

PRESENT

Members of the Council

THE MAYOR: CLLR WILL PASCALL
THE DEPUTY MAYOR: CLLR WALAA IDRIS

ADDENBROOKE, Sarah
ADOURIAN, Hamish
ALI, Kasim
ARETI, Aarien
ATKINSON, Robert
BAKHTIAR, Mohammed
BENNETT, Tom
BERRILL-COX, Adrian
BLAKEMAN, Judith
CAMPBELL, Elizabeth
CHAUHAN, Dr Max
CYRON, Anne
DENT COAD, Emma
ELNAGHI, Marwan
EVANS, Janet
FAULKES, Catherine
FREEMAN, Robert
HAMMOND, Gregory
HARGREAVES, Gerard
HEALY, Pat
HUSBAND, James

JACKSON, Alison
KEMAHLI, Cem
LARI, Sina
LINDSAY, David
MASON, Pat
McVEIGH, Sof
MILLS, Julie
NAIL, Nadia
O'CONNOR, Charles
PALMER, Matthew
RENDALL, Josh
ROSSI, Marie-Therese
SPALDING, Malcolm
TAYLOR-SMITH, Kim
THALASSITES, Johnny
THAXTER, Portia
WADE, Linda
WASON, Ian
WEALE, Mary
WOODGER, Maxwell

1. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor said it would be appropriate for the meeting to start by standing in silence for 72 seconds to remember all those who lost their lives in the Grenfell tragedy.

Councillors, officers and members of the public stood and observed the 72 second silence.

The Mayor advised the Council that his charity for this year would be working with NHS Chelsea & Westminster Hospital Plus and Helpforce to assist the mental and physical wellbeing of communities across the whole Borough.

The Mayor added that over the summer the Council would be reviewing the public speaking part of Council Meetings. The intention would be to keep the up-to-one hour slot, but see if there were any changes which could be made to make it more effective.

2. MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON 22 MAY 2019

The minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 22 May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Mayor.

3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S COMMUNICATIONS

Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs. Henderson, Press, Round, Will and Williams.

Apologies for lateness were submitted on behalf of Cllrs. Dent Coad, Freeman and Jackson and Barry Quirk.

Declarations of interest

None.

4. PUBLIC SPEAKING

The Mayor introduced Dr. Catherine Howe from the Democratic Society who facilitated the session. A summary of the points made is set out below:

Speaker 1 – Will Dubin

Mr. Dubin who lives near Portobello Road asked the following three questions:

1. What measures had been taken to prevent a terrorist attack on Portobello Road, given the lack of temporary or permanent infrastructure to prevent such an attack?
2. Why was valuable public money being spent on the replacement of pavements on a cyclical rather than needs basis?
3. How was the Council taking electric vehicles charging forward? Had funding been set aside to roll out more chargers? Would the Council have a scheme, like Westminster City Council, to request charging points near the home as overnight charging was a critical issue?

Cllr Kemahli, in his reply, said that the Council was aware of the risks of a terrorist attack to Portobello Road and also to Exhibition Road. The risks had changed across London and work was being done behind the scenes with the Prevent Team. In respect of pavement renewal, Cllr Kemahli said that highways maintenance comes from a distinct budget and would write to Mr. Dubin to fully explain why the programme was on a time rather than needs basis.

In response to the electric vehicle charger question, Cllr Kemahli said he owned an electric car and charged his vehicle all over the Borough and in also Westminster, therefore he understood the issues involved. The key was to increase awareness of the number of chargers installed in the Borough. The Council had already installed 40 of the

London Source charging points and over 60 on lampposts. There were a further 170 lamppost chargers scheduled to be rolled out over the coming months. He acknowledged that currently there was a lack of charging points but there was a clear direction to install more. As for residents being able to request electric charging points by their home, he said this was something the Council could look at.

Cllr Mason said we needed to find a method to serve the people driving electric cars. He said he heard Mr. Dubin's points about the pavement replacement programme and that instead of patching up pavements that need replacing it was cheaper to have whole streets done. He commented that streets in his ward had not had their pavements replaced in 10-15 years. In respect of the risk of terrorism, he said the Council had an Major Emergency Plan and that Portobello Road was included in it. The ward councillors had received a briefing.

