COUNCIL MINUTES

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2021

PRESENT

The Mayor Councillor PJ Murphy (attended in person)
Deputy Mayor Councillor Daryl Brown (attended remotely)

Councillors:

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

NOTE: This meeting was held as a hybrid meeting. 17 members attended in person and voted on decision reports. You can watch the meeting online: https://youtu.be/cWUJMIyNwZ8

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rachel Leighton, Donald Johnson, and Sue Macmillan.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Larry Culhane.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

7.08pm – The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 28 April 2021 and the minutes of the informal Council meeting held on 14 July 2021 were agreed as accurate records.

4. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor extended the Council's congratulations to Councillors Leighton and Connell on the birth of their first child, Phoebe.

Death of David Amess MP

The Mayor noted the tragic murder of Sir David Amess, Conservative MP for Southend West. Speeches were made by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan, the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler, and Councillor Andrew Brown.

The Council observed a minute of silence in his 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 16 public questions and a full agenda.

Questions 7 and 8 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. All of the questions and responses can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of the minutes.

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS

6.1 Results of the Local Government By-Election on 23 September 2021

The Mayor congratulated Councillor Frances Umeh on her election victory and welcomed her to the Council.

Speeches of congratulations were made by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan and the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler.

7.32pm – The report on the party appointments for the 2021/22 Municipal Year was noted.

6.2 Allocation of Seats and Proportionality on Committees

7.34pm – The report on the allocation of seats and proportionality on committees was noted.

6.3 Party Appointments for 2021-22 – October Updates

The Mayor noted that an amendment had been circulated for this item.

7.35pm – The Council is asked to note updates to the Party Appointments for the 2021/22 Municipal Year including the appointment of Councillor Bora Kwon as the Chief Whip.

6.4 **Committee Membership Changes – October 2021**

The Mayor noted that an amendment had been circulated for this item.

7.35pm – The amended report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan.

The amended report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	**UNANIMOUS**
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

7.35pm – RESOLVED

1. That Full Council approves the appointment of Councillor Frances Umeh to Planning and Development Control Committee and Licensing Committee.
2. That Full Council notes that Councillor Sharon Holder is the nominated substitute for Commercial Revenue Committee.
3. That Council agrees the appointment of Councillor Frances Umeh as a member and Chair of the Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee.

6.5 **Review of the Constitution**

7.35pm – The updates to Contract Standing Orders and the Departmental Registers of Authorities were noted.

6.6 **Dispensation of absence for all Councillors**

7.35pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	**UNANIMOUS**
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

7.35pm – RESOLVED

Full Council agreed that any member unable to attend a council meeting for a period greater than six months for Covid-19 related reasons, receives a dispensation further to section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 to 9 November 2021.

7. SPECIAL MOTIONS

7.1 Special Motion 1 - The Green Agenda

7.36pm – Councillor Andrew Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Matt Thorley, the special motion in their names:

"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."

Speeches on the motion were made by Councillors Brown and Thorley (for the Opposition).

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

"Delete all after "This Council…" in line 1 and replace with:

…recognises the importance of climate change and so declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 with an ambitious target of net carbon zero by 2030, far sooner than nationally set target dates. The Council further recognises the importance of the work done by the resident led Climate and Ecological Emergency Commission which reported earlier this year.

This Council notes the work already undertaken by the Climate Unit in developing a climate strategy and the continued input of residents into leading the newly established Strategic Implementation Group.

This Council also acknowledges how clean air, reduced pollution and waste contribute to a cleaner, greener future for our residents and recognises the success of Council initiatives such as retro fitting of properties on Gibbs Green, the last mile delivery service and the rapidly increasing number of electric vehicle charging points to list just a few.

This Council hopes that members, residents and businesses will take part in its series of Climate Carnival events scheduled for later this month.

This Council looks forward to continuing to work with residents to bring about the necessary changes that will achieve its ambition for net carbon zero by 2030 and a greener future for our borough."

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Harcourt, Cassidy, Frances Umeh (her maiden speech), Caleb-Landy, and Cowan (for the Administration) and Councillors Stanton and Brown (for the Opposition).

The amendment was then put to the vote.

FOR	**UNANIMOUS**
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

Councillor Brown then made a speech winding up the debate before the amended motion was put to the vote.

FOR	**UNANIMOUS**
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

The amended motion was declared **CARRIED**.

