

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

15 DECEMBER 2020

(7:30 pm - 10:23 pm)

The Mayor (Councillor Margaret Thompson)
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Sushila Abraham)

Councillors

Zain Abbas	Lesley Heap
Sushila Abraham	Alison Holt
Steph Archer	Jason Hughes
Roy Arora	Caroline Kerr
Kim Bailey	Andreas Kirsch
Rowena Bass	Katrina Lidbetter
Mark Beynon	Rebekah Moll
Fiona Boulton	Maria Netley
Olivia Boulton	* Munir Ravalia
Tim Cobbett	Dave Ryder-Mills
David Cunningham	Anita Schaper
Emily Davey	Malcolm Self
Kevin Davis	Nicola Sheppard
Lorraine Dunstone	Chris Stuart
Mark Durrant	Sharron Falchikov-Sumner
Simon Edwards	John Sweeney
Sam Foulder-Hughes	Thay Thayalan
Ed Fram	* Jon Tolley
Hilary Gander	Olly Wehring
Ian George	Diane White
Dennis Goodship	Annette Wookey
Liz Green	Yogan Yoganathan
Jaesung Ha	Sharon Young

* Absent

The Mayor's Chaplain, Reverend Luke Wickings, opened the meeting with prayers.

39. Global Teacher Prize

The Mayor, Councillor Margaret Thompson and the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services including Education, Councillor Diane White, gave a presentation to recognise the achievements of Jamie Frost, a maths teacher at Tiffin School, who had been featured on a shortlist of the ten most outstanding teachers in the world in the annual Global Teachers Prize competition, which was run in partnership with UNESCO.

The Council expressed its appreciation for Jamie's inspirational work with school children in Kingston and, indeed, across the world. It was explained that as well as teaching at Tiffins, Jamie had also created and ran a free online learning platform for maths that was originally designed to support lower attaining students but became an essential resource across the globe whilst schools were closed during lockdown. It had quickly reached 1.3m page views a day and the site was used in some capacity by over half of all secondary schools in the UK alone.

40. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Jon Tolley and Munir Ravalia.

41. Declarations of Interest

The Mayor, Councillor Margaret Thompson, declared an interest in relation to the question posed by Councillor Sharron Falchikov-Sumner at Item 8 on the agenda. She therefore left the meeting for the duration of that question and the Deputy Mayor took the Chair in her absence.

42. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 October 2020 were approved as a correct record.

43. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor paid tribute to Councillor Patricia Bamford, who had stood down as a member for Chessington South Ward at the beginning of December. It was explained that Councillor Bamford had been first elected to the Council in 1998 and served in numerous leadership roles, including Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People, and for Better Homes and, most recently, Chair of the Development Control Committee. The Council joined the Mayor in thanking Councillor Bamford for her long and dedicated service to the residents of Chessington South and the wider Borough and wished her and her family every happiness in the future.

The Mayor also thanked everyone that took part in the Great Christmas Quiz on Thursday 10 December, which included several Councillors and their families too. She announced that over 60 people attended virtually and raised just over £900 for the Mayor's Charitable Trust.

It was explained that the Mayor's Ball was provisionally scheduled to take place on Friday 23rd April and more details would follow nearer the time.

The Mayor reminded Members that the Mobile Mop Up project which had been run in the borough earlier in the year in partnership with Genuine Solutions would be returning after Christmas. The Mayor called for donations of unwanted mobile phones so that they could be reused or the parts recycled, so the Mayor's Charitable Trust could continue to benefit from the proceeds raised.

44. Petitions

The Council received notification of two petitions.

Councillor Rowena Bass presented a petition on behalf of the Lead Petitioner Jane Ramsey, signed by 384 residents, which concerned development at Roupell House.

There was also a request for the Council to hear a petition concerning the Go Cycle lane on Ewell Road, where notice of which was received after the deadline.

The Council unanimously agreed on this occasion to suspend the requirement to provide notice of a petition as outlined in the Petitions Scheme (Part 4G of the Council's Constitution).

The Lead Petitioner, Jayne Lomanto presented the petition, signed by 84 residents, which objected to the Go-Cycle Scheme at Ewell Road and the subsequent reduction of car parking affecting local businesses. It was explained that there were no parking spaces on surrounding streets and this was significantly affecting the small businesses in the area, especially during the covid situation.