Mr. Dubin said that he was pleased to note the plans for installing more charging points but said that residents did not know about them and suggested more awareness with signs and road markings.

Speaker 2 - Lizzie Spring

Lizzie Spring referred to a handout which had been circulated round the Chamber. She said she had lived in Borough since the 1970s and had come back to speak again about getting buy-in from the Council on developing community-led housing. She outlined in detail the work she had been doing over the last four years, including conversations with the GLA on developing a community-led hub. There was strong support from residents across all age spectrums who were really interested in developing something in the Borough. The group had huge support from experts in London and further afield, from the GLA and from a similar group of residents based in North Westminster, but they did not have any buy-in from the Council.

There was an expectation that the residents would work tirelessly for nothing. She urged the Council for proper support with office space and paid time to do research and development, working alongside Council officers to take this forward. She urged the Council to see residents as assets and not beneficiaries and to meet with her to discuss how it could support her and not ask her to continue to volunteer more of her time. She further added that she was asking for the co-production of developments with the Council at sites such as Kensal.

Cllr Taylor-Smith in his response said he had heard Lizzie Spring speak at a conference, had had a number of residents talk to him about community-led housing and had met with Jonathan Rosenberg, Chair of Waltherton and Elgin Community Homes. There were positive things about community-based housing. However, the issue was that the Borough did not have much land. The Council had announced its housing programme on four key sites. The Council wanted to provide more social housing but the shortage of sites influenced its decisions in developing and providing housing. The Council was also talking to residents about managing the future of housing and lots of residents were saying they want to look at community-based housing schemes. He said the Council would be most willing to invest in community-led housing provided the group came forward with a viable scheme.

Cllr Mason said he was a West London Cooperative tenant and supported community-led housing schemes and felt the Council should be assisting.

Speaker 3 – Nanda Shaheen

Nanda Shaheen said this was a beautiful Borough with its gardens squares, architecture and impressive schools and nurseries, but said that it was spoilt by litter. She worked in the Education sector and said although recycling was taught in schools, none of the schools in the Borough were themselves recycling. She asked how the Council could simplify recycling, so it was accessible to everyone and everyone understood how to recycle.

Cllr Kemahli thanked Nanda Shaheen for coming and said he was disappointed with what he had heard, as the Borough was one of the four councils still to collect rubbish twice a week and was far ahead in collection terms. More needed to be done to raise awareness of recycling. There was an element of individual responsibility for parents to teach their children to recycle. It cost the Council around 5.5 times more to dispose of normal waste than recyclable waste, so it was beneficial for everyone to recycle. He undertook to provide a full written response.

Cllr Bakhtiar said the Council needed to be creative in raising awareness. There were already successful examples of recycling, such as a system in Canada where the Council provided boxes to motivate people to recycle and paid children for collecting glass, tins, paper etc.

Speaker 4 – Nicholas Gligić

Mr. Gligić spoke in detail about his mother and his homelessness situation and interaction with the Council since 4 October 2017. He said the Council has failed in its duty to house him and his mother and felt criminal fraud had been committed. He said he was still sleeping rough and wanted to be housed together with his mother and dog.

Cllr Taylor-Smith said that Mr. Gligić's case was long and complex and that it was not appropriate to discuss it in an open forum. He said he believed the Council has found a solution and encouraged Mr. Gligić to talk to the Council's housing officer. In respect of homelessness, he reported that on average 300 people per month came to the Council. About 20% were put into Temporary Accommodation (TA). The Council had 3,000 people on the Housing Register with 2,477 in TA, of which 72% were placed out of Borough as there was not enough space. The Borough had the second highest homelessness figure in London, a reflection of being a small, densely populated Borough. In respect of what the Council was doing about homelessness, he referred to the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017, which had been resourced to provide early intervention support and advice to prevent homelessness. The Council was undertaking a Homelessness Review which would inform a Strategy. It also had the biggest house building programme in a decade and aimed to deliver 600 homes with 300 affordable units, but that would only deliver units for 10% of those currently in TA.

