

# **COUNCIL MINUTES**

**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

**WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY 2021**



## PRESENT

The Mayor – Councillor PJ Murphy  
Deputy Mayor – Councillor Daryl Brown

### Councillors:

Colin Aherne	Sharon Holder	Lucy Richardson
Adronie Alford	Lisa Homan	Ann Rosenberg
Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler	Donald Johnson	Helen Rowbottom
Andrew Brown	Andrew Jones	Alexandra Sanderson
Jonathan Caleb-Landy	Alex Karmel	Max Schmid
Iain Cassidy	Bora Kwon	Asif Siddique
Ben Coleman	Rachel Leighton	Fiona Smith
Christabel Cooper	Amanda Lloyd-Harris	Dominic Stanton
Stephen Cowan	Mark Loveday	Matt Thorley
Larry Culhane	Sue Macmillan	Matt Uberoi
Belinda Donovan	David Morton	Mercy Umeh
Sue Fennimore	Natalia Perez	Rory Vaughan
Wesley Harcourt	Zarar Qayyum	Guy Vincent
Rebecca Harvey	Patricia Quigley	
	Rowan Ree	

*NOTE: This meeting was held remotely.*

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Adam Connell.

### **2. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

All members were present at the start of the meeting except for Councillors Adam Connell, Lisa Homan, David Morton, Lucy Richardson, Ann Rosenberg, and Frances Stainton. Councillors Homan, Morton, Richardson, and Rosenberg joined later. Councillor Stainton attempted to join the meeting but had technical difficulties.

There were no declarations of interest.

### **3. MINUTES**

#### **6.37pm – RESOLVED**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 25<sup>th</sup> of November 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

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

#### **Queen's Birthday Honours List**

The Mayor noted the Council's congratulations to the following people who were recognised in the Queen's Birthday Honours for their outstanding achievements:-

Michael Clarke, H&F's former Director for Libraries, who was awarded an MBE for services to Public Libraries and to voluntary service in London during Covid-19.

Sheila Hancock CBE who was made a Dame for her services to drama and to charity.

Wasfi Kani OBE, Founder and Chief Executive Officer of the Grange Park Opera, who was awarded a CBE for services to music.

The Leader then made a speech thanking them all for their hard work and service to the community.

#### **Death of a former Councillor**

The Mayor announced the death of former Councillor Araminta Birdsey, who recently passed away. Ms Araminta Birdsey was elected as a Labour Councillor for Margravine ward in 1998, and for Fulham Reach ward in 2002.

The Leader and Councillor Alex Karmel made speeches of remembrance.

The Council then observed a minute of silence in her memory.

### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS (20 MINUTES)**

The Mayor thanked all of the residents who submitted questions. He noted that public question time was limited to 20 minutes and it would not be extended as there were 35 public questions and a full agenda.

Under Standing Order 15(e)(12), Councillor Alex Karmel moved a motion to suspend the standing orders but the motion was denied by the Mayor as he had already ruled that public question time would not exceed the allotted 20 minutes.

Questions 1, 3, 4, and 5 were addressed in the meeting. The Mayor noted that any questions not addressed in the meeting would receive written responses which

would also be published in the minutes. The questions and responses can be found in [Appendix 1](#).

## 6. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### 6.1 **Council Tax Support Scheme 2021/22**

7.13pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Commercial Services, Councillor Max Schmid.

Councillor Max Schmid made a speech (for the Administration) and Councillor Andrew Brown made a speech (for the Opposition).

Under Standing Order 17(e) the Opposition requested a recorded vote.

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>NOT VOTING</b>
Cllr Aherne	None	None
Cllr Alford		
Cllr Brocklebank-Fowler		
Cllr Brown (Andrew)		
Cllr Brown (Daryl)		
Cllr Caleb-Landy		
Cllr Cassidy		
Cllr Coleman		
Cllr Cooper		
Cllr Cowan		
Cllr Culhane		
Cllr Donovan		
Cllr Fennimore		
Cllr Harcourt		
Cllr Harvey		
Cllr Holder		
Cllr Homan		
Cllr Johnson		
Cllr Jones		
Cllr Karmel		
Cllr Kwon		
Cllr Leighton		
Cllr Lloyd-Harris		
Cllr Loveday		
Cllr Macmillan		
Cllr Murphy		
Cllr Perez		
Cllr Qayyum		
Cllr Quigley		
Cllr Ree		
Cllr Richardson		
Cllr Rosenberg		
Cllr Rowbottom		
Cllr Sanderson		

Cllr Schmid Cllr Siddique Cllr Smith Cllr Stanton Cllr Thorley Cllr Uberoi Cllr Umeh Cllr Vaughan Cllr Vincent		
--	--	--

<b>FOR</b>	<b>UNANIMOUS</b>
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

### 7.21pm – RESOLVED

That Full Council approves the following recommendations:-

1. That the Council Tax Support Scheme in operation in 2020/2021 shall continue in 2021/2022.
2. That the Council shall apply the annual uprating of allowances, applicable amounts and income set out in the DWP Housing Benefit circular to the Council Tax Support scheme for 2021/2022.

## 6.2 Council Tax Base and Collection Rate 2021/22 and Delegation of the Business Rate Estimate

7.21pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Commercial Services, Councillor Max Schmid.

Councillor Max Schmid made a speech (for the Administration) and Councillor Andrew Brown made a speech (for the Opposition).

Under Standing Order 17(e) the Opposition requested a recorded vote.

FOR	AGAINST	NOT VOTING
Cllr Aherne Cllr Alford Cllr Brocklebank-Fowler Cllr Brown (Andrew) Cllr Brown (Daryl) Cllr Caleb-Landy Cllr Cassidy Cllr Coleman Cllr Cooper Cllr Cowan Cllr Culhane Cllr Donovan	None	None

Cllr Fennimore Cllr Harcourt Cllr Harvey Cllr Holder Cllr Homan Cllr Johnson Cllr Jones Cllr Karmel Cllr Kwon Cllr Leighton Cllr Lloyd-Harris Cllr Loveday Cllr Macmillan Cllr Morton Cllr Murphy Cllr Perez Cllr Qayyum Cllr Quigley Cllr Ree Cllr Richardson Cllr Rosenberg Cllr Rowbottom Cllr Sanderson Cllr Schmid Cllr Siddique Cllr Smith Cllr Stanton Cllr Thorley Cllr Uberoi Cllr Umeh Cllr Vaughan Cllr Vincent		
---	--	--

<b>FOR</b>	<b>UNANIMOUS</b>
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

**7.34pm – RESOLVED**

That Full Council approved for the financial year 2021/22:

1. That the estimated numbers of properties for each Valuation Band as set out in this report be approved.
2. That an estimated collection rate of 97.0% be approved.
3. That the Council Tax Base of 80,930 Band “D” equivalent properties be approved.
4. To delegate authority to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Commercial Services, to determine the business rates tax base for 2021/22.

5. To note the provisional in-year 2020/21 council tax collection fund deficit of £6m and that the estimate will continue to be reviewed. The overall deficit, taking account of prior years, is estimated at £5.550m.
6. To note that the pan-London business rates pool is unlikely to continue in 2021/22. Should it be possible for the pool to continue the decision to participate is delegated to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Commercial Services.

### 6.3 Review of the Constitution

An amendment to the report was published online and circulated to members.

7.34pm – The amended report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan.

Under Standing Order 17(e) the Opposition requested a recorded vote.

FOR	AGAINST	NOT VOTING
Cllr Aherne	None	None
Cllr Alford		
Cllr Brocklebank-Fowler		
Cllr Brown (Andrew)		
Cllr Brown (Daryl)		
Cllr Caleb-Landy		
Cllr Cassidy		
Cllr Coleman		
Cllr Cooper		
Cllr Cowan		
Cllr Culhane		
Cllr Donovan		
Cllr Fennimore		
Cllr Harcourt		
Cllr Harvey		
Cllr Holder		
Cllr Homan		
Cllr Johnson		
Cllr Jones		
Cllr Karmel		
Cllr Kwon		
Cllr Leighton		
Cllr Lloyd-Harris		
Cllr Loveday		
Cllr Macmillan		
Cllr Morton		
Cllr Murphy		
Cllr Perez		
Cllr Qayyum		
Cllr Quigley		
Cllr Ree		
Cllr Richardson		

Cllr Rosenberg Cllr Rowbottom Cllr Sanderson Cllr Schmid Cllr Siddique Cllr Smith Cllr Stanton Cllr Thorley Cllr Uberoi Cllr Umeh Cllr Vaughan Cllr Vincent		
--	--	--

<b>FOR</b>	<b>UNANIMOUS</b>
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

### 7.39pm – RESOLVED

1. That Council approve the update to Article 11 of the Constitution in Appendix 1.
2. That Council agree the updates to the Departmental Register of Authorities in Appendix 2.
3. That Council agree the updates to Contract Standing Orders in Appendix 3.
4. That Council agree the following changes to committee memberships:
  - a. Appoint Councillor David Morton to the Finance, Commercial Revenue and Contracts Policy and Accountability Committee to replace Councillor Fiona Smith.
  - b. Appoint Councillor Fiona Smith to the Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee to replace Councillor David Morton.