It was confirmed that the petitions would be dealt with in accordance with the Petition's Scheme as set out in the Council's Constitution.

45. Public Questions

In accordance with Procedure Rule 17(A) replies were given to Public Questions (as set out in **Annex 1** to the minutes) and supplementary questions (as set out in **Annex 2** to the minutes).

46. Motion: White Paper, 'Planning for the Future'

In accordance with Procedure Rule 8(A)(5), the Council debated the following motion which was submitted on behalf of the Administration of the Council (Liberal Democrat Group), as proposed by Councillor Rebekah Moll and seconded by Councillor Caroline Kerr.

'Motion: White Paper, 'Planning for the Future'**This Council notes:**

- i. The Royal Institute for British Architects called the proposals in the White Paper 'shameful, and which will do almost nothing to guarantee delivery of affordable, well-designed and sustainable homes.' RIBA also said, 'proposals could lead to the next generation of slum housing.'
- ii. The proposals to reform the planning process seek to blame councils and communities for the root cause of issues with the planning system and yet, it's clear the housing delivery system is broken; not the planning system.
 - a) 90% of planning applications are approved by councils and more than one million homes with planning consent in the past decade are yet to be built according to figures from the LGA; and

- b) Kingston Council has permitted 2753 homes over the past five years which are not yet built.

This Council is concerned that the proposals seek to:

- i. Significantly increase housing targets in Kingston from 964 pa to 1526;
- ii. Provide less affordable housing, taking no account of housing land supply;
- iii. Take away many of the opportunities for communities and their locally elected representatives to have a final say on how their areas develop; .
- iv. Reduce or remove the right of residents to object to applications near them by giving automatic rights to build in 'growth' areas, and increase permitted development rights, risk unregulated growth and unsustainable communities;
- v. Remove Section 106 payments and the Community Infrastructure Levy for infrastructure and replace them with a national levy; it is unclear how the new level of developer contributions would work; and
- vi. Minimise the climate emergency as the reforms do not make it a key priority that would enable the planning system to respond to the climate crisis.

Calls on the Government to reform its current rules on development to give local authorities more powers to:

- Challenge unrealistic targets;
- Insist on improved infrastructure with new developments;
- Challenge viability assessments that allow developers to get away without providing adequate affordable housing for local people;
- Remove those permitted development rights that lead to substandard homes being built;
- Require new development to meet high sustainability standards.; and
- Prevent loss of biodiversity, threatening species of fauna, insects and other wildlife.

This Council resolves to:

- i. Object to the Government's proposals for arbitrary housing targets and the reduction of local control proposed in the consultation paper;
- ii. Highlight our concerns over these proposals with the public and local residents; and
- iii. Campaign for a planning framework that provides for our residents and our communities and puts people not developers at the heart of any solution."

Councillor Sharron Falchikov-Sumner proposed an amendment to the motion, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Kevin Davis, that inserted the words "on the Royal Borough of Kingston to use its current powers to the full as well as" after the word "calls" within the original motion. Furthermore a fourth item was added under the section "This Council Resolves to" which read as follows:

"iv. Commit to fully discharging its duties to ensure biodiversity net gain in ALL its decisions in line with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act".

After the debate, and on being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST.

Voting:

For: Councillor Falchikov-Sumner (1).

Against: Councillors Abbas, Abraham, Archer, Bailey, Beynon, Fiona Boulton, Olivia Boulton, Cobbett, Davey, Dunstone, Durrant, Edwards, Foulder-Hughes, Gander, Goodship, Green, Ha, Heap, Holt, Kerr, Kirsch, Lidbetter, Moll, Schaper, Self, Stuart, Sweeney, Thayalan, Thompson, White, Wookey, and Yoganathan. (32)

Abstain: Councillors Arora, Bass, Cunningham, Davis, Fram, George, Hughes, Netley, Sheppard and Wehring (10).

Councillors Ryder-Mills and Young were unable to vote due to technical difficulties.

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Kevin Davis, proposed an amendment to the original motion, seconded by Councillor David Cunningham, which deleted all content prior to 'this Council resolves to'.

