



HILLINGDON
LONDON



Cabinet

Councillors in the Cabinet:

Date: THURSDAY, 22 JANUARY
2015

Ray Puddifoot MBE (Chairman)
Leader of the Council

Time: 7.00 PM

David Simmonds (Vice-Chairman)
Deputy Leader / Education & Children's Services

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 6 -
CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH
STREET, UXBRIDGE UB8
1UW

Jonathan Bianco
Finance, Property & Business Services

Keith Burrows
Planning, Transportation & Recycling

Philip Corthorne
Social Services, Health & Housing

**Meeting
Details:** Members of the Public and
Press are welcome to attend
this meeting

Douglas Mills
Community, Commerce & Regeneration

Scott Seaman-Digby
Central Services

This agenda and associated reports can be made available in other languages, in braille, large print or on audio tape on request. Please contact us for further information.

Published: Wednesday, 14 January 2015

Contact: Mark Braddock

Tel: 01895 250470

Fax: 01895 277373

Email: mbraddock@hillington.gov.uk

This Agenda is available online at:
www.hillingdon.gov.uk

Useful information for residents and visitors

Travel and parking

Bus routes 427, U1, U3, U4 and U7 all stop at the Civic Centre. Uxbridge underground station, with the Piccadilly and Metropolitan lines, is a short walk away. Limited parking is available at the Civic Centre. For details on availability and how to book a parking space, please contact Democratic Services. Please enter from the Council's main reception where you will be directed to the Committee Room.

Accessibility

An Induction Loop System is available for use in the various meeting rooms. Please contact us for further information.

Attending, reporting and filming of meetings

Residents and the media are welcomed to attend, and if they wish, report on the public part of the meeting. Any individual or organisation may broadcast, record or film proceedings as long as it does not disrupt proceedings. It is recommended to give advance notice to ensure any particular requirements can be met. The Council will provide a seating area for residents/public, an area for the media and high speed WiFi access to all attending.

A media advisory is available for this meeting on the Council's website and the officer shown on the front of this agenda should be contacted for further information and will be available at the meeting to assist if required.

Emergency procedures

If there is a FIRE, you will hear a continuous alarm. Please follow the signs to the nearest FIRE EXIT and assemble on the Civic Centre forecourt. Lifts must not be used unless instructed by a Fire Marshal or Security Officer.

In the event of a SECURITY INCIDENT, follow instructions issued via the tannoy, a Fire Marshal or a Security Officer. Those unable to evacuate using the stairs, should make their way to the signed refuge locations.



Notice

The London Borough of Hillingdon is a modern, transparent Council and through effective Cabinet governance, it seeks to ensure the decisions it takes are done so in public as far as possible. Much of the business on the agenda for this Cabinet meeting will be open to residents, the wider public and media to attend. However, there will be some business to be considered that contains, for example, confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information. Such business is shown in Part 2 of the agenda and is considered in private. Further information on why this is the case can be sought from Democratic Services.

This is formal notice under The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 to confirm that the Cabinet meeting to be held on:

22 January 2015 at 7pm in Committee Room 6, Civic Centre, Uxbridge

will be held partly in private and that 28 clear days public notice of this meeting has been given. The reason for this is because the private (Part 2) reports listed on the agenda for the meeting will contain either confidential information or exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. A list of the reports which are expected to be considered at this meeting in both public and private are set out above on the agenda, including a number or reason why a particular decision will be taken in private under the categories set out below:

- (1) information relating to any individual
- (2) information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual
- (3) information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- (4) information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
- (5) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
- (6) Information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
- (7) Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

Notice of any urgent business

To ensure greater transparency in decision-making, 28 clear days public notice of the decisions to be made both in public and private has been given for these agenda items. The exceptions to this rule are the urgent business items on the agenda marked *. For these items it was impracticable to give sufficient notice for a variety of business and service reasons. The Chairman of the Executive Scrutiny Committee has been notified in writing about this urgent business.

Notice of any representations received

No representations from the public have been received regarding this meeting.

Agenda

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Declarations of Interest in matters before this meeting
- 3 To approve the public decisions and minutes of the last Cabinet meeting 1 - 16
- 4 To approve the confidential decisions and minutes of an item in the private part of the last Cabinet meeting 17 - 18
- 5 To confirm that the items of business marked Part 1 will be considered in public and that the items of business marked Part 2 in private

Cabinet Reports - Part 1 (Public)

- 6 Hillingdon's response to the Airports Commission's consultation: Appraisal of Short-Listed Airport Expansion Options (Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE & Cllr Keith Burrows) * 19 - 60
- 7 Standards and Quality of Education in Hillingdon - 2013/14 (Cllr David Simmonds) 61 - 74
- 8 Older People's Plan - Update (Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE & Cllr Philip Corthorne) 75 - 88
- 9 Housing Scheme for the Buy Back of Ex-Council Properties (Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE & Cllr Philip Corthorne) * 89 - 94
- 10 Monthly Council Budget Monitoring Report (Cllr Jonathan Bianco) 95 - 146
- 11 School Capital Programme Update (Cllr David Simmonds & Cllr Jonathan Bianco) 147 - 156

Cabinet Reports - Part 2 (Private and Not for Publication)

- | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 12 | Academy Conversion - Ryefield Primary School (Cllr Jonathan Bianco) | 157 - 168 |
| 13 | Contract extension - Housing and floating support services relating to Domestic Violence (Cllr Philip Corthorne) * | 169 - 174 |
| 14 | Voluntary Sector Leases (Cllr Jonathan Bianco) | 175 - 182 |
| 15 | Garage site adjacent to Culvert Lane, Uxbridge (Cllr Jonathan Bianco) * | |

REPORT TO FOLLOW

The reports listed above in Part 2 are not made public because they contains exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

- 16** Any other items the Chairman agrees are relevant or urgent

This page is intentionally left blank

Resident, public & media advisory about attending this meeting + Public Notice

About this Cabinet meeting

This is a meeting of Hillingdon Council's Cabinet, the body responsible for making all the key decisions in the Borough, putting residents first. It is chaired by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Ray Puddifoot MBE. Cabinet meets on a monthly basis.

Attending the Cabinet Meeting

Residents, the Public and the media are very welcome to attend for the public items on the agenda (see below). You will kindly be asked to leave when the Cabinet reaches the private items listed. If you attend Cabinet, you will not be able to directly speak, present to or lobby Councillors during the actual meeting, however, you are welcome to observe and listen to the proceedings quietly.

If there is a particular local matter that you wish to raise with a Cabinet Member, then we recommend you to take part in our well established [Petitions Scheme](#) in which thousands of residents each year participate in. Contact Democratic Services for more information on 01895 250636 or email us at petitions@hillingsdon.gov.uk

Reporting, recording and filming

Any individual resident, member of the Public or representative of a media organisation may live broadcast, audio or video record proceedings, as long as it does not disrupt the meeting on the night. We recommended you give advance notice of this, so we can try and ensure any particular requirements can be met. For the Council's part, we will provide a seating area for residents/public, a media table and high speed WiFi access to those attending. To find out more, the Council's [Policy](#) is available to read and you can contact Democratic Services Team on 01895 250636 for further advice.

What's on the agenda?

The meeting will go through a list of agenda items (reports) to make official decisions on as set out below. The meeting will first start with public items and then move into any private items (called Part 2), where the Public will be asked to leave the room. This is because these items often involve, for example, commercially sensitive information like competitive tender bids.

Agenda Item	Private reason (see public notice below)
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Declarations of Interest in matters before this meeting	
3 To approve the public decisions and minutes of the last Cabinet meeting	
4 To approve the confidential decisions and minutes of an item in the	

	private part of the last Cabinet meeting	
5	To confirm that the items of business marked Part 1 will be considered in public and that the items of business marked Part 2 in private	
Cabinet Reports - Part 1 (Public)		
6	Hillingdon's response to the Airports Commission's consultation: Appraisal of Short-Listed Airport Expansion Options *	Public
7	Standards and Quality of Education in Hillingdon - 2013/14	Public
8	Older People's Plan - Update	Public
9	Housing Scheme for the Buy Back of Ex-Council Properties *	Public
10	Monthly Council Budget Monitoring Report	Public
11	School Capital Programme Update	Public
Cabinet Reports - Part 2 (Private and Not for Publication)		
<i>The reports listed below in Part 2 are not made public because they contains exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</i>		
12	Academy Conversion - Ryefield Primary School	Private (3)
13	Contract extension: Housing and floating support services relating to Domestic Violence *	Private (3)
14	Voluntary Sector Leases	Private (3)
15	Garage site adjacent to Culvert Lane, Uxbridge *	Private (3)

**denotes urgent business item (see notice below)*

Public Notice (5 days)

What is the purpose of this notice?

The Council is required by law to give advance public notices of the decisions to be made by the Cabinet, the date the Cabinet meets and whether the decisions will be taken in public or private and the reasons why. This assists with making decision-making more transparent and accountable for local residents and taxpayers. Up to 5 months in advance (and a minimum of 28 days in advance), a notice of upcoming decisions and Cabinet meetings will be given on the [Forward Plan](#) - this is a key document available for viewing online or at the Civic Centre. A second notice is then given about 1 week before a particular Cabinet meeting when the agenda is published (a 5 day notice). Further notices may be given if very urgent decisions are tabled at the meeting at short notice.

Notice of meeting and any private business

The London Borough of Hillingdon is a modern, transparent Council and through effective Cabinet governance, it seeks to ensure the decisions it takes are done so in public as far as possible. Much of the business on the agenda for this Cabinet meeting will be open to residents, the wider public and media to attend. However, there will be some business to be considered that contains, for example, confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information. Such business is shown in Part 2 of the agenda and is considered in private. Further information on why this is the case can be sought from Democratic Services.

This is formal notice under The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 to confirm that the Cabinet meeting to be held on:

will be held partly in private and that 28 clear days public notice of this meeting has been given. The reason for this is because the private (Part 2) reports listed on the agenda for the meeting will contain either confidential information or exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. A list of the reports which are expected to be considered at this meeting in both public and private are set out above on the agenda, including a number or reason why a particular decision will be taken in private under the categories set out below:

- (1) information relating to any individual
- (2) information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual
- (3) information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- (4) information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
- (5) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
- (6) Information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
- (7) Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

Notice of any urgent business

To ensure greater transparency in decision-making, 28 clear days public notice of the decisions to be made both in public and private has been given for these agenda items. The exceptions to this rule are the urgent business items on the agenda marked *. For these items it was impracticable to give sufficient notice for a variety of business and service reasons. The Chairman of the Executive Scrutiny Committee has been notified in writing about this urgent business.

Notice of any representations received

No representations from the public have been received regarding this meeting.

Date notice issued and of agenda publication

14 January 2015
London Borough of Hillingdon

Agreed 11 September 2014 by full Council

Members of the public are entitled to report on meetings of Council, Committees and Cabinet, except in circumstances where the public have been excluded as permitted by law. Reporting means:-

- filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings of the meeting;
- using any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; or
- reporting or providing commentary on proceedings at a meeting, orally or in writing, so that the report or commentary is available as the meeting takes place or later if the person is not present.

Anyone present at a meeting as it takes place, is not permitted to carry out an oral commentary or report and must remain seated throughout the meeting. This is to prevent the business of the meeting being disrupted.

Anyone attending a meeting is asked to advise the Head of Democratic Services that they wish to report on the meeting and how they wish to do so. This is to enable Democratic Services staff to guide anyone choosing to report on proceedings to an appropriate place from which to be able to report effectively.

Any person present to film the proceedings of a meeting must respect the wishes of members of the public who do not wish to have their image recorded.

For meetings held at the Civic Centre, members of the public are welcome to use the Council's public Wi-Fi facilities. Occasionally, meetings take place in venues not run by the Council and in such circumstances members of the public are advised to check with the venue whether Wi-Fi is available.

Minutes

Cabinet

Thursday, 18 December 2014

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Published on: 19 December 2014

Come into effect on: 30 December 2014 *

Cabinet Members Present:

Ray Puddifoot MBE (Chairman)
David Simmonds (Vice-Chairman)
Keith Burrows
Philip Corthorne
Douglas Mills
Jonathan Bianco
Scott Seaman-Digby

Members also Present:

Wayne Bridges
Janet Duncan
Beulah East
Dominic Gilham
John Hensley
Allan Kauffman
Mo Khursheed
Tony Eginton
Raymond Graham
Becky Haggar
Henry Higgins
Jane Palmer
Jan Sweeting

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

All Cabinet Members were present.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS BEFORE THIS MEETING

Councillor Seaman-Digby declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Trustee of HART. He left the room during the discussion and vote on the matter (minute 8).

Councillor Seaman-Digby declared a non-pecuniary interest due to knowing a non-relation employed by one of the contractors mentioned in the report. He left the room during the discussion and vote on the matter (minute 17).

3. TO APPROVE THE PUBLIC DECISIONS AND MINUTES OF THE LAST CABINET MEETING

The public minutes and decisions of the Cabinet meeting held on 20 November 2014 were approved as a correct record.

4. TO APPROVE THE CONFIDENTIAL DECISIONS AND MINUTES OF AN ITEM IN THE PRIVATE PART OF THE LAST CABINET MEETING

The confidential minutes and decisions of the Cabinet meeting held on 20 November 2014 were approved as a correct record.

5. TO CONFIRM THAT THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 2 IN PRIVATE

This was confirmed.

6. MONTHLY COUNCIL BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15 - MONTH 7

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

- 1. Note the forecast budget position for revenue and capital as at October 2014 (Month 7).**
- 2. Note the treasury management update as at October 2014 at Appendix E.**
- 3. Continues the delegated authority up until the 22 January 2015 Cabinet meeting to the Chief Executive to approve any consultancy and agency assignments over £50k, with final sign-off of any assignments made by the Leader of the Council. Cabinet are also asked to note those consultancy and agency assignments over £50k approved under delegated authority between the 21 November and 18 December 2014 Cabinet meetings, detailed at Appendix F.**
- 4. Agree to the transfer of £171k funding from the general capital contingency budget to the ICT Single Development Plan.**
- 5. Approve funding of £50k in respect of Better Homes funding from the Greater London Authority to be added to the Private Sector Renewals Grant budget.**
- 6. Approve re-phasing of £20,543k capital expenditure budgets into later years of the capital programme.**
- 7. Agree grant funded expenditure up to £69.5k in 2014/15 to deliver 2 of the projects within the Operational Resilience and Capacity Plan recommended by HCCG and approved and funded by NHSE.**
- 8. Approve the addition of £92,250 DEFRA Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems grant funding to Residents Services operating budgets in 2014/15 and 2015/16.**
- 9. Approve the addition of £40,000 DCLG Site Delivery Fund Grant funding to Residents Services operating budgets in 2014/15.**

10. Approve the award of £10,000 to Uxbridge Forward from the Core Grants Budget
11. Ratify an Emergency Contract Decision made on 24 November 2014 by the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive to award a contract to Ability Housing Association to provide a care and support service for people with mental health needs at Sessile Court (formerly Tasman House) opening in 2014 for a period of five years.
12. Agree to:
 - a) Progress the 3 playgrounds and 2 outdoor gyms funded from Chrysalis as set out in Appendix G to this report;
 - b) Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration, the authority to procure, authorise capital release and make any other related decisions in respect of the 5 projects set out in the report from the Chrysalis Programme. This will enable their expedient installation during March 2015;
 - c) Request officers to report back to Cabinet the delegated decisions made on these 5 projects for public record and to keep residents and Ward Councillors informed on these beneficial local projects.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet was informed of the latest forecast revenue, capital and treasury position for the current year 2014/15 to ensure the Council achieved its budgetary and service objectives.

Cabinet made a range of further decisions in relation to the virement of various funds between budgets to support service delivery, acceptance of grant funds, the award of monies to Uxbridge Forward and provided delegated authority to deliver playground and outdoor gym improvements across the Borough.

Additionally, Cabinet ratified an Emergency Contract Decision made for an urgent contract to provide care and support services for people with mental health needs at Sessile Court (formerly Tasman House).

Alternative options considered and rejected

None.

Officer to action:

Paul Whaymand, Finance Directorate

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

7. THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL FORECAST 2015/16 - 2019/20 - POLICY FRAMEWORK

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

- 1) Approve the draft revenue General Fund and Housing Revenue Account budget and capital programme proposals for 2015/16 and beyond as the basis for consultation with Policy Overview Committees and other stakeholders.**
- 2) Request the comments of individual Policy Overview Committees on the draft budget proposals relating to their areas of responsibility, to be collated into a single report back to Cabinet from the Corporate Services and Partnerships Policy Overview Committee.**
- 3) Approve the proposed fees and charges, including HRA Dwelling Rents calculated under the DCLG rent restructure policy, included at Appendix 8, as the basis for consultation with Policy Overview Committees and other stakeholders.**
- 4) Agree the full use of the DCLG rent restructuring policy within the Housing Revenue Account, including changing to formula rent at tenancy change for all properties where convergence has not been completed.**
- 5) Authorise the Corporate Director of Finance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to respond on behalf of the Council to the consultation on the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement and to the Mayor of London's budget consultation.**
- 6) Agree to recommend to Council for approval in January that the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, first approved by Council on 17 January 2013 continue for a further year during 2015/16.**

Reasons for decision

Cabinet put forward for consultation its budget proposals. This included the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF), the draft General Fund revenue budget for 2015/16 along with indicative projections until 2019/20, the Housing Revenue Account, fees and charges proposals and the draft capital programme for 2015/16 and beyond.

Through prudent management of the Council's finances and a robust efficiency programme, Cabinet again confirmed that Council Tax would be frozen for all residents, and for the over 65's, over the next 5 years. In this endeavour, Cabinet's proposals utilise £5m of the Council's reserves to protect front-line resident services from continuing central Government austerity funding reductions.

It was noted that proposals for upcoming fees and charges would generally remain frozen for residents, with any modest increases aligned competitively with neighbouring local authorities.

Other welcomed proposals were the continued capital investment in the flagship school expansion programme, continued maintenance of the Borough's roads, new youth centres and a theatre and museum in St Andrew's Park.

The Leader of the Council set out his recent message to staff, in which it was demonstrated how Hillingdon was bucking the trend by improving service delivery to residents, in contrast to neighbouring local authorities and many other councils that were making significant staffing reductions and service cuts.

In considering the proposals, Cabinet gave its full endorsement to a very well thought out budget, which had been carefully developed to put residents first. The budget would go out for the required consultation, including the Policy Overview Committees before being re-considered and approved in February 2015.

Alternative options considered and rejected

The Cabinet could have chosen to vary the proposals in its budget before consultation. However, to comply with the Budget and Policy Framework, the Cabinet was required to publish a draft budget for consultation at the meeting.

Officers to action:

Paul Whaymand, Finance

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

8. GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS 2015/16

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet agrees:

- 1. The overall allocation of grants to Voluntary Sector of £1,723,700 for the provision of core grant funding for the 2014/15 financial year and specific awards as set out in the schedule - Appendix A,**
- 2. Grants totalling £54,140 to organisations to enable the provision of transport as set out in Appendix B,**
- 3. The Council's 2015/16 contribution of £306,665 to the London Councils Grants scheme and;**
- 4. That the Chief Executive be delegated authority to agree the terms and conditions of the 2015/16 small grants programme and any subsequent grant that may be considered appropriate in light of progress by**

Hillingdon Association of Voluntary Services, with any decisions subject to the full agreement of the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet appreciated the efforts of the diverse local voluntary sector and its critical role in supporting a wide variety of activities and vulnerable residents. Cabinet agreed to continue its significant financial commitment to this sector during 2015/16. It was noted that this was in comparison to some other local authorities who had cut their grants budget.

With careful consideration, Cabinet agree to delegate any decision on funding for the Hillingdon Association of Voluntary Services, subject to the organisation meeting the Council's expectations to prioritise investment in front line voluntary services which directly benefit residents.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have made changes to the proposed level of grants.

Officers to action:

Nigel Cramb – Administration Directorate

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

9. ADDITIONAL NEEDS STRATEGY

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet approves the Additional Needs Strategy.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet noted that the overall number of pupils with additional needs will increase over the next 5 years based on the increasing pupil population, with a higher than average number of pupils placed out of the Borough.

Cabinet therefore agreed a strategy to develop local educational provision to meet the predicted needs of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities and avoid costly out of area placements.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet considered that the option of not approving this strategy would have left gaps in local service provision and led to increased costs to the Council.

Officers to action:

Jackie Wright, Adult Social Care / Children's & Young People's
Venetia Rogers, Residents Services

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

10. QUARTERLY PLANNING OBLIGATIONS MONITORING

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet notes the updated financial information attached to the report.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet noted the report which detailed the financial planning obligations held by the Council and what progress had, and was, being made.

Alternative options considered and rejected

To not report to Cabinet. However, Cabinet believed it was an example of good practice to monitor income and expenditure against specific planning agreements.

Officer to action:

Nicola Wyatt, Residents Services

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

11. SCHOOL CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Note the progress made with primary and secondary school expansions and the school condition programme.

Primary Schools Expansions

2. Note the requirement for additional primary school places to be met by providing bulge classes for September 2015/2016 and permanent expansions for 2016 onwards.
3. Approves the commencement of a feasibility exercise for the primary school bulge year classes and permanent expansions.
4. Delegate to the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Business Services, in consultation with Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Residents Services, the full authority to make all necessary procurement and financial decisions, including the appointment of consultancies and the placing of building contracts for the primary school bulge year classes and primary school permanent expansions.

Schools Condition Programme

5. Notes the early progress made on developing a schools condition programme of work for 2015/2016.
6. Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Residents Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Business Services, the authority to finalise the 2015/2016 schools condition programme reporting back to Cabinet for approval.
7. Delegate to the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Business Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Residents Services, the authority to make necessary procurement and financial decisions for the appointment of consultancies for the 2015/2016 school condition programme of works.

New school adjacent to Laurel Lane Primary School

8. Note the specific grant funding requirements of the Education Funding Agency in respect of the proposed new primary school adjacent to Laurel Lane Primary School.

9. **Approve the conversion of the new 5 Form of Entry Junior School currently being constructed on the land adjacent to Laurel Lane Primary School, to a 3 Form of Entry Primary School with 15 Specialist Resource Provision places and subject to a feasibility study, 90 nursery places.**
10. **Delegate full authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Business Services, to make all necessary procurement, property and financial decisions required to facilitate the conversion and provision of this new 3FE Primary School.**

Reasons for decision

Cabinet received its monthly update on London's largest school building programme, aimed at ensuring that every child in the London Borough of Hillingdon would have a quality place at a local school.

Cabinet agreed further feasibilities for the primary school sector expansion and agreed to pursue planned improvements to the condition of the existing school estate during 2015/16.

In receiving recent information from the Education Funding Agency, Cabinet agreed to vary the proposed scheme at the new school adjacent to Laurel Lane Primary School to 3 Forms of Entry.

Alternative options considered and rejected

None.

Officer to action:

Jean Palmer, Bobby Finch – Residents Services

Classification: Public

The report relating to this decision by the Cabinet is available to view on the Council's website or by visiting the Civic Centre, Uxbridge.

12. PUBLIC HEALTH UPDATE - CONTRACT EXTENSIONS AND TRANSFERS

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet agrees:

1. To extend existing substance misuse contracts due to end on 31st March 2015 until 30th September 2015, at the latest;
2. To agree insurance requirements for the future provision of the services;
3. To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Social Services, Health and Housing, to negotiate and agree terms for the statutory transfer of the health visiting service from NHS England.

Reason for decision

Cabinet received an update in a number of key areas relating to Public Health and gave its approval for the short term extension to the Substance Misuse Contract and delegated authority to make decisions in respect of the Health Visiting Services being transferred to the Council from the NHS.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet considered there were no other options, other than to cease support for these services.

Officers to action:

Sharon Daye, Residents Services
Steve Powell, Finance

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

13. THE PROVISION OF WASTE WEEKENDS

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet approves the award of a single action tender to Powerday PLC to continue the operation of the 'Waste Weekends' for the period 1st April 2014 through to 31st December 2016.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet agreed the continuation of monthly 'Waste Weekends' at Tavistock Road, an efficient and convenient service for residents providing a disposal facility located within the Borough for bulky household waste.

It was made clear at the meeting that this decision was not related to any other proposals at the site.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have conducted a full tender exercise, but this was discounted as no other suitable sites currently exist within the Borough.

Officers to action:

Allison Mayo, Finance
Colin Russell, Residents Services

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

14. AWARD OF CONTRACT: SUPPORT LIVING FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

- 1) Agree to the award of a five year contract to Craegmoor Supporting You Ltd from the 1st April 2015 to provide the core care and support service for people with learning disabilities at Herne House, 7-9 Horton Road and Church Road, for the total sum of £2,157k (£431.4k pa) and the individual assessed flexible care and support for the average hourly cost and estimated value as set out in the report.**

- 2) **Agree to the award of a five year contract to Craegmoor Supporting You Ltd from the 1st April 2015 to provide the core care and support service for people with learning disabilities at Hyde House and Honeycroft Hill, for the total sum of £1,335k (£267k pa) and the individual assessed flexible care and support for the average hourly cost average hourly cost and estimated value as set out in the report.**
- 3) **Agree to the award of a five year contract to Enable UK Midlands Ltd from 15th January 2015 to provide supported accommodation for up to 29 clients in a range of properties at a cost of £31k pa per unit, including the 24/7 support. Flexible provision to be provided at an hourly cost set out in the report.**
- 4) **Agree to the award of contract by single tender action to Certitude for the provision of the core care and support service at 32 Frays Avenue, West Drayton and 14 Queens Road Uxbridge for two years at an estimated cost of £1,074k (£561k in year 1 and £513k in year 2).**

Reason for decision

Cabinet agreed to award the necessary contracts, following due procurement process, to providers for the provision of Supported Living to adults with Learning Disabilities for a number of new and existing schemes.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have decided to deliver the services in-house or decommission them in whole or in part.

Officers to action:

Richard Robbins, Finance
Tony Zaman, Adult Social Care

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

15. CATERING & VENDING SERVICES ACROSS COUNCIL VENUES

RESOLVED:

The Cabinet approves the award of a contract to Caterplus Services Limited to deliver the catering provision at the Council's Civic Centre and other corporate properties for 3 years with the possibility to extend by a further 1+1 years.

Reasons for decision

Following a competitive procurement process, Cabinet approved the most economically advantageous tender for a comprehensive, efficient, user friendly and cost effective catering and vending service to the Civic Centre and 15 other sites across the Council's non-housing property portfolio. Catering services provided within the contract would include those to residents in Day Centres, residential homes, Early Years Centres and extra care schemes.

Officers to action:

Perry Scott, Finance & Residents Services
Michael Breen, Finance

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

16. AWARD OF CONTRACT: FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCE SERVICE

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet approve the award of a three year contract, with the option of a two year extension, to Daybreak FGC from 1st April 2015 for Family Group Conference Service, for the total sum of £279,000 (based on an annual cost of £93,000).

Reasons for decision

Following due procurement process, Cabinet agreed to award a contract for the Family Group Conference Service to Daybreak FGC to enable the Council to offer more vulnerable families the opportunity to take ownership of their difficulties and set out their own solutions through a facilitated process.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have decided to provide the Family Group Service in-house, but noted that this would not deliver increased flexibility and value to the service.

Officers to action:

Gary Campbell, Children & Young People's Services
Richard Robbins, Finance

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

17. EXTENSION OF VOID CONTRACT

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet approves the 12 month extension of the contracts for First Choice Facilities Services Limited and R Benson Property Maintenance Limited to provide works to housing void properties based on existing arrangements, from 1st February 2015.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet approved a contract extension to minimise the time taken to bring vacant properties in to use, returning them to the minimum lettable standard, thereby minimising the use of temporary accommodation and controlling costs in respect of the use of this type of accommodation.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have decided to re-tender for the works required when vacant properties arise, but noted the improvements made in turnaround times by the current contractor and considered any change at this time to be too disruptive.

Officers to action:

Nigel Dicker, Residents Services
Christopher Tuohy, Finance

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

18. PROPERTY MATTER, UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES END

RESOLVED:

Cabinet made the necessary decisions in respect of a matter in relation to a property/land on the Uxbridge Road, Hayes End, as set out in the confidential report.

Note: this is an abridged public record of the Cabinet's decisions due to the confidential nature of the discussions that took place at the meeting.

Reasons for decision

As set out in the confidential report.

Alternative options considered / risk management

No other options were available to the Cabinet.

Officer to action:

Susan Williams-Joseph; Residents Services

Classification: Private

Whilst the Cabinet's decisions above are always made public, the officer report relating to this matter is not because it was considered in the private part of the meeting and contained information relating to an individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information). The public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

19. ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIRMAN AGREES ARE RELEVANT OR URGENT

No additional items were considered by the Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 7.48pm

*** IMPORTANT INFORMATION**

DECISION AUTHORITY

Meeting after Cabinet, the Executive Scrutiny Committee did not call-in any of the Cabinet's decisions.

All decisions in relation to Items 7 and 8 (minute nos. 7&8) are integral to the Council's budget proposals, which includes Policy Overview Committee consultation, and therefore cannot be called-in and take immediate effect.

The remaining decisions of the Cabinet will therefore come into effect from 5pm, Tuesday 30th December 2014.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

HILLINGDON'S RESPONSE TO THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION CONSULTATION: APPRAISAL OF SHORT-LISTED AIRPORT EXPANSION OPTIONS

Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Ray Puddifoot MBE Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Leader of the Council Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Jales Tippell, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1 - Hillingdon's response to the Airports Commission's consultation on its appraisal of short listed airport expansion options that was published in November 2014 . Appendix 2 - 'Equity Focused Review Report of the Airports Commission's Community Health Relevant Assessments' by Public Health by Design published in January 2015 (to follow and to be circulated separately).

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	This report provides information to the Cabinet on the Airports Commissions' consultation on its appraisal of short listed airport expansion options and seeks approval for the Council's response to the consultation.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	Putting our Residents First: <i>Our People; Our Built Environment; Our Natural Environment</i> Hillingdon's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy; Sustainable Community Strategy
Financial Cost	None directly from this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services
Ward(s) affected	All wards

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet:

- 1) Notes the content of this report.**
- 2) Agrees the Council's response to the consultation as set out in Appendix 1 for submission to the Airports Commission by 3rd February 2015;**
- 3) Agrees that the 'Equity Focused Review Report of the Airports Commission's Community Health Relevant Assessments' by Public Health by Design be submitted to the Airports Commission by 3rd February 2015; *(to follow)***
- 4) Delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling, to:
 - a) make any minor technical changes required to the Council's response before submission; and/or**
 - b) make any changes required in the event of new information or evidence that may be received supporting the Council's case before submission.****
- 5) Instructs officers to continue to respond to consultations on the future of aviation strategy and potential airport expansion, including joint working with the 2M group and other relevant technical groupings.**

Reasons for recommendation

The consultation presents a detailed analysis of the proposals that were shortlisted by the Airports Commission in 2013, namely the two options for expansion at Heathrow Airport and one proposal for expansion at Gatwick Airport. The analysis looks across a comprehensive range of subjects, looking at the benefits and adverse impacts of each proposal. This includes analysis of the cost of each proposal, the effect on communities of noise, property loss and construction, and the economic benefits and environmental impacts. It invites public comment on the Commission's detailed consideration of each proposal.

The Commission insists that no decision has been made over the best option, i.e. it has not taken a view on which proposal strikes the most effective balance between the assessment criteria. Instead it provides an opportunity for the evidence to be examined, challenged and improved. The responses received to this consultation will directly inform the Commission's recommendation to the Government when it publishes its final report in the summer of 2015.

By responding to this consultation, the Council is adhering to its commitment to continue to lobby against any capacity increases at Heathrow and to maintain pressure on the relevant bodies to ensure that there are appropriate environmental constraints on aviation in place to bring about improvements in noise, air quality and public transport for Hillingdon residents. The consultation response is an opportunity to reaffirm the Council's position of no expansion at Heathrow and to ensure that the Commission is aware of the adverse impacts

on local communities which will result from any such proposals for expansion at Heathrow airport.

Alternative options considered / risk management

The Cabinet may influence the proposals by:

- 1 Agreeing to the proposed response in full, or in part, or;
- 2 Making any amendments to the response considered appropriate, or
- 3 Alternatively the Cabinet may choose to make no response to this consultation. This option would not allow the Council any opportunity to influence the final recommendation for the location of future airport expansion.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

Background

1 On the 7th September 2012, the Coalition Government announced the creation of an independent Airports Commission (the Commission) to identify and recommend to government options for maintaining the UK's status as an international hub for aviation.

2 The Commission, chaired by Sir Howard Davies, was tasked with producing an Interim Report by the end of 2013 and a final report by summer 2015. The Interim Report was published in December 2013 and set out recommendations for immediate actions to improve the use of existing runway capacity. Following submissions by airport expansion proposers, the Interim Report went on to identify two potential sites for further analysis and assessment in order to respond to future increased runway capacity. One proposal was for expansion at Gatwick, the other was for expansion at Heathrow looking at two different runway expansion concepts. The Thames Estuary option (the Isle of Grain proposal) was identified as requiring further analysis to assess whether it should be added to the shortlist, but it was subsequently ruled out as an option in September 2014.

3 The Council submitted documents to the Airports Commission in relation to the calls for evidence on noise, utilisation of existing capacity and delivering new runway capacity. In addition, as a key member of the 2M group of local authorities, the Council has submitted responses directly to the Airports Commission on the short and medium term options identified by the Commission for implementation and in terms of the Commissions' choices of location for long term increases in runway capacity. All such responses have consistently raised the concerns of adverse impacts of any proposals to increase capacity at Heathrow airport on local residents. In addition, the Council has participated in responses from expert groupings such as Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG) and the Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC).

The Airports Commission's consultation on its appraisal of short listed airport expansion options

4 The current consultation sets out the Commission's detailed analysis of those proposals that it shortlisted in 2013, namely the two options for expansion at Heathrow

Airport and one proposal at Gatwick Airport. It appraises each short-listed option against five potentially different future aviation scenarios, i.e. assessment of need; global growth; relative decline of Europe by increased strength of far and middle-eastern hubs; low cost is king; and global fragmentation. In addition two separate future carbon scenarios are appraised, i.e. carbon traded and carbon capped.

5 The appraisal looks across a number of different topics, looking at the benefits and impacts against each proposal. This includes analysis of the cost of each proposal; the effect on communities of noise, property loss and construction; and the economic benefits and environmental impacts.

6 The consultation is based upon a substantial suite of documents including an overarching consultation document, a sustainability assessment and business case report for each of the three schemes, plus a series of 16 detailed technical reports. The performance of each scheme on each of the assessment criteria is measured in relation to the baseline "do minimum" case in terms of the following 5 levels:

- **Highly supportive** - positive impacts are substantial, or substantially accelerate an improving trend, or substantially decelerate a declining trend;
- **Supportive** - positive impacts are notable, or accelerate an improving trend, or decelerate a declining trend;
- **Neutral** - no impacts or on balance, a neutral outcome occurs;
- **Adverse** - negative impacts are notable, or decelerate an improving trend, or accelerate a declining trend;
- **Highly adverse** - negative impacts are substantial, or substantially decelerate an improving trend, or substantially accelerate a declining trend.

7 The consultation, which ends on 3rd February 2015, poses 8 consultation questions grouped under four major headings:

- Views and conclusions in respect of the 3 shortlisted options
- Questions on the Commission's appraisal and overall approach
- Comments on specific areas of the Commission's appraisal
- Any other comments

Hillingdon's consultation response

8 Expansion at Heathrow was ruled out by the Coalition Government in 2010 after considering the merits and demerits of the evidence. This was confirmed in a speech by Theresa Villiers:

Thousands live on a daily basis with a plane overhead every 90 seconds... not to mention the flights that wake them up at 4.30am. "The quality-of-life impact of a third runway, with up to 220,000 more flights over London every year, would be massive and there is no technological solution in sight to ensure planes become quiet enough quickly enough to make this burden in any way tolerable..So we need another solution" (Speech to Conference, 18th April 2012)

9 It is very disappointing that of the three short-listed options for the future of UK aviation, two out of these three are at Heathrow. Nothing has changed since 2010 to now make this a suitable location for expansion. Both Heathrow options will still require the demolition of communities, compromise health-based levels of air quality, and cause

widespread adverse impacts of aircraft noise pollution across more people than all of the other European hub airports put together.

