



HILLINGDON
LONDON



Residents' and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee

Councillors on the Committee

Michael White, (Chairman)
Teji Barnes (Vice-Chairman)
Kuldeep Lakhmana (Labour Lead)
Mohinder Birah
Peter Davis
Patricia Jackson
Judy Kelly
Brian Stead
Jas Dhot

Date: WEDNESDAY, 24
FEBRUARY 2016

Time: 5.30 PM

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS 4 &
4A - CIVIC CENTRE

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

Published: Tuesday, 16 February 2016

Contact: Khalid Ahmed
Tel: 01895 250833
Email: kahmed@hillington.gov.uk

This Agenda is available online at:

<http://modgov.hillingdon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=114&Year=0>

Putting our residents first

Lloyd White
Head of Democratic Services
London Borough of Hillingdon,
3E/05, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW
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

For accessibility options regarding this agenda please contact Democratic Services. For those hard of hearing an Induction Loop System is available for use in the various meeting rooms.

Attending, reporting and filming of meetings

For the public part of this meeting, residents and the media are welcomed to attend, and if they wish, report on it, 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. 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. Kindly ensure all mobile or similar devices on silent mode.

Please note that the Council may also record or film this meeting and publish this online.

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.



Terms of Reference

A central role of a Policy Overview Committees is to undertake in-depth policy reviews on specific issues. Reviews provide the opportunity to hear from members of the public and expert witnesses, including people from a wide range of external organisations. Reviews usually make recommendations to the Cabinet on how the Council could improve its work. They therefore perform an important role in opening up the policy-making process to a wider audience, including people who would not normally have the opportunity to participate.

This Committee undertakes the policy overview role in relation to the following matters:

- Highways, traffic, parking & street environment
- Local transport, including rail, cycling & London Underground
- Footpaths and Bridleways
- Road safety and education
- Planning & Building Control
- Libraries
- The Borough's heritage and history
- Sport & Leisure services
- Waste management & recycling
- Green spaces, allotments, woodlands, conservation and sustainable development
- Consumer Protection, Trading Standards & Licensing
- Registrars & Bereavement Services
- Local watercourses, drainage and flooding
- Environmental Health, Air & Noise Quality
- Local impacts of Heathrow expansion
- Local impacts of High Speed Rail

Agenda

Chairman's Announcements

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Declaration of Interest in matters coming before this meeting
- 3 To confirm that all items marked Part 1 will be considered in Public and that any items marked Part 2 will be considered in Private
- 4 To agree the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 1 - 4
- 5 Residents' & Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee - Major Review 2015/16 - Mechanisms for Reviewing Major Developments in the Borough and Identifying Lessons to be Learned for the Planning Process 5 - 16
- 6 Forward Plan 17 - 20
- 7 Work Programme 21 - 22