After the debate, and on being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST.

Voting:

For: Councillors Arora, Bass, Cunningham, Davis, Fram, George, Hughes, Netley, Sheppard and Falchikov-Sumner (10).

Against: Councillors Abbas, Abraham, Archer, Bailey, Beynon, Fiona Boulton, Olivia Boulton, Cobbett, Davey, Dunstone, Durrant, Edwards, Foulder-Hughes, Gander, Goodship, Green, Ha, Heap, Holt, Kerr, Kirsch, Lidbetter, Moll, Schaper, Self, Stuart, Sweeney, Thayalan, Thompson, Wehring, White, Wookey, Yoganathan and Young. (34)

Abstain: Councillor Ryder-Mills abstained as he missed part of the debate due to technical difficulties. (1)

After debate a vote was taken on the original motion:

Voting:

For: Councillors Abbas, Abraham, Archer, Bailey, Beynon, Fiona Boulton, Olivia Boulton, Cobbett, Davey, Dunstone, Durrant, Edwards, Foulder-Hughes, Gander, Goodship, Green, Ha, Heap, Holt, Kerr, Kirsch, Lidbetter, Moll, Schaper, Self, Stuart, Falchikov-Sumner, Sweeney, Thayalan, Thompson, Wehring, White, Wookey, Yoganathan and Young. (35)

Against: None. (0)

Abstain: Councillors Arora, Bass, Cunningham, Davis, Fram, George, Hughes, Netley and Sheppard. (9)

Councillor Ryder-Mills was unable to vote due to technical difficulties.

47. Member Questions

In accordance with Procedural Rule 6 (1&2) replies were given to Member Questions (as set out in **Annex 1** to the minutes) and supplementary questions (as set out in **Annex 2** to the minutes).

48. Achieving for Children Governance Arrangements

Appendix A

Members considered the recommendations of the Response and Recovery Committee at its meeting on 30 July 2020 regarding adjustments to the Achieving for Children (AfC) governance arrangements.

It was noted that AfC had been initially established by the London Borough of Richmond and the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames to undertake and provide a range of services to children and young people and an Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) had been entered into on 31 March 2014. On 1 August 2017, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead was admitted to the Company as a new member and entered into an IAA with the other authorities and AfC. The three councils established a Joint Committee to agree and assess the operation and performance of the Company.

Following a review of AfC governance arrangements it was proposed that functions in relation to Band 3 Reserved Decision Making Matters be transferred from the AfC Joint Committee to relevant bodies of the three constituent authorities with the Joint Committee becoming an ad-hoc dispute resolution committee. In the case of this Council it was proposed that the functions be transferred to the Children's and Adults Care and Education Committee. This would strengthen governance arrangements and ensure that each Council had direct oversight and influence over a number of significant AfC functions.

It was noted that similar reports had been considered and approved by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (on 27 October 2020) and the London Borough of Richmond (on 24 November 2020).

Resolved that the amendments to the Constitution detailed in **Appendix A** be approved.

Voting: Unanimous

49. Appointments of Members to Committees, Panels and other bodies

Resolved that the following appointments to Committees, Panels and other bodies be approved -

1. Councillor Sushila Abraham to be appointed as Chair of the Staff Appeals Panel to replace Councillor Patricia Bamford;
2. Councillor Anita Schaper to be appointed as a member of the Blue Badge Panel to replace Councillor Patricia Bamford;
3. Councillor Olly Wehring to be appointed as a member of the Scrutiny Panel to replace Councillor Patricia Bamford;
4. Councillor Diane White to be appointed as a member of the Response and Recovery Committee to replace Councillor Katrina Lidbetter;
5. Louise Gallagher to be appointed as alternate to Majid Mafi as the RBK Staff Representative on the Pension Fund Panel.

Voting: Unanimous

50. Urgent Items authorised by the Mayor

There were no urgent items.

51. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Signed:.....Date:
The Mayor

Council Questions and Response - 15 December 2020

Questions from Members

Responses were given verbally at Council to the following:

Question	From/ To	Response
<p><u>Lib Dem A</u> The UK is expected to end its Brexit transition period at the end of the year. Regardless of your view on leaving the EU, it is widely accepted that this will mean the British economy takes a hit, certainly in the short-term. Given the Council's finances are already under a great deal of stress from the Covid-19 pandemic, what is our readiness for the end of the transition period?</p>	<p>From: Cllr Sharon Young To: Cllr Caroline Kerr</p>	<p>You are quite right this is a very serious situation. Covid-19 has already affected the lives of our residents and as we approach a no deal with the European Union I fear that this government's incompetence will not serve us well.</p> <p>This week the Prime Minister announced that a no deal was very very likely. Our businesses have been given virtually no time at all to adapt to a new trading arrangement and even now they do not know if there will be a deal or there will not be a deal. We should not be in this situation.</p> <p>Locally, of course, the Covid response has taken precedence over planning for the EU exit and it is only now that officers have focused on brexit again. Covid-19 remains all encompassing and is still a major focus of effort, particularly in the second wave. The Council's Brexit plans and the risk register written prior to Covid have been adapted and updated and we have of course been supporting EU migrants with the settlement scheme and looking at what can be done to prepare and support our communities.</p> <p>The impacts of Covid-19 and Brexit with a no deal would be potentially very significant and felt across the whole country as well as across this Council and this borough.</p>

6

	<p>We are anticipating the same short term risks as before including shortages of potentially food, fuel and medical supplies; Pressures on trading standards and environmental health teams; Settlement status of residents and disruption to transport, but the lack of clarity between a no deal or deal is making the Brexit planning extremely difficult in terms of income generation and spend within the Council.</p> <p>We do have a contingency budget for unforeseen Brexit financial pressures and this currently stands at £445k. The Council also holds reserves to mitigate risks from Covid, Brexit and also other potential occurrences. This will be reviewed as part of the year end process.</p> <p>The difficulties lie with the medium and long terms where the implications of Brexit are unknown and therefore difficult to plan for. For our own retail sector in Kingston the combined impacts of Covid-19 and Brexit will leave them even more susceptible to economic decline. In turn this will have a further direct impact on the Council with our collection of local business rates. I recently met with Kingston’s strategic partners and everyone there was exhausted by months of dealing with Covid. The impression I had was that very few people had the energy left to fight a man made disaster, something that really did not need to happen and certainly nobody needs right now.</p> <p>Kingston First updated that businesses do not have Brexit as a priority because they are getting through 2020. The Chamber of Commerce outlined results from the last Brexit survey carried out in 2019 in which the main concern for business was data and among hospitality and catering businesses a concern by the number of staff leaving. So all in all we are in the Council doing all we can to prepare for Brexit but we wish it wasn’t happening and we particularly wish that whilst we are dealing with one crisis we are not having to brace ourselves for a second.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Lib Dem B</u> What progress is the Council making on building desperately needed council homes for our residents?</p>	<p>From: Cllr Steph Archer To: Cllr Emily Davey</p>	<p>The Council is committed to delivering the borough's first new build Council homes for over 30 years. In November, a significant milestone was achieved when the Development Control Committee approved plans for the first 60 homes in the programme, all of which will be available for low-cost rent. A further 41 homes have been approved by the Development Control Committee in December 2020 bringing us to 101 new affordable homes. Work on the new homes is due to commence in Spring 2021 and aim to be completed by early 2023.</p> <p>As members will also be aware, The Cambridge Road (RBK) LLP, a joint venture between RB Kingston and Countryside Properties UK Ltd, submitted a planning application for the redevelopment of Cambridge Road Estate on 13 November 2020. The Planning application is for 2,170 new homes of which 867 will be council homes. The proposals are that 767 of these will be council homes (an increase of 92 from the 675 rented homes currently on the estate) and the remaining 100 homes will be for shared equity. The first phase, currently forecast to start next year, includes 150 homes for council rent.</p>
<p><u>Lib Dem D</u> How will residents experience, when interacting with the Council, be enhanced as a result of the recent launch of our new website</p>	<p>From: Cllr Kim Bailey To: Cllr Tim Cobbett</p>	<p>The fact that we have been really able to move on with our digital offer to residents is really timely because obviously this is a year where we have all spent a bit more of our lives engaged digitally than we might have planned to and as much as there are times where we want really deep engagement with residents and we want them to help and come up with ideas for co-designing projects, the reality is that a lot of the time when people come onto our website they are simply trying to get a problem sorted out or find out information about one of our services and people don't want to spend a long time on our site they want to get the answer and get the issue sorted out as quickly and painless as possible.</p> <p>I hope that what we have done goes a long way to that and it has also been significantly shaped by resident feedback that we have had very much in the initial stage with the workshops around how people wanted to use the website and what they wanted to see. More recently we have done the</p>

