

Minutes

COUNCIL

19 January 2017

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



Councillor John Hensley (Mayor)
Councillor Carol Melvin BSc (Hons) (Deputy Mayor)

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <p>Councillors: Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Jem Duducu Michael Markham Lynne Allen Janet Duncan Douglas Mills Teji Barnes Beulah East Richard Mills Jonathan Bianco Ian Edwards Peter Money Mohinder Birah Duncan Flynn John Morgan Wayne Bridges Neil Fyfe John Morse Tony Burles Janet Gardner June Nelson Keith Burrows Narinder Garg Susan O'Brien Roy Chamdal Dominic Gilham John Oswell Alan Chapman Raymond Graham Jane Palmer George Cooper Becky Haggart Ray Puddifoot MBE Judith Cooper Henry Higgins John Riley Philip Corthorne Patricia Jackson Robin Sansarpuri Brian Crowe Phoday Jarjussey Scott Seaman-Digby Peter Curling Allan Kauffman David Simmonds CBE Catherine Dann Judy Kelly Jagjit Singh Peter Davis Manjit Khatra Brian Stead Nick Denys Mo Khursheed Jan Sweeting Kanwal Dheer Kuldeep Lakhmana Michael White Jazz Dhillon Eddie Lavery David Yarrow Jas Dhot Richard Lewis</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Fran Beasley, Jean Palmer, Paul Whaymand, Tony Zaman, Glen Egan, Mark Braddock, Morgan Eion, Beth Rainey and Nikki O'Halloran</p>
	<p>The Mayor requested that those present observe a one minute silence for Holocaust Memorial Day.</p>
33.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Eginton.</p>
34.	<p>MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2016 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
35.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allen declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Items 5.2, 8.2 and 9.1, as she had two family members that worked in local schools that had Children's</p>

Centres. She remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillor Dheer declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Items 5.2, 8.2 and 9.1, as she used the services provided at Pinkwell Children's Centre. She remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillor Lakhmana declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 8.1, as she worked at Heathrow Airport. She remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillor Khursheed declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 9.1, as his granddaughter was a teacher in a school affected by the motion. He remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

36. **MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS** (*Agenda Item 4*)

The Mayor advised that Mr Desmond Brady, who had been elected as a Councillor in 1978, had passed away in December 2016.

Hillingdon had raised £6,000 and had been awarded fifth place at the Mayor of London's New Years Day Parade. The Mayor thanked Jam 2000 for their tremendous effort.

Councillor Singh would be raising money for the Mayor's Charity by running seven marathons in seven days in seven continents, starting in Perth and finishing in Alaska.

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Kauffman back to the Chamber following his recent illness.

37. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME** (*Agenda Item 5*)

5.1 QUESTION FROM MR TONY ELLIS OF KEWFERRY ROAD, NORTHWOOD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS:

"Is the Council going to respond to the recent consultation document on air pollution published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and does it agree with NICE's findings that speed bumps cause excessive pollution and that alternative methods of traffic calming should be introduced as recommended in the report?"

In the absence of the questioner, the Mayor put the question on his behalf and Councillor Burrows advised that a written response would be provided.

[The response sent to Mr Ellis was as follows: *The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) consultation has been based upon a number of evidence based nationwide studies informing a series of recommendations which are the subject of the consultation. Where the evidence base is not sufficiently robust the consultation recommends a number of areas for further research.*

I have looked at the main topic areas within this consultation and am satisfied that the recommendations for actions that should be taken are ones that Hillingdon are either already implementing or will be considering for implementation under the recent London Local Air Quality Management regime launched by the Mayor of London in 2016. For this reason we do not feel there is a need to respond to this consultation. We will, however, be interested in the outcomes of the research topics the

consultation suggests are needed as these will help us ensure the measures being taken to improve air quality have the desired effect, for example:

Are air quality alerts effective in changing people's exposure to poor air quality? Hillingdon provides free access to the London-wide AirText alert system for all our residents and local businesses. Currently 145 people have subscribed to this service; information is available on the Hillingdon website.

The NICE consultation recognises that there are both benefits and harms of traffic calming and speed reduction. The benefits include improvements to road safety and a safer environment to promote walking and cycling however stop/start driving, which can be a result from the introduction of measures such as speed bumps, sometimes known as "sleeping policemen", can cause an increase in emissions locally.

