



HILLINGDON
LONDON

A

Council

To: all Members of the Council

Date: THURSDAY, 13
SEPTEMBER 2018

Time: 7.30 PM

Venue: COUNCIL CHAMBER -
CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH
STREET, UXBRIDGE

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

Published: Wednesday, 5 September
2018

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,
Phase II, 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 Rabbi Aaron Goldstein

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Minutes 1 - 10
To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2018 (*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 11 - 12
To take questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.
- 6 Report of the Head of Democratic Services 13 - 16
- 7 Local Development Scheme 17 - 32
To consider the recommendation of Cabinet regarding the adoption of a revised scheme.
- 8 Members' Questions 33 - 34
To take questions submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11
- 9 Motions 35 - 36
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

5 July 2018

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

Councillor John Morgan (Mayor)
Councillor David Yarrow (Deputy Mayor)

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <p>Councillors: Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Janet Duncan Carol Melvin Lynne Allen Tony Eginton Ali Milani Simon Arnold Scott Farley Douglas Mills Teji Barnes Duncan Flynn Richard Mills Jonathan Bianco Neil Fyfe Peter Money Mohinder Birah Janet Gardner John Morse Lindsay Bliss Martin Goddard June Nelson Wayne Bridges Raymond Graham Susan O'Brien Nicola Brightman Becky Haggar John Oswell Keith Burrows John Hensley Jane Palmer Roy Chamdal Henry Higgins Kerri Prince Alan Chapman Vanessa Hurhangee Ray Puddifoot MBE Farhad Choubedar Patricia Jackson Devi Radia Judith Cooper Allan Kauffman Paula Rodrigues Philip Corthorne Kuldeep Lakhmana Robin Sansarpuri Peter Curling Eddie Lavery David Simmonds CBE Nick Denys Richard Lewis Jagjit Singh Alan Deville Heena Makwana Brian Stead Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Jan Sweeting Jas Dhot Stuart Mathers Steve Tuckwell</p> |
| | <p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Fran Beasley, Paul Whaymand, Raj Alagh, Lloyd White, Morgan Einon and Beth Rainey</p> |
| | <p>The Mayor announced the death of Arthur Preston on 4 May 2018. Those present observed a one minute silence.</p> |
| 13. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Edwards, Scott Seaman-Digby and John Riley.</p> |
| 14. | <p>MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 10 May required amendment to correctly list Councillor Eginton as the seconder for the Labour Group's amendment to the motion on the review of the Council's Constitution.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 22 February, 12 April and 10 May 2018 be approved as a correct record, subject to the amendment set</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>out above.</p> |
| 15. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 16. | <p>MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Mayor announced that, two months into his mayoralty, he and the Deputy Mayor had attended over 100 events, including 22 street parties celebrating the royal wedding.</p> <p>The Mayor's Charitable Trust 2018/19 had been launched in the previous week. The Mayor thanked everyone who had helped make it a success.</p> |
| 17. | <p>REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>i) Urgent Implementation of Decisions</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Urgent Implementation of Decisions be noted.</p> <p>ii) Audit Committee Annual Report</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Audit Committee Annual Report be noted.</p> <p>iii) Health And Wellbeing Board Membership</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 Ms Lynn Hill, Chair of Healthwatch Hillingdon, be named as the statutory voting member for Healthwatch Hillingdon on the Health and Wellbeing Board.</p> <p>iv) Review of Constitution – Petition Scheme</p> <p>Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. Following debate (Councillor Eginton), it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the amended Hillingdon Council Petition Scheme, set out in Appendix B be approved.</p> <p>v) Local Government Boundary Commission - Review of Electoral Arrangements</p> <p>Councillor Puddifoot moved, and Councillor Simmonds seconded, the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. Following debate, (Councillor Curling), the motion was put to a recorded vote:</p> <p>Those voting for: The Mayor (Councillor Morgan), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Yarrow), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Arnold, Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Brightman, Burrows, Chamdal, Chapman, Choubedar, Cooper, Corthorne, Denys, Deville, Flynn, Fyfe, Goddard, Graham, Haggar, Hensley, Higgins, Hurhangee, Jackson, Kauffman, Lavery, Lewis, Makwana, Markham, Melvin, D Mills, R Mills, O'Brien, Palmer,</p> |

Puddifoot, Radia, Rodrigues, Simmonds, Stead and Tuckwell.

Those voting against: Councillors Allen, Birah, Bliss, Curling, Dhillon, Dhot, Duncan, Eginton, Farley, Gardner, Lakhmana, Mathers, Milani, Money, Morse, Nelson, Oswald, Prince, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was carried, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the draft submission, attached as Appendix C to the report, be approved for submission to the LGBCE and the Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to make any minor amendments prior to submission by the end of July 2018.

18. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (*Agenda Item 6*)

6.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ARNOLD TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

Would the Leader of the Council please provide an update on the Government proposal to expand Heathrow Airport?

Councillor Puddifoot thanked Councillor Arnold for his question on what was a very important issue for the Borough. The effect of an expanded Heathrow on the health and wellbeing of Hillingdon people and its environment was, and remained, a major concern to the administration.

Councillor Puddifoot reiterated that, regardless of the colour of central Government, if that Government proposed something that was felt to harm Hillingdon's people, the administration would fight hard against it. Whether it was a Conservative Government looking at business and shareholder interests or a Labour Government directed by trade unions, it would make no difference, and he urged Hillingdon's Conservative and Labour Groups to work together, against what was a common enemy.

For the benefit of new Members, Councillor Puddifoot briefly summarised the history of the proposed Heathrow expansion, which, most recently, had seen the Davies Commission, having rejected the option for a four runway Thames Estuary Airport, put forward their options: a third runway at Heathrow, the lengthening an existing runway at Heathrow, and a second runway at Gatwick.

