

COUNCIL MINUTES

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 13 JULY 2022



PRESENT

The Mayor – Councillor Emma Aphorp
Deputy Mayor – Councillor Daryl Brown

Councillors:

Jose Afonso	Rebecca Harvey	Rowan Ree
Aliya Afzal-Khan	Lisa Homan	Lucy Richardson
Paul Alexander	Laura Janes	Helen Rowbottom
Adronie Alford	Alex Karmel	Alexandra Sanderson
Stala Antoniadis	Bora Kwon	Max Schmid
Emma Aphorp	Adam Peter Lang	Asif Siddique
Jackie Borland	Amanda Lloyd-Harris	Nikos Souslous
Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler	Ross Melton	Dominic Stanton
Trey Campbell-Simon	Omid Miri	Sally Taylor
Florian Chevoppe-Verdier	David Morton	Nicole Trehy
Ben Coleman	Genevieve Nwaogbe	Frances Umeh
Liz Collins	Adrian Pascu-Tulbure	Mercy Umeh
Stephen Cowan	Ashok Patel	Rory Vaughan
Jacolyn Daly	Natalia Perez	Patrick Walsh
Andrew Dinsmore	Zarar Qayyum	
Wesley Harcourt	Patricia Quigley	

NOTE: Councillors Rebecca Harvey, Laura Janes, Adam Peter Lang, Patricia Quigley, and Rory Vaughan attended the meeting remotely and did not participate in the discussion or vote on decision items.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sharon Holder, Andrew Jones, and Ann Rosenberg.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Rory Vaughan declared a pecuniary interest in items 8.3 and 8.4 as an employee of the Bank of England. He recused himself from the meeting for the duration of the items.

Councillor Paul Alexander declared a pecuniary interest in item 8.5 as an employee of Transport for London. He recused himself from the meeting for the duration of the item.

3. MINUTES

7.12pm – The minutes of the Annual and Special Full Council meetings held on 25 May 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

4. MAYOR'S/CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Queen's Jubilee Birthday Honours List 2022

The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, noted her congratulations to the following people who were recognised in the Queen's Birthday Honours for their outstanding achievements:

- Professor James Robert Durrant, Professor of Photochemistry at Imperial College London, who was awarded a CBE for services to Photochemistry and Solar Energy Research.
- Professor Mary Patricia Ryan, Armourers and Brasiers' Chair in Materials Science at Imperial College London, who was awarded a CBE for services to Education and to Materials Science and Engineering.
- Professor Kathryn Maitland, Professor of Tropical Paediatric Infectious Disease at Imperial College London, who was awarded an OBE for services to Medical Science.

The Mayor thanked them for contributions to science and engineering.

5. PRESENTATION BY THE YOUTH MAYOR AND YOUTH COUNCIL

Ben Ruzbehan (Youth Mayor), Niamh Faleye (Deputy Youth Mayor), Anastasia Odusanwo (H&F's Member of Youth Parliament) and Vince Bigas (H&F's Deputy Member of Youth Parliament) addressed the Council and discussed their manifesto goals for 2022/23.

Councillor Trey Campbell-Simon made his maiden speech (for the Administration), and Councillor Aliya Afzal-Khan made her maiden speech (for the Opposition). The Leader of the Council also made a speech.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS (20 MINUTES)

The Mayor thanked all of the residents who submitted questions. She noted that public question time was limited to 20 minutes and it would not be extended as there were 9 public questions and a full agenda.

Questions 1, 5, 6, and 7 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 the questions and responses can be found in Appendix 1.

Under Standing Order 15(e)12, Councillor Alex Karmel moved to suspend Council Rules to allow an extension to public question time:

FOR	10
AGAINST	32
NOT VOTING	1

The motion to suspend was declared **LOST**.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 Council Appointments to Outside Bodies

8.06pm – 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**.

8.06pm – RESOLVED

1. That Councillor Bora Kwon replaces Councillor Omid Miri as a substitute member of the OPDC Planning Committee.
2. That Councillor Liz Collins, Councillor David Morton and Mr David Morris be appointed as trustees of Lygon Almshouses.

7.2 Review of the Constitution

8.06pm – 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**.

8.06pm – RESOLVED

1. That Full Council notes that David Tatlow, Director of Corporate Resources, is the Council's Proper Officer for Registration and approves updates to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers detailed in paragraph 5 of the report.

