

Minutes

COUNCIL

10 July 2025

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



Councillor Philip Corthorne (Mayor)
Councillor Reeta Chamdal (Deputy Mayor)

	MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Naser Abby Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Kaushik Banerjee Labina Basit Adam Bennett Kishan Bhatt Jonathan Bianco Tony Burles Keith Burrows Roy Chamdal Farhad Choubedar Peter Curling Darran Davies Nick Denys Jas Dhot Ian Edwards Scott Farley Janet Gardner Elizabeth Garelick Narinder Garg Tony Gill Martin Goddard Ekta Gohil Henry Higgins Mohammed Islam Kamal Preet Kaur Kuldeep Lakhmana Eddie Lavery Richard Lewis Heena Makwana Gursharan Mand Kelly Martin Stuart Mathers Douglas Mills Richard Mills Peter Money June Nelson Barry Nelson-West Susan O'Brien Jane Palmer Sital Punja John Riley Raju Sansarpuri Jagjit Singh Peter Smallwood Colleen Sullivan Jan Sweeting
	OFFICERS PRESENT: Tony Zaman, Dan Kennedy, Sandra Taylor, Lloyd White, Mark Braddock, Morgan Einon and Alice Pringault
	ONE MINUTE'S SILENCE Those present observed a one minute's silence in memory of former Mayor Ken Guy as well as past Mayoress Mrs Amtul Would Wallana and former councillors, David Bishop and Peter McDonald.
12.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>) Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Wayne Bridges, Becky Haggar, Rita Judge and Steve Tuckwell
13.	MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>) RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 27 February 2025 and 8 May 2025 be agreed as correct records.
14.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>) There were no declarations of interest in matters coming before this meeting.
15.	MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>) The Mayor reflected on a busy first nine weeks, highlighting the success of Picnic in the Park with over 1,500 attendees. Upcoming events include a bunker visit, charity

	cricket match and a family fun day in partnership with the Hillingdon Chamber of Commerce. The Mayor had also celebrated the DFN Project SEARCH graduation at Hillingdon Hospital and noted the value of recent school visits in reinforcing the purpose of public service.
16.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>) To take questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10. 5.1 QUESTION FROM BRIAN LAWRENCE OF MEADOW VIEW ROAD, HAYES, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY: <i>“As there has been no notification as to why Hillingdon in Bloom & Autumn Show was cancelled, can you please provide an answer?”</i> As the questioner was unable to attend the meeting, the Mayor asked the question on behalf of Mr Lawrence. Councillor Lavery thanked Mr Lawrence for his question and advised that he would provide him with a written response. <i>[NOTE: The following written response was forwarded to Mr Lawrence after the meeting:</i> <i>Thank you for your question to me, which was asked by the Mayor at last week’s Council meeting.</i> <i>As part of our efforts to ensure that we continue delivering value-for-money services for residents, the council has had to make the difficult decision not to run our annual growing competitions, Hillingdon in Bloom and the Autumn Show, this year.</i> <i>I am aware that those residents who enter each year really look forward to it and dedicate a lot of time and effort to those entries, but unfortunately the cost of running two competitions in which relatively few residents participate was not sustainable and despite efforts to find a sponsor to foot those costs, we were not successful this year.</i> <i>We appreciate the enthusiasm and contributions of those like yourself who have taken part in past years and very much hope they will continue their efforts to grow remarkable produce and create gardens and blooms across the borough to boost biodiversity, improve air quality and keep the borough looking beautiful.</i> <i>We will continue to look for sponsors to support any opportunities for running these competitions in the future.]</i> 5.2 QUESTION FROM JASH PATEL OF LEAHOLME WAY, RUISLIP, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY: <i>“Please consider charging an entrance fee for visitors (to the Ruislip Lido) from outside the Borough of Hillingdon. The attached article (extract and link below) means that the Ruislip Lido will be visited by thousands of visitors, free of charge to enjoy the</i>

beach etc. The sufferers of this will be Hillingdon residents paying Council tax. The visitors park all across the surrounding area causing problems for the residents. I have been a resident of Leaholme Way for 48 years and am an ex-Hillingdon Council pensioner.

"I have made this request 2-3 times before. No joy.

"There's a sandy beach in London that many don't know about. A beach in London might sound like a myth, but for those in the know, Ruislip Lido offers a surprising slice of coastal charm just 30 minutes from the heart of the capital.