In September 2016 Hillingdon Council passed a motion requesting that the Government choose the Gatwick option. However, the Government chose to proceed with the third runway option which, after some delay, resulted in the vote on a National Policy Statement on 25th June.

Hillingdon's Constitution made it clear that Councillor Puddifoot was responsible as Leader for making all necessary decisions in pursuit of the Council policy on Heathrow expansion, and in the week before the expansion vote Councillor Puddifoot spoke to both Boris Johnson MP and Nick Hurd MP regarding their position as Government Ministers and the parliamentary protocol that, with a three line whip, they must vote with the Government. Mr Johnson had asked Councillor Puddifoot if he thought that he should resign as Foreign Secretary and Councillor Puddifoot advised him that this would be the worst course of action for both his constituents, and the country, that he could take.

Councillor Puddifoot referred to his statement in the previous week that confirmed that "Boris Johnson has been and remains a tremendous asset to Hillingdon in many ways, but particularly in helping us, in the past, and going forward, in defeating the Heathrow Expansion proposal. This will be a long fight and it is about winning the war, not making a pointless gesture at the first sign of conflict".

With Mr Hurd, the same rationale applied; why, when there were concerns about policing, from personnel to infrastructure, would he best serve his constituents by such a pointless gesture.

Whilst it was predicted that the Government would win the vote, the majority of 296 was larger than anticipated due to a large number of Labour MPs following the Len McCluskey Union directive to support expansion.

On the day after the vote and again on Tuesday, Hillingdon's legal team had met to discuss their course of action regarding the bringing of a Judicial Review in the High Court. There was a six week window to do so, and the aim was to issue proceedings by Friday 3rd August. The parties to the challenge were to be Hillingdon, Wandsworth, Richmond, Windsor and Maidenhead, Hammersmith & Fulham, Greenpeace, TfL, The Mayor of London and possibly one or two more.

A Pre-action Protocol Letter was to be issued in the coming week, followed by Hillingdon's formal request for a Judicial Review, and it was anticipated that a Hearing would take place in October.

There were numerous grounds for challenging the Government policies and a number of these, including air quality, were to be taken forward. Hillingdon had a second option for a Judicial Review when the Development Consent Order was to be issued next year, should that be considered necessary, and a number of challenge grounds were to be held in reserve for that purpose.

Councillor Puddifoot concluded by confirming that Hillingdon had a long battle through the High Court ahead, in order to protect Hillingdon residents and their environment. Councillor Puddifoot reiterated the need to concentrate on turning Hillingdon's political groups' fire on the common enemy. Any attempt to divide those who opposed expansion would be political stupidity.

In such an instance, clear and unambiguous leadership was required, and that is what the Conservative Administration in Hillingdon had, and would, continue to deliver.

There was no supplementary question.

6.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMDAL TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS:

Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on the outcome of the recent full Ofsted inspection of Children's Services in Hillingdon?

Councillor Simmonds confirmed that the Ofsted inspection had taken place during the time when the elected Members were very busy due to the election, and for that reason it may have passed a little bit under the radar for many. A full Ofsted inspection was the opportunity for the regulator of children's social care in England to take a very detailed look at the workings of what the Council did to protect and

support the most vulnerable of its younger residents.

The Inspectors' report available for reading on the Ofsted website and one of the key findings was that, as a Borough, "a child-centred approach is woven into strategic and operational decision-making" which was a tribute to the Council's Chief Executive and other senior managers.

Regarding the frontline practice, which was the major focus of the inspection, the report had indicated that there was a need for some improvement, and Members were reminded that at the most recent Cabinet meeting, a new contract had been approved with a view to improving on two of the areas: quality of return to home interviews, and advocacy for children who were in the care system.

Inspectors had highlighted domestic abuse, and found that children assessed to be at risk received effective interventions to safeguard their health, and for those children who might be at risk of sexual exploitation, Hillingdon was taking effective action to reduce risks to children who were considered highly vulnerable and at risk of child exploitation.

Regarding those children who were in the care system, the inspectors had found that the plans drawn up by Council staff for children in need of health and protection were of a significant strength and quality. A pleasing finding from the inspection was that Hillingdon social workers knew the children very well and genuinely cared for them. The inspectors went on to find that the children's physical, emotional and mental health and wellbeing were given a high priority by staff and senior leaders, and when it came to the engagement the Council had with the children and young people, they noted, in particular, that processes were in place to "ensure that their concerns and views are heard directly by decision-makers."

While the report was not perfect and there remained issues that continued to be identified, a theme that ran through it was that the Council had a body of staff who cared very deeply about the children and young people that they were there to support, and they did it in a way that was extremely professional. A further theme that ran through the report was that of the impact that leaders and staff within the organisation had on the outcomes for Hillingdon's children and young people, which was an area of the inspection that was graded 'outstanding', the highest possible grade that Ofsted could allocate.

The overall grade of the inspection was 'good' and it was encouraging for Hillingdon that, given that the last inspection outcome in 2013, that the inspectors had noticed the dramatic improvement that had taken place since then.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Chamdal asked:

Could the Cabinet Member inform Councillors of the Terms of Reference of the Ofsted inspection?

Councillor Simmonds confirmed that the practice of Ofsted, and the way that they undertake inspections, had varied over the years. The recent inspection that had taken place involved more than a dozen inspectors, who were part of the inspection process for a period of more than a month in total. Inspectors began off-site by looking at all the data and the information that they could glean about the Council, then commenced with an interview with the Lead Inspector, the Cabinet Member, and the Council's Chief Executive.