10 The Council's response focuses on where it believes the Airports Commission has failed to adequately take into account the community impacts arising from either of the options to expand at Heathrow Airport. Whilst the majority of community impacts in Hillingdon arise from the Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) option for the North West Runway, the extended northern runway (Heathrow Hub) option also brings adverse environmental and community impacts. Neither expansion option can therefore be supported due to the detrimental impacts on the surrounding communities.

11 Details of the consultation questions and the full proposed Council responses are set out in Appendix 1. The Council have a number of significant issues which are summarised below.

Airports Commission consultation documentation

12 The wealth of information provided with this consultation is testament to how much work has been undertaken by the Commission. A business case and sustainability appraisal has been provided for each option and this is accompanied by 16 detailed technical reports, which in some cases such as the noise appraisal, run to over 600 pages. The addition of modules such as Quality of Life is a welcome addition and represents the first time this approach has been used when looking at expansion at Heathrow.

13 Despite all of this work, however, the Council has serious concerns about the substantial detrimental impacts on the local communities and how these have been assessed. Appraisals of some of the important local impacts have not yet been provided and there is also no indication how the local impacts will influence the decision making process in terms of any final recommendation.

Failure to address the current situation around Heathrow

14 The starting point of the appraisal process should have been to properly assess the current situation around Heathrow, in terms of adverse environmental impacts, before recommending mitigation for adding further adverse impacts by expansion. This has not been addressed in the consultation and is a significant flaw in the process.

15 Mitigation measures for reducing noise, achieving air quality compliance and improving public transport access are only coupled with the option to expand at Heathrow. Local communities deserve the implementation of these measures now. Not to do so shows a distinct lack of respect and lack of responsibility for the detrimental impacts currently brought upon communities by the operation of the current airport.

16 Not including an appraisal of the existing situation experienced by local communities, provides a false baseline for the comparison of locations and options. It also assumes that all is currently acceptable and mitigation measures, such as they are, are effective. This is not the case.

Strategic case for Heathrow expansion not sound

17 The separate locations for expansion i.e. Gatwick and Heathrow, both provide substantial economic benefits; they both provide future aviation connectivity in terms of passenger numbers and destinations served, including to the emerging markets; and they both provide jobs to the surrounding areas. The Council firmly believes recommending an option to expand at a location which knowingly inflicts the largest damage to local communities should not be supported.

No guarantee of operational resilience

18 The current Heathrow two runway airport operates at a capacity level which provides no operational resilience. There is no evidence to suggest that a 3rd runway will solve this. Gatwick airport, at present, has only one runway which gives it no operational resilience in the event of circumstances such as poor weather conditions, debris on the runway, and other such situations outside of the control of the operator. It is unclear how the Commission will appraise this issue.

Missing information

19 The Airports Commission has not factored in sufficient time to ensure that all the necessary assessments were completed prior to consultation. This includes vital information in relation to local impacts:

- No detailed air quality assessments;
- No assessment of the impacts on local roads;
- No assessment of the impact of the proposed increases in freight;
- No details of proposed flight-paths;
- No details of appropriate controls which will ensure mitigation of the adverse impacts.

Without this level of information communities, and those who represent them, cannot give a proper considered response to this consultation.

20 The Commission should publish how it intends to provide the missing information and how it intends to ensure that this is made publicly available for comment prior to any final recommendation on the option for expansion. Failure to do so does not represent an open and transparent process and neither does it allow the opportunity for stakeholder engagement on key information which relates directly to them prior to any final decision being taken.

Inadequate Appraisal Process

a) No information on trade-off issues between modules

21 The Commission refers to the need to trade off the results from different modules. As an example, nationally there may be positive impacts yet locally there may be highly adverse impacts. There is no information or methodology in terms as to how the Airports Commission will determine the trade-off between the outcomes of the different appraisal modules. This does not represent an open transparent process.

22 The impacts on the local communities are represented in several of the appraisal modules including the specific modules of Community and Quality of Life. It is not proven

that community impacts considered as positive in terms of local employment in one appraisal module and community impacts considered as negative in terms of the appraisal of the noise module or loss of residential housing in another can be traded off against each other in terms of appraisal of impacts. The Council considers this to be a flaw in the approach to the appraisal of community impacts.

23 It is also unclear what weighting is to be put upon the difference in the magnitude of the impacts. For example, the two options to expand at Heathrow airport expose over 25 times more people to aviation noise than expansion at Gatwick. The appraisal describes both these impacts as adverse. This approach is not supported

b) No assessment of the benefits from no expansion

24 The Commission has presented little detailed analysis in the appraisal process in terms of identifying and costing the community benefits that would occur from no expansion. There would be benefits accrued to the local communities over time from the use of less noisy planes and proposed future operating procedures; more chance of securing the health benefits associated with meeting air quality limits; no loss of current valued open space or loss of established communities.

25 In addition, the congested road and public transport networks, already predicted to be further stretched by growing population growth, cannot be further compromised. This aspect and the magnitude of any potential benefits, should be taken into account when appraising the two different locations ie Heathrow and Gatwick.

c) Inadequate appraisal of proposed mitigation

26 The Council does not that consider it is acceptable to take the proposers offers of mitigation and compensation and assume they will a) work, b) be implemented in reality and c) acceptable to the population impacted. Given the close proximity of the Heathrow expansion options to substantial numbers of people this deserves more scrutiny. To assume the mitigation will work and remove the negative impacts fully, without any proof behind the assumption, provides an ill-informed true comparison of the impact of the different options.

d) No cumulative assessment

27 There has been no proper cumulative appraisal of all the impacts arising from the short listed options. This is not an acceptable environmental assessment approach.

e) Failure to demonstrate economic benefits for the local community

28 The local communities who are adversely impacted should receive the greatest benefits from any claimed economic benefits of any aviation expansion proposals. The Commission should consider how such measures could be put in place. This has not been addressed in the consultation.

f) Health

29 The existing health burden of the area surrounding Heathrow is already distinctly disadvantaged and these people are all at further risk from the adverse health impacts associated with increased noise and pollution from an expanded Heathrow.

30 Whilst the quality of life appraisal module is a welcome addition, it does not adequately cover aspects such as health which is an important omission. The Commission's appraisal that the negative impacts and positive impacts can be simply combined to give an overall appraisal of neutral is not supported.

31 The Council commissioned an independent critique on the Commission's approach to health. The resulting report, 'Equity Focused Review Report of the Airports Commission's Community Health Relevant Assessments' by Public Health by Design, confirms the Council view that the distributional impacts and health equity/inequality issues have not been appropriately considered. Health Impact Assessments of each short listed option on the health of the surrounding communities should have been part of the appraisal process. This report will be sent to the Airport Commission and forms an integral part of the Council's consultation response.

g) Community

32 The direct community impacts in Hillingdon result from the Heathrow North West runway option which includes demolition of around 1,000 properties in the Borough and leaves large parts of the remaining communities of Harmondsworth and Sipson up against the new airport boundary. In addition, there is a loss of valued recreation land, open space and employment land.

33 With no plan for where people will be re-housed or where lost facilities will be relocated and no detailed evaluation as to whether the compensation offered is sufficient, the Council considers that this should remain a highly adverse impact.

34 The total loss of Longford would be very significant in terms of heritage loss and there is no mitigation possible which would reduce the impact from one of being significantly adverse. The impact on the remnant of Harmondsworth would be so severe in terms of loss of tranquillity and removal of its historic hinterland that it may not be sustainable in the longer term. The appraisal result which assumes reduction from significantly adverse impact to adverse is not supported.

h) Housing and infrastructure implications

35 Both the Heathrow expansion options have substantial negative impacts in terms of the loss of residential housing and community facilities, which will all require to be re-provided. There has been no proper assessment of the costs and the widespread implications of having to find land on the scale needed for the predicted employment growth. A recommendation to expand at Heathrow without properly identifying the solution to this problem is not acceptable.

36 No account has been taken of the potential negative impacts associated with expansion in an area which is already economically buoyant. An account of the implications and associated costs of overheating the local economy should be considered prior to any final recommendation on location.

i) Surface access

37 The Commission's transport assessment only looks at the surface access impacts of 103.6 million passengers at Heathrow in 2030. No assessment has been done for the 149

million passengers the Commission estimate to be the maximum potential throughput of a 3-runway Heathrow. This does not test the worse-case scenario and potentially underestimates the amount of surface access actually required to support expansion in this area.

38 The surface access elements of the two Heathrow proposals identified as supporting expansion (such as Crossrail, the Western Rail link, the Piccadilly line upgrade rail link and the proposed HS2 link at Old Oak Common) are all intended to cope with the predicted increase in background population growth with a two runway Heathrow. These have not been designed to cope with the increased passenger and employee demand that an extra runway would bring. The only new scheme suggested, Southern Rail Access, is not even at the design stage and there is no recognised funding.

39 The cost of surface access provision to support expansion proposals at Heathrow is four times higher than that at Gatwick. There is no information as to how the costs will be apportioned between the airport operator and the public purse.

40 The construction costs associated with the provision of expansion at Heathrow in either option, for example tunnelling the M25, widening parts of the surrounding motorway network, re-routing the A4, construction of a large integrated transport hub in Iver, will all be major construction projects for which the impacts will be felt over a wide geographical area. Given the significant construction period that will be required, consideration needs to be given to the detrimental impacts on other road users and the potential for surrounding local road networks to be negatively impacted.

41 The Heathrow Hub scheme proposer has put forward an additional surface transport strategy. This focuses on the creation of a transport hub on the Great Western mainline in Iver, along with a 10,000 space car park. The additional trip generation that this could create in terms of access to the new hub has not been assessed within the Airports Commission consultation. This could have implications for Hillingdon in areas such as West Drayton and Yiewsley, with passengers and employees accessing the new transport hub and thus putting additional pressure on the local road network in these areas.

j) Inadequate consideration of public safety issues

42 Insufficient attention has been given within the appraisal consultation to public safety issues. It is considered irresponsible not to have afforded this greater scrutiny given that the operation of Heathrow already puts hundreds of thousands of flights above one of the most densely populated areas of the UK. An assessment of the potential impacts arising from an accident or terrorist incident should have been appraised in terms of the costs and potential human lives involved.

k) Inadequate assessment of impact on RAF Northolt

43 With the North West Runway option, the Council has noted the potential impacts on RAF Northolt of expansion in terms of needing to cease commercial operations. A recent decision by central Government has included the need for RAF Northolt to increase the commercial side of the airfield in order to remain a viable military airfield. It is unclear how the Commission have taken this into account.

Conclusion

44 The Council believes that, the economic benefits of expanding at Heathrow, although substantial, requires a more thorough analysis. The Council has identified flaws in the Appraisal Framework with gaps in the provision of vital information in terms of local impacts and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures such as surface access provision. The Council believes that when all of this is taken into account, the option to expand at Heathrow must be dismissed.

45 It should be noted that officers are preparing a joint submission with 2M Councils on the Airports Commission's consultation. They are also providing input for the London Council's response.

Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations of the report beyond the use of existing officers time to compile and research responses to consultations.

There is no specific budget to address concerns or undertake activities arising from such consultations. Therefore if further resources are required in the future, for example to contribute towards local campaigns or joint activities through 2M, a funding source would need to be identified.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

By responding to this consultation the Council is adhering to its commitment to seek protection for residents from the negative social and environmental impacts associated with capacity increases and/or changes in operational procedures, such as mixed mode, at Heathrow airport.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

There are no external consultations required on the contents of this report. Relevant officers from within the Council have contributed to the consultation response.

In addition, officers will be contributing to the 2M consultation response and the response of other relevant technical groupings such as SASIG to ensure a consistent approach.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct budgetary implications arising from the recommendations included above. As noted within this report, there is no specific budgetary provision to support local campaigns or joint activities through 2M, The Council does however hold unallocated priority growth and general contingency budgets which would provide a potential source of funding for such expenditure.

As indicated within the report, the broader impact of changes at Heathrow Airport on the Council's finances are monitored and where material captured through the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast.

Legal

The Airports Commission has been set up as a temporary public body for the purpose of carrying out an examination of the need for extra airport capacity in the UK and to make a recommendation to the Government. The Airports Commission's consultation presents an analysis of their shortlisted proposals that are intended to improve the use of existing runway capacity and seeks the views of the public on these proposals. This report seeks approval for a proposed response to this draft document.

The Airports Commission must when undertaking this consultation ensure the details provided within the consultation are still at a formative stage, give sufficient reasons to permit the consultee (i.e. the Council or residents) to make a meaningful response and they must allow adequate time for consideration and response. The results of the consultation must then be conscientiously taken into account by the Airports Commission in finalising any proposals, including those which do not accord with their own proposals.

Fairness and natural justice require that there must be no predetermination by the Airports Commission of a particular decision which goes beyond a legitimate predisposition to a certain conclusion.

Corporate Property and Construction

There are no direct Corporate Property and Construction implications arising from the recommendations of the report. The report does not seek to comment specifically on Council owned property impacted by the options, however it is noted that the Council owns a number of properties which would be affected, including Green Spaces, housing and community buildings.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

[Airports Commission Consultation document, November 2014.](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

Airports Commission Consultation

London Borough of Hillingdon response

To be emailed to:

airports.consultation@systra.com

To be posted to:

Airports Commission Consultation

Freepost RTKX-USUS-CXA

PO Box 1492

Woking

GU22 2QR

The Airports Commission's Interim Report, published in December 2013, identified that one extra runway would be needed in the south east by 2030. This consultation seeks views on the three options for long term expansion that have been identified by the Commission. Two are for options to increase capacity at Heathrow Airport, the third is for expansion at Gatwick. The consultation asks eight questions and closes on 3rd February.

QUESTIONS INVITING VIEWS AND CONCLUSIONS IN RESPECT OF THE THREE SHORT LISTED OPTIONS

General comment

1 The wealth of information provided with this consultation is testament to how much work has been undertaken by the Commission. A business case and sustainability appraisal has been provided for each option and this is accompanied by 16 detailed technical reports, which in some cases such as the noise appraisal, run to over 600 pages.

2 Despite, however, all of this work the Council has serious concerns about the substantial detrimental impacts on the local communities and how these have been assessed. Appraisals of some important local impacts have not been provided and there is no indication how the magnitude of the local impacts will influence the decision making process in terms of any final recommendation.

3 The Council is clear that the best recommendation for the UK should also include the best recommendation for the substantial numbers of people that co-exist next to Heathrow.

Question 1

What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short listed options? In answering the question please take into account the Commission's consultation documents and any other information you consider relevant. The options are described in section three.

1 The following response to this question refers to both of the short listed options for expansion at Heathrow.

2 The Commission has appraised each short-listed option under five different future aviation development scenarios. In terms of the Commission's economy impacts objective to maximise economic benefits and support the competitiveness of the UK economy, each of the short-listed options has been appraised as highly supportive. In the Council's opinion, where the short-listed options differ is in the magnitude of local impacts. The Council's consultation response highlights why the Council believes that the costs of these local impacts should be a) adequately captured and b) given sufficient weight, in deciding where future airport expansion is located. In its current form the Council does not believe the appraisal consultation has covered this adequately.

3 In relation to both of the short-listed options for Heathrow, the review of the Commission's evidence, despite the amount of work done, simply confirms what is already known. Expansion at Heathrow has economic benefits for the UK, as it does at Gatwick; it provides international connectivity, as it does at Gatwick; it provides jobs, as it does at Gatwick; but, at the Heathrow location, it also brings about the largest environmental and community dis-benefits of the short-listed options.

4 The Council does not believe that the outputs from this appraisal make a robust case for expansion at Heathrow. The economic benefits of expansion are presented in a wide range of uncertainties, for example, increased jobs from 27,400 to 112,400 in 2030, passenger benefits from £10.3 - £42.0bn, which are all dependent upon future aviation models and future carbon scenarios. However, in regard to the local impacts, what is certain is that in choosing an option for expansion at Heathrow, as has been demonstrated in the Commission's documents, regardless of the future scenarios, will be to:

- expose more people, including significant numbers newly exposed, to aviation noise than all the other hub airports in Europe combined;
- bring about the largest amount of destruction in terms of lower quality of life, adverse community and place impacts as well as increased noise and air pollution (from airport operations and associated surface transport) and potentially increase health inequalities in terms of disproportionate distribution of these exposures;

- compromise the health and well being of more people in terms of increased noise and pollution;
- leave already pressured, surrounding local authorities with the problem, including costs, of providing suitable areas to accommodate the displaced communities and also the additional housing and community infrastructure associated with the new job-related growth arising from airport expansion and;
- concentrate up to 54% of the UK aviation emissions in relation to carbon at one location;
- bring about the largest increases in per passenger aviation charges;
- cost the most to build, with no assessment of how much will be required as a contribution from the public purse to aspects such as surface access provision.

5 The Council believes that the economic benefits of expanding at Heathrow, although substantial, requires a more thorough analysis. The appraisal consultation does not include a comprehensive assessment of all the local impacts and proposed mitigation measures across the appraisal modules. In addition, these have not been evaluated in terms of their feasibility, their costs or their effectiveness in achieving the appropriate mitigation. The Council believes that when all of this is taken into account, the option to expand at Heathrow must be dismissed.

6 The Council notes that the consultation document states (para 1.28) that it represents the Commission's initial assessment of the short-listed options. Responses will then inform what further consideration and analysis may be needed prior to recommendations to Government. It is unclear whether there is any intention to re-consult on any further analysis.

7 If there is no further public scrutiny it will mean that the evidence the Commission bases its conclusions on for future aviation expansion will not have all been made available to potentially impacted stakeholders. The Council considers this to be unacceptable. Given that important information about local impacts is missing from this appraisal consultation, such as detailed air quality assessments; impacts on local roads; no definitive flightpaths hence no identification of noise impacts on specific communities; the Council believes that further dialogue and consultation with impacted stakeholders is crucial.

Question 2

Do you have any suggestions for how the short-listed options could be improved, i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated? The options and their impacts are summarised in section three.

1 The comments below refer to the two short listed options to expand at Heathrow. Although the two options have been put forward by different proposers, the final airport, regardless of the option selected, is assumed to be operated by the current operator, Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL).

Addressing the current situation

2 The Council is clear that the current level of adverse environmental and health impacts, arising from the operation of the two runway airport, on the local communities around Heathrow is not acceptable. Mitigation measures for reducing noise, achieving air quality compliance, improving public transport access are only coupled with the option to expand at Heathrow. Local communities deserve the implantation of these measures now. Not to do so, shows a distinct lack of respect and responsibility for the detrimental impacts brought upon these communities now by the operation of the current airport.

3 The Commission's appraisal should acknowledge the current baseline of highly adverse impacts i.e. more people are exposed around Heathrow than across all of the European hubs combined, local air quality levels are already above health based limits, road and public transport networks already congested. The current detrimental impacts around Heathrow should be appropriately addressed before any airport expansion can be considered.

4 The current situation could be improved by widening the provision of mitigation measures to include issues excluded from any of the current mitigation proposals offered by Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL). For example, areas suffering from early morning flights; all adversely impacted educational establishments; compensation for loss of predictable respite; and compensation for loss of enjoyment of amenity including gardens.

5 In addition, the measures to ensure that air quality limits are met and maintained should be set in place now. This should be accompanied with detailed analysis to ensure that there is sufficient surface access and public transport available to avoid other road users and public transport users being compromised by the levels of airport related journeys on the surrounding transport networks.

Mitigating negative impacts/enhancing benefits of expansion

6 The Council considers that it is vital that mechanisms are put in place to ensure that the surrounding local communities benefit directly from the claimed economic benefits of any aviation expansion proposals. Measures must be identified, along with clear implementation controls, to ensure this occurs.

7 With either Heathrow expansion option mitigation must be provided to all newly impacted communities especially those newly exposed to over-flights. In relation to property compensation arising from the need to demolish properties, this must be set at a level to allow the affected communities to buy like for like properties.

8 The properties that will be lost in the Heathrow Villages are generally good quality family houses with gardens and such properties are likely to be difficult to find within the locality at an comparable price. This aspect has not been afforded any detailed scrutiny by either HAL or the Commission.

9 For the impacted local authorities, such as Hillingdon, it should be made a priority to assist in identifying locations for, and ensuring adequate funding for, the re-provision of lost community facilities; loss of housing; and for the provision of new facilities to support the creation of the newly identified jobs that have been predicted to arise from expansion. If this proves to be undeliverable for whatever reason, this needs to be clarified before a recommendation is made for airport expansion at Heathrow.

10 Surface access and public transport networks must be designed, and adequate provision made, so as not to compromise non-airport users. Such proposals must be fully funded and in operation prior to expansion. As the situation currently stands, the southern rail access (SRA) scheme has been put forward by HAL as a key intervention for people to access the airport, yet this is not at any stage of detailed design and has no identified funding, which is not an acceptable situation.

11 The Commission should re-appraise the claimed economic dis-benefits which would arise from imposing a night ban at Heathrow. The benefits in terms of reducing health impacts, improved sleep and restorative processes and improvements in worker productivity afforded by getting a good nights' sleep should be properly taken into account, especially where the predicted flightpaths are over densely populated areas such as around west London.

QUESTIONS ON THE COMMISSION'S APPRAISAL AND OVERALL APPROACH.

Question 3

Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal? The appraisal process is summarised in section two.

1 As stated in Question 2, the Council considers that not appraising the current unacceptable environmental and health impacts around the Heathrow area from the operation of the two runway airport situation represents a major flaw in the Airports Commission process. It provides a false baseline for the appraisal process with the assumption that all is currently acceptable and mitigation measures, such as they are, are effective.

2 The appraisal process has not yet completed assessments for key local impacts because these will be subject to further investigation. The lack of information on issues such as detailed air quality impacts; impacts on local roads including increases in freight traffic; details of the proposed flight paths; and confirmation of how any expansion proposal would be controlled in terms of any resulting environmental impacts; is considered to be unhelpful. The Council believes

that not to have completed and presented all the appropriate assessments, and not to have identified and costed the appropriate solutions to all the problems that would emanate from expansion in such a densely populated area, renders this appraisal consultation as incomplete and therefore flawed.

Inadequate appraisal benchmarks

3 The sustainability assessment uses a benchmark approach with each impact described as positive, neutral or adverse. This appears a very crude approach and the Council believes that it would benefit from being reviewed in terms of also addressing the magnitude of the impacts. This is demonstrated in the following two examples.

Example - appraisal of noise impacts

4 The Heathrow North West Runway option appraisal for noise, with HAL's mitigation measures in place, is assessed as an adverse impact. This adverse impact equates to 580,500 people exposed to aviation noise in 2030 rising to 637,700 by 2050. The appraisal framework describes the term adverse as "notable" negative impacts. The Gatwick second runway option is also appraised as an adverse impact, unlikely to be able to be reduced to neutral impact by the proposers' mitigation measures. This adverse impact equates to 22,100 in 2030 rising to 24,600 in 2050.

5 The Council does not consider it acceptable that these two levels of substantial difference, in terms of the number of people impacted, should both be assessed as simply adverse. The Heathrow expansion options will expose over 25 times more people to aviation noise by 2050 than the Gatwick option. There needs to be another level within the appraisal assessments which puts a weighting upon the actual numbers of people exposed and should include additional weighting to the numbers who would be newly exposed. This should then be factored into the decision-making process.

Example - appraisal of carbon emissions

6 The Gatwick expansion option yields a total of 334.7 tCO₂ over a 60 year appraisal period. The consultation document puts this into context as the carbon emission from departing flights from Gatwick in 2050 representing 14.2% of the UK total carbon from aviation.

7 The Heathrow expansion options yield 1,353 tCO₂ (Heathrow North West) and 1,326 tCO₂ (Heathrow Extended Northern Runway). The consultation document puts this into context as the carbon emissions from departing flights from Heathrow in 2050 representing 54.6% (Heathrow North West) and 54.8% (Heathrow Extended Northern Runway) of the UK total carbon from aviation.

8 Despite the Heathrow options being four times higher in terms of carbon emissions than the Gatwick option, all three schemes are appraised as adverse.

Trade-offs between objectives

9 There is no information or methodology in terms of how the Airports Commission will determine the trade-off between the outcomes of the different appraisal modules. As an example, nationally there may be positive impacts yet locally there may be highly adverse impacts. The two separate expansion locations, i.e. Gatwick and Heathrow, differ in terms of the magnitude of the impacts on various issues. It would be helpful if the Commission were to publish the methodology behind the decision making process that it intends to follow in relation to determining these trade-offs.

Assessing the benefits of no expansion

10 The Commission has presented little detailed analysis in the appraisal process in terms of identifying and costing the community benefits that would occur from no expansion. Without expansion around west London there would be benefits accrued to the local communities over time from the use of less noisy planes and proposed future operation procedures for noise mitigation; more chance of securing the health benefits associated with meeting air quality limits; no loss of current valued open space or loss of established communities.

11 In addition, the congested road and public transport networks, already predicted to be further stretched by growing population growth, will not be further compromised. This aspect and the magnitude of the potential benefits, should be taken into account when appraising the two different locations i.e. Heathrow and Gatwick.

Question 4

In your view, are there any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed by the Commission to date?

Missing Information

1 The Council is concerned that the Airports Commission had not factored in sufficient time to ensure all necessary assessments were completed prior to consultation. The lack of information on issues such as detailed air quality impacts; impacts on local roads and the impacts of proposals to increase freight operations; details of proposed flight-paths; and confirmation of how any expansion proposal would be controlled in terms of any resulting environmental and health impacts, is considered unhelpful. Without this level of information it is considered difficult for communities, and those who represent them, to be able to give a proper considered response to this consultation.

2 In terms of the future model for aviation demand, for which the Commission has assessed against five scenarios and two different scenarios in regard to carbon i.e. carbon traded and carbon capped, it is unclear from this consultation how the results of this appraisal process will inform any final recommendation. The Council requests that more information about the decision-making process on this matter is made publicly available.

Health

3 The Council has taken every opportunity to request that the Airports Commission include health as a separate appraisal module. The existing health burden of the area surrounding Heathrow is already distinctly disadvantaged. These people are at further risk of inequitable exposure from environmental impacts such as increased noise and air pollution and associated adverse health effects from an expanded Heathrow. A full assessment of each short listed option on the health of the surrounding communities should have been part of the appraisal process to ensure that health impacts inform the decision-making process to select the best option. It will be too late to do this work once a recommendation has been narrowed down to one option.

4 A separate review report by Public Health by Design on how health aspects have been considered throughout the Airports Commission's Assessments has been commissioned by the Council and is attached to the response.

5 The report confirms the Council view that a more comprehensive Health Impact Assessment, in line with current international and national good practice, should have been included as standard at this point in the process. This approach should include the use of qualitative and quantitative assessment methods and consideration of physical health, mental health and wellbeing outcomes and indicators rather than just focusing on subjective wellbeing and aspects of community. Other modules such as quality of life, local economy, community, place, noise and air quality assessments would then feed into, and hence be a part of, an overall health impact assessment.

6 The Airport Commission's focus on the need to provide quantitative indicators of Quality of Life (i.e. a set of comparable metrics) has placed less value on a qualitative assessment approach and hence is in danger both of discounting good quality qualitative assessments and setting a precedent that only quantitative health impact assessment methods have value in the assessment of airport schemes nationally and locally. This runs counter to international good practice guidance advocated by the World Health Organization as well as past UK, England and devolved regions government guidance on the value of both qualitative and quantitative assessment of health and wellbeing impacts of policies and projects.

7 The Council believes the report by Public Health by Design confirms that the Commission have taken a flawed approach in terms of how it has appraised the impacts on health.

8 The report does note that on reviewing the original submissions by all three proposers, the Gatwick Quality of Life assessment is a better quality, more detailed assessment and much more in line with UK and international Health Impact Assessment good practice than the assessments accompanying the Heathrow submissions.

Housing and community infrastructure

9 The options short-listed for expansion at Heathrow have substantial negative impacts in terms of the loss of residential housing and community facilities. In addition, there will also be additional pressure for new housing and community infrastructure to accommodate the requirements arising from the predicted job growth. For example, the North West Runway option indicates a requirement for 29,800-70,800 in additional housing. This has significant implications for the surrounding local authorities who will have to find land on an unprecedented scale for both the re-housing of the communities that are being forced away and also the new housing and facilities needed as a result of the creation of the forecasted new jobs.

10 The Airports Commission appraisal has not provided a detailed assessment of the costs and the widespread implications of having to find land on the scale needed. This is a major flaw in the appraisal process. The Council does not consider that a recommendation to expand operations at Heathrow without properly identifying the solution to this problem is acceptable.

Cumulative impacts

11 The Council is concerned that there has been no proper cumulative approach to the impacts of the expansion options at Heathrow. For example, the north west runway option, in addition to community impacts and direct impacts of noise and air pollution; takes nearly 700 hectares of Green Belt; presents a major flood risk, even with mitigation; will require the relocation of a major energy from waste facility; destroys heritage assets; takes away valued open space to replace it with overflowed open space; and, removes the "Green Lung" buffer from the current airport and the more densely populated areas of the borough. In terms of the Colne Valley it has devastating impacts on the southern Colne Valley at a time when the north of the Colne Valley is already scheduled to be compromised by the construction and operation of HS2. The full cumulative impacts of all the various 'specific impacts' should be properly accounted for in the appraisal process.

Mitigation

12 The Council has consistently requested the inclusion of a separate mitigation module into the appraisal process. This would have allowed the assessment of the cumulative impacts, including costs and it also would have provided a mechanism by which the proposed mitigation measures could have been assessed in terms of effectiveness and identified implementation mechanisms. This would have made the results of the Commission's appraisals for "with mitigation measures" scenario more robust. Without this level of detail, these measures exist simply as ideas on paper.

13 As an example, the Commission has appraised the HAL offer for property compensation to local communities as capable of reducing the impacts from highly adverse to adverse. There is no detail provided by HAL or by the Commission as to whether the compensation is satisfactory or acceptable and no details are given on how the level of compensation has been calculated.

14 When asked at the Airports Commission's Heathrow Discussion Day on 3rd December as to how the level of compensation was calculated, the CEO of HAL replied that the compensation offer was three times the amount of mitigation offered with the previous third runway consultation. This does not represent an informed approach. If impacted communities cannot buy a like for like property in proximity to where they wish to be relocated, then the mitigation is insufficient. If impacted houses and community buildings such as schools do not receive sufficient noise insulation, then the mitigation is insufficient.

15 The Council is very concerned that there is limited information available as to how the Commission have taken into account the impacts of individual proposed mitigation measures across the modules; whether they are sufficient and offer adequate protection, where relevant; whether they deliver appropriate compensation to impacted communities; whether they are guaranteed deliverable solutions; and whether they can be fully implemented to the point of controls being placed upon the promoter to ensure the benefits happen in reality.

16 The Council does not believe it is acceptable to take the HAL mitigation and compensation offers and assume they will a) work, b) be implemented in reality and c) acceptable to the population impacted. Given the close proximity of the Heathrow expansion options to substantial numbers of people this deserves more scrutiny in the appraisal process.

17 The evaluation of mitigation measures should have been addressed within the appraisal framework. To have done so would have given impacted consultees more reassurance that the impacts would be dealt with properly. As it currently stands this is not the case.

Inadequate consideration of public safety

18 Insufficient attention has been given within the appraisal consultation to public safety. It is considered irresponsible not to have afforded this greater scrutiny given that the operation of Heathrow already puts hundreds of thousands of flights above one of the most densely populated areas of the UK. Any expansion will, especially in the current age of terrorism, simply increase the risk of an accident or incident impacting the lives of vast numbers of people on the ground. A scenario which examines the impacts arising from such an incident occurring should have been appraised in terms of the costs and potential human lives involved.

QUESTIONS INVITING COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE COMMISSION'S APPRAISAL

Question 5

Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal of specific topics (as defined by the Commission's 16 appraisal modules), including methodology and results?

1 The paragraphs below highlight the areas that the Council believes should have been afforded more attention within the identified appraisal modules in terms of process. The comments are made in relation to the options for expansion at Heathrow. Further comments on the results of each appraisal module are provided in the response to Question 6.

Economy impacts module

2 It is not clear how the Commission intends to use this appraisal module to form a decision on the likely future aviation scenario or what importance the Commission intend to give to elements such as the ability of the short-listed options to provide competition and the knock on benefits this may bring in terms of lowering fares and giving more choice to UK residents. More information about how the results from this appraisal module will influence the decision making process would have been helpful to consultees.

Local economy impacts module

3 There is no detail or account taken of how or where the local authorities are expected to provide the housing and associated infrastructure needed for the influx of expected job growth, and there is no information of where or how the communities and infrastructure displaced can be re-provided. Prior discussion with impacted local authorities to identify the feasibility of providing potential development sites would have improved this appraisal approach.

Surface access

4 The delivery of sufficient surface access provision, especially rail services, is identified as a risk to the delivery of positive outcomes for local communities and the local economy. It is identified that inadequate provision could reduce the result of this appraisal module to neutral. The inclusion of identified implementation mechanisms and defined funding streams for key transport interventions would have improved this appraisal approach. Without this detail the schemes are simply ideas on paper without any substance.

5 In addition, the Commission's transport assessment only looks at the surface access implications for up to 103.6 million passengers at Heathrow in a timeframe to 2030. No assessment has been undertaken for the worse-case scenario ie 149 million passengers, the Commission estimation for a 3 runway Heathrow at capacity. This is an unacceptable approach and potentially underestimates the amount of surface access actually required to support expansion in this area.

6 The surface access process overview states that the Commission has taken the view that the surface access strategies put forward by the promoters were sufficiently credible so as to be taken forward in their totality for appraisal. This assumption appears to be rather naive. Whilst it is recognised that the Commission has used independent consultants, Jacobs, to appraise the work provided by the promoters, further information should be made publicly available to allow the assessment of the validity of the Jacobs model if this topic is to be openly and properly scrutinised.

7 The Council has grave concerns that the surface access element of the expansion options at Heathrow has not been fully appraised. There are no funding streams or implementation programmes for key interventions and the impacts resulting from the failure of the surface access delivery element will fall upon the already adversely impacted local communities in terms of congested roads and public transport networks and poor air pollution levels. More detailed information on this would have improved this appraisal approach.

Noise module

8 Whilst the appraisal has required the assessment of different noise metrics there is no explanation as to how the results will inform any decision making process or trigger any resulting mitigation measures. The appraisal module states that the indicative flight paths used for the noise modelling scenarios should "*not be taken as showing where future flight paths would in practice be located*". It is difficult to see how the Commission expect potentially impacted stakeholders to respond when this important level of detail has not been provided. The inclusion of this information would have strengthened this appraisal module.

Air quality module

9 The Council considers that not to have set aside sufficient time to have completed detailed air quality modelling as part of the appraisal module, to inform the assessment of local air quality impacts and associated health effects, is a serious omission. It is unclear how this topic can be appropriately assessed by consultees without this information and this is a flaw in this appraisal module. It is disappointing that there is no timescale provided for when this work will be completed and there should be a commitment given to ensure that it will be made available for public scrutiny.

Biodiversity module

10 The cumulative impacts of other infrastructure proposals have not been properly taken into account. For example, the North West Runway option will have a devastating impact on the southern section of the Colne Valley. The aim for runway operation to be available for 2026 would also coincide with the impacts from the proposed HS2 rail route in the north of the Colne Valley. Taken together the impacts in the Colne Valley would be significantly worse than presented in isolation in this report. This is a flaw in the approach to appraisal in this module.

Appraisal of community impacts

11 The impacts on local communities are represented in several of the appraisal modules including the specific modules of Community and Quality of Life. This approach makes it difficult to gain an overall assessment of all the impacts. The Council believes that the inclusion of a specific health appraisal module would have helped to achieve this in a more robust manner.

