

Minutes

COUNCIL

3 November 2016

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 Ian Edwards Richard Mills Jonathan Bianco Tony Eginton John Morgan Mohinder Birah Duncan Flynn John Morse Wayne Bridges Neil Fyfe June Nelson Tony Burles Narinder Garg Susan O'Brien Keith Burrows Dominic Gilham John Oswell Roy Chamdal Raymond Graham Jane Palmer Alan Chapman Becky Haggart Ray Puddifoot MBE George Cooper Henry Higgins John Riley Judith Cooper Patricia Jackson Scott Seaman-Digby Philip Corthorne Phoday Jarjussey David Simmonds CBE Peter Curling Judy Kelly Jagjit Singh Catherine Dann Manjit Khatra Brian Stead Peter Davis Mo Khursheed Jan Sweeting Nick Denys Kuldeep Lakhmana Michael White Kanwal Dheer Eddie Lavery David Yarrow Jazz Dhillon Richard Lewis</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Fran Beasley, Jean Palmer, Paul Whaymand, Tony Zaman, Raj Alagh, Lloyd White, Mark Braddock, Morgan Einon, Beth Rainey and Nikki O'Halloran</p>
	<p>The Mayor announced the death of Mr John A Watts who had served as Leader of the Council between 1978 and 1984. Those present observed a one minute silence.</p>
25.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Crowe, Dhot, East, Gardner, Kauffman, Money and Sansarpuri.</p>
26.	<p>MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
27.	<p>MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Mayor advised that he had had the privilege of awarding the Legion of Honour to Mr Peter Chesney, now aged 94, who had landed at Normandy on D Day +4.</p>

The Mayor had attended the opening of Northwood School which he believed to be a first class build with first class design. He had also attended the opening of the boathouse at Ruislip Lido.

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

5.1 QUESTION FROM MR DAVID BISHOP OF LICHFIELD ROAD, NORTHWOOD HILLS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS

"Can the Cabinet Member please confirm whether or not Hillingdon Borough intend to implement the proposal advertised in June, to remove the four parking bays in Joel Street, Northwood Hills, designated specifically for disabled blue badge holders and replace them with just one parking bay outside Namaste Lounge?"

Councillor Burrows advised that, when the Council set out to consider any changes of this nature, it was legally obliged to undertake a formal consultation. Consideration then had to be given to the feedback it received, especially any objections. This issue had arisen following a request from residents in Northwood Hills to review the location of the existing motorcycle parking space as well as the status of the eight dedicated disabled parking bays in the town centre, on the basis that perhaps the disabled bays weren't being used very much.

The Council had explored whether there could be a better layout and perhaps a change to the balance of the different types of parking bays between 'disabled' and regular 'pay and display'. On the face of it, the idea seemed at least worthy of investigation and so an advertisement had been placed over the summer based on options presented by officers to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.

Based on the feedback received during the consultation, Councillor Burrows had taken the decision not to reduce the overall number of disabled parking bays in the town centre. However, he had approved some minor alterations to the parking arrangements outside the Namaste Lounge, which included the introduction of an additional disabled parking bay there, alongside a new motorcycle bay. Councillor Burrows stressed that this work would be undertaken in a way which would not change the overall disabled bay parking provision in Joel Street. He suggested that Mr Bishop contact the Ward Councillors to discuss burning issues in future as this would generally be quicker than waiting to submit a question to Council.

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

i) Urgent Implementation of Decisions

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

RESOLVED: That the urgency decisions detailed in the report be noted.

(ii) Waiver of 6 Month Councillor Attendance Rule (Sec.85 Local Government Act 1972)

Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business. Councillor Oswell extended the best wishes of the Labour Group to Councillor Kauffman and his family. It was:

RESOLVED: That:

- a) the request to extend Councillor Kauffman's period of office beyond the six month period of non-attendance provided for within Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds of ill-health, be approved.
- b) the extension of time be for a further 6 month period, to expire on 7 July 2017.

(iii) Amendment to Council Constitution - Part 5(F), Council Petition Scheme

Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. Following debate (Councillors Eginton, Nelson and Sweeting), it was:

RESOLVED: That Part 5(f) of the Constitution, the Hillingdon Council Petition Scheme, be amended to remove the definition of a valid signatory as including those people who 'work' and / or 'study' in the Borough.

30. ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION TO PROTECT STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LAND WITHIN THE BOROUGH (*Agenda Item 7*)

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

RESOLVED: That:

- 1) officers be instructed to prepare an Article 4 D-irection withdrawing permitted development rights for office and light industrial floor-space within the identified strategic locations.
- 2) officers be authorised to implement the Article 4 Direction (taking into account the statutory notification period to avoid compensation), such Direction to have effect after 12 months prior notice has been given.

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

8.6 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DAVIS TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

"Would the Leader of the Council please provide an update on the position of the Conservative administration in Hillingdon in relation to proposed airport expansion in the South of England?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that, in 2010, as part of a coalition of councils and environmental groups, the Council had been successful in preventing the then Labour Government from pursuing expansion at Heathrow. The basis of the legal judgement then had been that the airport was breaking air quality laws and had no viable plans to correct this at that time or in the future. The High Court Judge described expansion at Heathrow as untenable in law and common sense, and the inability of the airport to deal with the air quality legislation was a show stopper with regard to expansion.

Very little had changed over the last six years. Heathrow Airport Limited had spent millions of pounds on publicity and the 'Back Heathrow' campaign and yet residents

and employees were still subjected to unacceptable air quality and noise pollution. The Davis Commission's own forecast on air quality confirmed that nitrogen dioxide pollution levels at Heathrow were currently illegal and in some locations would get worse with a third runway. Defra had stated that, even without a third runway, it was not expected that Heathrow would be able to comply with EU nitrogen dioxide pollution limits by 2025.

At the last Council meeting, Councillor Puddifoot had said that the Commission's conclusion that the detrimental health impact of noise disturbance and poor air quality should be offset by more people being able to benefit from a foreign holiday would be laughable if it were not so serious. Councillor Puddifoot believed that the Davis Commission had quickly dismissed the idea of a modern four runway airport in the Thames Estuary (with much of its electricity created by tidal waters) as it was a bit too visionary and ambitious. In July 2015, the Commission had concluded that either Heathrow or Gatwick should be expanded with the caveat that Heathrow had to resolve the air quality and noise issues.

In anticipation of the Government announcement on airport expansion, at the Council meeting in September 2016, the Leader had moved a motion in relation to the proposals and had given the facts and figures attributable to the two main options. The Heathrow Airport Limited option would see the loss of 1,072 homes, compared to 202 at Gatwick. 3,750 homes would be affected by blight compared to 200 at Gatwick. A loss of 431 hectares of green belt compared to 9.2 hectares at Gatwick. A loss of 61 hectares of recreation or public open space compared to 4.9 hectares at Gatwick. An additional 157,900 people affected by noise compared to 18,200 at Gatwick. An additional 108 schools affected by noise, compared to 14 at Gatwick.

Heathrow already had a massive noise footprint with about 725,000 people already exposed to noise above the recommended noise limit and the third runway would give Heathrow a noise pollution record that was worse than that of the top five European airports put together. The Conventional Treasury Forecasting model predicted growth of between £33.6bn and £54.8bn in the UK economy with a third runway at Heathrow, compared to between £27.2bn and £47.1bn at an expanded Gatwick. If the cost to the taxpayer of around £15bn for the work on the M4 and M25 was deducted, Gatwick would be economically the best option by far. The Government was about to choose between Gatwick and Heathrow and so expansion would happen somewhere. For elected representatives of those affected in Hillingdon, the decision to put residents first was both obvious and overwhelming. Not surprisingly, the motion had been carried with every Conservative Councillor present voting for it. What was both surprising and disappointing was that all of the Labour Councillors present had not supported the motion and had, instead, abstained. However, the Council would fight the third runway proposal with a robust legal challenge at the same time as saying that there was a viable alternative in Gatwick.

A few weeks ago, ahead of the anticipated decision, the legal team retained by Hillingdon, Wandsworth, Richmond and Windsor & Maidenhead councils (who had now been joined by Greenpeace) issued a pre action letter under the judicial review pre action protocol to the Secretary of State for Transport, reminding him of the 2010 judgement and stating that if the Secretary of State did not agree to rule out Heathrow or alternatively commit to further and fuller public consultation in advance of any different decision, legal proceedings would be issued. The Government had delayed announcing the decision by one week and had stated that this would now be a statement of preference as the next stage in moving from a short listing process to a location specific national policy statement, which would be subject to public scrutiny.