8.26pm – RESOLVED

This Council recognises the importance of climate change and so declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 with an ambitious target of net carbon zero by 2030, far sooner than nationally set target dates. The Council further recognises the importance of the work done by the resident led Climate and Ecological Emergency Commission which reported earlier this year.

This Council notes the work already undertaken by the Climate Unit in developing a climate strategy and the continued input of residents into leading the newly established Strategic Implementation Group.

This Council also acknowledges how clean air, reduced pollution and waste contribute to a cleaner, greener future for our residents and recognises the success of Council initiatives such as retro fitting of properties on Gibbs Green, the last mile delivery service and the rapidly increasing number of electric vehicle charging points to list just a few.

This Council hopes that members, residents and businesses will take part in its series of Climate Carnival events scheduled for later this month.

This Council looks forward to continuing to work with residents to bring about the necessary changes that will achieve its ambition for net carbon zero by 2030 and a greener future for our borough.

8.27pm – Councillor Bora Kwon moved a motion under Standing Order 15(e)3 to reorder the remaining special motions in the following order: 5, 4, 2, 7, 6 and 3. Councillor Zarar Qayyum seconded the motion and it was agreed.

7.5 **Special Motion 5 - The Threat to Charing Cross Hospital Posed by the Health and Social Care Bill**

8.27pm – Councillor Ben Coleman moved, seconded by Councillor Lucy Richardson, the special motion in their names:

"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 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 though Parliament addresses the concerns raised here and does not threaten Charing Cross Hospital by undermining local democracy and accountability."*

Speeches on the motion were made by Councillors Coleman, Richardson, and Cowan (for the Administration) and Councillors Brown and Lloyd Harris (for the Opposition).

Councillor Coleman made a speech winding up the debate before the motion was put to the vote.

FOR	**33**
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

8.59pm – RESOLVED

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 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 though Parliament addresses the concerns raised here and does not threaten Charing Cross Hospital by undermining local democracy and accountability.

7.4 **Special Motion 4 - 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**

8.59pm – Councillor Andrew Jones moved, seconded by Councillor Lisa Homan, the special motion in their names:

"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; and*
- *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."

Speeches on the motion were made by Councillors Jones, Homan, Holder, and Rowbottom (for the Administration) and Councillors Thorley and Karmel (for the Opposition).

Councillor Jones made a speech winding up the debate before the motion was put to the vote.

FOR	**33**
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

9.32pm – RESOLVED

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; and
- 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.

7.2 **Special Motion 2 - Disabled Access to Tube Stations in Hammersmith and Fulham**

9.33pm – Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler moved, seconded by Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris, the special motion in their names:

"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."

Speeches on the motion were made by Councillors Brocklebank-Fowler and Lloyd-Harris (for the Opposition).

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

"Delete all after "This Council" and insert:

…welcomes this administration's determination to make Hammersmith & Fulham the best borough for Disabled people and its commitment to work in co-production with Disabled people to remove the barriers they face.

This Council recognises the barriers that Disabled people and others, including older people and those with young families, face in using the London Underground.

This Council regrets that while some tube stations in our borough have step-free access, many others do not.

This Council regrets that at the time of the redevelopment of Shepherds Bush station, the then Conservative administration and the then London Mayor Boris Johnson did not support the local MP and Labour Party in insisting that step-free access to the station form part of the redevelopment.

This Council welcomes it that Transport for London (TfL) has made 21 stations step free in the past five years and that it will be launching a consultation in November to help shape its future approach to step-free tube stations should more funding become available.

This Council notes that prior to the pandemic TfL was on track to deliver an operating surplus by 2022/23, having reduced its net cost of operations by almost £1bn over the past four years and increased cash reserves to more than £2bn.

This Council regrets the catastrophic effect of the Covid pandemic on TfL's finances and notes that without government support, TfL may still face a £500m gap this year, which could inhibit the installation of step-free access at more stations.

This Council commits to:

- *Encouraging local residents, businesses and community groups to respond to the forthcoming TfL consultation to urge step-free access for more tube stations in our borough; and*
- *Organising sessions with TfL and residents so that TfL can hear directly about the problems caused by the lack of step-free access.*

This Council calls on the government to engage fully with TfL to secure a long-term funding agreement that will enable TfL to fund step-free access in more stations in Hammersmith & Fulham and across London."