The inspection team then arrived, and spent a considerable amount of time with social work staff, including some of the most junior social work staff. Clearly this had been a huge burden for people to experience but one of the big positives was that, again, the inspectors noted the enthusiasm and commitment of the social workers that they had met.

Councillor Simmonds concluded by encouraging Members to take the opportunity to meet some of the Children's Social Work staff and to talk to them about what is involved in their day to day job.

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

Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that the Council's offer to buy Uxbridge Police station, so that it can remain operational, was well received by local residents, and can he update us on the response to our letter sent to MOPAC?

Councillor Douglas Mills confirmed that, yes, there was no doubt that local residents were pleased with the Council's offer to purchase Uxbridge Police Station. It was clear that, from the moment that MOPAC had undertaken a consultation process, across the Borough many residents had not understood the logic of that decision, and more importantly had not agreed with that decision, and therefore welcomed the Council's offer to purchase Uxbridge Police Station as soon as MOPAC were willing to sign the contract.

Many residents across the Borough had raised their concerns about what was happening, and were surprised when they found out that Hillingdon's Labour Group had voted against the proposal to purchase Uxbridge Police Station.

With regard to the response, a holding response from MOPAC had been received on the preceding day. MOPAC had stated that they needed more time to consider the property issues, the financial issues, and the operational issues inherent to the offer. This was surprising as the offer to purchase had been quite straightforward, and Members were reminded that the only reason for the proposed closure of the station was because the Mayor of London had stated that there was no money available because the government hadn't given them any. However, this administration had been willing to give them the funding since November.

Operationally, the police station was still going to be run as a station for three years, and it didn't take much effort to put a front counter back on in order to help reassure the public. It was clear that MOPAC, and the Labour Group, did not understand the symbolism of the police presence in what was a major town centre in this Borough.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Goddard asked:

Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that the only plausible reason why we've not had a response to our offer of any substance is because the Mayor of London wants to have his cake and eat it too: he wants the cash from selling Uxbridge Police Station but he also wants to score a political point by saying that the Conservative government has been responsible for depriving residents of adequate policing?

Councillor Mills confirmed that the Mayor was in a difficult position, having made a very public statement that the sole reason to close police stations across London was because he didn't have enough money, and yet there was an offer of five million

pounds sitting on the table ready for him to use to support direct policing 24/7.

The offer would enable Hillingdon residents to feel the comfort of having a police station and police officers on the street, working for them. It was probable that the reason as to why they had not been able to come back and admit that they had made a mistake was because the Mayor of London had politically painted himself into a corner. However, there was now realisation across the whole of the Met' that their proposals to close a number of police stations were causing immense problems.

This administration remained committed to providing the public with what it needed – a police station in Uxbridge.

19. **MOTIONS** (*Agenda Item 7*)

7.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PRINCE

Councillor Prince moved, and Councillor Milani seconded, the following motion:

That Council recognises the positive record of championing older residents in this Borough, and celebrates the positive effect of older person engagement and support that they receive here in Hillingdon.

Council acknowledges that young people in Hillingdon face increasingly difficult challenges, and that they require specific and dedicated attention to address them.

Council, therefore calls upon the Leader to recommend the appointment of a Youth Champion which will be a role held by a sitting Hillingdon Councillor and would be the lead on exploring opportunities to increase engagement between the Council and young people in the Borough, and would be responsible for championing young people's issues here in Hillingdon.

Following debate, (Councillors Dhillon and Sweeting), Councillor Simmonds moved, and Councillor Puddifoot seconded, an amendment to the motion as follows:

Insert at the end of the first paragraph: *"and regrets that the Hillingdon Labour Group voted against the 2018/19 budget proposals providing the necessary funding to enable this to continue"*.

Insert at the end of the second paragraph: *"and again finds it disappointing that the Labour Group were unable to support the funding proposals to continue the services provided for our younger residents"*.

In the final paragraph after the words *"appoint a Youth Champion"* insert: *"when and if he feels it appropriate and necessary"* and at the end of the final paragraph insert: *"regardless of the lack of budgetary support from the Hillingdon Labour Group"*.

The motion then to read:

That Council recognises the positive record of championing older residents in this Borough, and celebrates the positive effect of older person engagement and support that they receive here in Hillingdon and regrets that the Hillingdon Labour Group voted against the 2018/19 budget proposals providing the necessary funding to enable this to continue.

Council acknowledges that young people in Hillingdon face increasingly difficult challenges and that they require specific and dedicated attention to address them and again finds it disappointing that the Labour Group were unable to support the funding proposals to continue the services provided for our younger residents.

Council, therefore calls upon the Leader to recommend the appointment of a Youth Champion, when and if he feels it appropriate and necessary, which will be a role held by a sitting Hillingdon Councillor and would be the lead on exploring opportunities to increase engagement between the Council and young people in the Borough, and would be responsible for championing young people's issues here in Hillingdon regardless of the lack of budgetary support from the Hillingdon Labour Group.

Following debate (Councillors Allen, Dhillon, Eginton, Hensley, Mathers, Nelson, Prince and Sweeting), the amended motion was put to a vote and carried.

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

RESOLVED: That Council recognises the positive record of championing older residents in this Borough, and celebrates the positive effect of older person engagement and support that they receive here in Hillingdon, and regrets that the Hillingdon Labour Group voted against the 2018/19 budget proposals providing the necessary funding to enable this to continue.

Council acknowledges that young people in Hillingdon face increasingly difficult challenges, and that they require specific and dedicated attention to address them and again finds it disappointing that the Labour Group were unable to support the funding proposals to continue the services provided for our younger residents.

Council, therefore calls upon the Leader to recommend the appointment of a Youth Champion, when and if he feels it appropriate and necessary, which will be a role held by a sitting Hillingdon Councillor and would be the lead on exploring opportunities to increase engagement between the Council and young people in the Borough, and would be responsible for championing young people's issues here in Hillingdon regardless of the lack of budgetary support from the Hillingdon Labour Group.