Minutes

RESIDENTS' AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

19 January 2016



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Michael White (Chairman), Teji Barnes (Vice-Chairman), Mohinder Birah, Peter Davis, Jas Dhot, Patricia Jackson, Judy Kelly, Kuldeep Lakhmana (Labour Lead), Brian Stead</p> <p>Witnesses Present: Dale Venn (Dale Venn Architects Ltd), Jane Venn (Dale Venn Architects Ltd), Satish Vekaria (Design Manager, Major Construction Projects)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Nigel Dicker (Deputy Director Residents Services), James Gleave (Local Development Framework Principal Policy Officer), Chris Mansfield (Deputy Director Planning, Transport & Community Projects), Gregory Pike (Finance Manager), Ceri Lamoureux, (Lead Finance Business Partner), Khalid Ahmed (Democratic Services Manager) and Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
40.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
41.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
42.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ALL ITEMS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT ANY ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items on the agenda would be considered in public.</p>	
43.	<p>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 NOVEMBER 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2015 were agreed.</p>	<p>Action by</p>
44.	<p>DRAFT BUDGET PROPOSALS REPORT FOR RESIDENTS SERVICES 2016/17 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>The Committee was presented with an update on the 2016/17 Residents' Services draft Budget Proposals, and raised the following points:</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall view set out in the report showed the funding position for the next 4 years improving from previous forecasts, however the 16/17 position was worse as a result of savings being front-loaded. • The Council continued to operate within the constraints of Government's deficit reduction programme, which had seen a reduction of 56% (£67m) in Central Government funding since 2010/11 and all indications were that funding would continue to decline. • Members were asked to note that the draft budget report did not include the impact of the recent Spending Review or LG Provisional Settlement, which would be addressed in the budget report to February Cabinet. • To ensure that there would be no Council Tax rise in the next financial year, savings of £12.144 million had been identified. The total savings included in the draft budget for Residents Services totalled £4.472 million. • Despite savings, the budget still contained significant capital programmes including the renovation of the Battle of Britain Bunker, a new Council vehicle fleet, school playgrounds and road safety signage for schools. <p>The Committee expressed admiration for the continued savings found within the budget without compromising front line services.</p> <p>The Committee commented that charges for non-resident users of services had remained static for several years, and this was a potential area to review for future savings. It was noted that charges have been benchmarked against those of neighbouring authorities and shown to remain competitive.</p> <p>RESOLVED -</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. That the Budget Proposals for Residents Services 2016/17 be noted.</p>	
45.	<p>RESIDENTS' & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - MAJOR REVIEW 2015/16 - MECHANISMS FOR REVIEWING MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BOROUGH AND IDENTIFYING LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FOR THE PLANNING PROCESS (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>As part of the second witness session of the Major review, the Committee was addressed by Dale and Jane Venn, Hillingdon-based architectural consultants, and Mr Satish Vekaria, Design Manager in the Council's in-house Major Construction Projects team.</p> <p>Dale Venn and Jane Venn raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In their contribution they would try to be the voice of the applicant/customer in the planning process. • Named contacts for Planning Officers and direct contact information would be a preferable system to negotiate planning applications. 	Action by

- Planning conditions were often seen as excessive or onerous, and too rigid rather than guidance.
- Though the overall process was good, it was seen as slow.
- The applicant perception was that Central Government wanted to encourage development, and local government wished to slow or prevent it.
- As a care of duty, inspections were made post-development.

In response to a Member question, Dale and Jane Venn reported that they did not perceive there was variation in how applications were treated within the Borough depending on their location.

The Council's Design Manager informed the Committee that he managed a small design team within the Council which undertook projects with a budget between £1,000 and £3 million. The team managed projects from design to conclusion, and also conduct follow-up with users.

During the discussion, designs and images for a community resource centre (located in Queen's Walk) were circulated and the following points were raised:

- After a building was completed, a client survey was undertaken regarding building and design quality, service, the delivery timescale and whether or not the building was meeting the needs of users.
- When designing and building Queen's Walk Community Centre, ongoing communication and close work with the Planning and Highways departments was critical.
- Upon completion, users of the building did not initially find all of the spaces suitable, in this case due to limited input from carers and families during development. To address this, the design team try to involve as many stakeholders and users of a building from an early stage, and at different points in the process.
- The design team make an effort to stay in contact with users of completed projects. Especially in the first 12 months they try to catch any defects in the building, however some users periodically return to the design team for advice on how changing usage could be accommodated.
- Reference was made to the very close working which took place with planning officers and in particular the discussions which took place on materials. This close liaison was vital to ensure details were correct. A Member referred to the excellence of the site but that some users had expressed concerns at the lack of gardens. The Council's Design Manager said he would have another look at this.

The Committee thanked the witnesses for attending.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the information provided be noted and be taken into consideration as part of the review.**
- 2. That officers be asked to provide a summary of the**

Agenda Item 5

Residents' & Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee - Major Review 2015/16 - Mechanisms for Reviewing Major Developments in the Borough and Identifying Lessons to be Learned for the Planning Process

Contact Officers: Khalid Ahmed / James Rodger
Telephone: 01895 250833 / 01895 277468

REASON FOR ITEM

The Committee is asked to give consideration to the evidence which has been received during the review into Mechanisms for Reviewing Major Developments in the Borough and Identifying Lessons to be learned for the Planning Process.