The NICE recommendation is to reduce this stop-go driving style which will then lower emissions of air pollutants from accelerations and decelerations, lowering exposure of the population to poor air quality.

The Borough no longer supports the use of the older type of speed bumps which were the main cause of this style of driving. In consultation with our residents, we look at different types of traffic calming including the introduction of 20mph zones, the use of physical measures such as flat topped tables (table cushions) in accordance with national and regional guidelines and additional measures such as recent investment in the enforcement, by camera, of no stopping zones near to schools.]

5.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR CHRIS WATERS OF FERRERS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS:

"As reported in the Cabinet Report of 15 December 2016, the proposed saving to the budgets for Children's Centres will amount to £405,000 for 2017/2018, which includes the outstanding saving of £215,000, and a further saving of £839,000 over the following 2 years, which will inevitably result in a reduction of staff. Therefore, could the Cabinet Member confirm that these savings will not result in any depletion and/or withdrawal of services at these highly valued centres, which are serving the ever increasing child population in the borough?"

In the absence of the questioner, the Mayor put the question on his behalf and Councillor Simmonds advised that a written response would be provided, based on his response to Members' Question 8.2.

5.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR STEPHEN GARELICK OF STOWE CRESCENT, WEST RUISLIP TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS:

"As has been demonstrated in New Years Green Lane twice following closure last year and with the latest closure, would the Cabinet Member agree that it would be logical to make New Years Green Lane one way to prevent delays due to oversize vehicles being unable to back up when meeting a vehicle of similar size?"

"Delays of up to 20 minutes can be experienced on such a comparatively short road upon which, of course, the refuse facility is based. There is also a safety aspect as speeding, on coming motorists would not cause traffic coming in the opposite direction to break suddenly. The proposal would also assist in reducing damage caused to the carriageway so soon after resurfacing and may further assist in

stopping HS2 using Breakspear Road South if evidence is forthcoming, even at this late stage, showing the environmental impact which has been based on assumption rather than reality."

Councillor Burrows was aware that New Years Green Lane had had to cope with some especially high traffic levels on a handful of occasions over the past year: there had been major gas main renewal works in Breakspear Road South last summer; and a water main had burst in Breakspear Road South last month causing traffic congestion across Ickenham and Harefield.

Councillor Burrows had carefully considered the questioner's suggestion but did not believe that making Breakspear Road South or New Years Green Lane one-way would be the right solution to these problems. Making roads 'one-way' could be fraught with problems for a number of reasons. First and foremost was how such a change would affect the residents and businesses in the immediate area and the inevitable impact the significant detours would have on their journeys and commercial activities. Councillor Burrows was not aware of any pressure from residents or businesses in the area for such a change.

If Breakspear Road South was made one-way, it would have a very broad impact on a number of households and businesses in the area, not to mention having a wider impact for commuters travelling to and from Northwood, Eastcote and Uxbridge, and other destinations beyond. The capacity of the links between Ickenham, West Ruislip and Harefield was already severely limited by the constraints of the road network, and it was thought that imposing any restriction on part of it would simply push the commuters onto other roads in the area, for example, Swakeleys Road, Long Lane, Harvil Road, Ruislip High Street, West End Road and all the residential roads in between.

If New Years Green Lane was made one-way, there were a number of businesses along this road who relied on access from the Harvil Road end, and others from Breakspear Road South, and the size of some of the vehicles involved would mean that one-way working in either direction would have some impact on the local road network.

As hinted in the question, the Council, in common with a great many local residents in Ickenham, Ruislip and Harefield, was already extremely concerned about the potential impact of heavy goods vehicles due to the construction of HS2. Councillor Burrows was not convinced that HS2 would welcome even more lorries being forced to make lengthy detours to cope with a formal one-way restriction.

The Council would be scrutinising the lorry paths planned by HS2 and its contractors for any road-borne construction traffic. The Council and many residents had made it very clear to HS2 that Hillingdon's road network was ill-equipped to cope with high levels of construction traffic. To that end, the Council had forced HS2 to reduce the numbers of lorries it planned to put on Hillingdon's roads. The Council would maintain this pressure to reduce these numbers even further.

After the HS2 consultation had closed, the Secretary of State had submitted an amendment which gave him the power to alter any traffic orders that he saw fit. Even if the Council introduced one-way working, the Secretary of State could overrule the decision. The Council believed that this was unfair and was objecting to it.