7.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ALLEN

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

That this Council notes that, quite rightly, much is talked of anti-social behaviour, the owners of Heathrow Airport's proposal for a 3rd runway, about the fumes residents breath in from tarmac companies in Townfield, hot wheel cars taking over local carparks and of residents causing problems for their neighbours.

The issues, however, that we never hear, here in the Council Chamber is the other type of ASB - the lack of proper street cleaning, the lack of proper maintenance of shrubbery or the removal of weeds in a timely manner to stop them seeding.

This Council calls upon Environmental Services to investigate what actions

they can take regarding the areas for which they are responsible, to bring the weeds under control and to improve our environment and make the residents proud to say they live in Hillingdon.

Following debate (Councillors Bianco, Corthorne, Curling, Money and Nelson) the motion was put to a vote, and lost.

7.3 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DHILLON

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

That this Council is concerned with increased anti-social behaviour associated with car street racing and their meets, and requests Cabinet to address this issue immediately to prevent further danger and ASB to residents and investigate ways, with other agencies such as the police, to help prevent future events on other venues.

Following debate, (Councillor Allen), Councillor D. Mills moved, and Councillor Palmer seconded, an amendment to the motion as follows:

Delete all wording after “...and their meets, and...”

And insert the following:

“asks the Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration to escalate concerns regarding incidents of Anti Social Behaviour that are at risk of becoming public order issues to the new BCU Chief Superintendent and that the Chief Executive writes to Sophie Linden, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime in London, to confirm clear guidance is in place for Basic Command Units to respond to such public order occurrences.”

The motion then to read:

That this Council is concerned with increased anti-social behaviour associated with car street racing and their meets, and asks the Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration to escalate concerns regarding incidents of Anti Social Behaviour that are at risk of becoming public order issues to the new BCU Chief Superintendent and that the Chief Executive writes to Sophie Linden, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime in London, to confirm clear guidance is in place for Basic Command Units to respond to such public order occurrences.

Following debate on the amendment (Councillors Allen, Curling, Dhillon, Morse, Nelson and Palmer), the amended motion was put to a vote and carried.

The substantive motion was then put to a vote, and it was:

RESOLVED: That this Council is concerned with increased anti-social behaviour associated with car street racing and their meets, and asks the Cabinet Member for Community, Commerce and Regeneration to escalate concerns regarding incidents of Anti Social Behaviour that are at risk of becoming public order issues to the new BCU Chief Superintendent and that the Chief Executive writes to Sophie Linden, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime in London, to confirm clear guidance is in place for Basic Command Units to respond to such public order occurrences.

7.4 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

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

That this Council recognises the value that the RAFA Battle of Britain Club provides to the local community and its historic significance in both its building and its location. With the redevelopment of the RAF base, including the new bunker museum and visitor centre, Council recognises that the Battle of Britain Club's profitability has a very good chance of improving substantially over the next few years. Its continued presence would also add to the proud heritage of the St Andrews Park estate.

Council further expresses its disappointment that this club is destined to close within the next few days. Council requests that the Leader of the Council uses his good offices to intervene and do everything in his power to persuade the Royal Air Force Association to hold off their closure plans and then enable the Council and community groups to work with the Battle of Britain Club on initiatives to secure the club's future.

Following debate (Councillors Allen and Puddifoot), the motion was put to a vote, and lost.

7.5 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MONEY

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

That this Council notes that it conducted a local referendum in which 66%, of those who took part, opposed Heathrow Expansion. This Council, therefore, expresses its disappointment that Boris Johnson MP and Nick Hurd MP didn't stand by their election pledges to put our residents first, and vote against a 3rd Runway at Heathrow.

That this Council calls upon the Leader of the Council to use his influence to persuade Boris Johnson MP and Nick Hurd MP to consider their positions, do the honourable thing and resign, to make way for MPs who will put our residents before their own self-interest.

Following debate (Councillors Allen, Curling, Denys, Dhillon, Milani, Morse, Puddifoot, and Sansarpuri), the motion was put to a vote, and lost.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.20 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 MS ANITA MACDONALD OF JACKS LANE, HAREFIELD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES - COUNCILLOR BIANCO:

Could the Council tell us how much council tax payers' money was wasted on car window replacements in the past year, and the average pay-outs for the last four years?

Supporting information:

After a recent window breakage by a careless speeding grass cutter, I was informed by the driver that it happened 'all the time'. I was then given a number to call at the Council to have my car window replaced.

5.2 QUESTION FROM MR MOHAMMED ISLAM OF LAVENDER RISE, WEST DRAYTON TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

Following the offensive remarks made by Boris Johnson concerning the wearing of the burka / hijab we ask Hillingdon Council to represent the deep concerns of the Muslim population in the borough. Will the Council, therefore, publicly condemn Boris Johnson for his ignorant, insulting and unacceptable language towards Muslim women in particular and the Muslim community in general?

5.3 QUESTION FROM MR CHRIS WATERS OF FERRERS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS:

Could the Council please clarify why it is advising that we have a lack of open/recreational space in Yiewsley and lack of open space in West Drayton then allowing numerous developments in these wards, more so, the plan to allow a development on current open space, which it is keeping confidential?

Supporting information:

In the Council's response to the Heathrow Expansion NPS dated 25th May 2017 - "LHB's open space strategy acknowledges: There is an insufficient quantity of accessible open space serving Yiewsley District Centre. Yiewsley Ward requires a further 40 hectares of open space to meet the overall quantity standard of which 12 hectares should be "recreational" open space to meet the recreational open space standard. In West Drayton Ward there is a shortfall of a similar magnitude for all open space, although there is sufficient "recreational" open space". A similar statement has been said about West Drayton except that it has sufficient "recreational" open space.