The legal team would be meeting on 11 November 2016 to consider the most effective legal route. Consideration would also be given to the effect on the councils' case following the decision yesterday in the High Court as a result of the judicial review challenge fought by ClientEarth against the manner in which Defra had dealt with quality planning. The judge had found that Defra had failed to deal properly with its quality planning, including setting what appeared to be arbitrary compliance dates and adopting too optimistic a model for future emissions.

It was disappointing that, six years on, there was a proposed expansion scheme at Heathrow that was still untenable in law and common sense. Councillor Puddifoot believed that Hillingdon residents deserved better than that and the people of London and the surrounding counties also deserved better. The Conservative administration had made it clear to the Government that it was bad enough that Heathrow continued to break the law relating to air quality and, unless they could demonstrate on a no ifs or buts basis that this could be resolved, it would again take the issue as far as required through the legal system.

Councillor Puddifoot had been confident in 2010 that the Council would win this battle, and he was even more confident that the Council would win it again. The Leader assured the West Drayton residents present in the Chamber of the Council's continued support.

There was no supplementary question.

8.4 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR OSWELL TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH & WELLBEING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:

"Does the Cabinet Member agree with the LGA that the government should re-think "pay to stay" before burdening Hillingdon's hard working families?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that the provision of social housing for rent represented a very significant investment of public funds. Making sure that this investment was targeted towards those in greatest need was therefore essential. However, there were concerns about Pay to Stay as it appeared to miss the point. On the face of it, Councillor Corthorne did not believe that it was unreasonable to ask people to pay a higher level of rent once their income crossed a given threshold due to a change in circumstances. That said, he queried whether it was acceptable to have a situation where there were long term tenants in social lets whose earnings levels meant that they might reasonably be expected to access market housing at the expense of others for whom market housing costs were out of reach.

The obligations on local authorities to deliver Pay to Stay were onerous, complex and unwieldy - wholly out of proportion to the scale of the problem and a resource intensive distraction at a time when authorities faced some serious housing pressures. Even at this stage, there had been no clarity about how local authorities would be able to access this information and what powers they might have to insist upon its provision. This process would involve over ten thousand households.

Any proceeds would go straight to the Treasury, with authorities able to keep a sum deemed appropriate by the Government to defray these costs if they were lucky. This also assumed that sufficient funds would be raised to cover the costs, as that in itself had been called into question as it was unlikely that there would be a large number.

The Cabinet Member believed that the Council's five year fixed term tenancies offered

a far more effective way of addressing the issue and helped make the most of the authority's housing stock which, alongside the ten year eligibility criteria, enabled the Council to put its residents first.

The reviews, which took place towards the end of tenancies, enabled the Council to assess whether the tenancies should be renewed and, of course, income was one factor that was considered.

Councillor Corthorne advised that he supported the calls for a rethink on Pay to Stay because it was not currently fit for purpose. The details were being finalised but the Council would not be implementing the scheme on the current terms.

There was no supplementary question.

8.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMDAL TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION - COUNCILLOR D.MILLS:

"Would the Cabinet Member please inform Council, if it is intended that Holocaust Memorial Day (27th January 2017) will be commemorated in Hillingdon?"

Councillor D Mills advised that the Council intended to mark the event in January 2017. A speaker (an author and historian) who had been involved in the event had been provisionally booked. Consideration would be given to holding a minute silence to commemorate the event.

There was no supplementary question.

8.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR EAST (AND POSED BY COUNCILLOR DUNCAN) TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH & WELLBEING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:

"On 3 October 2016 there were 592 Hillingdon families in bed and breakfast or other temporary accommodation. Can the Cabinet Member detail how many of these families have been in bed and breakfast for more than 6 weeks?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that, as in most local authorities in London and the South East, there was a high demand from residents for affordable housing in Hillingdon, including homeless families. Typically, 1,200 homeless households presented to the Council each year seeking assistance, of which approximately half were as a result of eviction from their private rented accommodation.

The Council worked closely with landlords and tenants to prevent homelessness and would rigorously challenge landlords to prevent eviction where possible. The Council actively offered advice and direct assistance to tenants to secure suitable, alternative accommodation in the private rented sector, including offering rent in advance and deposit schemes, on a case by case basis. This approach had continued to be successful for many families facing homelessness. There were occasions where it was necessary to place families into emergency temporary accommodation, such as bed and breakfast. During the first week of October 2016, 12 families had been living in non self contained B&B accommodation for six weeks or more. Officers had worked hard to minimise this but it was dependent on how quickly alternative accommodation became available.

