

Cabinet

Minutes



Monday 4 March 2024

NOTE: A recording of the meeting can be watched at on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Qxo3UDuzz0>

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Cowan, Leader of the Council
Councillor Ben Coleman, Deputy Leader
Councillor Wesley Harcourt, Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Ecology
Councillor Andrew Jones, Cabinet Member for The Economy
Councillor Sharon Holder, Cabinet Member for Public Realm
Councillor Rebecca Harvey, Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion and Community Safety
Councillor Bora Kwon, Cabinet Member for Civic Renewal
Councillor Rowan Ree, Cabinet Member for Finance and Reform
Councillor Alex Sanderson, Cabinet Member for Children and Education
Councillor Frances Umeh, Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor Jose Afonso
Councillor Aliya Afzal-Khan
Councillor Adronie Alford
Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler

1. MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 12 FEBRUARY 2024

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 12 February 2024 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings, and that the outstanding actions be noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Alex Sanderson noted she had to leave the meeting after presenting and voting on the first three reports on the agenda.

3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

4. SCHOOL BUDGET (DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT) 2024/25

Councillor Aliya Afzal-Khan asked what services comprised the historic commitment to Central Services Schools Block (CSSB) and how they would be impacted by the CSSB allocation for 2024/25. She also asked how the High Needs Block expenditure would be spent to directly benefit young people and children with special education needs.

Councillor Alex Sanderson, Cabinet Member for Children and Education, replied that she would respond to both her questions in writing.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

1. Schools Block Budget 2024/25 Financial Year:
 - a. To approve the Local Authority formula for allocating resources to Hammersmith & Fulham schools for 2024/25 as set out in Appendix 1, the Authority Proforma Tool (APT) for setting school budgets.
 - b. To approve the National Funding Formula (NFF) transitional funding formula factor rates (as set out in Appendix 1) as the basis for calculating the 2024/25 schools funding formula, together with a 0.5% per pupil Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) protection for individual schools versus 2023/24 levels with respect to pupil led funding.
 - c. To approve the transfer of £1.177m (1.0% of the total schools' block allocation) from the schools' block to the high needs block in the 2024/25 financial year. This is to support high needs education expenditure for special educational needs in Hammersmith and Fulham. This is subject to Ministerial agreement from the Department of Education.
 - d. To approve de-delegation budgets of £0.622m for maintained mainstream schools only which was agreed by Schools Forum on 16 January 2024.
 - e. To approve the education functions budgets of £0.307m for maintained mainstream schools only, which was agreed by Schools Forum on 16 January 2024.
2. Central Services Schools Block Budget 2024/25:
 - a. To approve the proposed budget allocation for Central Services Schools Block DSG totalling £2.106m.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

5. BECOMING A PARTNER OF THE NATIONAL CARE LEAVER COVENANT

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

That Cabinet approves the decision for the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to become a Partner of the national Care Leaver Covenant.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

6. PAN LONDON HOUSING COMPACT COMMITMENTS TO YOUNG PEOPLE LEAVING CARE

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

In fulfilling our aspirations and support for care leavers, we are seeking Cabinet support to enable the Council to implement the recommendations of the Pan London Housing Compact. To achieve this, officers are recommending that Cabinet:

1. Adopts the guiding principle that care leavers up to the age of 25 should, if possible, be found as being in 'priority need' under homelessness legislation;
2. Adopts the guiding principle that, if possible, no care leaver up to the age of 25 should be found 'intentionally homeless'.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

7. SOUTH FULHAM (WEST) CLEAN AIR NEIGHBOURHOOD

Councillor Sharon Holder, Cabinet Member for Public Realm, introduced the report highlighting that the South Fulham (West) Clean Air Neighbourhood trial had been developed with residents and aimed to promote healthy living by protecting people from toxic air which could lead to serious health conditions. The trial intended to reduce congestion and pollution and used smart number plate technology to discourage out-of-borough motorists, who were not shopping in the area or visiting friends and family, from using residential streets as cut-throughs.

