

Full Council Public Questions – 28 February 2024

Question 1

From: Nicola Dryden, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety

There seems to be an increasing problem with dog poo bags being dropped and littering the pavements. Therefore, I would like to understand what is the council is doing to enforce fines on those who are litter dropping? Is the council planning to have more dog poo bins across the borough in order to try to address the problem?

Question 2

From: Casey Abaraonye, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Finance and Reform

Decisions taken by adults in the room affect the futures of our young and we should be doing more to involve them in that process. Can the council commit to writing to 16 year olds and schools, to ensure that they are reminded when they become eligible to vote, to participate in the process? For schools this would form an active part of their Citizenship.

Question 3

From: Nick Smith, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Many streets in SW6 are suffering from a lack of investment in new infrastructure, paving, lighting and street furniture. Could the council please consider a programme of street improvements in the SW6 area using funds raised from the fines gained from non-residents cutting through our residential streets?

Question 4

From: Sarah, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety

Given the recent attacks on Bishops Park and the warnings about a sexual predator around Townmead Road, please can you let us know what the Council is doing to protect residents in the borough, both in terms of personal safety and also on matters such as car and bike theft.

Question 5

From: Andy Knowles, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Could the council please confirm if they have had any approach from the Department for Transport as part of the "LTN Review" and what good news does the council have for them on the popularity and effectiveness of the local schemes?

Question 6

From: David Tarsh, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

At the last full council meeting, it was made clear that the survey commissioned from Opinium would be used to decide whether to keep the CAN traffic scheme, which has caused huge social division, harm to local businesses and which Greg Hands' survey has found to be deeply unpopular.

The law requires LBHF to conduct a consultation if it is to retain the traffic scheme. And the law provides that a consultation is only legitimate when the Gunning Principles are met. However, the Opinium survey breaks the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct in several ways (its purpose was not transparent; its design and content were biased; and questions were leading); and the council has also breached the second provision of the Gunning Principles, ie: that there is sufficient information for the consultees to give 'intelligent consideration'.

"Intelligent consideration" is impossible when LBHF deliberately conceals the pivotal role of the survey in keeping the traffic scheme and, when LBHF refuses to answer repeated Fol questions asking how much money it has collected in fines and how air quality has changed on the Wandsworth Bridge Road and the New Kings Road.

So, will the council now provide full and frank answers to those questions; or will it continue refusing to do so, in which case, intelligent consideration is impossible; and its consultation is not legitimate?

Question 7

From: Caroline Shuffrey, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

In response to a resident's question at last month's council meeting the Council stated 'The council has commissioned Opinium, a member of the British Polling Council, to undertake one of the most comprehensive surveys ever seen in this country into a neighbourhood scheme. This is open to all residents, not just those within the Clean Air Neighbourhood area. Opinium have also been commissioned to carry out opinion polling both within the Clean Air Neighbourhood area and, again, across the borough'.

A leaflet directing residents to answer the poll Opinium.com/hfsurvey/ was only delivered by Royal Mail to random households in a small area in Fulham, many addresses appeared to be missed out. The poll was not advertised in the Council's weekly newsletters or on Next Door. The poll could not be answered by those residents who were not online. The poll was only open for a short period, much shorter than for other surveys.

Given that such a comprehensive survey was undertaken why did the Council make so little effort to advertise the poll to the 80,000 plus households across the borough?

Question 8

From: Donald Grant, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

The Traffic Camera Consulting Group is the largest residents' group in South Fulham, with several hundred members from over 100 Fulham streets. We advised your "Strategic Director of Environment" several times that due to this we wished to be involved in traffic and public realm issues being influenced by residents. That has not happened outside two staged meetings, and instead minority resident groups and individual residents routinely influence the punitive trial LTN details, and initiatives on Wandsworth Bridge Road. In the absence of any replies from your Director, when will we start to be involved in traffic and public realm discussions between the Council and other residents?

Question 9

From: Natalie Lindsay, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

In light of your Air Quality Assessment paper it is clear that urgent action needs to be taken to tackle the filthy air each and every resident of the borough is subjected to. We also know that to meet our Climate obligations by 2030 we must reduce car use by a minimum of 27%. Can the council lay out their proposed timetable to act on excessive volumes of vehicles in the borough (via CANS, LTNS, main road mitigations/de-prioritisations etc) and in parallel how quickly they plan to create safe segregated cycle lanes to help the families/residents that still drive to switch to active travel.

Question 10

From: Hillary Cannon, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Uber and other ride sharing apps - the more affordable options for private taxi service and therefore among the most frequently used by young people - do not have access through the LTN in south Fulham (or the CAN scheme, to use its common name), and because of this are regularly dropping young women at the top of Parson's Green and other points along Wandsworth Bridge Rd, forcing them to walk home alone at all hours of the night. Additionally, there has been at least one report of a known sexual predator operating in the exact area where these women are being forced to walk, and presumably other predators are already noticing that the neighbourhood is now rife with opportunities to harm young women, thanks to these cameras. This issue has been raised countless times in emails sent by myself and other women in the borough - all of which have been ignored.

Does the Council plan to turn off the cameras until a viable, solution can be found that ensures the safety of women and girls, or does it plan to continue knowingly risking their lives in favour of this divisive and now demonstrably dangerous scheme?

Question 11

From: Philip Jones, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for the Economy

At the end of the Council's response to my question at the last Full Council meeting I said that I wanted to drill down into the Council's figures of the 1,780 affordable residential units that it has permitted to be built over the last ten years to determine how many were residential units with rental prices capped at 80% of local market rents and how many were low-cost social rent properties?

Question 12

From: Jacqueline Rivadeneira, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for the Economy

Would Fulham & Hammersmith support that Builders and Construction Companies become licensed and formally Regulated to improve standards to reduce the number of rogue builders and companies and have an accountable and responsible industry?

Question 13

From: Richard Cazenove, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Re the CAN, thank you to Councillor Holder for providing traffic data from the Grimston Road monitoring camera. It shows vehicles using the street since the start of the CAN trial have increased by just under 9% to approximately 1,850/day. This compares to large reductions on other north-south routes – e.g. minus 58.8% on Broomhouse Lane. A demonstrable fall in “cut-through” traffic has been offset by a larger increase in “access” volumes. This is primarily due to out-of-borough cars/vans seeking a new route to the Hurlingham Club and 400 adjacent flats to avoid the Hurlingham Road CAN fine camera. The change in mix has had a much more detrimental impact in terms of traffic volumes on Ranelagh Avenue for reasons well understood by the Council.

As discussed previously there are a number of ways this could be mitigated and following communication with the Director for Climate Change and Transport, we seem to have had breakthrough. He has confirmed that the Council is working on providing “automatic” immunity to Hurlingham Club traffic from the cameras – no form filling, no pre-registration etc. I believe there are some specific points to be agreed (e.g. which cameras the exemptions will apply to) and technology to be refined, but with this in mind when do you expect the modification will be

implemented? The willingness to act on feedback is both encouraging and much appreciated.

Question 14

From: Caroline Brooman-White, Resident

To: The Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Two years ago Councillor Harcourt wrote to me saying initial pollution data for Wandsworth Bridge Road has shown it is not significantly different to the side streets. Is this still true?