2. That Full Council approves the revisions to the Cabinet portfolios and Lead Member responsibilities detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.
3. That Full Council appoint Councillor David Morton as Borough Representative for the Armed Forces Community.
4. That Full Council agree to change the name of the 'Policy Unit and Oversight Board' to the 'Policy and Oversight Board'.

7.3 Revisions to the Members' Allowances Scheme 2022-23

8.06pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan.

Councillor Alex Karmel made a speech (for the Opposition) and Councillor Max Schmid made a speech (for the Administration).

The report and recommendations were then put to the vote:

FOR	32
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	11

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

8.08pm – RESOLVED

1. That the revised Members' Allowances Scheme 2022/23 as set out in the report and attached as Appendix 1, be approved.

7.4 Statement of Licensing Policy Renewal

8.08pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by Councillor Zarar Qayyum.

The report and recommendations were put to the vote:

FOR	UNANIMOUS
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

8.09pm – RESOLVED

1. That Full Council adopt the Statement of Licensing Policy 2022 - 2027 at Appendix 2.

7.5 Hartopp & Lannoy Development – Building New Affordable Homes in Fulham

The Mayor noted that the report had an exempt appendix and any discussion of the contents of the exempt appendix would require passing a resolution to exclude the public and press from the meeting.

8.09pm – The report and recommendations were formally moved for adoption by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan.

Councillor Adronie Alford made a speech (for the Opposition) and Councillor Frances Umeh made a speech (for the Administration).

The report and recommendations were then put to the vote:

FOR	UNANIMOUS
AGAINST	0
NOT VOTING	0

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

8.15pm – RESOLVED

1. That Full Council agrees that Appendix 1 is not for publication on the basis that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) as set out in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).
2. That Full Council approve a further capital budget of £57,304,856 to deliver the new homes which will result in an overall Development budget, including contingencies, of £61,020,118 funded through a combination of HRA borrowing, GLA grant, Right to Buy receipts and capital receipts from private sales as set out in exempt Appendix 1.

8. SPECIAL MOTIONS

8.16pm – Councillor Max Schmid moved a motion under Standing Order 15(e)3 to reorder special motions in the following order: 4, 5, 1, 2, 3 and 6. Councillor Genevieve Nwaogbe seconded the motion, and it was agreed.

8.4 Special Motion 4 - Supporting Residents in the Cost-of-Living Crisis

NOTE: Councillor Rory Vaughan left the virtual meeting room for this item.

8.16pm – Councillor Rowan Ree moved, seconded by Councillor Rebecca Harvey, the special motion in their names:

“This Council recognises that Britain is in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis.

- *Inflation is currently above 9%, its highest level since 1982.*
- *Household bills are rising, with energy bills likely to rise significantly higher in October when the energy price cap is increased.*

- *Interest rates have increased from 0.1% to 1.25% since December, with further increases likely, putting pressure on borrowers, including mortgage payers.*

The Council recognises that people across our borough are struggling to make ends meet and are in need of support.

- *One in five adults in the UK has less than £100 in savings.*
- *Nearly four million children in Britain live in poverty.*
- *Areas of Hammersmith & Fulham are among the most deprived in the country.*
- *Hammersmith & Fulham Foodbank is distributing record numbers of meals to residents who cannot afford to feed themselves and their families.*

The Council thanks the many organisations across our borough who are providing much-needed financial support or advice to those who need it. We are blessed to have such caring, compassionate and dedicated residents who are prepared to go out of their way to help their neighbours and communities, and we praise this vital work.

This Council also recognises the need for government at all levels to step in and provide support for those who cannot bear the increasing costs that rising bills and prices bring.

H&F Council is playing its part by taking action to support residents through the cost-of-living-crisis. Although the Conservative government has cut 54% of the Council's general grant funding in real terms since 2010, action by the Labour administration since 2014 has so far included:

- *A real terms council tax cut of 9%;*
- *A generous and comprehensive council tax support scheme;*
- *Free breakfasts for primary school children, and free food for children who need it through school holidays;*
- *Abolition of home care charges for elderly and disabled residents;*
- *A freeze in other charges in children's and adults' services;*
- *Significant funding for local charities and the Hammersmith & Fulham Foodbank; and*
- *Expanded advice services for residents in need of support.*

The Council is now working with its partners to develop a wide range of further support, including an extensive Financial Inclusion Strategy to improve access to financial information, advice and services for residents.