Cabinet received eleven valid deputations for this item. With the Leader's permission each representative was permitted to address Cabinet for 5 minutes. The main points highlighted by each deputation were:

1. David Tarsh

- He said he was against the Clean Air Neighbourhood (CAN) scheme being made permanent as he believed the supporting information on the report was misleading.
- He said the Council's data showed that air quality in South Fulham was not a problem even before the trial.
- He said the scheme did not have public support, had divided the local community, endangered businesses, and harmed people's livelihoods.
- He believed the Opinion survey was not transparent on their questions.
- He believed streets should be free for everyone to use. By reducing traffic in certain streets it also reduced customers and pushed traffic elsewhere.

2. Caroline Shuffrey

- She said that visitors exemptions were issued using RingGo, which was not fit for purpose and had negatively impacted the community. She felt this issue had to be resolved before implementing the scheme.
- She said she had spent many hours explaining to residents how to use RingGo and helping them to appeal when fines had been issued. She said residents found the process very stressful and inefficient, and put off some people from using the system entirely. As the Cabinet report

highlighted, only 300 visitor permits were issued each month, in an area covering a large number of residents.

- She stated that comparisons of all data 22 vs 23 (not just RingGo data) had no sensible meaning and could not be used to indicate success of the trial due to the high number of Coronavirus cases in 2022.
- She said that visitors without a permit coming from the West could not turn right along New Kings Road and were forced to divert their journey, increasing it considerably.
- She said that private hire vehicles would not enter the trial area to drop-off or pick-up passengers to avoid fines, forcing women to walk home at night.
- She was in favour of a coordinated attempt to reduce traffic but that would need improvement to public transport and Government support.
- She had started a petition requesting consultation on the South Fulham CAN scheme that had raised over 12,100 signatories, showing many people were against the scheme.

3. Neil McCarroll

- He said he was the owner of a local business and was concerned about the negative effect on all businesses due to the implementation of CAN around Wandsworth Bridge Road.
- He said that his area was first introduced to the scheme at a well-attended 3-day event organised by the Council for businesses and residents. The majority of the attendees were concerned, but the Council reassured that the scheme was a success in South Fulham.
- Encouraged by the concerns of the community he travelled to South Fulham to enquire about the real impact of the scheme. He visited four businesses at random, and none were happy with the scheme or the process for visitor permits. Out of the four businesses he had consulted, one had since closed down and trade was down for the others. Since then he had consulted other business in the area who reported a downturn in trade and increase traffic on the boundary roads.
- He said that Mastercard data showed an increase in spending during the CAN trial but noted that could be due to NatWest having replaced expired Visa Cards with Mastercards since 2021.

4. Allison Rodger

- She said she was the owner of a couture fashion boutique on New Kings Road, with clients both local and from all over Britain.
- She said that since the introduction of the trial, businesses including hers had suffered a decline in revenue. Her customers from outside the borough did not wish to drive to Fulham due to longer journey times and the need to have a visitor permit to avoid a fine. She said her experience was echoed by many other businesses in South Fulham.
- She said that her views and views from other businesses were not heard during the trial period and questioned the data in the report related to South Fulham businesses.

- She said the Council stated that data indicated an increase in activity and spending in the area, which was not in line with the reality for many shops around her.

5. Vivienne Goldstein

- She said she had lived in Parsons Green for over twenty years and had started the Parsons Green Residents Group due to her concerns about the ramifications of the CAN scheme on the local area.
- She believed that the Council had failed to engage in a meaningful way with the wider community and the scheme only benefited a few.
- She stated that the scheme's supporters were boycotting businesses that did not support CAN.
- She said the scheme had eroded community spirit, which was now deeply divided, and had damaged businesses. She also said traffic had been pushed onto busier roads, adding to congestion and increasing pollution to residents living on those roads.
- She suggested the cameras should stop operating between 8pm and 6am to allow cars through at night and improve women's safety.

