

Minutes

RESIDENTS' SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

14 June 2023



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chairman), Colleen Sullivan (Vice-Chairman), Scott Farley (Opposition Lead), Janet Gardner, Ekta Gohil, Sital Punja and Peter Smallwood</p> <p>Officers Present: Rick Connors (HS2 Project Team Leader) Joanne Howells (Service Manager - Street Scene Enforcement Team (ASBET)) Neil O'Connor (Community Engagement Project Officer) Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer) Ian Thynne (Planning Specialists Team Manager) Stephanie Waterford (Head of Public Protection & Enforcement) Helena Webster (Community Engagement & Town Centre Improvements Manager) Jill Williamson (HS2 Project Manager)</p> <p>Others Present: Martin Baughurst (SCS Project Director) Malcolm Codling (HS2 Project Client Director) James Richardson (SCS Managing Director) Kimberley Royer-Harris (HS2 Engagement Lead) Lewis Stokes (SCS Engagement Lead)</p>
3.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
4.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
5.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 12 APRIL 2023 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 12 April 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
6.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 11 MAY 2023 (AGM) (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 May 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
7.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED AS PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THOSE MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>

It was confirmed that all the items of business were marked as Part I and would be considered in public.

8. **IMPACT OF HS2 ON PARKING AND NOISE** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Ian Thynne, Planning Specialists Team Manager introduced the item and presented some drone footage of the HS2 works to the Committee Members. It was noted that overground works were taking place in South Ruislip and there was a large amount of activity at the West Ruislip portal.

In response to Members' enquiries, it was confirmed that, in terms of spoil, approximately 1.1 million cubic metres stayed on site and the remainder (approximately 100,000 cubic metres) was relocated to a local tip in Beaconsfield or to a wet facility in North Acton. The aim was to keep as much material as possible on site.

Members were informed that a conveyor belt was used to move material to site areas. The aim was to use the conveyor belt for long movements whilst lorries would be used for more local movements only. It was confirmed that lorries were not permitted to use non-prescribed HS2 routes. Third party contractors would be penalised if they did not adhere to the rules.

Representatives of HS2 / SCS confirmed that innovative methods were being explored to ensure compliance; ANPR cameras were being installed to monitor lorry movements. Repeat offenders who did not adhere to the agreed routes would be removed from the project. Members heard that it was the first time ANPR cameras had been used in this way at a construction site in the UK and they would be in operation 24 hours a day. A new driver training package was also being considered.

Members noted that the ANPR cameras were to be located to the north of the A40 and enquired how lorry movements in the south of the Borough would be monitored. It was confirmed that all lorries displayed an HS2 sign – if they were seen to be deviating from the approved routes, residents were requested to inform HS2 Ltd to enable appropriate action to be taken accordingly. The agreed lorry routes had been approved by the Council, but it was noted that there was some flexibility so HS2 could access local businesses thereby supporting the local economy and lowering its carbon footprint.

Councillors were advised that the relationship between HS2 Ltd and the London Borough of Hillingdon was good but there was always room for improvement. It was important for HS2 to work very closely with the Council and with the utilities companies to minimise the timescales of the works. Council officers also worked hard to move things along as quickly as possible. Lewis Stokes, SCS Engagement Lead, invited Councillors and officers to visit the site to gain a better understanding of the project and see for themselves the measures which were in place. It was agreed that Democratic Services would share his contact details with Members after the meeting.

At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that Ward Councillors would be informed of any incidents when companies were removed from the project due to non-compliance.

Members commented that communication was key – residents wanted to know what was going on and where to go to get further information and raise their concerns. HS2 Ltd recognised the importance of community engagement and was keen to work with

Councillors to improve this. The Committee was informed that current initiatives included leaflet distribution, a drop-in hub for residents and engagement forums. However, it was acknowledged that more could be done – future plans included additional engagement forums and better use of the website and social media platforms to engage with residents. More partnership working with community groups and regular newsletters were also planned to engage with the wider community. It was noted that a drop-in centre had been requested in Harefield and HS2 officers wished to work with the Council to discuss the best location for this.

Councillors observed that residents would welcome information about road closures. It was important for SCS / HS2 to be seen to be working closely with the local community. It was noted that it was difficult for residents to access funds for community projects as the forms were complex and difficult to complete. Members heard that HS2 staff would be happy to assist with form filling and would welcome an opportunity to work with local Councillors on community engagement projects.