11

		<p>user testing to see what works and to make the final tweaks and changes. So I think in terms of the website itself it is very much about the navigation through the website, the terminology that we use and using language that most people would describe things as rather than the Council speak you may otherwise see on such sites. We have also done a lot of work around the search so that you more quickly get to the result that you are looking for so our Kingston results appear higher up in the search engines that they did previously and we rationalised the content and got rid of some of the content that was in the way of doing that. It is not just around the site itself but it is also when you undertake a transaction with the Council and how much easier it is and we still have work to do but in a couple of key areas we have come up with new forms and processes around how you deal with registration services when reporting a birth or a death or a marriage or if you see a fight on the street and you want to report it reporting fight. It's about reducing the number of steps and making it quicker about getting a report to the people that can sort out the problem and that triggering an update for you so you can see if someone else has reported it and you can see what is happening with the issue you have reported.</p> <p>I think these are the kinds of things that are the day to day interaction that our residents have with us and we still have got more to do but I hope this is going some way to us catching up with the era we are living in and making that an easier process for residents to engage with us.</p>
<p>Conservative A What is the point of the Opposition asking questions at Full Council when the Administration never answer them?</p>	<p>From: Cllr Kevin Davis To: Cllr Caroline Kerr</p>	<p>I was surprised when I saw your question and I went through the records and over the course of this year since I have been Leader the opposition has asked 22 questions and they have all received full answers. It is true that for two full Council's you didn't ask any questions but that is your right but I am not quite sure why you feel you haven't received responses.</p>
<p>Green A</p>	<p>From: Cllr</p>	<p>The preparation of a new Local Plan for the borough is to provide Kingston with an up to date</p>

21

<p>Given all the behind scenes lobbying on behalf of the Hook Park Village in Chessingtons Green Belt will Cllr Moll - on behalf of the administration - stand by both the Liberal Democrats Manifesto commitment and the more recent Appraisal of Kingston Greenbelt (where it states this parcel of land is still contributing to Kingston Greenbelt) and prevent any development on Chessington greenbelt.</p>	<p>Falchikov-Su mner To: Cllr Rebekah Moll</p>	<p>planning policy framework. A position which will enable DCC decision making to take place within a robust policy context. The plan will also identify the available development sites that will come forward which meet the (intend to publish) new London Plan requirement of 964 housing units per-annum. We are confident that the sites identified can meet the borough’s housing requirement without any need to consider the Green Belt sites which have been put forward for allocation as part of the 2016 Call for Sites process.</p> <p>Hypothetically, should the housing requirement for the borough increase beyond the numbers currently required and only if a shortfall is identified, the circumstances may necessitate a strategic review of the boroughs Green Belt. Were the borough to find itself in this position, such a review would have to demonstrate the suitability of any sites put forward against the 5 purposes of the Green Belt through objective assessment. Irrespective of this however, any proposition to develop a site within the Green Belt would be required to meet the National Planning Policy Framework’s stringent test of 'very special circumstances'.</p>
<p>Public A The condition of Broad Oaks in Tolworth is appalling, we don't get recycling taken, the road is so dangerously rutted, nothing is done about the catastrophic fly tipping and cars fly down there a ridiculous speeds. How are the council going to help the residents who live down</p>	<p>From: Megan Taylor To: Cllr Hilary Gander</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there have been ongoing issues with the recycling bins being heavily contaminated at this location and the recycling bins are emptied as refuse, due to the bins being filled with non-recyclable items. So the council has removed the recycling bins as a temporary measure. However, in Spring 2021 the flats-above-shops recycling bags service will be rolled out. This service will be better suited to the properties here; residents will be provided with single-use sacks that they only need to place out on collection day, which will help to reduce contamination and ensure that the contents are recycled.</p> <p>Regarding the flytipping and speeding, Broad Oaks is not public highway - the road is owned by the individual landlords of the buildings facing out onto the Broadway (not necessarily the shops), each owns a strip of land behind so it is a private road and the condition of the road and speeding</p>

there who feel forgotten and unhelped by the council?

issues are outside of the council’s jurisdiction.