12 It is not proven that community impacts that are considered as being positive in terms of local employment in one appraisal module and community impacts that are considered as being negative in terms of the appraisal within the noise module, or loss of residential housing in the community module can be traded off against each other in terms of appraisal of impacts. This is considered to be a flaw in the approach to the appraisal of community impacts.

Question 6

Do you have any comments on the Commission's sustainability assessments, including methodology and results?

1 These comments focus on the short-listed options at Heathrow. Surface access, whilst informing the business case, also has implications for the local economy appraisal and therefore detailed comments on surface access have been provided under this question.

Economy Impacts

2 The conclusions of this appraisal module are the same for both expansion locations i.e. Gatwick and Heathrow. From a national economic benefit perspective the two locations for expansion are appraised as highly supportive under the "low cost is king" and "global growth" future aviation scenarios, in terms of maximising economic benefits and supporting the competitiveness of the UK economy, with a further appraisal of supportive under the other three aviation scenarios. In terms of GDP/GVA effects from investment in aviation capacity and connectivity, both expansion locations are appraised as highly supportive. No decision has been made as to which scenario will be adopted.

3 The economic impacts in terms of scale are also dependent upon whether the figures are based upon a carbon-traded forecast or a more stringent carbon capped scenario. No decision has been made as to which scenario will be adopted.

4 The Heathrow expansion location is identified as having its main strength in being able to provide a large route network with connectivity benefits likely to be the largest if the capacity is taken up by the hub carrier and its partners. Benefits from competition in this scenario are identified as likely to be limited.

5 The Gatwick expansion location is identified as having a main strength in providing competition and providing a second gateway into London. The Gatwick airport operator has supplied independent analysis to the Commission which indicates that the benefits of competition from expanding at Gatwick are between £7.7 billion to £10.4 billion by 2050.

6 The Council considers that it is difficult to make informed comments on the appraisal result of this module when there are so many uncertainties raised by the Commission on future aviation demand. What is apparent is that both locations for expansion meet the Commission's objectives in terms of maximising the benefits and supporting the competitiveness of the UK economy.

7 Given the large uncertainties involved, the Council believes that it is correct that the final recommendation for expansion is not based solely on the economic benefits. On this basis the Council supports the Commission's approach in the sustainability of assessment incorporating, and appraising, a wide range of impacts. However in order for consultees to provide an informed response, more information needs to be provided on how the Commission will judge impacts against each other.

Local economy impacts

8 The likely growth of local employment is presented as a range. For example, for HAL North West Runway option, the job growth is given as a range of between 47,400 and 112,400 in 2030 rising to between 64,000 and 180,000 in 2050. The direct jobs are described as predominately lower skilled. This range is very coarse

and it is not clear how the Commission will use this information to influence its final recommendation i.e. low range, high range or an average.

9 The issues resulting from the need to provide the housing and associated infrastructure associated by the extra employment for expansion at Heathrow is suggested by the Commission as achievable. The analysis presented in the appraisal has averaged the numbers of additional housing needs across the 14 boroughs within the defined assessment area as between 2,100 and 5,100 homes per local authority over a 10 year period. No details are given as to how the Commission has concluded that this level of provision is achievable.

10 The additional housing requirements will need to be supported by the provision of additional social infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and leisure centres. It is suggested this amounts to the provision of 50 new primary schools (3.5 per local authority), 6 new secondary schools across the whole area, 2 additional health centres (14 GPs) and 2 primary care centres per local authority to 2030. No details are given as to how this will be provided.

11 There is no reference to the need to re-house the significant population that will be evicted due to the expansion options. For Hillingdon, the north-west runway option equates to a loss of nearly 1,000 houses plus associated community buildings such as schools. This provision will be required on top of the additional housing needs brought about by the projected increase in employment in the area.

12 There are no details of potential sites and no details of discussions with the 14 local authorities listed in the assessment area. As an example of the potential difficulties, the land available around Heathrow in Hillingdon is Metropolitan Green Belt and is heavily constrained for use as it is designated Flood Zone 3. The Council is already facing immense challenges in meeting its London plan requirements and recent new school development has unfortunately had to encroach onto significant green belt land.

13 It is also unclear whether the associated work journeys associated with accessing the airport from such a large assessment area have been properly taken into account. It is an omission that costs have not been apportioned to this and this could have significant implications for the local economic impact appraisal.

14 The Council believes that the Commission should consider if there are potential negative impacts associated with airport expansion in an area which is already economically buoyant. A full account of the dangers of overheating the local economy should be considered prior to any final recommendation on location.

Surface access

15 The local economy impacts appraisal is described as highly supportive and reduced to supportive if potential areas of constraint are realised. Whilst surface access is not a defined topic in the appraisal modules, it impacts across them and

has implications for the business case. The provision of appropriate surface access is key to the local economy impacts appraisal and therefore any non-delivery is identified by the Commission as potentially reducing the appraisal of this module to neutral.

16 Both Heathrow expansion schemes have been assessed as having the same forecasts in terms of trip generation and the same surface access solutions in terms of rail have been identified. Although passengers and employees may be travelling to the same airport for the same purpose it is not clear whether the differences between the two schemes may actually lead to different effects on the surface access network. This has not been addressed.

17 For example, on the roads in the vicinity of the airport there are differences in terms of access points to the M25 and access to the A4. As the local roads modelling has not been provided it is not possible to assess the impacts of the differing schemes.

18 The Heathrow Hub scheme promoter has put forward an additional surface transport strategy. This focuses on the creation of a transport hub on the Great Western mainline in Iwer, along with a 10,000 space car park. The additional trip generation that this could create in terms of access to the new hub has not been assessed within the Airports Commission consultation. This could have implications for Hillingdon with passengers and employees accessing the new transport hub and thereby putting additional pressure on the local road network in areas such as West Drayton and Yiewsley. This has not been assessed

19 The Council is concerned that in relation to the strategies put forward by HAL, insufficient analysis has been given in terms of deliverability and there is insufficient information provided for consultees to appraise their adequacy.

20 The major rail schemes proposed in the surface access proposals for Heathrow are mainly ones that are already proposed to cope with background growth in the existing two runway Heathrow scenario. This includes the Piccadilly line upgrade, Crossrail, the Western Rail Access proposal and the prospect of an HS2 connection via Old Oak Common.

21 The only "new" rail access scheme, the Southern Rail Access (SRA) scheme, is a re-vamped version of the original AirTrack scheme which was proposed as a solution to improve rail access to the two runway airport. The Council notes that the AirTrack scheme ended up not being taken forward due to difficulties in design.

22 Although the SRA scheme has been appraised as being able to deliver 17% of airport travellers from the associated catchment area, it is not yet even at design stage and is currently un-funded. If this scheme is not delivered, this potentially impacts on the business case as well as the sustainability assessment.

23 The Commission has noted that there may be capacity issues on the Great Western Mainline beyond 2040 and that tensions may emerge between rail infrastructure serving airport users as opposed to non-airport users. No solution is offered although comment is made that plausible solutions are likely to exist and will be expensive. Regrettably this has not been appropriately costed. This is considered to be a serious flaw in the appraisal.

24 The lack of a local roads impact assessment for this appraisal consultation is also a serious omission, especially the lack of a freight impact analysis which has the potential to have further detrimental impacts on local air quality. The full impacts of the proposed potential congestion charge have not been detailed or assessed. In addition, the Commission states that despite the proposer's mitigation schemes, it cannot be ruled out that additional widening of the M4 may be needed.

25 Given the issues raised above, the Council has serious concerns that the surface access elements of the proposals to accompany expansion at Heathrow have been insufficiently appraised. The Council believes that the appraisal of the local economy impacts module is more likely to be reduced from supportive to neutral.

Air Quality

26 The Council believes that the lack of a detailed air quality assessment is a serious omission and restricts the ability of consultees to respond to this consultation. There are no timescales for when the detailed assessment will be available and no commitment has been made to consult further on this. The inputs to the air quality modelling need to be rigorously scrutinised to ensure the outputs are accurate to make an informed judgement as to the estimated changes in air pollution concentrations and likely future air quality levels. It must include the local roads modelling and the impacts of the freight increases which are also currently missing from this consultation. The importance of the detailed local air quality predictions is that they impinge on the potential future health of the local communities and have potential legal implications for local authorities if European air quality standards are not achieved and maintained.

27 In addition there could be serious implications for the future business case if the use of the new runway is restricted in order to ensure compliance with air quality limits or if restrictive control measures need to be put in place to achieve compliance. These implications need to be properly costed and accounted for.

28 The appraisal module states that HAL has produced several credible mitigation proposals to reduce the impact of both existing and future road access to the airport on local air quality. Without a detailed air quality assessment it is not possible to assess whether such proposals are in fact credible in terms of achieving air quality compliance.

29 The Council requests that, prior to any final recommendation on options for expansion, there is further public consultation on the detailed air quality assessment including the methodology and assumptions used. The Commission appraisal which indicates a reduction from significantly adverse to adverse for local air quality cannot be currently supported given this lack of information.

Noise

30 The Commission has provided a noise scorecard in terms of appraisal outputs but no information on how these assessments will be used in terms of the decision making process on the location for airport expansion. It is unclear, for example, how much weight the Commission intends to give to recommending an option which would see the exposure of 637,700 people to aviation noise by 2050.

31 Improvements in future aviation technologies are identified as helping to deliver improvements in aviation noise to local communities. This shows a lack of understanding in how community noise is perceived. These will not be discernible improvements to local communities given that they will simply be overflowed by larger numbers of aircraft for longer periods of time.

32 The appraisal module has not included defined flight paths. The noise mitigation measures suggested by HAL, and accepted by the Commission as reducing the potential impact from significant adverse to adverse, include as yet untested new approaches such as curved landing paths, steeper approaches and displaced runway thresholds.

33 HAL makes reference to the provision of respite with expansion yet this cannot be guaranteed. Management of airspace is not in the airport operator's gift to deliver. Without cast iron guarantees from the regulators, such as the CAA and NATS, that all the proposed mitigation procedures can be delivered with predictable periods of respite, the reduction in the impact of noise as appraised in this module from significantly adverse to adverse with mitigation, is little more than a guess, based on wishful thinking.

34 This was highlighted in the recent Airports Commission's Heathrow Public Discussion Day on 3rd December 2014. The CEO of Heathrow confirmed that in terms of control the operator is limited to "influencing" and "incentivising"; it is the regulators who effectively control the airspace and operating procedures. For impacted communities to "influence" and "incentivise" to bring about change is not the same as a guarantee. It is unclear how the Commission has accounted for the inability of HAL to deliver the mitigation measures it has proposed in its appraisal of this module.

35 The Council has serious concerns in relation to how the Commission has appraised the potential noise impacts of an expanded Heathrow. It concludes that the impacts are similar in terms to the impacts around Gatwick and yet this makes

little sense because the magnitude of the impacts are vastly different. The Council does not therefore support the reduction from significantly adverse impact to adverse as defined in this appraisal module.

Biodiversity

36 Both Heathrow options are likely to require appropriate assessment under the Habitats Directive due to the likely significant effects on European Protected Sites. This is the same process that was influential in dismissing the Thames Estuary option. One of the important requirements of appropriate assessment is whether there are 'reasonable alternatives'. Gatwick would potentially appear to be a reasonable alternative when assessed on these terms however without a clear methodology in terms of how the Commission will assess trade-offs between appraisal modules it is unclear how this information will be used in the decision-making process. This is unhelpful to consultees.

37 Both options for expansion at Heathrow will have devastating impacts on the southern section of the Colne Valley. The aim for runway operation to be available for 2026 would coincide with the impacts arising from the proposed HS2 route in the north of the Colne Valley. Taken together the impacts in the Colne Valley would be significantly worse than presented in isolation in this report.

38 The North West Runway option, specifically, will also result in the loss of approximately 40 hectares of the Lower Colne Valley, which is a site of importance for nature conservation for London, not just Hillingdon. A further 35 hectares of this site would also be sterilized by virtue of bordering the new airport boundary, thus damaging a total of 75 hectares. This is in combination with more than a further 50 hectares loss of land in Hillingdon as a result of the proposed HS2 route.

39 The indirect impacts from the combined noise impacts will sterilise far wider areas both around Heathrow and the HS2 route. Once again, the cumulative impacts in the Colne Valley will be far more significant than that which is given credence in the airport assessments. The North West Runway option appears to result in the loss of the recently opened state of the art Colnbrook energy from waste facility. This is instrumental in managing waste for a number of local authorities. There are no identified plans or timescales for when this will be addressed in terms of relocation.

40 The Council considers that the appraisal framework has failed to demonstrate that all the cumulative impacts from the proposed expansion schemes for Heathrow have been properly assessed, costed and fully mitigated in terms of biodiversity. The reduction from adverse impact to neutral as defined in this appraisal module is not supported.

Carbon

41 The crude nature of the appraisal has been highlighted in the answer to question 3. There is no clear logic in a methodology that allows an impact to be four times higher than another and yet the conclusion is that they have the same impact i.e. adverse. With no local roads or freight impact assessments having been carried out and a lack of clarity over the surface access schemes, it is not possible to adequately understand the carbon emission impacts from the provision of surface transportation. Furthermore no account appears to have been taken of the carbon emissions associated with the re-housing of the substantial displaced communities or the provision of the housing and infrastructure required for the anticipated growth in jobs.

42 Given the scale of the carbon emissions related to the development at Heathrow, and that not all potential carbon sources in terms of the development in relation to Heathrow have been accounted for, the appraisal of the impact as adverse impact is not supported and the Council believes this should be appraised as highly adverse.

Water and flood risk

43 The appraisal module recognises that the proposed airfield expansion in the Heathrow area would increase the severity of an extant flood risk to properties in the vicinity. The Commission states that appropriate mitigating actions are possible and would need to be developed at the detailed design stage. This is a substantial risk to the delivery of the proposal.

44 There are insufficient details provided by HAL to reassure consultees that all the risks, especially groundwater flood risk, have been fully addressed. There are no detailed mitigation plans at this point in time. The Council does not feel there is sufficient information provided to support the Commission's assumption that its appraisal can be reduced from adverse impact to neutral, especially on aspects such as flood risk.

Place

45 The comments below relate only to the north-west runway option for expansion at Heathrow.

Longford

46 HAL has assessed Longford as a small collection of statutorily listed buildings which could be recorded, partially salvaged or even re-erected in some form. This was deemed to be sufficient mitigation to reduce the impact of total demolition from significantly adverse to moderate. Whilst the Commission's assessment has appreciated that this level of residual impact was 'still significant', it did not go far

enough in recognising the scale of the loss that would be incurred by total demolition.

47 The importance of Longford Village in heritage terms is much greater than a small collection of listed buildings. Longford is believed to have developed as a small, early Saxon settlement (5th - 7th century AD) around the site of the ford on the River Colne. This was an important crossing point for travellers on the Old Bath Road, the key east/west route in Roman/Saxon and Mediaeval Britain, linking London and Bristol. In the 18th century, the village became an important stop on the coaching route on the Old Bath Road. The fifteen or so listed and locally listed buildings, and other buildings of townscape merit make up a charming, and relatively unspoilt village on and around an island in the River Colne. Its total loss would therefore be very significant, and there is no mitigation possible which would reduce the impact from significantly adverse.

Harmondsworth

48 HAL has assessed Harmondsworth as losing three garden walls and a house which they considered could be recorded and its materials stored for re-erection. The chief impact on the small surviving section of the village was held to be that of noise from the runway. Whilst the Commission's assessment has appreciated that the proposal would have a significant impact on the listed buildings and conservation area, and the loss to their setting and tranquillity, the number of heritage assets to be totally demolished has been under represented, and the impact of the proposals on the surviving section of the village has been considerably down played.

49 Archaeological excavations in and around Harmondsworth village have shown that there was once a thriving Saxon settlement here and the finds, together with the occupation evidence, have been considered to be of national significance. The village was mentioned in the Domesday Book, and a Priory was constructed there in the 12th century. The 15th century Great Barn is considered one of the finest and most complete tithe barns still standing in the country, and the Barn, the former Manor House and the Church were at the heart of an important mediaeval settlement, which grew up at its gates.

50 The HAL proposal would place the airport's perimeter fence along the rear of the High Street frontages, divorcing this from the rest of the village, its through routes and much of its historic hinterland. This would lead to a complete loss of Harmondsworth's historic integrity. It would also lead to the loss of the role of the historic High Street at the heart of a living community, so leading to the inevitable redundancy of its Church, pub, shops and probably also the loss of its residents i.e. a significant loss in social capital and community cohesion that will be difficult if not impossible to recreate. Thus the impact on the remnant of Harmondsworth would be so severe that it may not be sustainable in the longer term.

51 The reduction from significantly adverse impact to adverse as defined in this appraisal module is therefore not supported.

Quality of life

52 Whilst the quality of life appraisal module is a welcome addition it does not provide a comprehensive assessment of local health and wellbeing impacts which is a serious omission. The lack of a full health impact assessment has important implications and to make an important policy decision on where airport expansion is best located without fully and appropriately taking the health and wellbeing of local communities into account is considered to be a flawed approach.

53 Hillingdon is already disadvantaged in terms of adverse health impacts. There are over 7,000 people on GP registers for coronary heart disease; 3,500 registered as having chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; 15,000 on asthma registers; and 1,500 recorded as having heart failure. Expansion will exacerbate the impacts on these people. The lack of a proper inclusive approach on health impacts is illustrated in the independent Health report commissioned by Hillingdon which has noted, for example:

- a quality of life assessment which does not include health and wellbeing impacts on children;
- air quality impacts stated as limited when there is clear evidence of air pollution affecting people's health which reduces their capacity to lead full lives and hence impacts on their quality of life;
- night time noise is stated to have no impact on wellbeing yet there are studies showing that sleep disturbance can lead to stress and mental ill health;
- place, and people's interaction with the built environment, the important link between open spaces and mental wellbeing are not considered;
- no detailed consideration of the implications of the loss of, and likely difficulty in re-placing and re-generating; social capital and community cohesion though the loss of community facilities; loss of people therefore making any unaffected community facilities less viable; the relocation of households and impacts on inequalities.

54 There is an attempt to trade off the positive impacts against the negative impacts, for example, the positive impacts of living near airports from aspects such as improved transport infrastructure and access to jobs are traded off against the negative impacts of noise, pollution and amenity loss. However the trade offs are not helpful, in part because the positives may not fall on the same set of people as the negatives. The inequalities element of a full Health Impact Assessment would help to identify these issues.

55 As an example the impacts of noise are suggested in the Quality of Life as having a greater impact on those living in social housing. Yet there is no proper analysis or assessment of the social and health equity implications of this and no discussion as to how these are factored into the quantification of the changes in wellbeing or their monetisation into wellbeing costs and benefits.

56 The data base of Mappiness is not robust enough to quantitatively estimate the wellbeing effects or to use the resulting estimates to value compensation, mitigation and enhancement measures. Quality of life is a composite indicator where each element is important in providing a comprehensive assessment. This assessment has not done this.

57 The Commission's appraisal that the negative impacts and positive impacts can be simply combined to give an overall appraisal of neutral in regards to quality of life is not supported. More information is available on this issue in the report commissioned by the Council and attached to this consultation response..

Community analysis

58 The appraisal acknowledges the significant devastation to the villages in Hillingdon resulting from the HAL Heathrow North West runway option which includes demolition of 783 properties, with the potential for the loss of another 245 due to new surface access alignments. Large parts of the remaining communities of Harmondsworth and Sipson will be left up against the new airport boundary. In addition there is a loss of valued recreation land and open space of up to 48 hectares and loss of 49 hectares of employment land.

59 The Commission has recognised that the HAL approach to mitigation is more about rebuilding communities as opposed to maintaining existing community cohesion. In the village communities, some of which have existed for over 1,000 years, the appraisal states it is difficult to see how any existing community cohesion can be maintained. It is unclear what level of importance the Commission has afforded this impact.

60 The final appraisal suggests that the mitigation plan proposed by Heathrow can mitigate this impact from highly adverse to a level of adverse. It is unclear how this can be achieved. There is no plan for where people will be re-housed or where lost facilities will be relocated. Without this detail it is unclear how the Commission has appraised a reduction in the impacts to adverse.

61 The lack of appraisal of the impacts of such a substantial land take has not been properly examined. It is not acceptable for this to be left to a promise from the airport operator at the Airports Commission's Heathrow Discussion Day on 3rd December that *"they will want to work with local developers to find new housing areas"* (page 25 transcript).

62 It is a major flaw in the appraisal process for the Commission not to have assessed the costs and widespread implications of having to find land for new homes on the unprecedented scale needed; for providing like for like residential properties; and also schools and other community buildings in close proximity. The Council considers that a recommendation to expand at Heathrow Airport without properly identifying the solution to this problem is not acceptable.

63 The reduction from highly adverse impact to adverse as defined in this appraisal module is not supported.

Question 7

Do you have any comments on the Commission's business cases, including methodology and results?

1 The business case is informed by the strategic case, economic case, financial and commercial case and management case. The Council has highlighted below where it has further concerns or where more information is required.

Strategic case

2 As previously discussed this appraisal consultation has provided a range of future aviation demand scenarios, two different carbon impacted scenarios and a range of associated outcomes. The separate locations for expansion i.e. Gatwick and Heathrow, both provide substantial economic benefits; they both provide jobs to their surrounding areas; and they both provide future aviation connectivity in terms of passenger numbers and destinations served, including to the emerging markets.

3 Expansion at Heathrow, under either proposal, is identified as having its main strength in being able to provide a large route network with the greatest connectivity benefits if the capacity is taken up by the hub carrier and its partners. Benefits from competition in this scenario are identified as likely to be limited.

4 Expansion at Gatwick, is identified as providing competition and a second gateway into London. This would provide a 2+2 runway future solution, which may have better flexibility in terms of route competition and providing future flexibility in terms of airline business models, as opposed to a 3+1 runway solution with expansion at Heathrow.

5 We note that the Gatwick airport operator has supplied independent analysis to the Commission which indicates that the benefits of competition from expanding at Gatwick are between £7.7 billion to £10.4 billion by 2050.

6 We believe the benefits of competition should be properly appraised. The original BAA group was broken up by the Competition Commission for very good reason. It has created competition and allows more choice for the travelling public. If the Commission recommend expansion at Heathrow it needs to publish why it

believes the re-creation of this monopoly to provide a 3+1 runway solution for the UK future aviation connectivity is in the best interests of the consumer.

7 In terms of providing a future operationally resilient airport operation, the Commissions' consultation has not provided evidence to show that the addition of a third runway at Heathrow will improve this. The current Heathrow two runway airport is run at capacity, which provides no operational resilience. The Commissions' assessment has indicated a faster rate of growth than the airport operator, with the airport being again close to capacity within a short time of opening.

8 If the future capacity levels have to be capped to ensure operational resilience then the business case should be amended accordingly. If the airport is not subjected to such a cap, the same situation of no operational resilience will simply occur again in the future.

9 Gatwick airport, at present, has only one runway which gives it no operational resilience in the event of circumstances such as poor weather conditions, debris on the runway, and other such situations outside of the control of the operator. It is unclear how the Commission will appraise this issue.

10 The Council firmly believes that, given the above, recommending an option to expand which knowingly inflicts the largest damage to local communities should not be supported.

Economic Case

11 The Council has provided detailed comments on the economic case in responses to questions 5 and 6. In addition, the Council has the following points which it believes the Commission should consider in regards to the economic case.

12 The Council does not believe that the assessment of carbon emissions has been properly considered in terms of its wider implications. To choose an option to expand at Heathrow would be to concentrate over half of the UK's aviation carbon emissions in one airport. Should future carbon reductions or emission constraints be needed, this could have wider implications for other airports. This should be properly considered.

13 The costs of providing the identified surface access proposals differ in magnitude between the two airport locations with the costs identified for Heathrow being approximately seven times that of the cost of surface access provision at Gatwick. The Commission has not offered any comment as to the appropriate share between private and public sectors in terms of financing the provision. This is a potential public sector cost which may differ in magnitude between the two airport locations and should be properly considered in terms of the business case.

Financial and commercial case.

14 The Council notes that the costs for providing capacity at Heathrow are higher than that at Gatwick and that this will involve higher costs per passenger. It is not clear what consideration the Commission has given in terms of the costs of higher charges on the flying public in its economic assessment.

Management case

15 A number of concerns have been raised by the Commission in terms of the delivery of the expansion proposals at Heathrow. The Council has additional concerns in relation these issues which are detailed below.

16 The Council is concerned that the business case has underestimated the costs that may be imposed upon the surrounding local authorities and the local communities by the options to expand at Heathrow. These impacts are described in Question 6, in regards to the local economy impact module.

17 The Council notes that the provision of appropriate surface access is key to the local economy impacts in terms of realising local benefits and that any non-delivery could see this appraisal result reduced to neutral. The Council has concerns that the surface access proposals for roads and public transport access have been insufficiently appraised in terms of their deliverability, their costs and their implementation and funding. These impacts are set out in the response to Question 6 and they will have implications for the business case.

Air quality challenges

18 The lack of a detailed air quality assessment in this appraisal consultation, along with other omissions such as the local roads modelling and the freight impacts assessment are all serious flaws in the appraisal. It means that the full impacts of expansion on local air quality levels and associated health effects have not yet been calculated. There is a distinct possibility that the airport infrastructure could be built and yet its capacity potential may not be realised due to constraints caused by increasing levels of air pollution.

19 The three areas identified by the Commission as main risks relate to air quality are a) fleet turnover does not deliver the expected reduction in emissions, b) modal shift towards public transport does not occur to the extent expected, c) European rules are tightened. None of these are in the direct control of the airport operator and therefore these remain high risks that lead to the inability of Heathrow to fully utilise the additional capacity that is assumed. This should be taken into account.

20 The Commission must ensure that account is taken of the implications on the economic impacts of a partially used runway. This consequence must be factored into the decision-making process for recommending an option for airport expansion.

Management of flood risk

21 The Commission acknowledges that the proposed airfield expansion would increase the severity of an extant flood risk to properties in the vicinity of the Heathrow site. Given the recent severe flooding experienced in the area close to Heathrow this is an issue of great concern to local communities.

22 The Commission states that appropriate mitigating actions are possible and would need to be developed at the detailed design stage. This assumption is a substantial risk to the delivery of the proposal because it may not necessarily be achieved without huge costs both financially, and to the community. There are insufficient detailed mitigation plans provided to reassure consultees that all the risks, especially groundwater flood risk, have been fully addressed. The appropriate solutions have not yet been identified or costed. This has implications for the business case.

Construction

23 The construction costs associated with the provision of expansion at Heathrow, for example tunnelling the M25, widening parts of the surrounding motorway network, re-routing the A4, construction of a large integrated transport hub in Iver, will all be major construction projects for which the impacts may be felt over a wide area. Given the significant construction period that will be required, consideration needs to be given to the detrimental impacts on other road users and the potential for surrounding local road networks to be negatively impacted. This should be costed and accounted for in the business case.

Lakeside Energy from Waste Plant

24 The impacts of removing and then replacing the Lakeside Energy from Waste Plant, do not appear to have been appraised in any detail. It is unclear if a suitable location has been identified and if not, it may prove extremely challenging to find a suitable site for this facility. This could result in adverse local impacts both in terms of its relocation site and the potential impacts on customers travelling to a different location. This is an aspect that does not have a solution; where the outcomes are unknown; and where the local impacts have not yet been identified. This should be accounted for in the business case.

RAF Northolt

25 The Council has noted the potential impacts on RAF Northolt. It is aware of a recent decision by central Government which included the need for RAF Northolt to increase the commercial side of the airfield in order to remain a viable military airfield. It is unclear how the Commission has taken this into account. This may have implications for the business case.

OTHER COMMENTS

Question 8

Do you have any other comments.

Flawed consultation

1 The Commission has produced a vast amount of information. It has stated in the Chair's Foreword to the consultation document that "*it is particularly important for local residents and their representatives to understand more clearly what the proposals entail, and what their consequences might be for the local environment*". Unfortunately, this consultation has failed to do this.

2 There is a wealth of missing information, all of which relates to understanding the detrimental local impacts. There is no evaluation process presented for consultees to consider and try to understand as to how the Commission has assessed the effectiveness of mitigation proposals. There is no discussion or commitment to hold further public consultation on the missing information. This does not represent an open and transparent process and neither does it allow the opportunity for stakeholder engagement on key information which relates directly to them prior to any final decision being taken.

3 The Council has identified flaws in the Appraisal Framework with gaps in the provision of vital information which would have aided a more informed response. It is crucial that the Commission publishes how it intends to plug the gaps on information such as detailed air quality assessment, local roads modelling, freight impacts, flightpath details and how it intends to ensure this is made publicly available for comment prior to any final recommendation being made on the best option for airport expansion.

Community Engagement

4 The Commission notes that aspects such as local airspace design are likely to be contentious given the large population affected by noise from Heathrow. This has been demonstrated by the recent flightpath changes trials which resulted in the trials being halted earlier than expected due to large community protests. This issue has still been insufficiently addressed by HAL and by the Commission. Potentially impacted communities are still unaware of the flightpaths which may impact on their lives. The creation of an Independent Noise Authority to help community engagement will be too late once the recommendation for expansion has already been made.

5 The resulting impacts on local communities, including the demolition and loss of community cohesion, have not been adequately appraised. No evaluation has been made as to the levels of compensation required to ensure the people are adequately compensated and will be able to find acceptable places to live in an area

of their choice. The CEO of HAL at the Airports Commission's Heathrow Discussion Day on 3rd December 2014 referred to the economic benefits and the creation of jobs arising from the proposal as the “prize of expansion”. The Council believes this is totally at the expense of the surrounding local communities and unacceptable.

Legal Framework

6 The Council believes that the Commission, when recommending a final option for airport expansion, should ensure there is a means by which the claims and projections of the promoter can be held to account. This includes ensuring that the wider community around the airport does benefit directly from the claimed economic benefits arising from expansion.

7 Given the close proximity of both the Heathrow expansion options to large densely populated areas, any failure in key aspects such as adequate surface access and public transport provision; appropriate measures to improve and maintain compliance with air quality; measures to reduce noise, will all impact directly on the local communities. Controls and implementation mechanisms need to be identified. Promises made by HAL, that are not in the gift of the airport operator to even deliver, are considered to be simply hollow promises.

This page is intentionally left blank

STANDARDS AND QUALITY IN EDUCATION IN HILLINGDON 2013/2014

Cabinet Member	Councillor David Simmonds
Cabinet Portfolios	Deputy Leader of the Council Education and Children's Services
Officer Contact	Daniel Kennedy, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1 - Further information about Looked After Children

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	This report provides Cabinet with an overview of the standard and quality of education across Hillingdon schools for local residents. The report focuses on attainment and achievement for the academic year 2013/14. Overall, results have improved and attainment for pupils in Hillingdon continues to rise throughout the key stages. Results remain either in line with or above national results in most subject areas. To ensure standards continue to rise, the report identifies further areas for action with schools.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	Putting our Residents First: <i>Our People; Our Built Environment</i> Ensuring every child in Hillingdon has access to a high quality school place as close to home as possible is central to putting our residents first.
Financial Cost	There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Children, Young People and Learning Policy Overview Committee
Ward(s) affected	All

RECOMMENDATION

That Cabinet:

1. Note the key findings set out in the report which identifies improvements in many of the key stages in education for Hillingdon's residents and;
2. Endorse the priorities for further action to ensure standards in education continue to rise.

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

To provide Cabinet with an overview of school performance in the Borough which underpins the role of the Local Authority to challenge performance where required.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage. The report is scheduled for presentation to the Children, Young People and Learning Policy Overview Committee in February 2015.

Summary

3. Ofsted inspection outcomes are generally positive and reflect the good quality of education provided by Hillingdon schools. The main findings from the review of schools performance for the academic year 2013/14 are:
 - Overall, results have improved and attainment for pupils in Hillingdon continues to rise throughout the key stages. Results overall remain either in line with or above national results. There have been a number of changes in the national assessment frameworks which means reliable comparison with previous years has not always been possible.
 - Ofsted assessments show that 76% of secondary pupils and 81% of primary pupils attended a school in Hillingdon which was judged as 'good' or 'outstanding'. This is on par with the national average.
 - For Looked After Children, due to changes in the national assessment framework at key stage 4 it is not possible at this stage to make comparisons to previous years performance. Targeted action is being taken to raise standards.
 - Special Educational Needs – outcomes for pupils in general show positive progress against peers.
 - Success rates of pupils in Hillingdon's Adult Learning Services continue to remain high at 87%, and above or equal to the national average.
4. The remainder of the report provides further information about the outcomes achieved at the different education stages.

Putting Our Residents First – Raising Standards in Education

5. Putting residents first is central to the work of Hillingdon Council. This includes ensuring that every child in Hillingdon has access to a high quality school place as close to home as possible. Hillingdon Council has delivered a significant primary school places expansion programme in recent years to meet the rising demand for school places; totalling £150m, the largest in London. Significant investment by the Local Authority in new and modern education buildings and facilities is providing the high quality learning environment that children need in Hillingdon for the best start in life.
6. The Council recognises that access to the very best education opportunities for Hillingdon's children and young people, from early years onwards, ensures the Borough remains a

popular and desirable place of choice for families who are attracted to the area by the positive reputation of Hillingdon's schools.

7. The education landscape has been changing nationally and locally. There is now a diverse range of providers in Hillingdon offering opportunities to children and young people from early years through to adulthood. Schools operate within a framework of autonomy and have the primary responsibility for their own performance. Schools are also responsible for deploying school improvement resources to support their continuous self-improvement and form part of a wider school community to raise standards in education across all schools in Hillingdon.
8. The Council has a particular role to play in promoting high standards for all pupils, including vulnerable pupils. This includes:
 - collating and analysing the performance for all publicly funded schools in Hillingdon to identify those at risk and those in need of additional support (i.e. managing intelligence on school performance).
 - monitoring and challenging the performance of individual schools for all pupils, specific groups of pupils and individual pupils. This includes reviewing school improvement plans and monitoring the progress of these plans.
 - adopting a brokerage role for schools to access support from other schools.
 - issuing warning notices and recommending intervention action for community schools where required to drive up standards. This action is usually recommended as a last resort.
9. For Academies and Free Schools the Local Authority has limited powers to intervene, but if necessary, can refer concerns to the new Regional Schools Commissioner and / or the Secretary of State for Education.

Ofsted Inspections of Schools

10. During the academic year 2014 eighteen state funded schools in Hillingdon (including Academies and one new Studio College) were inspected by Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education). Ofsted award schools a performance judgement from inspections using a four point assessment scale (1) outstanding, 2) good, 3) requires improvement and 4) inadequate).
11. The overall effectiveness of twelve of the eighteen schools inspected in 2014 was deemed to be outstanding or good with six judged as 'requiring improvement'. None were judged as inadequate. Overall, the percentage of schools judged to be 'good' or 'outstanding' in Hillingdon is on par with the national position of schools judged by Ofsted (see table 1 below).

Table 1: Summary of Schools in Hillingdon by Ofsted Judgement
(Figures for the number of schools are in brackets)

Ofsted Judgements from School Inspections								
	1) Outstanding		2) Good		3) Satisfactory or Requires Improvement		4) Inadequate	
	National*	LBH	National*	LBH	National*	LBH	National*	LBH
Primary	17%	19.7% (13)	64%	60.5% (40)	18% for categories 3 and 4	(13) 19.7%	See category 3	0
Secondary	21%	26.3% (5)	49%	47.4% (9)	23%	26.3% (5)	6%	0
TOTAL (all schools)	-	21.2% (18)	-	57.6% (49)	-	21.2% (18)	-	0

*Figures for national Ofsted results are for the period ending 31 August 2014.

Monitoring and Challenging the Performance of Individual Schools

12. As part of the statutory responsibilities placed on Hillingdon Council to monitor the performance of individual schools and support schools to raise their standards, the Local Authority commissioned a programme of school performance reviews of all community schools (excluding Academies and Free Schools). The programme of reviews commenced in September 2014 to complete 40 reviews by the end of the first year. By the end of the autumn term 14 schools were reviewed and received reports. These 14 reviews are being used by the respective Governing Body and the Head Teacher of individual schools to develop targeted improvement plans where these are required.
13. During the last year it has been necessary for Hillingdon Council to commence intervention action in three schools where education standards have not improved. In one instance a warning notice has been issued and in another two cases applications have been submitted to the Department for Education to set up Interim Executive Boards (IEB). Both IEBs were approved and are in place for the schools in question. The Boards are actively progressing the necessary action to raise standards in the two schools.
14. As a priority for the coming year officers will be working closely with schools to define and ensure understanding of roles and responsibilities to drive up school standards and agree with schools a school-led framework for school improvement.

