



Summary of Responses to the Council Survey

Centre for Public Scrutiny

Change at the Council

Independent Review of Governance for the
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

General

- This survey was run and analysed independently by the Centre for Public Scrutiny as part of their independent review of governance for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC).
- This survey was aimed at anyone with direct experience of any aspect of governance at RBKC.
- A separate survey was issued for residents.
- The introduction to the survey, setting out the background and approach, is attached at APPENDIX ONE.
- A list of survey questions is attached at APPENDIX TWO.
- The survey was launched on 13 November 2017 and closed on 9 February 2018.
- Distribution was via email for the online version (SurveyMonkey). Hard copies were provided to councillors and residents attending council meetings.
- In total, 79 responses were received.
- The breakdown of who responded is attached at APPENDIX THREE.
- Following a two-page summary, a separate section is provided for each of the eighteen text-based questions included in the survey.
- For each question, responses are listed in summarised form, with the number of responses for each shown in brackets. No brackets after an item indicates a single response. The items are listed in order of the number of responses.

Contact: info@cfps.org.uk

Summary

Opportunities for residents to get involved

Positive opportunities for residents to get involved with the Council include: service engagements and consultations; residents' associations; speaking at scrutiny; involvement via councillors; petitions at council meetings and "Ask Nick" question-and-answer sessions with the Leader.

Suggested short-term improvements to help residents get involved with the Council include: decision makers being more proactive; better and more proactive promotion; communication and website/email alerts; better involvement through ward members; having genuine consultation – not just lip service, more online consultation through polls and surveys and more co-design of services.

Hopes for how opportunities for residents to be involved could be better in 12 months' time include: having a wider range of residents involved; a bigger role for ward members and backbenchers; earlier involvement of residents; a greater focus on residents, rather than developers; more events, e.g. focus groups, commissions, working groups; new tech and better online engagement; more transparency, and more co-design with residents.

Councillors working with residents

Positive things that councillors do when they work with residents include: effective advocacy and casework; listening well; understanding local issues through knowing the residents, being out and about in the community and responding to emails and letters.

Short-term improvements that councillors could make to the way they work with residents include: making proactive contact with residents, e.g. letters, email, visit estates; holding more accessible surgeries and being more available; using tech/social media/Twitter, attending more groups/meetings/residents' associations and representing a wider range of views.

Longer-term hopes for how councillors work with residents include: having some new councillors, a more diverse group of councillors and more of an effort being made to engage with, listen and be more responsive to residents.

Lead members and decision-making

Positive things that lead members do when they make decisions include: consulting with residents before making decisions; looking at a range of options; making measured, considered decisions and trusting officer advice.

Short-term improvements to the way lead members make decisions include: listening and engaging residents earlier/better or using social media/digital; engaging with scrutiny earlier/more; working for the community rather than for developer interests; following officer guidance/the process better; working more as a team, explaining decisions better and being more transparent.

Longer-term hopes for how lead members make decisions include: more resident engagement, a more collective approach and being more transparent and visible.

Scrutiny

Positive things about the Council's system of scrutiny include: the questioning of lead members, working groups and themes reviews, and the involvement of backbenchers (but the most popular response was that there are no positive things).

Short-term suggestions for improving scrutiny include: training councillors in the scrutiny role and importance of scrutiny; changing the whole system; more independent and external input, and having a more constructive and less party-political approach.

Longer-term hopes for scrutiny include: earlier scrutiny with more pre-decision scrutiny; more informal working and working groups; scrutiny members having the right knowledge and skills, introducing an entirely new system and better work planning, including an annual work programme.

Council meetings

Positive things about council meetings include: good debates that reflect resident concerns and different political views; the public are able to speak, attend and watch; the opportunity for the opposition to present motions and ask questions, and information is available in advance.

Short-term improvements to council meetings include: better arrangements for public speakers, including questions being provided in advance and only local residents being able to speak; less party-political point scoring; more engagement from residents, more informality and more webcasting.

Longer-term hopes for council meetings include: genuine, thoughtful debate that is not party political with shorter speeches; more public engagement, fewer items considered more fully and shorter meetings.

