question 8 - Ms Josephine Miller

7.31pm – The Mayor called on Ms Josephine Miller who had submitted a question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Nicholas Botterill) to ask her question. The Leader responded.

(A copy of all the public questions submitted and the replies given are attached at **Appendices 1 - 8** to these minutes).

**31. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS**

31.1 Council Tax Support 2014/15

7.38pm - The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nicholas Botterill.

Speeches on the report were made by Councillors Nicholas Botterill and Peter Graham (for the Administration) and Councillors Stephen Cowan, Andrew Jones and PJ Murphy (for the Opposition).

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED**.

7.55pm **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council continues to award a council tax discount as though the Council Tax Benefit regulations were still in place, meaning that no one currently in receipt of council tax support will be worse off; and
- (2) That the Council adopts what has been known as the government's "default scheme" for its working age claimants that runs as though the regulations for council tax benefit were still in place.

The applicable amounts will be uprated in line with the prescribed scheme, or if not relevant to the prescribed scheme, in line with housing benefit regulations. The same will apply for non-dependant deductions and second adult rebate. The overall intention is to continue awarding the support as though the council tax benefit regulations were still in place.

31.2 Council Tax Base and Collection Rate 2014/2015 and Delegation of the Business Rates Estimate

7.56pm - The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nicholas Botterill.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED**.

7.56pm **RESOLVED:**

That Council approve the following recommendations for the financial year 2014/15:

- (1) That the estimated numbers of properties for each Valuation Band as set out in the report be approved.
- (2) That an estimated Collection rate of 97.5% be approved.
- (3) That the Council Tax Base of 69,875 Band "D" equivalent properties be approved.
- (4) That the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be delegated authority to determine the business rates tax base for 2014/15 as set out in section 10 of the report.

31.3 Treasury Mid-Year Review 2013-14

7.57pm - The report and recommendation were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nicholas Botterill.

Speeches on the report were made by Councillor Nicholas Botterill (for the Administration) and Councillor Stephen Cowan (for the Opposition).

The report and recommendation were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED**.

7.58pm **RESOLVED:**

That the Council's debt, borrowing and investment activity up to the 30 September 2013 be noted.

31.4 Petitioning High Speed 2 (HS2) Hybrid Bill

7.59pm - The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nicholas Botterill.

Speeches on the report were made by Councillors Nicholas Botterill, Andrew Brown, Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler and Mark Loveday (for the Administration) and Councillor Wesley Harcourt (for the Opposition). It was agreed that the report would include reference to protecting Wormwood Scrubs.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED.**

8.19pm **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council welcomes and supports the decision to locate the HS2 station in the Old Oak Opportunity Area. The resulting potential for regeneration and growth is huge with substantial benefits not only for local people but London in general;
- (2) Despite resolution 1 above that in the judgement of the Council it is expedient for the Council to oppose the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill introduced in the Session of Parliament 2013-14; and
- (3) That the Executive Director Transport and Technical services take all necessary steps to carry the foregoing Resolution into effect, that the Common Seal be affixed to any necessary documents and that confirmation be given that Sharpe Pritchard (Parliamentary Agents) be authorised to sign the Petition of the Council against the Bill.

31.5 Review of the Council's Constitution and Changes to Annual Council Date

8.20pm - The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nicholas Botterill.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED.**

8.20pm **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the changes to the Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust Committee terms of reference, as summarised in section 5.3 of the report and attached as Appendix 1, be approved;
- (2) The amendment to the Bi – Borough Director of Transportation and Technical services scheme of delegation as authorised by the Monitoring Officer, be noted; and
- (3) That the change of date for the next Annual Council meeting from Wednesday 28 May 2014 to Monday 16 June 2014, be approved.

31.6 Health and Wellbeing Board: Governance Arrangements

8.21pm - The report and recommendation were formally moved for adoption by the Cabinet Member for Community Care, Councillor Marcus Ginn.

Speeches on the report were made by Councillors Rory Vaughan and Stephen Cowan (for the Opposition) and Councillor Marcus Ginn (for the Administration).

The report and recommendation were put to the vote:

FOR	24
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED.**

8.30pm **RESOLVED:**

That two additional representatives of the Clinical Commissioning Group be appointed to the Health and Wellbeing Board and that all members of the Health and Wellbeing Board, including Council officers are entitled to vote.

31.7 Review of Polling Stations and Polling Districts

8.31pm - The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Cabinet Member for Communications and Chief Whip, Councillor Mark Loveday.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The report and recommendations were declared **CARRIED.**



8.31pm **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the polling place for CPD polling district be Brickfields Hall, Shinfield Street, W12;
- (2) That the polling place for HBC polling place be the Macbeth Centre, Macbeth Street, W6;
- (3) That the polling place for PGB polling district be Holy Cross School, Basuto Road, SW6;
- (4) That the polling place for WWB polling district be the White City Community Centre, India Way, W12;
- (5) That polling arrangements for other polling districts remain unchanged; and
- (6) That the boundaries of all polling districts remain unchanged.

## **32. SPECIAL MOTIONS**

8.32pm - Under Standing Order 15(e) (iii), Councillor Mark Loveday moved that Special Motions 8 and 11 take precedence on the agenda over all Special Motions other than Special Motion 1.

The motion was put to the vote:

FOR	24
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED.**

### **32.1 Special Motion 1 - Sullivan Primary School**

8.34pm – Councillor Caroline Needham moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Cowan, the special motion standing in their names:

“This Council congratulates Sullivan Primary School on the recognition received from both Boris Johnson, the London Mayor and David Laws MP, the Minister of State for Schools, in respect of the school’s excellent academic results.

The Council supports the addition of a high quality secondary school in the south of the Borough but agrees that the excellent Sullivan Primary School should remain open and a new site found for the free school that does not involve cannibalising Sullivan Primary School”.

