

COUNCIL AGENDA

INFORMAL COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday 14 July 2021



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

ADDISON

Adam Connell (L)
Rachel Leighton (L)
Sue Fennimore (L)

HAMMERSMITH
BROADWAY

Stephen Cowan (L)
PJ Murphy (L)
Patricia Quigley (L)

RAVENSCOURT PARK

Jonathan Caleb-Landy (L)
Bora Kwon (L)
Asif Siddique (L)

ASKEW

Lisa Homan (L)
Rowan Ree (L)
Rory Vaughan (L)

MUNSTER

Adronie Alford (C)
Alex Karmel (C)
Dominic Stanton (C)

SANDS END

Lucy Richardson (L)
Ann Rosenberg (L)
Matt Uberoi (L)

AVONMORE &
BROOK GREEN

David Morton (L)
Rebecca Harvey (L)
Fiona Smith (L)

NORTH END

Daryl Brown (L)
Larry Culhane (L)
Zarar Qayyum (L)

SHEPHERDS BUSH
GREEN

Andrew Jones (L)
Natalia Perez (L)
Mercy Umeh (L)

COLLEGE PARK &
OLD OAK

Alexandra Sanderson (L)
Wesley Harcourt (L)

PALACE RIVERSIDE

Amanda Lloyd-Harris (C)
Donald Johnson (C)

TOWN

Andrew Brown (C)
Belinda Donovan (C)
Victoria Brocklebank-
Fowler (C)

FULHAM BROADWAY

Ben Coleman (L)
Sharon Holder (L)
Helen Rowbottom (L)

PARSONS GREEN AND
WALHAM

Matt Thorley (C)
Mark Loveday (C)
Frances Stainton (C)

WORMHOLT AND
WHITE CITY

Colin Aherne (L)
Sue Macmillan (L)
Max Schmid (L)

FULHAM REACH

Iain Cassidy (L)
Christabel Cooper (L)
Guy Vincent (L)

NOTICE

This meeting of the Council will be held as an informal remote meeting.

The Council will meet at 6.30pm

You can watch live on YouTube:

youtu.be/I35nsnMH2lo

06 July 2021
3 Shortlands
Hammersmith W6

Kim Smith
Chief Executive

Full Council Agenda

14 July 2021

<u>Item</u>		<u>Pages</u>
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
2.	MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS	
	<p>If a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest in a particular item, whether or not it is entered in the Authority's register of interests, or any other significant interest which they consider should be declared in the public interest, they should declare the existence and, unless it is a sensitive interest as defined in the Member Code of Conduct, the nature of the interest at the commencement of the consideration of that item or as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>At meetings where members of the public are allowed to be in attendance and speak, any Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest or other significant interest may also make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter. The Councillor must then withdraw immediately from the meeting before the matter is discussed and any vote taken.</p> <p>Where Members of the public are not allowed to be in attendance and speak, then the Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest should withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is under consideration. Councillors who have declared other significant interests should also withdraw from the meeting if they consider their continued participation in the matter would not be reasonable in the circumstances and may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Councillors are not obliged to withdraw from the meeting where a dispensation to that effect has been obtained from the Standards Committee.</p>	
4.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS (20 MINUTES)	6 - 8
	<p>The Leader/relevant Cabinet Member to reply to questions submitted by members of the public.</p>	
5.	SPECIAL MOTIONS	
	<p>To consider and determine any Special Motions:</p>	
5.1	SPECIAL MOTION 1 - THE GREEN AGENDA	9
5.2	SPECIAL MOTION 2 - DISABLED ACCESS TO TUBE STATIONS IN HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM	10

