



‘The Council’



Following example serves as basis for interaction between ‘an electorate’ and their ‘council.’ ‘Tax’ has no recognition under true common (universal civil) law.

We *all* wish to live in comfortable surrounding with shelter and warmth. As such, ‘expenditure on surroundings’ is meant to encompass that. However, ‘tenant/landlord’ or ‘leasehold/freehold’ arrangement – be that landlord ‘private’ or ‘council’ – prevents such expenditure. This dichotomy introduces paying and accepting rent/interest as an acceptable way of conduct.

‘The landlord’ and ‘owner’ of Kingston Council (‘Corporation’) ‘property’ is held in that ancient office of Mayor of Kingston... or rather whomsoever occupies that office. This model applies, for example, to ‘Commonwealth of Massachusetts,’ ‘Commonalty of Paris’ and ‘Commonalty of London.’ A mayor’s role is duty of care; with all commonalties and commonwealths *automatically* united without resort to legalism. How this idea has been corrupted over millennia cannot be elaborated upon here.



With that in mind, let’s look at a particular Kingston Council landlord/tenant situation at Cambridge Estate, which Kingston Council is planning ‘to redevelop.’ Could anyone familiar with Cambridge Estate describe it as being ‘properly maintained’ *with continual improvements* compared to, say, Tiffin Girls’ School’s grounds? Let’s take a look at accounts for tenant payments to Kingston Council in their role as landlord versus their estate expenditure on maintenance.

CAMBRIDGE ESTATE						
626 occupied council owned properties.						
832 properties in total (206 privately owned.)						
Year	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	TOTAL
Total rent paid to Kingston council	3,274,753	3,344,497	3,316,847	3,285,704	3,190,278	16,412,079
Maintenance and repair costs *	190,930	190,930	190,930	190,930	190,930	954,650
Margin of surplus to Kingston council	3,083,823	3,153,567	3,125,917	3,094,774	2,999,348	15,457,429
* outsourced to private company 'Axis.'						
Source data: freedom of information request from Kingston Council on 22/02						

£15.4m has been diverted away from tenants' pockets to Kingston Council over the past five years *alone*. Maintenance is provided *without overt betterment*. 'The margin of surplus' to Kingston Council from rental payments has been in excess of 94%! Let's compare this to a private company, Grainger plc..

Grainger's shareholders own 'trading properties' to rent out for one 'revenue stream,' with 'profit from sales of trading properties' making up their second revenue stream. From their 2018 annual report, Grainger earned £43.8m in net rental income and £81.2m (profit) from the sale of 'trading properties.' Total general/administration expenses amounted to £27.9m. Splitting this administration expense proportionately according to revenue would give 'a surplus/profit margin' of 78% compared to Kingston Council's 94%!

Even with anti-mutual attitudes, as all 'limited companies' have, Grainger still manage to apportion a greater percentage of their 'rental revenue' into maintenance and administration than Kingston Council with Cambridge Estate. Of course, rental payments exclude the £7.5m (approximated) in 'council tax.' What is said to be provided by 'council tax' encompasses much more than that provided by Kingston Council with no accountability – (ironically) a spitting image of 'government' at 'parliament.'

Whatever 'a landlord' has received in rental payments is paid from their tenant's 'household income' and were that tenant outside of tenant/landlord bondage, such income would be used in maintaining *and bettering* surroundings but would be of a *much smaller quantity* than rent paid out to their 'landlord.' This difference makes tenants' surroundings fall into ruins whilst bettering that of their 'landlords.' No better example of this can be seen than in the 'commercialisation' of Kingston, especially over the past recent few decades: supermarkets; hotel after hotel; supermarkets... Just what council expenditure has been to accommodate these projects is incalculable. Whilst Kingston Council might not pay directly for private commercial project costs, they *would* pay for public access to those commercial projects. A new or improved road, for example, to a new hotel would indirectly mean that council tenants wouldn't have improved insulation or fire protection, say, for their own homes.



How would Kingston Council benefit from 'redevelopment' of Cambridge Estate? How will residents not benefit?

A typical 'one-bedroom freehold flat' might be offered for £500,000 on the redeveloped Cambridge Estate. How would 'relocated residents' get benefits from that? They wouldn't. Private/public building companies – or rather their directors/shareholders – get benefits from that... as well as associated 'ground charges' tied to properties.

It's worth highlighting 'building process' here: when 'a site' is 'redeveloped,' it is carved off in a 'legal entity' (if that hasn't been done beforehand) and the council contracts with 'directors' of 'a building company' who have 'capital resources.' These directors order 'their employees' to build properties *to sell to themselves, 'the legal owners' of 'the site,' for c.£13/hour...with 'directors' going on to sell those properties to the public at an equivalent of £130/hour. That difference between £13/hour and £130/hour goes into directors'/shareholders'/politicians' pockets to 'employees' detriment.*

How would Kingston Council benefit from 'redevelopment?' Through a combination of increased 'council tax' and from 'changing property bands' for 'council tax.' 2,000 properties, as Kingston Council plans for the site, at the 'highest band' of 'council tax' would mean c.£6.2m to Kingston Council v. 832 properties making c.£1.5m in 'council tax.' This is why councils across the land favour continual 'redevelopment' over their duties.

How have Cambridge Estate's residents lost out? Ability to maintain *and improve* their own surroundings (incalculable loss) through being 'tenants' (from '*tenere*' meaning 'to grasp' or 'to hold.')

Being held hostage in dangerous environments as a consequence.



It has been shown that:

- Kingston Council profiteering from tenants is no different to private landlords profiteering. Just how that profit/rent is spent is easier to see with councils. Mayoral duty of care has been usurped and replaced by mayoral landlordism.
- Accumulated 'rent surpluses' have been diverted away from tenants' surroundings' betterment – especially from a safety perspective – and into 'projects' generating various forms of 'revenue' for the council. This benefits 'the council' and private companies at the expense of ordinary residents' surroundings and living conditions. Endangerment of life.

Solutions for Cambridge Estate residents on pain of legal action.

- Complete redevelopment of Cambridge Estate, solely for current residents' benefits.
- Residents to be given 'the freehold' of their properties.

In terrorem,

Sandeep Jaitly, 12th April 2019.