Speeches on the special motion were made by Councillors Caroline Needham, Stephen Cowan and Lisa Homan (for the Opposition) and Councillor Steve Hamilton (for the Administration).

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Georgie Cooney moved, seconded by Councillor Marcus Ginn an amendment to the motion as follows:

"Delete Name of Motion and insert "Fulham Schools"

Delete all after "congratulates" and insert:

"... all the borough's primary schools and pupils on their recent academic achievements, including Sullivan and New King's Primary Schools.

The Council supports the addition of a high quality secondary school to improve further the opportunities for our children in the south of the borough and believes that all practicable sites should be considered as a permanent location for it."

Speeches on the amendment to the special motion were made by Councillors Georgie Cooney, Marcus Ginn, Donald Johnson, Mark Loveday and Andrew Brown (for the Administration) and by Councillors Stephen Cowan, Elaine Chumnerly, Andrew Jones, Max Schmid and Caroline Needham (for the Opposition).

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	24
AGAINST	13
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED.**

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Stephen Cowan moved, seconded by Councillor Mercy Umeh an amendment to the motion as follows:

"Delete all in the amended motion and replace with:

The Council notes with concern the email sent at 1.38pm today by the Chair of Governors, Sullivan Primary School to the Administration, which reads.

*"I would like to formally register my complaint to the Council for the timing of the meeting. I have looked back over Council meetings and I have struggled to find any examples of Council meetings scheduled for the morning.*

*I put it to you that this time has been selected specifically to make it difficult for both members of the Committee and the public to attend the meeting. I would ask you to consider postponing the date and time, selecting a new date in the evening, as has always been the practice by the Council, when its officers, councillors and the public, have more opportunity of attending. Do you think this would be a more democratic approach?*

*I also would have appreciated the courtesy of an email to the Governing Body and the Head Teacher at Sullivan, informing us of the meeting, given the meeting has been called to discuss Sullivan Primary. Another example of an unjust and at worst, flawed consultation process and administration by the Council.*

*I hope you will consider my request and advise me of the date when the meeting will be rescheduled.”*

The Council urges Cllr. Donald Johnson, the select committee chair, (Con), Cllr Tom Crofts (Con) , Cllr Charlie Dewhirst (Con), Cllr Belinda Donovan (Con), Cllr Harry Phibbs (Con) and Cllr. Matt Thorley (Con) to work with opposition and co-opted members of the Education and Children’s Services Select Committee in recognising the reasonable nature of this request, to consult with governors of Sullivan Primary School and other stakeholders to agree a more suitable time and date for the issues raised in the call-in to be properly considered.”

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Stephen Cowan, Mercy Umeh, PJ Murphy and Lisa Homan (for the Opposition) and Councillors Nicholas Botterill and Donald Johnson (for the Administration).

The amendment was put to the vote and a roll-call was requested:

FOR

AHERNE  
CARTWRIGHT  
CHUMNERY  
COWAN  
HARCOURT  
HOMAN  
JONES  
MURPHY  
NEEDHAM  
SCHMID  
UMEH  
VAUGHAN

AGAINST

ADAM  
ALFORD  
BOTTERILL  
BROCKLEBANK-FOWLER  
BROWN (A)  
CARLEBACH  
COONEY  
CRAIG  
CROFTS  
DEWHIRST  
DONOVAN (B)  
DONOVAN (G)  
FORD  
GINN  
GRAHAM  
IGGULDEN  
IVIMY

JOHNSON (A)  
JOHNSON (D)  
KARMEL  
LOVEDAY  
PHIBBS  
SMITH  
STANTON

FOR	12
AGAINST	24
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion as amended was declared **CARRIED**.

10.06pm – **RESOLVED:**

Fulham Schools

This Council congratulates all the borough's primary schools and pupils on their recent academic achievements, including Sullivan and New King's Primary Schools.

The Council supports the addition of a high quality secondary school to improve further the opportunities for our children in the south of the borough and believes that all practicable sites should be considered as a permanent location for it.

### 32.2 Special Motion 8 - A Safer Hammersmith & Fulham

10.07pm – Councillor Greg Smith moved, seconded by Councillor Steve Hamilton, the special motion standing in their names:

“This Council:

1. Welcomes the significant fall in crime in Hammersmith & Fulham since 2006, equating to 8,000 fewer crimes a year.
2. Congratulates the hard work of the Borough's police officers.
3. Notes the significant role H&F Council has played in this success, through providing 44 extra warranted police officers, expanding the borough's CCTV network to over 800 cameras with a 24/7 control room, funding car, bicycle and house sting operations, cracking down on problem licensed premises,

introducing a borough wide controlled drinking zone and pioneering integrated offender management.

4. Resolves to continue putting the fight against crime and anti-social behaviour at the top of its agenda.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Lisa Homan moved, seconded by Councillor Caroline Needham, an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Remove all after This Council and replace with:

- 1) Welcomes the reduction of crime nationally and in Hammersmith & Fulham since 1996.
- 2) Congratulates the hard work of the Boroughs police officers, council staff and local residents who have contributed to community safety in Hammersmith & Fulham.
- 3) Express’s deep concern that the UK Statistics Authority has withdrawn official status from recorded crime figures until Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary is able to clear up the “*degree of fiddling*” that has taken place, and the impact this has on reliability of crime statistics in Hammersmith & Fulham.
- 4) Notes considerable concern amongst local residents that since the boroughs Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been dismantled, police visibility has dramatically decreased, and inclusive, wide reaching participation by the community in local policing matters has disappeared.
- 5) Notes that Hammersmith and Fulham’s police numbers have fallen by 32 since the last local elections in 2010.
- 6) Notes that in 2006, the cabinet member for residents services claimed he would deliver a 60% to 80% fall in crime and provide every ward with 24/7 neighbourhood policing. But failed to achieve even the 10% fall in crime that occurred under that last Labour Administration and is now an apologist for the cuts in ward sergeants, cuts in police numbers and the ending of the neighbourhood police teams.
- 7) Resolves to take actions to help restore falling police morale, restore neighbourhood policing and support local police so they more effectively work with residents in the continued fight against crime and anti-social behaviour in Hammersmith & Fulham.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	24
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