Good practice elsewhere

Suggestions of good practice elsewhere include: support offered to members at Westminster City Council; Hammersmith and Fulham website and mail bulletins to residents; Lambeth Scrutiny Commissions (involving external stakeholders, community groups etc.); Hammersmith and Fulham commissions, Lambeth's use of map-based consultation software and Lambeth/Southwark community forums.

What one thing would you like to see the Council put into practice?

The one thing that people would like to see the Council do includes: humility and honesty; the first duty is to serve all residents; listen to all residents; proper consultation and engagement with residents; introduce the committee system of decision-making; change the leadership, staff, culture and behaviours, and bring back the residents' panel.

Opportunities for getting your voice heard in the decision-making process

1. What positive opportunities have you noticed for residents to get involved with the Council?

Summary: Respondents noted the following positive opportunities for residents to get involved: service engagements and consultations; residents' associations; speaking at scrutiny; getting involved via councillors, petitions at council meetings and "Ask Nick" question-and-answer sessions with the Leader.

Responses

- Service engagement / consultation (13)
- Residents associations (8)
- Speak at scrutiny (7)
- Through councillors (6)
- Council meeting petitions (5)
- Ask Nick (5)
- Limited / none (4)
- Public consultation meetings (4)
- Through planning (4)
- City Living Local Life (4)
- Exhibitions etc. for developments (3)
- Speak at council meetings (3)
- Grenfell meetings / scrutiny (2)
- RBKC publicity (2)
- Speaking at cabinet (2)
- Council website (2)
- Licensing
- Surveys
- Service co-design
- Safer neighbourhood board
- Ward votes
- Informal networking
- Community centre
- Working parties
- Elections
- Parent Carer Forum
- Active volunteering
- Some meetings in Chelsea

2. What could be done now to improve opportunities for residents to get involved in decision-making?

Summary: Suggested short-term improvements to help residents get involved with the Council include: decision makers being more proactive; better and more proactive promotion; communication and website/email alerts; better involvement through ward members; having genuine consultation – not just lip service, more online consultation through polls and surveys and more co-design of services.

Responses

- More proactive engagement as part of decision making / budget setting (9)
- Better, more proactive promotion, communication via website / email alerts / social media (9)
- Better involvement through ward councillors (7)
- Genuine consultation – not lip service (5)
- More online consultation through polls and surveys (4)
- More co-design of services (4)
- More engagement through scrutiny e.g. co-option (3)
- “Listening Forum” / listening committee / open forum for residents (3)
- Involve earlier (2)
- Residents panel (2)
- Sack managers / staff / employ residents (2)
- Better engagement with resident associations (2)
- Involve everyone – not just the few (2)
- Feedback to residents with the results of consultations (2)
- More webcasting
- More council staff
- Residents are not interested
- More transparent decision-making
- Public question time at council
- Hammersmith and Fulham Commissions
- Empowerment rather than consultation
- Explaining why difficult decisions need to be made
- Engagement through the voluntary sector
- Community compact
- Ward forums

3. Thinking longer term about opportunities for residents to get involved in decision-making, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?

Summary: Hopes for how opportunities for residents to be involved could be better in 12 months' time include: having a wider range of residents involved; a bigger role for ward members and backbenchers; earlier involvement of residents; a greater focus on residents, rather than developers; more events, e.g. focus groups, commissions, working groups; new tech and better online engagement; more transparency, and more co-design with residents.

Responses

- Wider range of residents involved (8)
- Bigger role for backbenchers / ward members in involving residents (4)
- Earlier involvement of residents in decisions (4)
- Decisions taken more in interests of residents – not developers (4)
- More engagement / engagement events e.g. focus groups, commissions, working groups (3)
- New tech / better online engagement (3)
- More transparency / open council (3)
- More co-design with residents (3)
- More decisions taken jointly with residents (2)
- No change / nothing (2)
- More mutual respect and trust (2)