Cllr Ali said he was very sorry to hear of Mr. Gligić's situation and felt the Council had a duty to rehouse him. The Council was reviewing its Homelessness Policy to inform a Strategy and he thanked Mr. Gligić for his contributions.

Speaker 5 – Kimia Zabihyan

Kimia Zabihyan said that she was speaking on behalf of Mr. El Alami Hamdan. He had lived in the Borough for 50 years and had tragically lost five members of his family in the Grenfell Tower fire. He has since been living in unsuitable conditions and it had taken volunteers to bring Mr. Hamdan to the Council's attention. She spoke of her experience of supporting families which had 'fallen off the radar' and expressed great disappointment at the state of the Housing Department, Key Worker and Dedicated Service. She said there were 38 families and 200 households from the Tower at the core of the disaster and the Council had not been able to identify and assist them. She asked the Council to ensure the next £50million was not wasted on 'massages, pedicures and manicures.' She asked the Council to talk to the people on ground and work out individuals' need.

Cllr Campbell said she could not discuss Mr. Hamdan's case in a public meeting.

In response to Kimia's allegation that the Council had wasted money on housing and commissioned services for the Grenfell survivors and bereaved Cllr Campbell said that the Council had spent £300 million buying the right houses and 92% had chosen their houses and moved. The Dedicated Services had been co-designed with the bereaved and survivors and for the majority of people was working well.

Cllr Elnaghi thanked Mr. Hamdan for having the courage to attend the meeting and Kimia for speaking and said that as Chair of the Grenfell Recovery Scrutiny Committee he would look into the Dedicated Services at its next meeting and would fully investigate. He asked to visit Mr. Hamdan.

5. PETITIONS

(i) Sheppard Trust Homes ACV

The Mayor informed the Council that a debate at Council had been triggered by the receipt of a petition in excess of 2,000 signatures about the Sheppard Trust homes in Lansdowne Walk.

Cllr. Mills said that the petitioners had asked her to represent them and she addressed the Council on their behalf. She highlighted the history of the Alms Houses in Lansdowne Walk and added that they were home to 29 elderly ladies. She criticised the trustees of the Sheppard Trust for acting like property developers and threatening to move the elderly residents to Surrey without consultation, so that they could sell off the properties. The ladies wanted to continue to live in the Borough, close to their family, friends and doctors and urged the Council's Planners to resist the loss of the properties by designating them as Assets of Community Value (ACV) which, as Alms Houses, supported the wellbeing of the local elderly community. The homes were fit for purpose and were assets of community value.

Cllrs Lindsay, Dent Coad, Wade, Atkinson, Rendall and Taylor-Smith spoke in support of the petition. The following main points were made:

- Members urged the Lead Member for Planning to resist any change in use of the site, to minimise the chances of the Trust deciding to sell off the properties.

- Since 2006, the Council had seen a reduction in housing for older people, e.g. the closure of Edenham Way, Thamesbrook and Vicarage Gate and was the fourth worst for provision of residential care in the country.
- The Borough needed a range of housing for different groups of people and should protect its housing for the elderly.
- It was unacceptable that the residents felt they could not openly campaign to save their homes.
- The Council was getting a better record at listening to its residents and should give an undertaking that it would support the residents and fight for them in preserving their homes.
- The Council should look at the definition of Assets of Community Value (ACV) and try to protect the properties.
- The Sheppard Trust should work with the Council to see how they could keep the homes in the Borough.

In response, Cllr. Thalassites thanked Cllr Mills for presenting the petition and also the ladies from the Sheppard Trust homes for attending the meeting. He provided assurance that the Council would resist any change of use of the properties and said he wanted to see more affordable housing for the elderly in the Borough. His understanding was that an application to designate the properties as an ACV would be unsuccessful because residential units were excluded from the listing but he encouraged the petitioners to pursue an application to test out the law. He also said the Council would be happy to work with the Sheppard Trust to find a solution.

RESOLVED:

- (i) to note the Lead Member's response; and
- (ii) to invite the Lead Member to take fully into account the matters raised during the debate when responding to the petition.