In respect of parking, the Committee was advised that HS2 staff were encouraged to use public transport or travel by minibus where possible. There was sufficient parking on site – the situation was monitored, and any illegal parking could be reported to the SCS/HS2 help desk.

In response to further questioning from the Committee, it was confirmed that the emergency services (to include local hospitals) were invited to six-weekly HS2 traffic liaison group meetings. The HS2 engagement lead agreed to check that Harefield Hospital was represented at these meetings.

In terms of ANPR cameras and the data recorded, Members heard that the data was captured for HS2 lorries only – not for all traffic. This data would not be stored any longer than was necessary.

With regard to timings, Councillors were advised that HS2 works were likely to continue until 2030; however, these would ramp down significantly around 2027/2028. It was anticipated that roadworks would reduce significantly by November 2023 which would minimise disruption in the local area.

In summary it was confirmed that SCS/HS2 Ltd would try to limit the impact of the works on residents and would focus on adding social value. Councillors and community groups were invited to visit the site.

RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee noted the content of the report and sought further clarification as necessary.

9. **PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER 2023 REVIEW** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Having read the Public Spaces Protection Order report in the agenda pack, Members were invited to ask questions / seek clarification as necessary.

In response to their queries, Councillors were advised that PSPOs could be implemented for a maximum of three years. They were boroughwide and covered all public spaces.

It was confirmed that PSPOs were subject to a public consultation period to seek the views of residents. Once the final version had been agreed, PSPOs were promoted in

social media and on the Council's website. Individual residents' associations were also encouraged to comment. At the request of Councillors, it was agreed that Hillingdon East Residents' Association would be included in this list. Councillor Sullivan would send the contact details to officers.

In response to further questions from the Committee, Members heard that PSPOs did not apply solely to town centres. Restrictions could be added to other hotspots in the Borough too - such as Ruislip Lido and other green spaces. However, it was noted that the issuing of a PSPO had to be justifiable and proportionate in all cases.

Members requested further clarification regarding the Public Spaces Restriction Order (Town Centre) 2023 as set out on page 34 of the agenda pack. Officers confirmed that the relevant complaint history had been taken into consideration – a large number of complaints were regularly received regarding town centres, including from police partners.

With regards to charities operating on the streets, Members were informed that the aim was to ensure people legitimised their activity and sought authorisation, rather than to restrict appropriately authorised procedures. In terms of enforcement, it was confirmed that the Council's CCTV room worked collaboratively with the Police who could enforce PSPOs. Environmental Enforcement officers, who routinely patrolled seven days a week and responded to intelligence-led tasking, could also issue FPNs. Moreover, members of the public could report contraventions.

At the request of Councillors, it was agreed that a monthly report showing the breakdown of FPNs issued under PSPOs would be shared with Members of the Committee.

Members requested further clarification regarding the Street Trading and leaflet distribution item (point (h)) as set out on page 34 of the agenda pack which stated that 'No person(s) shall distribute any free leaflet, pamphlet or written word without written permission of the Council'. It was confirmed that this was aimed primarily at commercial businesses; exemptions applied in respect of political leaflets and those produced by non-profit organisations etc. These exemptions would apply to all exemption groups – not just those from Hillingdon. It was agreed that point (h) would be amended to further clarify these exemptions.

It was confirmed that, to date, 85 individual responses had been received during the consultation period.

RESOLVED: That comments be submitted to Cabinet on behalf of the Committee on the Public Spaces Protection Order 2023 Review.

10. **HIGH STREET REGENERATION POST COVID EVALUATION** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Having read the High Street Regeneration post Covid-19 evaluation report in the agenda pack, Members were invited to ask questions / seek clarification as necessary.

In response to Members' questions regarding ULEZ and its potential impact on the high street, it was stressed that the paper captured activity undertaken from August 2021 until March 2022 hence ULEZ expansion announced in November 2022 was not directly relevant to the report being presented. It was anticipated that a new Economic Development Manager post would be recruited to – in terms of ULEZ, the new staff

member would be able to build on the platform of the activity funded through the Welcome Back Fund once in post.