The substantive motion was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	12

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.07pm – **RESOLVED**:

This Council:

1. Welcomes the significant fall in crime in Hammersmith & Fulham since 2006, equating to 8,000 fewer crimes a year.
2. Congratulates the hard work of the Borough's police officers.
3. Notes the significant role H&F Council has played in this success, through providing 44 extra warranted police officers, expanding the borough's CCTV network to over 800 cameras with a 24/7 control room, funding car, bicycle and house sting operations, cracking down on problem licensed premises, introducing a borough wide controlled drinking zone and pioneering integrated offender management.
4. Resolves to continue putting the fight against crime and anti-social behaviour at the top of its agenda.

### 32.3 Special Motion 11 - Housing

10.08pm – Councillor Andrew Johnson moved, seconded by Councillor Harry Phibbs, the special motion standing in their names:

“That this Council notes the successful record of the Conservative administration in seeking to ‘Build a Borough of Housing Opportunity’ through:

- The introduction of a new, fairer, and more transparent, allocations policy which gives greater priority to those eligible people who work or make a community contribution, which prevents those would-be applicants earning over £40,200 from joining the register, which introduces a minimum five year local connection criteria and which prevents those people not eligible for social housing from joining the register at all;
- Fixed-term tenancies within the Borough, allowing the Council as a landlord to make better use of its housing stock and provide a flexible approach to delivering a housing options service;
- A revised HomeBuy register of nearly 6000 for those who live or work in the borough who have a household income of up to £66,000pa, where top priority is given to existing council and housing association tenants, members of the armed forces and police officers, and
- The successful lobbying of Government to increase the maximum Right to Buy discount to £100,000 and the proposals to introduce the Right to Buy Part

which is supported by the Mayor of London in the draft London Housing Strategy 2013.

That this Council resolves to expand homeownership opportunities for local residents by:

- Continuing to work with public and private bodies to deliver thousands of new homes in the Old Oak Common, White City and Earl's Court Opportunity Areas;
- Increasing the supply of new housing for low cost homeownership using council land and assets;
- Allowing higher earning tenants to be able to convert to a form of low cost homeownership at the end of their fixed-term tenancy;
- Enabling a greater proportion of council tenants to own part of their own home through shared ownership including Right to Part Buy, a deposit fund or disposal under a Discount Market Sale (DMS) model, and
- Creating tenure forms such as Discount Market Rent to enable would be homeowners to save for a deposit to purchase a DMS unit, thereby creating a cycle of housing opportunity."

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Stephen Cowan moved, seconded by Councillor Michael Cartwright, an amendment to the motion as follows:

"Deletes all after the word "administration" in the first sentence and adds:

"... in delivering it's distorted priority of agreeing more new homes for overseas investors than it has for local residents. The Council recognises that this has been detrimental and added to the current housing crisis. It notes that Conservative councillors have repeatedly voted against building affordable homes to buy and rent that *"Londoners can afford"* as they are required to do by the GLA.

The Council regrets the Administration:

- Using mechanisms to allow property developers to duck out of their responsibilities to build affordable housing to buy or rent
- Consistently arguing at Planning Applications Committee meetings that it needs to put property developers' profits over the concerns residents have over developments that share a lack of affordable housing, being too dense, too tall, too much massing, and out of character with or detrimental to many Borough neighbourhoods
- Offering a third of all the Borough's council estates for demolition to property developers here in the UK and at conferences in Cannes on the French Riviera
- The cabinet member for housing telling a housing magazine in 2006 that the Conservative Administration regretted the Decent Homes programme and had been *"Saddled"* with it.
- Record increases in council rents and service charges
- Their simple caricaturing of all residents of social housing as *"locked in a dependency and expectancy culture"*
- Lobby for the ending of genuinely affordable rents and the introduction of near market rents at 80% of market value

- Its failure to take imaginative policies to increase home ownership, tackle overcrowding, prevent homelessness and make a positive impact on London's housing crisis.

The Council notes the Shelter report that states how the average twenty something now has a less than 15% chance of getting onto the property ladder, and resolves to:

- lobby Government to increase opportunities for home ownership
- Adhere to planning guidelines that make more homes available for residents to buy
- Genuinely expand homeownership opportunities for local residents
- Lobby for new forms of home ownership that offer all tenants the opportunity to attain an ever increasing share of their property
- Prioritise building homes "*Londoners can afford*."

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	25
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

The substantive motion was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.09pm – **RESOLVED**:

That this Council notes the successful record of the Conservative administration in seeking to 'Build a Borough of Housing Opportunity' through:

- The introduction of a new, fairer, and more transparent, allocations policy which gives greater priority to those eligible people who work or make a community contribution, which prevents those would-be applicants earning over £40,200 from joining the register, which introduces a minimum five year local connection criteria and which prevents those people not eligible for social housing from joining the register at all;
- Fixed-term tenancies within the Borough, allowing the Council as a landlord to make better use of its housing stock and provide a flexible approach to delivering a housing options service;
- A revised HomeBuy register of nearly 6000 for those who live or work in the borough who have a household income of up to £66,000pa, where top priority is given to existing council and housing association tenants, members of the armed forces and police officers, and



- The successful lobbying of Government to increase the maximum Right to Buy discount to £100,000 and the proposals to introduce the Right to Buy Part which is supported by the Mayor of London in the draft London Housing Strategy 2013.