By contrast, we regret that where Boris Johnson's government has acted, support has been poorly targeted and insufficient for those struggling the most.

- *Measures such as the regressive increase in National Insurance will push local residents deeper into financial difficulty.*
- *The £20 per week cut to Universal Credit was a disastrous step just as the country became gripped by the-cost-of-living crisis.*

This Council urges central government to take as proactive an approach to the cost-of-living crisis as Hammersmith & Fulham Council has done.

This Council calls on the government to reverse the £20 a week cut to Universal credit.

It also calls on the government to fund local authorities adequately as these are often best placed to understand the direct needs of their residents through their work in the community. As a first step, this should mean increasing the general grant to councils and funding for payments such as Discretionary Housing Payments that allow councils to support those in the greatest need.”

Speeches on the motion were made by Councillors Ree, Harvey, and Janes (who made her maiden speech) (for the Administration) and Councillors Karmel, Pascu-Tulbure (who made his maiden speech), and Afzal-Khan (for the Opposition).

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

FOR	32
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	0

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

8.46pm – RESOLVED

This Council recognises that Britain is in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis.

- Inflation is currently above 9%, its highest level since 1982.
- Household bills are rising, with energy bills likely to rise significantly higher in October when the energy price cap is increased.
- Interest rates have increased from 0.1% to 1.25% since December, with further increases likely, putting pressure on borrowers, including mortgage payers.

The Council recognises that people across our borough are struggling to make ends meet and are in need of support.

- One in five adults in the UK has less than £100 in savings.
- Nearly four million children in Britain live in poverty.
- Areas of Hammersmith & Fulham are among the most deprived in the country.
- Hammersmith & Fulham Foodbank is distributing record numbers of meals to residents who cannot afford to feed themselves and their families.

The Council thanks the many organisations across our borough who are providing much-needed financial support or advice to those who need it. We are blessed to have such caring, compassionate and dedicated residents who are prepared to go out of their way to help their neighbours and communities, and we praise this vital work.

This Council also recognises the need for government at all levels to step in and provide support for those who cannot bear the increasing costs that rising bills and prices bring.

H&F Council is playing its part by taking action to support residents through the cost-of-living-crisis. Although the Conservative government has cut 54% of the Council's general grant funding in real terms since 2010, action by the Labour administration since 2014 has so far included:

- A real terms council tax cut of 9%;
- A generous and comprehensive council tax support scheme;
- Free breakfasts for primary school children, and free food for children who need it through school holidays;
- Abolition of home care charges for elderly and disabled residents;
- A freeze in other charges in children's and adults' services;
- Significant funding for local charities and the Hammersmith & Fulham Foodbank; and
- Expanded advice services for residents in need of support.

The Council is now working with its partners to develop a wide range of further support, including an extensive Financial Inclusion Strategy to improve access to financial information, advice and services for residents.

By contrast, we regret that where Boris Johnson's government has acted, support has been poorly targeted and insufficient for those struggling the most.

- Measures such as the regressive increase in National Insurance will push local residents deeper into financial difficulty.
- The £20 per week cut to Universal Credit was a disastrous step just as the country became gripped by the-cost-of-living crisis.

This Council urges central government to take as proactive an approach to the cost-of-living crisis as Hammersmith & Fulham Council has done.

This Council calls on the government to reverse the £20 a week cut to Universal credit.

It also calls on the government to fund local authorities adequately as these are often best placed to understand the direct needs of their residents through their work in the community. As a first step, this should mean increasing the general grant to councils and funding for payments such as Discretionary Housing Payments that allow councils to support those in the greatest need.

8.5 **Special Motion 5 - Government-Forced Cuts to London's Buses**

NOTE: Councillor Paul Alexander left the room for this item.

8.47pm – Councillor Ben Coleman moved, seconded by Councillor Lisa Homan, the special motion in their names:

“This Council deeply regrets that Conservative ministers have told Transport for London to cut services after it lost money during Covid. Essential bus routes across Hammersmith & Fulham are now threatened with closure or severe reductions in service.

- The C3, 11, 14, 72 and 74 will be scrapped.*
- Night buses N27 and N74 will be scrapped, and the N72 will no longer serve Hammersmith.*
- The 23, 27, 211, 272, 283, 328 and 430 will operate a reduced timetable or be rerouted.*

Other governments from New York to Paris are funding public transport after the pandemic to maintain services and keep fares low. This is even more important in the cost-of-living crisis. Boris Johnson’s Conservatives, however, are requiring TfL to reduce services in return for a partial bailout.