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Coleman, Quigley and Harcourt (for the Administration) and Councillor Donovan (for the Opposition).

The amendment was then put to the vote.

FOR	**33**
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

The guillotine fell at 10pm.

Councillor Brocklebank-Fowler made a speech summing up the debate before the amended motion was put to the vote.

FOR	**33**
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The amended motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.03pm – RESOLVED

This Council welcomes this administration's determination to make Hammersmith & Fulham the best borough for Disabled people and its commitment to work in co-production with Disabled people to remove the barriers they face.

This Council recognises the barriers that Disabled people and others, including older people and those with young families, face in using the London Underground.

This Council regrets that while some tube stations in our borough have step-free access, many others do not.

This Council regrets that at the time of the redevelopment of Shepherds Bush station, the then Conservative administration and the then London Mayor Boris Johnson did not support the local MP and Labour Party in insisting that step-free access to the station form part of the redevelopment.

This Council welcomes it that Transport for London (TfL) has made 21 stations step free in the past five years and that it will be launching a consultation in November to help shape its future approach to step-free tube stations should more funding become available.

This Council notes that prior to the pandemic TfL was on track to deliver an operating surplus by 2022/23, having reduced its net cost of operations by almost £1bn over the past four years and increased cash reserves to more than £2bn.

This Council regrets the catastrophic effect of the Covid pandemic on TfL's finances and notes that without government support, TfL may still face a £500m gap this year, which could inhibit the installation of step-free access at more stations.

This Council commits to:

- Encouraging local residents, businesses and community groups to respond to the forthcoming TfL consultation to urge step-free access for more tube stations in our borough; and
- Organising sessions with TfL and residents so that TfL can hear directly about the problems caused by the lack of step-free access.

This Council calls on the government to engage fully with TfL to secure a long-term funding agreement that will enable TfL to fund step-free access in more stations in Hammersmith & Fulham and across London.

7.7 **Special Motion 7 - The Government's Inadequate Funding for Education Catch-Up Will Cost Our Country Far More in the Long Term**

The special motion was withdrawn.

7.6 **Special Motion 6 - Learning from the Failures of the £37BN National Test and Trace System**

The special motion was withdrawn.

7.3 **Special Motion 3 - Eel Brook Common**

The special motion was withdrawn.

Meeting started: 7.03 pm
Meeting ended: 10.03 pm

Mayor .....

Minutes are subject to confirmation at the next meeting as a correct record of the proceedings and any amendments arising will be recorded in the minutes of that subsequent meeting.

Appendix 1

Public Questions and Responses – 20 October 2021

NOTE: 'TCPR' refers to the South Fulham Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction scheme. You can read about the scheme on our website: https://www.lbhf.gov.uk/transport-and-roads/south-fulham-traffic-congestion-and-pollution-reduction-scheme

Question 1 – The TCPR and commitments on health and traffic reduction
From: Nick Smith, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"Can the Council please confirm that its Eastern TCPR scheme – and the future Western extension – are critical components of its COP 26 Pledge and its local environmental commitments on health and traffic reduction?"

Response
The current experimental Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reducing (TCPR) has shown traffic has reduced by 75% in the streets east of Wandsworth Bridge Road and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road. This is essential to the council's work to improve the environment and to our COP 26 pledge.

Question 2 – Proposed western TCPR
From: Sarah Law, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"Please can you confirm the trial East TCPR won't be made permanent without a West TCPR also being implemented. The streets to the west are badly affected by the East TCPR, so it would not be acceptable for the east trial scheme is made permanent while this imbalance persists. Please reassure the residents on the west that the east TCPR won't be quietly rubber stamped."

Response
The Council is hugely grateful for the very significant time that a large number of residents have spent engaging with it on refining the current TCPR and developing thinking on an extension to the west.

We have heard concerns about traffic displacement and are consistently monitoring residential streets to the west of Wandworth Bridge Road (WBR) and on WBR to inform future proposals. We understand the importance of considering an extension to the TCPR scheme in parallel. Our monitoring has considered both these aspects in detail and our approach to decision-making will be led by the data.

The decision on the current TCPR will be made by Cabinet. Any extension of the scheme will be subject to legal and governance requirements and any associated consultation.