## 7. **SPECIAL MOTIONS**

At the start of the meeting the Mayor noted that amendments had been circulated and if the guillotine fell, all special motions and amendments would be taken as moved and seconded.

### 7.1 **Special Motion 1 - Limiting the second bigger wave of pandemic infections**

7.39pm – Councillor Ben Coleman moved, seconded by Councillor Patricia Quigley, the special motion in their names.

*“This Council:*



*Expects swift, clear government action to deal with the coronavirus pandemic and its consequences, and recognises that anything less costs lives, damages the economy, causes business failures and unemployment, and threatens the NHS.*

*Agrees that in managing any epidemic or pandemic, the government must act upon the best scientific advice that not only explains what has happened but predicts what is likely to happen.*

*Notes that at a meeting on 13 December, London's council leaders heard from Public Health England that since early December the pandemic had been growing exponentially in London's population and that unless immediate lockdown action was taken the virus could grow out of control within days.*

*Notes that all London's council leaders called at that meeting for tough measures to be introduced immediately to control the virus by effectively "cancelling Christmas".*

*Regrets that the government resisted that call for five crucial days, leaving tens of thousands of asymptomatic but infected people to travel freely about the country and spread the infection.*

*Recognises that from the earliest days of the pandemic the Prime Minister and his government have frequently failed to act on the best scientific advice. Instead, they have dithered and prevaricated, too often focused on the politics above all else, and on too many occasions have acted too late and done too little. The Council calls on the government to urgently change its approach.*

*Notes that on 20 December, Health Secretary Matt Hancock admitted the virus was now "out of control".*

*Notes that at a meeting on 31 December, ministers, London council leaders and chief executives were told by a government public health expert that every class in every London school was estimated to contain at least one infected student.*

*Notes that the virus is largely being spread by people who are asymptomatic and that the consequences of this new peak in infection are likely to continue to 21 March at the earliest.*

*Recognises that the only solution now available to the government is a full lockdown.*

*Advises residents to do the following:*

- **Stay home.** *To stop the spread of the virus and cut the length of time a lockdown is needed, which will save lives, protect our NHS and save businesses and jobs*
- **Get tested.** *The more we know about who has the disease and how they got it, the better we can fight it. Hammersmith & Fulham has capacity to test 74,000 local residents over the next six weeks and urges residents to book via [www.lbhf.gov.uk/gettested](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/gettested) for a test at one of our three locations*

- **Get the vaccine.** *This is being rolled out to priority groups but the sooner everyone is vaccinated, the sooner life will begin to get better. People should get it as soon as they are offered it.*
- **When out exercising: always wear a mask, practice strict social distancing and sanitation.** *This means keeping a car's length away from other people and always sanitise when you've touched surfaces outside home."*

Speeches on the special motion were made by Councillors Ben Coleman, Patricia Quigley, Larry Culhane, and Lisa Homan (for the Administration) – and Councillor Andrew Brown (for the Opposition).

Councillor Ben Coleman made a speech summing up the debate before the special motion was put to the vote:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>34</b>
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING:	10

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

### **8.11pm – RESOLVED**

This Council:

Expects swift, clear government action to deal with the coronavirus pandemic and its consequences, and recognises that anything less costs lives, damages the economy, causes business failures and unemployment, and threatens the NHS.

Agrees that in managing any epidemic or pandemic, the government must act upon the best scientific advice that not only explains what has happened but predicts what is likely to happen.

Notes that at a meeting on 13 December, London's council leaders heard from Public Health England that since early December the pandemic had been growing exponentially in London's population and that unless immediate lockdown action was taken the virus could grow out of control within days.

Notes that all London's council leaders called at that meeting for tough measures to be introduced immediately to control the virus by effectively "cancelling Christmas".

Regrets that the government resisted that call for five crucial days, leaving tens of thousands of asymptomatic but infected people to travel freely about the country and spread the infection.

Recognises that from the earliest days of the pandemic the Prime Minister and his government have frequently failed to act on the best scientific advice. Instead, they have dithered and prevaricated, too often focused on the politics above all else, and on too many occasions have acted too late and done too little. The Council calls on the government to urgently change its approach.

Notes that on 20 December, Health Secretary Matt Hancock admitted the virus was now “out of control”.

Notes that at a meeting on 31 December, ministers, London council leaders and chief executives were told by a government public health expert that every class in every London school was estimated to contain at least one infected student.

Notes that the virus is largely being spread by people who are asymptomatic and that the consequences of this new peak in infection are likely to continue to 21 March at the earliest.

Recognises that the only solution now available to the government is a full lockdown.

Advises residents to do the following:

- **Stay home.** To stop the spread of the virus and cut the length of time a lockdown is needed, which will save lives, protect our NHS and save businesses and jobs
- **Get tested.** The more we know about who has the disease and how they got it, the better we can fight it. Hammersmith & Fulham has capacity to test 74,000 local residents over the next six weeks and urges residents to book via [www.lbhf.gov.uk/gettested](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/gettested) for a test at one of our three locations
- **Get the vaccine.** This is being rolled out to priority groups but the sooner everyone is vaccinated, the sooner life will begin to get better. People should get it as soon as they are offered it.
- **When out exercising: always wear a mask, practice strict social distancing and sanitation.** This means keeping a car's length away from other people and always sanitise when you've touched surfaces outside home.

## 7.2 **Special Motion 2 - Protecting the finances of Hammersmith & Fulham residents and businesses**

8.11pm – Councillor Max Schmid moved, seconded by Councillor Wesley Harcourt, the special motion in their names.

*“The Council notes recent demands made by Government that the borough’s residents and businesses face the consequences of paying an unprecedented £64million towards the repair of the 133-year-old Grade II\* listed Hammersmith Bridge.*

*It also notes the £8.6million LBHF has been investing to repair the bridge since residents elected the current administration into office in 2014 and how that is ten times more than the previous administration spent during the whole of its eight years in office.*

*The Council recognises how the £64m demanded by the government is substantially more than any other London Council has paid for bridge maintenance noting: it is twenty-five times greater than the £2.6m the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea was required to invest in the repair of Albert Bridge; and that data from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government*

*demonstrates how, since 2010, only £100m has been spent by London Councils in total maintenance and repair of London road and river bridges – equivalent to less than £400,000 a year for each borough which, even then, saw most of that money eventually paid by the government or Transport for London.*

*The Council notes that the government has advised the Council that because the residents of Hammersmith & Fulham enjoy the third lowest Council tax in the country, they should and can afford to pay a significant increase (£800+ per taxpayer) in Council tax to meet their £64m demand.*

*The Council supports the Labour administration's commitment to keep Council tax and all resident charges low with H&F's Council tax remaining the third lowest in the country. It recognises that this is particularly important as residents face the consequences of a difficult recession which will see business failures and unemployment affecting many people's livelihoods across our borough and agree that our residents must remain our priority.*

*The Council recognises that Hammersmith & Fulham's low Council tax and improved services has been achieved despite a decade of Austerity which was introduced in 2010 by the Conservative/LibDem government, and which cut LBHF's budget as follows:*

- in 2010/11 LBHF's total net budget was £184.345m*
- in 2020/21 LBHF's total net budget is £121.003m*

*And it notes that the pandemic has caused the Council to spend millions of pounds keeping people safe and that these sums have not been fully repaid by government despite government's promises to do so.*

*The Council is therefore dismayed to note that on 7 December 2020, Lord Greenhalgh (Minister of State in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) called for Hammersmith & Fulham's residents and businesses "to stump up the cash" to repair Hammersmith Bridge over just five years. He said: "Surely £50 million over 5 years is a reasonable contribution from the Council that owns the bridge". He also made the inaccurate statement that "LBHF has £61m in unearmarked Council reserves + a £20m general fund balance!"*

*The Council recognises that Lord Greenhalgh appears to have misunderstood the issues around local government finance when he stated that the borough has "£61m in unearmarked Council reserves + a £20m general fund balance!" The Council's 2019-20 accounts clearly set out £61m of earmarked, not unearmarked, reserves and a further £19m general fund balance. Earmarked reserves have been set aside for particular purposes, and the Council's auditors have recommended that to ensure financial resilience the Council work to increase, not decrease, reserves over the medium term.*

*The Council notes the contrast of Lord Greenhalgh's current position to that when he led this Council between 2006 to 2012 as he spent just £64,000 on the upkeep and maintenance of Hammersmith Bridge, which is 1,000 times less than the £64,000,000 the government has now requested the residents and businesses Hammersmith & Fulham pay toward its repair.*

*The Council regrets the slow progress made by the Government Task Force (set up by the Secretary of State on 9 September 2020) which is in large part because “financing options” for the repair works has not been allowed onto any of the Taskforce meeting’s agenda.*

*It recognises that the Government Taskforce was set up to “effectively take over this project”, to “get this thing sorted” accompanied by promises from Conservative national and London politicians that the Government has “provided the money... to repair the bridge”.*

*The Council recognises that Hammersmith Bridge is an important road link largely benefitting people outside of Hammersmith & Fulham and that must be reflected in any agreed financial scheme.”*

Speeches on the special motion were made by Councillors Max Schmid, Wesley Harcourt, Andrew Jones, Rowan Ree, Christabel Cooper, Rory Vaughan, and Iain Cassidy (for the Administration) – and Councillor Andrew Brown (for the Opposition)

Councillor Schmid summed up.