Then, in the Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's review 2018, it shows the developments taking place in the Borough over the period 2017/2018 - 2023/2014. This includes a development of 72 units in 2021 noted as "Potential Scheme - Subject to confidential negotiations" which many people are

aware is the Yiewsley Library / Bowls Green / Ex Swimming Pool location. This has been raised on various forums and neither the Council or local Councillors have said otherwise (and I'm aware that a local Yiewsley Councillor is active on the local community Facebook pages where this is all posted).

Now there seems to be some contradiction in the statements - on one hand, the Council is stating that is a lack of open space in Yiewsley and on the other hand, it's planning to allow a scheme for 72 units to be built on open space. Then one just has to look at all the major developments that have been allowed in these two wards over the past years - over 2000 units and still more in the pipeline.

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 |
|------------------|--|--|
| 22/06/2018 | Housing Revenue Account Major Adaptations to Property 2018/19 - Release No 5 - works to properties to assist disabled residents. | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services |
| 29/06/2018 | Housing Revenue Account Works to Stock 2018/19: Replacement Of Communal Boilers At Barden Court, Harefield And Associated Capital Release | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services |
| 29/06/2018 | Housing Revenue Account Major Adaptations to Property 2018/19 Release No 6 - works to properties to assist disabled residents. | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services |
| 11/07/2018 | Highways Programme 2018/19 - Release No 1 – upgrades to various roads across the Borough | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services |
| 18/07/2018 | University Bursary Policy – approving the operation of a new scheme offering Hillingdon residents a bursary to pay for the first years' university tuition fees of their undergraduate course. | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Education & Children's Services |
| 24/07/2018 | Upgrade of CCTV Systems in Town Centres and Associated Capital Release – control room and new digital camera upgrades to protect various towns and villages across the Borough | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Members for Community, Commerce & Regeneration and Finance, Property & Business Services |

| Date of Decision | Decision Type / Nature of Decision | Decision-Maker |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| 01/08/2018 | Charging Schedule for Civil Penalties – agreement to consult on new fines to protect tenants from rogue landlords. | Leader or the Council |
| 17/08/2018 | Guru Nanak Sikh College, Springfield Road, Hayes – approve of new lease arrangements for the playing fields. | Leader or the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services |
| 21/08/2018 | Hillingdon Christmas Lights Programme 2018-2019 – grant awards and a new contract to deliver lights across the Borough from 2018 onwards. | Leader or the Council |

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Decision Notices

(ii) LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Members will recall that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is undertaking a review of the London Borough of Hillingdon's local government electoral arrangements. The outcome of the review will be implemented for the May 2022 Council elections.
- 1.2 The purpose of an electoral review is to consider the:
- number of Councillors elected to the Council,
 - number & names of wards,
 - ward boundaries and
 - number of Councillors per ward.
- 1.3 At the meeting of Full Council in July 2018 Council approved the content of a submission to the Commission regarding the proposed size of the Council (number of Councillors) from 2022 onwards. The purpose of this report is to update Members with progress of the review and to outline the next stage.

RECOMMENDATIONS: That

- a) **it be noted that the LGBCE has recommended that, w.e.f May 2022, the Council size will be 53 Members.**
- b) **the Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to submit proposals for consideration to the LGBCE by 5 November 2018 for the composition, size and name of wards for the London Borough of Hillingdon from May 2022 onwards.**

2. Background

- 2.1 Periodically the LGBCE will conduct a review of all local authority electoral arrangements using the following statutory criteria:-

- The need to secure electoral equality (a consistent number of electors per Councillor)
 - Community identity (strong ward boundaries that reflect communities); and
 - Securing effective and convenient local government (coherent wards)
- 2.2 The current LBH electoral arrangements were established after the previous review in 1999 and resulted in 22 wards and 65 Councillors.
- 2.3 The preliminary stage of the current review, just concluded, has resulted in a recommended future Council size; i.e. the number of elected Councillors as being 53; a reduction of 12 from the current size.
- 2.4 This will result in an average of 4,294 electors per elected Member (currently 3,096) based on a projected electorate in 2024 of 227,620, as detailed in the Council submission – an increase of approximately 13% over the current figure.
- 2.5 The recommendation regarding the number of Councillors now informs the next stage of the review which is a 10 week period of public consultation during which the Commission will invite submissions from all interested parties within the Borough for the structure of the LBH electoral wards i.e. the size and number of wards, ward names, ward boundaries and the number of councillors to represent each ward.
- 2.6 The public consultation programme, co-ordinated by the Commission, has commenced and aims to reach out to all interested persons (individuals / organisations / residents associations / public bodies / schools / political parties / charities etc.) and invite their suggestions for the future make-up of wards in the Borough.
- 2.7 As a part of that consultation the Council is entitled to submit proposals for the warding patterns. Unfortunately, the deadline for such a submission (5 November) falls before the next Council meeting (22 November) and it is, therefore, proposed, that the Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to make a submission by the deadline of 5 November and to report details of the submission to the Council meeting on 22 November.
- 2.8 The submission will be required to follow the criteria as set out in 2.1 (above) and produce wards with, as near as possible, an electoral equality of 4,294 electors per Councillor.
- 2.9 In January 2019 the Commission will then produce a first set of draft proposals based on the submissions received and a second period of consultation will commence until 18 March 2019.
- 2.10 A final decision will then be expected in May 2019 for implementation at the Council elections in May 2022.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. The decision of the LGBCE to reduce the number of elected Members to 53 will result in financial implications in 2022. The scale of these implications will not be quantified fully until the completion of the Stage Two part of the review process.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 sets out the duty placed on the LGBCE to undertake an electoral review of every principal local authority in England 'from time to time'. Decisions regarding electoral arrangements in the Borough are reserved to Full Council.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Reporting Officer: Head of Democratic Services

SUMMARY

Cabinet on 26 July 2018 resolved to recommend to Council the adoption of a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) for the Council, which sets out timescales for the production of forthcoming Local Plan documents. The Cabinet report is attached as an appendix.