That this Council resolves to expand homeownership opportunities for local residents by:

- Continuing to work with public and private bodies to deliver thousands of new homes in the Old Oak Common, White City and Earl's Court Opportunity Areas;
- Increasing the supply of new housing for low cost homeownership using council land and assets;
- Allowing higher earning tenants to be able to convert to a form of low cost homeownership at the end of their fixed-term tenancy;
- Enabling a greater proportion of council tenants to own part of their own home through shared ownership including Right to Part Buy, a deposit fund or disposal under a Discount Market Sale (DMS) model, and
- Creating tenure forms such as Discount Market Rent to enable would be homeowners to save for a deposit to purchase a DMS unit, thereby creating a cycle of housing opportunity.

#### 32.4 Special Motion 2 - Halt Council Plans for Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue to become an Articulated Lorry Thoroughfare

10.10pm – Councillor Wesley Harcourt moved, seconded by Councillor Max Schmid, the special motion standing in their names:

“The Council notes that it currently plans the following detrimental measures for Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue:

- “Heavy vehicle access to the depot during the Earls Court development will be from Beaumont Avenue and emergency access will be from Aisgill Avenue.”
- “Large 77ft long articulated lorries will access/egress the LUL depot site approximately 6-9 times a day from Beaumont Avenue.”
- “Very long 99ft lorries will need to access the site approximately 4 times a year.”
- “There are also 60 parking spaces on the LUL depot site for transit vans that will need to access/egress the site throughout the day.”

It also notes that Conservative councillors chose not to consult any residents. Instead CapCo, the developer, was consulted extensively.

The Council recognises that this plan has been badly thought through, that it will increase the danger of road accidents, it will cause unacceptable levels of extra traffic, extra noise and extra dust and it will detrimentally affect property prices.

The Council therefore resolves to halt current plans to use Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue for these purposes and instead find other routes acceptable to and in consultation with residents.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Tom Crofts moved, seconded by Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Replace title of Motion and insert “Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue traffic”

Delete all after “this Council” and insert:

“Notes that:

1. The Earl’s Court development will bring huge benefits to local people, not least to the residents of Beaumont Avenue and West Kensington.
2. The TfL depot at Earls Court currently has two main access gates at Lillie Road and Beaumont Avenue, but that the Lillie Road entrance will not be available for TfL in the initial phases of the Earls Court development.
3. During this time, there will be (i) a regrettable increase in TfL traffic accessing the depot and Ashfield House (including HGV vehicles) through the existing gate at Beaumont Avenue and (ii) the need for an emergency access gate to the depot at Aisgill Avenue.

This Council welcomes measures taken to mitigate the disturbance to residents of Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue, including:

- The maintenance of two-way traffic in Beaumont Avenue for the duration of the works.
- The widening of the road by moving CPZ parking spaces onto the pavement in Beaumont Avenue.
- The maintenance of residents’ parking spaces in Beaumont Avenue (with the loss of only one car parking space which will be replaced within the zone).
- The requirement that any works will be done to Street Smart standards.
- Lobbying TfL to vacate Ashfield House at the earliest opportunity - so as to lead to an overall reduction in commercial traffic using Beaumont Avenue for the duration of the works.
- A requirement that these mitigation measures will be fully funded by the developers

This Council further commits itself to working with residents, TfL and the developer to further reduce any disturbance to residents at Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue by TfL traffic.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED.**

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion as amended was declared **CARRIED**.

10.10pm – **RESOLVED**:

Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue traffic

This Council notes that:

1. The Earl's Court development will bring huge benefits to local people, not least to the residents of Beaumont Avenue and West Kensington.
2. The TfL depot at Earls Court currently has two main access gates at Lillie Road and Beaumont Avenue, but that the Lillie Road entrance will not be available for TfL in the initial phases of the Earls Court development.
3. During this time, there will be (i) a regrettable increase in TfL traffic accessing the depot and Ashfield House (including HGV vehicles) through the existing gate at Beaumont Avenue and (ii) the need for an emergency access gate to the depot at Aisgill Avenue.

This Council welcomes measures taken to mitigate the disturbance to residents of Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue, including:

- The maintenance of two-way traffic in Beaumont Avenue for the duration of the works.
- The widening of the road by moving CPZ parking spaces onto the pavement in Beaumont Avenue.
- The maintenance of residents' parking spaces in Beaumont Avenue (with the loss of only one car parking space which will be replaced within the zone).
- The requirement that any works will be done to Street Smart standards.
- Lobbying TfL to vacate Ashfield House at the earliest opportunity - so as to lead to an overall reduction in commercial traffic using Beaumont Avenue for the duration of the works.
- A requirement that these mitigation measures will be fully funded by the developers

This Council further commits itself to working with residents, TfL and the developer to further reduce any disturbance to residents at Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue by TfL traffic.

32.5 Special Motion 3 - Hospitality and Public Concerns about the "Too Close for Comfort" Relationship between the Administration and Property Developers Doing Business in the Borough

10.12pm – Councillor PJ Murphy moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Jones, the special motion standing in their names:

“The Council notes that its self-confessed *“property-developer-friendly”* approach has resulted in many controversial land development schemes being opposed by large numbers of Hammersmith and Fulham residents who have attended the Planning Applications Committee and expressed concerns that the Council’s relationship with many developers are *“too close for comfort”*.”

The Council therefore regrets the decision of administration cabinet members and other Conservative councillors to enjoy *“gifts and hospilities”* from property developers operating in the Borough. The Council notes that no minutes or records are kept of the conversations that take place during these generous social engagements and that meetings such as these do nothing to dispel residents’ concerns.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council resolves to tighten its protocols and halt councillors from accepting personal gifts and personal hospitality from businesses hoping to profit from decisions they might make or the influence they may be able to bring to bear on decision makers.

Furthermore, the Council agrees that agenda and minutes need to be made of all meetings its councillors, officials and representatives have with businesses, their agents or their lobbyist when discussing issues pertinent to the Borough and those businesses. Those records will be made available for public scrutiny”.