Councillor Max Schmid made a speech summing up the debate before the special motion was put to the vote:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>34</b>
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING:	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

### **9.00pm – RESOLVED**

The Council notes recent demands made by Government that the borough’s residents and businesses face the consequences of paying an unprecedented £64million towards the repair of the 133-year-old Grade II\* listed Hammersmith Bridge.

It also notes the £8.6million LBHF has been investing to repair the bridge since residents elected the current administration into office in 2014 and how that is ten times more than the previous administration spent during the whole of its eight years in office.

The Council recognises how the £64m demanded by the government is substantially more than any other London Council has paid for bridge maintenance noting: it is twenty-five times greater than the £2.6m the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea was required to invest in the repair of Albert Bridge; and that data from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government demonstrates how, since 2010, only £100m has been spent by London Councils in total maintenance and repair of London road and river bridges – equivalent to less than £400,000 a year for each borough which, even then, saw most of that money eventually paid by the government or Transport for London.

The Council notes that the government has advised the Council that because the residents of Hammersmith & Fulham enjoy the third lowest Council tax in the country, they should and can afford to pay a significant increase (£800+ per taxpayer) in Council tax to meet their £64m demand.

The Council supports the Labour administration's commitment to keep Council tax and all resident charges low with H&F's Council tax remaining the third lowest in the country. It recognises that this is particularly important as residents face the consequences of a difficult recession which will see business failures and unemployment affecting many people's livelihoods across our borough and agree that our residents must remain our priority.

The Council recognises that Hammersmith & Fulham's low Council tax and improved services has been achieved despite a decade of Austerity which was introduced in 2010 by the Conservative/LibDem government, and which cut LBHF's budget as follows:

- in 2010/11 LBHF's total net budget was £184.345m
- in 2020/21 LBHF's total net budget is £121.003m

And it notes that the pandemic has caused the Council to spend millions of pounds keeping people safe and that these sums have not been fully repaid by government despite government's promises to do so.

The Council is therefore dismayed to note that on 7 December 2020, Lord Greenhalgh (Minister of State in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) called for Hammersmith & Fulham's residents and businesses "to stump up the cash" to repair Hammersmith Bridge over just five years. He said: "*Surely £50 million over 5 years is a reasonable contribution from the Council that owns the bridge*". He also made the inaccurate statement that "LBHF has £61m in unearmarked Council reserves + a £20m general fund balance!"

The Council recognises that Lord Greenhalgh appears to have misunderstood the issues around local government finance when he stated that the borough has "*£61m in unearmarked Council reserves + a £20m general fund balance!*" The Council's 2019-20 accounts clearly set out £61m of earmarked, not unearmarked, reserves and a further £19m general fund balance. Earmarked reserves have been set aside for particular purposes, and the Council's auditors have recommended that to ensure financial resilience the Council work to increase, not decrease, reserves over the medium term.

The Council notes the contrast of Lord Greenhalgh's current position to that when he led this Council between 2006 to 2012 as he spent just £64,000 on the upkeep and maintenance of Hammersmith Bridge, which is 1,000 times less than the £64,000,000 the government has now requested the residents and businesses Hammersmith & Fulham pay toward its repair.

The Council regrets the slow progress made by the Government Task Force (set up by the Secretary of State on 9 September 2020) which is in large part because

*“financing options”* for the repair works has not been allowed onto any of the Taskforce meeting’s agenda.

It recognises that the Government Taskforce was set up to “effectively take over this project”, to *“get this thing sorted”* accompanied by promises from Conservative national and London politicians that the Government has *“provided the money... to repair the bridge”*.

The Council recognises that Hammersmith Bridge is an important road link largely benefitting people outside of Hammersmith & Fulham and that must be reflected in any agreed financial scheme.

### 7.3 **Special Motion 3 - Council Consultations**

9.00pm – Councillor Matt Thorley moved, seconded by Councillor Mark Loveday, the special motion in their names:

*“This Council acknowledges the huge contribution local residents make to towards all aspects of life in Hammersmith & Fulham. The Council is committed to working with local residents, not doing things to them. The Council recognises that local residents have a deep understanding of their local area, its needs, shortcomings and importantly what improvements can and need to be made to make H&F an even better place to live.*

*The Council plays a vital role in formulating and implementing policies and change in H&F. However, the Council understands that there are other important local stakeholders involved in this process as well. Local residents in particular have an invaluable role given their deep understanding of their local area. As such the Council regrets that many residents recently have felt that the Council is doing things to them, not with them.*

*This Council regrets recent examples of their failure to properly consult with local residents, including over the South Fulham Traffic Scheme, the hugely unpopular Wheelie Bin fiasco and the controversial proposals to sell off playgrounds and redevelop two primary schools, and resolves to put right these situations that have caused such anger with local residents.*

*The Council’s resolves to adopt a LBHF Code of Good Practice to ensure that all future consultations with local residents and other local stakeholders are undertaken in a consistent manner that promotes genuine, wide public engagement. Such an approach will ensure all residents impacted by any scheme are properly consulted which will hopefully result in future schemes, when implemented, having the widest possible level of local support.”*

Speeches on the special motion were made by Councillors Matt Thorley and Mark Loveday (for the Opposition).

Under Standing Order 15(e)(6), Councillor Ben Coleman moved, seconded by Councillor Wesley Harcourt, an amendment in their names:

*“Delete all after “As such...” in para 2, and insert:*

*“this Council notes the significant levels of engagement with local residents in developing the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction Scheme. It further notes the involvement of Keep Britain Tidy in speaking to residents regarding the prototype waste collection scheme, the number of information leaflets provided and the continued direct contact with residents before, during and after the start of the scheme.*

*The Council is extensively consulting and listening to residents on rebuilding two primary schools in the absence of government funding since the Conservative-led coalition scrapped Building Schools for the Future.*

*The numerous resident-led commissions are also testament to this Council’s determination to put residents at the heart of decision-making and policy in the borough in a wide range of policy areas, including Disabled People, Older People, Biodiversity, Climate and Ecological Emergency, Air Quality, Parks, Policing and Crime, Teaching, Women’s Equality, Poverty and Worklessness, Business, Airport Expansion, Council Housing, and Rough Sleeping.”*

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Ben Coleman, Wesley Harcourt, and Lisa Homan (for the Administration) – and Mark Loveday (for the Opposition).

Councillor Matt Thorley made a short speech summing up the debate as the guillotine fell. The amendment was then put to the vote.

<b>FOR</b>	<b>34</b>
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

The amended motion was then put to the vote.

<b>FOR</b>	<b>34</b>
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The amended motion was declared **CARRIED**.

### **9.33pm – RESOLVED**

This Council acknowledges the huge contribution local residents make to towards all aspects of life in Hammersmith & Fulham. The Council is committed to working with local residents, not doing things to them. The Council recognises that local residents have a deep understanding of their local area, its needs, shortcomings and importantly what improvements can and need to be made to make H&F an even better place to live.



The Council plays a vital role in formulating and implementing policies and change in H&F. However, the Council understands that there are other important local stakeholders involved in this process as well. Local residents in particular have an invaluable role given their deep understanding of their local area. As such this Council notes the significant levels of engagement with local residents in developing the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction Scheme. It further notes the involvement of Keep Britain Tidy in speaking to residents regarding the prototype waste collection scheme, the number of information leaflets provided and the continued direct contact with residents before, during and after the start of the scheme.

The Council is extensively consulting and listening to residents on rebuilding two primary schools in the absence of government funding since the Conservative-led coalition scrapped Building Schools for the Future.

The numerous resident-led commissions are also testament to this Council's determination to put residents at the heart of decision-making and policy in the borough in a wide range of policy areas, including Disabled People, Older People, Biodiversity, Climate and Ecological Emergency, Air Quality, Parks, Policing and Crime, Teaching, Women's Equality, Poverty and Worklessness, Business, Airport Expansion, Council Housing, and Rough Sleeping.

**7.4 Special Motion 4 - Hammersmith Bridge Engineering Reports**

The special motion was withdrawn.

**7.5 Special Motion 5 - Covid 19 Vaccination Programme**

The special motion was withdrawn.

Meeting started: 6.34 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.36 pm

Mayor .....

## Public Questions and Responses – 20 January 2021

### Question 1 – CycleWay 9

From: John Bridges, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Answers to a Freedom of Information Request appear to show:-

1. No consultation with the Emergency Services.
2. Reliance on data from TfL, which is out of date and predates Olympia expansion and Hammersmith Bridge closure.
3. The Council is withholding its own research conducted by the Campaign Company from the Commission.
4. The Council is refusing to gather/analyse any data on the current temporary cycle lanes.