RECOMMENDATION: That the revised Local Development Scheme be adopted with effect from 14 September 2018.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The LDS is a project plan for the production of the Local Plan and other planning policy documents. It sets out the documents that the Council intends to produce and the timescale for their production. In order to be considered legally compliant in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council's Local Plan documents should be in general conformity with the LDS. This means that they should be listed in the LDS and prepared in accordance with the timescales set out in the document.

The Council's current Local Development Scheme (LDS) was published in January 2016 and is considered to be out of date. Under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) the Council is required to publish an up to date LDS setting out the timetable for the production of Local Plan documents. In the absence of evidence that the necessary steps are being taken to prepare an up to date version, there is a risk that the Local Plan Part 2, will not be found to be 'legally compliant' at examination. This could result in a suspension of the examination process and a delay in the adoption of the Plan.

Financial Implications

The cost of preparing the Local Development Scheme will be contained within existing revenue budgets.

Legal Implications

The Council is required to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS) in accordance with the requirements of section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires the LDS to be revised at such times as the Local Planning Authority considers appropriate.

Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires Development Plan Documents to be prepared in accordance with the LDS. As such it is vital that the LDS is updated to ensure the Council's Local Plan can be found legally compliant in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and relevant supporting legislation.

Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires a resolution of the Council, which must specify the date from which the LDS is to have effect.

Background Papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE TO HILLINGDON'S LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Cabinet Member(s) | Councillor Keith Burrows |
| Cabinet Portfolio(s) | Planning, Transportation and Recycling |
| Officer Contact(s) | James Gleave: Residents Services |
| Papers with report | Appendix 1: London Borough of Hillingdon Local Development Scheme: June 2018 |

HEADLINES

| | |
|---|--|
| Summary | This report seeks approval for a revision to the Council's Local Development Scheme which sets out timescales for the production of forthcoming Local Plan documents. |
| Putting our Residents First | The Local Development Scheme is a statutory document that sets out the timetable for the production of future Local Plan documents. As such, it will assist in delivering the objectives of the Sustainable Community Strategy and its objectives, including maintaining the borough's local heritage and ensuring that the natural environment is protected and enhanced. It will also contribute to delivering key plans and strategies, in particular the Transport Strategy, Economic Development Strategy and Housing Strategy. |
| Financial Cost | The cost of preparing the Local Development Scheme can be met from the existing revenue budget for 2018/19. |
| Relevant Policy Overview Committee | Residents, Education and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee. |
| Relevant Ward(s) | All |

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet:

- 1. Endorses and recommends that the Local Development Scheme is referred to Full Council in September 2018 for adoption.**
- 2. Grants delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services to agree, in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling, any editing and textual changes to the Local Development Scheme prior to submission to Council.**

Reasons for recommendation

The Council's current Local Development Scheme (LDS) was published in January 2016 and is considered to be out of date. Under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) the Council is required to publish an up to date LDS setting out the timetable for the production of Local Plan documents. In the absence of evidence that the necessary steps are being taken to prepare an up to date version, there is a risk that the Local Plan Part 2, will not be found to be 'legally compliant' at examination. This could result in a suspension of the examination process and a delay in the adoption of the Plan.

Legal advice confirms that the decision for the LDS to take effect must be taken by Full Council. As such, Cabinet is asked to recommend that the document be referred to the next meeting of the Full Council in September 2018.

Alternative options considered / risk management

Cabinet may decline to recommend that the updated LDS at Appendix 1 is referred to Full Council. This option could result in the legal compliance of the Local Plan Part 2 being challenged and a delay in its adoption.

A further option would be to instruct officers to make amendments to the LDS, before it is referred to Full Council. Depending on the nature of the changes this option could delay the publication of the LDS and affect the examination process for the Local Plan Part 2.

Policy Overview Committee comments

Relevant Policy Overview Committees have previously be consulted on key aspects in developing the Local Plan.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

1. The Local Development Scheme (LDS) is a project plan for the production of the Local Plan and other planning policy documents. It sets out the documents that the Council intends to produce and the timescale for their production. In order to be considered legally compliant in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council's Local Plan documents should be in general conformity with the LDS. This means they should be listed in the LDS and prepared in accordance with the timescales set out in the document.

2. The current LDS was prepared in 2016 and whilst the Local Plan Part 2 documents approved by Cabinet for Public Consultation on 24th September 2015 are listed, the timescales for document production are now out of date. A new, up to date LDS is therefore required to ensure the Local Plan is found to be legally compliant with the necessary regulations at Examination.

Content of the Local Development Scheme

3. The proposed LDS is attached at Appendix 1 of this report. Table A below summarises the documents and timescales that are identified in the document.

Table A: Timescale for Key Documents identified in the Local Development Scheme

| Document | Proposed timescale for: | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| | Submission | Examination | Adoption |
| Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Policies Map Atlas of Changes. | May 2018 | July 2018 - March 2019 | April -June 2019 |
| Review of the Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies | July - Sept 2020 | October 2020 - June 2021 | July - Sept 2021 |
| Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule | To be confirmed | | |

4. The following paragraphs provide further commentary on the documents identified in Table A.

Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Policies Map Atlas of Changes

5. Cabinet approved a recommendation to undertake further consultation on these documents in September 2015. The documents were submitted for examination in May 2018 and the public examination hearings have been set for August 2018. Adoption of the Local Plan Part 2 is expected in early 2019.

Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies

6. Following the Adoption of the Local Plan Part 2, officers propose to commence a review of the Local Plan Part 1 to ensure the document reflects up to date evidence and Council policy, as well as maintaining general conformity with recently proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and London Plan. The timetable for this review has been prepared to broadly mirror the production of the new London Plan and is expected to commence in the latter part of 2018.

Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule

7. The Council's current Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by the Council in April 2014. The timing of a further review of the CIL charging schedule will be considered in the light of updated viability evidence and any additional charges proposed by the Mayor of London.

West London Waste Plan

8. The West London Waste Plan was adopted in July 2015. During the examination, it was agreed to carry out an early review of the document to take account of changes to waste apportionment targets. Whilst the timetable has yet to be agreed, identifying this item allows this work to commence, subject to Cabinet approval and the agreement of the other boroughs in the West London waste planning area.

Heathrow Opportunity Area Planning Framework

9. The Heathrow Opportunity Area is identified in the London Plan as one of 38 Opportunity Areas with the capacity to accommodate 9,000 new homes and 12,000 new jobs. Revised figures are put forward in the Mayor of London's draft London Plan, published in December 2017. Whilst the boundary of the area has not yet been defined, it is described in the London Plan as covering much of the southern part of Hillingdon, Heathrow Airport and western Hounslow.

10. Paragraph 5.32 of the Local Plan Part 1 notes that the Council will work with key partners to prepare and implement a spatial planning framework for the Heathrow Opportunity Area. It is noted that further capacity testing is required by Hillingdon and Hounslow to establish what proportion of jobs and new homes in the Opportunity Area will be provided by each Borough. The details of this work will be subject to Cabinet approval, however, the LDS notes that the production of the Opportunity Area Planning Framework will likely commence in mid 2019.

Next Steps

11. Subject to Cabinet approval, the LDS will go forward to Full Council in September 2018. The document will then be made available on the Council's website.

Financial Implications

12. The cost of preparing the LDS will be contained within existing revenue budgets.

RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION

The benefit or impact upon Hillingdon residents, service users and communities?

The preparation of the LDS will ensure that the Council's Local Plan can be kept up to date and that the objectives of the Sustainable Community Strategy will continue to be met.

Consultation carried out or required

The LDS is a project plan for the production of the Council's own Local Plan and as such no consultation is required beyond the statutory internal consultees below.

CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications arising from the publication of an updated Local Development Scheme. The timescales contained within the Local Development Scheme indicate that Local Part Plan 2 is scheduled for adoption by Spring 2019.

Legal

The Council is required to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS) in accordance with the requirements of section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires the LDS to be revised at such times as the Local Planning Authority considers appropriate.

Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires Development Plan Documents to be prepared in accordance with the LDS. As such it is vital that

the LDS is updated to ensure the Council's Local Plan can be found legally compliant in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and relevant supporting legislation.

Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires a resolution of the Council, which must specify the date from which the LDS is to have effect.

Infrastructure / Asset Management

There are no Corporate Property and Construction implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Report to Cabinet - Local Plan Part 2: Draft Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Policies Map. September 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

**London Borough of
Hillingdon
Local Development Scheme**

July 2018

1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) the London Borough of Hillingdon must prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS).

1.1 Background and Purpose

This LDS was approved by the Council's Cabinet on **[date]** and takes effect from **[date]**. It will replace the previous version which was published in January 2016.

The LDS is essentially a project plan which identifies the documents to be prepared and an indicative timetable for preparation, including milestones to be achieved. It must be made publicly available and kept up-to-date. This enables the public and stakeholders to find out about planning policies in their area, the status of those policies and the details of and timescales for the production of all relevant documents.

2 THE ADOPTED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

At the time of writing the adopted Development Plan for Hillingdon consists of the following documents:

- The Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies (November 2012)
- The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies (September 2007)
- The Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map (September 1998)
- The West London Waste Plan (July 2015)¹
- The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (March 2016)²

Some of the strategic policies in the Local Plan Part 1 are supported by Supplementary Planning Documents, which provide greater detail to assist in the interpretation of the parent policy. The adopted Supplementary Planning Documents that form part of Hillingdon's planning framework are set out in Appendix 2 of this LDS.

Whilst there may be a need for the Council to revise and/or prepare Supplementary Planning Documents, they do not form part of the statutory Development Plan for Hillingdon. As such, the programme for future SPDs is not identified in this LDS.

3 EMERGING DOCUMENTS

¹ The West London Waste Plan was prepared jointly by the London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames

² The London Plan is prepared by the Mayor of London and represents the Regional Spatial Strategy for London

The Council is currently preparing the Local Plan Part 2, which comprises the following documents:

- Site Allocations and Designations
- Development Management Policies
- Policies Map Atlas of Changes

These three documents are being progressed concurrently and were subject to pre-submission consultation in late 2014 and then again in October 2015. Appendix 1 sets out the indicative timetable for the remaining stages in the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2. Once adopted, the Local Plan Part 2 will supersede and fully replace the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map (September 1998) and the Saved Policies (September 2007).

4 DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED/PREPARED

4.1 Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies

Following the publication of the latest version of the London Plan in March 2015, Hillingdon's annual average housing supply monitoring target currently stands at 559 units. A full review of the London Plan is now underway and is likely to result in further changes to strategic growth targets. The Council is therefore proposing an update to its Local Plan Part 1 which will broadly follow the timescales of the production of the new London Plan. The review is expected to commence in 2017 and will conclude with the adoption of the new Local Plan Part 1 in 2020. Further details of this timetable are contained in Appendix 1.