The motion was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	25
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **LOST**.

32.6 Special Motion 4 - Encouraging Strong, Safe Neighbourhoods and Successful High Streets

10.14pm – Councillor Wesley Harcourt moved, seconded by Councillor Michael Cartwright, the special motion standing in their names:

“This Council notes that the rapid growth of betting shops is being driven by the presence of new, high-stakes fixed odds betting terminals (FOBTs), which are often used by gambling addicts and money launderers and which fuel criminal activity.

The Council also recognises that allowing betting and loan shops to spread and cluster across our borough’s high streets with no checks blights our

neighbourhoods, undermines existing businesses and discourages new businesses from setting up as their presence deters retailers from moving into nearby empty properties.

The Council recognises that many local authorities are successfully using Article 4 Directions to give residents and their elected representatives a mechanism to protect their neighbourhoods and agrees to do the same.

The Council also agrees to consider the many innovative best practices used by councils of all political persuasions to regenerate their high streets and secondary shopping areas. It recognises that returning local control of the Borough's high streets to residents is an important and democratic measure which encourages the retailers that residents want, halts the unchecked spread and clustering of betting shops, payday lenders and pawnshops and curtails serious criminal activity."

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Greg Smith moved, seconded by Councillor Mark Loveday an amendment to the motion as follows:

"Delete all after "This Council" and insert:

"... welcomes all moves to ensure economic growth and rising employment in the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham; and would always rather see commercial premises occupied and employing people than lying empty."

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	12
NOT VOTING	0

The motion as amended was declared **CARRIED**.

10.15pm – **RESOLVED**:

This Council welcomes all moves to ensure economic growth and rising employment in the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham; and would always rather see commercial premises occupied and employing people than lying empty.

### 32.7 Special Motion 5 - Council Resolves to Improve the Repairs Service

10.16pm – Councillor Stephen Cowan moved, seconded by Councillor Mercy Umeh, the special motion standing in their names:

“The Council notes the alarming concerns raised by residents about serious failures in the Council housing repairs service. It resolves to urgently review this service and take all necessary measures to stop failures and significantly raise standards.”

The motion was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	25
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **LOST**.

### 32.8 Special Motion 6 - Milson Road Health Centre

10.17pm – Councillor Rory Vaughan moved, seconded by Councillor PJ Murphy, the special motion standing in their names:

“The Council notes that Milson Road Health Centre currently offers a wide range of services to local residents including district nursing, health visiting, diabetes, hospital at home, an ulcer clinic, family planning and podiatry. The council recognises residents’ concerns that the centre is due to be closed and that private talks have already occurred with the Council about the future use of the site.

The Council resolves to campaign to protect high quality and localised NHS services on the Milson Road site and agrees to publicly disclose agendas and minutes of all private meetings with property developers about the future of this much valued local public asset.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Marcus Ginn moved, seconded by Councillor Belinda Donovan an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Delete all after: “closed” and insert:

“but it is reassured by the expanded provision of community and primary care services planned for the new Parkview Centre and redeveloped Charing Cross Hospital, at which all services currently provided at Milson Road will be re-provided at purpose built facilities.

This Council notes that plans are also under consideration by the NHS to provide new GP surgeries on the Milson Road site, in addition to any residential accommodation.

This Council resolves to continue to campaign and negotiate for high quality and localised NHS services which are accessible to residents from across the borough and welcomes the increased investment that the NHS plans to make in community and health services over coming years.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	12

The amendment was declared **CARRIED.**

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote:

FOR	25
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	12

The motion as amended was declared **CARRIED.**

10.18pm – **RESOLVED:**

The Council notes that Milson Road Health Centre currently offers a wide range of services to local residents including district nursing, health visiting, diabetes, hospital at home, an ulcer clinic, family planning and podiatry. The Council recognises residents' concerns that the centre is due to be closed but it is reassured by the expanded provision of community and primary care services planned for the new Parkview Centre and redeveloped Charing Cross Hospital, at which all services currently provided at Milson Road will be re-provided at purpose built facilities.

This Council notes that plans are also under consideration by the NHS to provide new GP surgeries on the Milson Road site, in addition to any residential accommodation.

This Council resolves to continue to campaign and negotiate for high quality and localised NHS services which are accessible to residents from across the borough and welcomes the increased investment that the NHS plans to make in community and health services over coming years.

### 32.9 Special Motion 7 - Cutting Crime in Ravenscourt Road

10.19pm – Councillor Lisa Homan moved, seconded by Councillor Caroline Needham, the special motion standing in their names:

“The Council notes residents' concerns about the recent but consistent crime in Ravenscourt Road. It agrees to install temporary CCTV while carrying out a full review of the problem and working with local residents and the police to agree a better way forward.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Charlie Dewhirst moved, seconded by Councillor Harry Phibbs an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Delete all after “this Council” and insert

“... welcomes:

- The stunning 24% reduction in reported crime rates in Ravenscourt Park ward over the past 12 months.
- The work of the police Safer Neighbourhood Team and neighbourhood watch groups in the ward in helping to achieve this.
- The contribution to crime reduction in the ward made by CCTV systems including Council CCTV systems in King Street and TfL CCTV systems at Ravenscourt Park station.
- The contribution to crime reduction in the ward made by the borough wide public drinking ban (introduced by this Conservative administration) and the previous dispersal zone at Ravenscourt Road.

This Council resolves to continue to work with the residents of Ravenscourt Road and the police to tackle all crime and anti-social behaviour in order to reduce crime in Ravenscourt Park Ward even further.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	24
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	12

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote:

FOR	24
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	12

The motion as amended was declared **CARRIED**.

Councillor Loveday left the room during the debate and did not vote.