- Genuine consultation (2)
- More resident co-optees on committees (2)
- A more diverse administration
- More infrastructure to support engagement
- Staff leading engagement being more committed
- Real equality impact assessments
- Tenants should employ their own builders
- Completely different approach
- Clear demonstration of how engagement has made a difference
- Dismantle cabinet / scrutiny
- Engagement becomes part of the culture of the whole organisation
- More engagement through scrutiny
- More engagement in big projects
- Using profiling to reach residents and service users
- Resident panel
- More decision-making at the locality level
- Simpler borough plan – like Westminster
- Ward panels
- Encouraging local resident community champions
- Better information about decisions
- More debate and discussion

4. What positive things have you noticed that councillors do when they work with residents?

Summary: Respondents mentioned the following positive things that councillors do when they work with residents: effective advocacy and casework; listening well; understanding local issues through knowing the residents, being out and about in the community and responding to emails and letters.

Responses

- Effective advocacy and casework (18)
- Listen well (10)
- Understand local issues / know the residents / out and about in the community (8)
- Responsive through different channels e.g. email, letters (5)
- Help residents understand / get involved in policy making (4)
- Hold surgeries and drop-ins (3)
- Little / nothing (2)
- Labour councillors work well (2)
- Participate in borough wide conferences / forums
- Creation of Grenfell Scrutiny
- Protect the wealthy over the needy
- Make judgements in the wider interest
- Attentive to resident associations

5. What could councillors do now to improve how they work with residents?

Summary: Respondents thought that short-term improvements that councillors could make to the way they work with residents include: making proactive contact with residents, e.g. letters,

email, visit estates; holding more accessible surgeries and being more available; using tech/ social media/Twitter, attending more groups/meetings / residents' associations and representing a wider range of views.

Responses

- Make proactive contact with residents e.g. letters, email, visit estates (12)
- Hold more accessible surgeries / be more available (8)
- Use tech/social media/twitter (4)
- Attend more groups / meetings / Residents Associations (3)
- Reflect the wider range of views (3)
- Increase awareness of the councillor role (2)
- Get involved in case issues – not just signposting (2)
- Focus on community before money (2)
- Involve residents earlier (2)
- Demonstrate that they are listening (2)
- Focus on the needy before the wealthy (2)
- Respond quicker
- Be a tenant or a housing officer for a day like Undercover Boss
- Tell the truth – not vague promises
- Be visible outside their wards
- Hold each other to a higher standard
- Already lost trust
- Change
- Stop looking down their noses
- Officers respond more quickly to councillors
- Do more
- Be users of the services they make decisions about
- Look outwards not inwards
- Make more use of City Living Local Life
- More authority over officers

6. Thinking longer term about how councillors work with residents, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?

Summary: Respondents answers about longer-term hopes for how councillors work with residents include: having some new councillors, a more diverse group of councillors and more of an effort being made to engage with, listen and be more responsive to residents.

Responses

- New / different councillors (4)
- Councillors are a more diverse group to reflect borough (4)
- Councillors are making more effort to engage with residents (4)
- More listening / listening without judgement (4)
- More responsive / accountable to residents / follow their concerns (4)
- Better system of communication between councillors and their constituents (3)
- Councillors walk in the shoes of residents to understand the life of the less well-off (3)
- Better engagement mechanisms to encourage discussion (3)
- More awareness of the councillor role (2)
- Greater trust / Grenfell residents can trust again (2)

- A diversity of views is represented (2)
- Better support for councillors doing casework (2)
- Officers respond promptly to councillors
- More informality
- More accessible
- A change
- Councillors review their own effectiveness
- More people believe the council works for them
- More scrutiny themed policy development work
- Residents have greater trust / respect for councillors
- Council explain its challenges better
- More councillor webpages and blogs
- More feedback to residents
- Ward panels
- More surgeries
- Engage better with businesses

7. What positive things have you noticed that Lead Members do when they make decisions?

Summary: Respondents noted the following positive things that lead members do when they make decisions: consulting with residents before making decisions; looking at a range of options; making measured, considered decisions and trusting officer advice.