(ii) Save the Trees in Noting Hill Gate and Holland Park Avenue

The Mayor informed the Council that a debate at Council had been triggered by the receipt of a petition in excess of 7,500 signatures about the trees in Notting Hill Gate and Holland Park Avenue.

Emma and Isabel Kay addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners and urged the Leadership Team not to support TfL's proposal to cut down 27 trees to make way for a cycle lane. They clarified that they were supporters of cycling and walking in London, but not at the cost of chopping down trees. They then read out some of the comments on why people had signed the petition so that their views could help shape future Council policy on cycling. The comments were around three major themes:

- Trees were vital for absorbing pollution – the 27 mature trees could not be replicated by new plantings.
- Cyclist preferred to use quieter backroads which were safer. Side roads should be promoted rather than congested main roads.
- Trees were needed to sustain local wildlife and improve the area for residents.

They concluded by urging the Council to issue Tree Preservation Orders on the 27 trees at risk.

Cllrs Lindsay, Lari, Mills and Areti spoke in support of the petition. The following main points were noted:

- The speakers were commended for demonstrating commitment to wildlife and green initiatives and were praised for generating in excess of 7,500 supporters for the petition.
- Trees were necessary to absorb pollution, promote mental wellbeing and improve the streetscape.
- More trees needed to be planted to reduce pollution and absorb CO2 emissions.
- Most of the supporters of TfL's cycle proposal lived outside of the Borough.
- Many resident cyclists were opposed to the proposal and supported alternative cycle routes. The Council needed to investigate this.
- The trees were planted by the community and belonged to them.
- The Council should have sought the views of residents on TfL's potential plans two years ago when they first emerged.
- Cllr Mills was waiting for a response from the Chief Executive on Tree Preservation Orders.
- TfL was criticised for the structure of the consultation as there was no option to object to the proposals.

In response, Cllr. Thalassites thanked Emma and Isabel Kay for presenting their petition and praised the level of support, engagement and use of social media. He said it was important that TfL recognised the number of people opposed to the chopping down of the trees. The Council had a target in the Local Implementation Plan that residents should be within 400 meters of a cycleway. It was determined to promote cycling and was expanding its cycleway network. TfL should recognise what the Council had done to promote cycling and engage with it on all transport related items. He said he wanted to save the trees and that was the key reason the Council has opposed TfL's plans. He undertook to explore Tree Preservation Orders.

RESOLVED:

- (i) to note the Lead Member's response; and
- (ii) to invite the Lead Member to take fully into account the matters raised during the debate when responding to the petition.

6. STATEMENT BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND RESPONSE BY LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Cllr. Campbell spoke about the community events she had attended to mark the second year since the Grenfell tragedy and after speaking to members of the community, families, and fellow residents she repeated the same message - Grenfell needed to remain a clear priority for the next Government and the next Prime Minister needed to know that this community and Council was expecting to see commitments honoured: to refurbish Lancaster West Estate, for families to receive NHS support and funding and for the Inquiry to move quickly and find the truth. The Council was committed to its task

of rehousing the families and to continue to listen to residents to deliver the services they wanted. In terms of the Council listening to its residents she provided two recent examples:

(i) A petition opposing TfL's proposal for a cycle superhighway in Holland Park Avenue which had attracted over 7,500 signatures and 1,000 emails. A large number of residents had directly contacted her about their concerns with TfL's proposal. The Council stood by its decision to ask TfL to look again at the scheme. She highlighted that the Council had built cycle lanes and had more in the pipeline, plus connecting links on quiet streets - a total of 10 miles plus the five miles already completed. She said the Council was open to TfL and the Mayor of London for discussing alternative schemes which would win local support.

(ii) The Kensington Forum Hotel, where the Mayor of London had approved a poorly designed building against the wishes of the residents and the Council's Planning Committee. Affordable housing remained a high priority for the Council but the amount of affordable homes in the Hotel's plan was disproportionately small. The Council shared residents' concerns and was looking at the legal options open to it.

Cllr. Mason said that he had attended the second anniversary memorial service where the Bishop of Kensington spoke about the failures of the Government. Hearing Messrs Gligic and Hamdan tonight he felt the Council was going backwards and that Cllr Campbell's first response to defend the Dedicated Service and protect the authority was disrespectful. His fellow councillors had other similar cases which highlighted the need to keep the Grenfell Recovery Scrutiny Committee going to ensure matters were scrutinised properly.

7. ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Mayor advised Members that the order of debate would be as set out in the agenda.

8. REPORTS FROM THE LEADERSHIP TEAM

There were no reports to this meeting.

9. MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL BY COUNCIL-SIDE COMMITTEES

Report of the Audit and Transparency Committee – Annual Treasury Report 2018/19

The reception of the report was moved by Cllr. Wason and seconded by Cllr. Berrill-Cox.

RESOLVED -

That the report be received and noted.

10. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

Report of the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee – Historic Built Features

The reception of the report was moved by Cllr. Hammond and seconded by Cllr. Spalding.

It was then moved by Cllr. Lari and seconded by Cllr. Thaxter:

To amend the recommendations by deleting Recommendation 4.

Debate ensued, during which Cllr Thaxter explained that the reason for the amendment was because councillors were still unaware of the new arrangements for City Living Local Life (CLLL) and that in the North of the Borough CLLL money was used to support vital community projects and Grenfell recovery. Any new CLLL proposal needed to be consulted upon with full participation from ward councillors and be adjusted to local demand for use of the money.

Cllr Hammond did not support the amendment. He said councillors needed to decide on the priorities for CLLL funding in their ward. Recommendation 4 was worded so it was an option for ward councillors to consider using CLLL money for preserving historic built features but did not make it an obligation.

The amendment was then put to the vote by the Mayor and declared by the Mayor to be lost.

Cllr Lari said that because the amendment had been lost, the Labour Group could not support the recommendations as it believed using CLLL money was not appropriate.

RESOLVED – (with the Labour Group voting against)

That the recommendations of the Leadership Team be endorsed.

11. QUESTIONS TO LEAD MEMBERS

By Cllr. Wade of Cllr. Kemahli

“In light of the fact that Earl's Court has achieved the unenviable status of coming first in Poor Air Quality and High Street Kensington fourth, please can the Lead Member provide information as to the reasons for the change of Air Quality Monitoring in the Borough from the pan London Air Quality Network managed by King's College, London to Air Quality England hosted by Ricardo Energy & Environment? It is not clear as to why this decision to terminate the contract with this London wide organisation – i.e. was it budgetary or another reason. How is the monitoring data being collated, processed, used and is the data in a comparable format to that of the LAQN and are there any differences in the range pollutants that are being monitored? Also, in recognition of these results are there any plans to extend monitoring sites at present at Chelsea, Cromwell Road, Earl's Court Road, Knightsbridge and North Kensington?”

Response

Cllr. Kemahli said it was important for the Council to push forward with measures which addressed the national issue of air quality. He explained King's College London and

Ricardo AEA were the main providers of air quality monitoring management in London. The Council's contract with King's College had come to an end and following a tendering exercise, Ricardo AEA, who serviced seven other London Borough, were the successful bidder based on cost and quality of service. Ricardo AEA had been acquiring more monitoring stations across London over the past few years but the monitoring had not changed nor had the quality of data produced. The Council had no plans to change monitoring networks. However, the contract with Ricardo AEA would be expiring next year and the Council would have to go out to tender again. He felt having more monitoring stations would not tell us any more as air pollution was present on every street in the Borough and cleaning the air required a London-wide strategy.

Cllr. Kemahli welcomed the ULEZ charge which had just come into force but said habits needed to change across London and vehicles needed to become greener. The Council was supporting this through the roll out of electric charging. He stressed the Mayor of London needed to speed up the roll out of greener buses and taxi drivers needed to make the switch to lower emission vehicles. Transportation issues were only one element of air pollution. Gas boilers could be more efficient and non-road going machinery needed to be looked at with regards to building and construction sites. He was pleased to announce the Council was looking at enforcement options on construction sites using the Mayor of London's Air Quality Fund.

Cllr. Wade in her supplementary question said that the air quality monitors needed to be in the right locations on the busiest of junctions. She asked when the contract came for renewal, if a map of the Borough could be produced to inform where the monitors needed to be located.