10.19pm – **RESOLVED**:

This Council welcomes:

- The stunning 24% reduction in reported crime rates in Ravenscourt Park ward over the past 12 months.
- The work of the police Safer Neighbourhood Team and neighbourhood watch groups in the ward in helping to achieve this.
- The contribution to crime reduction in the ward made by CCTV systems including Council CCTV systems in King Street and TfL CCTV systems at Ravenscourt Park station.
- The contribution to crime reduction in the ward made by the borough wide public drinking ban (introduced by this Conservative administration) and the previous dispersal zone at Ravenscourt Road.



This Council resolves to continue to work with the residents of Ravenscourt Road and the police to tackle all crime and anti-social behaviour in order to reduce crime in Ravenscourt Park Ward even further.

### 32.10 Special Motion 9 - Celebrating Cleaner and Greener Parks

10.20pm – Councillor Greg Smith moved, seconded by Councillor Steve Hamilton, the special motion standing in their names:

“This Council:

1. Celebrates the award of 10 Green Flags and 3 Green Pennants by Keep Britain Tidy to Hammersmith & Fulham parks and open spaces, up from zero in 2006.
2. Notes that Ravenscourt Park, Frank Banfield Park and Margravine Cemetery have been awarded with Green Flag status for the fifth year in a row, Normand Park has won the honour for the fourth year, St Peter’s Square for the third time, Hammersmith Park, Hurlingham Park, South Park and Norland North for the second time and Brook Green for the first time with Loris Road Open Space, Godolphin Road Open Space and Phoenix Farm picking up Green Pennants for the first time.
3. Thanks the Friends’ groups in all the winning parks for their tireless voluntary efforts to keep our parks the best they can be, our grounds maintenance contractor Quadron for their professional excellence and the Hammersmith Community Gardens Association for their incredible work in transforming Loris Road Open Space and Godolphin Road Open Space and their management of Phoenix Farm.
4. Resolves to continue to improve our parks and open spaces and increase the number of parks and open spaces with Green Flag and Green Pennant status.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Michael Cartwright moved, seconded by Councillor Wesley Harcourt, an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Following point 4 and the word “status” adds:

Notes residents’ concerns that leasing a large proportion of Hammersmith Park for 35 years to a private firm is, for all intents and purposes, the same as selling it. Recognises that Borough residents do not want their parks concreted over, or large proportions of them turned into car parks and or other private rentable spaces.

The Council agrees to maintain all the Borough’s parks as free at the point of use and will not agree any private deals to sell or long-lease any more.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	25
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

The substantive motion was put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.20pm – **RESOLVED**:

This Council:

1. Celebrates the award of 10 Green Flags and 3 Green Pennants by Keep Britain Tidy to Hammersmith & Fulham parks and open spaces, up from zero in 2006.
2. Notes that Ravenscourt Park, Frank Banfield Park and Margravine Cemetery have been awarded with Green Flag status for the fifth year in a row, Normand Park has won the honour for the fourth year, St Peter's Square for the third time, Hammersmith Park, Hurlingham Park, South Park and Norland North for the second time and Brook Green for the first time with Loris Road Open Space, Godolphin Road Open Space and Phoenix Farm picking up Green Pennants for the first time.
3. Thanks the Friends' groups in all the winning parks for their tireless voluntary efforts to keep our parks the best they can be, our grounds maintenance contractor Quadron for their professional excellence and the Hammersmith Community Gardens Association for their incredible work in transforming Loris Road Open Space and Godolphin Road Open Space and their management of Phoenix Farm.
4. Resolves to continue to improve our parks and open spaces and increase the number of parks and open spaces with Green Flag and Green Pennant status.

### 32.11 Special Motion 10 - Super Sewer

10.21pm – Councillor Nicholas Botterill moved, seconded by Councillor Mark Loveday, the special motion standing in their names:

“This Council:

1. Remains fundamentally opposed to the principle of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.
2. Believes that Carnwath Road is a wholly inappropriate location for a main drive shaft site.
3. Resolves to continue its campaign against the Thames Tideway Tunnel and the drive shaft site at Carnwath Road.”

Under Standing Order 15(e) (vi), Councillor Michael Cartwright moved, seconded by Councillor Wesley Harcourt, an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Following point 3 and the word “Road” adds:

The Council regrets that at the on 15<sup>th</sup> January at the Planning Application’s Committee meeting the Borough’s Conservative Administration agreed to spend scarce Section 106 monies to make ready large parts of Carnwath Road for the Super Sewer development. The Council notes that this raises legitimate concerns about the Administrations genuine or effective lobby to halt the Super Sewer taking over the Carnwath Road site and agrees to revisit this decision.

The Council also notes that on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2013 the Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP (Con), the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) served a Safeguarding Direction on the land on Carnwath Road affected by the Thames Tunnel. This means that LBHF cannot grant planning permissions on this land without specific authorisation from DCLG. The Council regrets this and agrees to utilise the Administration’s close relationship with Mr. Pickles to have this overturned.

Furthermore, the Council recognises that the Carnwath Road site would make a better location for any new secondary school than anywhere else and agrees to lobby both Mr. Pickles and Mr. Gove to make this site a priority for the school instead of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.”

The amendment was put to the vote:

FOR	12
AGAINST	25
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

The substantive motion was put to the vote:

FOR	unanimous
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.21pm – **RESOLVED**:

This Council:

1. Remains fundamentally opposed to the principle of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.
2. Believes that Carnwath Road is a wholly inappropriate location for a main drive shaft site.
3. Resolves to continue its campaign against the Thames Tideway Tunnel and the drive shaft site at Carnwath Road.

**33. INFORMATION REPORTS - TO NOTE**

**33.1 Special Urgency Decisions - Monitoring Report**

The report was noted.

\* \* \* \* \* CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS \* \* \* \* \*

Meeting started: 7.00 pm  
Meeting ended: 10.22 pm

Mayor .....