Of the 12 households, three had since been permanently housed, one had been

offered and refused permanent accommodation and had therefore been discharged, one had been found intentionally homeless and three families were now living in self-contained temporary accommodation. Four families remained in bed and breakfast pending further work to secure alternative accommodation.

Despite all of the challenges, the swift action taken by the Council to prevent homelessness meant that Hillingdon had consistently fewer homeless families needing to live in temporary accommodation compared to many other London boroughs. Using data to 31 March 2016, the average number of households living in temporary accommodation across London boroughs was generally twice as high when compared to Hillingdon.

Councillor Corthorne acknowledged the challenging work that officers had undertaken in very difficult circumstances.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Duncan asked how many of the 12 families had been rotated from other bed and breakfast premises.

Councillor Corthorne advised that he would provide a written response to the supplementary question.

N.B. The written response was subsequently provided as follows:

Of the 12 households with children, 7 had no previous B&B tenancy, each came from the private rented sector (i.e., 7 did not have a previous B&B placement immediately prior to being placed).

4 households had one previous placement in B&B accommodation. Two of these had experienced a short-term stay prior to their current placement (one for 3 days at their previous B&B accommodation and one other for 4 days).

1 household had experienced stays at 2 other B&B placements. Wherever possible officers seek to minimise B&B placement moves, but subject to day to day demands for accommodation, sometimes this is unavoidable in an emergency homeless situation.

8.8 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR PALMER TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

"Would the Leader of the Council please provide an update on the position of the Conservative administration in Hillingdon in relation to the proposed High Speed 2 rail scheme?"

Councillor Puddifoot was aware that politicians and senior civil servants found it difficult to reverse a poor decision. In the case of High Speed 2, he believed that the public would genuinely appreciate a common sense approach. It had been known for years that the project had no business case. In 2013, Treasury officials had said that the project, which had started with a budget of £30bn which then rose to £42bn, was at £72bn and at high risk of not delivering value for money. In the same year, the National Audit Office had issued a devastating statement advising that officials were using fragile numbers, out of date data and had made assumptions that did not affect real life. Hillingdon had experienced this first hand in its dealings with High Speed 2 officials and the Department of Transport. Councillor Puddifoot had written to the Secretary of State for Transport in September 2016 stating that he regretted having to inform him that the quality of technical and financial information provided by High

Speed 2 would not be accepted as adequate for a decision on a major project in Hillingdon, let alone for a national project of this scale. The Leader found this disappointing and frustrating. He had been responding to the decision to proceed with the viaduct over the lakes in Harefield used by Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre (HOAC) rather than tunnelling under it.

The costs had been examined by High Speed 2 officials who maintained that the tunnel option could cost up to £273m more than a viaduct. Costings produced by the professional team acting for the Council had accepted that the tunnel would cost more in purely construction costs (between £59m and £81m) but that this would reduce to between £44m and £66m if social and economic costs were included.

On 19 October 2016, Chris Grayling MP, Secretary of State for Transport, had written to Nick Hurd MP advising that there would not be a tunnel under the HOAC lake as it would be too expensive. Given the history of High Speed 2 with regard to costings, this had not been a surprise. However, what was a surprise was that on the same day, he had written to the HOAC Chair of Trustees advising that he could no longer support the move of HOAC to Denham Quarry as High Speed 2 now considered that it would cost £55m rather than the original £26m estimation. As such, Councillor Puddifoot found it difficult to understand how High Speed 2 could have confidently advised the Tunnel Working Group in August that it would cost £26.5m to relocate HOAC. In less than three months, and with no explanation, this figure had doubled to £55m. These were the same officials who had calculated the viaduct costs.

However, if the Council's costings for the viaduct were correct (i.e. costing an average of £55m more than the viaduct), Councillor Puddifoot queried why HOAC could not be left where it was and save the £55m that it would cost to move them as this would then cover the difference between the tunnel and the viaduct.