Clearly mistakes have been made. Can the Leader assure me that steps will be taken to put things right immediately before any physical work is started on the project?”

### **Response:**

The original consultation on the scheme carried out by Transport for London (TfL) included full engagement with all the Emergency services. The council works constantly with Emergency teams through both our own Network management Team and that from TfL.

The data used by Transport for London to determine the original scheme did not incorporate any changes to the network such as the closure of Hammersmith Bridge or the future proposal for Olympia, but did forecast future traffic levels as part of its modelling. Data gathered by TfL was also used by the Olympia development to form their application.

With regards to The Campaign Company, they were employed to provide the council with a pre-consultation overview on setting up a Residents Commission and not to carry out any other specific research. The TCC report will be shared with the Residents Commission in the near future.

The council is working with TfL to set up appropriate monitoring of the temporary cycle lanes in the near future.

Officers will work across all its services to ensure that the Safer Cycle pathway is delivered in a way that meets all the council's objectives.

**Question 2 – South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction Scheme (TCPR) (Health Survey)**

From: Eva Burgess, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The TCPR has caused increased air pollution on the Wandsworth Bridge Road since its introduction 5 months ago. This has been most acutely experienced by residents living or working on the Wandsworth Bridge Road. Can the council kindly agree to urgently conduct a formal survey of residents on the WBR to ascertain whether they believe they have experienced any negative health outcomes (including negative impact on mental health) directly as a result of the TCPR commencing 20th July 2020?”

**Response:**

There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the TCPR has increased air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road. In fact, traffic data shows that there has been an overall decrease in traffic in the area and crossing the bridge on to Wandsworth Bridge Road. There have, however, been significant outside factors affecting congestion in the area and in the whole borough in recent months. These are the closure or partial closure of London bridges including Wandsworth, Hammersmith, Vauxhall and Tower. Furthermore driver behaviour has changed because of Covid, which has seen peak hour traffic spread across the whole day rather than just am and pm rush hours, and less use of public transport.

The specific purpose of the TCPR is to reduce traffic, congestion and air pollution across the whole South Fulham area by reducing the total traffic, including that which uses Wandsworth Bridge Rd. The scheme is the first significant effort in decades to tackle the very long-standing problem of traffic in the area and we are working with around 70 residents across three working parties to bring together plans for the wider area, including streets to the west of WBR and WBR itself. We believe this is the largest resident engagement programme of any current low traffic scheme under development in London.

Among the proposals being discussed for WBR are air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution, and high impact measures along WBR including reassignment of road space to prioritise public transport and cyclists while reducing car volumes.

Once there is a consensus around the proposals for the area, wider consultation will take place..

To monitor air pollution we are currently installing the highest density of air quality monitors anywhere in Europe across south Fulham, including the WBR. This live data will be publicly available.

Over three years, NO<sub>2</sub> air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road has fallen 37% from annual average mean figure of 87.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2017 to 57.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2019.

An initial generic EqiA was carried out regarding traffic control measures for climate change covid emergency traffic and parking measure report. In general terms, any measures that reduce traffic in an area has an overall positive effect.

Imperial College has done independent research on low traffic schemes across London of which there are currently 80 in operation. They indicate that all schemes have a positive impact on an area improving, safety, accessibility, health, and reduces inequality.

It also noted that whilst traffic went down in study areas, it did not get worse on the main roads around the area.

**Question 3 – Wheelie Bin Scheme**

From: Rosemary Mortimer, Resident

To: Cllr Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“Wheelie bins may be regarded as intrusive and unnecessary in small front gardens. Whilst applauding Council policy to ‘do things with residents’ and a wish to improve borough recycling will the Administration commit to full consultation with residents before expanding its wheelie bin scheme?”

**Response:**

The prototype service is in and of itself a consultation exercise. It would be impossible to meaningfully engage with residents on the modifications to the service without anyone having had the experience of using the new container and food waste service. Officers would also have no meaningful local data with which to contextualise the effectiveness of the scheme until a prototype service was trialled.

An online survey via Citizen Space is planned for residents within the scheme area to gauge their experience of the prototype service. This will be launched once the scheme has been in place for over three months. Officers are also working to ensure that residents who do not have access to the online survey can have their views heard.

In addition, as part of developing the prototype service delivery and in keeping with the H&F Vision, officers have and will be continuing to carry out other methods of consultation, including face to face surveys where appropriate, dip sampling surveys of properties within the scheme area and consultation with other stakeholders including the council’s co-production team, ward councillors and the contractor.

**Question 4 – South Fulham TCPR (Independent Review)**

From: Anand Sinha, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“It has increasingly become clear to me through attendance at the WBRA meetings with the council that the arguments and data put forward by LBHF are not balanced and designed to further their agenda.

Can the council commit to an independent review of its modelling work, in particular to review the conclusions around impacts of opening Imperial Road?”

**Response:**

As part of the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction scheme, the resident working parties agreed on a set of objectives. Officers test ideas brought forward to ensure they deliver on all objectives. The impact of re-opening Townmead Road/ Imperial Road to out-of-borough drivers was one such suggestion. The data presented for the reopening of Imperial Road and Townmead Road provided a summary of data sourced information including demographics of the area, junctions control capacity and traffic information on the road network.

It was shown that the proposal does not meet the objectives of the scheme therefore the council cannot support it. The only agenda the council has is to reduce traffic, congestion and pollution across South Fulham.

An area wide Strategic Model is being developed for traffic and transport modelling purposes by independent consultants based on real origin and destination data received from GPS tracking data. This model will be used to determine the impact of all scenarios within the area.

**Question 5 – South Fulham TCPR (Duty of Care)**

From: Pranita Sinha, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The objectives of the council with the TCPR are to reduce traffic in the area. Given a number of factors including lockdowns, bridge closures, it has been difficult to assess whether there has been a genuine traffic reduction, however, what is clear is that over the Autumn when lockdown had been eased then the traffic on WBR was worse than I had ever seen it in the 14 years that I have lived here.

Is the council is prepared to damage the health and wellbeing of those on WBR for some potentially marginal benefit to those in the East and West and if so, how has the council discharged its duty of care to those on the WBR given there was no real consultation or pollution monitoring in place prior to scheme introduction and no clear plans exist to deal with serious issues caused by TCPR?”

**Response:**

The objectives for the South Fulham TCPR are to reduce traffic, congestion and pollution and enhance the area, for all areas of South Fulham.

As noted, traffic on Wandsworth Bridge has fluctuated throughout the past year due to Covid and a series of London bridge closures and partial closures. However the data trends from the traffic monitoring has shown a reduction in traffic across the area including traffic coming over Wandsworth Bridge. According to the data for Wandsworth Bridge Rd, 2017 saw higher traffic volumes and NO2 readings than we have in 2019/2020, when the first traffic pilot began with the closure of Harwood Terrace. In 2019 prior to the closure at the end of September, NO2 mean average was 5% higher than post the implementation on Wandsworth Bridge Road. Ratified data for 2020 will not be available until June 2021.

Council officers continue to work with residents of South Fulham via three working parties, including one for Wandsworth Bridge Road, to develop measures for WBR to address traffic, congestion and pollution issues. A number of proposals have been prepared by officers and presented to the WBR working party. However they have yet to be agreed for the next phase of the scheme.

As noted above, air quality monitors are currently being installed across the area.

**Question 6 – South Fulham TCPR (Data Quality)**

From: Gaynor Churchward, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The ongoing Covid-19 epidemic has substantially changed travel behaviour (both public and private) and will continue to do so until we are over the epidemic. The travel patterns being assessed now are in no way typical and are further confounded by numerous bridge closures across London.

Should we be relying on transport data taken in 2020 during a global epidemic to inform long term structural changes to the borough relating to LTN's, strategic road networks and public transport networks?”

**Response:**

Whilst the pandemic has changed travel behaviour, including an extension of rush hour travel periods and an increased traffic volume on residential streets, the basic concept of removing out-of-borough traffic from side streets still holds true, if fact is more pressing to help solve the problem of extra traffic demand.

As the Covid traffic impacts have been seen globally, it is possible to take references from roads that are not part of the scheme to normalise the data.

To monitor the current phase and develop the next phase of the South Fulham TCPR scheme, officers continue to utilise existing traffic data from before the 2020 pandemic. In addition, a series of on-site monitoring cameras and traffic counters have been installed across the area to supplement this information. It is intended to maintain this series of cameras and traffic counters across the area as the scheme develops and settles in so as to continue to monitor the traffic data and changes to traffic flows.



**Question 7 – South Fulham TCPR (Equality Impact Assessment 1)**

From: Caroline Brooman-White, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Did the Council complete an Equality Impact Assessment for the Traffic Reduction Scheme prior to implementation and if so, did this include the indirect discrimination against residents of Wandsworth Bridge Road with disabilities such as chronic or progressive health conditions that put them at greater risk of the harmful effects of air pollution e.g. Cardiovascular, Respiratory and Neurological conditions?”

**Response:**

Air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road has been a long-standing issue. Reducing traffic, congestion and pollution are the key objectives of the South Fulham TCPR. The council will continue to work with residents and businesses across the area, including the Wandsworth Bridge Road working party, to introduce measures to reduce or mitigate air pollution as part of the TCPR scheme. Measures under consideration include new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR to support public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, while reducing car volumes.