Members sought clarity regarding the Welcome Back Events set out in the agenda pack. It was confirmed that the Hayes Town Centre Canal Festival had taken place after the Welcome Back funding had finished and had been held by the Canal and River Trust directly hence the footfall figures were shown as TBC in the pack. With regard to the successful Pumpkin Festival in Ryefield Avenue, Members were informed that this had been funded via unspent European Development funding which was no longer available.

Members heard that, further to the Welcome Back Events, businesses had been provided with a template for planning future events and had been offered support and further training including digital workshops. High-level Boroughwide data had been captured in relation to the Welcome Back Events which had taken place.

It was noted that larger centres such as Uxbridge were still suffering from the large concentration of offices and Headquarters not being fully occupied allied with limited commuting from hybrid office working and needed more support. Members heard that officers were active in sourcing external funding and an example was given of HS2 Business & Local Economy funding being sought to initiate a community shop in Harefield and promotional events in some other town centres impacted by HS2 construction.

Members sought further clarification from officers in respect of how the funding had been used, noting that some town centres were still struggling post-pandemic – a lot of shops were empty, and things had not returned to normal in many cases. It was emphasised that the money allocated for the Welcome Back initiative had been European Regional Development Funding; the Council had not entered into a competitive funding bid for this as it had been unallocated funding earmarked for all England Local Authorities. It was further stressed that the funding could not be used to support individuals and there had been no requirement to evidence and achieve outputs in the usual way. The project had been set up at short notice and had only lasted six months as activity could not continue post March 2022. Some Members expressed a view that the initiative had lacked ambition and were reminded of the specific parameters associated with the Welcome Back Fund initiative. It was confirmed that the Council would continue to be ambitious in driving business forward in the future.

RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the range of bespoke promotional events and initiatives tailored to the feedback from business and residents within the high streets and associated outputs achieved by the London Borough of Hillingdon utilising the Welcome Back fund grant.

11. **REVIEW FINDINGS 'A REVIEW OF ALLEY GATING IN HILLINGDON'** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Helena Webster, Community Engagement & Town Centre Improvement Manager, presented the report noting that, as part of the Committee's review, testimony had been received from local residents, Ealing Council, the Police and officers. Section 4 set out possible areas for emerging recommendations. The following points were highlighted:

- It was noted that Ealing Council displayed a sign on all their alley gates stating

that residents were responsible for them and to use them as intended. It was suggested that Hillingdon could introduce a similar scheme whereby signs were erected on gates advising residents to keep clear / keep the gates closed and providing a generic email address for residents to contact officers if needed. It was suggested that stating the scheme was resident-led could possible lead to antisocial behaviour;

- Officers to create a draft template for review with universal branding;
- Officers confirmed that annual emails were sent out to contacts on the database to check the contact details of the lead residents – this would be an opportunity to check if there were any issues with the gates which the Council could help with;
- New residents who needed to get hold of a key quickly were encouraged to speak to neighbours to get a copy. If the Council had the details of the lead petitioner, they would ask if their contact details could be passed on – thereby creating a contact between the enquirer and the lead resident;
- When new residents moved in to an area with alley gates, it was suggested that officers could write to them proactively with the contact details of the lead resident and with the generic email address;
- When a new scheme had been implemented, officers felt it would be useful to request feedback from residents six months later regarding the application process and how the scheme was working;
- A feature in Hillingdon People to promote the alley gating scheme was recommended;
- In terms of banking problems reported by residents, it was confirmed that these issues related to older schemes and did not apply to more recent schemes as community banking was now much more user friendly. With regard to older schemes and issues experienced by some residents with accessing money in community banks, it was agreed that officers would follow this up with colleagues in legal and finance and feed back to the Committee. It was suggested that two Council officers could be counter signatories on each scheme as a back-up option – officers would follow this up with HR and legal;
- In terms of providing minutes to assist with banking issues for older schemes, it was confirmed that the Council kept a comprehensive log and could provide information to lead residents to help with banking matters if needed.

It was agreed that the wording of the recommendations would be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead. A final list of recommendations would be presented to the Committee in due course.

Officers thanked the Committee for the review which had been very helpful.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Committee considered possible conclusions, findings and early draft recommendations in relation to the review; and**
- 2. That the wording of the final recommendations be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.**

12. **FORWARD PLAN** (*Agenda Item 10*)

RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee noted the Cabinet Forward Plan.

13.	WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>) RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee noted the Work Programme.
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.14 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer on epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, officers, the press and members of the public.