5.3	SPECIAL MOTION 3 - THE DECISION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HOUSING AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO CALL IN THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR EDITH SUMMERSKILL HOUSE ON THE CLEMENT ATTLEE ESTATE IN FULHAM	11 - 12
5.4	SPECIAL MOTION 4 - ENDING THE GOVERNMENT'S SHORT-SIGHTED FAILURE TO FUND SELF-ISOLATION	13 - 14
5.5	SPECIAL MOTION 5 - THE THREAT TO CHARING CROSS HOSPITAL POSED BY THE HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE BILL	15
5.6	SPECIAL MOTION 6 - LEARNING FROM THE FAILURES OF THE £37BN NATIONAL TEST AND TRACE SYSTEM	16 - 17
5.7	SPECIAL MOTION 7 - THE GOVERNMENT'S INADEQUATE FUNDING FOR EDUCATION CATCH-UP WILL COST OUR COUNTRY FAR MORE IN THE LONG TERM	18 - 19

Agenda Item 4

Public Questions

Question 1 – Bus Boarders on Wandsworth Bridge Road

From: Donald Grant, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

It was recently mentioned that the Roads Department are proposing to install “bus boarders” on Wandsworth Bridge Road. These pavements which extend into the road add congestion, pollution and noise from stationary traffic, by blocking all other traffic behind stopping buses, including other buses and emergency services. They increase journey times for other road users, and interrupt cycle lanes. Will the Council confirm that it will not be adding to the recent congestion, pollution and noise on Wandsworth Bridge Road by not installing “bus boarders”, and concentrate instead on solving the problems it has caused immediately – such as completing cycle lanes, working with TfL to reduce the speed limit on the bridge, and re-opening the underused Imperial Road to some through traffic?

Question 2 - Experimental Traffic Congestion & Pollution Reduction Scheme

From: Caroline Shuffrey, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

It has now been nearly a year since the experimental Traffic Congestion & Pollution reduction scheme was put in place in Sands End East. So far there has not been a full review of the success or failure of the scheme. Some figures were published which showed a reduction in traffic levels from September 2019 to September 2020 on the East Side and New Kings Road but despite various Freedom of Information requests we have seen no data on the level of traffic on the West side, the level of traffic penalties, congestion and pollution levels and most importantly no meaningful feedback from residents and businesses in South Fulham. The scheme has set resident against resident on this matter as evidenced on Next Door and discussions have sometimes become heated and unpleasant. This has been mirrored in the working parties. We have had no feedback from the council since March. It has been said that the silent majority want this scheme to go ahead. But there is no actual evidence to support this.

Is it not time for the council to ask the whole South Fulham community to vote on whether or not they wish to continue, extend or abandon the East scheme providing all the information that is required in order to make an informed decision?

Question 3 – Business Impact of the Wandsworth Bridge Road Traffic Trial

From: Gauri Nafrey, Business Owner
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

Many businesses on and around Wandsworth Bridge Road are being destroyed by the reduction in passing trade since the Council sacrificed the businesses and residents on the road to improve the environment for residents in other areas with their disastrous traffic trial. A friend from Richmond told me he can have an exemption to drive through the proposed West traffic scheme to the Hurlingham Club without penalty, as cameras are being fitted to the private members club gates. What schemes do the Council propose to enable visiting traffic to use the many shops on Wandsworth Bridge Road using their quickest route, without penalty?

Question 4 – Wandsworth Bridge Road Pollution

From: Caroline Brooman-White
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

Please can you tell me what medical advice you have now sought about the effects that the dramatic increase of pollution could have on the health of the residents on the Wandsworth Bridge Road due to the implementation of the East scheme. Why are you prioritising the health of the people in the side streets over us?

Question 5 – Plan for Net Zero by 2030

From: Jonathan Tassell, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

Now that the CEE commission has published their report when can we see a comprehensive plan published to get all activity in our Borough to net zero by 2030?

Question 6 – Reducing Car Usage and Reclaiming Parking Spaces

From: Wilf Macdonald-Brown, Resident
To: The Leader of the Council

Leaders in other cities, Paris and Barcelona for example, are implementing policies to dramatically reduce car usage and reclaim car parking spaces for people and nature. This is what taking a climate and ecological emergency seriously looks like. Why is LBHF not acting with similar urgency?