Unlike the proposed third runway, this railway project was progressing via the Hybrid Parliamentary process which protected such decisions from scrutiny in the courts. The next and final stage in the process would be petitions heard by the House of Lords' Select Committee which was likely to take place on 17 November 2016. The Council would not be permitted to petition on the tunnel option but would provide support to residents' groups and HOAC who would probably cease to exist if they could not be relocated.

The Council would continue to work with HOAC and the residents' groups opposed to this vanity project but could only hope that, at some stage before too much public money was wasted, common sense prevailed. Councillor Puddifoot advised that there were far more pressing needs for public funding such as the NHS, social care and transport infrastructure projects. He hoped that the Government would see sense and recognise this.

There was no supplementary question.

8.9 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION - COUNCILLOR D.MILLS:

"Given that we are told that only one in eight persons with disabilities receives the necessary support to gain employment does the Administration support the LGA's call for Local Authorities to be given the funding, power and responsibility of helping the most disadvantaged into work through the work and health programme?"

Councillor D Mills advised that the last Government spending review, carried out in 2015, included a commitment that the Mayor of London, together with London Councils, would jointly commission employment support for those who were very long term unemployed, had health conditions or disabilities to enable them to re-enter the workplace. Discussions with the Department of Work and Pensions continued at the Mayor of London and London Councils level and, therefore, it was not appropriate at this stage to draw conclusions as to how best Hillingdon should respond. However, Councillor D Mills assured Members that, whatever arrangements were decided, the Council would do its best to ensure that these met the needs of Hillingdon residents.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Allen suggested that one size of training would not fit all and asked if assurance could be given that the Council would listen to individuals and the feedback from doctors and that no sanctions would be imposed on those who did not use the service.

In response, Councillor D Mills advised that, without knowing the outcome of the discussions, it would be impossible to provide a full answer. Notwithstanding those discussions, he assured those present that action was already being taken by the Council to support individuals back to work. Hillingdon was actively involved with the West London Mental Health Employment trailblazer to support 152 residents to date. Work was also being undertaken in conjunction with Hillingdon Mind and the Big Lottery Fund to provide assistance to those that needed extra support. Great work had been undertaken at the Rural Activities Garden Centre through the provision of work experience and gardening skills for a range of residents with learning disabilities. Support was being provided to Recycle a Bike, a not for profit organisation that had recently opened a new workshop in Fassnidge Park, to help individuals with a disability back to work.

Councillor D Mills reiterated that the Council looked forward to a scheme that would enable it to specifically support Hillingdon residents rather than one which would be too generic.

8.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR MORGAN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS:

"As the London Borough of Hillingdon decided, in a ground breaking move, to install CCTV safety cameras outside school entrances, can the Cabinet Member confirm, that every school in our Borough that has the yellow 'School Keep Clear' markings, now has at least 1 safety camera installed and the camera is in operation?"

Councillor Burrows advised that the Council had decided to install CCTV safety cameras outside every school entrance in the Borough that had yellow 'School Keep Clear' markings. Keeping these areas clear of illegally parked vehicles had helped to improve road safety for children by allowing an unrestricted view for approaching motorists and for children waiting to cross the road.

Councillor Burrows was pleased to confirm that every school in Hillingdon that had yellow 'School Keep Clear' markings now had at least one safety camera installed and operational.

There was no supplementary question.

8.10 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DHILLON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH & WELLBEING -

COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:

"The Local Government Association has said that the sugar levy on soft drinks should be administered by councils, who are best placed to work with schools and communities to fight childhood obesity. What would Hillingdon do with the money raised through the sugar levy?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that there would be no certainty that any income would be received by local authorities from this levy. Although the LGA had been discussing the issue with the Government in terms of who should administer it and how, there had been some suggestion that beneficiaries could include schools through a school sports premium and breakfast clubs. Furthermore, the sugar levy was seen as a measure to influence the behaviour of producers to encourage them to reduce the sugar content in products and to move consumers towards healthier alternatives.

Councillor Corthorne saw this as an opportunity to provide various interventions to improve the health of the proportion of the population that carried excess weight. The Council had already invested in an adult weight management pilot programme earlier in the year and Mind, Exercise, Nutrition, Do It! programmes. It was suggested that revenue from the levy could be used to expand these programmes. Other areas which could benefit included the Healthy Catering Commitment in fast food outlets and working with partners in schools, hospitals and the Clinical Commissioning Group. There would be time to develop this as the income position became clearer and it was noted that the Council would not have any further information until 18 April 2017 at the earliest.