Responses

- Consult with residents before making decisions (5)
- Look at a range of options (5)
- Little / none (5)
- Make measured, considered decisions (5)
- Trust officer advice (5)
- Decisive / stick to decisions / quick when needed (4)
- Challenge officers before making a decision (3)
- Observe / follow scrutiny process (2)
- Take personal responsibility (2)
- Keep residents' interests in mind (2)
- Follow the process
- Financially motivated
- Showing a commitment to help
- Understand their brief
- Poor at engaging other councillors
- Use own experience
- Think strategically
- Challenge each other
- Some good decisions e.g. Notting Hill Tower Block

8. What could Lead Members do now to improve the way they make decisions?

Summary: Respondents suggested the following short-term improvements to the way lead members make decisions: listening and engaging residents earlier/better or using social media/

digital; engaging with scrutiny earlier/more; working for the community rather than for developer interests; following officer guidance/the process better; working more as a team, explaining decisions better and being more transparent.

Responses

- Listen / engage residents earlier / better / use social medial / digital (10)
- Engage with scrutiny earlier/more (5)
- Work for community rather than developed interests (3)
- Follow officer guidance / the process better (3)
- Work more as a team (3)
- Explain decisions better (3)
- Greater transparency (3)
- Understand member / officer roles better (2)
- Be strong minded (2)
- Balance different interests when making decisions (2)
- Leave (2)
- More truthful / do what they say (2)
- Communicate better with staff / residents (2)
- Learn from other councils
- Reply to backbenchers when they contact you
- Work more closely with officers / attend senior management meeting
- Challenge officers more
- Be more inclusive
- A central research resource
- Support better services in less well-off areas
- Protect public assets from developers
- Clearer allocation of actions to officers
- Have plainer criteria for making decisions
- Stay the same
- Fewer urgent decisions
- New mind-set / approach
- More strategic use of Key Decisions
- Make longer term funding decisions
- Involve local ward members more in decisions that affect them
- More informal briefings
- Think about all the residents when making decisions
- Understand the brief better

9. Thinking longer term about how lead members make decisions, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?

Summary: Longer-term hopes for how lead members make decisions include: more resident engagement, a more collective approach and being more transparent and visible.

Responses

- More resident engagement (8)
- A more collective approach (3)
- More open / transparent / visible (3)
- More Lead members / smaller portfolios (2)

- Taking fewer / bigger decisions (2)
- Understand process / constitution better (2)
- Stronger accountability (2)
- Better backbench engagement with cabinet (2)
- Taking difficult decisions (2)
- Putting residents first – not finances or business (2)
- More inclusive (2)
- Everyone aligned in their thinking
- Review what other councils do
- More external expert advice
- More due diligence
- Quicker decisions
- Less outsourcing
- More truthful
- Call it cabinet again
- Greater confidence / sense of direction
- Better working with scrutiny
- More respect between councillors
- Rotation of lead members
- Trust has been gained
- Robust governance demonstrated
- Representing the needy
- Key Decision process replaced
- Central database of decisions
- Better quality of officer advice
- More flexible if things aren't working
- Broader vision
- Show leadership

10. What positive things have you noticed about the Council's system of scrutiny?

Summary: The following positive things about the Council's system of scrutiny were mentioned: the questioning of lead members, working groups and themes reviews, and the involvement of backbenchers (but the most popular response was that there are no positive things).

Responses

- None / little (10)
- Check and balance / questioning of lead members (7)
- Working groups / themed reviews (4)
- Involvement of backbenchers (3)
- Resident involvement / issues of concern (3)
- Follows process (2)
- Transparency / open to public (2)
- Reflects interest of members
- The style it is run
- People perceive its effect
- Knowledgeable councillors
- Robust
- Interested in people

- Number of committees
- Engagement of lead members
- Community reps can speak
- Grenfell Recovery Scrutiny Committee
- External impact
- Keeps out of routine matters
- Opposition chair
- Opportunity to scrutinise decisions

11. What could be changed about the Council's system of scrutiny now?

Summary: Respondents thought about the following short-term suggestions for improving scrutiny: training councillors in the scrutiny role and importance of scrutiny; changing the whole system; more independent and external input, and having a more constructive and less party-political approach.