Much of the traffic that flowed through these roads was tidal in nature, with dominant traffic flows one way in the morning and the other way in the evening. Imposing a

one-way restriction in one direction alone would only help, if it would really help at all, either in the morning or the afternoon, and would be a major inconvenience the rest of the time, not least to the businesses and residents in the area.

Councillor Burrows' final observation concerned the speed of traffic. It was a long established fact that, when any road was made one-way, traffic speed tended to increase for the simple and obvious reason that anyone using the road knew with reasonable certainty that they would not face any opposing traffic coming towards them. He was not convinced that making either of the roads one-way would help road safety as these roads were quite narrow and had some challenging sections.

Councillor Burrows thanked the resident for his question which had been made in a constructive way to try to find a way to tackle a very real traffic problem. He hoped that Mr Garelick appreciated the points that he had made and understood why he would not be supporting changes of either Breakspear Road South or New Years Green Lane to one-way working.

38. **REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business and it was:

RESOLVED: That the appointment to the membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board of Mr Stephen Otter as a statutory voting member, with Mr Turkey Mahmoud as substitute, representing Healthwatch Hillingdon, be approved.

39. **COUNCIL TAX BASE AND BUSINESS RATES FORECAST 2017/18** (*Agenda Item 7*)

It was noted that there was a typo at the bottom of page 19 of the agenda where it should have stated 30% (not 20%) but that the calculations in the report were correct. Councillor Bianco moved, and Councillor Puddifoot seconded, the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business and it was:

RESOLVED: That:

- a) **the report of the Corporate Director of Finance for the calculation of the Council Tax Base and the Business Rates Forecast, be approved;**
- b) **in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the London Borough of Hillingdon as its Council Tax Base for 2016/17 shall be 97,220; and**
- c) **the Corporate Director of Finance be authorised to submit the 2017/18 NNDR1 return to the Department of Communities & Local Government (CLG) and the Greater London Authority (GLA).**

40. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (*Agenda Item 8*)

8.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR GILHAM TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

"Could the Leader of the Council update Members on the current situation regarding the legal challenge against the Government's decision to expand Heathrow Airport?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that, as the Council was aware, a judicial review request had been issued in the High Court in December on two grounds: that the wrong legal test had been applied in relation to air quality; and that residents had a legitimate expectation that there would be no expansion at Heathrow unless the Government had reneged on repeated promises that there would be no third runway. Government lawyers had applied to strike out the judicial review claim on the basis that it was premature and could only be lodged once the Government had completed the national policy statement process which would start in January 2017. This statement was required under the Planning Act 2008 to consider all relevant facts appertaining to a proposed major development. In effect, the Government had made the decision and would now go through due process to justify that decision and the lawyers were arguing that the Council could not challenge the decision that had already been made until the Government had had a chance to justify it. The Government lawyers appeared to have no response to the challenge on air quality.

Two days had been set aside to hear the strike out claim but all evidence had been given in one day and it was expected that judgement would be handed down within the next 7-10 days. The Government lawyers had already indicated that they would appeal the decision if their application was not successful, going on to the Court of Appeal and then the Supreme Court. They seemed to think that they would be able to intimidate the Council with the threat of further legal fees but were mistaken as the authority had made a commitment to fight this injustice through the court process for as long as it took to defend the health and wellbeing of the Borough's residents, community and environment.

Whilst the Government and Heathrow were spending millions of pounds on their campaign, the Council believed that what the Government was doing was illegal and no amount of money bought the right to break the law in this country. Mr Zac Goldsmith, a man of sincerity and integrity with an immense amount of knowledge about the issues and an enviable record of opposing expansion at Heathrow, had agreed to take a supporting role in the Council's campaign and the legal challenge. Mr Goldsmith had been supportive on this issue over many years, putting his passion to protect the environment and the health and wellbeing of people above narrow party politics, and would be championing the Council's campaign with the media.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Gilham asked whether Councillor Puddifoot could give his view of the Back Heathrow campaign complaining about this democratically elected Council's use of council funds to protect the residents and the environment.

Councillor Puddifoot noted that the Council was fortunate to have such a poor performing support group such as Back Heathrow acting for Heathrow Airport Limited. Back Heathrow felt that it was inappropriate for the Council to have, between January 2015 and August 2016, spent £154,219 on its campaign to stop expansion at Heathrow. This sum included £50k to assist HACAN and £45,800 to support the Stop Heathrow Expansion Group. Since its launch in September 2013, despite spending a fortune on literature, publications and mailshots, Back Heathrow's figures showed that they had managed to find just over 100k people in a vast area surrounding the airport to support expansion.