4.2 Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule

The Council's current Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by the Council in April 2014. The timing of a review of the CIL charging schedule will be considered in the light of updated viability evidence and any additional charges proposed by the Mayor of London.

4.3 West London Waste Plan

The West London Waste Plan was adopted in July 2015. During the examination process the West London Boroughs jointly agreed to carry out an early review to take account of changes to waste apportionment targets in the current version of the London Plan. The review is expected to commence in 2019.

4.4 Heathrow Opportunity Area Planning Framework

Opportunity Areas are London's major source of brownfield land with significant capacity for new housing, commercial and other development linked to existing or potential improvements to public transport accessibility. The London Plan 2016 identifies the Heathrow Opportunity Area as one of 38 Opportunity Areas in London and suggest it has the capacity to accommodate 9,000 homes and 12,000 jobs. The Heathrow Opportunity Area extends across the southern part of the London Borough of Hillingdon into Hounslow. The London Plan states that boroughs should develop more detailed policies for these areas.

An indicative timetable for the preparation or review of plans and planning policy documents is set out in Appendix 1.

5 MONITORING

The Local Development Scheme will be monitored and updated as necessary, in accordance with the timescales set out in Hillingdon's Authority Monitoring Report.

Appendix 1: Indicative Timetable for the Preparation of Plans and Planning Policy Documents

| Document /Plan | Nature of Plan | Plan Area | Status and forward work plan |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| Local Plan Part 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Allocations and Designations • Development Management Policies • Changes to Policies Map Atlas of Changes | Borough-wide | Submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 18 th May 2018. Documents to be progressed in accordance with the following timetable. |

| 2018 | | | | 2019 | | | | 2020 | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June |
| P | S | EP | EP | EP | A | | | | |

| | |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| P | Plan preparation and Consultation |
| S | Submission to Examination |
| EP | Examination in Public |
| A | Adoption |

| Document/ Plan | Nature of Plan | Plan Area | Status and forward work plan |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---|
| Local Plan Part 1 | Strategic Policies | Borough-wide | To be commenced in Spring 2019 and progressed in accordance with the following timetable. |

| 2018 | | | | 2019 | | | | 2020 | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June |
| | | | | | EG | EG | EG | P | P |

| 2020 | | 2021 | | | | 2022 | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec | Jan - March | April - June | July - Sept | Oct - Dec |
| P | P | S | EP | EP | EP | A | | | |

| | |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| EG | Evidence Gathering |
| P | Plan Preparation and Consultation |
| S | Submission to Examination |
| EP | Examination in Public |
| A | Adoption |

| Document/Plan | Nature of Plan | Plan Area | Status and forward work plan |
|---|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. | Sets out charging rates for different types of development to be spent on new infrastructure. | Borough-wide | To be confirmed. |

| Document/Plan | Nature of Plan | Plan Area | Status and forward work plan |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| West London Waste Plan | Joint Local Plan Document, including strategic policies and site allocations | West London, including the London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames | To be confirmed. |
| Heathrow Opportunity Planning Framework | Joint non-statutory planning framework | Heathrow Opportunity Area | Likely to commence in mid 2019. |

Appendix 2: Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

1. Planning Obligations SPD (July 2014)
2. Accessible Hillingdon SPD (September 2017)
3. RAF Uxbridge Planning Project (January 2009)
4. Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008)
5. Affordable Housing SPD (May 2006)
6. Noise SPD (May 2006)
7. Live/Work SPD (May 2006)
8. Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Shopfronts (July 2006)
9. Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: New Residential Layouts (July 2006)
10. Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Transport Interchanges (July 2006)
11. Porters Way Planning Brief SPD (December 2005)
12. Air Quality (SPD 2002)

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

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

Would the Cabinet Member for please provide an update on the proposals from the Healthy London Partnership to reduce the number of Health Based Places of Safety in North West London?

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

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm to me how the Council has fared in respect of the recent national awards of Green Flags?

This page is intentionally left blank

MOTIONS

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR NELSON

That, as we approach Black History Month, with the scandal of the treatment of our Windrush generation fresh in our minds, this Council calls on the Cabinet to reconsider their position and reintroduce the celebration of black history in this borough.

The treatment of the Windrush generation by this country has reminded us and highlighted how important it is for black history to not only be taught, but also celebrated by our communities. To recognise and celebrate black history is not to ignore other history, but rather pay tribute to black men and women who helped build our country.

Hillingdon has in the past celebrated this important time in our calendar and, in our current climate, we believe it more pertinent than ever to revitalise the spirit of diversity.

By re-introducing the annual Black History Month events, this authority will be increasing learning outcomes and demonstrating greater and current understanding of the harm racism is causing to our society.

9.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

That this Council recognises that a significant number of women in Hillingdon, born on or after 6 April 1950, have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the state pension age with lack of appropriate notification.

Many women born in the 1950's are living in hardship. Retirement plans have been shattered with devastating consequences. Many of these women are already out of the labour market, caring for elderly relatives, providing childcare for grandchildren, or suffer discrimination in the workplace so struggle to find employment. Women born in this decade are suffering financially. These women have worked hard, raised families and paid their tax and national insurance with the expectation that they would be financially secure when reaching 60.

It is also recognised that it is not the pension age itself that is in dispute - it is widely accepted that women and men should retire at the same time. The issue is that the rise in the women's state pension age has been too rapid and has happened without sufficient notice being given to the women affected, leaving women with no time to make alternative arrangements.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet to receive a report into how this issue is affecting women in Hillingdon and how best to join other Councils (of all colours) in support of the WASPI campaign and to lobby Government to reconsider transitional arrangements for women born on or after 6 April 1950, so that women do not live in hardship due to pension changes they were not told about until it was too late to make alternative arrangements.

This page is intentionally left blank