6. Caroline Brooman-White

- She said that she had lived on the Wandsworth Bridge Road for over forty years and the introduction of the CAN had negatively impacted her life and that of her family and neighbours, and local businesses, who were not happy with the scheme.
- She stated that the report did not provide a comprehensive picture of how the congestion, increased pollution, tyre dust and general decline of many businesses on the road was destroying the heart of the community.
- She added that businesses needed to be supported as they were suffering but afraid to speak up to avoid being boycotted.
- She stated that she fully understood that there was a traffic problem in South Fulham and would like to see a scheme implemented that would be of benefit to everyone. She started a new residents group, but they were not able to engage with the Council and would like to have their views heard.

7. Donald Grant

- He said that Wandsworth Bridge Road residents were suffering from displaced, slower moving and more idling traffic which would otherwise have used public roads to the west.
- He stated that the interpretation of data in the report had ignored the increased journey time.
- They would like the air quality to be properly considered and reported over periods reflecting the start and end of the trial.
- He believed that the majority of residents were not in favour of the scheme.
- He stated that the Opinion survey questions were theoretical, and the survey had not explained it would inform the decision to make the

scheme permanent. He added that the survey missed out some neighbouring areas and had some misleading questions.

8. David Morris

- He said his deputation strongly supported the report's recommendation to make the scheme permanent to deal with out of Borough through traffic without resorting to physical barriers.
- He said before the scheme, Perrymead Street residents had suffered with 'rat running' traffic for decades. Throughout the day and night there used to be either gridlocked traffic and road rage or the street was used as a 'racetrack' for speeding vehicles. Cars and trees were damaged and the air was polluted.
- He said that the trial had transformed not only Perrymead Street but also the whole area which had become safer, quieter and healthier.
- He said that children coming to the four schools in the area suffered with the traffic in Peterborough Road before the trial was implemented, which had since considerably reduced.
- He said that since the trial started 13 shops had opened.
- He stated that not all of the traffic had been displaced to perimeter roads as some had disappeared.
- They were concerned by reports that some Uber drivers were still declining to take passengers to their doors. They were glad to see that Council had been in discussions with Uber to allow pick-ups and drop offs to trigger automatic permits.
- He believed that there had been substantial consultation on the scheme. The independent polling and online consultation showed that the majority of residents in the trial area and in the Borough supported the scheme.

9. Edward Jospé

- He said that his deputation commended the Council's commitment to tackling Air Pollution in the Borough.
- He said that over the course of the past 3 years Wandsworth Bridge Road Association (WBRA) had engaged with the local community via multiple means to develop the vision of the road.
- He stated that as part of the CAN and substantial consultation the Council appointed WSP to develop detailed plans with that vision. The plans were publicly presented by Council officers in May 2023 and attended by 15,000 visitors at a series of public events.
- He said that the detailed plans were on the Council's website and on the WBRA's website and were publicly visible on the boardings opposite Barton House on the Wandsworth Bridge Road, including a timeline for works.
- He stated that the redesign of the Wandsworth Bridge Road had been a commitment from the Council for nearly two years following extensive and ongoing consultations.
- He urged the Council to begin the transformation and include improvements on the road, with raised crossings, widened pavements,

and to work with TfL and Wandsworth to fully redesigned pedestrian, and cycle friendly junctions at either end of the road.

10. Jonathan Massey

- He said that his deputation supported the scheme to be made permanent as the trial had improved the quality of life of all local residents, making the area less polluted and congested, making the streets safer and easier to navigate, in particular for pedestrians and cyclists.
- He said that there were four schools located within the area, as well as South Park and the Sands End Community Centre; all of these had benefitted from the CAN.
- He stated that they did not want to go back to the unacceptable traffic congestion, pollution, road rage and danger to local pedestrians and cyclists which was a daily occurrence before the scheme was introduced.
- He asked the Council to implement further restrictions in Clancarty Road and Settrington Road.
- He said that the bad publicity regarding the scheme could be negatively impacting businesses.