Heathrow Airport Limited and its associates had spent tens of millions of pounds on its expansion campaign, including well over £1m on propping up Back Heathrow as its

mouthpiece. If this were not true, they would say so but were too embarrassed to be open and honest about the financial support given. Without honesty and openness, they had no credibility which was why they would not be taken seriously as anything other than the public relations arm of Heathrow.

On the subject of finance, in the four years to January 2016, Heathrow Airport Limited had paid its shareholders £2.1bn. As such, it was no wonder that the airport's foreign owners wanted it expanded as, for them, it was a cash cow. In the ten years to January 2016, only £24m had been paid in UK corporate tax, an average of £2.4m per year. Since July 2015, when the Government announced the Heathrow expansion, it had spend £3.8m of taxpayers' money trying to take the scheme forward. It was expected that this figure would rise dramatically. In the ten years since January 2007, after deducting £170k contributed by other councils, Hillingdon had utilised £587,078 of Council funds to fight pro expansion. This figure averaged at £58,708 per year and amounted to 60p per year for each household or 20p per year for each resident.

Councillor Puddifoot advised that the Council would continue to provide the funding, sincerity and integrity necessary to both defend and represent Hillingdon residents for however long it took to win the battle.

8.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES - COUNCILLOR BIANCO:

"As the Housing Maintenance Department is aware many parts of the walk ways in both Austin Road and Silverdale Road are in a poor state, as is the quality of the lighting in the same area. It is only a matter of time before an accident takes place.

"Could the Cabinet Member please inform Members what action is proposed to remedy the situation, be it in the short term whilst this inclement weather is upon us, making it safe for residents, particularly the elderly and those with disabilities who are less steady on their feet?"

Councillor Bianco advised that Carriageway and Pavement condition surveys only included footways and pavements adjacent to carriageways/roads. These surveys did not include footpaths in between houses or across grassed areas which would be inspected by Highways upon request by Housing/Green Spaces or as a result of a Members' Enquiry and any subsequent repairs would be funded from Housing Revenue Account budget.

A recent search of Members' Enquiries showed that Councillor Allen had not reported any of the issues raised in this question which would normally have been the correct way to report these concerns. However, in a bid to assist Councillor Allen, Councillor Bianco had requested that Highways inspect the areas referred to and report the findings back to him so that action could be taken if required.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Allen advised that she was aware that Members' Enquiries on this subject had been submitted by another Member of her Group and asked when was the last time that Councillors had stepped foot in Austin Road. Councillor Bianco advised that he was aware that Councillors D Mills and Corthorne had visited Austin Road in the last six months.

8.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR FLYNN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COUNCILLOR

SIMMONDS

"Can the Cabinet Member please update the Council on the consultation regarding the future of Hillingdon's Children's Centre programme?"

Councillor Simmonds advised that his response to this question would also apply to Mr Waters' public question. It was recognised that Children's Centres were host to a number of universal services including baby clinics. As most Members would be aware from the consultation that was underway, Hillingdon had 18 Children's Centres which had been set up under the last Labour Government under the Sure Start programme.

The Centres, at the time, had been provided with generous capital funding and very tight deadlines by which they had to be built and opened. Hillingdon Council had delivered on this programme, as had many parts of the country. However, the Centres had lacked sustained revenue funding to ensure that these buildings had plenty going on within them to ensure day to day service delivery. This lack of ongoing revenue funding, combined with emerging evidence which was being examined at national and local level, had raised questions about whether the current configuration of Children's Centres was reaching the most vulnerable children and families and had prompted the Government and councils to look again at the service model.

The proposals that were currently under consultation aimed to allow the service to look towards a more sustainable future and, like the Music Service and the Council's libraries, the Borough needed to live within its means and apply its experience of reducing costs and sustaining services to its Children's Centres. The Council's experience had been that great efficiencies could be achieved whilst expanding the offer, in many cases, to residents and this was the aim for Children's Centres.