Overview of School Performance – 2013/14

A. Foundation Stage (age 3 to 5):

15. The Foundation Stage assessments were changed in 2013. The year 2014 was therefore the first year where it has been possible to draw comparisons with the previous year's performance under the new system. Overall, performance for the seven key subjects shows improvement across all areas, but remains below the national and outer London averages. In some subjects, Early Years providers in Hillingdon are now very close to achieving the average for outer London and nationally.
16. The assessment at the Foundation Stage is based entirely on teacher assessments. Officers from the Local Authority have been working with staff in early years settings to

improve the way in which assessments are conducted, which has directly raised standards. During 2013/14 the moderation focus was on mathematics, which has improved by 14 points. For 2014/15 the focus will initially be on literacy.

Priorities for Foundation Stage

- To continue to support Teachers in making secure and consistent judgements against national standards through rigorous moderation. The initial focus will be on literacy.
- Narrowing the gap between the attainment of boys and girls to address the difference between Hillingdon’s performance and national performance.

Table 2: Performance at Foundation Stage - Percentage of Overall Teacher Assessments (Difference in performance to 2013 shown in brackets)

SUBJECT	HILLINGDON		NATIONAL		OUTER LONDON	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Communication & Language	64	69 (+5)	72	77 (+5)	72	78 (+6)
Physical Development	77	83 (+6)	83	86 (+3)	83	86 (+3)
Personal Social & Emotional Development	71	78 (+7)	76	81 (+5)	77	82 (+5)
Literacy	58	65 (+7)	61	66 (+5)	62	68 (+6)
Mathematics	55	69 (+14)	66	72 (+6)	67	74 (+7)
Understanding the World	67	77 (+10)	75	80 (+5)	75	80 (+5)
Arts/Design & Making	72	82 (+10)	78	83 (+5)	78	83 (+5)

B. Key Stage 1 (age 5 to 7):

17. At key stage 1, pupils are expected to achieve a Level 2 assessment. For the specific areas of assessment analysis shows:

- Reading - the proportion of pupils attaining Level 2 or above has remained at the same level as last year whilst the proportion of pupils attaining Level 3 or above has continued to improve and is above the national and outer London averages.
- Writing - the proportion of pupils attaining level 2 or above has improved to above national averages and is in-line with the outer London averages. The proportion of pupils attaining Level 3 or above is better than last year, is above the national average but below the outer London averages.
- Maths - the proportion of pupils attaining Level 2 or above has improved compared to the previous year and remains above the national and outer London averages.
- Phonics - 77% of pupils are working at the desired phonics level which is 6% better than last year and is above the national average (74%) and in line with the outer London average (77%).

Priorities for Key Stage 1

- Further detailed analysis shows some differences in attainment across specific pupil groups, including differences between boys and girls. Therefore a priority is to continue to narrow the gap between boys and girls in relevant areas;
- Continue to maintain the improvement and remain above the national average in all areas.

Table 3: Performance at Key Stage 1 (percentage of pupils)
(Difference in performance from 2013 shown in brackets)

SUBJECT	LEVEL	HILLINGDON		NATIONAL		OUTER LONDON	
		2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Reading	2+	91	91 (-)	89	90 (+1)	90	90 (-)
Reading	3+	31	33 (+2)	29	31 (+2)	30	32 (+2)
Writing	2+	85	87 (+2)	85	86 (+1)	86	87 (+1)
Writing	3+	15	17 (+2)	15	16 (+1)	16	18 (+2)
Maths	2+	92	93 (+1)	91	92 (+1)	92	92 (-)
Maths	3+	26	28 (+2)	23	24 (+1)	25	27 (+2)

C. Key Stage 2 (age 7 to 11):

18. At key stage 2, pupils are expected to achieve a Level 4 assessment. The measure of expected progress is built on the principle that pupils achieving a level 4 in English or in Maths by the end of key stage 2 should be expected to achieve at least a 'C' grade GCSE in that subject. The key stage 2 tests were changed in 2013. The English test was replaced by Reading, Writing and Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling (GPS). 2014 is the first year it has been possible to compare the results with previous years. Overall, results for Hillingdon schools show continued improvements in 2014 compared to previous years and in all subject areas exceed or equal the national average. For the specific areas of assessment:

- Reading – the proportion of pupils attaining level 4 has improved over the last year and remains above the national position and matches the average performance for pupils attending schools in outer London. Almost 9 out of every 10 pupils in Hillingdon are achieving the required standard.
- Writing – the share of pupils attaining level 4 or higher has markedly improved over the last year, and is above the national and outer London average.
- Maths – The proportion of pupils attaining level 4 or above is slightly better than last year. Performance is above the national average and is in line with outer London averages. The proportion of pupils attaining Level 5 or above is the same as last year and above national averages but just below the outer London average.
- Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling - the proportion of pupils attaining level 4 is above the national position and matches the average performance for pupils attending schools in outer London.

Priorities for Key Stage 2

- Continue to target and challenge schools to increase achievement at key stage 2 to be above the national average for all areas.

Table 4 – Performance at Key Stage 2 (percentage of pupils)
(Difference in performance from 2013 shown in brackets)

SUBJECT	LEVEL	HILLINGDON		NATIONAL		OUTER LONDON	
		2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Reading	4+	87	89 (+2)	86	88 (+2)	86	89 (+3)
Reading	4B+***	76	78 (+2)	75	78 (+3)	76	79 (+3)
Reading	5+	43	49 (+6)	45	49 (+4)	45	51 (+6)
Writing (TA*)	4+	84	88 (+4)	83	85 (+2)	84	86 (+2)
Writing (TA*)	5+	29	33 (+4)	30	33 (+3)	32	38 (+6)
Maths	4+	87	88 (+1)	85	85 (-)	86	88 (+2)
Maths	4B+	77	79 (+2)	73	75 (+2)	77	79 (+2)
Maths	5+	46	46 (-)	41	42 (+1)	46	47 (+1)
GPS**	4+	78	80 (+2)	73	76 (+3)	78	80 (+2)
GPS**	4B+	70	73 (+3)	64	68 (+4)	70	73 (+3)
GPS**	5+	53	58 (+5)	47	52 (+5)	54	59 (+5)

*TA refers to teachers' assessment of writing

**GPS = Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling

*** 4B is defined as a "good level 4"

D. Key Stage 4 (age 14 to 16):

19. During the academic year 2013/14, significant national reforms were introduced which affected the results of key stage 4 assessments. The main reason for this can be attributed to early entry and vocational qualification reforms which impact on the way qualifications contribute to performance table measures. Not only were the range of subjects which attract points reduced, but some subjects which previously equated to two or more GCSEs were capped at one award. In addition, the points from subsequent re-sits resulting from early entry to exams have been limited to the first entry for assessment only. The collective impact of these reforms has reduced the potential average points scores on which performance tables are constructed. During this time, the exams framework moved away from modular qualifications to "end-only" exams and this has resulted in changes to the taught curriculum and transitional arrangements.

20. As a result of these collective changes, it is not accurate to directly compare 2014 key stage 4 results with previous years. The following table summarises the performance at key stage 4 and for completeness the results from the key stage 4 assessments in 2013 have been retained and included for ease of reference.
21. At key stage 4 a key benchmark of performance is the percentage of pupils attaining at least five GCSEs at grades A*-C. Overall, a higher share of pupils attending a Hillingdon school in 2014 achieved the benchmark compared to the average across the country.

Table 5 – Performance at Key Stage 4 (percentage of pupils)

SUBJECTS	HILLINGDON		NATIONAL		OUTER LONDON	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Percentage of pupils attaining at least 5 A* - C Grades	86	68	81	63	84.5	71
Percentage of pupils attaining at least 5 A* - C Grades (inc English and Maths)	61	58	58.5	52.5	65.5	61.5
Percentage of pupils making expected progress in English	73.5	72.5	71	71	78	78
Percentage of pupils making expected progress in Maths	74	69	72	65	78.5	72

Priorities for Key Stage 4

- Supporting the two remaining LA Secondary Schools for which the LA retains responsibility (i.e. non Academies).
- Supporting LA schools to move from 'requiring improvement' to 'good' in the Ofsted ratings.

E. Key Stage 5 (Age 16 to 19):

22. At key stage 5 there are two main national indicators of performance:
- The average point score per student (based on cumulative performance in GCSE/ A/AS and key skills examinations – usually over 2 years).
 - The average point score per examination entry (based on cumulative performance in GCSE/A/AS and key skills examinations – usually over 2 years).
23. The average point score per student has shown significant falls both in Hillingdon, outer London and nationally. The average point score per examination entry is slightly down in Hillingdon for 2014, leaving it just below both outer London and national averages.

Table 6 - Key Stage 5 Summary (Difference in performance from 2013 shown in brackets)

SUBJECTS	HILLINGDON		NATIONAL		OUTER LONDON	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Average point score per student	710	624 (-86)	724	680 (-44)	705.5	689 (-16.5)
Average point score per entry	208	203.5 (-4.5)	213	213.5 (+0.5)	211.5	212 (+0.5)

F. Looked After Children (LAC):

24. From reviewing the attainment of those children looked after continuously for 12 months for the year 2013/14 the findings show at key stage 4, the percentage of children looked after achieving A*-C in all subjects was 14.3% in 2014. The percentage achieving 5+ A*-C including English and Mathematics was 7.1%. Due to the impact of the national reform of the key stage 4 assessments, it is difficult at this stage to draw reliable comparisons to previous years. Targeted checks are being made on schools to ensure looked after children receive the additional support they need to raise attainment. Further information about the attainment of looked after children can be found in appendix 1 and will also be reported separately to Hillingdon’s Corporate Parenting Board.

Priorities

- Ensure every looked after child has an up-to-date Personal Education Plan setting out the targeted support needed for the young person to improve their education outcomes.
- All action plans are regularly reviewed and progress checked to ensure looked after children receive the support that has been agreed.

Table 7 – Looked After Children Key Stage 4 Summary

KS4 Attainment	2013-14
A* - C in English and Mathematics	7.1%
5 + GCSEs A* - C including English and Mathematics GCSEs	7.1%
5 + GCSE’s A* - C or equivalent – all subjects	14.3%

G. Special Education Needs (SEN):

25. In line with the Children and Families Act 2014 from September 2014 onwards the SEN statements are being replaced by Education, Health and Care Plans (EHC). The new Plans will be phased in over a three and a half year transition period. The School Action and School Action Plus categories will be combined for reporting purposes into an SEN support category in 2014/15, although SEN statements will remain for the time being. This will make comparisons with previous performance more difficult as the changeover happens. Work to implement these changes is well advanced in Hillingdon.

26. For key stages 1, 2 and 4, analysis of attainment for children and young people with additional support needs shows that good progress has been made across most groups, with notable improvements at key stage 1 and key stage 4. Progress from year to year will, however, depend on the specific needs of children. Pupil progress is based on a range of factors e.g. pupil prior attainment, gender, month of birth and other pupil and school

contextual factors. The tables below provide further information about progress at the different key stages.

Table 8 – Education Outcomes for Children with Special Needs

8a. SEN KS1 (scores for reading, writing and maths)

Pupils	Actual Results			Pupil Progress		
	Avg Point Score	% Level 2+	% level 3+	Average Point Score	% level 2+	% level 3+
School Action (318)	13.1	60%	0%	+0.0	+1%	0%
School Action+ (245)	13.0	55%	3%	+0.2	+2%	+1%
Statement (93)	7.6	23%	2%	-0.1	+6%	+2%

8b. SEN KS2 (scores for reading, writing and maths)

Pupils	Actual Results			Pupil Progress		
	Average Point Score	% level 4+	% level 5+	Average Point Score	% level 4+	% level 5+
School Action (345)	25.2	47%	1%	-0.1	-3%	-2%
School Action + (213)	24.5	40%	5%	+0.4	+4%	+1%
Statement (101)	16.6	10%	4%	+0.8	-2%	+2%

8c. SEN KS4 (5 GCSEs A*-C)

Pupils	Actual Results			Pupil Progress		
	% 5+ A*-C Eng and Maths GCSE	Avg point score best 8*	% EBacc**	%5+ A*-C Eng and Maths GCSE	Avg point score best 8*	% EBacc**
School Action (324)	30%	254	7%	-1%	-4	-0%
School Action + (122)	30%	226	2%	+4%	-8	-2%
Statement (112)	11%	108	2%	+2%	-5	+0%

*Average Point Scores are the total points achieved by pupils in their best 8 GCSEs (or equivalents).

**English Baccalaureate

H. Hillingdon Adult Learning Service:

27. The Hillingdon Adult Learning Service provides opportunities for adults to learn new skills which align to Hillingdon’s priorities and those of the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. The service is subject to Ofsted inspections and is graded as ‘good’.

28. Overall, the service continues to deliver positive outcomes for Hillingdon residents with a high proportion of learners achieving their expected learning aims, and consistently above average. The following table summarises the key outcomes.

Table 9 – Hillingdon Adult Learning Outcomes

Key Performance Indicator	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2013/14 comparison to Provider Group average	2013/14 comparison to National average
Success Rates %	88%	89%	87%	83.6%	84.6%
Retention Rate %	93%	93%	92%	92%	92%
Achievement Rate %	94%	95%	95%	91%	92%

Notes:

Success rates: the proportion of enrolled learners who successfully achieve their aims.

Retention rates: the proportion of enrolled learners who are retained until the course ends.

Achievement rates: the proportion of retained learners who successfully achieve their aims.

I. School Attendance and Exclusions

29. The times that children are absent from school can have a detrimental impact on their learning outcomes. Levels of attendance and exclusions from schools are closely monitored to ensure children remain in education and standards are being met.

Attendance

30. In the period 2013-14, attendance for key stage 1 pupils was 95%, 96% for key stage 2 pupils and 95% for key stage 4 pupils. These levels of attendance are consistently above the Ofsted thresholds. Ofsted thresholds for 2012-13 were 93.72% in primary schools and 92.46% in secondary schools. Attendance is closely monitored.

Exclusions

31. The latest comparable data available for school exclusions is for the period 2012-13. The next available data set will be collected from the January 2015 School Census. In Hillingdon during 2012-13, there were 5 permanent exclusions for assaults against another pupil, 8 permanent exclusions for persistent disruptive behaviour and 8 permanent exclusions for 'other' unspecified reasons. In Hillingdon levels of permanent exclusion are slightly above national and outer London levels at secondary school stages.

Table 10 - Permanent Exclusions

Permanent Exclusions	State-funded Primary	State- funded Secondary	Special
England	0.02%	0.12%	0.07%
Outer London	0.01%	0.14%	0.07%
Hillingdon	0	0.15%	0

32. The proportion of fixed term exclusions was below average at primary level. At secondary stage the proportion of fixed term exclusions was above the average for outer London schools. The main reasons for fixed term exclusions included assault against another pupil, verbal/threatening behaviour, persistent disruptive behaviour and a high proportion for other

"unspecified" reasons. Over the coming year further analysis of exclusions will be undertaken and shared with schools to highlight any patterns or concerns.

Table 11 - Fixed Term Exclusions

Fixed term exclusions	State-funded Primary	State- funded Secondary	Special
England	0.88%	6.75%.	14.68%
Outer London	0.60%	6.12%	17.63%
Hillingdon	0.40%	6.35%	49.06%

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

The report presents a summary of education attainment and standards in Hillingdon schools and sets out priorities to continue to improve education for Hillingdon's residents.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None required as the report is a summary of attainment and inspection evidence.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations outlined above.

Legal

Under the Education Act 1996 (sections 13,13A and 14) the Council has statutory obligations to: ensure that efficient primary, secondary and further education is available to meet the needs of the local population; ensure that its education functions are discharged with a view to promoting high standards; ensure fair access to opportunity for education and learning, and promote the fulfilment of learning potential; and secure that sufficient schools, for providing primary and secondary education, are available for its area.

The report sets out in detail the high standards and quality of education in Hillingdon schools. There are no specific legal implications arising from the report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

NIL

Appendix 1 - Additional Information for Looked After Children (LAC)

A. About the Looked After Children (LAC) Population:

	2012-13	2013-14
Current statutory school age LAC population	172	205
Total number of statutory school age children worked with during the academic year	262	266

B. Place of Education

	2012-13	2013-14
Number of statutory school age LAC educated within Hillingdon	99	121
Number of statutory school age LAC educated outside Hillingdon (as at 19.10.14)	78	84
Number of 17 and 18 year old LAC (as at 19.10.2014)	142	91
Non-Hillingdon LAC educated within Hillingdon (as at 19.10.2014)	152	274

C. LAC with Statements of SEN*

	Number of LAC aged 5- 18 with a Statement of SEN	Educated in Borough	Educated outside the Borough
2012-13	58	22	36
2013-14	59	23	36

D. Categories of SEN *

	BESD*	LD	ASD	SLD	PMLD	VI	Not Known
2012-13	30	18	5	3	1	1	0
2013-14	30	18	3	4	2	1	1

* BESD = Behaviour, emotional and social difficulty LD = Learning difficulty ASD = Autistic spectrum disorder
SLD = Severe learning difficulty PMLD = Profound and multiple learning difficulties VI = visually impaired

*NB - from 2014/15 BESD will be replaced by a new category of "Social, emotional, and mental health difficulties".

E. Education data for LAC - Key Stage 2 attainment

Key Stage 2 Attainment - There was attainment data for 9 pupils. The available teacher assessment data showed: that for Maths and English 5 pupils achieved Level 5, 2 pupils achieved Level 3 and 2 pupils achieved level 2.

Key Stage 4 Attainment

KS4 Attainment	2013-14
A* - C in English and Mathematics	7.1%
5 + GCSEs A* - C including English and Mathematics GCSEs	7.1%
5 + GCSE's A* - C or equivalent – all subjects	14.3%

Of the KS4 Cohort:	2012-13 (Cohort: 39)	2013-14 (Cohort:28)
How many indigenous children?	67%	75%
How many are UAS/C have ESOL?	33%	25%
How many have a Statement of SEN	31%	39%
How many are male?	74%	57%
How many are female?	26%	43%
How many are educated outside the Borough?	64%	25%
How many are educated inside the Borough?	36%	75%

Reportable KS4 data	Actual number of pupils achieving at this level 2012-13	Actual number of pupils achieving at this level 2013-14
Achieved 5 GCSE's at A*- C or equivalent including English and Maths	4	2
Achieved 5 GCSE's at A*- C or equivalent	12	4
Achieved 5 GCSE's at A*- G or equivalent	14	10
Achieved 1 GCSE or equivalent	10	15
Sat 1 GCSE or equivalent	10	15
Did not take any GCSE or equivalent exams.	9	13

OLDER PEOPLE'S PLAN - UPDATE 2014-15

Cabinet Members	Councillor Ray Puddifoot MBE Councillor Philip Corthorne
Cabinet Portfolios	Leader of the Council Social Services, Health & Housing
Officer Contact(s)	Kevin Byrne, Administration Directorate
Papers with report	Appendix A - Plan update

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To provide an update on the progress with delivering the actions in the plan for older people.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The Older People's Plan assists the Council to deliver its plans to put residents first. Supporting older people to live independent, active, healthy lives and providing opportunities to improve well-being is key to Hillingdon's Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
Financial Cost	Putting our Residents First: <i>Our People</i> There are no additional cost implications for the Council in respect of this report. The projects detailed in this report are financed from within existing resources across the Council including the "Leader's Initiative" Fund.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Social Services, Housing and Public Health
Ward(s) affected	All

2. RECOMMENDATION

That Cabinet notes the successes to date and continued progress to deliver the Older People's Action Plan during 2014-15 to improve the quality of life, health and wellbeing of older people in Hillingdon.

Reasons for recommendation

The Older People's Plan endorses the commitment from the Council and its partners to the continued improvement of services and support designed to create a better quality of life for

older people in Hillingdon. The plan supports the Council to put residents first and contributes to improving the health and wellbeing of Hillingdon's older residents.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None considered.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

The headline results from the 2011 Census demonstrate that more and more people in Hillingdon are living longer. Supporting older people to live independent, active lives, to make a positive contribution to local communities and helping older people to feel safer in their homes and in the wider community is at the heart of improving the health and wellbeing of older people in Hillingdon and contributes to the priorities of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

In Hillingdon there are well-established arrangements to hear from older people and keep Hillingdon's older residents informed and involved across the Borough on important matters. This includes their involvement through Hillingdon's Older People's Assembly.

Hillingdon's Older People's Plan, led by the Older People's Champion (Cllr Ray Puddifoot, Leader of the Council) sets out a range of actions the Council and partners are taking in response to issues that older people in Hillingdon have said are important to them. The key themes in the plan include: safety and security; preventative care; keeping independent and healthy; supporting older people in the community; and housing. The action plan is regularly updated and monitored by the Older People's Champion.

There have been a number of achievements so far during 2014/15 highlighted in the summary below. This includes service improvements supported by the Leader's Initiative developed both within the community, with partners and across Council services to enable older people to remain independent, active and healthy. The full update is attached at Appendix A.

Safety and Security

- Free burglar alarms – To date, the burglar alarm scheme funded by the Leader's Initiative has fitted more than 5,500 alarms to the homes of older residents. A new phase of installing burglar alarms (phase 8) will commence in March 2015 and will install alarms into the homes of 1,000 older residents. Older people confirm that the installation of a burglar alarm in their home helps to reduce their fear of crime.
- Tackling rogue traders – Council officers have continued to respond quickly to reports of rogue traders. When complaints are received officers review the circumstances of each case and decide if an intervention is required. Since April 2014, Trading Standards Officers have received eleven complaints regarding rogue traders including doorstep crime and over charging for building works. Articles have appeared in Hillingdon People advising local residents what to do if they suspect they are being targeted by a rogue trader.

Preventative Care

- Joined-up preventative services – The TeleCareLine service supports residents to live safely and independently in their own homes using a range of equipment, such as sensors and detectors all connected back to a local staffed control centre to provide assistance to older people if needed.

From 1st April 2014 the TeleCareLine Scheme has been extended to be free to older people aged 80 years or older. As at 5th January 2015, 4,033 service users (3,596 households) were in receipt of a TeleCareLine equipment service, of which 3,044 people (2,783 households) were aged 80 years or older. Between 1st April 2014 and 31st December 2014 there have been 833 new service users taking up TeleCareLine.

The development of services like TeleCareLine is part of a broader strategy in Hillingdon working to help reduce the need and frequency for admission to hospital or a nursing home for people with needs arising from a stroke, incontinence, dementia and injuries arising from a fall.

Key elements of the wider approach include:

- Providing supported and extra care housing – to help older people maintain their independence in their own home.
- Personal budgets for people in need of social care – to give older people more choice and control over their care and support instead of traditional care services. People who receive a personal budget can tailor services to meet their particular needs. As of end December 2014, 89.1% of all older people receiving social care are in receipt of a personal budget.

Keeping Independent and Healthy

- Active ageing - A range of activities are in place and available to older people in Hillingdon. These include Drumunity, a drumming activity specifically targeted to service users with dementia, chair-based exercise and bike rides.

Tea dances - Tea dances have been running on a monthly basis during 2014-15 with over 1600 people attending so far this year. Extra dances have been put on in targeted locations e.g. Harefield and two took place at the Civic Centre in partnership with the Mayor's Office. They continue to remain extremely popular and are helping to break down social isolation and promote physical activity amongst older people.

Free swimming – The Council has continued to provide free swimming sessions to support older people to live an active and healthy lifestyle. The programme for older people to take up free swimming continues to be successful. While the total number of free swims for the year to date (18,874) is slightly down on last year (19,564), attendance for the last quarter (7,014) is slightly up on the same period for the previous year (6,867).

Free swimming lessons commenced from 28th April 2014 and continue to be popular at Highgrove, Botwell and Hillingdon Sports & Leisure Complex. The demand for beginner or confidence level classes has been higher than that for improver classes so where possible sessions have been converted to accommodate numbers.

- Extending the Brown Badge Parking Scheme – The Brown Badge Parking Scheme offers older people a designated place to park their car / vehicle closer to amenities. This helps to maintain their independence and encourages older people to get out and about to reduce the risk of social isolation.

The Brown Badge parking scheme continues to be popular amongst older people. Following the resurfacing of the car park, the brown badge scheme has been extended into Uxbridge Golf Course car park so that brown badge holders that use this site can now park in preferential locations.

Finally, in response to requests from local car park users, two additional brown badge bays have now been installed in Northview car park, Eastcote.

Supporting Older People in the Community

- Support for older people during the economic down-turn - Financial health check sessions continue to be delivered by Age UK in local libraries, sheltered housing, lunch clubs and community centres across the Borough. These health checks often result in benefit checks which then generate much needed income for elderly residents.
- Heater loan scheme – The heater loan scheme is in place offering older people temporary portable heaters to keep warm and well when their home heating system experiences a breakdown. A total of 16 households have received heaters during the last three months and demand is expected to increase over the coming winter months.
- Celebrating in style - A number of community groups for older people commemorated the start of WW1 this summer. Grants were also provided to enable groups to celebrate the festive period in December 2014 and other outings throughout the year. Feedback from the older people continues to be very positive and they are grateful for the support provided.

Housing

- Home adaptations – From April to December 2014, 140 homes have had adaptations completed to enable disabled occupants to continue to live at home. This includes adaptations to the homes of 88 older people, of which 62 were in the private sector and this will help them to live independently and safely in their own home.

Financial Implications

There are no additional cost implications for the Council in respect of this report. The projects detailed in this report are financed from within existing resources across the Council, including the "Leader's Initiative" Fund.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

The Older People's Plan is welcomed by older people as positively continuing to raise their value and profile and is an opportunity to improve the lives of older people in the community.

Consultation carried out or required

Regular feedback from the Hillingdon Older People's Steering Group and Older People's Assembly is used to help shape future priorities. The Older People's Assembly in Hillingdon periodically receives progress updates on delivering the promises set out within the Older People's Plan.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and the associated financial implications, noting that the broad range of initiatives outlined above are fully funded within the existing budgets - including the Leader's Initiative. In addition, specific provision for investment in TeleCareLine was included in the Council's 2014/15 revenue budget and capital programme.

Legal

Before the Cabinet is a progress update report on the delivery of Hillingdon's Older People's Plan for the year 2014/15.

There is no legal obligation placed on local authorities to produce Older People's Plans/Strategies. However, in 2005 Central Government published a document titled "Opportunity Age: Meeting the challenge of ageing in the 21st century". This is a ten year strategy document setting out the Government's approach in three key areas:

- age and the workforce;
- promoting active ageing;
- and developing services which promote independence and wellbeing.

'Opportunity Age' requires Central Government, local authorities and the voluntary sector to work in close cooperation to:

- identify and tackle the issues that limit older people's ability to get the most out of life, including rooting out age discrimination and tackling poor housing and fear of crime;
- ensure that older people can be actively involved locally, influencing decisions that affect their lives, such as planning and local transport;
- ensure that older people have access to opportunities locally, such as learning, leisure and volunteering;
- promote healthy living at all ages: the rational being older people are better able to enjoy good health later in life if they look after themselves when they are younger.

It is worth bringing to Cabinet's attention the relevant provisions of section 29 of The Equality Act 2010, which came into force on 1st October 2012. This extends the ban on age discrimination to cover the provision of services, public functions and association unless covered by an exception (amongst others aged based concessionary services) from the ban as set out in The Equality Act 2010 (Age Exceptions) Order 2012, or that the provider can show good reason [objectively justifiable] for the differential treatment. That is to say if it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

Under the Council's Constitution the Cabinet has the appropriate powers to agree the recommendation proposed at the outset of this report.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Previous updated to Cabinet.

Older People's Action Plan 2014/15 (Update as of December 2014 for January 2015 Cabinet)

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
Safety and Security				
1.1	Increase home security amongst older people.	1.1.1 Ensure burglar alarms are maintained and install those commissioned by the Leader by March 2015 (phase 7&8)	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – To help older people feel safe and secure burglar alarms have been installed into the homes of older people.</p> <p>Installations for Phase 7 of 1000 alarms are now complete.</p> <p>Servicing of the alarms issued under phase 5 of the scheme (500 alarms) began in April 2014 and to the end of December 2014, 349 have been serviced. Servicing of phase 6 has also started with 116 completed.</p> <p>Phase 8 of 1000 installs will start in March 2015 and there are currently 350 people on the waiting list.</p>
1.2	Take action to tackle rogue traders.	1.2.1 Address reports of Rogue Traders	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> - Council officers have continued to respond quickly to reports of rogue traders. When complaints are received officers review the circumstances of each case and decide if an intervention is required.</p> <p>In the period October to December, only 1 report of doorstep crime has been received. This related to the possible mis-selling of cavity wall insulation. After signing some documents, the resident became suspicious of some of the claims made and cancelled the agreement without parting with any money.</p>
		1.2.2 Promote home safety by training front-line staff to provide advice when they visit older people at home. Roll-out a new training programme to staff working in a range of agencies.	31.03.15	<p><u>On track</u> - The content of a training programme for a range of staff who visit older residents in their own homes is being revisited in order to maximise effectiveness. This is part of the revision of a Better Care Fund project intended to identify older people at risk of falls, dementia and/or social isolation. This will be delivered in Q1 2015-16.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
2.1	Assist vulnerable people to secure and maintain their independence	2.1.1 Continue to expand the TeleCareLine service to ensure a further 750 users by March 2015.	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> - From 1st April the Telecareline Scheme has been extended to be free to older people aged 80 years or older.</p> <p>As at 5th January 2015, 4,033 service users (3,596 households) were in receipt of a TeleCareLine equipment service, of which 3,044 people (2,783 households) were aged 80 years or older. Between 1st April 2014 and 31st December 2014 there have been 833 new service users taking up TelecareLine.</p> <p>The technology is helping people to live safely and independently at home. The take-up of TeleCareline is expected to exceed the target of 750 new service users set for each year of the scheme.</p>
		2.1.2 Pilot the use of a technology bracelet to help support at least 50 older people with dementia to live independently.	31.03.15	<p><u>On track</u> At end of December 2014, 66 Vega watches have been issued, with 26 being returned, resulting in 40 remaining active.</p> <p>Out of the Vega watches returned, 2 residents had passed away, 6 found the device no longer suitable as their condition had changed, 13 residents had moved to a care home and 5 residents did not engage well with the technology.</p> <p>The average length of time a service user used the Vega watch before returning it is 254 days.</p>
3.1	Ensure all new and existing service users / carers are offered a personal budget.	3.1.1 Promote take up of personal social care budgets to provide greater choice and control	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – A personal care budget gives people who need care and support a greater say on deciding their support arrangements to suit their own needs.</p> <p>As at the end of December 2014, 89.1% of older people in receipt of a care/support service (1,733 of 1,943 older people in receipt of services) were in receipt of a personal budget (based on services which are subject to a personal budget).</p>
3.2	Provide opportunities for older people to participate in sport and physical activity.	3.2.1 Work with a range of partners to deliver and promote take-up of physical activity as part of Hillingdon's Health	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – As part of Hillingdon's Health and Wellbeing Strategy a range of activities are being delivered specifically for older people to encourage the take-up of regular exercise in their weekly routine.</p> <p><u>New chair-based exercise programme</u> – this is a less demanding exercise programme for older people.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
		and Wellbeing Strategy		<p>Due to the popularity of the chair based exercise sessions the Council will set up a series of exercise sessions for Older People in the new year at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uxbridge Library - Cobden Close - Oak Farm Library - West Drayton Community Centre - EKTA Asian Women's Group - Robert's Close <p><u>'Drumunity' for older people</u> 'Drumunity' for older people is specifically targeted to service users with dementia. Feedback from the Drumunity sessions has been positive: gained through staff feedback, observations and feedback from families.</p> <p>Due to the success of the pilots at Cottesmore and Sibley Court, the Council will fund a further 12 weeks of sessions at these locations.</p> <p>Since September 2014, a total of 18 people have taken part in 12 weeks of sessions.</p> <p>Triscott house, Grassy meadows and Asha day centre also continue to offer the drumming sessions as part of their core activity.</p> <p><u>Information Events</u> In October 2014 a wellbeing day was held at Harefield Community centre. A total of 60 people took part. There was very good feedback regarding the stalls both from residents and stallholders. Due to the smaller numbers, providers were able to offer more in depth information to residents and take time to answer their questions. In the afternoon the centre offered tasters of existing activities. These were very well received with several participants never having been to the centre before.</p> <p>In the new year there is a wellbeing day planned for Uxbridge Library and an event for Older people who are housebound at West Drayton Community Centre.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
		3.2.2 Continue to offer free swimming sessions to residents aged 65+	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – The programme for older people to take up free swimming continues to be successful.</p> <p>While the total number of free swims for the year to date (18,874) is slightly down on last year (19,564), attendance for the last quarter (7,014) is slightly up on the same period for the previous year (6,867).</p>
		3.2.3 Deliver free swimming lessons for people aged 65+	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – Free swimming lessons commenced from 28th April 2014.</p> <p>Lessons continue to be popular at Highgrove, Botwell and Hillingdon Sports & Leisure Complex. The demand for beginner or confidence level classes has been higher than that for improver classes so where possible sessions have been converted to accommodate numbers.</p>
		3.2.4 Hold regular tea dances and other dances for older people to promote participation in physical activity.	31.03.15	<p><u>On track</u> - Tea dances help to break down social isolation and promote physical activity amongst older people. Tea dances continue to remain very popular.</p> <p>During October-December 2014, 701 people attended five tea dances. This included two tea dances run in partnership with the Mayor's office.</p> <p>An analysis of the feedback collected at the September and October dances this year showed that out of 239 Older residents who attended the dances, 86% stated that the dances have a positive impact on their wellbeing.</p>
		3.2.5 - NEW To better enable residents living with dementia to continue to live independently in our community and feel supported and knowledgeable of where they can access advice and help when required.	31.03.15	<p><u>NEW:</u> Dementia Friends Scheme</p> <p>From October until December 2014, 535 people attended Dementia Friends sessions. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 360 pupils from St Bernadette's school - 23 sheltered housing scheme managers - 44 library staff - 82 residents - 26 care home staff <p>The local Met Police have now agreed to run sessions for local Police Officers. There is also ongoing work with the local Alzheimer Society to develop more support for people living with dementia.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions		Target Dates	Progress Update
3.3	Continue to develop and expand the Brown Badge Parking Scheme for older people.	3.3.1 In 2014/15 extend the Brown Badge older persons parking scheme into at least two additional car parks and promote the scheme to older people.		31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – The number of our older residents applying for a brown badge continues to show no sign of abating.</p> <p>To extend the options available to residents to apply for a brown badge, the records of all Brown Badges holders have now been uploaded onto the Onyx system. In addition to the existing application options, this enables older residents to submit online applications directly to the Council. It also ensures that the brown badge records are automatically updated when people move away from the borough or pass away.</p> <p>Following the resurfacing of the car park, the brown badge scheme has been extended into Uxbridge Golf Course car park so that brown badge holders that use this site can now park in preferential locations.</p> <p>Finally, in response to requests from local car park users, two additional brown badge bays have now been installed in Northview car park, Eastcote.</p>
3.4	Continue to develop and expand facilities for older people in Hillingdon's allotments.	3.4.1 Improve access and facilities for older people in Hillingdon's allotments including adult education sessions		31.03.15	<p><u>On track</u> – A number of projects have been funded by the Chrysalis scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stone track at Hill End Road Allotment, Harefield to improve access to the site. • A car parking area at Western Avenue Allotment which will allow plot holders to park their car on the site whilst working their plots in an area that is within a controlled parking zone. This work will also improve pedestrian access to the site. • New 2m high paladin mesh style gates have been erected at Ashford Avenue Allotment Site, Hayes. This work has been carried out to improve security at the site following a number of break-ins during the summer. • Drayton Fencing are currently erecting 240 metres of 2m high palisade fencing at Wood End Green Allotment, Hayes. This work is aimed at improving security at the site • Approximately 124 metres of new boundary fencing is due to be installed

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
				<p>at Station Road Allotment, Hayes. This work is aimed at improving security at the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moor Lane Allotment, Harmondsworth has received new fencing and a stone access track. <p>Park Officers continue to be used on a weekly basis to undertake routine works such as strimming communal paths, removing dumped rubbish and cutting hedges.</p> <p>The Site Secretary of Glebe Avenue Allotment recently requested a delivery of stones to the site so plot holders could improve the track/car park area. In response to this request, 10 tonnes of planings have been provided to the site.</p> <p>On the take up of free plots for the over 65's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 225 tenants at the 28 Council managed sites were granted free rent on 1 April 2014 • An estimated 150 tenants at the Council's 7 fully self managing sites have been granted free rent this rental year • Since 1 April 2014, 27 plots have been granted free of charge to new applicants aged 65 or over <p>The Annual Allotment Competition prize giving ceremony took place in November 2014 with many older plot holders featuring in the top 50 plots.</p>
3.5	Actively contribute to an integrated care programme.	3.5.1 Implement the Better Care Fund to develop integrated services for Older People.	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> - The Better Care Fund is now the main vehicle by which Health and Social care will deliver integrated services for Older People. The plan has been revised following new guidance being issued. Work is continuing on the 7 BCF schemes where this will deliver better health and social care outcomes for residents.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
3.6	Actively promote the opportunities available to older people to keep healthy, independent and well and establish what difference they are making to improve the lives of older people	3.6.1 Ensure articles appear in every edition of Hillingdon People and on the Council website promoting the opportunities available and making use of feedback from older people	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – articles appear in every edition of Hillingdon People within the older people's page.</p> <p>The November/December issue of Hillingdon People featured articles about the heater loan scheme, the Phoning Friends scheme run by Friends of the Elderly and dates for the December Assembly for older people.</p> <p>The magazine also included promotion of the World War One book commemorating soldiers from Hillingdon, World War One inspired art and writing competition and the Harefield Victoria Cross plaques.</p> <p>The January/February issue features an article about and photographs of Christmas lunches, New Year events, a Chanukah party, activities and entertainment for older people in sheltered housing schemes.</p> <p>Services and events for older people continue to be promoted across the borough through the local newspaper, online and by other methods.</p> <p>Visitors to the Older People's Assembly on 9 December 2014 were provided with information about wellbeing events for older people that took place throughout 2014 and the plans for 2015, renewing the freedom pass and neighbourhood policing. The next assembly will take place 31 March 2015.</p> <p>Regular feedback is sought from older people about their experience of the services provided through the older people's plan and included in updates within this plan.</p>
4.1	Improve financial inclusion for older people in the borough	4.1.1 Deliver benefits and financial advice and support sessions for older people across the borough through the Age UK Hillingdon financial health checks	31.03.15	<p><u>Ongoing</u> – Information provided by Age UK demonstrates that older people are benefitting from financial health checks. In the period 1st October 2014 to 31st December 2014, 38 older people were referred for a financial health check of which 25 received a benefit check, leading to a benefit claim for 21 older people and an amount of £45,061 generated for the community.</p>

Ref No	Task	Actions	Target Dates	Progress Update
4.2	Support older people in their own homes to stay warm and healthy during the winter months	4.2.1 Provide free temporary heaters and small grants to cover electricity costs to older people.	31.03.15	<u>Ongoing</u> – The Heater Loan scheme is in place for residents who need access to the scheme during the colder months when their heating system experiences a breakdown. There have been 16 requests since September 2014.
4.3	Provide and encourage opportunities for older people to actively participate in events across Hillingdon.	4.3.1 Provide support to community groups for older people as requested through the Leaders Initiative for Older People.	31.03.15	<u>Ongoing</u> – The Leader continues to support community groups working with older people. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Christmas parties and events • Development works for Elm Park dining centre • Top up for Age UK electric blanket exchange scheme
5.1	Help older people to live independently in safe, warm homes	5.1.1 Improve 100 private sector homes for older vulnerable people, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 heating measures • 30 insulation measures • Complete essential repairs to homes for 40 vulnerable & older households 	31.03.15	<u>On track</u> – Target has been increased this year from 70 homes improved last year to 100 in 2014/15. In light of the recent decision regarding sign up to the Green Deal Communities Scheme, a new strategy to provide heating and insulation measures this year is now required. 8 homes of older residents received essential repairs as needed. Essential repairs can include roof and glazing repairs to reduce health and safety risks. 3 of these Essential Repair Grant cases involved heating improvements and there are also two more nearing completion.
5.2	Deliver the major adaptations programmes for all tenures within budget	5.2.1 Complete at least 100 major adaptations increasing independence for older people	31.03.15	<u>On track</u> – From April to December, a total of 140 homes have had adaptations completed to enable disabled occupants to continue to live at home. This includes adaptations to the homes of 88 older people, of which 62 were in the private sector.