Responses

- Scrutiny councillors trained in role / importance of scrutiny (4)
- Change whole system / have committee system (4)
- More external / independent input / hear from not just officers (3)
- More constructive / less party political (3)
- Scrutiny councillors lead agenda planning (2)
- Members attend more / more engaged (2)
- Members prepare better / read papers (2)
- More working groups / themed reviews (2)
- Scrutiny councillors become more subject knowledgeable (2)
- Tracking system for recording actions (2)
- Shorter / more focused agenda (2)
- More transparent (2)
- More informal working
- More evidence based
- Opposition chairs
- Clearer links to cabinet portfolios
- Needs to be given more time
- Needs more teeth to call in / challenge
- Sack them
- Select committee approach
- Outcome focus
- More professional
- More resident involvement
- Smaller committees
- Transcriptions available
- More drive from committee members
- Lead members / senior officers pay more attention
- More weight on councillor views
- Insight and balance

12. Thinking longer term about the Council's system of scrutiny, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?

Summary: Longer-term hopes for scrutiny include: earlier scrutiny with more pre-decision scrutiny; more informal working and working groups; scrutiny members having the right knowledge and skills, introducing an entirely new system and better work planning, including an annual work programme.

Responses

- Scrutiny takes place earlier / more pre-decision (4)
- More informal working / working groups (3)
- Scrutiny members have the right subject knowledge / skills (3)
- New constitution / system (3)
- Annual work programme / better work planning (3)
- More resident involvement including in workplan (2)
- Officers more confident to report issues
- More councillors on committees
- Community focus – not just services
- More residents attending
- More opposition chairs
- Reconciliation and forgiveness project post Grenfell
- Meetings held around the borough
- Greater accountability
- Clear expectations set for scrutiny councillors
- Stay the same
- Committees review their effectiveness
- Annual scrutiny report to council
- Scrutiny resourced better / respected across organisation
- More searching / honest / robust
- More constructive
- Greater commitment shown by scrutiny councillors
- Power to send decisions back to be amended
- Topic based with external input
- A more diverse council

13. What positive things have you noticed about council meetings?

Summary: Respondents noted the following positive things about council meetings: good debates that reflect resident concerns and different political views; the public are able to speak, attend and watch; the opportunity for the opposition to present motions and ask questions, and information is available in advance.

Responses

- Good debates / reflect issues of resident concern / different political views (7)
- Public can speak (7)
- None / limited (6)
- Opposition motions / questions / can challenge (3)
- Public attend and watch (3)
- Information available in advance (3)

- Transparent / open to public (2)
- Petitions
- Webcasting
- Councillors speaking knowledgeably
- Themed meetings
- Members attend
- Decent papers
- Well run / administered
- Everyone comes together
- Well informed officers brief councillors

14. What could be changed now about council meetings? (To improve them)

Summary: Short-term improvements to council meetings include: better arrangements for public speakers, including questions being provided in advance and only local residents being able to speak; less party-political point scoring; more engagement from residents, more informality and more webcasting.

Responses

- Better arrangements / agenda items for public questions / questions in advance / residents to speak (8)
- Less party politics / point scoring (5)
- More engagement from residents (3)
- More informal (2)
- Webcasting (2)
- More themed meetings
- Devolve more to scrutiny
- Stream on Facebook live to encourage debate
- Proper accountability
- More real, open debate
- More tenant involvement
- Change the system
- More external speakers
- Shorter
- More caring and compassionate
- Public friendly papers
- Allow current changes to be tested first
- Hold public interest items first
- Hold meetings around the Borough
- More expert speakers
- More open-minded debates

15. Thinking longer term about council meetings, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?

Summary: Longer-term hopes for council meetings include: genuine, thoughtful debate that is not party political with shorter speeches; more public engagement, fewer items considered more fully and shorter meetings.

Responses

- Genuine, thoughtful debate that is not party political with shorter speeches (6)
- More public engagement (3)
- Fewer items considered more fully (2)
- Shorter meetings (2)
- The administration comes from diverse backgrounds
- More available online
- More open to residents
- More accountability
- Committed council employees with resident interests at heart
- Modified format with public speakers / questions
- Stay the same
- New administration
- New layout so councillors don't have their backs to the audience
- Agendas reflect local concerns
- More reports from scrutiny
- Wider range of speakers
- More themed meetings
- More professional
- Training and refreshers for councillors
- People listened to
- Communicate to residents what's happening following meetings
- Decisions based on evidence and expert opinion

16. Are you aware of any good practice elsewhere that you think could be applied in Kensington and Chelsea? If so please tell us here.