Councillor Simmonds referred Members to the Leader's speech that he gave at the staff roadshow in 2012 when he had advised that a lot of hard work and the Business Improvement Delivery (BID) programme would help the Council to achieve an increased degree of efficiency whilst reaching all residents. BID fundamentally reshaped the way that the Council delivered and operated services and was currently the most important project in the Hillingdon Improvement Programme. The pledge had been given that, when embarking on such an ambitious programme that would cover every area of Council activity, it was absolutely essential that there was a consistency of approach in how service delivery was transformed. The process had to be started with no preconceptions or 'holy cows'.

Hillingdon was one Council: it was not Social Services, education, central services, housing or the environment. It needed to be recognised that not all managers, senior managers or directors would deliver the BID programme in the same way and, whilst financial savings were a very important aspect of what BID achieved, it also enabled the Council to look at the operational procedures and the structure of each area of activity to both maintain and improve services to residents.

In terms of what the Government expected from the Council, Councillor Simmonds drew Members' attention to the Ofsted Social Care report 2016. Key things identified in high performing local authorities included leaders making decisions to invest in, and reduce spending on, programmes based on what had been shown to work. Because investment was linked to better outcomes, the more costly problems were prevented, freeing up resources for further investment. This was what was at the heart of the BID programme. The Council needed to ensure that every one of its services

reached the most vulnerable children that they were intended to serve.

The principal source of funding for Children's Centres was the Government's Early Intervention Grant (EIG). There had been a lot a political debate about the future of Children's Centres across the country as the EIG had disappeared in its entirety in 2013. At that point, some of the money had been transferred into the Business Rates allowance given to the Council and the remainder had been put into the Dedicated Schools Grant which funded the offer of free care for vulnerable two year olds provided by a wide range of private and Council nurseries within the Borough. Although the money was being put to good use, the consequence of this change meant that the Council had a significantly reduced resource base from which to support the Centres. Consideration needed to be given to whether a reduction in management overheads and reducing some of the costs would ensure that the money got much closer to the front line.

If the Council brought the services back in house, staff would be employed by the Council. This would mean that, in the short and medium term, staff at the Children's Centres would remain the same. However, Hillingdon needed to be confident that this was a model that other councils had looked at and found to be effective. The proposed delivery model had been found to be effective and adopted in neighbouring boroughs. Harrow had reduced its Children's Centres from 16 to 10 and, in order to sustain the service to residents, had now implemented the hub model that Hillingdon was looking at resulting in the reach of the Centres significantly improving. Hounslow had implemented the same model after deciding to reduce from 18 to 5 Children's Centres in December 2015 with some other centres operating in a slightly different way and four of the buildings being handed over to schools for them to use as they chose (potentially as nurseries). Councillor Simmonds noted that, although these were not bad uses of the facilities, this was absolutely not the core purpose of Children's Centres.

The Council was focussed on the outcomes that it needed to achieve. There were still too many children growing up in Hillingdon who could have been identified earlier by Children's Centres to partners in the NHS and schools. These children ended up going into care or perhaps having different outcomes than the child or their family would have wanted and didn't represent the Council's ambitions for them. Parents want their children to have access to the very best and, as a Council that aspired to ensure that every child was reached, it should not just be those who already engaged with the system, but also the most vulnerable children that lived on traveller sites, whose families may only be briefly resident in the Borough or who had unrecognised special educational needs because their parents might not have the language skills to engage with the system. These were the children and families that Children's Centres had to focus on to reduce costs but also because it was the right thing to do. This had been what laid behind the consultation and the proposals that the Council had put forward.

There was no supplementary question.

8.4 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR NELSON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES - COUNCILLOR BIANCO:

"Many councils have recently chosen to scrap burial fees for infants and children. In contrast Hillingdon, in its draft budget for 2017/18, has proposed raising these fees by between 6 and 12% (depending on the type of burial). Why has Hillingdon chosen not to alleviate this unexpected financial burden on families experiencing an

excruciatingly painful time in their lives?"

Councillor Bianco advised that child mortality in Hillingdon was low and, in 2015, the Council had made the decision to provide cremations for under 18 years of age at no charge, recognising this painful time in families' lives. However, there had always been a fee for infant burials as they occupied a grave space, which had to be prepared and then maintained into the future. The Council's fees had been benchmarked at 90% of the average charged by neighbouring boroughs with Brent, Harrow, Ealing, Hounslow, Hendon, Richmond and North Watford (Hertfordshire) all still charging for infant burials.

As part of the Social Fund, a Funeral Payment was also available to help pay for a funeral for those on a low income. The Council's Bereavement Services staff knew the impact a sudden infant death could have on families and received specialist training to help explain the complex thoughts and feelings of grief as well as the practicalities of an infant bereavement.