HOUSING SCHEME FOR BUYBACK OF EX-COUNCIL PROPERTIES

Cabinet Members	Councillor Ray Puddifoot MBE Councillor Phillip Corthorne
Cabinet Portfolios	Leader of the Council Social Services Health and Housing
Officer Contact	Andy Evans - Finance David Ollendorff - Residents Services
Papers with report	None

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	On 21 November 2013 Cabinet agreed in principle to establish a scheme to buyback ex-council properties. This report outlines how the scheme will operate and be financed, and seeks Cabinet approval to proceed to implementation.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The scheme will contribute to the London Borough of Hillingdon's Housing Strategy 2012-15, and will support the Council's vision of Putting Our Residents First.
Financial Cost	The approved HRA Capital Programme 2014/15 - 2018/19 for Purchase & Repair of properties has a budget of £9,766k that can be used to fund the scheme.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Social Services, Housing and Public Health
Ward(s) affected	All

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

1. Approves the implementation of the scheme as outlined in the report;
2. Delegates to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, with the agreement of the Leader of the Council, authority to purchase properties, agree any necessary purchase prices and/or parameters and any other property transactions or decisions required to effectively implement the Scheme:

Reasons for recommendation

Cabinet resolved on 21 November 2013 to the principle of establishing an ex-Council property buyback scheme, on the basis that the details of the scheme and its implementation were reported back for future decision. This report outlines how the scheme will operate and be financed and seeks approval to implement it.

The scheme will have benefits for both the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the general fund. In terms of the former, the additional stock will help to sustain the HRA rental income whilst assisting in mitigating the financial pressure arising from the increased cost and requirements for temporary accommodation to house homeless households in the general fund. It will also allow the Council to apply some of the time-limited retained Right to Buy (RTB) receipts.

Alternative options considered / risk management

The Council could choose not to operate a buyback scheme, however the Council would not then have this option available to increase the supply of affordable housing, or be able to apply some of the retained RTB receipts.

The operation of the policy will be kept under review, given the potential for changes in the operation of right to buy scheme, wider housing finance regime and the state of property market. The purchase decisions will be considered on a case-by-case basis with the benefit of full market knowledge from valuations, the impact on the HRA business plan and Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF).

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

2. INFORMATION

Background

The Right to Buy scheme was introduced in 1980 and gives qualifying social tenants the right to buy their home at a discount. During 2013 the Government increased the discount cap for London to £100,000 and this has accelerated sales. The maximum discount in London currently stands at £102,700 and is uplifted by the Consumer Price Index on the 1st April each year. Hillingdon sold 47 properties during 2012/13, 106 during 2013/14, and has sold a further 138 to the end of November 2014. At the same time the Council regularly receives enquiries from residents who are looking to sell their properties back to the Council, which could be facilitated through the implementation of a buyback scheme.

The funding for acquisitions through a buyback scheme will come from within the HRA. The council is able to retain the receipts from RTB sales for replacement housing using an agreement with Government which can be used to part fund the acquisitions within the scheme. The balance which is not met from RTB receipts, will utilise HRA resources and borrowing as required. The current HRA Capital Programme for 2014/15 to 2018/19 includes a budget of £9.766m for Purchase & Repair that is available to fund the scheme.

The acquisition of such properties offers a number of benefits, as part of a wider programme to deliver increases in housing units:

- Supports the sustainability of the HRA through replenishment of stock and replacement of rental income lost through RTB sales,
- Management and maintenance arrangements are already in place for such properties, and in many instances the properties are leasehold with the council as landlord.
- It allows a relatively quick application of RTB receipts when compared to new build schemes, which will support the maximum application of RTB receipts within allowable timescales.
- It will assist in mitigating the general fund pressures on temporary housing accommodation by increasing the supply of affordable housing,
- The dwellings are normally offered at a discount to the local market due to their location.

It is not currently known what level of conversion into actual purchases will be achieved as much will depend on valuation and purchase price negotiations and the location and type of properties that are purchased. However, this scheme, if implemented, will complement other initiatives aimed at increasing numbers of housing units and utilising the retained RTB receipts - which are included in the existing MTFF - such as the General Needs New Build and Supported Housing Programmes.

Supporting Information and operation of the Scheme

During 2014 expressions of interest were sought through a targeted letter which invited interested owners to complete an on-line form. Expressions of interest were received back from almost 250 owners, the majority of which were leaseholders but also included a small number of freeholders. The mailshot excluded any leasehold properties where the leasehold interest was held by a Registered Social Landlord (RSL), and also made it clear that the Council could not give any obligation that the property would be purchased.

As a general principle the scheme will prioritise properties based on their cost, size, condition and location to ensure the best value is obtained. An initial shortlist has been compiled from the expressions of interest which takes into account the following considerations:

- The Council will only be purchasing properties with vacant possession, and priority will be given to properties that are empty, to reduce the possibility of delays.
- Any sub-let properties being used for temporary accommodation of clients on the Housing Register will be excluded at this time.
- In view of the lower value of property prices and the priority housing need requirements, the initial focus will be on the repurchase of two and three bedroom properties in the south of the Borough.
- Any tenant who purchased a property under the Right to Buy Scheme would have to repay a proportion of the discount they received if they sell within the first five years.

Once inspection has been undertaken by the Valuer, and provided that it is considered appropriate and feasible to repurchase the property within a reasonable period of time, each individual acquisition will be submitted for approval. It is proposed that delegated authority is given to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, to approve the formal offer of sale, the proposed purchase prices relating property decisions. Each offer will be "subject to contract",

vacant possession and achieving a target date for exchange. The completion of the transaction will be subject to the Council's usual capital release process.

The current rules concerning the RTB scheme state that a person has to be a council tenant for a minimum of 5 years before they can achieve the maximum discount under the scheme, but is expected to reduce to three years during 2015 as part of the Deregulation Bill currently before Parliament. The cost floor determination (Section 131 of the Housing Act 1985) will also apply to any acquisitions within the scheme for a period of up to 15 years from the date of purchase. This limits the Right to Buy discount to ensure that the purchase price of the property does not fall below what has been spent on building, buying, repairing or maintaining it over that period. In practice this would ensure that if the cost floor is higher than the market value the property would be sold at market value - regardless of the tenant's discount entitlement - or alternatively if the cost floor is lower than market value, but higher than the discounted market value, the property would be sold at the cost floor value.

Financial Implications

The current HRA capital budget for 2014/15 to 2018/19 includes provision of £9,766k to support the Purchase and Repair of former Council properties as approved in the 2014/15 budget. It is not certain as to the exact number of units that will be acquired at this early stage, but existing market data for 2 and 3 bedroom ex-council properties would suggest that it should be possible to purchase approximately 50 properties from this budget, if a suitable number come forward.

As these are replacement homes the Council can use the retained RTB receipts to part finance the acquisitions. The application of net RTB receipts is usually limited to 30% of the cost of replacement homes, but Housing Finance regulations allow this to be increased to 50% in the case of ex-council properties, subject to a cap of 6.5% of the overall net receipts. The balance not covered by the RTB receipts, will utilise HRA resources and borrowing as required, with the necessary funding assumptions already built into the existing HRA MTF and business plan. The application of RTB receipts to such a scheme will assist in meeting the Council's obligation to apply retained RTB receipts within three years of receipt. If these receipts are not utilised within the allowable timescales they are returned to central Government and an accrued interest charge is levied.

The acquisitions will also replace some of the lost rent from the sale of RTB properties in the HRA and can also contribute to increasing the more general supply of affordable housing units, and assist in reducing the pressures on temporary accommodation spend in the general fund. As the acquisitions are alongside existing Council stock there will be economies of scale in terms of the ongoing management and maintenance costs. The cost floor determination gives protection for up to 15 years with regard to future RTB discounts on the acquired properties.

It is anticipated that the staffing implications of the scheme and any marginal costs in terms of undertaking valuations and legal procedures to support the timely conveyance of the properties can be managed within existing resources and budgets.

3. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendations?

The recommendations will assist in meeting the objectives of the Council's Housing Strategy 2012-2015 and specifically support managing the supply, through increasing the provision of affordable housing within the Borough.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

No consultation is required to implement the changes proposed in this report.

4. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

The scheme for the buy-back of ex-Council properties outlined in this report is intended to replenish lost housing stock within the HRA, thereby supporting the financial sustainability of the Council's social landlord function. In addition, the increased supply of affordable rented accommodation will reduce the pressures within the Council's General Fund associated with the use of temporary accommodation to manage homelessness.

As detailed in the financial implications above, these purchases will enable the use of retained Right-to-Buy receipts which could otherwise become repayable to the Department for Communities and Local Government - thereby avoiding an interest charge of 4% plus base rate being borne by the HRA. The current cost floor mechanism, if maintained by central Government, will prevent any sale of repurchased properties to future tenants for less than the purchase price, or prevailing market value if lower, for a period of fifteen years.

Legal

The Borough Solicitor confirms that there are no legal impediments to Cabinet authorising the purchase of former Council properties.

Section 9 of the Housing Act 1985 enables the Council "to acquire housing accommodation".

Corporate Property

Corporate Property and Construction has been consulted regarding the implementation of the buyback scheme, specifically concerning arrangements for the valuation of properties in the scheme. The valuation report will be carried out by a suitably qualified Valuer and will give the market value with vacant possession for each property inspected.

5. BACKGROUND PAPERS

NIL

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL BUDGET -2014/15 MONTH 8 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING

Cabinet Member	Councillor Jonathan Bianco
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance, Property and Business Services
Report Author	Paul Whaymand, Corporate Director of Finance
Papers with report	Appendices

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	<p>This report provides the Council's forecast financial position and performance against the 2014/15 revenue budget and capital programme.</p> <p>A net in-year underspend of £2,886k is projected against 2014/15 General Fund revenue budgets as of November 2014 (Month 8). This represents an improvement of £248k on the position previously reported to Cabinet.</p> <p>The latest positions on other funds and the capital programme are detailed within the body of this report.</p>
Contribution to our plans and strategies	<p>Putting our Residents First: <i>Financial Management</i></p> <p>Achieving value for money is an important element of the Council's medium term financial plan.</p>
Financial Cost	N/A
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Corporate Services and Partnerships
Ward(s) affected	All

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet:

1. Note the forecast budget position for revenue and capital as at November 2014 (Month 8).
2. Note the treasury management update as at November 2014 at Appendix E.
3. Approves the addition of £16k ADASS/Department of Health funding to support Care Act Implementation to Adult Social Care revenue budgets
4. Continue the delegated authority up until the 12 February 2015 Cabinet meeting to the Chief Executive to approve any consultancy and agency assignments over £50k, with final sign-off of any assignments made by the Leader of the Council. Cabinet are also asked to note those consultancy and agency assignments over £50k approved under delegated authority between the 18 December 2014 and 22 January 2015 Cabinet meetings, detailed at Appendix F.

5. Approves the acceptance of gift funding of £69k from Cathedral Group to fund additional resources and expedite a series of planning applications, to be submitted for determination by the Council throughout the next 9 to 12 months on the major development site known as 'The Old Vinyl Factory, Blyth Road Hayes, in accordance with the provisions of Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003.
6. Approves the acceptance of gift funding of £22,000 from Arora Developments to fund additional resources and expedite a planning application, to be submitted in relation to a 400 room, 5 storey hotel near Terminal 4 (Heathrow Airport).
7. Approves the block booking of the second floor of Point West, 1040 Uxbridge Road, Hayes for a further period of three months to March 2015 at a cost of £31k. The accommodation is used as interim accommodation for bed & breakfast and avoids booking expensive alternatives such as Travelodges.
8. Ratifies the Emergency Winter Decisions made by officers, with the agreement of the Leader of the Council, since the Cabinet meeting on 20 November 2014, as shown in Appendix G
9. In relation to Library Book Stock contracts:
 - a) Gives formal approval for the one year extension of Hillingdon's contract with the London Libraries Consortium, until 31 March 2015;
 - b) Delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration, for any necessary interim procurement and expenditure decisions required on the library book stock from 1 April 2015 and;
 - c) Notes that a report will be presented to Cabinet later in 2015 following a strategic procurement exercise in relation to the Council's book stock.

INFORMATION

Reasons for Recommendations

1. The reason for the monitoring recommendation is to ensure that the Council achieves its budgetary objectives, providing Cabinet with an update on performance at outturn against budgets approved by Council on 20 February 2014.
2. Appendix E provides an update to Cabinet on Treasury Management performance during this financial year.
3. Recommendation 3 - Hillingdon has secured £16k of Department of Health funding available through the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) to facilitate effective implementation of the Care Act. This funding be used to implement a focused training programme to support assessment staff incorporate the requirement of the act effectively into their practice.
4. Recommendation 5 - The gift funding from Cathedral relates to pre-application advice and processing of subsequent reserved matters applications for six different parts of the wider Old Vinyl Factory site.

The developer has advised that they consider it essential to have dedicated planning staff to process their applications. The work is anticipated to take approximately 9 months, these proposals are complex and will require additional time and resource to process and additional resources are needed to support that function. The developer has offered to cover the cost of temporary staff to deal with the respective applications.

Officers also consider it essential to have dedicated staff to process these applications in order to prioritise and facilitate growth and development within the Borough. It is therefore considered appropriate that the Council engage additional staff to provide the discretionary services to the developers in exchange for gift funding which has been offered to cover the reasonable and justifiable costs of carrying out such discretionary services.

5. Recommendation 6 - For information, Members may also wish to note that the gift funding from Arora Developments relates to processing of a planning application for which outline planning permission has already been obtained.

The developer has advised that they consider it essential to have dedicated planning staff to process their application. The developer has offered to cover the cost of temporary staff to deal with the application and subsequent condition discharge applications.

Officers also consider it essential to have dedicated staff to process these applications in order to prioritise and facilitate growth and development within the Borough. It is therefore considered appropriate that the Council engage additional staff to provide the discretionary services to the developers in exchange for gift funding which has been offered to cover the reasonable and justifiable costs of carrying out such discretionary services.

6. Recommendation 7 seeks approval to block book the second floor of Point West, 1040 Uxbridge Road, Hayes for a period of three months at a cost of £31k. The accommodation is used as interim accommodation for bed & breakfast and avoids booking expensive alternatives such as Travelodges.
7. Recommendation 8 - To ensure responsive decision-making over the Winter season, Cabinet on 20 November 2014 agreed to delegate authority to officers, with the agreement of the Leader of the Council, any necessary urgent decisions (including those ordinarily reserved to the executive) to release funds, procure and incur expenditure in order to safeguard residents, deliver services and manage the effects of bad weather or incidents adversely affecting the Borough. 3 decisions were taken, and they are reported to Cabinet in Appendix G for both noting and ratification.
8. Recommendations 9 a) to c) - Cabinet approval is sought for a one year extension of Hillingdon's contractual participation in the London Libraries Consortium (LLC) until 31 March 2015, for the purchase of adult and children's fiction and nonfiction books to ensure the continuity of supply of new books to residents using Hillingdon Libraries. The majority of the adult and children's book stock is procured from a company called Bertram Library Services. The LLC contract was procured by the London Borough of Redbridge, with 9 London boroughs participating in the contract. The original contract was agreed, on Hillingdon's part, by Cabinet in September 2011. The cost of the 1 year contract extension is £373,500, which will be funded from within the existing approved revenue budget for the service.

Officers are currently negotiating with the LLC (and via the consortium, Bertrams), the potential book offer and contract costs post 1 April 2015. It is possible that any upcoming arrangements may be short-term or interim in nature. Therefore, to secure continued stock supply for the Borough's libraries and our residents, it is proposed to delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with Members, to enable swift decision-making on this.

For the medium to longer-term, Council officers are exploring strategic procurement options to ensure both continued quality and value for money in the Council's book stock. These will be presented to the Leader and Portfolio Cabinet Member in due course and subject to their approval, a report to Cabinet will be presented around the third quarter of the 2015/16 financial year, following the receipt of any satisfactory and compliant tenders.

Alternative options considered

9. There are no other options proposed for consideration.

SUMMARY

REVENUE

10. An underspend of £2,886k is projected at Month 8 for General Fund revenue budgets, consisting of £1,100k of deferred capital financing costs, a £59k underspend on contingency budgets and a net underspend of £1,727k across Directorate Operating Budgets. This represents a net improvement of £248k, with £478k improvement on base budget positions being off-set by adverse movement within Development and Risk Contingency.
11. The 2014/15 revenue budget contains £16,491k of savings, including sums brought forward from 2013/14. £13,836k of this sum is reported as either on track for delivery in full or already banked with the remaining £2,655k classed as amber due to relating to more complex or harder to deliver projects. No savings are reported as being at risk of non-delivery.
12. General Fund balances are projected to reach £38,801k at 31 March 2015, assuming that the remaining £2,370k of unallocated General Contingency and £1,452k of unallocated Priority Growth are committed in full during 2014/15. Taking account of the £5,000k drawdown from balances planned for 2015/16, remaining uncommitted General Fund balances will be £33,801k.
13. In relation to other funds, there are no material adverse variances affecting the 2014/15 General Fund outturn, with actions being taken to review the £130k income pressure reported within the Parking Revenue Account. Within the Collection Fund, no movement is reported from the £2,197k surplus.

CAPITAL

14. General Fund capital expenditure is projected to reach £80,302k at outturn, with underspends of £4,235k and £6,785k expected rephasing against a revised budget of £91,322k. Forecast outturn over the life of the General Fund programme for 2014/15 to 2018/19 is an under spend of £5,322k.
15. General Fund capital receipts of £5,981k are forecast for 2014/15 with receipts over the period to 2018/19 expected to reach £42,811k representing a favourable variance of £11,092k over the revised budget. The forecast level of receipts to be achieved for 2014/15 has increased from Month 7 to reflect progress on disposal of major sites.
16. Prudential borrowing is forecasting a favourable variance of £8,614k over the life of the programme due to the cost under spends of £5,322k and the improvement in the capital receipts forecast of £11,092k, being partly offset by a reduction of £7,800k in the forecast level of Community Infrastructure Levy that will be collected.

FURTHER INFORMATION

General Fund Revenue Budget

17. An underspend of £2,886k is projected on normal operating activities at Month 8, representing an improvement of £248k from Month 7. The Month 8 position incorporates a £1,727k net underspend across Directorate Operating Budgets, a £1,100k underspend on capital financing costs and a favourable variance of £59k on Development and Risk Contingency.
18. Movements from Month 7 on Directorate Operating budgets result in a net improvement of £478k, principally relating to staffing underspends within Adult Social Care and Residents Services and a reduced projection on Homecare costs within Adult Social Care. Adverse movement of £230k on contingency relates to an increase in demand for Homeless accommodation, the impact of the September school intake on SEN transport and the stepping down of Asylum funding for those clients reaching 18.
19. As previously reported, the position on Directorate Operating Budgets consists of a number of compensatory variances which will continue to be closely monitored and factored into the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast as appropriate. Within the reported position there remains significant scope to manage emergent pressures or support new initiatives.
20. The Council's General Fund revenue budget contains £16,491k savings, including the £12,802k approved by Cabinet and Council in February 2014, of which 54% are already banked and further 30% on track for delivery in full. An element of risk associated with those savings at an earlier stage of delivery, totalling £2,655k remains.

Table 1: General Fund Overview

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
168,044	1,725	Directorate Operating Budgets	169,769	168,042	(1,727)	(1,249)	(478)
17,154	(1,625)	Corporate Operating Budgets	15,529	14,429	(1,100)	(1,100)	0
24,738	0	Development & Risk Contingency	24,738	24,679	(59)	(289)	230
2,252	(100)	Priority Growth	2,152	2,152	0	0	0
212,188	0	Sub-total Normal Activities	212,188	209,302	(2,886)	(2,638)	(248)
		<u>Exceptional Items</u>					
212,188	0	Total Net Expenditure	212,188	209,302	(2,886)	(2,638)	(248)
(212,188)	0	Budget Requirement	(212,188)	(212,188)	0	0	0
0	0	Net Total	0	(2,886)	(2,886)	(2,638)	(248)
(35,915)	0	Balances b/fwd	(35,915)	(35,915)			
(35,915)	0	Balances c/fwd 31 March 2015	(35,915)	(38,801)			

21. At 31 March 2014 General Fund Balances totalled £35,915k, with the projected underspend expected to reach £38,801k by 31 March 2015. The Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast assumes that balances over £30,000k will be retained to manage emergent risks and issues, with sums above that level earmarked for use to smooth the impact of government funding cuts.

Directorate Operating Budgets (£1,727k underspend, £478k improvement on Month 7)

22. An overview of the forecast outturn on directorate operating budgets is contained in Table 2, with further detail for each directorate contained within Appendix A to this report. Variances

relating to those more volatile areas of activity being managed through Development and Risk Contingency are expanded upon below.

Table 2: Directorate Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service		Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
				Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
14,218	83	Admin.	Expenditure	14,301	13,945	(356)	(286)	(70)
(3,187)	906		Income	(2,281)	(2,330)	(49)	(42)	(7)
11,031	989		Sub-Total	12,020	11,615	(405)	(328)	(77)
169,100	330	Finance	Expenditure	169,430	169,524	94	87	7
(155,788)	(101)		Income	(155,889)	(156,292)	(403)	(392)	(11)
13,312	229		Sub-Total	13,541	13,232	(309)	(305)	(4)
139,103	792	Residents Services	Expenditure	139,895	138,969	(926)	(745)	(181)
(73,138)	(371)		Income	(73,509)	(73,204)	305	291	14
65,965	421		Sub-Total	66,386	65,765	(621)	(454)	(167)
31,163	(3,433)	Children & Young People's Service	Expenditure	27,730	28,142	412	466	(54)
(8,961)	544		Income	(8,417)	(8,577)	(160)	(183)	23
22,202	(2,889)		Sub-Total	19,313	19,565	252	283	(31)
68,691	13,642	Adult Social Care	Expenditure	82,333	82,612	279	383	(104)
(13,157)	(10,667)		Income	(23,824)	(24,747)	(923)	(828)	(95)
55,534	2,975		Sub-Total	58,509	57,865	(644)	(445)	(199)
168,044	1,725	Total Directorate Operating Budgets		169,769	168,042	(1,727)	(1,249)	(478)

23. An underspend of £405k is reported on the Administration budget due to posts being held vacant across the group and an improved outlook for Legal service income. This position has improved by £77k since Month 7, principally due to posts being held vacant for longer.

24. A small improvement from Month 7 of £4k is reported on Finance budgets, with the reported underspend of £309k resulting from strong performance on the recovery of Housing Benefit overpayments and delayed recruitment in Internal Audit and Operational Finance.

25. An underspend of £621k is forecast within Residents Services, which represents an improvement of £167k from Month 7 due to a general improvement on staffing projections as a number of posts are expected to remain vacant for the remainder of the current financial year. Within the overall group position, an underspend attributable to the closure of Victoria Road Civic Amenity Site by the West London waste Alliance is off-set by previously reported pressures on facilities management, buyer's premium income and parking revenues. The buyer's premium variance relates to the timing of assets sales and does not represent an on-going issue.

26. An improvement of £31k is reported on Children & Young People's Services, resulting in a net pressure of £252k which is principally attributable to the use of agency staff to cover vacant posts across the service. Within the non-staffing position increased use of Special Guardianship Orders is resulting in marginal increase in costs, which is off-set by the expectation that more posts will remain vacant for the remainder of 2014/15.

27. Within Adult Social Care an improvement of £199k is reported, which includes reductions in homecare costs arising from the work of Skylakes in aligning support packages to need and revised staffing projections arising from the opening of Queenswalk Resource Centre. The underlying position across the service is principally driven by posts being held vacant.

Progress on Savings

28. The Council's 2014/15 General Fund Revenue Budget contains £16,491k savings, with £12,802k new items approved by Cabinet and Council in February 2014 and a further £3,689k of items in progress brought forward from prior years. Delivery against these targets is closely monitored through the Council's Business Improvement Delivery Programme and regular updates presented to the Hillingdon Improvement Programme Steering Group.

29. As at Month 8, £13,836k (£13,405k at Month 7) is either on track for delivery or already banked, with the remaining £2,655k classed as amber due to being more complex or harder to deliver but are expected to continue being steadily upgraded to green in the coming months.

Table 3: Savings Tracker

2014/15 General Fund Savings Programme	Cross-cutting BID	Admin. & Finance	Residents Services	Adult Social Care	Children & Young People's Services	Total Savings	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%
B Banked	(1,363)	(1,448)	(3,092)	(2,484)	(551)	(8,938)	54.2%
G On track for delivery	0	(91)	(2,381)	(1,530)	(896)	(4,898)	29.7%
A Potential significant savings shortfall or a significant or risky project which is at an early stage;	(1,637)	0	(31)	(987)	0	(2,655)	16.1%
R Serious problems in the delivery of the saving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Total 2014/15 Savings	(3,000)	(1,539)	(5,504)	(5,001)	(1,447)	(16,491)	100%

Corporate Operating Budgets (£1,100k underspend, no movement)

30. Corporately managed expenditure includes revenue costs of the Council's capital programme, externally set levies and income arising from provision of support services to other funds and ring-fenced budgets. These budgets are relatively non-volatile and therefore limited movement in forecast outturn is expected.

Table 4: Corporate Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000	
0	0	Interest and Investment Income	Salaries	0	0	0	0	0
9,927	292		Non-Sal Exp	10,219	9,119	(1,100)	(1,100)	0
(39)	(376)		Income	(415)	(415)	0	0	0
9,888	(84)		Sub-Total	9,804	8,704	(1,100)	(1,100)	0
0	0	Levies and Other Corporate Budgets	Salaries	0	0	0	0	0
11,077	792		Non-Sal Exp	11,869	11,869	0	0	0
(3,812)	(2,332)		Income	(6,144)	(6,144)	0	0	0
7,265	(1,540)		Sub-Total	5,725	5,725	0	0	0
17,153	(1,624)	Total Corporate Operating Budgets		15,529	14,429	(1,100)	(1,100)	0

31. In line with the position at Month 7, an underspend of £1,100k is reported on capital financing costs as a result of prioritisation of Government grants within the programme. This remains a temporary position with the on-going investment in school expansions continuing to require substantial support from Council-funded Prudential Borrowing.

Development & Risk Contingency (£59k underspend, £230k adverse)

32. The Council set aside £24,738k to manage volatile and uncertain budgets within the Development & Risk Contingency, which included £22,238k in relation to specific risk items and £2,500k as General Contingency to manage unforeseen risk items. The overall level of contingency requirement remains broadly consistent with this budgeted provision, however, in line with the volatile nature of such activity variances are reported on a number of items.

Table 5: Development & Risk Contingency

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000	
400	0	Fin.	Uninsured Claims	400	400	0	0	0
240	0	Residents Services	Carbon Reduction Commitment	240	240	0	0	0
200	0		HS2 Challenge contingency	200	200	0	0	0
200	0		Heathrow Expansion Challenge Contingency	200	200	0	0	0
2,144	0		Impact of welfare reform on homelessness	2,144	2,026	(118)	(178)	60
229	0		SEN transport	229	299	70	0	70
811	0		Waste Disposal Levy (Demand-led Tonnage Increases)	811	884	73	73	0
0	70		Compulsary Purchase Order Legal Costs	70	70	0	0	0
0	60		Powerday Public Enquiry	60	60	0	0	0
1,458	0		Children and Young People	Asylum Funding Shortfall	1,458	1,528	70	(30)
(200)	0	Potential Extension of Asylum Gateway Agreement		(200)	(200)	0	0	0
1,860	0	Social Care Pressures (Children's)		1,860	1,860	0	0	0
2,406	0	Adult Social Care	Increase in Transitional Children due to Demographic Changes	2,406	1,816	(590)	(590)	0
11,990	0		Social Care Pressures (Adult)	11,990	12,426	436	436	0
500	0	Corp. Items	Pump Priming for BID Savings	500	500	0	0	0
2,500	(130)		General Contingency	2,370	2,370	0	0	0
24,738	0	Total Development & Risk Contingency		24,738	24,679	(59)	(289)	230

33. An adverse movement of £60k is reported in relation to Homelessness from the Month 7 position as a result of higher than anticipated demand for accommodation between December and January being forecast. The level of demand is anticipated to return to current levels by February, resulting in a £118k favourable variance against the £2,144k contingency provision. The draft budget for 2015/16 reflects an expected reduction to £1,836k in the contingency requirement for Homelessness.

34. Projections on demand for SEN Transport have been increased by £70k to reflect the additional demand arising from the new intake of students from September 2014. This increased level of activity will continue to be monitored and reflected in the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast as appropriate.
35. There has been no movement on Waste Levy projections from Month 7, with the previously reported pressure of £73k remaining. This variance is attributable to green waste and commercial waste tonnages, the on-going impact of which will be reflected in future revenue budgets.
36. An adverse movement of £100k is reported on Asylum, reflecting the step down of Home Office funding for those clients turning 18 over the coming months. As the level of support required by these clients should also reduce, this will be closely monitored over the coming months.
37. As in previous months the majority of volatility in relation to Social Care placement costs is being managed through ASC and CYPs operating budgets. Variances reported due to lower numbers of children transitioning into Adult Social Care and additional demand for services arising from the Winterborne View report are unchanged from Month 7.
38. There remains £2,370k uncommitted General Contingency balance which is available to manage emergent risks and cost pressures.

Priority Growth

39. The 2014/15 General Fund revenue budget approved by Cabinet and Council in February 2014 set aside £1,452k of unallocated Priority Growth, in addition to £800k of specific growth monies to support Hillingdon Improvement Programme Initiatives. To date £100k has been allocated from unallocated Priority Growth, to fund a review of ICT across the Council which was agreed at November Cabinet.
40. The original HIP Initiatives Budget has been supplemented by £138k of uncommitted funds brought forward from 2013/14, providing a balance of £938k for investment in the current year. To date approved projects total £301k, leaving £637k available for new initiatives.

Table 6: Priority Growth

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Priority Growth	Revised Budget £'000	Month 8 Approved Allocations £'000	Unallocated Balance £'000
800	138	HIP Initiatives Budgets	938	301	(637)
0	(138)	B/fwd Funds	(138)	(138)	0
1,452	(100)	Unallocated Priority Growth	1,352	0	(1,352)
2,252	(100)	Total Priority Growth	2,252	163	(1,989)

Schools Budget, Parking Revenue Account and Collection Fund

41. Latest forecasts on other funds, except the Parking Revenue Account, indicate favourable positions at year end and therefore will not adversely impact upon the General Fund. The planned approach to managing any pressure on the Parking Revenue Account is set out below.
42. An in year pressure is reported within the Schools Budget at Month 7, reflecting the release of significant retained balances to individual schools within the Borough and resulting in

projected year end balances of £1,547k. There has been a £41k favourable movement on the position from Month 7 due to a minor reduction in the projected costs of SEN placements, with the remaining balance remaining available to support future investment in Borough's schools.