Summary: Respondents provided the following good practice examples: support offered to members at Westminster City Council; Hammersmith and Fulham website and mail bulletins to residents; Lambeth Scrutiny Commissions (involving external stakeholders, community groups etc.); Hammersmith and Fulham commissions, Lambeth's use of map-based consultation software and Lambeth/Southwark community forums.

Responses

- Support offered to members at Westminster City Council
- Hammersmith and Fulham website and mail bulletins to residents
- Ward / area forums
- Westminster charge planning applicants for reviewing CTMPs
- Invest more in developing and supporting community participation in routine business – not just in high profile contentious issues
- Committee model should remain
- Co-design of services and co-production of review reports
- It seemed to work better before the Grenfell Tragedy
- Tower Hamlets housing have tried to start new initiatives
- Opposition chairs for scrutiny committees
- More time on the Council agenda for motions
- Occasional Council / Scrutiny meetings at community venues
- Give money to tenants stop giving money to builders
- Scrutiny Commissions (involving external stakeholders etc) e.g. Lambeth
- Some Councils involve people on issues outside of formal MTGS

- Scrutiny can have representatives from the voluntary sector at the table as with health and wellbeing boards
- WCC [Westminster City Council] is a bit different and may be worth looking at
- Allowing public questions
- Improving relations/ co-ordination between scrutiny and executive would help
- Focus on what people need rather than party politics
- Put the council into special measures
- Hammersmith and Fulham commissions
- Manchester City Council response to Manchester Arena bombing
- Growing use of technology as a means to engage
- Lambeth's use of map-based consultation software that allowed residents and visitors to identify locations where they felt streets could be improved
- Lead officer group meetings which facilitate information sharing across the Council
- Hammersmith and Fulham approach to supporting and serving residents
- Committee system
- Shorter local plan like Westminster
- Webcasting
- Resident co-design, co-production, co-option
- Community Forum – like Lambeth/Southwark

17. Thinking about all of the issues covered in this survey, what one thing would you like to see the Council put into practice?

Summary: The one thing that people would like to see the Council do includes: humility and honesty; the first duty is to serve all residents; listen to all residents; proper consultation and engagement with residents; introduce the committee system of decision-making; change the leadership, staff, culture and behaviours, and bring back the residents' panel.

Responses

- Humility and honesty; the first duty is to serve all residents (5)
- Listen to all residents (4)
- Proper consultation / engagement with residents / open to their ideas (3)
- Committee system of decision-making (2)
- New leadership / staff (2)
- The culture and behaviours need to change (2)
- Bring back residents' panel (2)
- Councillors meeting more residents in their homes / wards (2)
- Involve local residents (2)
- Better support for backbenchers
- More dynamic and efficient decision-making culture with fewer meetings
- More time in decision making for scrutiny and consultation with residents
- More engagement and team working in all areas
- More transparency
- Better communication to residents
- Learning from best practice in other boroughs and organisations
- Focus on residents who live in the borough rather than developers
- Scrutiny of corporate impact of decisions
- Engage more innovatively and digitally with residents
- More decisive decisions and leadership
- Start representing the constituents who voted them in

- Reinstated Cabinet by name
- Guidance for scrutiny councillors
- All scrutiny committees chaired by a member of the opposition
- The establishment of several community forums in the North?
- Local ballots on certain issues
- Ensure that cabinet members give strong leadership to their officers
- Let tenants decide who they use to do work
- Compassion for others
- Committees reviewing their effectiveness and reporting this to Council
- A clearer, easier key decision process
- More contributions from residents about what should be debated
- Sustained engagement with communities
- System of questions and answers from the public
- More awareness about the decision process
- More delegated decisions where appropriate, by value/impact
- Commissions on key issues
- Make better use of elected members
- Better tools for elected members
- Senior officers should delegate or learn to use the relevant system
- A more representative council
- Councillors engaging better with residents in their wards
- Effective community engagement strategies
- Resident friendly local plan
- Evidence based decisions
- Listen to a wide range of organisations / institutions