Councillors and council officers including our neighbourhood rangers have worked with businesses and residents since 2013, the Broad Oaks Action Group was formed in 2016, and they all arrange an annual clean-up, paid for out of councillors’ ward funding. Unfortunately, this year had to be cancelled due to Covid-19. And during Lockdown fly tipping here increased; the council managed to get the landowners to clear up in some cases; Broad Oaks Action Group paid to clear a large fly tip with the support of the councillors.

Broadoaks Action Group has raised funds through crowdfunding to buy equipment for the clean-ups and to pay for disposal of the fly tipping. Some businesses have CCTV and have agreed to direct them onto Broadoaks to help against the fly tippers, which was how one was caught a few months ago and successfully fined: in October 2020, a £400 fixed penalty notice was issued. Another investigation is ongoing.

Councillors have met with residents on numerous occasions over the years. The members of the Group have visited and spoken to all the businesses about taking collective responsibility and supporting resolving the issues. Most of the businesses have not shown interest nor contributed funds to help with resolving the issues and the clean-up. Installing CCTV cameras, signages, making it one way and installing barriers are some of the ideas being looked at and discussed at meetings between officers and residents. It cannot be achieved without the permission of the landowners and the business owners. Tracing and getting responses from the land owners has proved difficult. Finding a permanent solution can only be achieved if the landowners, residents and businesses take ownership and support the councillors and Broad Oaks Action Group.

13

<p>Public B When is the multiple occupancy 'Kupe' barge/boat mooring along the Queen's Promenade leaving permanently?</p>	<p>From: Janet Brannigan-Croggon To: Cllr John Sweeney</p>	<p>The Council does not have bylaws to regulate the use of its moorings, although there is legislation unique to Kingston that can be used to remove unlawfully moored boats after the service of a notice. This is effective for unoccupied boats, but has proved ineffective where boats are occupied. There are numerous itinerant vessels that moor unlawfully along the river bank or overstay on the 24 hour moorings. The owners of these boats can be issued with an enforcement notice requiring them to move on within 28 days. Typically, owners move on or move just before the end of the period, but often return shortly after and currently if they return, to another Council mooring in the Borough, the process starts again and a fresh notice has to be served giving another period of 28-days. Where these boats are occupied as in the case of KUPE the council has been legally advised to apply for an injunction to require removal of the boat and to prevent its return. An application to the court for a possession order and injunction on October 19 2020 was not granted but the council was invited to resubmit its application and we are awaiting dates for the injunction to be heard. This is unlikely to be before February 2021. If successful it would mean that the boat could not moor on Kingston Council land.</p>
<p>Public C On behalf of some residents Parking is a major problem on the Alpha Road Estate It's used as a car park for Surbiton Station and Berrylands Surgery. And some of shops on Ewell Road. Residents need to park here not 1 mile away. Resident parking bays are constantly full but most of</p>	<p>From: Mary Parmar To: Cllr Emily Davey</p>	<p>It is recognised that parking on the council's estates as with other areas around London is becoming more difficult with the ever growing levels of car ownership. In order to tackle this problem on RBK council housing estates, a parking review on all of the council's housing estates, including the Alpha Road Estate is planned for 2021. The review will explore ways in which the problem of inappropriate parking can be managed and thereby ease the inconvenience experienced by residents on the estates.</p> <p>There is currently a PPA in Browns Rd, Warwick Grove, Alpha Rd & Britannia Rd, all of which form part of the Alpha Road estate. If resident bays are full of 'non residents' then I suspect this occurs outside of the time of enforcement (11am-2pm Mon-Fri). The hours could be extended and rolled out to other roads on the estate however it is worth noting that many road here have their own off street parking (town houses in The Retreat, Smith Street & Howard Rd) and placing further bays</p>