43. There is a £55k improvement on the month 7 position reported on the Parking Revenue Account (PRA), with shortfalls in income against historic targets resulting in a pressure of £130k. Work to zero-base budgets with the PRA continues and intended to bring the account back into balance, thereby mitigating any impact on the Council Taxpayer.
44. The projected outturn on Council Tax and Business Rates income within the Collection Fund is unchanged from Month 7, with a surplus of £2,697k on Council Tax and deficit of £500k on Business Rates. The pressure on commercial properties relates to the continuing high level of empty property reliefs being awarded and delays on the part of the Valuation Office Agency on adding new properties to the list. The principal risk area remains Heathrow Terminal 2, which despite opening in June 2014 has only partially been added to the rating list, meaning that the Council can only bill, at this stage, for an element of the expansion.
45. There is no change in the headline Collection Fund position reported from Month 7. A net surplus of £2,197k is projected for 31 March 2015, which will be released to the General Fund in 2015/16. As previously noted, the Valuation Office Agency are still to confirm the full rateable value of the new Heathrow Terminal 2. As such a significant element of Business Rate income remains at risk and will continue to be closely monitored.

Housing Revenue Account Budget

46. An in year surplus of £5,135k is projected on Housing Revenue Account operations, a favourable movement of £755k from the position at Month 7 as a result of further projected underspends within Housing Management and deferral of Planned Maintenance projects into 2015/16. As previously noted, the majority of the overall variance is due to the rephasing of such works. Uncommitted balances are projected to reach £27,955k by 31 March 2015, with further monies earmarked to support on-going investment in housing stock.

Future Revenue Implications of Capital Programme

47. Appendix D to this report provides an update on the current capital programme, with a headline underspend of £5,322k reported on the 2014/15 - 2018/19 programme. Within this position, underspends on Disabled Facilities Grants and the School Expansions Programme are sufficient to off-set reported pressures on Yiewsley Health Centre and the legacy Hillingdon Sports & Leisure Centre. There remains £7,259k committed contingency funding within this budget to support new investment without impacting upon the reported underspend.
48. Capital receipts are projected to reach £42,811k over the MTF period, representing an overachievement of £11,092k against budget as a result of increased valuations on two key sites. Taking account of the expected shortfall of £7,800k on Community Infrastructure Levy receipts, arising due to delays in implementing the scheme and the projected underspend noted above, this reduces the Council's borrowing requirement by £8,614k to £147,589k on the current programme. If realised, this reduced level of borrowing would enable savings to be released over the medium term from the current provision for capital financing costs.
49. Continued application of external resources ahead of Council resources and further rephasing of expenditure into future years is likely to result in reduced revenue costs during 2015/16 - although further deferral of capital receipts into 2015/16 will begin to impact upon this position. This will be monitored closely and any resulting revenue implications factored into the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast.

Appendix A – Detailed Group Forecasts (General Fund)

ADMINISTRATION (£405k underspend, £77k improvement)

50. The Administration Group is showing an underspend of £405k at Month 8, a £77k improvement on Month 7. The movement since month 7 is due to reduced salary expenditure in Legal Services and Performance as a result of delayed recruitment to posts and additional vacancies arising. The remaining underspend is primarily due to a number of vacant posts across Performance some of which have been put forward as a saving for the 2015/16 MTFF process. There is a surplus of income in Legal Services and a MTFF proposal for 2015/16 has also been put forward relating to this.

Table 7: Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000	
485	0	Directorate	Salaries	485	496	11	1	10
6	0		Non-Sal Exp	6	4	(2)	(2)	0
(58)	58		Income	0	0	0	0	0
433	58		Sub-Total	491	500	9	(1)	10
707	0	Corporate Comms	Salaries	707	721	14	14	0
159	(9)		Non-Sal Exp	150	139	(11)	(7)	(4)
(27)	9		Income	(18)	(18)	0	0	0
839	0		Sub-Total	839	842	3	7	(4)
1,449	0	Democr. Services	Salaries	1,449	1,461	12	12	0
1,882	0		Non-Sal Exp	1,882	1,896	14	14	0
(957)	339		Income	(618)	(583)	35	35	0
2,374	339		Sub-Total	2,713	2,774	61	61	0
2,273	51	Human Resources	Salaries	2,324	2,267	(57)	(54)	(3)
639	12		Non-Sal Exp	651	655	4	0	4
(303)	0		Income	(303)	(272)	31	35	(4)
2,609	63		Sub-Total	2,672	2,650	(22)	(19)	(3)
1,871	0	Legal Services	Salaries	1,871	1,867	(4)	16	(20)
111	0		Non-Sal Exp	111	105	(6)	(4)	(2)
(575)	0		Income	(575)	(668)	(93)	(93)	0
1,407	0		Sub-Total	1,407	1,304	(103)	(81)	(22)
2,173	(1,593)	Policy & Partnerships	Salaries	580	587	7	6	1
2,463	(166)		Non-Sal Exp	2,297	2,264	(33)	(32)	(1)
(1,267)	1,222		Income	(45)	(64)	(19)	(18)	(1)
3,369	(537)		Sub-Total	2,832	2,787	(45)	(44)	(1)
0	1,620	Performance	Salaries	1,620	1,363	(257)	(200)	(57)
0	168		Non-Sal Exp	168	120	(48)	(50)	2
0	(722)		Income	(722)	(725)	(3)	(1)	(2)
0	1,066		Sub-Total	1,066	758	(308)	(251)	(57)
8,958	78	Admin. Directorate	Salaries	9,036	8,762	(274)	(205)	(69)
5,260	5		Non-Sal Exp	5,265	5,183	(82)	(81)	(1)
(3,187)	906		Income	(2,281)	(2,330)	(49)	(42)	(7)
11,031	989		Total	12,020	11,615	(405)	(328)	(77)

FINANCE (£309k underspend, £4k improvement)

51. The Finance Group is showing an under spend of £309k at Month 8, an improvement of £4k on the Month 7 position. The improvement is largely due to delayed recruitment in the Operational Finance area. The majority of the under spend is due to an improved rent allowance subsidy position since the start of the year. Expenditure and income budgets across Revenues and Benefits will be realigned as part of the 2015/16 MTF process.

Table 8: Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000	
537	0	Internal Audit	Salaries	537	515	(22)	(21)	(1)
56	0		Non-Sal Exp	56	81	25	17	8
0	0		Income	0	(10)	(10)	(10)	0
593	0		Sub-Total	593	586	(7)	(14)	7
2,050	0	Procurement	Salaries	2,050	2,058	8	3	5
150	100		Non-Sal Exp	250	277	27	25	2
(557)	13		Income	(544)	(566)	(22)	(11)	(11)
1,643	113		Sub-Total	1,756	1,769	13	17	(4)
3,299	0	Operational Finance	Salaries	3,299	3,332	33	48	(15)
704	(25)		Non-Sal Exp	679	686	7	7	0
(963)	0		Income	(963)	(963)	0	0	0
3,040	(25)		Sub-Total	3,015	3,055	40	55	(15)
3,729	107	Revenues & Benefits	Salaries	3,836	3,826	(10)	(10)	0
154,439	187		Non-Sal Exp	154,626	154,626	0	0	0
(154,102)	(280)		Income	(154,382)	(154,753)	(371)	(371)	0
4,066	14		Sub-Total	4,080	3,699	(381)	(381)	0
1,445	(60)	Strategic Finance	Salaries	1,385	1,411	26	18	8
2,691	21		Non-Sal Exp	2,712	2,712	0	0	0
(166)	166		Income	0	0	0	0	0
3,970	127		Sub-Total	4,097	4,123	26	18	8
11,060	47	Finance Directorate	Salaries	11,107	11,142	35	38	(3)
158,040	283		Non-Sal Exp	158,323	158,382	59	49	10
(155,788)	(101)		Income	(155,889)	(156,292)	(403)	(392)	(11)
13,312	229		Total	13,541	13,232	(309)	(305)	(4)

52. A breakeven position is projected on the contingency for uninsured claims at Month 8.

Table 9: Development & Risk Contingency

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Development & Risk Contingency	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
400	0	Uninsured Claims	400	400	0	0	0
400	0	Current Commitments	400	400	0	0	0

RESIDENT SERVICES GENERAL FUND (£621k underspend, £167k favourable)

53. Residents Services directorate is showing a projected outturn underspend of £621k at Month 8, excluding pressure areas that have identified contingency provisions.

Table 10: Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000	
2,240	(39)	Asset Management	Salaries	2,201	2,278	77	77	0
8,681	260		Non-Sal Exp	8,941	9,234	293	271	22
(5,494)	(141)		Income	(5,635)	(5,152)	483	483	0
5,427	80		Sub-Total	5,507	6,360	853	831	22
8,451	(662)	Education (GF)	Salaries	7,789	7,597	(192)	(148)	(44)
11,182	(639)		Non-Sal Exp	10,543	10,597	54	89	(35)
(9,681)	(97)		Income	(9,778)	(9,853)	(75)	(91)	16
9,952	(1,398)		Sub-Total	8,554	8,341	(213)	(150)	(63)
1,641	(1)	Environ. Policy & Commun. Engage.	Salaries	1,640	1,566	(74)	(61)	(13)
1,013	(423)		Non-Sal Exp	590	590	0	0	0
(7,491)	0		Income	(7,491)	(7,501)	(10)	(10)	0
(4,837)	(424)		Sub-Total	(5,261)	(5,345)	(84)	(71)	(13)
3,099	0	Housing (GF)	Salaries	3,099	3,141	42	42	0
9,048	0		Non-Sal Exp	9,048	8,995	(53)	(53)	0
(7,489)	0		Income	(7,489)	(7,496)	(7)	(7)	0
4,658	0		Sub-Total	4,658	4,640	(18)	(18)	0
17,347	(3,086)	ICT, Highways & Business Serv.	Salaries	14,261	14,112	(149)	(131)	(18)
9,805	278		Non-Sal Exp	10,083	9,990	(93)	(84)	(9)
(5,416)	(407)		Income	(5,823)	(5,819)	4	4	0
21,736	(3,215)		Sub-Total	18,521	18,283	(238)	(211)	(27)
7,674	(117)	Planning, Green Spaces & Culture	Salaries	7,557	7,463	(94)	(90)	(4)
6,389	(345)		Non-Sal Exp	6,044	6,084	40	40	0
(9,404)	336		Income	(9,068)	(9,196)	(128)	(128)	0
4,659	(126)		Sub-Total	4,533	4,351	(182)	(178)	(4)
13,800	19	Public Safety (GF)	Salaries	13,819	13,789	(30)	(30)	0
24,237	(181)		Non-Sal Exp	24,056	23,700	(356)	(363)	7
(11,965)	0		Income	(11,965)	(11,927)	38	40	(2)
26,072	(162)		Sub-Total	25,910	25,562	(348)	(353)	5
1,773	(457)	Public Health (PHA)	Salaries	1,316	1,316	0	0	0
14,401	(8)		Non-Sal Exp	14,393	14,393	0	0	0
(16,208)	499		Income	(15,709)	(15,709)	0	0	0
(34)	34		Sub-Total	0	0	0	0	0
172	5,904	Residents Services Directorate	Salaries	6,076	5,685	(391)	(304)	(87)
(1,850)	289		Non-Sal Exp	(1,561)	(1,561)	0	0	0
10	(561)		Income	(551)	(551)	0	0	0
(1,668)	5,632		Sub-Total	3,964	3,573	(391)	(304)	(87)
56,197	1,561	Residents Services	Salaries	57,758	56,947	(811)	(645)	(166)
82,906	(769)		Non-Sal Exp	82,137	82,022	(115)	(100)	(15)
(73,138)	(371)		Income	(73,509)	(73,204)	305	291	14
65,965	421		Total	66,386	65,765	(621)	(454)	(167)

54. The overall underspend is a result of the closure of Victoria Road and staffing underspends across the group, offset by pressures on off-street parking income and facilities management. The group is also reporting continuing pressures on buyers' premium income as a result of slippage in asset disposals into 2015/16.
55. The Council's 2014/15 contingency budget contains provision for areas of expenditure or income within Residents Services for which there is a greater degree of uncertainty. The position against these contingency items is shown in Table 11 below. At month 8 projected calls on contingency is £25k over provision, £130k adverse movement from month 7. The table below shows the breakdown for each contingency item.

Table 11: Development and Risk Contingency

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Development & Risk Contingency	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
240	0	Carbon Reduction Commitment	240	240	0	0	0
200	0	HS2 Challenge contingency	200	200	0	0	0
200	0	Heathrow Expansion Challenge Contingency	200	200	0	0	0
2,144	0	Impact of welfare reform on homelessness (Current)	2,144	2,026	(118)	(178)	60
229	0	SEN transport	229	299	70	0	70
811	0	Waste Disposal Levy (Demand-led Tonnage Increases)	811	884	73	73	0
0	60	Poweday Public Enquiry	60	60	0	0	0
0	70	Legal costs associated with compulsory land purchase	70	70		0	0
3,824	130	Current Commitments	3,954	3,979	25	(105)	130

56. Further to continuing pressures on the Housing Needs budget (£1,753k overspend in 2013/14), contingency of £2,144k has been set aside in 2014/15 to resource the need for Temporary Accommodation in the Borough. The call on contingency relating to homelessness is currently projected to be £2,026k, which gives a projected underspend of £118k against the contingency provision (£60k adverse).
57. Temporary Accommodation and housing advice data for the period August to November are shown below. Whilst B&B data still compares favourably to levels seen in 2013/14, sustained levels of demand is being experienced within the service as shown by the Homeless Threat, priority need & eligible indicator below. The data continues to show each month above the 13/14 average of 106, with an average of 134 over the last three autumnal months showing a marked increase from the demand experienced in the summer.

Table 12: Housing Needs performance data

	August	September	October	November
Homeless Threat, Priority Need & Eligible	113	131	150	120
Presenting As Homeless	46	57	44	41
Duty Accepted	22	34	23	32
Households in Temporary Accommodation	508	502	515	521
Households in B&B	154	146	155	155

58. Due to the lack of private sector properties to use as prevention on private sector discharge, the number of homeless accepted cases remains high at projected figures of around 350 this year. This figure is 3 times higher than the low figure achievable prior to changes in supply for the private sector.
59. The Housing Needs service is still experiencing a high level of demand in terms of homelessness presentations. At month 8, the projected call on contingency is £2,026k (£60k adverse).
60. The adverse movement is caused by a projected increase in B&B between mid December and January, before falling back to current levels in February. The figure represents a broad view of the units procured for the new PSL scheme, the control of B&B costs, the successful retention of existing PSLs and the levels of incentives paid out on prevention schemes. The use of an additional 22 hard to let HRA properties as shortlife gives a total of 122 in use by the end of December 2014, which will assist in managing the pressure on B&B. The key challenge in containing the pressure will be in retaining existing properties on the Private Managed Accommodation (PMA) and Private Sector leasing (PSL) at economic rates, whilst at the same time managing the demand at the front end of the service.
61. An additional £2,439k was added to the base budget to resource expected increases in the waste disposal levy, leading to a net decrease in contingency to £811k. This has been set aside to fund estimated increases in waste tonnage and the move to a new compliant rubble and hardcore contract.
62. At month 8 the latest modelling forecast remains at an overspend on contingency of £73k (no change) owing in part to the increasing demand for rubble and other heavy waste tonnages to private contractors and in addition the increasing tonnages of green waste and refuse tonnages which would appear to be in common with other WLWA boroughs.
63. The contingency for the Carbon Reduction Commitment is for the estimated costs to purchase carbon allowances.
64. Special Educational Needs (SEN) Transport continues to experience significant pressure and as a result corporate contingency of £229k is available to manage risks for the service for 2014/15.
65. The service has reassessed its forecast against the assumed growth of 6% in the budget now that the impact of the new school year and the associated changes in routes has bedded in. Current analysis of the data for the new cohort shows an increase in the projected cost of £70k, which includes provision for the new routes starting in January.
66. The reported position for month 8 allows for the continuing risk in this volatile area, given the projected increase in the SEN population to 1,645 by the end of the financial year (a 7% increase) reported in the Schools Budget section of this report.

67. HS2 and Heathrow expansion challenge contingencies provide resources to enable the Council to respond to the continuing threat of these projects to residents.

Asset Management (£853k pressure, £22k adverse)

68. As previously reported, the service manages risks around the achievement of capital receipts and delivery of the capital programme. Achievement of buyers' premium income is volatile; slippage of one of the larger disposals in the schedule can lead to a material drop in revenue. At Month 8 the service is reporting a net reduction in buyers' premium income to £106k for the financial year (no change). This relates to the slippage of major sites in the disposals programme into 2015/16.
69. Asset Management is projected to overspend by £250k on maintenance (£200k Borough wide, £50k Civic Centre) and experience shortfalls on Civic Centre income £57k relating to leases for the multi storey car park and hire of committee rooms, £20k.
70. The income stream from commercial leases is currently forecast at £840k, £60k higher than the budget. There is also a £50k underspend on the planned maintenance contingency.
71. There is a £22k adverse movement for month 8 in relation to costs for building maintenance contract costs.

Education GF (£213k underspend, £63k favourable)

72. The Education Service is projecting an underspend of £213k as at Month 8, an improvement of £63k on the month 7 projections. This consists of an underspend of £191k on staffing, an improvement of £44k on the month 7 position, due to a reduced projection for Early Years and Youth Services. An overspend of £55k on non staffing costs, an improvement of £35k on the month 7 position, due to a further review of planned expenditure.
73. A projected surplus of £76k on income streams, an adverse movement of £16k on the month 7 position, due to a reduction in the level of SLA income received from schools.

Environmental Policy & Community Engagement (£84k underspend, £13k favourable)

74. Environmental Policy and Community Engagement is reporting a £10k favourable variance on New Homes Bonus grant allocation. This follows the adjusted topslice allocation of £142k received on 15 May 2014, bringing the total NHB allocation to £6,928k, £10k above budget.
75. The service is also projecting an underspend on salaries of £74k , a favourable movement of £13k reflecting part year vacancies and delays to recruitment of vacant posts across Planning Policy and Road Safety.

Housing GF (£18k underspend, no change)

76. The service is expecting to produce a small underspend relating to non-salaries expenditure. This is currently projected at £38k, relating to an unallocated training budget. In addition, there are projected underspends within team budgets of £4k for miscellaneous items including printing and stationary.
77. There is a £24k adverse variance due to £42k agency cost for two Homelessness Prevention Caseworkers, netted down by £18k favourable movement in PSL court fees (£11k) and rents & wayleaves (£7k).

ICT Highways & Business Services (£238k underspend, £27k favourable)

78. The service is reporting a £18k favourable movement in staffing underspends in a range of service areas across the group.
79. Within Highways, there are favourable movements of £7k relating to a reduced projection for training and £2k for building activity licences.

Planning Sport & Green Spaces (£182k underspend, £4k favourable)

80. The Golf courses overspend has reduced from £12k to £8k (£4k favourable movement). This is a result of savings identified in the ongoing restructure and staffing underspends from vacant posts as well as a reduction in overtime payments.
81. Cabinet approved the increased contract fees in relation to planning applications on 20 November 2014. As at month 8, the service expects to be able to contain the additional costs within existing budgets.
82. Building Control is projected to make a shortfall in income of £81k (no change), offset by £154k underspends including Breakspear Crematorium income £64k (no change) and Stockley Park/leisure rents £90k.

Public Health (nil variance, no change)

83. There is currently an underspend forecast in relation to staffing costs for both Public Health Administration and the Health Promotion team. For Public Health Administration, an underspend of £46k (£14k favourable) is anticipated for the year. It is anticipated that the Director of Public Health post will be filled from January this year. The Health Promotion Team is forecasting a £141k underspend against staffing costs (£5k favourable), due to three positions being vacant which are considered unlikely to be filled this year.
84. BID and category reviews of Public Health services are underway, with new sexual health and school nursing contract arrangements in place. The National Chlamydia Screening Programme contract and the condom distribution contract with Terrence Higgins Trust have finished and a new contract with CNWL is now in place to provide these services, with savings of around £120k per annum contributing to the MTFP.
85. The school nursing contract has been re-let with a saving of around £80k per annum. The new school nursing contract includes the school vision service that was previously contracted separately at a cost of £60k per annum. These will contribute to the existing 2014/15 procurement savings for Public Health.
86. Bids for the drug and alcohol services tender have now been received and are being evaluated. It is anticipated that new contracting arrangements will be in place for July 2015.

Public Safety (£348k underspend, £5k favourable)

87. The off-street parking income at the Cedars and Grainges multi-storey car parks continues to experience pressure relating to the loss of season ticket income at both car parks. The most recent forecast is unchanged from month 7, resulting in an income pressure of £242k.
88. The off-street parking team is forecasting a staffing underspend of £15k due to only one of two vacant posts being filled for the remainder of this financial year.
89. Public Protection is forecasting staffing underspends in Trading Standards due to retirements and anticipated delays in the recruitment process (£47k, no change), and in Pollution Control

a forecast underspend of £10k (no change) due to the restructure. There is also an £8k underspend on non-staffing costs. The service is also forecasting scrap metal additional licences income £3k (no change).

90. There is a forecast income overachievement of £49k (£2k favourable) for the sampling of soil products and a reduction in analyst fees of £53k (£12k favourable). This is a prudent forecast variance for this volatile income stream which will continue to be closely monitored.
91. In Waste Services, there is a projected underspend of £357k which primarily relates to the impact of the closure of the Victoria Road CA site.
92. The remaining underspends of £48k (£19k adverse) relate to Waste Services previously reported at month 7. These relate to New Years Green Lane Civic Amenity site reporting net underspends of £57k and additional underspends of £10k relating to additional overtime/agency costs. This underspend is offset by the purchase of additional bulk bins in trade waste (£19k).

Residents Services Directorate (£391k underspend, £87k favourable)

93. There are a number of vacant posts across Technical Admin and Business Support teams that have been consolidated into Residents Services. The majority of these posts are not planned to be recruited to until the second half of this year. The current projection at month 8 relating to these vacancies is an underspend of £391k.
94. The favourable movement consists of a £57k improvement from month 7 relating to the anticipated phasing of the restructures and a £30k improvement relating to the transfer of the full year costs of a member of staff seconded into a role in social care.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES (£252k overspend, £31k improvement)

95. The Children and Young People's Service is projecting an overspend of £252k as at Month 8, an improvement of £31k on the month 7 projections, which is explained in more detail below.
96. The month 8 position is now reflecting an overspend of £363k on Salaries, an improvement of £101k on the month 7 projections, due to a line by line review of the number of agency staff required to cover vacant posts, where senior management are ensuring that agency staff are appointed only where there is a defined need, resulting in a reduction in the projected cost of agency. However, the overspend still reflects the current position on the staffing establishment where the service has a high level of vacant posts, including a number of Senior Manager posts, the majority of which are being covered by agency staff and an increase in sessional staff costs to support children's contact as instructed by the courts. The agency market for Social Workers remains highly competitive with a consequential pressure on pay rates in order to retain and attract good quality staff.
97. There is an overspend of £49k on non-staffing budgets, an adverse movement of £47k on the month 7 projections. Within this there is a further projected increase in the cost of Secure/Remand placements, over which the Council has only limited control, and an increase in the cost of Adoption and Special Guardianship Order allowances and subsistence that is provided to clients. This is netted down by underspends across supplies and services, where the service is challenging and tightly controlling spending decisions.
98. There is a projected surplus of £160k on income, an adverse movement of £23k on the month 7 projections, due to a reduction in the anticipated income that will be received from the Dedicated Schools Grant for joint funded placements. The surplus of £160k relates to the funding received from a number of external partners, including Health, the Youth Justice Board and Education.
99. The projected variances at Month 8 are summarised in the following table, with more detail provided in the paragraphs below.

Table 13: Operating Budgets

Original Budget	Budget Changes	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance (As at Month 8)	Variance (As at Month 7)	Movement from Month 7	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
1,033	31	Safeguarding Children	Salaries	1,064	1,342	278	276	2
1,356	126		Non-Sal Exp	1,482	1,637	155	154	1
(146)	(2)		Income	(148)	(211)	(63)	(65)	2
2,243	155		Sub-Total	2,398	2,768	370	365	5
1,711	366	Early Intervention Services	Salaries	2,077	1,769	(308)	(312)	4
288	(1)		Non-Sal Exp	287	294	7	(3)	10
(657)	0		Income	(657)	(731)	(74)	(55)	(19)
1,342	365		Sub-Total	1,707	1,332	(375)	(370)	(5)
3,355	(1,176)	Looked After Children	Salaries	2,179	1,912	(267)	(271)	4
1,056	(309)		Non-Sal Exp	747	678	(69)	(101)	32
(304)	(10)		Income	(314)	(315)	(1)	(1)	0
4,107	(1,495)		Sub-Total	2,612	2,275	(337)	(373)	36
9,970	(1,964)	Children's Resources	Salaries	8,006	8,667	661	771	(110)
12,394	(506)		Non-Sal Exp	11,888	11,843	(45)	(48)	3
(7,854)	556		Income	(7,298)	(7,320)	(22)	(62)	40
14,510	(1,914)		Sub-Total	12,596	13,190	594	661	(67)
16,069	(2,743)	Children's and Young Persons Directorate	Salaries	13,326	13,690	364	464	(100)
15,094	(690)		Non-Sal Exp	14,404	14,452	48	2	46
(8,961)	544		Income	(8,417)	(8,577)	(160)	(183)	23
22,202	(2,889)		Total	19,313	19,565	252	283	(31)

Safeguarding Children: (£370k overspend, £5k adverse)

100. The Safeguarding Children's service is projecting an overspend of £370k, an adverse movement of £5k on the month 7 projections. The overall position comprises an overspend of £278k on staffing, due to a high level of agency staff and an overspend of £155k on non staffing costs, where there are projected pressures in the Local Safeguarding Children's Board budget (which provides amongst other things, training for outside organisations including Health and schools) and the Corporate Parenting budget. This is offset by a surplus of £63k in income streams, due to additional funds being received from external partners.

Early intervention (Youth Offending Service): (£375k underspend, £5k improvement)

101. This service is projecting an underspend of £375k, an improvement of £5k on the month 7 projections. This relates to an underspend of £309k on staffing, where there are a number of staff vacancies relating primarily to Key Worker posts, due to the impending implementation of the Early Support restructure, an overspend of £7k on non staffing budgets and a surplus of £74k on income, which is due to additional funds being received from external partners including the Youth Justice Board.

Looked After Children: (£337k underspend, £36k adverse)

102. This service is projecting an underspend of £337k, an adverse movement of £36k on the month 7 projections, due to an increase in client support costs. This relates to an underspend on staffing costs of £267k, due to a high level of vacant posts, some of which are not being covered by agency or permanent staff and an underspend of £69k on non staffing costs, where the service is incurring expenditure on essential items only.

Children's Resources: (£594k overspend, £67k improvement)

103. This service is projecting an overspend of £594k, an improvement of £67k on the month 7 projections as a result of an ongoing review of salary cost forecasts, where it has been assumed that the service will continue with agency appointments up to the 31 March 2015, whilst the service implements fully the Children's Pathway and faces ongoing challenges in permanent recruitment. The gross overspend on staffing costs is £661k, which reflects the cost differential of agency staff, including a number of Senior Manager posts, over this period, together with sessional staff costs required to support Looked After Children contact, where the number of court instructions has increased significantly this year. This is netted down by an underspend of £45k on non staffing costs, where the service continues to control and challenge spend, and a surplus of £22k on income, which is due to additional funding being received from external partners. This latter variance more than offsets the reduced contribution that will be received from the Dedicated Schools Grant, as the majority of the residential placements that have been converted to local provision, no longer require a contribution from education.
104. In terms of the placements budget, this is projecting a breakeven position, assuming the full draw down of contingency sums.
105. There are an additional number of emerging pressures which are having a direct impact on the projected year end position. These relate to the following:
- An increase in activity relating to Looked After Children contact, where the Council is experiencing a high volume of requests and instructions from the Courts, which requires an officer to accompany the child. The current mechanism has been to employ sessional staff to undertake this duty. This is currently being reviewed to determine whether there is a different, more cost effective, model that could be developed. Based on current projections this is creating a budget pressure of £312k.
 - There is an additional staffing cost within the Triage service due to additional resources being required to cover staff absence, as well as a high level of agency staff, resulting in a pressure of £159k.
 - This year has seen a high incidence of Looked After Children being placed in secure accommodation, where the cost is projected to be in the region of £382k. The Youth Justice Board provides a grant to the Council to cover this cost, however the grant for 2014/15 is only £102k. Officers are planning to enter into discussions with the Youth Justice Board to ascertain whether additional grant funding can be secured.

Exceptional Items

106. With effect from 22 September 2014, the Council entered into a contract for a Children's Social Care managed service at a cost of £1,149k, primarily to provide some short term stability across the service and build in capacity to deal with a high volume of agency recruitment. This service has been monitored closely which has resulted in a revised delivery model being put in place with effect from 24 November 2014, which will focus on the assessment stage only. The latest caseload analysis indicates that the caseloads per Social Worker are moving closer to the optimum level as set out in the Munro report, which will allow the service to review the staffing resource requirement and start planning to reduce the requirement for the appointment of additional agency staff. The month 8 monitoring staffing position reflects the planned slow down in the number of agency staff appointed, based on the current improvements that are being seen through the introduction of the managed service. This position will be monitored on a weekly basis to allow the service sufficient time

to act and make decisions on future staffing resource requirements over the next four months up to 31 March 2015.

107. The Council has also entered into a similar temporary arrangement to support the Adoption and Fostering service, which will be phased in over December 2014 and is estimated to cost £423k over a period of 6 months, with an estimated cost of £257k in 2014/15 for the period mid December 2014 to 31 March 2015. This managed service is likely to have a direct impact on the number of children that will be adopted or be subject to a Special Guardianship Order as well as potentially increase the number of In House Foster Carers, thus reducing the need to use Independent Fostering Agencies, where the cost differential is approximately £20,000 per placement per annum. The impact of this service will also be monitored very closely.
108. It should be noted that these two items have not been accounted for within the month 8 monitoring position reported above. However, there is provision within earmarked reserves and contingency to fund these costs, where they cannot be met from the base budget.

Analysis of Placements

109. The following table sets out the number of current placements in October 2014, and compares the total with the data used to determine the base budget position for 2014/15 as part of the Medium Term Financial Forecast submission.

Table 14: Children's Care Placements

November 2014 Projections	Projecte d 14/15		Annualise d Cost	Cost	2014/15	2014/15
	Numbers	%	£000	%	Projecte d £000	Budget £000
Secure/Remand Accommodation	4	1%	416	4%	382	111
Residential	14	7%	3,139	30%	2,122	1,468
Semi Independent Living	25	13%	1,324	13%	692	409
Fostering Private	76	39%	3,987	38%	3,210	2,395
In House	78	40%	1,612	15%	1,353	1,722
Risk Contingency						1,860
Total November 2014	197	100%	10,478	100%	7,760	7,965

October 2014 Reported Position	210		10,478		7,899	7,965
Movement Between October and November 2014	-13		0		-139	0

110. This indicates that the projected cost is in line with the 2014/15 budget plus the risk contingency. The current split between In House and Independent Fostering now stands at 49% to 51% respectively, and is starting to move towards the desired 60% to 40% split.
111. It should be noted that the numbers reported do not take account of the impact of the managed service, where more up to date data is indicating that the Looked After Children numbers are beginning to increase.

Development & Risk Contingency (£70k overspend, £100k adverse)

112. The Corporate Risk Contingency holds three budgets; one relating to growth in Looked After Children placement numbers (£1,860k) another relating to a provision for the shortfall in grant

funding for the Asylum service (£1,458k) with the final one relating to an anticipated additional funding of £200,000 from the Home Office to reflect the financial burden of Heathrow.

Table 15: Development & Risk Contingency

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Development & Risk Contingency	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
1,458	0	Asylum Funding Shortfall	1,458	1,528	70	(30)	100
(200)	0	Potential Extension of Asylum Gateway Agreement	(200)	(200)	0	0	0
1,860	0	Social Care Pressures (Children's)	1,860	1,860	0	0	0
3,118	0	Current Commitments	3,118	3,188	70	(30)	100

113. The Asylum Service is projecting an overspend of £1,528k, an adverse movement of £100k on the month 7 projections, due to a high number of children turning 18 in this financial year, which attracts less grant funding from the Home Office. This reflects the true running costs of the service in providing support for asylum seeking children, for which the Home Office will provide grant funding of £4,562k to cover the direct costs based on a unit rate for different age children.

114. The majority of the costs incurred, which are not covered by the Home Office grant, relate to support that is provided to children over 18 years of age. The cost of supporting these children net of any grant, results in the overspend of £1,528k being reported, for which a sum of £1,458k has been set aside in the Corporate Risk Contingency. This results in the overspend of £70k currently reported.

The following table provides an analysis of the gross Asylum service budget projected position for month 8:

Table 16: Asylum Expenditure

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Change from Month 7 £'000
3,294	259	Asylum Services	3,035	2,680	(355)	(234)	(121)
2,810	(259)		3,069	4,001	932	1,240	(308)
(6,104)	(0)		(6,104)	(5,153)	951	422	529
0	(0)	Sub-Total	0	1,528	1,528	1,428	100

115. Negotiations took place with the Home Office last year, which secured an additional funding of £200k for both 2013/14 and 2014/15. This assumption was built into the Risk Contingency for 2014/15. In April 2014 the Home Office confirmed that the Council would receive an additional £200k in 2014/15, which matches the prediction built into the Risk Contingency.

116. The Placements budget built in additional growth for Looked After Children, which, based on the current projections, will need to be fully drawn down from the Risk Contingency.

ADULT SOCIAL CARE (£632k underspend, £187k improvement)

117. The Adult Social Care directorate is projecting a forecast underspend £632k as at month 8, a favourable movement of £187k since the last month, when a projected underspend to year end of £445k was anticipated. The main areas of movement relate to a reduction in staffing forecast and increased income forecast. Further details of these movements are detailed below.

Table 17: Operating Budgets

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service		Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
				Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
2,329	305	All-Age Disabilities	Salaries	2,634	2,375	(259)	(243)	(16)
25,061	6,766		Non-Sal Exp	31,827	32,395	568	488	80
(3,802)	(496)		Income	(4,298)	(4,948)	(650)	(587)	(63)
23,588	6,575		Sub-Total	30,163	29,822	(341)	(342)	1
3,629	671	Social Work	Salaries	4,300	4,088	(212)	(208)	(4)
21,966	3,275		Non-Sal Exp	25,241	25,277	36	111	(75)
(8,281)	43		Income	(8,238)	(8,384)	(146)	(141)	(5)
17,314	3,989		Sub-Total	21,303	20,981	(322)	(238)	(84)
7,178	920	Early Intervention & Prevention	Salaries	8,098	7,968	(129)	(89)	(40)
2,914	733		Non-Sal Exp	3,647	3,967	320	372	(52)
(711)	(10,181)		Income	(10,892)	(10,930)	(38)	(12)	(26)
9,381	(8,528)		Sub-Total	853	1,005	153	271	(118)
2,292	(296)	Safeguarding, Quality & Partnerships	Salaries	1,996	1,900	(96)	(91)	(5)
4,753	(59)		Non-Sal Exp	4,694	4,674	(20)	(28)	8
(363)	92		Income	(271)	(314)	(43)	(54)	11
6,682	(263)		Sub-Total	6,419	6,260	(159)	(173)	14
1,539	(1,243)	Directorate & Support Services	Salaries	296	319	22	22	0
(2,970)	2,570		Non-Sal Exp	(400)	(351)	49	49	0
0	(125)		Income	(125)	(159)	(34)	(34)	0
(1,431)	1,202		Sub-Total	(229)	(191)	37	37	0
16,967	357	Adult Social Care Directorate Total	Salaries	17,324	16,650	(674)	(609)	(65)
51,724	13,285		Non-Sal Exp	65,009	65,962	953	992	(39)
(13,157)	(10,667)		Income	(23,824)	(24,735)	(911)	(828)	(83)
55,534	2,975		Total	58,509	57,877	(632)	(445)	(187)

118. The Council's 2014/15 Development and Risk Contingency contains provision for areas of expenditure within Adult Social Care for which there is a greater degree of uncertainty caused by the demographic changes in the number of adults requiring care and support for a range of care needs and Children with Disabilities who transition into Adult Social Care on reaching adulthood. The current forecast expenditure against these contingencies is set out in Table 2 below.