18. If there is anything else to do with this review that you would like to tell us about please let us know here:

Responses

- Different role for Governance Services – focus on key decisions and scrutiny, as opposed to assisting the departments with meetings.
- Talk to local charities and find out about what they are doing to plug the gaps that RBKC is leaving through negligence and poor allocation of funds.
- Higher financial thresholds like other boroughs. This may free up officer time to focus on supporting resident and community involvement in high interest, cross department issues.
- Councillors should meet officers more often.
- Many examples of best practice in RBKC governance, however, aspects of the Member culture may have hindered opportunities to engage with scrutiny and the public.
- Tri- and bi-borough arrangements have reduced officer support for decision making and have knocked staff morale and resident confidence – until tri and bi-borough is tidied up we will continue to struggle.
- Exec directors managing vast portfolios is simply going to replace the problems of governance with problems of logistics.
- Are we changing procedures that in the past have led the council to receive high ratings for the services they have provided over many years?
- The council are too much on the side of the developer and a few voices from well-connected members of resident associations.
- Give tenant right to decide.
- Some extremely poor decisions have been made post Grenfell which will unfortunately result

in this council reaching rock bottom within the next three-year period.

- Have said a lot in short time. Thank you!
- Ask the Government to put RBKC into special measures now.
- Financial prudence is important, but K&C seems to have taken disproportionate pride in building up reserves.
- The review provides a real chance to do things better.
- We mustn't allow it to become a vehicle to provide for the capture of the Council by self-appointed "community spokespeople". We have elections to identify who speaks for the community. Let's use them!
- I think it would be a good idea if scrutiny meetings were observed by the review team.
- The quality of Councillor is low. Some are excellent, most are very nice, but not enough are good enough for what are demanding roles.
- There are plenty of examples of issues where the genuine concerns of residents have been ignored and in some cases belittled. Kings Road Crossrail station is a good example. Instead of attacking local residents, the council should genuinely consult and work with them.
- Residents rely on their local associations to deal with many issues that protect the neighbourhood but this seems to carry little weight with the council.
- Deal with rubbish on the streets – more street patrols to increase street safety.
- I feel so negative about the Council.
- It's about time that RBKC took on board ethical debt collection.

APPENDIX ONE

Survey Introduction

About this survey

This survey is part of the independent review of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Council. It aims to gather views of residents on various aspects of council decision-making. The views gathered from this survey will be used to provide advice to the Council about how it can improve the way it makes decisions in the future.

This survey is for residents of Kensington and Chelsea. There is a separate survey for those who work for the Council, service as councillors or run community organisations. It is divided into four sections, aiming to get views on opportunities or residents to get their voices heard, on councillors working with residents, council decision-making and council meetings.

Your responses to this survey will be completely anonymous and no identifiable individual responses will be shared with the Council or any other body or individual. The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete and we appreciate you taking the time to help with this important review.

If you would rather respond by email, please use the following email address: info@cfps.org.uk

You can return this survey to:

Jacqui Hird, Scrutiny Manager, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea,
Level One (Purple Zone), Kensington Town Hall, London W8 7NX

Or

Centre for Public Scrutiny, 77 Mansell Street, London, E1 8AN

Thank you!