Under the Experimental Traffic Order for the South Fulham TCPR scheme, an Equality Impact Assessment was not required to introduce the trial scheme. Independent research from Imperial College has determined that reducing traffic in residential streets has a positive equalities impact. It is also a government and London Mayoral priority to introduce more of these schemes across London.

**Question 8 – South Fulham TCPR (Cycling/Walking/Bus Infrastructure)**

From: Natalie Lindsay, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The Council’s traffic scheme does not encourage any form of transport modal shift in the residents of the Borough. On the contrary it is creating a de-facto private rat-run for H&F residents to use and abuse, making short car trips easier - provided the residents cut across the traffic-congested and polluted Wandsworth Bridge Road.

Why has there not been important infrastructure changes put in place to favour cycling/walking/bus use in parallel with the scheme and does the council recognise that at present they are acting for the exclusive benefit of local car users to the detriment of everyone else and in complete violation of their own green objectives and the Climate crisis?”

**Response:**

The original closure of Harwood Terrace had modal filters, but was unpopular with local residents as it impacted heavily on their daily lives. The purpose of the original closure was to stop rat running and over 85% of the traffic was out of borough.

Modal filters are not necessary for local residents to drive behaviour change as there are more levers that can be used to encourage greener car ownership and active travel, such as emission based charging for parking.

The mission of the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction scheme is to improve the life for residents of South Fulham by reducing traffic, congestion and pollution and enhancing the area, and this is linked with objectives to:

- Reduce traffic across South Fulham
- Remove rat running
- Improve air quality
- Enhance WBR as a place to live, work and visit
- Support local businesses
- Make roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists
- Ensure public transport runs smoothly

The aspiration of the Council, and as put forward to the Wandsworth Bridge Road working party, is to reduce traffic across the area and introduce measures on WBR to encourage cycling and walking while protecting bus journeys and ensuring there is no impact on current bus journey times through the area.

As previously stated, measures under consideration for WBR include new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR to support public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, while reducing car volumes.

**Question 9 – South Fulham TCPR (Impact on Wandsworth Bridge Road)**

From: Gary Fannin, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The council has insisted repeatedly that current traffic congestion and pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road is not related to the current eastern LTN/TCPR scheme and insist that it is purely due to works on Wandsworth Bridge. However, since both lanes on the bridge reopened in November we have not seen the reduction in congestion that had been suggested. In fact we have seen an increase in queueing northbound traffic.

Will the council admit that the TCPR scheme is designed to protect residents East and West of Wandsworth Bridge Road to the detriment of those living on Wandsworth Bridge Road itself and that the WBR residents are a necessary 'causality' in order for this scheme to be a success?”

**Response:**

Since the launch of the South Fulham TCPR scheme, Council officers have met with residents from the area, including the Wandsworth Bridge Road working party, on several occasions. Within these meetings, officers have presented the cause of traffic, congestion and pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road (WBR), which has been a long standing issue.

The levels of traffic and congestion were impacted during 2020 due a number of bridge closures and partial closures across London, including Hammersmith Bridge, Vauxhall Bridge, London Bridge, Tower Bridge as well as Wandsworth Bridge, along side changes in travel partners due to the Covid19 pandemic.

Since the full reopening of Wandsworth Bridge, traffic monitoring data has shown a reduction in the volume of traffic on Wandsworth Bridge.

The South Fulham TCPR scheme has been developed to improve the life for all residents of South Fulham by reducing traffic, congestion and pollution and enhancing the area, including WBR.

As presented to the WBR working party of local residents and businesses, the most recent proposal to extend the TCPR was developed to restrict access for out of borough drivers to residential streets to the west of WBR and introduce traffic calming measures on WBR and measures to reduce air pollution on the street to create a 'café culture' on WBR.

**Question 10 – South Fulham TCPR (Pedestrians)**

From: Tom Ward, Business Owner

To: The Leader of the Council

“The Wandsworth Bridge Road is the busiest pedestrian route in South Fulham. We are concerned that all the emphasis of the TCPR Scheme debates focus on traffic movements, rather than pedestrian movements. NO2 levels are highest at pavement level and most affect the old and young. What surveys have been undertaken by the council to capture the quantum of pedestrians and cyclists using the road?”

**Response:**

The first phase of the South Fulham TCPR Scheme has been introduced to reduce traffic on the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road (WBR), and the next phase is proposed to do a similar restriction to streets to the west and introduce traffic calming measures for WBR. The objectives of the TCPR include making roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists and enhancing WBR as a place to live, work and visit

Further measures are being developed to address air pollution on WBR include new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR. Additional measures are also being proposed to increase pedestrian safety, including new pedestrian crossings, alterations to existing junctions and improved safety at side roads.

**Question 11 – South Fulham TCPR (Access to Public Transport)**

From: Susan Waterhouse, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Have LBHF consulted with Metroline and Tower Transit who run the two bus routes in WBRd?”

**Response:**

Yes. All bus operators within the South Fulham area were consulted accordingly through the Experimental Traffic Order process.

**Question 12 – South Fulham TCPR (Gathering Feedback)**

From: Gauri Nafrey, Business Owner (124 Wandsworth Bridge Road, SW6 2UL)

To: The Leader of the Council

“The council have presented data to show the support of the current scheme and are using it to support a similar scheme to the west of WBR. Given the level of feeling the scheme has induced and looking at the council's own survey via the Commonplace website, it is clear there is little support or desire for this scheme. Can we ask if the council is using a different means to gather feedback for this scheme and if so, why is this not being shared with the public?”

**Response:**

The Council considers all feedback received. A public facing feedback page was launched for the scheme via Commonplace, which was accessible by out of borough drivers who had received fines. Many of them expressed their displeasure at receiving fines for travelling through camera-controlled zones. It also highlighted several areas for improvement, notably around access for deliveries, taxis and carers to local residents. We have responded to these concerns. Significant improvements have been made, and are continuing to be made, as a result of the feedback.

Additional feedback is received directly from residents to Council officers and members and via the dedicated scheme email address and Council enquiries. Further feedback has been received from residents as part of the ongoing and extensive engagement with three residents working parties from within the South Fulham area. New traffic schemes routinely take six months to bed in. The feedback we have received recently suggests local support for the scheme has grown considerably since its launch, and continues to do so.

**Question 13 – South Fulham TCRP (Air Quality)**

From: Laura Sharrock, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The level of air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road is dangerous. Can the Council provide PM2.5 face masks to residents and visitors and agree to conduct indoor air quality assessments of the residential properties and businesses on this road to determine the need for air purifiers, and provide these for all impacted rooms on WBR where pollution exceeds WHO limits?”

**Response:**

Air Quality on Wandsworth Bridge Road (WBR) has been a longstanding issue, and for several areas across the borough. Over three years, NO<sub>2</sub> air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road has fallen 37% from annual average mean figure of 87.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2017 to 57.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2019 because of many local, National and London wide initiatives.

There is currently no data available which indicates that the recently introduced South Fulham TCPR has caused an increase in air pollution on WBR. To monitor air pollution we are currently installing the highest density of air quality monitors anywhere in Europe across south Fulham, including the WBR. This live data will be publicly available and connected to the main monitoring station in Hammersmith to understand the borough wide background levels and weather influence on the data.

Council officers continue to work with residents and businesses of WBR to address air quality as part of the TCPR scheme, a key objective of the scheme. To address this, officers have proposed measures such as new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR. These have been presented to residents and businesses via the WBR working party.

**Question 14 – South Fulham TCRP (Pollution)**

From: Isabel Blunden, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“I do not believe that LBHF Councillors nor officers fully appreciate the scale of the pollution situation on the Wandsworth Bridge Road. Can LBHF agree to undertake a socially distanced walk with residents at 4pm one day (when schools return) to experience the air quality that we are being subjected to on a daily basis?”

**Response:**

Air pollution is a problem across LBHF and London, and this was one of the reasons which led the Council to declare a Climate Emergency in 2019.

With knowledge of the air pollution faced by residents of South Fulham, the Traffic, Congestion and Pollution scheme has been developed to address this issue. Specifically, for Wandsworth Bridge Road, officers continue to develop additional measures including new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR, which have been presented to residents and businesses of WBR.

Thank you for the invite to undertake a site visit. Officers regularly visit the area and their first hand experience contributes towards the development of the scheme and measures outlined above.

**Question 15 – South Fulham TCRP (Equality Impact Assessment 2)**

From: Kerry Collins, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Did the council complete an Equality Impact Assessment for the Traffic Reduction Scheme prior to implementation and if so, did this include the indirect discrimination of resident’s safety and gender discrimination?”

Mini-cabs refusing to enter the side streets and requesting passengers to alight from the cab on the main road and walk the rest of their journey home is a safety concern to residents inside the exclusion zone compared to main road residents and one that disproportionately impacts female residents.”

**Response:**

The TCPR scheme introduced to residential streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road ensures that all properties remain accessible, without passing through an enforcement camera.