Agenda Item 5.1

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 1 – THE GREEN AGENDA

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Donald Johnson
- (ii) Councillor Andrew Brown

This council is committed to work with all residents and put them at the heart of decisions on how we will decarbonise heat and transport, and build a sustainable future for economic, social and environmental prosperity in Hammersmith and Fulham.

We stand by the principal that no one is left behind, and everyone's choice can and will be supported, allowing all residents to contribute to the 2050 net zero target, at their pace and without unnecessary upheaval.

We acknowledge climate change and the imperative for clean air, reduced pollution and minimal waste. And we also recognise that solutions must be pragmatic, flexible and fair, so no residents – especially those most vulnerable, lose out. One size does not fit all.

This council accepts that it has made mistakes in the past, forcing well intended but ill-conceived changes to local traffic management without considering the wider implications for the local area, the increased air pollution and congestion in key parts of the Borough, and the inherent risk that brings by increasing emergency response times for critical health and emergency services.

In future, the Council commits to deliver on its pledge to “do things with residents, not to them”, and will respect the views of all communities to find a balanced and fair path to achieve its goals that is acceptable to all. The Council facilitates – but the residents choose.

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 2 – DISABLED ACCESS TO TUBE STATIONS IN HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler
- (ii) Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris

This Council recognises the challenge facing people with disabilities and others with limited mobility, including older people and those with young families, of using the London Underground.

This Council notes that whilst some tube stations in our borough have step free access, many others do not.

This Council regrets that no progress has been made on important accessibility improvements to our transport infrastructure in over seven years.

This Council calls on Transport for London to put forward plans to give additional stations across the borough step-free access, such as Putney Bridge, Parsons Green and Barons Court Tube Stations.

This Council pledges to work with TfL, local residents, businesses and developers to support plans for step free access, and to provide Section 106 funding to support these schemes.

Agenda Item 5.3

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 3 – THE DECISION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HOUSING AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO CALL IN THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR EDITH SUMMERSKILL HOUSE ON THE CLEMENT ATTLEE ESTATE IN FULHAM

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Andrew Jones
- (ii) Councillor Lisa Homan

This Council notes the decision of the Secretary of State for Housing and Local Communities to call in the planning application for Edith Summerskill House on the Clement Attlee Estate in Fulham. This decision prevents the construction of 133 new homes for residents, the vast majority of which are urgently needed genuinely affordable or temporary housing. The Council notes that after an unnecessary deliberation which took 9 months, the housing scheme is now further delayed for up to 4 years and the replacement of affordable homes under threat.

With respect to this decision, this Council further notes:

- The Council and its partners have invested significant resources into replacing an uninhabitable building with social rented homes of the highest quality;
- The call-in purports to be on the grounds of a tall building, but the new building is of very similar height and dimensions to the building it replaces;
- The project has been granted planning permission after extensive consultation, and has the approval of the GLA and the Mayor of London;
- The eleventh hour call-in delay has a severely negative impact on the Council's finances – it will delay the provision of 105 temporary housed households which will cost the Council on average £175,000 per month;
- Further delays will severely impact the lives of over-crowded families and those on the housing register waiting for an offer of permanent accommodation;
- By creating this delay the Government is imposing a further £840,000 to £1.26m to the overall costs of the project.
- The Council will also have to continue to fund 24/7 site security at a cost of £8,000 per month
- Peabody, who are the final developer/operator, have also spent £1.5m to date;

- The delay threatens the project's overall finances as some of the funding will time-out.

This Council further notes that Edith Summerskill was identified under the previous Conservative administration as an affordable/private tenure redevelopment and the current scheme is little different to that which has been proposed for nearly a decade.

The Council therefore calls upon the Government to cancel this unjustified, costly and detrimental eleventh-hour decision and to allow the scheme to proceed in order to deliver much need genuinely affordable housing.