11. Lou Abigail Savage

- She said that her deputation overwhelmingly supported the CAN scheme as it had profoundly improved the quality of life for the residents of Linver Road and the other roads within the scheme in many ways.
- She said that since the introduction of the scheme the side roads were no longer used as 'racetracks' or noisy and polluted, which improved safety on the roads and fostered a new sense of community. Before the trial began, residents had to endure excessive noise from drivers including verbal abuse and blaring horns at all times of the day.
- She said the reduction in noise and air pollution had improved the health and safety of all residents.
- She said that during the previous summer, 90% of residents of Linver Road had signed a letter of support for the scheme.
- She stated that people on her road were helping each other learning to use the RingGo system to register visitors.

The Leader asked numerous questions to each deputation speaker at the end of their speech and asked what suggestions they would make to improve the scheme. In response to some concerns about the perceived impact of the scheme on local businesses, he said the Council was committed to engaging with businesses and helping them to thrive.

The Leader invited John Galsworthy, Director of Climate Change and Transport, to respond to the issues below raised by the deputations.

Businesses - He reassured members and residents that anyone visiting residents or businesses would receive exemptions if they registered. Visitors had until midnight on the day of their visit to register. Businesses were offered a

tablet free of charge to register customers on the premises. Council officers had supported businesses to understand the process and he said further business support and communication would follow. He noted that 13 businesses had opened since the trial began and 8 had closed.

In relation to Mastercard data, he said it was the industry standard for the investment market to use data from all transactions carried out using Mastercard and hand-held terminals which took into account adjustments for changes in suppliers in the market.

Traffic - He stated that generally once the traffic was full it flooded into the side streets with the help of Satnav technology. According to studies, reducing capacity of access routes increased traffic flow as it reduced backlogs and congestion. He added that the post-pandemic traffic in London had increased considerably throughout the day, rather than only at peak times. The congestion was now marginally less in Wandsworth Bridge Road, depending on the time of the day, and more interventions would be necessary in the future following further consultation and TfL involvement. The Council was hoping to start some interim measures in the summer.

Air Quality – John Galsworthy stated that the key aim of the scheme was to reduce pollution emission at source and experts had confirmed that the air quality in the area was below acceptable levels prior to the scheme's introduction. With the queues of traffic in the inner road gone and less pollution generated in those areas the pollution dispersed from the main roads into the side roads and the overall concentration of pollution across the whole area went down.

The Leader asked for the experts' air quality data and the risks to be published to avoid misunderstandings.

Uber – Councillor Coleman stressed that the Council was extremely concerned about women's safety and had just signed an agreement with Uber for a technical solution that would trigger automatic permits rather than relying on the driver or passenger having to register manually. The Council was also engaging with other private hire car companies to make similar arrangements.

Survey – John Galsworthy stated that in addition to the statutory survey and numerous public meetings consulting residents, independent opinion polling was carried out by Opinium, one of Britain's leading market research agencies. Opinium prepared the questions in line with Government guidance on traffic scheme consultations.

Councillor Coleman stressed that he had participated in a large number of meetings with residents to discuss the scheme. John Galsworthy added that residents' input was used on the design of the camera placements.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler stated that many people had complained about the questions on the consultation. She asked if not being able to ask a direct question was specific to a traffic order. John Galsworthy replied that this was the traffic order regulation process given by the Secretary of State.

Councillor Brocklebank-Fowler asked why the Council had not consulted all residents before the traffic order was put in place. The Leader replied that the initial scheme started on the eastern side of Wandsworth Bridge Road and involved significant consultation. The scheme was developed with residents and was widely supported. This success led to residents on the western side to ask for the scheme to be implemented in their area.

Councillor Coleman stressed that the scheme would continue to evolve and improve. The majority of people in the area supported it. He invited residents to work together with the Council to help improve the scheme in the future.