Table 18: Development & Risk Contingency

Original Budget	Budget Changes	Development & Risk Contingency	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance (As at Month 8)	Variance (As at Month 7)	Movement from Month 7
£'000	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
2,406		Increase in Transitional Children due to Demographic Changes	2,406	1,816	(590)	(590)	0
		Total Social Care Demographic Pressures for Care and Support:					
		Older People	6,254	6,254	0	0	0
		Clients With Disabilities	3,771	4,207	436	436	0
11,990	0	Clients With Mental Health Issues	1,965	1,965	0	0	0
14,396	0	Current Commitments	14,396	14,242	(154)	(154)	0

119. It is forecast, as at month 8, that the Development and Risk Contingency for demographic changes in the number of clients requiring care and support costs will underspend by a net £154k this year.

120. The actual contingency required for transitional children is still anticipated to underspend by £590k as reported in month 7 as the number of children transferring is less than originally forecast and those who do transfer have been assessed at a lower cost of care than forecast as they move into adulthood.

121. The pressure from the Winterbourne View report is still estimated at a cost of £436k in this year. No further cases have been agreed to transfer this month.

All Age Disabilities(AAD): (£341k underspend, £1k movement)

122. This service includes clients with physical and sensory disabilities for both Children and Adults, following the implementation of the recommendations from the BID review covering disabilities. This service currently shows an underspend of £341k (£16k improvement) in salary expenditure due to the delay in filling vacancies at team leader level. A pressure of £568k (£80k increase) on placement costs due to additional placements, the increase in month 8 is due to increase costs for health clients and provisional forecast of £50k for the lift to be installed at the new Church Road supported living scheme due to change in client accommodation from MH to LD. This is offset by additional client contributions of £190k and increased contributions from Education and HCCG of £460k for joint funded placements.

123. The pressure in Merrifields Resource Centre remains unchanged at £179k. Although this pressure is covered within the forecast for the service, the review being undertaken is not complete and it is anticipated this pressure will be able to be mitigated further in this year.

124. The number of Children with Disabilities requiring care and support as they transition into adulthood is less than the original forecast built into the 2014/15 Development and Risk Contingency for transitional children due to lower number of clients transferring and lower

costs arising from the ongoing care and support needs of those who have transferred estimated to be £590k during this financial year, this is unchanged from month 7.

125. In terms of the impact of the placements arising from the Winterbourne View report, referenced in previous reports, there are 14 known service users who are likely to become the responsibility of the Council. So far, 4 service users have transferred which has led to a pressure on adult placements for disabilities and is reflected in the increased pressure on the Adult Social Care contingency as set out above. The financial pressure in this year is estimated at a gross cost of £479k, with income from the HCCG of £43k, creating a net cost to LBH of £436k. The full year impact of these transfers equate to a gross cost of £504k, potential CCG income of £56k and a net cost of £448k in a full year.
126. There are a further 10 service users who have been identified to transfer to the Council. The financial impact of these clients has been worked up using assumptions based upon the cost of the clients who have already transferred. The additional funding to cover this pressure is included as contingency in the MTF for 2015/2020.

Social Work (£322k underspend, £84k improvement)

127. It is forecast that there is an underspend of £322k, which is an improvement of £84k from Month 7.
128. Non staff expenditure pressure has reduced £75k. The current forecast includes an increase of 2 Nursing placements of £66k which has impart been offset by a further reduction in forecast homecare costs of £141k. This continued reduction in homecare reflects the trend being seen in month 7 and is partly from the impact of the work of Skylakes to reassess client's needs and their support packages and the continuing pro-active work within the service to manage the demand and cost of the service.

Early Intervention and Prevention (£153k pressure, £118k improvement)

129. A pressure of £153k (an improvement of £118k from month 7) is forecast on Early Intervention and Prevention arising mainly from the non-achievement to date of a significant element of the savings relating to transport (£345k), brought forward from 2011/12. This pressure is currently offset by underspends on staffing costs. A review has commenced to identify other opportunities to realise alternative savings to offset this outstanding target.
130. The improvement on staffing (£41k) and non staffing (£52k) this month in the main are due to revised forecasts for LD Day Services as costs relating to the opening of Queenswalk and closure of Woodside and Phoenix are more certain.

Safeguarding, Quality and Partnerships (£159k underspend, £14k movement)

131. It is forecast that there will be an underspend of £159k mainly arising from staff savings as a result of current vacancies. Expenditure incurred in supporting identified service users with no recourse to public funds remains unchanged from Month 7 at a pressure of £145k which is being managed within the above forecast.
132. Expenditure on Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS) cases is projected to be £235k, although it is expected that these costs will be funded corporately or from alternative sources, with no net impact on the department's base budget. This forecast remains unchanged from month 7. So far, 189 cases have come through this financial year - this figure will continue to be monitored over the following months.

Directorate and Support (£37k pressure, no change)

133. There is a projected pressure of £37k, mainly arising as a result of the managed vacancy factor not being achieved.
134. The Care Act Implementation Grant has been included in the month 8 forecast and it is currently anticipated the full £125k will be spent in this financial year. Work is continuing to ensure compliance with the Care Act from April 2015 and the ICT solution for the Advice and Information service is in the process of being purchased.

Appendix B – Other Funds

Schools Budget

Dedicated Schools Grant (£2,234k overspend, £41k adverse)

135. The Dedicated Schools Grant is projecting an in year overspend of £2,234k, a slight improvement of £41k on the month 7 projections, due to a slight reduction in the projected cost of SEN placements. The overspend on the DSG, in the main, reflects the planned use of the surplus balance that was carried forward from 2013/14, where additional resources totalling £1,294k were delegated to schools above the actual amount of DSG and £300k was earmarked to fund early years initiatives, with the remainder relating to a pressure on SEN placement costs. The following Table summarises the Total DSG income and expenditure for 2014/15.

Table 19: Dedicated Schools Grant

Original Budget	Budget Changes	Funding Block	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		Change from Month 7
			Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance (As at Month 8)	Variance (As at Month 7)	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
(145,373)	0	Dedicated Schools Grant Income	(145,373)	(145,840)	(467)	(467)	0
113,606	0	Delegated to Schools	113,606	114,900	1,294	1,306	(12)
4,581	0	Early Years	4,523	4,874	350	348	3
3,604	0	Centrally Retained	3,604	3,919	315	314	0
23,582	0	Special Needs	23,640	24,381	742	774	(32)
0	0	Total Schools Budget	0	2,234	2,234	2,275	(41)
0	0	Balance Brought Forward 1 April 2014	(3,781)	(3,781)			
0	0	Balance Carried Forward 31 March 2015	(3,781)	(1,547)			

Dedicated Schools Grant Income (£467k surplus, no change)

136. The Department for Education have confirmed that the DSG will be adjusted and increased for the funds that were deducted for Pentland Fields Special Free School at the beginning of the year, which equates to £467k.

Delegated to Schools (£1,294k overspend, £12k improvement)

137. The overspend of £1,294k is due to Schools Forum agreeing to utilise part of the surplus balance carried forward from 2013/14 by delegating more resources to schools than were allocated in the DSG.

Early Years (£350k overspend, £3k adverse)

138. The Early Years funding block is projecting an overspend of £350k, an adverse movement of £3k on the month 7 position. This is primarily due to Schools Forum agreeing to utilise £300k from its surplus balances to fund a range of new initiatives targeted at early years and early intervention.

139. The base budget includes a provision to develop capacity for the Two Year Old Free Entitlement offer. It is likely that this fund will not be fully allocated, but at this point in time it has been assumed that it is fully committed. Schools Forum at its meeting on 22 October 2014, agreed to release £347,378 for a new Two Year Old facility at Laurel Lane Primary School, leaving an unallocated balance of £1,063k.

Centrally Retained (£315k overspend, £1k adverse)

140. The centrally retained budgets are projecting an overspend of £314k, which relates to payments that have been made for additional bulge year classes, which have opened in September 2014 and the cost of the two new Basic Need Academy school set up costs and diseconomies of scale funding.

Special Needs (£742k overspend, £32k improvement)

141. The Special Needs budgets are projecting an overspend of £742k, an improvement of £32k on the month 7 position, due to a slight decrease in the projected number and cost of SEN placements. The overspend relates to the increase in the number of children with a statement across a much wider age range, which now encompasses 0 to 25. The estimated growth in the SEN pupil population is 7%, within this there is a higher proportion of early years pupils that need additional support within early years settings, which is offset by a reduction in the number of post 16 pupils. The following table sets out the change in the number of pupils with an SEN statement over the last 4 years:

Difficulty	Actuals 31/3/11	Actuals 31/3/12	Actuals 31/3/13	Actuals 31/3/14	Actuals 30/11/14	Yr end projection
Autistic Spectrum disorder	315	355	405	440	481	492
Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulty	152	143	149	129	129	129
Hearing Impairment	37	31	38	42	41	45
Mild Learning Difficulty	295	290	298	298	300	305
Multi-Sensory Impairment	7	7	6	6	6	6
Other ie: (Medical/mental health)	34	32	37	39	37	39
Physical Disability	76	85	89	90	89	94
Profound & Multiple learning diffs	29	33	32	30	32	35
Speech Language and Communication Needs	237	247	259	272	275	282
Severe Learning Difficulty	108	115	114	117	120	118
Specific Learning Difficulty	23	28	32	37	37	38
Visual Impairment	18	18	21	26	29	27
Unclassified	9	3		8	11	35
Total	1,340	1,387	1,480	1,534	1,587	1,645
Change - Numbers		47	93	54	53	111
Change - Percentage		3.51%	6.71%	3.65%	3.46%	6.99%

Year End Balances

142. The DSG is allowed to carry forward any in year over or underspends. At the end of the 2013/14 financial year, the DSG had a surplus balance of £3,781k. It should be noted that where the DSG is expected to underspend, it is anticipated that this will be factored into the total DSG available for delegation in the following year. At its meeting on 20 January 2014, Schools Forum agreed to include £1,294k of this surplus within the Schools Delegated Budget for 2014/15, additionally they agreed to set aside the £937k two year old capacity funding underspend as an earmarked reserve for the two year old free entitlement offer in 2014/15 and provide an additional £300k for new initiatives to support Early Years provision. Based on the projected outturn position reported in the table above, the projected year end balance will reduce to £1,547k.

PARKING REVENUE ACCOUNT (£38k in year deficit, £55k favourable)

143. The Parking Revenue Account is established to govern the use of income from Penalty Charges Notices (PCNs), together with other on-street parking income streams, in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Table 20: Parking Revenue Account

Original Budget £'000	Budget Changes £'000	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (As at Month 8) £'000	Variance (As at Month 7) £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
(4,153)	0	Income	(4,153)	(3,879)	274	298	(24)
4,061	0	Expenditure	4,061	3,917	(144)	(113)	(31)
(92)	0	In-year (Surplus) / Deficit	(92)	38	130	185	(55)
76	0	Unallocated Balances b/fwd	76	76	0	0	0
(16)	0	Unallocated Balances C/fwd	(16)	114	130	185	(55)

144. An in-year deficit of £38k is forecast for the 2014/15 financial year. There is a total shortfall of income of £274k (£24k favourable from month 7). The favourable movement relates to improved income collection from bailiffs. The overall position reflects the continued lower level of Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) income relative to the historic income target.

145. The income pressure is offset by compensating savings totalling £144k (£31k favourable movement), as well as the budgeted surplus of £92k. The favourable movement reported relates to a reduced projection for non-staffing costs (ICT equipment) and private contractors costs.

COLLECTION FUND (£2,197k surplus, no movement)

146. The collection of local taxes is managed through the Council's Collection Fund in order to avoid short-term volatility in income impacting on provision of services. No change is reported from Month 7, with strong collection rates for Council Tax off-setting a projected shortfall of £500k on Business Rate revenues. There remains a high level of uncertainty with regard to Business Rates as income due in relation to Heathrow Terminal 2 has not yet been confirmed.

147. Overall performance within the collection fund remains strong, with a net surplus of £2,197k reported as a Council Tax surplus of £2,697k is partially off-set by a relatively minor £500k deficit on Business Rates income. In the event that current trends continue a rebalancing of income projections between these taxes will be included in the Council's draft budget for 2015/16.

Table 21: Collection Fund

Original Budget	Budget Changes	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)			
			Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance (As at Month 8)	Variance (As at Month 7)	Movement from Month 7	
£'000	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
(114,070)	0	Council Tax	Gross Income	(114,070)	(115,534)	(1,464)	(1,464)	0
14,743	0		Council Tax Support	14,743	14,297	(446)	(446)	0
(3,610)	0		B/fwd Surplus	(3,610)	(4,397)	(787)	(787)	0
(102,937)	0		Sub-Total	(102,937)	(105,634)	(2,697)	(2,697)	0
(105,485)	(911)	Business Rates	Gross Income	(106,396)	(106,283)	113	113	0
(981)	567		Section 31 Grants	(414)	(414)	0	0	0
59,158	0		Less: Tariff	59,158	59,158	0	0	0
2,136	344		Less: Levy	2,480	2,480	0	0	0
0	0		B/fwd Deficit	0	387	387	387	0
(45,172)	0		Sub-Total	(45,172)	(44,672)	500	500	0
(148,109)	0	Total Collection Fund	(148,109)	(150,306)	(2,197)	(2,197)	0	

148. Council Tax revenues continue to grow strongly with the £1,464k additional yield arising from new development in the Borough and strong performance on collection. Current levels of demand for the Council Tax Reduction Scheme are marginally lower than anticipated at budget setting, however this movement is off-set by increased eligibility for Single Person Discounts. This position will remain under review and any on-going implications reflected in the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast.
149. As previously reported, significant growth has been factored into the Council's Business Rates income budgets to reflect new developments in the Borough and the re-opening of Heathrow Terminal 2 in June 2014. Continuing delays by the Valuation Office Agency in adding the new premises to the rating list mean that the Council is not in a position to confirm the full rates payable for 2014/15 and as such the forecast set out above remains subject to change. To date only Phases 1 and 2 have been added to the Valuation List, resulting in a risk of a potential income shortfall in 2014/15 if this is not addressed.
150. Given the continuing uncertainty around Terminal 2 revenues, and the continuing high level of unoccupied commercial property in the Borough an in-year deficit of £113k is projected for 2014/15. As with Council Tax, the medium term implications of this position will remain under review and be reflected within the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast as necessary.
151. The brought forward deficit of £387k on Business Rates included the cost of establishing a provision to manage the cost of backdated appeal losses. Experience since 1 April 2014 indicates that such appeal losses can be contained within the provision and barring any exceptional outcomes it is expected that this risk can be contained in the short-term.

Appendix C – HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

152. The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast is a surplus of £5,135k, a movement of £755k from the previous month, principally attributable to a revised forecast due to further movement in the phasing of the planned maintenance to stock programme. The table below presents key variances by service areas:

Table 22: Housing Revenue Account

Original Budget	Budget Changes	Service	Month 8		Variance (+ adv / - fav)		
			Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance (As at Month 8)	Variance (As at Month 7)	Movement from Month7)
£'000	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
(56,975)		Rent Income	(56,975)	(56,782)	193	186	7
(5,717)	(513)	Other Income	(6,230)	(6,066)	164	156	8
(62,692)	(513)	Net Income	(63,205)	(62,848)	357	342	15
13,813	(198)	Housing Management	13,616	12,272	(1,343)	(1,055)	(288)
5,607	334	Tenant Services	5,941	5,340	(601)	(601)	0
4,801	351	Repairs	5,152	5,142	(10)	(10)	0
5,798	25	Planned Maintenance	5,823	2,697	(3,126)	(2,644)	(482)
15,691		Contribution to Works to Stock	15,691	15,691	0	0	0
15,412		Interest & Investment Income	15,412	15,000	(412)	(412)	0
1,570		Development & Risk Contingency	1,570	1,570	0	0	0
62,692	513	Operating Costs	63,205	57,713	(5,492)	(4,722)	(770)
0		(Surplus) / Deficit	(0)	(5,135)	(5,135)	(4,380)	(755)
(25,083)		General Balance 01/04/2014	(22,820)	(22,820)			
(25,083)		General Balance 31/03/2015	(22,820)	(27,200)	(5,135)		

Rental Income

153. The projected loss in dwelling rental income has increased to £193k due to a revised projection of 175 sales for the year (the original forecast was for 165 sales). There were 138 sales to the end of November and the indications are that the strong sales will continue for the remainder of the year. The MTFE will be adjusted accordingly to reflect this change.

154. The net projected loss in other income of £8k is due to estimated leaseholder charges for external decoration works being projected at a higher level than actual charges but being partly offset by additional income from RTB capital receipts for transaction costs.

Housing Management & Tenant Services

155. The Housing Management budgets shows a net underspend of £1,343k, a decrease of £288k from Month 7. The £288k is money earmarked by the Senate to spend on prioritised new initiatives and it is anticipated that this spend will now slip into 2015/16. When Hillingdon Homes was closed down it was agreed with tenants that a portion of estimated savings would be invested in housing estates. There was no spend in 2013/14 on this initiative and the

£300k budget was transferred into the MRR intended to be used in 2014/15 but remains unspent. The £288k slippage in 2014/15 could also be transferred to the MRR which would then total £588k for tenant initiatives to be spent in 2015/16.

156. Tenancy Services shows a net underspend of £601k mainly due to savings from the new leaseholders building insurance contract, plus staffing vacancies within a number of services.

Repairs

157. The repairs forecast is a net underspend (excluding any capital related works) of £10k which includes an estimated voids overspend of £254k, fully offset by an underspend from staffing vacancies in the DLO and back office functions. Projections also include an estimated £200k works on short-term lets and Mears management and ICT implementation costs of £453k.
158. Efficiency savings anticipated from the Mears management of the internal repairs team are now being realised through improvements in productivity levels following the implementation of the new works order management system, mobile working and initial structure changes. Some initial changes to the staffing structure have also contributed to performance improvements.

Planned Maintenance

159. The Planned Maintenance forecast is a net underspend of £3,126k, a decrease of £482k on the Month 7 position. The main variances are shown below:

- A reduction of £140k on lift consultancy/servicing to reflect actual work likely to be completed within the year;
- Cyclical decorations forecast is reduced to zero (a £200k reduction) due to the need for a retendering of the contract, and pending the results of the revised stock condition survey;
- A number of projects within the structural repairs budgets have slipped (including Victoria Road, Green Lane, Hale End and Waterloo Road) resulting in a projected £178k underspend in 2014/15;
- Slippage in Better Neighbourhoods Team (BNT) planned maintenance schemes (including street works to Avondale estate) has reduced the forecast by £61k. This is a tenant led budget;
- An appraisal of the fencing forecast has resulted in a reduction of £63k due to slippage;
- A stock condition survey has been commissioned at a cost of £184k.

Appendix D –GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

160. Table 23 below sets out the latest forecast outturn on the current General Fund capital programme. Forecasts for future years include live capital projects and programmes of works as included in the draft programmes for 2014/15 to 2018/19 reported to Council in February 2014.

Table 23 – General Fund Capital Programme Summary

	2014/15 £'000	Future Years 2015/16- 2018/19 £'000	Total Project £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
Original Budget	119,832	271,510	391,342	-
Revised Budget	91,322	306,725	398,047	40
Forecast Outturn	80,302	312,423	392,725	(2,401)
Total Capital Programme Variance	(11,020)	5,698	(5,322)	(2,441)
Analysis of Programme Variances:				
Schools Expansions Programme	(2,121)	(2,312)	(4,433)	(2,585)
Disabled Facilities Grants	(995)	-	(995)	-
Civic Centre Works Programme	(671)	-	(671)	-
Property Works Programme	(200)	-	(200)	20
Adaptations for Adopted Children	(200)	-	(200)	-
New Years Green Lane	(119)	-	(119)	-
Rural Activities Garden Centre	(115)	-	(115)	-
Private Sector Renewal Grants	(35)	-	(35)	-
South Ruislip Plot A	(30)	-	(30)	-
Grounds Maintenance	(26)	-	(26)	(26)
Childrens Centres	(25)	-	(25)	-
Central Library Refurbishment	62	-	62	-
Hayes End Library Development	90	-	90	-
Harlington Road Depot Refurbishment	150	-	150	150
Hillingdon Sports & Leisure Centre	-	530	530	-
Yiewsley Health Centre & Sports Facility	-	695	695	-
Cost Variance	(4,235)	(1,087)	(5,322)	(2,441)
Projected Re-phasing	(6,785)	6,785	-	-
Total Capital Programme Variance	(11,020)	5,698	(5,322)	(2,441)
Financing Variance:				
Council Resourced Variance	(9,498)	4,176	(5,322)	(2,441)
External Grants & Contributions Variance	(1,522)	1,522	-	-
Total Capital Programme Variance	(11,020)	5,698	(5,322)	(2,441)
Movement from Month 7	17,827	(20,268)	(2,441)	

161. Actual capital expenditure is £45,648k for the eight months to 30 November, whilst the revised budget has increased by £40k from Month 7 due to Section 106 monies allocated to a new Highways scheme phased into 2015/16.

162. The main programme shows a favourable variance of £5,322k. The following paragraphs provide details of the reasons for movements in the other cost variances in the above table:

- Schools Expansions Programme - the forecast under spend on the Primary Schools Expansions programme has increased by £2,585k due mainly to consequential improvements works not being required on various completed schools within Phase 2 as energy efficiency standards have been met. There are also elements of contingency budgets on completed schemes that are not required to be used.

- Harlington Road Depot - refurbishment works have commenced on site and are now expected to be complete by the end of March which is a further delay due to additional works arising while on site. This is resulting in a forecast over spend of £150k. The completion of this project will allow for the sale of another depot site within the capital receipts programme.
- Grounds Maintenance vehicles - there is an under spend of £26k arising on tendered prices for the purchase of 35 ground maintenance vehicles.
- Property Works Programme - an element of the £600k budget remains unallocated and although a new scheme is being implemented it is forecast that £200k will not be spent this financial year.

163. A summary of the capital programme by type of project is provided in Table 24 below:

Table 24 - General Fund Capital Programme

	Revised Budget 2014/15 £000	Forecast 2014/15 £000	Cost Variance Forecast vs Budget £000	Project Re-phasing £000	Total Project Budget 2014-2019 £000	Total Project Forecast 2014-2019 £000	Total Project Variance £000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
Main Programme	59,794	54,646	(2,134)	(3,014)	85,485	82,264	(3,221)	(2,461)
Programme of Works	26,650	22,395	(2,101)	(2,154)	78,067	75,966	(2,101)	20
Future Projects	3,619	2,002	-	(1,617)	198,307	198,307	-	
Total Main Programme	90,063	79,043	(4,235)	(6,785)	361,859	356,537	(5,322)	(2,441)
Development & Risk Contingency								
General Contingency	1,259	1,259			7,259	7,259		
Provision for Additional Schools Funding	-	-			28,929	28,929		
Total Capital Programme	91,322	80,302	(4,235)	(6,785)	398,047	392,725	(5,322)	(2,441)
Movement from Month 7	(20,643)	(2,816)	(29)	17,856	40	(2,401)	(2,441)	

164. The revised budget for 2014/15 has reduced by £20,643k due to re-phasing of budgets into later years to reflect latest spend profiles on various schemes. There are general contingency funds totalling £7,259k over five years which are currently unallocated however it is forecast that these funds will be used as risk issues arise over the life of the programme. The provision for additional secondary schools funding is anticipated to be required for future schools developments.

165. The detailed General Fund capital programme by scheme is presented in Appendix 1 to this report. Projected re-phasing of £6,785k into future years is presented by scheme within this Appendix. Details of performance for key projects and programmes of works are detailed in the paragraphs below.

MAIN PROGRAMME (SCHOOLS)

166. Over the life of the existing programme there is a forecast under spend of £4,433k due mainly to savings on completed schemes within Phase 2 of Primary Schools Expansions. Final accounts have been agreed or proposed for several schemes. The key issues and risks on performance of the overall Schools Expansions programme are outlined below with further information in the Schools Capital Programme update report.

Primary Schools

Phase 2

167. Cherry Lane - an over spend of £106k is forecast due to costs for a multi use games area and floodlighting, however, this is offset by under spends elsewhere within the programme.
168. Glebe - the school is fully operational however a number of outstanding defect works remain which are being progressed but are not expected to be completed until January 2015. External cladding panels are required to be reinstalled, however, this will be completed over a longer timescale to minimise disruption.

Phase 3 - New Schools

169. John Locke and Lake Farm Park Academies - outstanding remedial items are scheduled to be completed shortly at both sites. There is an overall forecast under spend of £418k on these schemes due to savings on professional fees and highways works.
170. St Martin's, Laurel Lane - there is a change of scope to the works to provide a 3FE primary school to meet the requirements of the Education Funding Agency. Construction works are progressing on site for delivery by August 2015.

Special Educational Needs

171. Temporary classrooms have been provided at Hedgewood Primary School and Meadow Secondary School for the new term. An under spend of £204k is reported on completion of these works. Planning consent has been granted for the installation of a modular SRP unit at Cherry Lane for the spring term in January 2015.
172. Free School Meals - from September 2014, schools are required to offer infant school children (from reception to year 2 inclusive) with a universal free school meal. Additional kitchen and dining equipment is being provided to schools where the need has been demonstrated. A bid has been submitted to the Department for Education for additional grant funding for seven schools and the announcement is expected in January.

FUTURE PROJECTS (SCHOOLS)

Primary Schools - Expansions Programme

173. An initial review has been undertaken of primary school sites in the north of the Borough where there is excess demand for additional school places. The existing programme contains budget provision of £13,500k for the next phase of primary school expansions.

Secondary Schools - Expansions Programme

174. The forecast of future demand for secondary school places predicts a shortfall in places commencing from 2016/17. Detailed feasibility work will commence on the sites that have been identified as potentially suitable for expansion.

Secondary Schools - Replacement Programme

175. Northwood Academy - the design of the new 6FE school is underway and a planning application will be submitted in January. The construction phase of the project is not expected to commence this financial year and hence there is a further £400k re-phasing variance in 2014/15.
176. Abbotsfield School - the Education Funding Agency (EFA) are managing the re-building of this school through the Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP) with the Council making a contribution of £7,166k towards the overall costs. The Council is also funding an additional 12 place SRP and new vocational training centre. There will also be commitments for infrastructure works, furnishings fittings and equipment. Construction works are not anticipated to commence until next year.

PROGRAMMES OF WORKS (SCHOOLS)

177. Schools Conditions Programme - the current year programme has largely been completed within budget. Roofing works at Hedgewood and Oak Farm are scheduled to be complete by the end of December. A number of schemes have been identified for the 2015/16 programme which are currently under review. There is an agreement from the schools to make contributions to the cost of works no greater than 20% of their reserves.

MAIN PROGRAMME (NON-SCHOOLS)

178. Yiewsley Pool Development & Health Centre - the scheme is comprised of three elements: a new health centre; sports facility; and 12 supported housing units (funded through the HRA). After evaluation of tenders for the construction works there is a forecast over spend of £977k (inclusive of £282k on the supported housing element reported in the HRA). Negotiations are ongoing with the NHS around the Health Centre lease before works commence on site which will not be until next financial year resulting in a further re-phasing of £364k.
179. Hayes End Library Development - there have been contractual issues leading to an arbitration process that is proceeding slowly and the impact on the Council is uncertain. There is a forecast remaining capital over spend of £90k to close out finishing works in 2014/15. The final liability will depend on the outcome of the dispute proceedings which are not expected to take place until next financial year.
180. Hillingdon Sports & Leisure Centre - the forecast over spend is £530k due to the additional costs around remedial and defect works to finally close the project. The contractual issues around this scheme are not expected to be resolved until next financial year.
181. Rural Activities Garden Centre - the new modular building and path works have been completed and a welfare facility is to be installed. There is a forecast under spend of £115k as there are no identified requirements for the remainder of the budget.
182. New Years Green Lane Civic Amenity Site - the final account has been reviewed and the project is forecast to be completed with a £119k under spend.
183. Highways Programme - a major programme of road improvements is underway across the Borough. Currently approved works will be completed this financial year.
184. Car Park Resurfacing - a budget of £920k was originally earmarked this year for resurfacing works at Cedars & Grainges car park. However, these works are now on hold as plans are being developed for a more extensive improvement of the car park which serves the Pavilions shopping centre.

185. ICT Migration to Windows 7 Project - the project is complete and is forecast to be within budget.
186. ICT Single Development Plan - the programme consists of several projects which are in various stages of progress. An amount of £87k is projected re-phasing to complete a small number of projects in 2015/16.
187. Vehicle Replacement Programme - the programme is forecasting further slippage of £667k. Several vehicles will not be purchased until next financial year as specifications require to be completed.
188. Eastcote House & Gardens - works are progressing on site for this refurbishment project which is mainly funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund. An estimated £150k slippage is forecast as the works will not be completed until early in the next financial year.
189. Queenswalk Development - construction works on site have been completed and the resource centre and sensory garden have opened. Negotiations on the final account are underway however the project is expected to be within budget.
190. CCTV Programme - the third phase of the programme consists of providing new mobile cameras at nine sites and upgrading the Civic Centre control room. An amount of £310k is forecast as slippage as the bulk of the programme will not be completed until next year.
191. Whiteheath Farmhouse Refurbishment - works are complete on replacement of doors and windows at the farmhouse but structural works are on hold resulting in slippage of £260k.
192. Sports & Cultural Projects - the main project under this heading is the enhancement of Compass Theatre which is in early planning and design stages. Works on site will not commence until next financial year resulting in forecast slippage of £562k. The existing budget includes £270k Section 106 monies which must be spent by November 2015.
193. Telecareline Equipment - a re-phasing under spend of £400k is forecast as there is currently low demand for this equipment however it is anticipated this will increase as the project is progressed.
194. Central Library Refurbishment - the over spend of £62k is due to additional items that have been required to finish the project. These include additional ICT equipment, sprinkler and roofing works. The library was re-opened in April however there were still outstanding finishing works that resulted in slippage into this year.
195. Childrens Centres Programme - there is a forecast under spend of £25k on completion of the children's centres refurbishment programme which commenced in previous years.
196. South Ruislip Plot A development - further recommissioning and servicing works have been carried out on the flats with a £30k under spend on the remaining budget for this scheme.

PROGRAMMES OF WORKS (NON-SCHOOLS)

197. Civic Centre Works Programme - due to the level of activity at this stage of the financial year there is an overall under spend of £671k forecast on the budget.
198. Disabled Facilities Grants & Private Sector Renewal Grants - the forecast under spend of £1,230k (including Adaptations for Adopted Children) represents the forecast level of uncommitted funding after taking into account potential increases in clients this year.

199. Empty Homes Programme - the funding level of £782k is based on revised GLA targets for 34 properties and increased funding per property. There are enough projects identified to fully utilise this funding including one major development in Yiewsley. However there is a risk around delivering this programme to maximise use of the grant which is required to be used by the end of this financial year.
200. Transport for London Programme - the 2014/15 programme is underway and further schemes are being implemented. The Council's annual spending submission for the 2015/16 Local Implementation Plan has been approved by TFL who have also announced indicative allocations for Crossrail Complementary Measures.
201. Town Centres Initiatives Programme - the Initiatives at Northwood Hills and Ruislip Manor are close to completion. Works on site will be commencing early next year at Hayes Town Centre as part of a major three year project to revitalise the town centre. Shop front grants totalling £99k at Harefield Village Centre will be rolled out this year. Funding of £255k is reported as re-phasing for completion of shop front grant schemes next year.
202. Chrysalis Programme - the majority of this year's budget has been allocated to new schemes. Some schemes will not be completed until next financial year resulting in £500k re-phasing.

FUTURE PROJECTS (NON SCHOOLS)

203. ICT Infrastructure - works are to commence shortly to implement WiFi in specific areas of the Civic Centre. Re-phasing of £220k is forecast as an element of the budget is to be allocated.
204. Uxbridge Cemetery Gatehouse - this £1,000k project is to renovate the Gatehouse and Anglican chapel which are listed buildings. A detailed planning application has been submitted to the National Planning Casework Unit to obtain listed building consent and due to the length of this process the delivery of the project will not be completed until 2015/16.
205. St Andrew's Park Theatre - a feasibility study is commencing for a new theatre in Uxbridge. An amount of £75k is forecast as further re-phasing into next financial year.
206. St Andrew's Park Museum - this project is yet to proceed and is being reviewed in conjunction with potential developments around Battle of Britain bunker. An amount of £75k further re-phasing is forecast as construction works will not commence this financial year.
207. Youth Centres - the project relates to the building of three new youth centres. There is one currently identified site at Ash Grove and development work is in very early stages resulting in further slippage of £150k.
208. Bowls Club Refurbishment - works have commenced to refurbish Cowley and Bessingby bowls clubs and are expected to be complete before the end of the financial year subject to winter weather conditions.
209. Local Plan Requirement - there is forecast re-phasing of £197k as these works are not anticipated to be carried out this financial year.
210. Community Safety Assets - the budget of £250k is forecast as re-phasing as there are currently no existing commitments.

CAPITAL FINANCING - GENERAL FUND

211. Table 25 sets out the latest capital financing forecast.

Table 25: Capital Financing

	Revised Budget 2014/15 £'000	Forecast 2014/15 £'000	Variance £'000	Total Financing Budget 2014-2019 £'000	Total Financing Forecast 2014-2019 £'000	Total Variance £'000	Movement from Month 7 £'000
Council Resource Requirement	38,137	28,639	(9,498)	210,922	205,600	(5,322)	(2,441)
Financed By:							
Capital Receipts	15,647	5,981	(9,666)	31,719	42,811	11,092	300
CIL	3,000	200	(2,800)	23,000	15,200	(7,800)	-
Prudential Borrowing	19,490	22,458	2,968	156,203	147,589	(8,614)	(2,741)
Total Council Resources	38,137	28,639	(9,498)	210,922	205,600	(5,322)	(2,441)
Grants & Contributions	53,185	51,663	(1,522)	187,125	187,125	-	-
Total Programme	91,322	80,302	(11,020)	398,047	392,725	(5,322)	(2,441)

212. Forecast General Fund capital receipts are £5,981k for 2014/15. Actual capital receipts achieved this year as at the end of November total £1,061k including the sale of a further six flats at Hayes End Library development. The remaining four flats are forecast to be sold this financial year. Including the flats, there are two major sales in excess of £1,000k that are included in the forecast for this year and one of these is close to completion. There is an element of risk in the timing of receipts that will be achieved this year which is reflected in the current year forecast.
213. The implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy was delayed until 1 August 2014 and this has had an adverse impact on this year's income target. The current removal of the sui generis charging band has also reduced the forecast although this may be established in future years based on economic viability analysis. The estimated shortfall is forecast to be partially met from Section 106 contributions that will continue for developments that fall outside the current CIL charging schedule.
214. Due to the length of time new developments after 1 August become liable for paying CIL the forecast for the current year has reduced to £200k. There is a significant risk that borrowing will have to increase to meet the funding gap. The forecast over the life of the programme has been reduced by £5,000k as it is anticipated that CIL receipts will be low in the short term due to the time lag between planning approvals and developments commencing and the removal of the sui generis charging band.
215. Over the life of the programme the prudential borrowing forecast shows a favourable variance of £8,614k due mainly to the overall cost under spends and increase in the capital receipts forecast, partially offset by the CIL reduction. The revised borrowing budget has reduced by £1,258k as additional grant is available to finance the latter year of the existing Schools Expansions Programme.