There was no supplementary question.

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

"Would the Cabinet Member please inform us all whether the Council was successful in the recent annual awards of new Green Flags?"

Councillor Bianco advised that Pinn Meadows (of which Kings College formed a part) had recently received a Green Flag. It was suggested that Members encourage their residents to form Park Friends groups to lobby for a Green Flag. This year, the Borough had been awarded eight new Green Flags including one at the garden adjacent to the Polish War Memorial. Hillingdon now had a total of 42 Green Flags across the Borough which was more than any other area in the world.

Councillor Bianco noted that Hillingdon had also recently won its category in the RHS London in Bloom competition and so would be entering, once again, in the Britain in Bloom competition. He advised that looking after open spaces was just as important as putting residents first and was something that was appreciated by residents. Councillor Bianco thanked local residents and Council officers who had put a lot of hard work into improving the Borough.

There was no supplementary question.

8.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH & WELLBEING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:

"Can the Cabinet Member give an update as to how the Council responded during the recent BT Cable issue ensuring that all our vulnerable residents were kept safe and protected?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that the major BT failure had first been reported very early on Wednesday 19 October 2016. Council staff had started work on urgently contacting all TeleCare users, those with social care packages and their next of kin that same day. This action had been taken to check on their immediate welfare and advise them of the situation so that alternative welfare and communication arrangements could be made. Over the following days, it emerged that the fault had not been resolved and it had been suspected that the affected area was much wider than previously thought. Officers began identifying the new wider group of vulnerable residents so that they or their next of kin could be contacted. In the first week, as a result of a call, an elderly resident who had suffered a fall and sustained a head injury had been rescued.

Throughout this period, teams of up to 100 staff in the Contact Centre and Technical Support had worked until late in the evening. Staff from the Reablement Team and the Anti Social Behaviour Team had also assisted. Councillor Corthorne believed that all staff concerned had displayed an extraordinary level of care and commitment to residents and were a credit to the Council. On behalf of the Council, he extended his heartfelt thanks to all staff that had been involved.

There was no supplementary question.

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

Councillor O'Brien moved, and Councillor Morgan seconded, the suspension of Council procedure rules 14.4 to allow ten minutes of speaking time for the mover of the motion only.

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR D.MILLS

Councillor D Mills moved, and Councillor Lavery seconded, the motion as set out on the Order of Business. Following debate (Councillors Curling, Denys, Duducu, Eginton and Morse), the 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, Dann, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Graham, Haggar, Higgins, Jackson, 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, Duncan, Eginton, Garg, Jarjussey, Khatra, Khursheed, Lakhmana, Morse, Nelson, Oswell, Singh and Sweeting.

Those abstaining: None.

RESOLVED: That, following the publication of proposed new parliamentary constituencies by the Boundary Commission for England, Council authorises the Head of Democratic Services in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, to respond with a counter proposal that has at least two of the three constituencies covering the Borough, consisting of solely Hillingdon wards.

Council notes that the Boundary Commission must work within numbers as laid

out by statute but also notes that one of the Commission's key principles is the continuity of wards within existing constituencies. Council therefore proposes that only three Hillingdon wards change rather than the five wards currently suggested.

Council further asks the Boundary Commission to achieve the continuity of wards principle in neighbouring Boroughs of Ealing, Harrow and Brent by creating more constituencies that are wholly contained within the same Borough.

Counter proposal of wards for each constituency:

Northwood & West Harrow		Hayes and Harlington	
Harefield	5,350	Heathrow Villages	6,875
Northwood	7,863	West Drayton	9,733
Northwood Hills	8,306	Yiewsley	8,397
Eastcote & E Ruislip	9,701	Charville	8,421
Pinner	7,825	Barnhill	8,270
Pinner South	7,802	Yeading	8,236
Rayners Lane	7,539	Botwell	9,965
Roxbourne	8,078	Townfield	9,167
Roxeth	7,432	Pinkwell	9,033
West Harrow	7,115		78,097
	77,011		

Uxbridge and Ruislip	
Brunel	7,831
Cavendish	8,433
Hillingdon East	8,481
Manor	8,236
South Ruislip	8,305
Uxbridge North	9,225
Uxbridge South	7,698
Ickenham	7,945
West Ruislip	8,332
	74,486

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.59 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.