Cllr. Kemahli in his response said that he had recently spoken with a company which could install WiFi systems on pavements with built in air quality monitoring. They were willing to work with the Council but the locations would be subject to ward councillor approval.

12. MATTERS OF LOCAL CONCERN RAISED UNDER S.O. 11

Cllr. Bakhtiar

Cllr. Bakhtiar spoke about a Council Motion approved last year to provide future Council jobs, training and apprenticeship to local residents and to encourage local organisations and businesses to become partners in the scheme. He then proceeded to ask the following questions:

1. How many people had left the Council since last year?
2. How did we fill those positions?
3. How many residents had managed to get a job in the Council?
4. How many apprenticeships did the Council give to its residents?
5. What type of jobs did the Council give to its residents?
6. How many of the Borough's job seekers have been given a chance to apply for Council jobs?
7. Did the Council approach the local Job Centre to find out who was looking for jobs amongst its residents and did we find a working partnership with the local job centres?

8. How many of our young school leavers received training by the Council?

The Council noted the matter raised and that the Lead Member will respond.

Cllr. Palmer expressed concern at comments made by Cllr. Dent Coad at a parliamentary debate on Grenfell. The Mayor drew Cllr. Palmer's attention to Standing Order 11 which allowed members to raise issues of local concern. He ruled that this matter did not comply with that Standing Order. He also drew Cllr. Palmer's attention to Standing Order 25 on members' conduct.

13. MOTIONS FOR DEBATE

(i) Serious youth violence

The Mayor informed the Council that Cllr Will was unable to attend the meeting and had requested that the motion be deferred to the Council meeting on 24 July. Under Standing Order 1 he had agreed to this request.

(ii) Holiday Inn, Cromwell Road

It was moved by Cllr. Evans and seconded by Cllr. Rendall:

"This Council calls on the Mayor to listen to the overwhelming view among West London residents about the redevelopment of the Holiday Inn on the Cromwell Road that the proposals are too tall, too dense and inappropriate, as reflected in the decision by the RBKC Planning Committee on 27th September 2018 to refuse planning permission."

It was then moved by Cllr. Lindsay and seconded by Cllr. Faulks

To amend the Motion so that it reads as follows:

~~"This Council calls on the Mayor to listen to the overwhelming view among West London residents about the redevelopment of the Holiday Inn on the Cromwell Road that the proposals are too tall, too dense and inappropriate, as reflected in the decision by the RBKC Planning Committee on 27th September 2018 to refuse planning permission~~ notes with grave concern the Mayor of London's decision last Friday to overrule the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea's Planning Committee in relation to the Holiday Inn on Cromwell Road. This Council also notes the manner in which the decision was issued, including the lack of consultation by the Mayor in completing the section 106 agreement. We call on the Executive via the Lead Member and the Leadership Team to urgently explore Judicial Review - to explore all legal options available to the Council to challenge the decision with view to quash the decision."

Debate ensued, with speeches by Cllrs. Evans, Jackson (her maiden speech), Adourian, Bennett, Dent Coad, Lari, Hammond, Woodger and Taylor-Smith.

At 9.15pm during the debate, it was moved by Cllr Lindsay, seconded by Cllr. Lari and

RESOLVED –

that Standing Order 24.01 be suspended and that the meeting terminate after consideration of this Motion and the Appointments.

Cllr. Thalassites then responded.

The Amendment was then put to the vote by the Mayor and declared to be carried, with Cllr. Healy abstaining.

The Motion as amended was then put to the vote by the Mayor and declared to be carried, with Cllr. Healy abstaining.

The time being 9.32pm, the Mayor ruled that the Motion on Air Quality, as an important subject with wide interest, would be deferred to the next meeting on 24 July to allow a full discussion.

14. APPOINTMENTS

Executive and Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee

The appointment of Cllr. Idris by the Mayor pursuant to Standing Order 34.02 was noted.

London Councils Grants Committee (Associated Joint Committee)

The Council noted the resignation of Cllr. Hargreaves and appointed Cllr. Cyron.

No other appointments were made.

The meeting ended at 9.33pm.

Mayor