Question 3 – Improving access to the TCPR scheme
From: Nicola Dryden, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"The TCPR implementation in Fulham is making a difference with stats showing that that traffic and pollution in the area is down. Since the TCPR trial scheme began, traffic has reduced by 75% in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road (WBR) and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road. Which is a huge step forward for reducing traffic and pollution making the streets and roads safer for local residents. To improve access to the scheme the Ringo App needs some updating to allow more than one person to grant access for visitors. The current challenge is that only one person per household can grant access. This does not always work as the person with access may not always be available. Are there plans to update the app so that more than one person per household can grant visitor access within the app?"

Response
Thank you for comments about the scheme's positive impact on traffic and pollution. We much appreciate your views on the Ringo App, which we have also heard from others. As a result, the council has created its own TCPR app, which is due for launch in November. This will enable more than one person per household to grant visitor access.

It will remain possible, as now, to book an unlimited number of free TCPR access-only sessions in the RingGo app.

Question 4 – Proposed western expansion to the TCPR
From: Carlos Lutterbach, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"It is my understanding that the extension to the west together with the east and the measures taken to improve Wandsworth Bridge Road will work in concert to improve the quality of life in the whole area. Could you please expand on how the extension to the west will help the traffic scheme as a whole?"

Response
The data currently collected during the eastern TCPR experiment has shown a significant reduction in traffic and pollution. With an average traffic reduction of 75% in residential streets east of Wandsworth Bridge Road this has proportionately reduced air pollution. To further reduce traffic on the main road network, we would need to secure the residential side streets with a scheme in the west.

Most of the traffic to the west continues to come from out-of-borough drivers cutting through: currently 50% in Studdridge Street and higher in Peterborough Road and Broomhouse Lane. Protecting these roads and others to the west of WBR from this traffic would make it possible to reduce WBR's capacity for vehicles, leading to fewer cars, without the risk of displacement to the residential streets to the east or the west.

Question 5 – The traffic impact of the Kings Park and Chelsea Creek developments
From: Natale Giostra, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"Can the Council give assurances to local residents that the 2,000 flats due to come on-line in Kings Park and Chelsea Creek will NOT overrun the small residential roads (namely

Harwood Terrace) around them and that the TCPR will be maintained (especially because all these folks' car will be in the zone and can travel through the cameras)?"

Response
To help achieve our goal of H&F becoming carbon neutral by 2030, we are aiming to reduce demand for parking and discourage car use. As part of this, the Chelsea Creek development will be permit-free, meaning that its residents will not be eligible for a parking permit. While they can still have guest and visitor permits for deliveries and visitors, we expect this to generate very little additional traffic compared to the volume of traffic in the area prior to the TCPR scheme. The proposed link road to Imperial Road will also be within the TCPR controlled area, preventing traffic from using it as a bypass and we will work with the developer to limit the scope of any off-streetcar parking provision.

Question 6 – Implementing the western TCPR
From Jonathan Massey, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"The existing TCPR on the East side has driven traffic towards the West side. At the same time traffic from the North travels down Peterborough Road and then uses the rat run via Clancarty Road and the streets to the immediate South (Beltran, Ashcombe, Narborough, Friston and Woolneigh), and vice versa. Traders also use this rat run heading North and West from Carnwath Road to avoid congestion on the Wandsworth Bridge Road because they cannot pass through the barrier on the Peterborough Road. There are many schools in this area (Hurlingham Academy, Sulivan Primary, Marie d'Orleac / Holy Cross) whose pupils suffer appalling levels of pollution and a dangerous and hostile environment regarding the traffic congestion. This also applies to people of all ages who use South Park. My concern is that unless the West side TCPR is implemented that traffic levels will continue to increase. It seems to me that the whole scheme, both East and West, has to be implemented or the situation on the West side will deteriorate even further."

Response
The monitoring data supports your observations. There has been a rebalancing of traffic in the west as well as a growth in school-run traffic due to travel habits changing during the Covid pandemic. We are grateful to the many residents who have engaged with the council to develop ideas for extending the TCPR scheme to the west, which is now being considered. Any extension of the scheme will be subject to legal and governance requirements and any associated consultation.

Question 7 – The success of the TCPR
From: Andy Knowles, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"The Traffic, Congestion and Pollution Reduction (TCPR) scheme appears to residents in Sands End East to have been a great success in its aims of reducing traffic, congestion and pollution, for example with queues now very rarely seen stretching past the pedestrian entrance to Sainsbury's. Can the council provide data to confirm what we are seeing ourselves?"