The Committee and the Head of Planning and Building Control are asked to discuss suggested recommendations for the review.

OPTIONS OPEN TO THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is asked to give consideration to suggested recommendations for the review based on the evidence given during the review and the professional opinion of officers.

INFORMATION

1. The Committee have held two witness session meetings on the review and firstly heard from James Rodger, the Head of Planning and Building Control who provided Members with a presentation on the aims of the review topic. The Committee was provided with details of the current review mechanisms used by the Council on Major Developments.
2. At the second meeting of the review the Committee heard evidence from Satish Vekaria, Design Manager, Major Constructions Projects and from Dale Venn and Jane Venn (Dale Venn Architects Ltd).
3. For Members information the scoping report for the review is attached as **Appendix 2**. In addition **Appendix 1**, provides the Committee with the details of the evidence which has been given at the two meetings. The Head of Planning and Building Control will attend the meeting to discuss with the Committee potential recommendations
4. The Head of Planning and Building Control has provided the following information to help Members with their deliberations and to help in formulating recommendations of the review.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

Matters learnt from Head of Planning's evidence

5. There is no current post development review process in place which enables lessons to be learnt from planning decisions either by officers or Councillors.
6. All high profile/major development decisions are effectively made by Councillors who sit on the 3 planning Committees, hence any post development review process agreed by this Committee must heavily involve Planning Committee Councillors as well as officers.
7. The Council historically has taken Councillors on tours of the Borough, but there was limited rigour applied to the process which was basically Councillors visiting a list of sites and sharing their views with officers.
8. There are criteria related to national schemes (e.g. Building For Life) designed to encourage high quality development that officers could draw on to establish meaningful criteria to decide whether development that has been allowed is high quality or not.
9. Parking (pressure placed by new development on existing on-street parking) is a contentious issue with almost all planning developments in Hillingdon.
10. Councils can use design awards as a kind of post development review. But in the Head of Planning's view they only include the very best schemes, they are expensive and it is doubtful whether they encourage understanding of any flaws in current decision making.
11. The Council has undertaken post development surveys of new development, unfortunately these provide limited valuable data as local residents rarely will focus on a topical issue related to the Council (e.g How often refuse is collected) rather than answer questions in the way a survey intends.

Matters learnt from internal/external witnesses

12. It is rarely the case that what is approved is precisely what is built, as building projects evolve to reflect client requirements and the need to meet Building Control, budgetary and other important requirements.
13. The views of the end user are important, good planning is not just about whether the scheme complied with Council planning policies.
14. If there have been positive communication channels between the developer and the Council throughout the planning process, it should lead to better quality development.
15. Planning conditions are an important and much debated part of the planning process; hence it is important to consider whether the right planning conditions were imposed.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

Some of the key questions:

16. Were the planning conditions flexible enough and fit for purpose?

17. Developments evolve and there will be some amendments - how have these been handled/affected the final development?

18. How can the Council find out in a simple way the views of the end user?

Note: It was clear from RESPOC's debate with external speakers that Ward Councillors have considerable knowledge in this regard.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Summary of evidence

Appendix 2 - Scoping Report for the review

Summary of Evidence received during the review - Appendix 1

Witness Session on 12 November 2015

The Head of Planning and Enforcement attended the meeting and gave Members a presentation on the purpose of the review.

The Committee was informed that the aim of the review was to consider whether there were any simple post development processes which could be introduced to analyse the successes or failures of major developments in the Borough. Also to look at how decision makers could try to learn lessons from any post development review processes which had been introduced.

Members were informed that Hillingdon processed between around 4,000 planning application a year, of which there were around 100 major applications. The major applications approved had a huge impact on areas of the Borough. New housing developments affected lots of stakeholders.

Reference was made to the current mechanisms which were used by the Council to monitor developments. These included:

- The Local Plan - This provided an opportunity for officers and public to give feedback regarding future developments. However, much of the feedback on planning issues of importance stems from views on developments which had already taken place. In addition the Local Plan was also developed over many years and did not represent a targeted qualitative review of whether the Borough's planning decisions were resulting in high quality development.
- The Planning Department also undertook occasional customer feedback exercises which were targeted at applicants and agents. However, this feedback tended to result in customers focusing on whether they liked the service provided by a particular officer or the merits or otherwise of phone calls going through a customer contact centre. Therefore, the feedback given did not tend to provide meaningful responses on the quality of developments arising from the planning process.
- There was individual site specific feedback from residents or Resident Associations on developments which were being built, but this almost entirely focused on potential breaches of planning control, rather than constructive feedback on schemes once they had been built.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement acknowledged that Hillingdon did not have any processes put in place which monitored planning applications post Committee decision. For instance it would be useful to receive feedback on landscaping at developments.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

The Committee was provided with examples of approaches taken by other local authorities in terms of post development review processes.

- Receiving development advice from a Design Review Panel. Reference was made to Guildford Borough Council who received development advice on proposals for large scale new developments from a Design Review Panel. This was a Panel which was made up of professionals with expertise in architecture, urban design, landscape planning, building conservation, transport planning and sustainability. The advice offered was impartial and the intention was that a design review would improve the quality and functionality of development proposals, resolve potentially contentious design issues, anticipate problems and provide alternative solutions, ensure development proposals move smoothly through the planning process and provide a way of testing design ideas.
- The staging of an awards scheme such as held at the London Borough of Bromley. This could aim to promote good design in the Borough and reward and promote excellent developments.
- Reference was made to the previous Council tours which took place, which took Members of the Planning Committee around the Borough to observe recent developments. The tours presented an opportunity for Members to see how new developments had contributed positively to the strategic vision as set out in the Local Plan. It also gave Members an opportunity to consider the detail of some of the sites and to see what had worked well and what had worked not so well.
- Building for Life Standard - This was a well known post development quality review process and was linked to the "Build for Life" website. This website allowed potential house purchasers to see how a new development rated against twelve quality standards. Reference was made to the nearest rated developments to Hillingdon which were in the London Borough of Barnet and which had a handful of large major developments which were subject to the "Building for Life" quality standards.
- Post development questionnaires - The feedback received to these tended to concentrate on micro-issues; however, feedback could be requested of planning agents, builders and architects.

Witness Session on 19 January 2016

Dale Venn and Jane Venn raised the following points:

- In their contribution they would try to be the voice of the applicant/customer in the planning process.
- Named contacts for Planning Officers and direct contact information would be a preferable system to negotiate planning applications.
- Planning conditions were often seen as excessive or onerous, and too rigid rather than guidance.
- Though the overall process was good, it was seen as slow.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

- The applicant perception is that central government wanted to encourage development, and local government wished to slow or prevent it.

In response to a member question, Dale and Jane Venn reported that they did not perceive there was variation in how applications were treated within the borough depending on their location.

Satish Vekaria manages a small design team within the council which undertakes projects with a budget between £1,000 and £3 million. The team manage projects from design to conclusion, and also conduct follow-up with users. During the discussion, designs and images for a community resource centre (located in Queen's Walk) were circulated. Satish Vekaria raised the following points:

- After a building is complete they undertake a client survey regarding building and design quality, service, the delivery timescale and whether or not the building is meeting the needs of users.
- When designing and building Queen's Walk Community Centre, ongoing communication and close work with the Planning and Highways departments was critical.
- Upon completion, users of the building did not initially find all of the spaces suitable, in this case due to limited input from carers and families during development. To address this, the design team try to involve as many stakeholders and users of a building from an early stage, and at different points in the process.
- The design teams make an effort to stay in contact with users of completed projects. Especially in the first 12 months they try to catch any defects in the building; however some users periodically return to the design team for advice on how changing usage can be accommodated.