This Council urges TfL to maintain the essential routes on which Hammersmith and Fulham residents depend.

This Council regrets that Fulham’s Greg Hands, a Conservative minister, is seeking to divert people’s attention from the real reason for the proposed bus cuts by attacking Transport for London. It calls on Mr Hands not to let his constituents pay for the pandemic but instead to campaign for his government to provide the investment that London’s transport needs.”

A speech on the motion was made by Councillor Coleman (for the Administration).

Under Standing Order 15(e)(6), Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Dinsmore, an amendment in their names:

“Delete all after ‘This council’ and replace with:

The opposition is deeply shocked by the bus service cuts proposed by Sadiq Khan and TfL. These would affect the residents in our borough to an unacceptable degree.

The C3, 11, 14, 72 and 74 would be cancelled.

The 23, 27, 211, 272, 283, 328, 414 and 430 would have a less regular or altered service.

The N27, N11 and N74 would be cancelled and the N72 diverted from Hammersmith.

This council calls for TFL to stop these proposed changes and stop the strikes on the London Underground and for the mayor to run the transport system efficiently, especially given the vast financial support coming from the government.

Londoners deserve a better service on public transport.”

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Brocklebank-Fowler, Dinsmore (who made his maiden speech) and Afzal-Khan (for the Opposition) – and Councillor Homan (for the Administration).

The amendment was then put to the vote.

FOR	10
AGAINST	31
NOT VOTING	1

The amendment was declared **LOST**.

Speeches on the substantive motion were made by Councillors Homan, Souslous (who made his maiden speech), and Antoniadès (for the Administration).

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

FOR	31
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	1

The motion was declared **CARRIED**.

9.26pm – RESOLVED

This Council deeply regrets that Conservative ministers have told Transport for London to cut services after it lost money during Covid. Essential bus routes across Hammersmith & Fulham are now threatened with closure or severe reductions in service.

- The C3, 11, 14, 72 and 74 will be scrapped.
- Night buses N27 and N74 will be scrapped, and the N72 will no longer serve Hammersmith.
- The 23, 27, 211, 272, 283, 328 and 430 will operate a reduced timetable or be rerouted.

Other governments from New York to Paris are funding public transport after the pandemic to maintain services and keep fares low. This is even more important in the cost-of-living crisis. Boris Johnson's Conservatives, however, are requiring TfL to reduce services in return for a partial bailout.

This Council urges TfL to maintain the essential routes on which Hammersmith and Fulham residents depend.

This Council regrets that Fulham's Greg Hands, a Conservative minister, is seeking to divert people's attention from the real reason for the proposed bus cuts by attacking Transport for London. It calls on Mr Hands not to let his constituents pay for the pandemic but instead to campaign for his government to provide the investment that London's transport needs.

8.1 Special Motion 1 - Reverse Parking Charges

9.26pm – Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Dinsmore, the special motion in their names:

“This Council welcomes the announcement made by the leader of the Administration, ahead of the May 2022 local government elections, that a Labour administration would reverse parking charges.

This Council endorses comments made by the Leader on 14 April that “the parking charge increases were a mistake at the time and they are even more of a mistake now that the pandemic has eased. I want to apologise for getting this wrong and promise that we will get it right if residents hire us again to run the Borough.” This Council notes that this U-turn took place several months after the Conservative Opposition had themselves pledged to reverse increases to parking charges if elected.

This Council welcomes the bipartisan agreement that a reversal of the parking charges increase is the right thing to do. However, this Council notes with concern that, over two months since the elections, this has not yet happened. This Council therefore calls upon the Administration to provide a clear and detailed plan of how and when these charges will be reversed.”

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

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

“Delete all after “This Council...” in line 1 and add:

Reaffirms the commitment in the Labour Party 2022 Manifesto ‘Rising to the challenges of our times, together’ to “...introduce emissions-based residents’ parking, which will reduce parking fees for many residents and include free parking for clean vehicles outside of high-volume neighbourhoods and rush hour and school-run traffic.” The Council notes that the cut in parking charges will be introduced after the summer and is a part of the Administration’s measures to help residents deal with the cost-of-living crisis.