There was no supplementary question.

8.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR LAVERY TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

"Would the Leader of the Council confirm that Hillingdon Council will oppose the request made by Ealing Council to the Mayor of London that RAF Northolt be considered as a site on which to build 20,000 new homes?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that the Mayor of London had started a review of the London Plan, a key part of which would be a review of the boroughwide housing targets to meet identified housing needs. Large sites had been identified through a desktop study and through a call for sites process which took place in June 2016, giving an unrestricted opportunity for individuals and organisations to submit sites for consideration for development. Ealing Council, without any reference to Hillingdon, had put forward RAF Northolt as a site with the potential to deliver 20,000 homes. The Council had only become aware of this just prior to Christmas. When asked why this had been done, an Ealing representative had said that, despite its housing trajectory, Ealing would struggle to meet assessors' needs in the future and this site would help in the long term to address the housing needs of West London.

It had further been commented that the closure of RAF Northolt would help ensure that Heathrow mitigated some of its environmental impacts by sharing the pain with amended flight paths. Although Heathrow was not yet willing to announce where the new flight paths would be, Ealing had suggested that they would be coming over Northolt. Ealing Council had been supportive of Heathrow expansion and it was correct to say that, apart from military aircraft movements, no civil aircraft would be able to use Northolt which would be overflown by Heathrow aircraft going in and out.

With regard to providing housing for West London, Ealing had not considered traffic movements, the need for new infrastructure, basic utilities, and the social infrastructure such as healthcare provision. A development of this scale would be expected to accommodate between 45k-60k residents. The lower of these estimates would include around 13k children who would require a school place and there would be a need for 30-40 new GPs. Although living in Hillingdon might look very attractive to those in other London boroughs, this would not be the case if the Borough was involved in massive overdevelopment of this kind. It was anticipated that this would be revisited in the coming year. For now, the Ward Councillors representing the

Ruislip and Hillingdon areas, which would be massively affected, should assure their residents that the Council would robustly oppose this suggestion if it was not rejected by the Mayor of London.

There was no supplementary question.

41. **MOTIONS** (*Agenda Item 9*)

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR SWEETING

Councillor Sweeting moved, and Councillor Nelson seconded, the following motion:

That, as studies have recently shown that services to support the youngest are critically important to their lives and development and often affect their need, or otherwise, for services in Adult Life, this Council confirms its support to its youngest residents in their earliest years including the very valued services provided by the borough's Children Centres. In view of the pressure on budgets, this Council will seek funding from all available sources, including central government, in order to protect these services for its youngest residents.

Councillor Simmonds moved, and Councillor Higgins seconded, an amendment to replace all words after "In view of the pressure on budgets,..." with "and the significant reductions since 2010 in Government funding for children's centres, Council supports the action being taken to place the centres on a more sustainable footing by bringing services in-house in order to seek efficiencies while ensuring support for those in need".

Following debate (Councillors Allen, Dheer, Khatra, Lakhmana, Money, Nelson and Sweeting), the amended motion was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting for: The Mayor (Councillor Hensley), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Melvin), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Burrows, Chamdal, Chapman, G Cooper, J Cooper, Corthorne, Crowe, Dann, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Graham, Haggar, Higgins, Jackson, Kauffman, Kelly, Lavery, Lewis, Markham, D Mills, R Mills, Morgan, O'Brien, Palmer, Puddifoot, Riley, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds, Stead, White and Yarrow.

Those voting against: Councillors Allen, Birah, Burles, Curling, Dheer, Dhillon, Dhot, Duncan, East, Gardner, Garg, Jarjussey, Khatra, Khursheed, Lakhmana, Money, Morse, Nelson, Oswell, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

Those abstaining: None.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and it was:

RESOLVED: **That, as studies have recently shown that services to support the youngest are critically important to their lives and development and often affect their need, or otherwise, for services in Adult Life, this Council confirms its support to its youngest residents in their earliest years including the very valued services provided by the borough's Children Centres. In view of the pressure on budgets and the significant reductions since 2010 in Government funding for children's centres, Council supports the action being taken to place the centres on a more sustainable footing by bringing services in-house in order to seek efficiencies while ensuring support for those in need.**

9.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DUNCAN

Councillor Duncan moved, and Councillor Allen seconded, the following motion:

That this Council wishes to support Hillingdon's vulnerable adults and will, therefore, ensure that, where it is making a vulnerable adult homeless, an effective in-house process exists to ensure appropriate support is given to securing alternative housing for the vulnerable adult without the need to resort to the time, expense and stress of court action. Further that when vulnerable adults are made homeless by non-Council landlords, that adequate support will be given to securing alternative housing for them.