<p>time not by residents. Drop Curbs are also now used for parking so wheelchair, mobility scooters and parents with buggies walk on the road. Parking meters like Holyfield Road are needed, or a charge for parking. Some flats/houses have 3 or 4 cars.</p>		<p>could be difficult. The main issue appears to be for residents living in flats situated mainly in the middle of the estate where there is currently only limited parking provided by way of either underground car parking garages or small car parks (not currently controlled by Parking & on housing land).</p>
<p>Public D Recently it was anti-bullying week. In neighbouring Sutton, the Council have adopted the Anti-Bullying Alliance Pledge which a majority of Councillors have signed up to. The pledge reads: "I back the Anti-Bullying Alliance and pledge to "Choose Respect", reject bullying and lead by example in my actions and interactions as a councillor." Signatories believe in the Anti-Bullying Alliance which</p>	<p>From: James Giles To: Cllr Caroline Kerr</p>	<p>This Council is vehemently opposed to bullying in any shape or form and the Anti-Bullying Alliance is a great organisation set up by the NSPCC and the Children's Bureau to raise the profile of the effect of bullying on children. I am very glad to see that eight of our schools are signed up and indeed that all of our schools have their own anti-bullying policy.</p> <p>We fully support anti-bullying initiatives and for this reason our Members' Code of Conduct, which every Councillor is bound to comply with, already contains provisions regarding bullying.</p> <p>The Local Government Association is preparing a new draft model Code of Conduct which will place Members under a specific obligation not to bully or harass another person and specifically sets out a range of behaviors which may be amount to bullying or harassment</p> <p>The Councils' Audit, Governance and Standards Committee has also indicated its support and it would be my expectation and hope that when the model code is confirmed the Council will adopt these provisions in full. Individual members are of course welcome to sign the alliance's pledge but it is the adoption of the new code that will formally incorporate anti-bullying standards into our governance arrangements and this is much more meaningful as it will ensure that sanctions are available where there is any breach of those standards.</p>

51

61

<p>means they: - believe bullying in any form is wrong and should not be tolerated, and that any environment that encourages bullying, or shows indifference to prejudice and discrimination is unacceptable; - believe bullying is a behaviour choice and that anyone can be encouraged to change their behaviour; - support a range of positive strategies to deal with bullying and actively challenge the use of humiliation, fear, ridicule and other similar approaches in an effort to reduce bullying; and - believe that people should be treated with respect and courtesy. Will Kingston Council formally support the Anti-Bullying Alliance, and formally ask all Councillors to 'choose respect' and sign the</p>		<p>And I would just like to add that we know bullying takes many forms and I for one would consider cyber bullying to be just as serious as any other form of bullying.</p>
--	--	---

pledge?		
<p>Public F What can the Council do to ensure that children and young people with SEND receive information in a format they understand and that everyone working with them understands and supports their individual communication needs?</p>	<p>From: Kirsty To: Cllr Diane White</p>	<p>Thank you very much Kirsty,</p> <p>Thank you so much for coming along tonight Kirsty and thank you for the beautiful and informative film which really showed so well the challenges that some young people face. It's incredibly important that our children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities are able to access all information in a manner that is meaningful for them and we take that so seriously.</p> <p>I like to think that there is some progress. The Young People's Easy Info Group brings its expertise to help us create accessible communications, including the use of different formats such as symbols. We have also developed individual profiles for children and young people with more complex communication needs. So it's all around their understanding and specific to them and the best way forward the young person has suggested they need help.</p> <p>We use our Recruits Crew to test potential new employees' skills in communicating with young people, but we recognise that we need to continue to train all of our staff in accessible communication, so that they understand and are able to support the individual communication needs of the young people they work with.</p>

17

Supplementary Council Questions and Responses - 15 December 2020

Question	From/ To	Response
<p>Public supplement (2) I appreciate the answer given Madam Mayor but the code is something members have to sign up to whereas the Anti-Bullying alliance pledge as passed by Sutton Council reaffirms that they actively seek to stop bullying as opposed to it being forced upon them.</p> <p>Perhaps it was unsurprising that in effect the answer was a no, when you have a Berrylands Councillor shouting residents down.</p> <p>An Alexandra Councillors abusing another elected Member including following them into a women's loo?</p> <p>A Canbury Councillor who I may be addressing now, taking to berating residents about China at a Full Council meeting.</p>	<p>From: James Giles To: Cllr Caroline Kerr</p>	<p>Of course we expect decent standards of actions from our Councillors and that is what we have. If you have complaints against a Councillor you know the procedure, your complaint will be submitted and will be fully investigated in accordance with our procedures.</p>