Agenda Item 5.4

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 4 – ENDING THE GOVERNMENT’S SHORT-SIGHTED FAILURE TO FUND SELF-ISOLATION

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Max Schmid
- (ii) Councillor Sue Fennimore

This Council believes:

- The third pillar of testing and tracing is isolation;
- With the virus becoming more infectious and infection numbers rising rapidly, it is essential that people can afford to self-isolate;
- If they fear being plunged into financial hardship, people are less likely to get tested or self-isolate; and
- The more that infection circulates due to poor self-isolation, the likelier it is that the country and our Borough will be plunged into further expensive lengthy lockdowns.

This Council notes:

- UK statutory sick pay is among the lowest in Europe at just £96 per week and the Chancellor has repeatedly refused to increase it;
- The self-employed are excluded from sick pay and nearly two million workers don't earn enough to qualify for it, mostly low-paid women;
- In a survey earlier this year, 40 per cent of all workers and 48 per cent of disabled workers said they would have to go into debt or arrears if their income dropped to £96 a week;
- Having initially rejected extra payments to support self-isolation, the Chancellor then introduced one-off £500 payments with such restrictive rules that relatively few people can receive them; and
- As recently revealed by the Politico website, the Treasury undermined self-isolation at the height of the pandemic last winter by instructing officials to conceal a little-known part of the furlough scheme which enabled more self-isolation payments.

This Council regrets:

- The government's lamentable and dangerous record on self-isolation payments, which has resulted in more people with Covid symptoms going into work and greater transmission of the virus.

This Council calls on the Chancellor and Prime Minister:

- To support self-isolation and head off further expensive lockdowns by introducing an easily accessible flat-rate payment for everyone who contracts Covid.

Agenda Item 5.5

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 5 – THE THREAT TO CHARING CROSS HOSPITAL POSED BY THE HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE BILL

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Ben Coleman
- (ii) Councillor Lucy Richardson

This Council:

- Notes the replacement of Rt Hon Matt Hancock MP as Secretary of State for Health and Social Care by Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP;
- Notes that one of the first matters in Mr Javid's in-tray will be his predecessor's proposals for a new Health and Social Care Bill, as set out in a White Paper of 11 February 2021;
- Is concerned that the Bill increases the power of the Secretary of State at the expense of local accountability and democracy;
- Is deeply concerned that the Bill gives the Secretary of State a new power to intervene in local services configuration proposals "where required", which could end the NHS's current duty to consult local authorities about substantial variations or reconfigurations of health services and make it easier for the government to close Charing Cross Hospital;
- Is concerned that the Secretary of State will have a new power over NHS appointments, enabling him to install compliant allies to run the new, regional Integrated Care Systems that bring together the NHS and local authorities;
- Is concerned about the impact on residents' health and wellbeing of proposals to transfer unspecified functions from Public Health teams, which are based in Councils close to their communities, to the more remote NHS;
- Regrets that the White Paper prioritises new government control of Councils' social care services over new funding as part of a much-needed national plan;
- Regrets that the White Paper says nothing about requiring the NHS to share data better with Councils, despite the need for this being a key lesson of the Covid pandemic; and
- Urges the Secretary of State to ensure that the Bill which he takes through Parliament addresses the concerns raised here and does not threaten Charing Cross Hospital by undermining local democracy and accountability.

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 6 – LEARNING FROM THE FAILURES OF THE £37BN NATIONAL TEST AND TRACE SYSTEM

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Ben Coleman
- (ii) Councillor Patricia Quigley

This Council recalls the motion passed by Full Council on 21 October 2020, which:

- Urged the government to recognise that the national Test and Trace (T&T) system it had created had failed; and
- Called on the government to turn T&T into a locally led service, putting local authorities and local public health officials in the driving seat in the battle against coronavirus, with appropriate delegated powers and funding.

This Council notes a subsequent report by the Public Accounts Committee on 10 March 2021 which said:

- There was “no clear evidence” that T&T had cut Covid rates despite its huge cost of £37bn over two years;
- The system had ignored important stakeholders and not exploited the existing networks of local authorities and NHS primary-care bodies; and
- Although T&T’s rationale had been to help avoid a second national lockdown, since its creation there had been two further lockdowns.

This Council notes a recent report by the National Audit Office (NAO) on 25 June which criticises T&T for:

- Failing recently to reach nearly 100,000 people who had tested positive for Covid, and by extension all their contacts who could infect others;
- Losing track of nearly 600 million Covid tests (only 14% of the 691m tests distributed have been registered);
- Lacking targets for increasing the uptake of lateral flow testing or compliance with self-isolation;
- Failing to share data effectively with local public health directors (hindering efforts to tackle outbreaks);
- Continuing to rely on expensive private consultants (45% of head office staff); and
- Risking value for money by giving out contracts without competition.

This Council:

- Welcomes the NAO's finding that local authority-run testing and tracing schemes have increased, including a Local Zero pilot whereby councils undertake all contact tracing in their area;
- Is proud that Hammersmith & Fulham is one of the first Local Zero Councils – a recognition of our effectiveness in contacting those residents failed by the central system and in being the first local authority to make welfare calls to residents with Covid, to support self-isolation, identify sources of infection and target activity; and
- Is concerned by the NAO's finding that councils still have numerous problems with T&T, including difficulties with accessing data for mass testing, a lack of national clarity about local roles and responsibilities, multiple uncoordinated local pilots and funding streams, and new testing approaches planned without local authorities (e.g. for schools and international travellers).

This Council notes that:

- Former Health Secretary Matt Hancock recruited Baroness Dido Harding to set up and run T&T, and she remained in charge until Mr Hancock merged T&T and Public Health England into the new National Institute for Health Protection on 1 April 2021; and
- In mid-June 2021, Baroness Harding applied to be the new Chief Executive of NHS England after Sir Simon Stevens stands down in July.

This Council:

- Calls on the government to take full account of and implement all the findings of the NAO's highly critical report on T&T, including taking all necessary steps to increase public compliance with testing and self-isolation.

SPECIAL MOTION NO. 7 – THE GOVERNMENT’S INADEQUATE FUNDING FOR EDUCATION CATCH-UP WILL COST OUR COUNTRY FAR MORE IN THE LONG TERM

Standing in the names of:

- (i) Councillor Larry Culhane
- (ii) Councillor Alexandra Sanderson

This Council is:

- Deeply grateful for the incredible effort throughout the pandemic made by the borough’s schools, who have remained open for key workers and vulnerable children while also implementing blended learning to support children at home to learn while playing their part in tackling the pandemic.

This Council notes:

- Children’s education and development have suffered as a result of government mismanagement of schooling throughout the pandemic;
- The Prime Minister and Chancellor are spending far less on catch-up lessons for school children than other leading nations and have refused to find more than a tenth of the sum recommended by the government’s own education recovery commissioner, Sir Kevan Collins;
- Sir Kevan resigned on 2 June, writing to the Prime Minister that he did "not believe it is credible that a successful recovery can be achieved with a programme of support this size".
- Sir Kevan also said the government package of support “falls far short of what is needed. It is too narrow, too small and will be delivered too slowly. The average primary school will directly receive just £6,000 per year, equivalent to £22 per child. Not enough is being done to help vulnerable pupils, children in the early years or 16-to-19-year-olds.”

This Council regrets:

- The government’s failure to deliver on its promise that all children affected by digital poverty would be provided with laptops to continue their education while at home; and
- The government’s parsimonious and short-sighted attitude to our children’s future.

This Council calls on the Chancellor and Prime Minister:

- To increase the funding allocated for catch-up education to the level recommended by the government's education recovery commissioner.
- To deliver on their promise and end the digital divide experienced by children in our borough and across the country.