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Mr Adam Connell

To: The Leader of the Council

---

**QUESTION**

“As you know, the Milson Road Health Centre currently offers a wide range of care services to local residents who are concerned that the centre is due to be closed and that private talks have already occurred with the Council about the future use of the site. Will he explain exactly what his administration thinks about this closure and exactly what it has discussed with those interested in the future of the site?”

**RESPONSE**

The Council notes that Milson Road Health Centre currently offers a wide range of services to local residents including district nursing, health visiting, diabetes, hospital at home, an ulcer clinic, family planning and podiatry. The council recognises residents’ concerns but it is reassured by the expanded provision of community and primary care services planned for the new Parkview Centre and redeveloped Charing Cross Hospital, at which all services currently provided at Milson Road will be re-provided at the new purpose built facilities. It notes that plans are also under consideration by the NHS to provide new GP facilities on the Milson Road site, in addition to any residential accommodation.

The proposal would involve the closure of the existing medical centre. The Council's Development Management Local Plan Policy DM1 states that "In any development proposal, existing community uses should be retained or replaced, unless there is clear evidence that there is no longer an identified need for a particular facility."

Officers noted information in the submission from the NHS suggesting that the Milson Road Health Centre was earmarked for closure as part of wider restructuring of health care facilities in the borough. However, they advised that to satisfy the principal land use policy any planning application for redevelopment must include a clear justification to demonstrate how and where the existing health care provision would be reprovided and/or why the existing facilities were no longer required.

Planning officers concluded that subject to satisfactory justification of the loss of the facility, a small residential scheme might be an acceptable alternative use. A residential redevelopment must comply with detailed design considerations and standards regarding the quality of accommodation, and impact on neighbouring amenity. The scheme submitted for consideration did not satisfactorily meet all these detailed planning requirements. Officers made their considered response to the scheme in early August 2013.

Although officers' pre-application planning advice is confidential, the NHS did publicise its plans through leaflets to the local community and an exhibition. This generated a great deal of interest from local residents, mostly unhappy about the proposals.

This Council resolves to continue to campaign and negotiate for high quality and localised NHS services which are accessible to residents from across the borough. It welcomes the increased investment that the NHS plans to make in community and health services over coming years.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**  
**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**  
**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Mr Robert Largan

To: The Leader of the Council

---

**QUESTION**

"The proposed super sewer will put an estimated extra £80 a year on our water bills and will cause chaos and disruption for many residents living in Sands End. Can the Council outline what they are doing to fight this flawed project?"

**ANSWER**

This Council has been fighting Thames Water's proposals for the Thames Tideway Tunnel since 2008. In 2011 we were one of five local authorities that established the Thames Tunnel Commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Selborne, to look into the plans for the Tunnel, hear evidence and examine alternative options. In October 2011, the Selborne Commission released its findings: that alternative solutions focussed on sustainable drainage systems could deliver the improvements necessary to the combined sewer system to comply with the EU Directive that instigated the super sewer proposals. Since that report, world experts on water management have been queuing up to condemn Thames Water's plans for a tunnel as an out of date solution that is far too costly in comparison to the actual benefits it will deliver. This Council has been at the forefront of local government objections to the project and you can view the history of our campaigning activity on this issue on our website at [www.lbhf.gov.uk/supersewer](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/supersewer).

Thames Water's application for a Development Consent Order was put before the Planning Inspectorate in September 2013 and the Examining Authority is now two thirds of the way through a six month process and due to make recommendations to Government at the end of March. As part of this process, we have submitted detailed objections to the plans, particularly in relation to the chosen drive strategy and construction site selection. We have presented evidence throughout the process, via written submissions and via counsel at two Issue Specific Hearings that have examined whether Thames Water's insistence on a construction site at Carnwath Road is really necessary. We have commissioned expert international tunnelling engineers to look at Thames Water's plans and, as a result, we have presented the Examining Authority with alternative proposals that are far less socially and environmentally damaging to South Fulham and the surrounding area than the selection of Carnwath Road Riverside as a main construction site. The most recent Hearing was last week (22 January), where we presented the Examining Authority with expert evidence from international tunnelling engineers, CDM Smith, that there are viable and preferable alternatives to siting a main drive shaft at Carnwath Road. We are hopeful that the evidence we have presented and the submissions we have made to the Examining Authority will influence its recommendations to Government, due after March.

The Government's final decision, on whether or not to grant the Development Consent Order, is expected in September this year and I can assure you that this authority will continue to lobby and campaign against the proposals for this project right up to the wire.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Mr Rowan Ree

To: The Deputy Leader of the Council

---

**QUESTION**

“The Council will be aware of residents’ concerns about the consistent levels of crime affecting Ravenscourt Road. Will the Council agree to install temporary CCTV while carrying out a full review of the problem and working with local residents to agree a better way forward? “

**ANSWER**

Cutting crime is this Council’s number one priority and as soon as I was made aware of the issues raised in your question and indeed a later motion on this Council’s agenda, I immediately tasked officers to look into it. The MET police crime analyst has done research into Ravenscourt Road over the last 6 months and reported back the following:

- there have been 10 offences recorded on Ravenscourt Road since September 2013; 1 in September, 2 in October, 5 in November, 1 in December and 1 this January to date
- offences are a mixture of vehicle crime, theft, burglary, with a single possession of cannabis offence and 1 GBH offence recorded
- in terms of full year data for the period up to which the crime figures have been made publicly available, there were 26 recorded crimes in Ravenscourt Road in December 2012 against 28 total offences in the same period the previous year
- the Safer Neighbourhood Team are indeed aware of the concerns raised and residents raised this issue at the Neighbourhood Watch meeting in November 2013, particularly raising the issue of possible CCTV
- the spike of crime in November consisted of criminal damage to motor vehicles where a number of cars were damaged in the area at the same time and that is believed by the police to have been by one group behaving clearly criminally on the Halloween weekend.