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) CAPITAL PROGRAMME

216. The forecast outturn on the HRA capital programme is set out in Table 26 below:

Table 26 - HRA Capital Expenditure

	Revised Budget 2014/15 £000	Forecast 2014/15 £000	Cost Variance Forecast vs Budget £000	Project Re-phasing £000	Total Project Budget 2014-2019 £000	Total Project Forecast 2014-2019 £000	Total Project Variance £000	Movement from Month 7 £000
Dwelling Components	9,657	2,711		(6,946)	43,319	43,319		
Estates / Blocks	2,586	547		(2,039)	8,916	8,916		
Welfare	2,540	887		(1,653)	11,632	11,632		
Other Projects	2,378	684	(1,424)	(270)	11,890	10,466	(1,424)	(12)
Total Works to Stock	17,161	4,829	(1,424)	(10,908)	75,757	74,333	(1,424)	(12)
Purchase & Repair	2,088	1,365		(723)	9,766	9,766		
Council New Build	1,000	24		(976)	37,376	37,376		
Supported Housing	2,876	519		(2,357)	13,042	5,474	(7,568)	
Total Major Projects	5,964	1,908		(4,056)	60,184	52,616	(7,568)	
Former New Build Schemes	227	245	18		227	1,144	917	
Total	23,352	6,982	(1,406)	(14,964)	136,168	128,093	(8,075)	(12)
Movement from Month 7		(5,801)	(12)	(5,789)		(12)	(12)	

217. The Works to Stock programme is forecasting a phasing under spend of £10,908k as numerous schemes will not be completed this financial year. This is a reduction of £2,170k spend from the previous forecast.

218. Dwelling Components - forecast expenditure has been reduced by £1,313k because a number of roofing projects will not commence until next year. Also the electrical upgrades and kitchen replacement programmes are yet to commence.

219. Estates and Block Renewal - the forecast has reduced by £219k due to works on four schemes that will not be completed this financial year.

220. Welfare - under spends are reported on sheltered scheme upgrades and conversions based on the number of projects that have currently been identified.

221. Other Projects - the tender for 57 housing fleet vehicles has been approved and a further nine vehicles are anticipated to be required resulting in a total estimated cost of £954k. There are no commitments for the remainder of the budget resulting in an under spend of £1,424k.

222. Purchase and Repair Programme - valuations are being made for up to 25 properties and estimates to bring them up to standard for letting purposes. It is anticipated that the repurchase of a maximum of 7 properties can be completed by the end of the financial year based on the timescales required to obtain agreement between the parties, complete the legal formalities and to gain vacant possession. Repurchase of the remaining properties will

occur in 2015/16 once agreements are reached. The projection is based on an average cost of £195k per property however this may change once valuations are completed.

223. Council New Build - no further spend is forecast this financial year as schemes are in development and construction work is not anticipated to commence until next year.
224. Supported Housing Programme - the original programme included seven sites however the strategy has changed significantly and the current proposed in house new build programme retains only three sites from the original plan plus three new sites which are being taken into account in the Council's budget review. The above forecast includes only the three sites in the current approved budget resulting in a significant under spend of £7,568k. However, this will be subject to change once the new strategy is finalised and approved by Council.
225. The forecast over spend of £917k on former New Build schemes largely relates to contractual issues around the Triscott House development which have yet to be resolved. The dispute is going through arbitration which is a lengthy process and the outcome remains uncertain. The forecast has been re-phased to 2015/16 as the arbitration process will not be finished until then.

HRA Capital Receipts

226. There have been 138 Right to Buy sales of Council dwellings for the year as at end of November 2014 for a value of £13,742k and a total of 175 sales are forecast totalling approximately £17,500k in 2014/15.
227. The Council has signed an agreement with Department for Communities & Local Government to re-invest the proceeds in housing stock regeneration. This enables the Council to retain a higher level of receipts because of reduced pooling, however the terms of the agreement stipulate that receipts must be spent or committed within three years or otherwise are returned to government with the addition of punitive interest. Proposals are being developed by officers to develop an Affordable Housing programme to utilise these receipts within allowed timescales.
228. Table 27 below sets out the time limits for the retention of Right to Buy receipts since the commencement of the agreement. A further £4,128k receipts have been retained for the quarter ending 30 September and a total of £18,990k retained receipts have now been generated which require to be spent or committed by the deadlines set out in the table, up to September 2017.

Table 27: Right to Buy Sales

Period	Number of Sales	Retained Right to Buy Receipt (£'000)	Cumulative Expenditure Required to Utilise Funds (£'000)	Deadline for Commitment of Retained Right to Buy Receipt
2012/13 Quarter 4 Actual	33	3,169	10,563	March 2016
2013/14 Quarter 1 Actual	13	833	13,340	June 2016
2013/14 Quarter 2 Actual	35	2,666	22,227	Sept 2016
2013/14 Quarter 3 Actual	24	1,730	27,994	December 2016
2013/14 Quarter 4 Actual	34	2,290	35,626	March 2017
2014/15 Quarter 1 Actual	56	4,174	49,540	June 2017
2014/15 Quarter 2 Actual	49	4,128	63,300	Sept 2017
Total Retained Receipts	244	18,990	63,300	

229. The use of retained Right to Buy receipts are limited by the regulations to the agreement to a maximum 30% of the cost of replacement housing. Therefore, in order to utilise the receipts the cumulative gross expenditure level (including 70% HRA contributions) required to be achieved is £10,563k by end of 2015/16 and £63,300k by September 2017. The regulations also allow 50% of the cost of purchase and repairs expenditure to be financed from retained receipts however this is capped at 6.5% of the total level of receipts.
230. The current approved budget for housing major projects programmes includes £18,055k in Right to Buy receipts to be utilised and there is now a higher level of retained receipts available. The programmes are being reviewed to maximise the use of Right to Buy receipts within allowable timescales.
231. There have been £74k in HRA non dwelling receipts for the year to date and the sale of a HRA site in Ruislip for residential development has recently been approved which is expected to result in further receipts this financial year. These funds will be used to support the capital programme or be applied for repayment of debt.

ANNEX 1a - General Fund Main Programme

Prior Year Cost	Project	2014/15 Revised Budget	2014/15 Forecast	2014/15 Variance	Project Re-phasing to future years	Total Project Budget 2014-2019	Total Project Forecast 2014-2019	Total Project Variance 2014-2019	Project Forecast Financed by:		
									Council Resources	Government Grants	Other Cont'ns
£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	Main Programme										
86,411	Primary School Expansions	45,900	43,943	(1,957)	164	61,250	56,817	(4,433)	17,176	29,353	10,287
3,910	Purchase of Vehicles	1,617	950	(667)	(667)	3,458	3,458	0	3,458	0	0
144	Yiewsley Health Centre & Sports Facility Development	464	100	(364)	(364)	7,631	8,326	695	8,326	0	0
9,254	Libraries Refurbishment	248	310	62		248	310	62	310	0	0
1,138	Queenswalk Redevelopment	1,589	1,589	0		1,664	1,664	0	1,664	0	0
3,565	South Ruislip Development - Plot A	64	34	(30)		64	34	(30)	34	0	0
11	Harlington Road Depot Refurbishment	1,276	1,426	150		1,341	1,491	150	1,491	0	0
65	Car Park Resurfacing	1,079	159	(920)	(920)	1,079	1,079	0	1,079	0	0
5	Eastcote House Buildings and Gardens	1,142	1,092	(50)	(50)	1,242	1,242	0	0	1,112	130
251	Grounds Maintenance	777	751	(26)		777	751	(26)	751	0	0
722	ICT Single Development Plan - Migration to Windows 7	1,067	1,067	0		1,067	1,067	0	1,067	0	0
0	Telecare Equipment	600	200	(400)	(400)	600	600	0	29	571	0
0	Free School Meals Projects	609	609	0		609	609	0	0	565	44
124	CCTV Programme	363	53	(310)	(310)	363	363	0	288	0	75
0	West Drayton Cemetery & Resurfacing	522	522	0		522	522	0	522	0	0
0	Sports & Cultural Projects	63	63	0		625	625	0	317	0	308
0	Whiteheath Farm Refurbishment	310	50	(260)	(260)	310	310	0	310	0	0
0	Rural Agricultural Garden Centre	340	225	(115)		340	225	(115)	225	0	0
0	Youth Centres Kitchen Replacements / Upgrades	143	143	0		143	143	0	0	113	30
0	Kings College Pavilion Running Track	230	230	0		230	230	0	0	0	230
0	Natural England Fencing & Gating	0	0	0		29	29	0	0	29	0
52,847	Major Projects from previous years	1,391	1,130	(261)	(207)	1,893	2,371	476	2,339	0	30
158,447	Total Main Programme	59,794	54,646	(5,148)	(3,014)	85,485	82,265	(3,221)	39,385	31,744	11,134

ANNEX 1b - Programme of Works

Prior Year Cost	Project	2014/15 Revised Budget	2014/15 Forecast	2014/15 Variance	Project Re-phasing to future years	Total Project Budget 2014-2019	Total Project Forecast 2014-2019	Total Project Variance 2014-2019	Project Forecast Financed by:		
									Council Resources	Government Grants	Other Cont'ns
£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	Programme of Works										
N/A	Leader's Initiative	437	245	(192)	(192)	1,237	1,237	0	1,237	0	0
N/A	Chrysalis Programme	1,895	1,395	(500)	(500)	5,895	5,895	0	5,315	0	580
N/A	Civic Centre Works Programme	1,387	716	(671)		2,887	2,216	(671)	2,216	0	0
N/A	Formula Capital Devolved to Schools	1,957	1,957	0		4,097	4,097	0	0	3,264	833
N/A	Highways Programme	6,169	5,196	(973)	(973)	11,001	11,001	0	9,951	0	1,050
N/A	ICT Single Development Plan	516	429	(87)	(87)	2,604	2,604	0	2,604	0	0
N/A	Property Works Programme	600	400	(200)		3,000	2,800	(200)	2,800	0	0
N/A	Road Safety	250	250	0		1,250	1,250	0	1,250	0	0
N/A	Street Lighting	180	180	0		900	900	0	875	0	25
N/A	Town Centre Initiatives	1,005	750	(255)	(255)	2,483	2,483	0	2,141	300	42
N/A	Transport for London	3,845	3,845	0		14,669	14,669	0	0	14,084	585
N/A	Urgent Building Condition Works	3,935	3,841	(94)	(94)	10,390	10,390	0	2,813	7,032	546
N/A	Disabled Facilities Grants	2,300	1,305	(995)		11,500	10,505	(995)	3,080	7,425	0
N/A	Adaptations for Adopted Children	200	0	(200)		1,000	800	(200)	0	800	0
N/A	Private Sector Renewal Grants	1,282	1,247	(35)		4,330	4,295	(35)	2,215	2,080	0
N/A	GF Supported Housing Programme	210	210	0		210	210	0	210	0	0
N/A	Section 106 Projects	482	429	(53)	(53)	614	614	0	0	0	614
	Total Programme of Works	26,650	22,395	(4,255)	(2,154)	78,067	75,966	(2,101)	36,707	34,985	4,275

ANNEX 1c - Future Projects & Contingency

Prior Year Cost	Project	2014/15 Revised Budget	2014/15 Forecast	2014/15 Variance	Project Re-phasing to future years	Total Project Budget 2014-2019	Total Project Forecast 2014-2019	Total Project Variance 2014-2019	Project Forecast Financed by:		
									Council Resources	Government Grants	Other Cont'ns
£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	Future Projects										
N/A	Secondary Schools Expansions (Expansion)	500	250	(250)	(250)	76,900	76,900	0	17,733	57,604	1,563
N/A	Secondary Schools Expansions (Replacement)	882	482	(400)	(400)	44,170	44,170	0	32,654	11,516	0
N/A	St Andrew's Park Theatre	150	75	(75)	(75)	44,000	44,000	0	42,950	0	1,050
N/A	New Primary School Expansions	0	0	0		13,500	13,500	0	4,049	9,451	0
N/A	New Years Green Lane EA Works	0	0	0		6,490	6,490	0	3,244	3,246	0
N/A	Youth Centres	400	250	(150)	(150)	5,100	5,100	0	5,100	0	0
N/A	Community Safety Assets	250	0	(250)	(250)	250	250	0	250	0	0
N/A	ICT Infrastructure	440	220	(220)	(220)	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	0	0
N/A	Uxbridge Cemetery Gatehouse & Anglican Chapel	150	150	0		1,000	1,000	0	1,000	0	0
N/A	St Andrew's Park Museum	150	75	(75)	(75)	5,000	5,000	0	4,250	0	750
N/A	Bowls Clubs Refurbishment	500	500	0		500	500	0	500	0	0
N/A	Local Plan Requirement Works	197	0	(197)	(197)	197	197	0	197	0	0
N/A	Total Future Projects	3,619	2,002	(1,617)	(1,617)	198,307	198,307	0	113,127	81,817	3,363
	Development & Risk Contingency										
N/A	General Contingency	1,259	1,259	0		7,259	7,259	0	7,259	0	0
N/A	Provision for Additional Secondary Schools Funding	0	0	0		28,929	28,929	0	9,123	19,807	0
	Total Development & Risk Contingency	1,259	1,259	0		36,188	36,188	0	16,382	19,807	0
	Total Capital Programme	91,322	80,302	(11,020)	(6,785)	398,047	392,725	(5,322)	205,600	168,353	18,772

Appendix E – Treasury Management Report as at 30 November 2014

Outstanding Deposits - Average Rate of Return on Deposits: 0.56%

	Actual £m	Actual %	Bench-mark %
Up to 1 Month	32.8	31.94	35.00
1-2 Months	5.0	4.87	0.00
2-3 Months	13.0	12.66	10.00
3-6 Months	28.9	28.14	10.00
6-9 Months	0.0	0.00	10.00
9-12 Months	14.8	14.41	15.00
12-18 Months	2.4	2.34	15.00
18-24 Months	5.0	4.87	5.00
Subtotal	101.9	99.23	100.00
Unpaid Maturities	0.8	0.77	0.00
Total	102.7	100.00	100.00

1. With the exception of the unpaid Heritable investments, London Borough of Hillingdon's deposits are held with UK institutions, which hold at a minimum, a Fitch or lowest equivalent of A- long-term credit rating. Deposits are currently held with the following institutions; Bank of Scotland, BlackRock MMF, Goldman Sachs MMF, Insight MMF, Ignis MMF, PSDF MMF, Santander UK, HSBC Bank, Nationwide Building Society, Barclays Bank, Birmingham City Council, Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council, Lancashire County Council, Monmouthshire County Council, Moray Council, Redditch Borough Council, Salford City Council, and Wolverhampton City Council. The Council also currently holds three Certificates of Deposit, two with Standard Chartered and one with Barclays.
2. During November fixed-term deposits continued to mature in line with cashflow requirements. As cashflow allowed, a three month deposit was placed in November. To maintain liquidity all other surplus cash was placed in instant access accounts and fixed term deposits with maturities of up to two days.

Outstanding Debt - Average Interest Rate on Debt: 2.99%

	Actual £m	Actual %
General Fund		
PWLB	69.38	21.01
Long-Term Market	15.00	4.54
HRA		
PWLB	212.82	64.46
Long-Term Market	33.00	9.99
Total	330.20	100.00

3. There were no early debt repayment opportunities or rescheduling activities during November, neither were there any breaches of the prudential indicators or non-compliance with the treasury management policy and practices.

Ongoing Strategy

4. In order to maintain liquidity for day-to-day business operations, short-term balances will either be placed in instant access accounts or short term deposits of up to one week. Opportunities to place longer term deposits will be monitored.

Appendix F – Consultancy and agency assignments over £50k approved under delegated authority

232. The following Agency staff costing over £50k have been approved under delegated powers by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and are reported here for information.

Post Title	Original Start Date	Approved From	Proposed End Date	Previous Approval £'000	Approved £'000	Total £'000
Residents Services						
Programme Co-Ordinator, General Construction	22-Apr-13	08-Dec-14	07-Jun-15	103	21	124
Tech Admin Officer	01-Jul-13	22-Dec-14	19-Jan-15	48	2	50
Tech Admin Officer	03-Mar-14	22-Dec-14	19-Jan-15	59	2	61
Building Control Surveyor	04-Mar-13	29-Dec-14	27-Mar-15	79	10	89
Project Manager	14-Jul-13	22-Dec-14	22-May-15	105	48	153
Adult Social Care						
Occupational Therapist	02-Feb-14	05-Jan-15	28-Feb-15	49	5	54
Occupational Therapist	02-Feb-14	05-Jan-15	28-Feb-15	48	5	53
Children & Young People's Services						
Residential Placements Manager	07-Jul-13	01-Feb-15	30-Jun-15	131	8	139
Social Worker	20-Jan-14	01-Feb-15	28-Feb-15	52	4	56
Quality Assurance Auditor (Social Work Cases)	08-May-14	01-Feb-15	28-Feb-15	51	6	57
Education Key Worker	14-Oct-13	01-Feb-15	28-Feb-15	49	3	52
Independent Reviewing Officer	12-May-14	01-Feb-15	28-Feb-15	50	6	56
Independent Reviewing Officer	27-May-14	01-Feb-15	28-Feb-15	45	6	51

Appendix G - Emergency Winter Decisions 2014/15

Cabinet on 20 November 2014 agreed that "During the 2014/2015 winter season, with the full agreement of the Leader of the Council (or Deputy Leader if unavailable), the Chief Executive or the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Resident Services are both authorised to take all necessary urgent decisions (including those ordinarily reserved to the executive) to release funds, procure and incur expenditure in order to safeguard residents, deliver services and manage the effects of bad weather or incidents adversely affecting the Borough. Such decisions taken, that would have required Cabinet or Cabinet Member approval, are to be reported to a subsequent Cabinet meeting for formal ratification."

The following decisions were taken under this interim authority and are reported to Cabinet below for noting and ratification.

Nature of Decision	Decision Type	Cost	Date approved	Decision-makers (where applicable on behalf of the CEO or DCE)
Essential Repairs Grant: Provision of new, condensing combination boiler and new radiators for a property on Rodwell Close, Eastcote.	Capital release	£3k	27 November 2014	Leader of the Council and Deputy Director, Housing
Essential Repairs Grant: New condensing boiler, radiators and hot water tank for a property on Collingwood Road, Uxbridge.	Capital release	£4k	27 November 2014	Leader of the Council and Deputy Director, Housing
Essential Repairs Grant: urgent heating works for a property on Moray Avenue, Hayes.	Capital release	£3k	9 December 2014	Leader of the Council and Deputy Director, Housing

Essential Repair Grants are means tested grants to owner-occupiers on benefits or low income to assist with essential work where it is deemed the property is prejudicial to health, or there is an imminent or direct risk to health.

The capital funds above released were within the approved Private Sector Renewals Grant Capital Budget and implemented using approved contractors in line with the Council's procurement policies.

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOL CAPITAL PROGRAMME - UPDATE

Cabinet Members	Councillor Jonathan Bianco Councillor David Simmonds
Cabinet Portfolios	Finance, Property & Business Services Deputy Leader of the Council / Education & Children's Services
Officer Contact	Bobby Finch, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1: Summary of phase 2 and 3 construction works

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	This report provides an update on the primary and secondary school expansions, the school condition works programme and other school capital works.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	Putting our Residents First: <i>Our Built Environment; Our People; Financial Management</i> Investment in schools to adequately address the impact of the population increase within the London Borough of Hillingdon on existing school places. This project also forms part of the Hillingdon Improvement Programme.
Financial Cost	The current forecast of the existing Primary Schools Capital Programme is £143,228k inclusive of £796k for Special Resources Provision. An additional £13,500k is forecast new primary school expansions (Phase 4). The Secondary Schools Expansions/Replacement forecast is £150,000k.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Children, Young People and Learning
Ward(s) affected	All wards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet note the progress made with primary and secondary school expansions and the school condition programme.

INFORMATION

1. PRIMARY SCHOOLS

School Places Forecast

The demand for school places in Hillingdon has been rising in recent years and is forecast to continue to rise in line with national and London-wide predictions. Demand for reception places at primary school level is being driven by rising birth rates which the GLA are now predicting to be slightly higher than they previously forecast. Demand for new school places is arising due to new house building and families moving into the Borough. Overall, at primary school level, the need for additional school places has largely been met by the successful school places expansion programme to date.

Phase 2 - Primary Schools Permanent Expansions

Phase 2 of the Primary School Expansion Programme will permanently expand 18 schools and add a bulge year to an additional school. To date, expansion works have been completed at 16 schools. The remaining 3 schools are scheduled to be completed in 2015. Appendix 1 provides a brief summary of the works being carried out for each scheme as well as the current status.

A number of the completed projects will require some remedial works to be carried out by the contractors during the next few months.

Projects to be Completed during the 2014 / 2015 Academic Year

The following remaining construction works in Phase 2 are scheduled to be completed during the 2014 / 2015 academic year.

Cherry Lane, Multi Use Games Area (MUGA): A planning application for the revised location for the MUGA was submitted during December 2014. Subject to planning approval, the MUGA is scheduled to be installed during the summer term in 2015.

Glebe: The contractor was originally scheduled to complete the external works in August 2014; however, this has now been revised to a 2015 completion. This revised date includes the substantial remedial works required on the new school building as well as the completion of the external works.

Hermitage: The construction of the new single storey classroom block is progressing well and is due to be completed during February 2015. This will be followed by the removal of the remaining temporary classrooms and the completion of external works. The project is due to be completed in April 2015.

Phase 3 - New Primary Schools

Phase 3 of the Primary School Expansion Programme consists of the construction of 3 Form of Entry (FE) Primary Schools on Lake Farm and the St Andrew's Park (former RAF Uxbridge) sites both of which are now complete, as well as a further new 3 FE Primary School on land adjacent to Laurel Lane School due for completion in 2015.

John Locke Academy (St Andrew's Park) and Lake Farm Park Academy (Lake Farm)

The main outstanding works required was completed by the contractor during December 2014 and both schemes have now reached practical completion. The remaining minor snagging items will be completed during February 2015.

New 3 FE Primary School on Land Adjacent to Laurel Lane School

Following discussion with the Education Funding Agency and approval from Cabinet in December 2014, it has been agreed by the local authority that the new school will be a 3 FE Primary School. Officers are progressing with the necessary steps required to facilitate this change, the first of which is to commission the architects appointed to design the original scheme to work in conjunction with the main contractor to start making the necessary design changes to the internal building layouts and external areas.

Once the proposed design changes and the associated costs are reviewed and approved, the contractor will then be instructed to incorporate these changes into the works which have already started in this site.

Phase 4 - Primary School Bulge Classes and Permanent Expansion Feasibility

The latest forecast for school places indicates a residual need for up to three additional forms of entry in primary schools in the north of the Borough over the next 2-3 years. This additional demand is largely a result of pupils from outside the Borough travelling to primary schools in Hillingdon (an equivalent of 2 FE from Harrow travelling to schools in the East Ruislip area and 1 FE from Hertfordshire attending schools in the Northwood area).

To mitigate this remaining risk, officers are progressing discussions with schools about bulge year classes from September 2015 onwards and permanent expansion at existing schools for future years.

2. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN)

Bulge Year Classes

Meadow: The electrical upgrade has completed by Scottish and Southern Electric (SSE) in December 2014. This was the last element of work required as part of the installation of the modular temporary classroom unit and this project is now been fully complete.

Cherry Lane Specialist Resource Provision (SRP)

The project consists of relocating the existing school library in to a single modular classroom unit that will be installed on the school site adjacent to the existing school building. The area vacated by the library will then be remodelled into a Specialist Resource Provision (SRP) unit.

Following the completion of the ground works in December 2014, the single modular classroom unit was delivered to site and installation and internal fit-out is scheduled to be completed at the end of January 2015. The remodelling works in the area vacated by the library will start the following month with the full project due to be completed by the end of the Easter school holiday.

3. SECONDARY SCHOOLS

School Places Forecast

As previously reported, the rising demand for school places is moving into secondary schools. The updated forecast shows a longer-term sustained pressure for additional secondary school places rising to 27 additional forms of entry over the next 8 years, with pressure for places commencing from 2016/17 onwards as predicted in previous forecasts. In particular, the forecast need for additional secondary school places is higher in the north / central parts of the Borough, which is where there tends to be higher numbers of pupils living outside the Borough travelling to a Hillingdon school.

Feasibility Studies

The feasibility studies on schools deemed suitable for potential expansion continue to be progressed and are due to be concluded during January 2015. The results will be fed back to Members and the final list of the schools that will be expanded will be reported to Cabinet.

Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP)

The school buildings at Abbotsfield, Swakeleys and Northwood Secondary Schools require improvement and have attracted funding from the Priority School Building Programme for all three to be rebuilt. Abbotsfield and Swakeleys rebuilds are being managed by the Department for Education (DfE) and Northwood is being managed directly by the Council.

Northwood School: The planning application has been submitted and the statutory planning consultation commenced early January 2015. The detailed design work required for the tender to procure the main works contractor has now commenced.

Abbotsfield and Swakeleys Schools: Officers are working closely with the DfE to support the re-build of these schools. The DfE have advised that the project moved into the design phase during November 2014 with a planning application expected during February 2015. The Education Funding Agency has sought decisions and an input from the Council about the final scope and specification of the new school building, which has been provided.

4. SCHOOLS CONDITION PROGRAMME

Update on Works from 2013 / 2014 Programme

Hedgewood: The main roofing works were completed in October. The minor outstanding elements of work have now been substantially completed.

Oak Farm: The main roofing works have been completed. A revised roofing edge protection scheme was installed in December 2014.

Preparation for the 2015 / 2016 Programme

An assessment of the final list of condition works which could potentially be part of the 2015/2016 programme of works has concluded and a finalised list of potential projects to be taken forward to the feasibility stage has been compiled and presented to Members.

Once the projects to be taken forward to feasibility have been approved using the delegated authority granted at Cabinet in December 2014, consultants will be procured to progress the detailed feasibility works.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Schools Expansion Capital Programme budget totals £311,161k for the period up to 2019/20 including prior years. It includes £147,661k for existing primary schools expansions, £13,500k for new primary schools expansions and £150,000k for secondary schools expansions and replacements

The Month 8 forecast for the overall schools programme is an under spend of £4,433k stemming from cost savings within phases 1, 2 and 3 of the primary schools expansion programme. The position has improved by £2,586k from Month 7 due mainly to consequential works not being required on various completed schools within Phase 2 as energy efficiency standards have been met. There are also additional elements of contingency budgets on completed schemes that are no longer required which have been released.

The main works on all eight schools within phase 1 of the primary school expansions have been completed with a forecast outturn under spend of £380k. This is predominantly due to a combination of effective final account negotiations and efficiency gains from close management of CCT fees.

All but three of the 19 primary schools (inclusive of bulge year) within the phase 2 expansions have now been completed. The forecast outturn position is an under spend of £3,277k as a result of final account settlement figures being less than anticipated at Field End, Rabbsfarm, Highfield and Ruislip Gardens Primary Schools. This has resulted in the release of contingency and consequential improvement budgets. The outstanding works at Glebe and Hermitage Primary Schools are expected to be contained within existing budgets. The costs for a multi use games area and floodlighting at Cherry Lane are contained within the overall programme under spend.

John Locke and Lake Farm Academies have both now reached practical completion with the exception of minor snagging items to be completed in February 2015. There is an overall forecast underspend of £417k on these schemes due to savings on professional fees and highway works. The school being built on land adjacent to Laurel Lane Primary School has changed in scope. The school build is no longer for a 5 FE Junior School, rather following discussion with the Education Funding Agency and approval from Cabinet in December 2014; it is now proposed to be a 3 FE Primary School. This was amended to safeguard the external funding provision for the school. Despite the modification, early expectations are that the school will still be delivered within the existing budget of £10,853k, although this will be monitored closely going forward.

The indicated need for up to three additional forms of entry in primary schools is expected to be met through some provision of additional bulge year classes. There is sufficient capacity within the phase 3A expansions budget to meet the costs of any bulge year expansions. Any future permanent expansions will be funded through the phase 4 new primary expansions budget of £13,500k.

The secondary schools replacement budget of £44,171k provides for the replacement of Abbotsfield and Swakeleys Secondary Schools and Northwood School. Abbotsfield and Swakeleys will be delivered by the EFA through the Priority Schools Building Programme. The Council's contribution is £13,071k covering FF&E, vocational centre and additional SRP provision.

Northwood School is being project managed internally and has been allocated a budget of £31,100k to provide for 6 forms of entry. EC Harris has been appointed as multi-disciplined design consultant and project manager. Mott McDonald has been appointed as Quantity Surveyor. Design is progressing well and will finalise to stage D in December 2014. Issue of first stage tender is programmed for early January 2015.

Temporary classrooms have been provided at Hedgewood Primary School and Meadow Secondary School for the new term as part of the Special Resources Provision budget of £1,000k. Approval has been received to commence works with respect to the modular classroom at Cherry Lane with an anticipated completion date of April 2015. The forecast outturn for SRP's at all 3 schools is an underspend of £204k due to tender values for Hedgewood and Meadow being lower than expected.

The funding for the feasibility works for the secondary schools will be met from the Secondary Schools Expansion budget. More detailed feasibility work will commence on the sites so far identified as suitable for expansion. The revised budget for Secondary School Expansions is £76,900k which is sufficient to meet the increased demand up to 2019/20. The forecast demand beyond this remains uncertain and volatile but will be reviewed annually as part of the pupil placement planning forecast and considered for accordingly as part of future MTFE strategies.

The Schools Expansion programme is funded from EFA grants totalling £197,934k, S106 £21,703k, other contributions £144k and council resources of £91,380k. The table below summarises the financial position:

Priority Schools Capital Programme	Budget	Prior Years	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Minor Works	1,154	953	201	0	0	0	0	0	1,154	0
Phase 1	23,571	21,924	684	583	0	0	0	0	23,191	(380)
Phase 1A (Inc. Rosedale)	2,116	2,074	3	0	0	0	0	0	2,077	(39)
Phase 2	84,212	51,604	25,081	4,250	0	0	0	0	80,935	(3,277)
Phase 2A	2,929	2,885	7	0	0	0	0	0	2,892	(37)
Phase 3	29,932	6,275	16,878	6,227	135	0	0	0	29,515	(417)
Special Resources Prov.	1,000	0	750	25	21	0	0	0	796	(204)
Phase 3A	2,747	698	337	1,633	0	0	0	0	2,668	(79)
Phase 4 (New Primary Schools Expansions)	13,500	0	0	1,710	4,645	4,105	2,760	280	13,500	0
Secondary Schools (Expansions)	76,900	0	250	2,438	10,750	21,000	21,500	20,962	76,900	0
Secondary Schools (Replacement)	44,171	0	482	23,052	19,012	1,625	0	0	44,171	0
Secondary Schools (Provision)	28,929	0	0	551	3,396	7,341	9,590	8,051	28,929	0
Total Expenditure	311,161	86,413	44,673	40,469	37,959	34,071	33,850	29,293	306,728	(4,433)

Priority Schools Capital Programme	Budget	Prior Years	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Resources:										
DfE Grant	158,613	50,479	9,129	12,094	15,751	23,883	24,806	22,471	158,613	0
TBNP	39,321	19,726	19,383	212	0	0	0	0	39,321	0
Section 106	21,703	10,154	8,724	2,807	175	0	0	0	21,860	157
Schools Contributions	144	0	144	0	0	0	0	0	144	0
Council Resources	91,380	6,054	7,293	25,356	22,033	10,188	9,044	6,822	86,790	(4,590)
Total Financing	311,161	86,413	44,673	40,469	37,959	34,071	33,850	29,293	306,728	(4,433)

Members will note that of the total £197,934k grant financing, £91,548k is assumed funding whilst £106,385k has been confirmed. The assumed funding is estimated on the basis of future anticipated successful bids for additional DfE funding for the Secondary Schools expansions and the Phase 4 Primary Schools expansions programme.

Schools Condition Programme

The 2014/15 budget for the Schools Conditions programme is £3,935k including an estimated £546k schools' contributions towards the works. Currently schools contributions of £347k have been agreed for nine schemes that have been implemented. Contributions for four other schemes are subject to agreement from the schools. The schools contribution is based on a capping formula of a contribution and a banded percentage ranging between 50% to 75% dependant on the cost of the project and capped to a maximum of 20% of the school reserves.

As part of the Month 7 re-phasing exercise £1,422k has been re-phased into next year for schemes that are yet to be allocated or approved. It is anticipated that this will be fully required in addition to the 2015/16 budget to finance existing allocated schemes which will be completed next year subject to contribution agreements and new schemes arising from the feasibility exercise to be undertaken for next year's programme.

COMMENTS OF POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE(S)

None at this stage.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

Completion of both the temporary and permanent phases of the programme will result in additional school places needed for local children, which the Council has a statutory duty to provide.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

In September 2012, Cabinet approved the statutory proposals to enlarge the premises at Harlyn, Glebe, Field End Infant and Junior, Ruislip Gardens, Hermitage Primary, Highfield, Hillingdon, Ryefield, Rabbsfarm, Pinkwell, Heathrow, Cherry Lane and West Drayton Schools. This approval was conditional on the planning permission for the individual sites being granted by 31 July 2013, which has now been met. The Council cannot take school organisation decisions regarding

Academies; therefore as Wood End Park was in the process of conversion it was not included in the statutory notice.

Consultation was also needed as part of the process of establishing new schools. A Cabinet Member Report on the process for establishing the 3 new primary schools was approved in May 2013. The process concluded in December 2013 when the Department for Education (DfE) announced the organisations that will be managing the schools.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Property and Construction

Corporate Property and Construction authored this report.

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and notes that investment in the borough's schools remains at the heart of the Council's capital programme. Monies have been earmarked within the Council's Medium Term Financial Forecast to finance on-going revenue financing costs associated with the use of Prudential Borrowing to support this level of investment to 2019/20. Demand for school places continues to be closely monitored, with any relevant financial implications being captured through the Council's budget planning processes and reflected in the budget report to Cabinet and Council during February 2015.

Legal

The Borough Solicitor confirms that there are no specific legal implications arising from this report. Legal advice is provided whenever necessary, in particular cases, to ensure that the Council's Interests are protected.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

NIL

APPENDIX 1

Summary of Phase 2 (school expansions) and Phase 3 (new schools) construction works

School Name	Summary of Works	Status
PHASE 2		
Harefield Infants	Single storey extension to a Year 2 classroom, replacement of windows and external walls in the reception, together with associated works.	All works complete
Harefield Junior	Construction of a single-storey classroom to accommodate two classrooms and associated facilities	All works complete
Field End Infants	1 FE Expansion: Construction of new single storey building and associated facilities.	All works complete
Field End Junior	1 FE Expansion: Construction of single storey building and associated facilities.	All works complete
Bourne Primary	(Bulge Year) Single storey extension to existing school to provide two new classrooms with associated facilities.	All works complete
Highfield Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of a two storey building and associated facilities.	All works complete
Ryefield Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of a single storey building, a two storey block and associated facilities.	All works complete
Heathrow Primary	0.5 FE Expansion: Part demolition of the existing building, construction of a two storey extension and associated facilities	All works complete
Rabbsfarm Primary	1 FE Expansion: Demolition of existing school and construction of a new 3 FE school including nursery.	All works complete
Ruislip Gardens	1 FE Expansion: Construction of a new two storey extension and associated facilities.	All works complete
West Drayton Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of two storey building and associated facilities.	All works complete
Pinkwell Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of a stand alone classroom block and associated facilities.	All works complete
Rosedale Primary	Demolition of school sports hall/gymnasium and construction of a new 2 FE school including nursery.	All works complete
Wood End Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of 2 stand alone buildings and associated facilities.	All works complete
Harlyn Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of part two storey/part single storey extension to existing school and a stand alone two storey classroom block.	All works complete
Hillingdon Primary	1 FE Expansion: Part demolition of existing school and construction of a new two storey classroom block and associated facilities.	All works complete
Glebe Primary	1 FE Expansion: Demolition of existing school and construction of a new 3 FE school including nursery.	Expansion works will be completed in 2015
Cherry Lane Primary	1 FE Expansion: Construction of a two storey building and associated facilities	Main Expansion Works completed 2014. MUGA be completed in 2015
Hermitage Primary	1 FE Expansion: Demolition of existing school and construction of a new 2 FE school including nursery.	Expansion works will be completed in 2015
PHASE 3		
Lake Farm site	New 3 FE primary school, nursery, a Special Resource Provision unit and other associated facilities.	All works complete
St Andrews Park site	New 3 FE primary school, nursery, a Special Resource Provision unit and other associated facilities.	All works complete
New 3 FE Primary School	New 3 FE Primary School and other associated facilities.	Works will be completed in 2015

Note: A Form of Entry (FE) is a group of 30 pupils. Expanding a school by 1 FE will add accommodation sufficient for 30 additional pupils to every year group.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank