



HILLINGDON
LONDON



Council

To all Members of the Council

Date: THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY
2017

Time: 7.30 PM

Venue: COUNCIL CHAMBER -
CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH
STREET, UXBRIDGE UB8
1UW

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

Published: Wednesday, 11 January 2017

Contact: Lloyd White, Head of
Democratic Services
Tel: 01895 556743
Email: lwhite@hillington.gov.uk

This Agenda is available online at:

<http://modgov.hillingdon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=117&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

Watching & recording this meeting

You can watch this meeting on the Council's YouTube channel, live or archived.

Residents and the media are also welcome to attend in person, and if they wish, report on the public part of the meeting. Any individual or organisation may record or film proceedings as long as it does not disrupt proceedings.

Watch a **LIVE** broadcast of this meeting on the Council's YouTube Channel: *Hillingdon London*

Those attending should be aware that the Council will film and record proceedings for both official record and resident digital engagement in democracy.



It is recommended to give advance notice of filming to ensure any particular requirements can be met. The Council will provide seating areas for residents/public, high speed WiFi access to all attending and an area for the media to report. When present in the room, silent mode should be enabled for all mobile devices.

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.

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.

Agenda

Prayers

To be said by the reverend Felicity Davies

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Minutes 1 - 12
To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2016 (*attached*)
- 3 Declarations of Interest
To note any declarations of interest in any matter before the Council
- 4 Mayor's Announcements
- 5 Public Question Time 13 - 14
To take questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.
- 6 Report of the Head of Democratic Services 15 - 16
- 7 Council Tax Base and Business Rates Forecast 2017/18 17 - 24
To consider the report of the Corporate Director of Finance (*attached*)
- 8 Members' Questions 25 - 26
To take questions submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11
- 9 Motions 27 - 28
To consider Motions submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 2



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Minutes

COUNCIL

3 November 2016

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

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

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

	<p>The Mayor had attended the opening of Northwood School which he believed to be a first class build with first class design. He had also attended the opening of the boathouse at Ruislip Lido.</p>
28.	<p>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>5.1 QUESTION FROM MR DAVID BISHOP OF LICHFIELD ROAD, NORTHWOOD HILLS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS</p> <p>"Can the Cabinet Member please confirm whether or not Hillingdon Borough intend to implement the proposal advertised in June, to remove the four parking bays in Joel Street, Northwood Hills, designated specifically for disabled blue badge holders and replace them with just one parking bay outside Namaste Lounge?"</p> <p>Councillor Burrows advised that, when the Council set out to consider any changes of this nature, it was legally obliged to undertake a formal consultation. Consideration then had to be given to the feedback it received, especially any objections. This issue had arisen following a request from residents in Northwood Hills to review the location of the existing motorcycle parking space as well as the status of the eight dedicated disabled parking bays in the town centre, on the basis that perhaps the disabled bays weren't being used very much.</p> <p>The Council had explored whether there could be a better layout and perhaps a change to the balance of the different types of parking bays between 'disabled' and regular 'pay and display'. On the face of it, the idea seemed at least worthy of investigation and so an advertisement had been placed over the summer based on options presented by officers to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Based on the feedback received during the consultation, Councillor Burrows had taken the decision not to reduce the overall number of disabled parking bays in the town centre. However, he had approved some minor alterations to the parking arrangements outside the Namaste Lounge, which included the introduction of an additional disabled parking bay there, alongside a new motorcycle bay. Councillor Burrows stressed that this work would be undertaken in a way which would not change the overall disabled bay parking provision in Joel Street. He suggested that Mr Bishop contact the Ward Councillors to discuss burning issues in future as this would generally be quicker than waiting to submit a question to Council.</p>
29.	<p>REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>i) Urgent Implementation of Decisions</p> <p>Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business and it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the urgency decisions detailed in the report be noted.</p> <p>(ii) Waiver of 6 Month Councillor Attendance Rule (Sec.85 Local Government Act 1972)</p> <p>Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business. Councillor Oswald extended the best wishes of the Labour Group to Councillor Kauffman and his family. It was:</p>

RESOLVED: That:

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That:

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

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

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

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

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

Very little had changed over the last six years. Heathrow Airport Limited had spent millions of pounds on publicity and the 'Back Heathrow' campaign and yet residents and employees were still subjected to unacceptable air quality and noise pollution. The Davis Commission's own forecast on air quality confirmed that nitrogen dioxide pollution levels at Heathrow were currently illegal and in some locations would get worse with a third runway. Defra had stated that, even without a third runway, it was not expected that Heathrow would be able to comply with EU nitrogen dioxide pollution limits by 2025.

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

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

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

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

statement of preference as the next stage in moving from a short listing process to a location specific national policy statement, which would be subject to public scrutiny.

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

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

Any proceeds would go straight to the Treasury, with authorities able to keep a sum deemed appropriate by the Government to defray these costs if they were lucky. This

also assumed that sufficient funds would be raised to cover the costs, as that in itself had been called into question as it was unlikely that there would be a large number.

The Cabinet Member believed that the Council's five year fixed term tenancies offered a far more effective way of addressing the issue and helped make the most of the authority's housing stock which, alongside the ten year eligibility criteria, enabled the Council to put its residents first.

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

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

in non self contained B&B accommodation for six weeks or more. Officers had worked hard to minimise this but it was dependent on how quickly alternative accommodation became available.

Of the 12 households, three had since been permanently housed, one had been offered and refused permanent accommodation and had therefore been discharged, one had been found intentionally homeless and three families were now living in self-contained temporary accommodation. Four families remained in bed and breakfast pending further work to secure alternative accommodation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Councillor Puddifoot was aware that politicians and senior civil servants found it difficult to reverse a poor decision. In the case of High Speed 2, he believed that the public would genuinely appreciate a common sense approach. It had been known for years that the project had no business case. In 2013, Treasury officials had said that the project, which had started with a budget of £30bn which then rose to £42bn, was at £72bn and at high risk of not delivering value for money. In the same year, the

National Audit Office had issued a devastating statement advising that officials were using fragile numbers, out of date data and had made assumptions that did not affect real life. Hillingdon had experienced this first hand in its dealings with High Speed 2 officials and the Department of Transport. Councillor Puddifoot had written to the Secretary of State for Transport in September 2016 stating that he regretted having to inform him that the quality of technical and financial information provided by High Speed 2 would not be accepted as adequate for a decision on a major project in Hillingdon, let alone for a national project of this scale. The Leader found this disappointing and frustrating. He had been responding to the decision to proceed with the viaduct over the lakes in Harefield used by Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre (HOAC) rather than tunnelling under it.

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

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

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

COUNCILLOR D.MILLS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

Councillor Bianco noted that Hillingdon had also recently won its category in the RHS London in Bloom competition and so would be entering, once again, in the Britain in Bloom competition. He advised that looking after open spaces was just as important as putting residents first and was something that was appreciated by residents.

Councillor Bianco thanked local residents and Council officers who had put a lot of hard work into improving the Borough.

There was no supplementary question.

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

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

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

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

There was no supplementary question.

32. MOTIONS (Agenda Item 9)

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

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR D.MILLS

Councillor D Mills moved, and Councillor Lavery seconded, the motion as set out on the Order of Business. Following debate (Councillors Curling, Denys, Duducu, Eginton and Morse), the motion was put to a recorded vote:

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

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

Those abstaining: None.

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

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

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

Counter proposal of wards for each constituency:

Northwood & West Harrow	
Harefield	5,350
Northwood	7,863
Northwood Hills	8,306
Eastcote & E Ruislip	9,701
Pinner	7,825
Pinner South	7,802
Rayners Lane	7,539
Roxbourne	8,078
Roxeth	7,432
West Harrow	7,115
	77,011

Hayes and Harlington	
Heathrow Villages	6,875
West Drayton	9,733
Yiewsley	8,397
Charville	8,421
Barnhill	8,270
Yeading	8,236
Botwell	9,965
Townfield	9,167
Pinkwell	9,033
	78,097

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

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

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

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delays of up to 20 minutes can be experienced on such a comparatively short road upon which, of course, the refuse facility is based. There is also a safety aspect as speeding, on coming motorists would not cause traffic coming in the opposite direction to break suddenly. The proposal would also assist in reducing damage caused to the carriageway so soon after resurfacing and may further assist in stopping HS2 using Breakspear Road South if evidence is forthcoming, even at this late stage, showing the environmental impact which has been based on assumption rather than reality.

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Reporting Officer: Head of Democratic Services

(i) URGENT IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS

RECOMMENDATION: That the Urgency decisions detailed below be noted.

Information

1. The Constitution allows a Cabinet or Cabinet Member decision to be implemented before the expiry of the 5 day call-in provided there is agreement from the Chief Executive and the Chairman of the Executive Scrutiny Committee to waive this. All such decisions are to be reported for information only to the next full Council meeting.
2. Recently the following decisions have been made using the urgency procedures:

Date of Decision	Decision Type / Nature of Decision	Decision-Maker
10/11/2016	Award of Contract Extension to Northgate Arinso (Resourcelink) HR payroll system - PART II (also ratified by Cabinet on 17 November 2016)	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
25/11/2016	Award of a contract for Capital Programme Kitchen and Bathroom Replacement 2016-2017 - PART II	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
25/11/2016	Acquisition of apartments for use as a Homeless Hostel with Capital Release (Berkeley Apartments, Marlborough Crescent, Harlington) - PART II	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
01/12/2016	Acceptance of Tender for Unattended Mobile CCTV System and Cameras - PART II	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member Community, Commerce and Regeneration
13/12/2016	Former Hayes Swimming Pool Site, Botwell Lane, Hayes - land transactions - PART II	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
14/12/2016	Western Access (Pump Lane) to Southall Gas Works site - Land appropriation at Minet Country Park	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
07/11/2016	Civic Centre Works Upgrades 2016/17: Refurbishments Arising from Employee Forum Suggestions	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
06/12/2016	Housing Revenue Account New General Needs Housing Stock 2016/17 (Housing Buy-Back Scheme) Release No 10	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services
08/12/2016	Corporate Technology & Innovation Programme 2016/17 - Google for Work Project: Procurement of Essential Microsoft Office Licences	Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Decision Notices

(ii) HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

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

Information

1. The Health and Wellbeing Board was established by Council on 9 May 2013, in accordance with the Health and Social Care Act 2012, with the aim of seeking to improve the quality of life of the local population and provide high level collaboration between the Council, the NHS and other agencies to develop and oversee the strategy and commissioning of local health services.
2. Statutory membership of the Board includes a representative (and substitute) from Healthwatch Hillingdon who have recently put forward a proposed change of representative and substitute. The appointment of statutory, voting members of the Board is reserved for Council and this report therefore requests Council approval to the proposed change in membership. Other Statutory Members that may attend meetings are:
 - Cabinet Members from the London Borough of Hillingdon
 - A representative from the Clinical Commissioning Group covering Hillingdon
 - Statutory Director of Adult Social Services
 - Statutory Director of Children's Services
 - Statutory Director of Public Health

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

COUNCIL TAX BASE AND BUSINESS RATES FORECAST 2017/18

Reporting Officer: Corporate Director of Finance

SUMMARY

This report sets out the proposed Council Tax Base and Business Rates Forecast for 2017/18 in accordance with the legislation for approval by the Council. The Council is required to calculate both its Council Tax Base as at 30 November 2016 by 31 January 2017 and the Business Rates forecast by 31 January 2017. This report also notes the impact of introducing a Council Tax Long Term Empty Property Premium with effect from 1 April 2017.

RECOMMENDATIONS: That

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

COUNCIL TAX BASE

The calculation of the Council Tax Base is prescribed under the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 and represents the equivalent number of Band D Properties within the Borough. The calculation of the Council Tax Base is based upon the following formula:

$$((H-Q+E+J)-Z) \times (F \text{ divided by } G)$$

Where:

H is the number of chargeable dwellings for the band on the relevant day less the number of exempt dwellings on that day;

Q is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day;

E is a factor to take account of premiums, if any, to which the council tax payable, was subject on the relevant day;

J is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwelling or premiums calculated by the authority;

Z is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied as a result of the introduction of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme expressed as an equivalent number of chargeable dwellings in that band;

F is the number appropriate to that band which is used in determining the Band D equivalent (i.e. Band A =6, Band B = 7, Band C =8, Band D = 9, Band E = 11, Band F = 13, Band G = 15 and Band H = 18;

G is the number applicable to Band D i.e. 9.

Table 1 sets out a summary of the Council Tax Base for 2017/18 including the estimated collection rate and allowance made for contributions in lieu of Council Tax in respect of Forces Barracks and Married Quarters. The detailed calculation is set out in Appendix A to this report.

Table 1 Total Number of Band D equivalent properties.	
Band	Number of properties
A	437
B	2,867
C	16,313
D	37,858
E	19,673
F	12,766
G	7,240
H	832
Total	97,986
Equivalent number adjusted for the estimated collection rate (98.5%)	-1,470
Plus the contribution in Lieu of Council Tax in respect of Forces Barracks and Married Quarters	704
Council Tax Base for 2017/18	97,220

CHANGES IN COUNCIL TAX BASE SINCE 2016/17

In calculating the Council Tax Base for 2017/18 the authority has to estimate the various changes that will occur during the financial year, which result in an increase of 1,450 Band D Equivalent Properties, taking the tax base to the 97,220 outlined in Table 1 above. This movement consists of: 1,400 increase due to new development in the borough and projected changes to the number eligible for discounts, exemptions and reductions; alongside assumed income equivalent to 50 Band D equivalent properties from the introduction of the Empty Property Premium. Assumed Collection Rates have been maintained at 98.5% reflecting current experience.

Long Term Empty Property Premium

Implementation of an Empty Property premium is reflected in 2017/18 income projections, in line with the draft budget proposals approved by Cabinet on 15 December 2016. The Council has the power to levy a 50% premium on Council Tax for properties which have remained vacant and unfurnished for two years, of which there are currently 156 across the borough and numbers have remained consistently above 100 since 2013/14. The draft budget assumes income equivalent to 50 Band D properties from the introduction of such a premium with effect from 1 April 2017.

Impact on 2017/18 General Fund Budget

The actual impact upon Hillingdon's General Fund budget for 2017/18 of the new Council Tax base is an increase of 1,450 Band D equivalents properties generating £1,614k in additional funding for the General Fund in 2017/18 compared to 2016/17. This position reflects the outlook presented within the draft budget considered by Cabinet on 15 December 2016, assuming no increase in the Hillingdon share of Council Tax.

Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992

It is noted that this report falls within the provisions of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. Any member who is two or more months in arrears with his/her Council Tax must declare the fact and not vote on the recommendations in this report.

BUSINESS RATES INCOME FORECAST

The Local Government Finance Act 2012 introduced a mechanism whereby Councils will retain a proportion of business rates as a revenue funding stream and as a result, the business rates income forecast for 2017/18 has a direct impact upon the Council's finances and is therefore submitted to Council for approval alongside the Council Tax Base.

The Business Rates Income forecast for 2017/18 has been derived from the newly released 2017 local rating list, which will come into force from 1 April 2017. Following allowance for the current levels of both mandatory and discretionary reliefs, the Council anticipates a gross yield of £366,328k.

As the 2017 rating list had only been made available in draft prior to publication of the consultation budget approved by Cabinet in December 2016, Business Rate income had been modelled on the basis of the current 2010 rating list. While the gross yield arising from this new rating list will be lower, the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement published by DCLG in December 2016 confirmed that the Council will be reimbursed for this loss of income, resulting in the net revenues available to support services being unchanged.

A number of new reliefs have been introduced by Government since the introduction of the Business Rate Retention System, for which the Council and other preceptors receive government funding in lieu of forgone income. An additional £2,000k income is projected with regard to the doubling of small business rate relief and support for small businesses. This grant funding will also reimburse the Council for the net cost of any transitional relief granted to businesses to compensate for material changes in rates liabilities.

This gross yield has been adjusted to provide £1,919k for losses in collection, representing a collection rate of 99.5% and £2,000k against appeals currently outstanding with the Valuation Office. The Council will retain £598k to cover the costs of administration and collection, resulting in forecast a net yield of £359,811k from business rates within the borough in 2017/18.

The Local Government Act 2012 permits the retention of 20% revenues by London Boroughs, with the remainder being split between Central Government and the

Greater London Authority. Hillingdon's share of this income therefore amounts to £107,943k. As in previous years, this sum is adjusted downwards by a £51,412k tariff to reflect historic levels of central government funding.

The remaining £56,531k of income is separated into the £44,098k baseline level of funding, as determined by central government and £12,433k growth, which is subject to a levy of 50%. After taking account of this levy, the Council retains £50,314k of business rate income, including £6,216k of growth.

The Council is required to submit a certified NNDR1 return, containing a more detailed analysis of this business rates forecast, to both DCLG and GLA by 31 January 2017. A recommendation to delegate authority to the Corporate Director of Finance to submit this return is included in this report.

Impact on 2017/18 General Fund Budget

The £50,314k income retained by the Council will be reflected in the budget presented to Cabinet for approval in February 2017, an increase of £1,754k from 2016/17. £901k of this increase represents the retained growth arising from the new developments in the borough and is available to support local services. The remaining £853k represents the 2.0% uplift in business rates, the proceeds of which are retained by central government through a topslice on the Council's Revenue Support Grant.

As noted above, net revenues available to support local services remains unchanged from the draft budget approved by Cabinet on 15 December 2016, although gross rates collectible from local businesses will be lower due to introduction of the new rating list. The Council will be reimbursed for this loss of income through a reduction in the tariff payable to DCLG.

Financial Implications

The forecasts outlined in this report for both Council Tax and NNDR revenues in 2017/18 were included within the draft budget published for public consultation in December 2016. Income collected during 2017/18 will be closely monitored and any variation from the projections outlined above captured through future refreshes of the Medium Term Financial Forecast process.

Legal Implications

The Borough Solicitor reports that the legal implications are contained in the body of the report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

Calculation of the Council Tax Base 2017/18

Appendix A

CALCULATION OF 'H' (The number of chargeable dwellings on valuation list)	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Number of properties in the valuation list as at 28.11.16	969	5,928	23,975	45,555	18,450	9,804	5,025	451	110,157
Exempt Properties	(57)	(274)	(541)	(906)	(474)	(283)	(447)	(7)	(2,989)
Properties re Disabled Persons relief - Drop a Band	0	(5)	(52)	(220)	(136)	(86)	(39)	(22)	(560)
Properties re Disabled Persons relief - Drop a Band	5	52	220	136	86	39	22	0	560
Value of 'H'	917	5,701	23,602	44,565	17,926	9,474	4,561	422	107,168
CALCULATION OF 'Q' (the value of discounts allowed)									
Equivalent number of properties entitled to single occupancy discount/ Disregard (i.e. actual number x 25%)	(117)	(842)	(2,540)	(2,579)	(960)	(450)	(152)	(6)	(7,646)
Equivalent number of properties entitled to 50% discount as all residents disregarded (i.e. actual number x 50%)	(1)	(6)	(10)	(6)	(8)	(7)	(12)	(5)	(55)
Empty Property Discount	(3)	(32)	(94)	(71)	(27)	(6)	(6)	0	(239)
Value of 'Q'	(121)	(880)	(2,644)	(2,656)	(995)	(463)	(170)	(11)	(7,940)
CALCULATION of 'E' (Any premiums payable on empty properties)									
Calculation of Premiums applicable	2	4	11	13	6	5	3	2	46
Value of 'E'	2	4	11	13	6	5	3	2	46
CALCULATION OF 'J' (Expected adjustments to number of properties on valuation list)									
New properties added to valuation list since 01/12/16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Properties completed but not yet shown on valuation list	30	48	37	17	5	21	6	7	171
Properties known to be on valuation list but to be taken out of list as demolished	0	(5)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	0	(17)
Assumed increase in no of properties over year	0	20	981	337	54	17	0	0	1,409
Estimated in year changes to discounts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated in year changes to exemptions	0	(9)	(16)	(23)	(10)	(5)	(7)	0	(70)
Value of J	30	54	1,000	328	45	32	(3)	7	1,493

Calculation of the Council Tax Base 2017/18

Appendix A

CALCULATION OF 'H' (The number of chargeable dwellings on valuation list)	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Value of (H+Q+E+J)	828	4,879	21,970	42,250	16,982	9,048	4,391	420	100,768

Calculation of the Council Tax Base 2017/18

Appendix A

CALCULATION OF 'H' (The number of chargeable dwellings on valuation list)	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Value of (H+Q+E+J)	828	4,879	21,970	42,250	16,982	9,048	4,391	420	100,768
CALCULATION of 'Z' (Band adjustment due to Council Tax Reduction (CTR) Scheme)									
Equivalent Band reduction based upon estimated monetary values of Council Tax Support Grant	(178)	(1,222)	(3,693)	(4,475)	(900)	(213)	(48)	(4)	(10,733)
Estimated in year changes	5	29	76	83	14	3	1	0	211
Value of 'Z'	(173)	(1,193)	(3,617)	(4,392)	(886)	(210)	(47)	(4)	(10,522)
Value of H+Q+E+J-Z	655	3,686	18,353	37,858	16,096	8,838	4,344	416	90,246
Convert to band D equivalent properties (F/G) where G = 9 and F = number shown in column.	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18	
Band D Equivalent properties by Band	437	2,867	16,313	37,858	19,673	12,766	7,240	832	97,986
Value of ((H+Q+E+J)-Z)*(F/G)									
Collection rate allowance 2017/18	98.5%								(1,470)
Estimated Collectable Band D Properties									96,516
Ministry of Defence properties									704
COUNCIL TAX BASE 2017/18									97,220

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH AND WELLBEING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

MOTIONS

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR SWEETING

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

9.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DUNCAN

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

9.3 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

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

9.4 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR EAST

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

This page is intentionally left blank