However we have been made aware of cases where mini-cabs have refused to enter side streets and we have tremendous system with this accessibility issue. To prevent this happening we have added local minicab forms to the exempt lists and officers are working with Uber to develop a technical solution to permit access where a trip begins or ends within the restricted zone. London black cabs are exempt from the restrictions.

An initial generic EqiA was carried out regarding traffic control measures for climate change covid emergency traffic and parking measure report. In general terms, any measures that reduce traffic in an area has an overall positive effect.

A detailed Equality Impact Assessment was not a requirement in the introduction of the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution (TCPR) scheme which was introduced under an Experimental Traffic Order as the intent is to reduce traffic across the whole area.



**Question 16 – Recycling Scheme**

From: Illtyd L Lewis, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Please could you advise details with dates and numbers as to how residents (and refuse collectors) were consulted regarding the new recycling and rubbish area experiment; I understand that the cost of the experiment has been £60 per address?”

**Response:**

The full cost to authority to provide the prototype service, including the purchase of containers is £26 per property. The collection rounds were optimised before the prototype service was introduced to enable that part of the service to be delivered at no extra cost. The costs to the authority will be offset within 24 months through a reduction in disposal costs and a reduced requirement for single use recycling sacks which is a priority of the Council’s Climate Emergency Response priority of reducing the use of single plastics in the borough.

The prototype service is in and of itself a consultation exercise. It would be impossible to meaningfully engage with residents on the modifications to the service without anyone having had the experience of using the new container and food waste service. Officers would also have no meaningful local data with which to contextualise the effectiveness of the scheme until a prototype service was trialled.

With the background of a global pandemic our priority was to keep residents and staff safe, so initially face to face contacts had to be limited for safety reasons, hence the reliance on leaflets and electronic information. However, over 1000 socially distanced interaction took place when safe to do so.

An online survey is planned for residents within the scheme area to gauge their experience of the prototype service. This will be launched once the scheme has been in place for over three months. Officers are also working to ensure that residents who do not have access to the online survey can have their views heard.

In addition, as part of developing the prototype service delivery and in keeping with the H&F Vision, officers have and will be continuing to carry out other methods of consultation, including face to face surveys where appropriate, dip sampling surveys of properties within the scheme area and consultation with other stakeholders including the council’s co-production team, ward councillors and the contractor.

10th September	1st Ward Councillor Briefing Note on the prototype roll out.
30th September	2nd Ward Councillor Briefing Note on the prototype roll out.
1st October	Residents start to receive an introduction leaflet through the post by Royal Mail to 5800 residents in the prototype area. Leaflet includes direction to dedicated mailbox and webpage
1st October	Covid-19 safe face to face engagement and individual

	property assessments commence
1st October	Resident engagement through dedicated mailbox (newbins@lbhf.gov.uk) commences.
1st October	New webpage <a href="http://www.LBHF.gov.uk/newbins">www.LBHF.gov.uk/newbins</a> , goes live. Includes detailed FAQ section included, which is constantly updated.
16th October 2020	3rd Ward Councillor Briefing Note
19th October 2020	Instructional leaflet sent to 5,800 residents in the prototype area. (Delivered alongside the food waste containers).
w/c 26th October	Wheeled bins delivered to eligible properties in prototype area
28th October 2020	4th Ward Councillor Briefing Note
w/c 2nd November	Face to face engagement with residents to address needs by offering alternative container sizes, bin sharing and wheeled bin suitability reassessments over 1000 engagements in the first four weeks
w/c 9th November	New Prototype Container Collection Service commences, communication consultation on going
w/c 24th November	Social Media Twitter feed explaining service improvements.
	5th Ward Councillor Briefing Note

### **Question 17 – Recycling Scheme**

From: Dr Tim Rees, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“What assessment did the council make prior to implementing the new rubbish collection pilot in my area, that the bins it had selected were appropriate for the areas selected?”

#### **Response:**

Keep Britain Tidy were commissioned by Resource London on behalf of Hammersmith & Fulham Council to carry out a street level survey of properties across the borough to assess their suitability for the prototype scheme. This was completed in January 2020. Officers in street environmental services completed analysis of the data from this survey by March 2020, identifying streets that had a high number of eligible properties for the collection service.

Officers from street environmental services, alongside colleagues from Serco, carried out a further detailed assessment of properties in the prototype area in June 2020, after the first Covid 19 lockdown had ended.

The survey outcomes identified a scheme area of approximately 5800 properties. All of these were assessed as suitable for food waste collection. In addition, approximately 4600 properties were also assessed as suitable for the prototype wheeled bin collection service.

As with any prototype service of this size, officers were conscious that some properties that were assessed as suitable for inclusion may need to be reassessed. A standard bin configuration of 1 x 140 litre refuse bin and 1 x 240 litre recycling bin was deemed appropriate based on estimates of household waste capacity across the 4,600 properties.

Once bins were delivered officers undertook visits to individual properties (adhering to Covid-19 guidelines) where residents raised concerns to reassess properties, and in the appropriate circumstances offer a smaller or larger capacity recycling bin. On the rare occasions where it was evident that a property was unsuitable for the prototype service one or more of the bins were removed or bin sharing was introduced.

**Question 18 – South Fulham TCRP (Measuring Success)**

From: Katerina Tanti, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“How are the council going to define if the East LTN is a success and what are the exact parameters it is using to measure this success?”

**Response:**

The Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction scheme was introduced as an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) and Council officers continue to address concerns raised by residents of South Fulham.

Measures of success are being prepared, to be worked through with residents via the three working parties, to include a reduction of congestion and out of borough traffic passing through South Fulham, a reduction in vehicle based pollution across South Fulham and ensuring buses are not adversely affected by the measures introduced.

Under the ETO, the trial scheme can be in place for up to 18 months to allow consultation and determine the success of the scheme before it is made permanent, amended or removed. Council officers continue to work with residents from the three working parties, including that for residents to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road, to address and mitigate concerns raised since the launch of the trial scheme in July 2020, as well as seeking to make improvements.

**Question 19 - South Fulham TCRP (Compensation)**

From: Susana M Valle, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“The existing and upcoming traffic measures around Wandsworth Bridge Road are intentionally directing all traffic passing through Sands End towards Wandsworth Bridge Road exclusively, increasing pollution, unsafety and noise for residents/users on this particular road, so others can benefit.

As this is against any principle of fairness and equality, my question is which compensation provisions will the council be granting to WBR residents for both the discrimination and for our health and property damages?”

**Response:**

The South Fulham TCPR does not discriminate against residents of Wandsworth Bridge Road. Traffic data shows that there has been an overall decrease in traffic in the area and crossing the bridge on to Wandsworth Bridge Road. There have, however, been significant outside factors affecting congestion in the area and in the whole borough in recent months. These are the closure or partial closure of London bridges including Wandsworth, Hammersmith, Vauxhall and Tower. Furthermore driver behaviour has changed because of Covid, which has seen peak hour traffic spread across the whole day rather than just am and pm rush hours, and less use of public transport.

The specific purpose of the TCPR is to reduce traffic, congestion and air pollution across the whole South Fulham area by reducing the total traffic, including that which uses Wandsworth Bridge Rd. The scheme is the first significant effort in decades to tackle the very long-standing problem of traffic in the area and we are working with around 70 residents across three working parties to bring together plans for the wider area, including streets to the west of WBR and WBR itself.

Among the proposals being discussed for WBR are air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution, and high impact measures along WBR including reassignment of road space to prioritise public transport and cyclists while reducing car volumes.

To monitor air pollution we are currently installing the highest density of air quality monitors anywhere in Europe across south Fulham, including the WBR. This live data will be publicly available.

Over three years, NO<sub>2</sub> air pollution on Wandsworth Bridge Road has fallen 37% from annual average mean figure of 87.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2017 to 57.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2019.

Imperial College has done independent research on low traffic schemes across London of which there are currently 80 in operation. They indicate that all schemes have a

positive impact on an area improving, safety, accessibility, health, and reduces inequality.

An initial generic EqiA was carried out regarding traffic control measures for climate change covid emergency traffic and parking measure report. In general terms, any measures that reduce traffic in an area has an overall positive effect to all equality strands.

### **Question 20 – South Fulham TCRP (Air Quality)**

From: Beatrice Goater, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Wandsworth Bridge Road is the most polluted road in Fulham, breaching air quality limits since records began and made even worse by the Traffic Reduction Scheme to the East of Wandsworth Bridge Road (and soon to be further worsened by a similar scheme to the West, if it goes ahead).

Are the council going to either move half of the traffic to an alternative route (e.g Southbound traffic moved to Imperial/Townmead Road) to reduce pollution on this road or do the council plan to acquire all of the properties on the Wandsworth Bridge Road via Compulsory Purchase Order in order to legitimately turn this road into the central polluted highway of South Fulham?”

#### **Response:**

As has been shown by a presentation to members of the three working parties, opening up Townmead/ Imperial Rd will not move half of the traffic to an alternative route. It will result in a significant increase in traffic across the area, while causing huge congestion in Townmead Road, and failing to alleviate the congestion issue in Wandsworth Bridge Road.