Residents and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee Review Scoping Report 2015/16

Mechanisms for Reviewing Major Developments in the Borough and Identifying Lessons to be Learned for the Planning Process

BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

Aim of the Review

The planning decisions made by the Council can have a fundamental impact on our residents. This is primarily through the change in environment that occurs through new development; ranging from impacts on everything from security, drainage, visual appearance, outlook, light, noise, traffic congestion, parking, through to the wider multi faceted impacts on neighbourhoods and town centres from very large scale redevelopments.

It is certainly the case that considerable effort is given to determining planning applications by Planning officers and the Councillors on Hillingdon's Planning Committees. But it is also the case that considerably less effort is given once a decision is made into considering whether the approved development is successful, or once built actually creates a high quality environment for occupiers, users or neighbours.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

The review is intended to consider whether there firstly are any simple post development processes that could be introduced to analysis the successes or failures of major developments in the Borough and secondly how decision makers could try to learn lessons from any post development review processes introduced.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The following Terms of Reference are proposed:

1. To understand how lessons are currently learned post approval from processing planning applications;
2. To look at suggested models of best practice (such as the Building for Life Standard) that stem from Governmental or professional bodies and to seek advice from local experts in the fields of planning or architecture.
3. To consider, and recommend to Cabinet any improvements to, the Council's present approach.

INFORMATION & ANALYSIS

It is proposed that the review be broken into two key themes, in order that it is managed efficiently and covers all aspects of the review. The structure is offered as a broad outline in order to ensure that all key aspects of the review are covered. Members are welcome to revise this structure and to add additional themes as they see appropriate.

Hillingdon's Current Mechanisms

It is proposed that Members will firstly gather evidence regarding the review mechanisms currently used by Hillingdon Council. Members will need to understand clearly the aims of the planning process in Hillingdon and identify how well these are met by the existing mechanisms.

- The Local Plan to an extent provides a mechanism whereby officer and public feedback regarding development is given, however, much of the feedback on planning issues of importance stems from views on development already undertaken. The Local Plan is also developed over many years and does not represent a targeted qualitative review of whether the Borough's planning decisions are resulting in high quality development.
- The Planning Department also undertakes occasional customer feedback exercises targeted at applicants and agents. However, this tends to result in customers focusing on whether they liked the service given by a particular officer or the merits or otherwise of phone calls going through a customer contact centre. The feedback given, however, does not tend to provide meaningful responses on the quality of developments arising from the planning process.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

- Lastly there is individual site specific feedback from residents or Resident Associations on development which is being built. This is almost entirely focused on potential breaches of planning control, rather than constructive feedback on schemes once built.
- Historically, the Council has undertaken annual mini-bus tours for Planning Committee members. These no longer occur. When they did occur they were structured only in so far that officers selected a range of sites and secured access to the sites. The developments were not reviewed by Councillors following a prescribed framework or process.

Alternative Approaches

An initial review of practices of nearby Councils has not identified any potential models of best practice or usage of post development review processes. There is literature available from professional bodies such as the RTPI (Royal Town Planning Institute), RIBA (Royal Institute British Architects) and RICS (Royal Institute Chartered Surveyors) and from the Design Council concerning post development review. There is a Housing Quality Indicator System used by affordable housing providers (but this has limitations).

The most well known post development quality review process is the Building for Life Standard. Linked to the Building for Life Standard is the 'Built for Life' website. This website allows potential house purchasers to see how a new development rates against 12 quality indicators. The nearest rated developments to Hillingdon are in the London Borough of Barnet, which has a handful of large major developments subject to the 'Building for life' quality standards.

Within the Borough of Hillingdon there are a small number of very experienced planning and architectural practitioners who it is considered would be willing to attend a witness session to share their expert views.

Members may also wish to consider how modern technology can be used in the review of developments, and engaging the public in this process.

Members will want to look at how the Council could constructively review its decisions, and what benefits such approaches could bring to Planning in Hillingdon. Members will wish to be mindful of the resource implications of different review mechanisms.