This Council also notes that when in office, the previous Conservative Administration (which many current opposition councillors belonged to) raised record amounts from local and visiting motorists by:

- *Increasing parking fine limits by 50% in 2007*
- *Ending free visitor parking on bank holidays over the Christmas period in 2009*
- *Increasing visitors’ parking charges by 55% in 2010*
- *Increasing residents parking permit charges by 20% in 2010*
- *Budgeted to introduce a 14.7% increase in parking charges in 2014”*

Speeches on the amendment were made by Councillors Harcourt, Miri, Schmid, Coleman, Homan, Cowan, and Ree (for the Administration) – and Councillors Lloyd-Harris, and Karmel (for the Opposition).

The amendment was then put to the vote.

FOR	32
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	1

The amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

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

FOR	32
AGAINST	10
NOT VOTING	1

The amended motion was declared **CARRIED**.

10.07pm – RESOLVED

This Council reaffirms the commitment in the Labour Party 2022 Manifesto ‘Rising to the challenges of our times, together’ to “...introduce emissions-based residents’ parking, which will reduce parking fees for many residents and include free parking for clean vehicles outside of high-volume neighbourhoods and rush hour and school-run traffic.” The Council notes that the cut in parking charges will be introduced after the summer and is a part of the Administration’s measures to help residents deal with the cost-of-living crisis.

This Council also notes that when in office, the previous Conservative Administration (which many current opposition councillors belonged to) raised record amounts from local and visiting motorists by:

- Increasing parking fine limits by 50% in 2007
- Ending free visitor parking on bank holidays over the Christmas period in 2009
- Increasing visitors’ parking charges by 55% in 2010
- Increasing residents parking permit charges by 20% in 2010
- Budgeted to introduce a 14.7% increase in parking charges in 2014

8.2 Special Motion 2 - Traffic Congestion and Pollution Reduction (TCPR) Extension

The special motion was withdrawn.

8.3 Special Motion 3 - Protecting the UK's Parliamentary Democracy

The special motion was withdrawn.

8.6 Special Motion 6 - The Conservative Government's Failing Justice System

The special motion was withdrawn.

9. INFORMATION REPORTS - TO NOTE

9.1 Special Urgency Decisions - Monitoring Report 2021/22

10.08pm - The report was noted.

Meeting started: 7.07 pm
Meeting ended: 10.08 pm

Mayor

Public Questions and Responses – 13 July 2022

Question 1

From: Caroline Shuffrey, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

Question:

“On December 6th 2021, Cabinet decided to make an experimental traffic order for the South Fulham TCPR West Scheme based on further engagement with a small group of residents standing to benefit from the scheme. This would operate needlessly 24/7, and would mean that there will be no right turn on to Wandsworth Bridge Road for non-local Eastbound vehicles who do not have a visitors permit, causing havoc on other Fulham roads outside the scheme.

Following two fairly acrimonious online meetings earlier this year, set up by a small group of largely anonymous residents, around 4000 people of predominantly borough residents have signed a petition to stop the traffic camera exclusion zone spreading across Fulham without consultation first.

Will the Leader describe what comprehensive consultation with residents and businesses he will direct our Council to carry out across Fulham, to assess their views on the impact of the proposed camera scheme before introducing it?”

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

Thank you for your question, Ms Shuffrey. I know how passionately you feel about this subject and I know the strength of your opposition to the measures we have introduced to clean the air in South Fulham streets by reducing the number of out-of- borough motorists using residential streets as rat runs.

The scheme has reduced traffic by 75% in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road itself.

Across the area, traffic is down by 23%, with 8,000 fewer cars in the area per day. CO2 pollution is down by 60%.

As regards the petition, at face value, I can see why 4,000 people might think they needed to sign it. The trouble is that – to quote a local Conservative Party officer – it is “based on limited information, false facts and unfounded speculation”. What the petition is protesting about is not what the council is doing or planning.

I appreciate you say it has been signed “predominantly” by residents, which I take to mean more than half the signatures are from residents. This doesn’t tally with my understanding that the petition has been shared far and wide beyond the borough, including by a national climate-change-denying lobby group.

As regards consultation, the original scheme to the east of WBR and the proposed extension to the west have already been subject to the largest resident consultation and

engagement programme in this borough's history, far beyond the guidelines laid down by the Secretary of State for Transport. It was a pleasure to see you at some of the meetings.