The issue of traffic, congestion and pollution is a long-standing issue for residents across south Fulham, including those of Wandsworth Bridge Road. The South Fulham TCPR is the first major effort to tackle this issue in decades. Using smart cameras, data modelling and air quality monitoring, the council believes traffic, congestion and pollution can be reduced for all streets in the area.

Specifically, for Wandsworth Bridge Road, officers continue to develop additional measures including new air pollution screening, planting of additional trees where possible, piloting additional street cleaning to reduce pollution and the high impact reassignment of road space along WBR, all of which have been presented to residents and businesses of WBR.

**Question 21 – South Fulham TCPR (Engaging with Sustrans)**

From: Jonathan Goater, Resident and Business Owner

To: The Leader of the Council

“Can LBHF engage with Sustrans as an independent body to provide advice for the South Fulham Traffic Scheme and in particular the designation of appropriate through-routes in South Fulham.

Can the council please invite Sustrans into the working group meetings to discuss the Imperial/Townmead Road route and help us to develop a scheme that genuinely benefits all residents, including the residents of WBR?”

**Response:**

We are committed to developing a TCPR scheme that genuinely benefits all residents, including those of WBR. Re-opening Townmead/Imperial Road to out of borough traffic will not do so, for the reasons stated above.

Members of the working parties, and residents generally, are welcome to offer up advice from bodies such as Sustrans. However we employ highly-regarded transport and highways engineers to carry out this work. The need for an independent body to input into the scheme has not been identified and any such appointment would require be undertaken in accordance with the Council’s procurement methods.

**Question 22 – South Fulham TCRP (Public Approval)**

From: George Blunden, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Councillor Ben Coleman has been meeting with 'working parties' on the East and West of Wandsworth Bridge Road including a few residents and businesses on WBR itself. However these working parties are not fully representative of the entire area to sufficiently gather full public opinion.

Will the council agree that before any further changes or indeed approval of the East LTN/TCPR that ALL residents within the South Fulham area (from New Kings Road to the north to Imperial Wharf on the east and Hurlingham Estate to the west and as far as the river south) will be given a final, binding, public vote on the approval of any said scheme, and will the council acknowledge that without this full democratic process they cannot claim to be working local residents as stated on their website?”

**Response:**

To develop the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction scheme, the Council has worked extensively with around 70 residents from across the South Fulham area in three working parties which meet individually and collectively. This has enabled officers to make continuing improvements to the first phase of the TCPR in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road, as well as to develop approaches towards extending the scheme.

This is because the council is committed to working with residents. We are extremely grateful for the input so far of all those residents who are on the working parties. We believe this is the largest resident engagement programme of any current low traffic scheme in London.

We are committed to resident engagement and consultation and are asking the three working parties to consider, once a consensus on the way forward is agreed, what form that engagement and consultation should take. All options remain on the table.

Phase One of the scheme was introduced under an Experimental Traffic Order, with consultation with local residents during the 18month period to ensure the success criteria is met before the scheme is made permanent, changed or removed. This is ongoing for the scheme introduced to the east, where officers continue to address concerns raised by residents since its launch.



**Question 23 – Home Deliveries**

From: Andrew Male, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Are Councillors and Council Officers aware that according to DfT data, the significant increase in minor road vehicle miles seen in recent years correlates to a 49% increase in vans and 26% increase in cars and taxis over the past 10 years which indicates that the majority of increased traffic may be related to vehicles making deliveries to homes on the side streets rather than ‘rat-running’ traffic?”

What is the council doing to tackle the proliferation of home deliveries and is it feasible to block couriers and mandate deliveries by cargo bike only within traffic schemes to reduce road vehicle miles locally?”

**Response:**

The Council and Officers are aware of wide range of data sets periodically published by organisations such as the DfT and TFL that provide information on national and regional trends. We also conduct localized traffic studies to understand traffic behaviour on local borough roads. The trend of increased trips due to more home deliveries, passenger vehicles and uber is an emerging national trend with regional and local variations that is acknowledged. The reasons for this can be attributed to a wide range of factors such as growth and complicated changes in emerging consumer behaviour and economic activity.

A distinction at the local level does often exist and a need to better understand the profile of delivery or individual trips in a local context. E.g. delivery services made to a residential street within Hammersmith and Fulham or those deliveries where the origin or destination is on a main road or elsewhere in the London.

Although, the Council are not currently adopting a policy that mandates the use of delivery consolidation services, the council are keen to trial and promote delivery consolidation services such as ‘Parcels not Pollutions’. It is also important to consider and balance the wide-ranging needs of residents and the business community and maintain access for a range of servicing and delivery needs.

We will continue to explore developments in this area and engage delivery providers to consider consolidation services as the use and provision of these increase.

**Question 24 – Recycling Scheme**

From: Francine Lyle, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“Chiddingstone street is in the Conservation Area, which requires all developments and alterations to properties to contribute positively to the ‘visual quality’ in the ‘view of the street’. How is the new recycling scheme in compliance with Conservation Guidelines with large, unhoused bins taking away from the ‘scene view’ of the street?”

**Response:**

Refuse bins are considered to be movable structures that do not require planning permission. In some instances local residents have previously sought to erect bin stores in front gardens to enclose existing bins/refuse storage. Any new or rebuilt bin stores would require planning permission and are generally not supported, as these developments are considered to introduce additional visual clutter into the streetscene.

In the Studdridge Street Conservation Area the Conservation Area Character Profile produced in 2004 advised that in streets and terraces with traditional railings, dustbin enclosures will not normally be permitted where these would detract from the appearance of the area.

Instead it is considered that the installation of hedges or planters, (which do not require planning permission), may be helpful to screen bins/refuse storage in front gardens.

Notwithstanding the environmental benefits of the new refuse/recycling collection scheme in increasing take-up of recycling in the Borough, the revised refuse/recycling scheme is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of our Conservation Areas overall. The provision by the Council of refuse bins/recycling containers as part of the scheme may also assist in resolving a number of untidy land issues which can occur within these areas and reduce incidents involving the spillage of waste from split refuse bags.

The prototype scheme was introduced using powers under the environmental protection act 1990. Section 46 of the act allows the authority to require the occupier to place the waste for collection in receptacles of a kind and number specified.

**Question 25 – Hammersmith Bridge (New Bridge)**

From: Antonia Muir, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“The Council’s own experts say a new Hammersmith Bridge is cheaper, faster and better value to the taxpayer than trying to repair the old bridge. Is the Council leadership pressing for a new bridge with the taskforce? If yes, what progress? If no, why not?”

**Response:**

Following detailed inspections and assessments to determine the current load carrying capacity, designs were developed for the refurbishment and strengthening of the Bridge. The solutions developed have been in place for some time now and have been proven to be feasible. The Bridge is Grade II\* Listed and protected. With solutions developed, there can be no justification for demolishing such a significant heritage asset and replacing with a new bridge. Contrary to the statement in your question, replacing the protected Grade II\* listed structure with a new bridge has not been considered as there is no justification for doing so.

It would not be cheaper or faster to replace the bridge with new, as this would require Secretary of State approval, lengthy consent and consultation processes, procurement and implementation of a demolition contract and design and construction of an entirely new bridge.

An alternative proposal we are exploring is a new temporary bridge that fits within the current bridge and allows works on refurbishing the current bridge to continue while allowing bridge passage to traffic within a considerable shorter timeframe than the current proposal.

**Question 26 – Hammersmith Bridge (Comprehensive Plan)**

From: Charlie Pryor, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“What will it take for the Council to reach an agreement with the Hammersmith Bridge Task Force, to deliver a comprehensive financed plan to fix the bridge?”

**Response**

The Department for Transport has been presented with a comprehensive business plan for the stabilisation and strengthening of Hammersmith bridge. The council and the Secretary of State for Transport are currently considering the financial options.

**Question 27 – Hammersmith Bridge (New Bridge on Current Footings)**

From: Luke Robinson, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“Why can the bridge not be removed and a new bridge be installed rapidly on the current footings?”

**Response:**

Hammersmith Bridge is Grade II\* Listed and is therefore of particular importance and of more than special interest. The Bridge is therefore protected.

New bridges have to be designed to modern codes and standards including their foundations. The ‘current footings’ would not comply with these modern standards and could not simply be reused.

An alternative proposal we are exploring is a new temporary bridge that fits within the current bridge and allows works on refurbishing the current bridge to continue whilst allowing bridge passage to traffic within a considerable shorter timeframe than the current proposal.

**Question 28 – Hammersmith Bridge (Viable Solution)**

From: Christopher Jones, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“I would like to ask the Council if they have agreed on a viable solution going forward, found funding from council and government funds, and if so when work will start on fixing this bridge and if not, why not?”

**Response:**

The Department for Transport Taskforce has already been presented with a comprehensive business plan for the stabilisation and strengthening of Hammersmith bridge. The council and the Secretary of State for Transport are currently considering the financial options.