WITNESS, EVIDENCE & ASSESSMENT

The table below sets out the possible witnesses that could be invited to present evidence to the Committee. Members are reminded that this is not an exhaustive list and that additional witnesses can be requested at any point throughout this review.

Meeting	Action	Purpose / Outcome
RESPOC: 29 July 2015	The scoping report will be presented to the Committee. Members will have the opportunity to agree and/or propose alternative witnesses/topics.	Information and analysis
RESPOC: 12 November 2015	Witness Session 1 Hillingdon's Current Mechanisms Planning Policy Senior Planning Officers	Evidence and enquiry
RESPOC: 19 January 2016	Witness Session 2 Alternative Approaches Expert Planning Consultant Expert Architect Consultant	Evidence and enquiry
RESPOC: 24 February 2016	Consideration of evidence and suggested recommendations	Suggested recommendation
Cabinet: TBC	The draft final report will be presented to Cabinet by the Chairman of the Committee.	Cabinet may approve, amend or reject as many of the report's recommendations as it wishes.

It is also proposed that a tour of a few recent developments is undertaken at some point between the two witness sessions.

ASSESSMENT

As is standard practice for a Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee review, once a report's recommendations have been agreed by the Cabinet, officers will be asked to begin delivering the necessary changes. The monitoring of officers' work is a fundamentally important aspect of the Committee's work and, as such, regular reports on progress can be requested by Members and a full update report will be added to the future work programme of the Committee.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

This review will be undertaken within current resources. The plan set out above will be coordinated and delivered by Democratic Services. The additional resource of staff time required to present, collect and format evidence for witness sessions will also need to be considered.

Part I – Members, Public and Press
Residents' & Environmental Services POC
24 February 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

Forward Plan

Contact officer: Alex Quayle
Telephone: 01895 250692

REASON FOR ITEM

The Committee is required by its terms of reference to consider the Forward Plan and comment as appropriate to the decision maker on key decisions that relate to services within its remit (before they are taken by Cabinet or Cabinet Member).

OPTIONS OPEN TO THE COMMITTEE

- To comment on items going to the Cabinet or Cabinet Members for decision.
- Or to note the items and decide not to comment.

INFORMATION

1. The Forward Plan for the following months has been published. Those items that are within this Committee's remit are shown on the attached version of the Forward Plan. The Committee may wish to consider and comment on these items.
2. Committee Members are requested to send in any questions they have regarding the attached Forward Plan or on any reports going to the next meeting of Cabinet, and to notify any officers that they would like to attend to give advice.

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

- To consider whether there are comments or suggestions that the Committee wishes to make that will aid Cabinet's decision making.

This page is intentionally left blank

Ref	Upcoming Decisions	Further details	Ward(s)	Final decision by Full Council	Cabinet Member(s) Responsible	Officer Contact for further information	Consultation on the decision	NEW ITEM	Public / Private Decision & reasons
Council Departments: RS = Residents Services SC = Social Care AD = Administration FD= Finance Cabinet Member Decisions - February 2016									
98	Framework Agreement for Hire of Mobile Elevating Work Platforms Vehicles	Cabinet Members will be asked to award a tender to up to 3 suppliers onto a Framework Agreement for hire of Mobile Elevating Work Platform vehicles.	Various		Clr Ray Puddifoot MBE / Clr Jonathan Bianco	FD / RS - Mahomed Ladha / Richard Burnham		NEW	Private (3)
91	Tender: Hay Cutting and Hedge Trimming	Cabinet approval will be sought to award a contract to carry out Hay Cutting and Baling including Hedge Trimming within Borough.	Various		Clr Ray Puddifoot MBE / Clr Jonathan Bianco	RS - Adrian Batten			Private (3)
Cabinet - 17 March 2016									
99	Supply and Fitting Services of Vehicle Tyres	Cabinet approval will be sought to award a tender for supplying tyres, fitting and providing associated services for the Council's Fleet.	All		Clr Jonathan Bianco	FD / RS - Mahomed Ladha / Richard Burnham		NEW	Private (3)
101	Grounds Equipment Maintenance Contract	Cabinet approval will be requested in order to award the Grounds Equipment Maintenance tender within Green Spaces.	All		Clr Jonathan Bianco	FD / RS - Mahomed Ladha / Robert Cox		NEW	Private (3)
81	Flood Risk Management Strategy	Following consultation on a draft agreed by the Cabinet Member, Cabinet will receive the Flood Risk Management Strategy for the Council for approval, setting out how Hillingdon and other Flood Risk Management Authorities should manage flood risk.	All		Clr Jonathan Bianco	RS - Vicky Boorman	Public consultation		Public
92	Tender - Vehicle Hire Framework Agreement	Cabinet will be asked to consider a Procurement Framework Agreement for Vehicle Hire of General Purpose, Passenger Carrying Vehicles and Specialist Vehicles including municipal type of vehicles on short, medium and long term basis.	N/A		Clr Jonathan Bianco	FD / RS - Mahomed Ladha / Colin Russell			Private (3)