We already have one H&F CCTV Camera (camera 101) sited at the junction of Ravenscourt Road and King Street, which can pan round to capture Ravenscourt Road



towards the tube station and there are also further cameras as part of TfL's property on the tube station.

The area community safety officer is aware of the assault on 4 October against one of our civil enforcement officers which is being dealt with by the police.

One crime is too many crimes but given the relatively low level of crime compared to other streets in the borough this would not normally warrant a CCTV installation. However I am more than happy to look at deploying some of our covert equipment on a short term basis in order to give residents the protection that they want.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Mr Larry Culhane

To: The Leader of the Council

---

**QUESTION**

"At the last Council Cabinet Meeting on the 6th January, you and your fellow Conservative councillors unanimously voted to use Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue for "Heavy vehicle access to the depot during the Earls Court development". The report detailed how the residents in Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue (along with all the routes leading up to that area) will have to suffer the following:

"Large 77ft long articulated lorries will access the neighbourhood approximately 6-9 times a day from Beaumont Avenue."

"Very long 99ft lorries will need to access the site approximately 4 times a year."

"There are also 60 parking spaces on the LUL depot site for transit vans that will need to access/egress the site throughout the day."

The report confirmed that there has been extensive consultations with CapCo, the developer but absolutely none with residents. Will the Council now accept this was a mistake, that this will blight this neighbourhood during the works and that this decision should be overturned with a new route and a new plan devised in consultation with the local residents that will be affected?"

**ANSWER**

The questioner is incorrect in his statement that the Cabinet has voted to use Beaumont Avenue and Aisgill Avenue for heavy vehicle movements.

What the Cabinet agreed on 6 January was to undertake mitigation measure to protect residents from the effect of additional vehicle movements requiring access to and from the Lillie Road Depot of London Underground during demolition work of Earl's Court 2 to enable the Earl's Court development, which will be of huge benefit to local residents.

The Beaumont Avenue entrance to the depot has been in existence for many years and the Council has no powers to prohibit its use but we have secured funding from Capco for the mitigation measures, which will protect residents' and visitors' parking and ensure that road safety is not compromised.

No decisions have yet been taken on how demolition and construction traffic for the Earl's Court development will access the site, and in due course the developers will have to submit to the council a Construction and Logistics plan detailing vehicle routes, types, numbers and operating hours.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Ms Emily Genochio

To: Cabinet Member for Education

---

**QUESTION**

“Can the Cabinet Member for Education explain the administration’s position that it is a surplus of school places in south Fulham and economies of scale and nothing else ...that these are the only two factors behind the planned closure of Sullivan Primary School?”

**ANSWER**

The report on which Cabinet made its decision set out the relevant factors for that decision. It is a matter of fact that there are surplus places at Sullivan school, and it is also a matter of fact that savings will be made by implementing the proposal. These savings will enable additional spending for the benefit of pupils at the enlarged New King’s school.

The term ‘closure’ hides the fact that the Council is effectively amalgamating two schools, as well as making a significant capital investment.

It is not denied that further opportunities may be opened up by the decision. The report recognises this at paragraph 6.6.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Ms Wendy Aldridge

To: Cabinet Member for Children's Services

---

**QUESTION**

“Can the Cabinet Member for Children's Services give more detail about the logic behind the choice of Sullivan Primary School as the 'preferred' site for Fulham Boys School, and tell us which other sites in the area were viewed. Can she tell us how many feasibility studies were conducted in total?”

**ANSWER**

The Department for Education is responsible for assessing the feasibility of sites for free schools such as Fulham Boys School. The Council has tried to work with the DfE for some time to try and help identify a suitable site. Very few realistic options have been found which provide the size and site characteristics consistent with a secondary school. Certainly none have justified a detailed feasibility study.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Ms Rosie Wait

To: Cabinet Member for Education

---

**QUESTION**

“How does the Cabinet Member for Education justify spending a minimum of £4.5m of local money to forcibly close what is recognised as one of the best primary schools in the country, which has an acclaimed and proven track record with some of the most disadvantaged pupils in the borough?”

**ANSWER**

The question is misleading. The Council is not spending £4.5M to forcibly close a school. It is investing £3.8M in a structurally sound building in which to continue and expand another school, and incurring an estimated £600,000 in temporary accommodation and re-locating other services. It is avoiding capital expenditure in maintaining the school it intends to close, which it believes can be successfully amalgamated with the school receiving the investment. This is a matter of value for money.

The Council believes that opportunities for all pupils will be enhanced by the proposals. Both existing schools are high-performing and the Council is taking a long-term view of the opportunity to build on this success in a cost effective way.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**COUNCIL MEETING – 29 JANUARY 2014**

---

Question by: Ms Josephine Miller

To: The Leader of the Council

---

**QUESTION**

“Will Members of the borough’s Cabinet explain exactly what personal dealings and relations they have each had with the people behind Fulham Boys School prior to the consultation being submitted?”

**ANSWER**

I have no personal dealings of any significance with the people behind Fulham Boys School. But I am sure, like me, a number of Cabinet Members know a lot of people involved with all the schools in the borough, as well as people who live and work in the borough or grew up here and went to school together.

We are elected from the people and by the people, so we know the people who are involved with local schools including Sullivan and New King’s School and those interested in a Fulham Boys School.

There have been a number of attempts to suggest some impropriety in relation to the decision on the Fulham primary schools’ merger, all of which are entirely unfounded, incredulous and frankly rather nasty.

There are very strict rules about declaring interests and we know when and where to declare an interest and I know these rules have not been broken.

My final comment is that if knowing people disbarred us from making decisions, the Council would grind to a halt. This claim is nothing more than a desperate attempt to slur people, it is without any merit and unworthy of the Council Chamber.