**Question 29 – Hammersmith Bridge (New Bridge)**

From: John Griffiths, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“Has the Council considered a completely new bridge of outstanding design, fit for the purpose of carrying pedestrians, cyclists and road traffic including double decker buses, and able to accommodate river traffic at all tides. It could be the new forward-looking emblem for the Borough.”

**Response:**

Following detailed inspections and assessments to determine the current load carrying capacity, designs were developed for the stabilisation and strengthening of Hammersmith Bridge. The solutions developed have been in place for some time now and have been proven to be feasible. The Bridge is Grade II\* Listed and therefore protected and there is no justification for demolishing such a significant heritage asset and replacing with a new one. Replacing the protected Grade II\* listed structure with a new bridge has not been considered as there is no justification for doing so.

It would not be cheaper or faster to replace the bridge with new, as this would require Secretary of State approval, lengthy consent and consultation processes, procurement and implementation of a demolition contract, and design and construction of an entirely new bridge.

An alternative proposal we are exploring is a new temporary bridge that fits within the current bridge and allows works on refurbishing the current to continue whilst allowing bridge passage to traffic within a considerable shorter timeframe than the current proposal.

**Question 30 – Hammersmith Bridge (Financial Planning)**

From: Justin Sumner, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“As owners of the Bridge the Council may mortgage or raise Finance against the ASSET. Therefore, Will the Council confirm their financial planning and Bridge repair time frame, with specific target dates, please.”

**Response:**

The Council is able to raise finance for capital investment by borrowing through the Public Works Loans Board. This borrowing is based on affordability and ability to pay, not on any value of the assets owned. The Council will be outlining its overall financial position and medium term plans at Full Council in February 2021. The position with regard to Hammersmith Bridge is dependent on the ongoing discussions with the Department of Transport’s Task Force and the Secretary of State for Transport.

**Question 31 – Hammersmith Bridge (Moving the Bridge)**

From: David Chamberlain, Resident

To: Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for the Environment

“Is it not time to bite the bullet and remove Hammersmith Bridge to another location? It is clearly not fit for purpose and any repairs currently contemplated will have to be repeated time and time again.”

**Response:**

Hammersmith Bridge is Grade II\* Listed and is therefore of particular importance and of more than special interest. The Bridge is therefore protected and cannot be removed to another location.

Design of strengthening works have been developed and have been proven to be feasible. Indeed, similar works have been successfully implemented to numerous historical bridges in the UK and abroad. With the allocation of funding Hammersmith Bridge can be fit for purpose.

**Question 32 – New Bins**

From: Snjezana Maclean, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

“I live in W6 and have received the new bins unexpectedly. The bins are far too big and completely block my small front garden. I have two bikes that are in constant use so would like to know how do you think this will work with the request that the bins should be wheeled in and out every week?”

**Response:**

The Council is sorry to hear you feel the wheeled bins arrived unexpectedly. There has been extensive activity on social media and informatics were sent to Facebook, Mobile, Nextdoor and Twitter before the containers were delivered.

On the 1st October residents in the prototype area started to receive an introduction leaflet through the post via Royal Mail. The leaflet includes direction to dedicated mailbox and webpage.

The food caddy enclosed an instruction “how to use the service” leaflet that was delivered up to two weeks in advance of the recycling and refuse containers.

If residents have not already done so, they can request for the property to be reassessed by contacting [newbins@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:newbins@lbhf.gov.uk), and a visit will be arranged following Covid safe practices.



**Question 33 – Demolition of Hartopp and Lannoy Points**

From: Mr and Mrs James O'Brien, Residents

To: The Leader of the Council

“Given that we leaseholders in Chasemore House and Donnelly Courts are blighted by not being able to sell our properties, as we are unable to obtain valuations, what compensation is the council proposing to offer us as we are suffering from this council's actions?”

**Response:**

The council is demolishing Hartopp Point and Lannoy Point on the advice of structural experts; following detailed intrusive surveys of the buildings that highlighted serious concerns around structural integrity and fire safety. The advice was that that the council should act as soon as practicably possible to demolish them. Cabinet approved demolition in April 2019 and by February 2020, all 91 tenants were rehoused and 21 leasehold interests acquired.

Demolition contractors started work in May last year and work is expected to be completed by March 2021 and site cleared later in the spring. Unfortunately, it is inevitable that demolition work will cause some disturbance to neighbours especially as more residents will be at home during working hours due to the Government recommendations aimed at reducing the spread of coronavirus.

We are doing everything we can to minimise disturbance. A detailed air quality, dust and noise management plan has been prepared for the demolition work. Measures are being implemented which include wrapping the building in scaffolding and protective sheeting, water spraying, and crushing of material predominantly at ground level.

Noise, vibration and air quality monitors have been installed around the site with one directly outside Chasemore House. These monitors will automatically raise an alert if dust, noise or vibrations exceed acceptable levels. If this happens our demolition contractor must stop work until air quality improves and adapt their methodology to manage dust, vibration and noise from the site. To date, all levels have been well within the acceptable range.

To further limit the noise council's contractors are using equipment fitted with specialist noise suppression systems. Most importantly, the towers will be dismantled panel by panel with material crushed at basement level, as opposed to traditional demolition which would see crushing at height. This further and significantly reduces both noise and dust.

We have taken a proactive approach to working with residents and managing the contractor and have:

- Communicated regularly with residents and provided them with a named contact person to report any issue they may experience during the demolition;
- Restricted working hours to Monday to Friday 8 am to 6 p.m. with generally no weekends work or Bank holidays;
- Prevented deliveries to the site during school drop-offs and pick-ups, between 08:30 to 09:15 and 15:00 to 15:45;
- Maintained resident access to the garages under Chasemore House for storage;
- Maintained level access to Chasemore House from Dawes Road;
- Provided Chasemore residents with a fob as an additional access point through adjoining Donnelly Court;
- Offered and issued free parking permits to residents affected;
- Reduced service charges to account for loss of amenity spaces during the demolition;
- Offered car washing and window washing to residents immediately near the site;
- Carried out regular site inspection to identify and resolve issues proactively.

Officers have been working closely with residents to proactively respond to issues as they arise and additional temporary CCTVs have been installed to deal with fly-tipping on William Close.

There are no plans to demolish Chasemore House and Donnelly Court or include them in the redevelopment and therefore no blight had been caused. There is no reason to prevent residents from re-mortgaging or selling their properties on the open market and if there is a misunderstanding with lender's surveyor council officers will be happy to contact them and clarify the project and help resolve any issues.

It is not a standard practice, nor is it recommended, in any regulatory guidance or council policy, to pay compensation for the impact of construction or demolition works. Therefore, it is not something we can consider in this instance. However, officers are happy to continue to discuss specific issues with residents and work with them to reach a resolution.

As to the redevelopment, we've recently appointed BPTW Architects to develop concept designs for the new development that will deliver new, genuinely affordable homes for local residents.

We want residents to be involved and influence the design of the development and we will shortly write to you to explain how you can get involved and help shape this new exciting development in your area.

**Question 34 – Demolition of Hartopp and Lannoy Points**

From: Jack Holmes, Resident

To: Councillor Lisa Homan, Cabinet Member for Housing

“When is the council going to tell us what is going to be built on the land? I am concerned that homes will be built in front of Chasemore House and will block our light.”

**Response:**

The Council has recently appointed BPTW Architects to work with residents to develop plans for the new development on the Hartopp and Lannoy site, which will include new, genuinely affordable homes for local residents.

We are at the start of the design process. In February we will write to residents of Chasemore House and Donnelly Court as well as the wider Aintree Estate to explain how they can get involved, help shape the design of the development and work with the council to engage the wider community.

**Question 35 – Hammersmith Bridge**

From: Dionne Bridgeman, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

“If Professor Fleck’s mid-December government-commissioned engineering report said the bridge could be quickly made safe for pedestrians to use, what is stopping you from opening it?”

**Response:**

The business case for the stabilisation of Hammersmith Bridge, produced by world leading engineers working for H&F and prepared by Transport for London, states that Phase 1 of the works would see the bridge temporarily reopened for pedestrians and cyclists within a year. The cost is £16m. This work has been reviewed and accepted by the Taskforce and others including Professor Norman Fleck. All parties agree that this involves the removal of the pedestal casings, clean blasting of the pedestals and the stabilisation of the pedestals.

Professor Fleck's paper is a technical review of the actual investigations carried out by our engineers, notably Mott MacDonald. His contention that somehow the bridge emergency stabilisation can be done "quickly and cheaply" is unsupported by either detail or evidence. His suggestions included work that is already underway and two other brief points which are not developed to any level where he demonstrates that they would or could be effective. In extensive meetings our engineers have held with Professor Fleck he has not brought forward any detailed evidence to show how the works programme could be done quicker or cheaper.

The Continued Case for the Safe Operation of Hammersmith Bridge has been made available to all parties on the Taskforce. A report and a covering letter produced by the CCSO, following the Professor Fleck and AECOM reports, have been published on the LBHF website and sent to the Taskforce. The CCSO conclusion has not been challenged by any of the other parties. We must follow its provisions to meet our legal responsibilities to avoid exposing the public to unacceptable safety risk. Safety is the key priority of the Council.