Ref	Upcoming Decisions	Further details	Ward(s)	Final decision by Full Council	Cabinet Member(s) Responsible	Officer Contact for further information	Consultation on the decision	NEW ITEM	Public / Private Decision & reasons
	SI = Standard Item each month								
38b	Local Plan - Part 2 POLICY FRAMEWORK	Following consultation on additional amendments to the Local Plan - Part 2: Draft Development Management Policies, Sites Allocation and Designations and the Policies Map, Cabinet will consider the responses before the Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.	All	Date in 2016 TBC after examination stage	Cllr Keith Burrows	RS - James Gleave	Various consultees		Public
Cabinet - 19 May 2016									
95	Environmental Enforcement Service	Cabinet will consider a tender for the provision of an Environmental Enforcement Service.	All		Cllr Jonathan Bianco	RS - Bill Hickson	Partners		Private (3)

Agenda Item 7

Work Programme 2015/16

Contact officer: Alex Quayle
Telephone: 01895 250692

REASON FOR ITEM

This report is to enable the Committee to review meeting dates and forward plans. This is a standard item at the end of each agenda.

MEETINGS

25 Jun 2015	Major Review 1 – discuss potential review topics for first major review Update on implementation of recommendations from past reviews
Venue: CR4	'Beds in Sheds' – Enforcement and Impact Trading Standards Update Work Programme – review the annual work programme Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
29 Jul 2015	Major Review 1 and Review 2 – consideration of scoping report Consideration of Budget Planning Report for Residents Services 2015/16
Venue: CR5	Work Programme – review the annual work programme Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
23 Sep 2015	Major Review 1 – First witness session Work Programme – review the annual work programme
Venue: CR5	Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
15 Oct 2015	Major Review 1 – Second witness session Licensing Policies Consultation
Venue: CR6	Work Programme – review the annual work programme Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
12 Nov 2015	Major Review 1 - consideration of draft final report on Hoarding Major Review 2 - Mechanisms for Reviewing Major Developments in the Borough and Identifying Lessons to be Learned for the Planning Process - First Witness Session
Venue: CR3a	Briefing on West London Coronial Service Work Programme – review the annual work programme Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
19 Jan 2016	Major Review 2 - Second Witness Session Budget Report for consideration
Venue: CR5	Briefing on Local Plan Part 2 Work Programme – review the annual work programme Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions
24 Feb 2016	Review 2 - consideration of draft recommendations of the reiew Annual Safety at Sports Grounds Report DEFERRED

Venue: CR4+4a	Work Programme – review the annual work programme
	Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions

23 Mar 2016	Update on the Council's and other bodies' responses to flooding in the Borough
	Venue: CR5
	Work Programme – review the annual work programme
	Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions

27 Apr 2016	Consideration of topics for major reviews for the next Municipal Year
	Update on implementation of recommendations from past reviews
	Venue: TBC
	Work Programme – review the annual work programme
	Cabinet Forward Plan – review forthcoming decisions

OPTIONS OPEN TO THE COMMITTEE

1. To note dates for meetings
2. To make suggestions for future working practices, reviews, and updates.