Response

We appreciate this comment and many others which we councillors have received. Our traffic survey data continuously monitors traffic levels in the area. It correlates with your observations and we have seen a reduction of traffic on Bagleys Lane, Imperial Road, Townmead Road of 72%, 77% and 56% respectively. In addition there has been a net reduction of total traffic volumes on Wandsworth Bridge Road and New Kings Road.

NOTE: As public question time is limited to 20 mins we've explained to the following people that a written response will be provided

Question 8 – Wandsworth Bridge Road Speed Limit
From: Gary Fannin, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"The Wandsworth Bridge Road is the only road leading to a bridge crossing still at 30mph. SatNavs priorities roads first based on speed limit and then secondly on traffic volumes. This leads to the WBR being prioritised above all other bridge crossing for many through commuters which leads to more and unnecessary congestion. I understand the council conducted a consultation on 20mph some years ago and the public didn't have a strong opinion either way. So therefore, can you please give us an indication when the WBR can have a 20mph speed limit urgently implemented to help create a level playing field with other bridge crossings to help deter commuting traffic?"

Response
We confirm that the introduction of a 20mph limit on Wandsworth Bridge Road will be considered at Cabinet. As the road is a key link road, the council will also be required to consult TfL and neighbouring boroughs, which will inform the timeframe for implementation.

Question 9 – Maintain the eastern TCPR and expand to the West
From: Casey Abaraonye, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for the Environment

"Given the number of schools within the south Fulham area and the failure to implement any school streets to date, will the council confirm that it will maintain the TCPR in the east and imminently implement it in the west as 25% more road traffic collisions occur on minor roads than on A roads[1] and LTNs by whatever name you call them have seen a 2-3 times reduction in road traffic collisions?[2] Can the council confirm that such a safety outcome is a priority and such evidence a justification for implementation?"

Response
The council can confirm that the safety priorities you have highlighted form part of the considerations for the future of the TCPR scheme. A decision on the scheme will be made by Cabinet.

Question 10 – Public consultation on the continuation of the TCPR
From: Donald Grant, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"The various traffic management acts and guidance require statutory consultation of affected residents and businesses, before making permanent those traffic schemes implemented using temporary orders. This includes objective measures such as "polling to British Polling Council standards to ensure that the loudest minority voices do not dominate".

The Sands End experimental traffic scheme, which has caused significant public controversy from hurting many more Fulham residents than it has benefited, is due to be removed next January. If the Council intends to continue the traffic scheme unlike Ealing, Hounslow and other London Boroughs have done with theirs, what statutory consultation and polling measures does he plan to ensure the Council complies with the law, and will he pledge to give all Fulham residents the final say like neighbouring boroughs have?"

Response
Although the TCPR scheme has followed the statutory consultation process required to implement, it is important to recognise that consultation is about understanding the views and requirements of residents and not a referendum on a scheme. Consensus amongst residents with conflicting priorities and differing opinions is rarely achieved and in addition to the consultation, the scheme also has to take into consideration other national and local objectives such as climate change, air quality and active travel. In addition, data has been continuously collected over the duration of the scheme and together this information and data needs to be considered as part of the decision-making process.

The secretary of state, wrote to all councils urging them to ensure policy objectives take priority when delivering experimental schemes and to implement them if they achieve the desired outcomes. Despite this guidance, the council took the view to heavily engage with residents in the largest consultation process undertaken and their views have been listened to and acted upon where appropriate.

Question 11 – Mitigating traffic collisions on Kings Road
From: Francesca Moore, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"The area of Kings Road between the Tesco Esso Express filling station at 601 Kings Road and Edith Row has been the scene of too many Road Traffic Collisions, very often because when motor vehicles are stationary and cyclists are riding down the advisory lane on the inside, drivers turning into either the filling station or the road are unsighted until it is often too late to avert a collision.

This can be mitigated by design and the filling station is currently closed for works. Can the council urgently redesign this hazard zone or acknowledge its responsibility for this dangerous layout?"

Response
The council is committed to increasing cycling, reducing vehicular traffic and improving safety. Safety is a key element in enabling people to switch to cycling as a journey choice and the area highlighted is one that has been brought to the council's attention before. We will look at the collision history in the area but also work with the residents and cycling groups to look at possible solutions here.