Following debate (Councillor Sansarpuri), Councillor Corthorne moved, and Councillor Edwards seconded an amendment to:

- delete the words starting on line 2 "where it is making a vulnerable adult homeless" and replace with "where there is a risk of a vulnerable adult being made homeless"; and
- delete the final sentence and replace with a new sentence as follows: "This Council notes the close work between social care and housing departments to find housing solutions for Hillingdon's most vulnerable residents, which includes well established protocols for referrals and also for complex cases and thanks the staff involved in for dealing with such cases in a professional manner."

Following debate (Councillors Duncan and East), the amended motion was put to the vote and carried. Following further debate (Councillor Duncan), the substantive motion was then put to the vote and it was unanimously:

RESOLVED: That this Council wishes to support Hillingdon's vulnerable adults and will, therefore, ensure that where there is a risk of a vulnerable adult being made homeless, an effective in-house process exists to ensure appropriate support is given to securing alternative housing for the vulnerable adult without the need to resort to the time, expense and stress of court action. This Council notes the close work between social care and housing departments to find housing solutions for Hillingdon's most vulnerable residents, which includes well established protocols for referrals and also for complex cases and thanks the staff involved in for dealing with such cases in a professional manner.

9.3 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

Councillor Curling moved, and Councillor Morse seconded, the following motion:

That this Council calls upon the Executive Scrutiny Committee, Corporate Services Policy Overview Committee, or an appropriate working group, to scrutinise the Cabinet Member petition process, especially with regard to the time taken for the decisions made at petition hearings to result in action being taken, and then make recommendations on how the process can be improved so that it delivers more timely outcomes for the residents who organise, sign and present their petitions to Cabinet Members.

Following debate (Councillors Allen, Money and Nelson), the motion was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting for: Councillors Allen, Birah, Burles, Curling, Dheer, Dhillon, Dhot, Duncan, East, Gardner, Garg, Jarjussey, Khatra, Khursheed, Lakhmana, Money,

Morse, Nelson, Oswell, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

Those voting against: The Mayor (Councillor Hensley), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Melvin), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Burrows, Chamdal, Chapman, G Cooper, J Cooper, Corthorne, Crowe, Dann, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Graham, Haggar, Higgins, Jackson, Kauffman, Kelly, Lavery, Lewis, Markham, D Mills, R Mills, Morgan, O'Brien, Palmer, Puddifoot, Riley, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds, White and Yarrow.

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was lost.

9.4 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR EAST

Councillor East moved, and Councillor Khatra seconded, the following motion:

That this Council believes that a decent society provides the necessary resources to care for its older and disabled people. There is a crisis in social care caused by an increasingly ageing population with more complex needs, more demands for social care services and less funding to pay for it. This Council therefore asks the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Health and Housing to jointly write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer to bring forward to the current year the additional Better Care Fund money planned for 2018/19.

Councillor Corthorne moved, and Councillor Puddifoot seconded, an amendment to delete last sentence and replace with the following:

'This Council notes that representations have been made by the Leader of the Council, the Director of Finance and by the Chairman of the Local Government Association to various levels of Government requesting a more adequate level of funding.

The Council resolves to continue to implement the sound financial management and good business practices that has enabled Hillingdon Council to deal with the issue of underfunding so well to date.'

Following debate (Councillor East), the amended motion was put to the vote and carried. The substantive motion was then put to the vote and it was unanimously:

RESOLVED: That this Council believes that a decent society provides the necessary resources to care for its older and disabled people. There is a crisis in social care caused by an increasingly ageing population with more complex needs, more demands for social care services and less funding to pay for it. This Council notes that representations have been made by the Leader of the Council, the Director of Finance and by the Chairman of the Local Government Association to various levels of Government requesting a more adequate level of funding.

The Council resolves to continue to implement the sound financial management and good business practices that has enabled Hillingdon Council to deal with the issue of underfunding so well to date.'

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.39 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Lloyd White, Head of Democratic Services on 01895 556743. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.