Councillor Sharon Holder noted that Mark Fanneran, Head of Service Development for Parking Services, had visited numerous businesses and organisations in the area and asked that any issues or new ideas be reported to him.

The Leader concluded by thanked residents for taking the time to provide their views and said the concerns and suggestions heard at the meeting would be taken on board.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

1. That Cabinet notes and carefully considers the feedback received for the South Fulham (West) Clean Air Neighbourhood trial carried out from the time the experimental traffic management order detailed in the body of this report was made on 14th December 2022 (“ **the Trial**”) in addition to the independent polling analysis (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2), alongside the data collected as part of the trial.
2. That Cabinet approves the consulting and publication of the proposal to make a permanent traffic management order for the South Fulham (West) Clean Air Neighbourhood project (as detailed in the section Permanent Order based on the Trial) and delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Realm to consider the responses received and make and publish the making of the permanent order along with any necessary associated highway works subject to the outcome of the statutory consultation process.
3. That Cabinet approves the publication of an experimental traffic order to implement further vehicle restrictions in Clancarty Road and Settrington Road (as detailed in the section New Experimental Order identified during the Trial) along with any necessary associated highway works.
4. That Cabinet gives authority to the Strategic Director of Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Realm to take all necessary steps to affect the decisions in recommendations 2 and 3.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

8. PARKING STRATEGY

Cabinet received one valid deputation for this item. With the Leader's permission Natalie Lindsay, the representative, was permitted to address Cabinet for 5 minutes. The main points highlighted were:

- She said cars contributed to air pollution, poor health in the population, and climate change - and were dangerous to other users of the public realm.
- She noted that the Council applied public space storage principals for the cycle storage hubs, but not for all vehicles. Parking a bicycle was 6 times more expensive than parking a SUV.
- She believed targeting new charges at the heaviest-emitting vehicles would be the most effective and equitable policy approach.
- She urged the Council to implement a radical emissions-based charging model on top of a fully comprehensive space allocation payment schedule.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

- To approve the parking related initiatives set out as follows:
 - Business Visitor Parking Permit – section 1
 - Motorcycle Parking Permit – section 2
 - All day Trader Parking Permit – section 3
 - Cycle Hub Permit – section 4
 - EV charging for residents – section 5
 - Prescribed loading and places – section 6
- To delegate the implementation of those initiatives to the Strategic Director of Environment, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Realm.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

9. **APPROVAL TO PROCURE A BOROUGH-WIDE RESPONSIVE REPAIRS CONTRACTOR AND TERMINATE EXISTING TERM-SERVICE CONTRACT FOR LOT 1 AND LOT 2**

Councillor Adronie Alford praised the Council for terminating the contract with a company that had caused many problems in the community.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CABINET MEMBERS:

1. To note that Appendix 2 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) 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. To authorise the termination of the contracts (LOT 1 and LOT 2) for responsive repairs (housing) with Morgan Sindall Property Services LTD on 31 August 2024 subject to the finalisation of approved terms between the parties, the negotiation of which is delegated to the Strategic Director of Finance in consultation with the Assistant Director of Legal Services and the Assistant Director of Repairs.
3. To approve the procurement strategy to undertake a mini competition via the 'Responsive Maintenance and Void Property Works' part of the 'National Housing Management Forum' Framework. This contract will be for a period of 36 months. We will incept the contract on 1 September 2024.
4. To approve that the Strategic Director of Finance, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Legal Services and the Assistant Director of Repairs be authorised to enter into agreements as necessary to bring the decisions in this report into effect.

Reason for decision:

As set out in the report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As outlined in the report.

Record of any conflict of interest:

None.

Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:

None.

10. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

The Key Decision List was noted.

11. DISCUSSION OF EXEMPT ELEMENTS (ONLY IF REQUIRED)

There was no discussion of exempt elements.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm
Meeting ended: 10.18 pm

Chair