<p>So perhaps I can ask the Leader to do something a bit more simple and uphold the manifesto pledge in the Liberal Democrat Manifesto to ensure that action is taken against Councillors who do not uphold decent standards of professionalism when it comes to their actions and interactions.</p>		
<p>Member Supplement (1) I was concerned to hear that Lib Dem Lord Matthew Taylor was now involved in lobbying on behalf of the site (Hook Park Village in Chessingtons Green Belt.)</p> <p>And as we've seen most recently a Chessington Councillor was in a Development Control Committee more intent on polishing her nails than dealing with the content of the Development Control meeting.</p> <p>And given that we have had previous occasions in the Lib Dem administration where lobbying</p>	<p>From: Cllr Falchikov-Sumner To: Cllr Rebekah Moll</p>	<p>We have a strict Code of Conduct and meetings can only happen with officers present. Every Member abides by this and declares interests as we have seen with the Mayor Councillor Margaret Thompson this evening.</p> <p>If there is any corruption then this needs to be dealt with seriously. All of us would agree with that and any evidence of corrupt behaviour would be reported to the police.</p> <p>With regards to a Lobbying Register I would have to get back to you on that but I am happy to do so.</p>

<p>companies carried out entertainment of Councillors?</p> <p>I would like Councillor Rebekah Moll and the rest of the administration to commit to my requests for a lobbying register?</p>		
<p>Member Supplement (2) Will the Leader now tell us the latest date by which she commits to the new Kingston Town centre swimming pool being opened and will she confirm that she will resign as a Councillor if that date is missed?</p>	<p>From: Cllr Kevin Davis To: Cllr Caroline Kerr</p>	<p>The Committee Report to the Response and Recovery Committee on the 26th November had annexes which outlined the programme of delivery in relation to the replacement leisure centre at the Kingfisher site. As set out in that programme the construction phase takes us into 2023/2024. Once the necessary steps set out in that programme are achieved the Council will provide further information on opening dates.</p>
<p>Member Supplement (3) What action is the Council taking to permanently house the borough's rough sleepers that were taken into temporary accommodation under the 'Everyone in Scheme' during lockdown?</p>	<p>From: Cllr Steph Archer To: Cllr Emily Davey</p>	<p>I'm pleased to report that Kingston continues to work with our former rough sleepers. We have been given £1.5million to spend on support and accommodation and is part of a long term programme. Many rough sleepers have led complex lives and have multiple physical and mental health problems, therefore we are supporting people throughout the process. We are moving people at the moment from emergency accommodation into interim accommodation in the private sector. They will receive the support that they need to enable them within two years or so to be able to live independently in the private sector. Our ambition is to make this a more permanent scheme so as one former rough sleeper leaves and lives independently in the private sector another one can be taken in. So it is not a question of everyone in only this once during Covid but in the future we will be able to help people who become rough sleepers and move them on so that they can live independently and maintain tenancies independently.</p>

The MHCLG announced funding on 17th July for the Next Steps Accommodation Programme to provide support to the rough sleepers accommodated under Everyone In. The overall objectives of the Next Steps Accommodation Programme are to reduce rough sleeping and to seek to ensure rough sleepers brought into emergency accommodation in response to Covid 19, do not return to sleeping rough. As Covid 19 remains a risk, it is also essential that people, particularly those sleeping rough who are at increased risk of severe illness, are kept safe.

Two funding streams; one for short term and interim revenue funding of £105m from MHCLG and long term funding of £66.7m from the GLA, was made available for councils to bid to source accommodation and support for rough sleepers. RBK made bids for both funds and has successfully been awarded £733k from MHCLG and £806k from the GLA. This will provide over 60 units of accommodation for rough sleepers with associated support to these clients. RBK has already begun to source accommodation and to plan support for rough sleepers with our partners, KCAH and SPEAR. This funding will ensure that those who sleep rough on our streets will have an opportunity for a safe home to live in and be offered support to ensure they are able to live independently.