I can assure you that if the trial clean air neighbourhood scheme to the west of WBR is to go ahead, there will need to be a consultation that again follows and indeed goes beyond government guidelines.

Question 2

From: Bill Tomlin, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Question:

"Many/all of the borough's public parks are included in the dog walker scheme. Hurlingham, Eel Brook Common, South Park and Bishops Park, all situated close to and within walking distance of Parsons Green are included.

Parsons Green appears to have been omitted. There is already an issue with dog fouling on the Green, it's an ongoing issue. Omission suggests we'll see the volume of unlicensed dog walkers flocking to Parsons Green to walk the dogs in their care making an existing problem worse.

We have a church, a health centre, a hotel, two pubs and a school standing directly on the Green; this means we have a high volume of school kids, visitors, health centre patients and people out socialising using the Green all day every day - it's very busy.

What can we do to include Parsons Green in the scheme to avoid the inevitable consequences of omission?"

Response:

The Council is about to consult on introducing new powers Public Space Protection Orders, (PSPO's) to control the behaviour of dogs within the borough and this will include a review of the professional dog walking license restrictions. The consultation will be available on the council's "Have your say" webpage. Generally, the larger parks and green spaces have been included such as Parsons Green as areas where it is appropriate for professional dog walkers to walk up to four dogs while other smaller parks and green spaces have been omitted as they are not suitable for such activities.

The introduction of PSPOs will give the Law Enforcement Team, and any other delegated officer, the ability to ensure license holders follow the restrictions accordingly. The PSPO's will also cover issues such as dog fouling and where dogs are not allowed or are required to be on a lead.

Question 3

From: John Davis, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

Question:

“The traffic abs pollution on WBR is horrific. Why do you still report that this show the LTN in Sands End is working?”

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

The South Fulham scheme is not a low traffic neighbourhood (LTN). LTNs block streets and stop all drivers, whether residents or from outside the borough. Our pioneering clean air neighbourhood uses smart tech cameras to allow H&F residents free access everywhere. Visitors can enter the area at eight points without going through a camera and residents can give them free access through the cameras (up to midnight on the day of the visit even after they have left). The scheme stops out-of-borough traffic from using our residential streets as rat runs and cut-throughs rather than visiting someone in the area.

Since the scheme began in July 202, traffic has reduced by 75% in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road itself. Across South Fulham, traffic is down by 23% with 8,000 fewer cars in the area per day.

Traffic and pollution volumes are being constantly monitored on Wandsworth Bridge Road and surrounding streets. The data are showing lower numbers than for before the scheme came in. CO2 levels are down by 60%. This fall is against a national rise in traffic after the Covid lockdowns.

Question 4

From: Nick Walker, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

Question:

“As a long-term resident of the borough, it is clear that traffic has got much worse in recent years and I want to ask how the council plans to actively reduce traffic to make the borough healthier & safer?”

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

We share the ambition to reduce traffic and pollution and deliver a healthier and safer environment for residents across the borough. That is precisely why we have introduced the clean air neighbourhood scheme in South Fulham which has resulted in 8,000 fewer cars a day using the area.

Question 5

From: Brian Mooney, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

Question:

“Dear Councillor Cowan, thank you for your reply to my previous question on 16 Oct 2019, in which you provided assurance that, with the possible exception of Hammersmith Bridge tolls, the Council was against residents being charged to use the roads.

The Mayor of London is running an under-publicised consultation on introducing London-wide road pricing.

Will you publicise this consultation and your opposition to LBH&F residents and make it straightforward for us to submit our objections to this proposal?"

Link to consultation: <https://haveyoursay.tfl.gov.uk/cleanair>

Response (from the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Ecology):

We're really happy to confirm that we've got absolutely no plans to charge Hammersmith and Fulham residents to drive on the borough's roads. We've also made it clear that if there is a toll or a user charge is implemented on Hammersmith Bridge, Hammersmith and Fulham residents would be exempt.

I'm grateful for you highlighting the issue of the ULEZ consultation that TfL is undertaking but it's their job to publicise the consultation, but having said that we would support any proposals that reduce the number of high polluting out-of-borough motorists using our streets – and the things such as those that impact on our ambition for clean air neighbourhoods.

Question 6

From: Kate Jakobsson, Resident

To: The Deputy Leader

Question:

"After an expansion of mobile phone masts, Hammersmith and Fulham residents are experiencing symptoms such as palpitations, headaches and sleep disruption.