Question 12 – Ending the TCPR experiment early
From: Caroline Brooman-White, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"As it has now become clear that the residents and businesses on the Wandsworth Bridge Road are suffering so badly from the impact of the experimental East scheme, will the Council end the experiment earlier than the January deadline?"

Response

We are aware that some residents and businesses were affected by the scheme during its initial implementation and apologise for any inconvenience caused while the scheme bedded in. H&F Council have been keen to ensure that businesses can continue to provide their services and that residents truly benefit from the scheme. We have opened up several lines of communication to ensure all voices are heard – whether this be by phone, our dedicated South Fulham Streets email inbox and via our Commonplace consultation platforms. All comments and enquiries are logged, and we have made several improvements to the scheme since its inception, in response to suggestions provided by residents and businesses including provision of a separate RingGo code for Access-only permits. All business vehicles with a valid LBHF business parking permit holder are also able to pass through control points without being penalised. A report that informs a decision will be published in advance of being presented to Cabinet, where a decision will be made on the future of the scheme.

Question 13 – Will there be a western TCPR
From: Caroline Shuffrey, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"Cabinet is considering whether to remove the Sands End East TCPR or make it permanent in the last quarter of 2021. Should it decide to make the TCPR permanent will it bring in a temporary or experimental TCPR on the West Side of Wandsworth Bridge Road at the same time or at a later date – and what consultation will the council undertake before doing this?"

Response
The introduction of any TCPR scheme to the west of WBR will follow the correct democratic and legal processes, and any new scheme implementation will require consultation with residents, businesses and other key stakeholders. As part of our initial review of the scheme to the east of WBR, we are aware of existing resident concerns and identification of congestion hotspots and other issues identified on residential streets to the west of WBR. We have already logged and reviewed initial responses received, and we will continue to consult with all relevant parties. H&F Council are committed to working with residents to provide a scheme that will help alleviate existing issues west of WBR.

Question 14 – King Street Safer Cycle Way
From: Henrietta Bewley, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"HF cyclists are pleased to see the progress being made on the King Street Safer Cycle Way. Will the new temporary cycle lane be able to carry cycle traffic, including cargo bikes, adapted tricycles and Dutch family bikes in both directions, all the way from Hounslow to

Kensington? And while works are ongoing can there be signposting to direct riders as to what to do or which way to go when approaching from the west going eastwards, or temporary safe provision be made for them?"

Response
The cycle route implemented along King Street within the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham is designed mainly as a 3m wide bi-directional cycle lane, although there are some sections where the width has needed to be reduced down to 2.5m. This should be able to accommodate a variety of bicycles, tricycles and cargo bikes.
Although the route continues from and into neighbouring boroughs, unfortunately we cannot comment on the specification of the cycle route beyond the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, but fully support the aim of providing space for active travel wherever possible.

During the works there will be diversion signs to direct cyclists and other road users and we will continue to consider any other additional signage that may be required while the work is being carried out.

Question 15 – Wandsworth Bridge Road, A High Street for All
From: Perunika Petkova, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"Improvements to North End Road are underway and will benefit one of London's oldest street markets at a time of great need. We would like the council to note our expression of support for this scheme. Wandsworth Bridge Road is a similar road that would benefit from transformation from a highway into a high street. The proposals to do this have been supported with a successful bid to the Mayor for London's "High Streets For All" challenge[3]. Will the council allocate effort and resources to bring this vision to life, and consider how it's benefits can be implemented in other parts of the borough?"

Response
The council actively supported the WBRA on their successful bid to the GLA and will continue to do so. The council is committed to supporting all local projects that bring benefits to our residents.

Question 16 – A borough-wide 20mph speed limit
From: Kenneth McCosh, Resident
To: The Cabinet Member for Environment

"I applaud the Council's work to make cycling and walking easier and safer throughout the borough, including the imposition of the 20mph speed limit in many streets. However, I consider that the existence of different speed limits throughout the borough tends to make drivers inattentive to safe speed requirements. Given the lack of segregated cycle lanes and the broad support for motoring speed reduction, could the Council please implement a borough-wide general speed limit of 20mph?"

Response
The council has implemented 20mph zones in many residential streets but following a consultation conducted several years ago residents at the time wanted to exclude the main roads. Since that consultation, the traffic and environmental objectives have changed along with community perceptions of 20 mph on main roads. Many more people are requesting

lower speed limits in built up areas and the application of 20mph speed limits to main roads is under consideration as a result of this.