APPENDIX TWO

Survey Questions

- Overall, in your experience, how would you rate the opportunities for residents to get involved with the decisions made by Kensington and Chelsea Council? Please give a score between zero and ten where zero means not good at all and ten means excellent
- What positive opportunities have you noticed for residents to get involved with the Council? (The reasons why you gave a score higher than zero)
- What could be done now to improve opportunities for residents to get involved in decision making that would make the score you gave one point better?
- Thinking longer term about opportunities for residents to get involved in decision making, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?
- Overall, in your experience, how good are Kensington and Chelsea councillors at working with residents? Please give a score between zero and ten where zero means not good at all and ten means excellent
- What positive things have you noticed that councillors do when they work with residents? (The reasons why you gave a score higher than zero)
- What could councillors do now to improve how they work with residents to make the score you gave one point better?
- Thinking longer term about how councillors work with residents, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?
- Overall, in your experience, how good are the Lead Members for Kensington and Chelsea Council at making decisions? Please give a score between zero and ten where zero means not good at all and ten means excellent
- What positive things have you noticed that Lead Members do when they make decisions? (The reasons why you gave a score higher than zero)
- What could Lead Members do now to improve the way they make decisions, to make the score you gave one point better?
- Thinking longer term about how Lead Members make decisions, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?
- Overall, in your experience, how good are councillors at providing effective scrutiny? Please give a score between zero and ten where zero means not good at all and ten means excellent
- What positive things have you noticed about the Council's system of scrutiny? (The reasons why you gave a score higher than zero)
- What could be changed about the Council's system of scrutiny now to make the score you gave one point better?
- Thinking longer term about the Council's system of scrutiny, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?
- Overall, in your opinion, how good are council meetings? Please give a score between zero and ten where zero means not good at all and ten means excellent.
- What positive things have you noticed about council meetings? (The reasons why you gave a score higher than zero)

- What could be changed now about council meetings to make the score you gave one point better?
- Thinking longer term about council meetings, what do you hope will be different in 12 months' time?
- Are you aware of any good practice elsewhere that you think could be applied in Kensington and Chelsea? If so please tell us here.
- Thinking about all of the issues covered in this survey, what one thing would you like to see the Council put into practice?
- If there is anything else to do with this review that you would like to tell us about please let us know here:
- If you would like to be kept updated about progress with this study please provide your email here.

APPENDIX THREE

Survey Respondents

Are you?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
A councillor	14.52% 9
A council officer	45.16% 28
Working for another public service	1.61% 1
Working with a resident or community group	20.97% 13
A resident of Kensington and Chelsea	12.90% 8
None of the above	6.45% 4
TOTAL	63

Describe your gender?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Male	53.57% 30
Female	46.43% 26
TOTAL	56

How old are you?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Under 18	0.00% 0
18–34	12.07% 7
35–64	75.86% 44
65 and over	12.07% 7
TOTAL	58

How old are you?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	67.27% 37
White: Irish/British	5.45% 3
White: Irish	0.00% 0
White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.00% 0
White: Other	9.09% 5
Indian	1.82% 1
Pakistani	1.82% 1
Bangladeshi	1.82% 1
Chinese	0.00% 0
White and Black Caribbean	0.00% 0
White and Black African	1.82% 1

White and Asian	0.00% 0
Other Mixed background	3.64% 2
Caribbean	0.00% 0
African	1.82% 1
Any other Black background	0.00% 0
Arab	0.00% 0
Other ethnic background	1.82% 1
Not covered above	3.64% 2
TOTAL	55

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	9.62% 5
No	90.38% 47
TOTAL	52

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Heterosexual	67.31% 35
Bisexual	3.85% 2
Lesbian/ Gay woman	1.92% 1
Gay man	3.85% 2
I am not prepared to say	17.31% 9
None of these	5.77% 3
TOTAL	52

What is your religion?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
No Religion	36.54% 19
Christian (including C of E, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations)	50.00% 26
Buddhist	0.00% 0
Hindu	1.92% 1
Jewish	1.92% 1
Muslim	5.77% 3
Sikh	1.92% 1
Any other religion (please specify)	1.92% 1
TOTAL	52

If you are a resident in Kensington and Chelsea is your current home?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Rented from council / housing association	5.56% 3
Rented from a private landlord	1.85% 1
Owner occupied	29.63% 16
Other	1.85% 1
Not resident in Kensington and Chelsea	61.11% 33
TOTAL	54



77 Mansell Street London E1 8AN
telephone **020 3866 5100** email **info@cfps.org.uk** twitter **@cfpscrutiny**

www.cfps.org.uk

Centre for Public Scrutiny Limited is a registered charity: 1136243 and a Limited Company registered in England and Wales: 5133443