Michael Mansfield QC's Action Against 5G has made the case that the government has failed to properly investigate the health effects from 5G technology or inform the public on the risks. The courts have accepted the evidence and there will be a full hearing.

As exposure effects are cumulative and the population of transmitting devices in our streets is increasing, will Hammersmith and Fulham Council engage with residents to establish the scale of the problem and identify remedial measures?"

Response:

As I said in my response to a similar question at the Full Council meeting in January 2020, the Council continues to ensure that the current best available science is used to inform any decision it makes on 5G.

The Council does not have control over every 5G installation in the borough but where it does have control it considers expert advice from Public Health England (now called the UK Health Security Agency - UKHSA).

This in turn draws on expertise from the Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards (CRCE) and guidelines from the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (IC-NIRP), with which UK network operators must comply.

There are extremely strong arguments for 5G to improve digital connectivity for residents and businesses in the borough, supporting economic recovery and reducing digital exclusion for those with poor connection speeds.

However, there are also arguments against it and the Council will seriously consider the outcome of the Court of Appeal's recent decision to grant permission for a judicial review, brought by Michael Mansfield QC, once this is concluded.

Question 7

From: Donald Grant, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Question:

"The Leader gallantly admitted during the election campaign that the Council got the parking charge changes wrong and promised to reverse them. Will the Member for Public Realm now admit that the previous Council got the traffic camera scheme to the East of WBRd wrong for the majority of Fulham residents, especially those living and working on Wandsworth Bridge Road, and reverse that too?"

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

I think we are going to have to agree to differ here. The evidence is that the clean air neighbourhood is working. It also supported by local groups, including the Wandsworth Bridge Road Association. It has reduced traffic by 75% in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road itself. Across South Fulham, traffic is down by 23%, with 8,000 fewer cars in the area per day. CO2 pollution is down by 60%.

Question 8

From: Caroline Brooman-White, Resident

To: The Leader of the Council

Question:

"All the public roads within Fulham have been built and paid for from general taxation. Through traffic is now being sent to the Wandsworth Bridge Road, increasing traffic, noise, pollution, congestion and journey time for residents on the road. What reasons do the Council have to prioritise the health and enjoyment of some residents on some taxpayer funded roads, over the residents and businesses on the Wandsworth Bridge Road?"

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

Traffic has reduced by 75% in the streets to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road and by 12% on Wandsworth Bridge Road. This is good for residents and businesses alike.

Public roads in Hammersmith and Fulham are paid for from the contributions of council tax revenue and the parking account surplus, not general taxation.

Through-traffic that was present in local streets was due to drivers trying to avoid delays on the main road, Wandsworth Bridge Road, which was at capacity. The traffic we have removed from the residential streets has not gone on to Wandsworth Bridge Road, where traffic has fallen by between 5% and 12% depending on the time of day.

We think that residents expect the council to put the health of its residents above the convenience to out-of-borough motorists of using residential streets as rat runs to reduce their journey times into London and the wider region.

Question 9

From: Victoria Angell, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety

Question:

"I note that H&F Council aims to be the greenest council. It is seeing rising numbers of mobile phone masts, small cells and devices for the internet of things. What steps is it taking to quantify and address the impact of electromagnetic radiation on people in council buildings, and on species such as pollinators and trees so vital to our environment".

Response (from the Deputy Leader):

As outlined in response to the earlier question (6), the Council draws on the current best available science to inform any decision it makes on telecommunications, such as phone masts and small cell devices.

In doing so it considers expert advice from Public Health England (now called the UK Health Security Agency - UKHSA), the Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards (CRCE) and guidelines from the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), with which UK network operators must comply.

The UKSHA continues to monitor the health-related evidence and is committed to updating its advice as required.

To date, scientific evidence and UKSHA advice do not support a link between health symptoms and exposure to electromagnetic fields for people or biodiversity.

However, the Council will continue to monitor national advice and will respond accordingly.

The Council carries out regular inspections of all Council buildings to ensure employees and members of the public are free from any harm or risk and that all buildings are accessible to the public as part of its obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act etc 1974.

At present, in light of the current scientific evidence, this doesn't include specific monitoring of exposure to mobile phone masts.

As mentioned, the Council will seriously consider the outcome of the Court of Appeal's recent decision to grant permission for a judicial review of whether the government has properly investigated the health impacts of 5G.