"Nestled on the edge of Ruislip Woods National Nature Reserve in Northwest London, Ruislip Lido is fast becoming a viral sensation after a TikTok video by user Callum Ryan revealed its sandy shoreline and 60-acre lake to a wider audience"

Link to full article: [Secret sandy beach just 30 minutes from London | Travel News | Travel | Express.co.uk](https://www.express.co.uk/travel/secret-sandy-beach-just-30-minutes-from-london)

As the questioner was unable to attend the meeting, the Mayor asked the question on behalf of Mr Patel. Councillor Lavery thanked Mr Patel for his question and advised that he would provide him with a written response.

[NOTE: The following written response was forwarded to Mr Patel after the meeting:

Thank you for your question to me at last week's Council meeting which was asked by the Mayor.

I am aware of your long-standing residency in Leaholme Way and welcome your continued engagement with the Council regarding Ruislip Lido.

As you are aware, Ruislip Lido is a popular attraction appealing to many groups from those who enjoy walking their dog or running but also to those wishing to enjoy a day out. The Council is aware of the quoted article which does originate some years ago and is unhelpful in publicising the beach area at The Lido. We have raised this with the authors.

You mention that you have raised the question of a charge on previous occasions and I am aware of this fact. Let me assure you that the Council has considered this option on more than one occasion and sought advice on this. Survey data has shown that the majority of visitors are Hillingdon Residents although not necessarily from Ruislip.

The recurring issue is that the Lido also has multiple entrances from the car parks and public footpaths in the woods meaning the introduction of a charge is not straight forward.

We understand the impact that increased visitor numbers—particularly from outside the Borough—can have on residents, especially in terms of parking and general congestion, but please be assured that we have carefully considered various options and have already implemented measures aimed at mitigating these issues. These include enhanced parking enforcement, increased signage, and ongoing monitoring of visitor impact during peak times.

We are committed to continuing to explore further solutions that balance accessibility with the needs of our residents.]

5.3 QUESTION FROM ANDREA SCRIVENS OF BROADWOOD AVENUE, RUISLIP AND THE FRIENDS OF THE RAGC, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE - COUNCILLOR PALMER:

“At the Cabinet meeting on 26 June (in relation to the item concerning the RAGC) it was stated that all those who required an assessment of their social care needs would have one. At a time when I understand social services to be already stretched, have they got the capacity to carry out those assessments, what is the timescale for their completion and what are the estimated costs?”

Councillor Palmer advised that Cabinet’s decision to close the Rural Activities Garden Centre’s retail element had been supported by Adult Social Care and ensured that all individuals with potential eligible needs had been assessed under the Care Act 2014. The service had maintained capacity for assessments, prioritised cases and provided support through Learning Disability Team social workers. Despite budget pressures, the service remained committed to its statutory duties.

5.4 QUESTION FROM ISABEL STEVENSON OF PARKFIELD ROAD, ICKENHAM, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE - COUNCILLOR PALMER:

“I am frightened for the safety of my son, who has been attending the Rural Activities Garden Centre as a gardener for many years. It is a safe and calming environment where our family can get respite for a few hours knowing he is safe with friends doing what he enjoys the most. Please can the Cabinet Member explain to me how the open aspect of the Civic Centre gardens allocated as the alternative provision to RAGC can be made safe for my son.”

Councillor Palmer advised that Adult Social Care recognised the vital role of carers and the need to manage changes to routine with care. Support had been made available through social workers and third-sector partners such as the Carers Trust. Each individual attending the Civic Centre had received a risk assessment and a detailed support plan, with familiar staff continuing to provide care. The service was managed by the experienced Daycare Team from Queens Resource Centre and the Civic Centre was equipped with robust safety measures including controlled access, CCTV and designated assembly points.

5.5 QUESTION FROM SARAH GREEN OF IVER LANE, UXBRIDGE, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY:

“The Council has a statutory responsibility to remediate the New Years Green landfill site and stop the landfill leachate polluting Ickenham Public Water Source on Breakspear Road South. After the 5-year period of Natural Monitored Attenuation (2013 to 2019), a report should have been written to inform decision makers of the pollution rates and what the recommended next steps are. Sufficient quantity of clean tap water is becoming critical in London. Can the Cabinet member tell the public the results of the Monitored Natural Attenuation at New Years Green landfill site and the next steps being taken?”

Attached Document:

Notice under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part IIA – Section 78C, issued by LBH to the Environment Agency of a decision that Contaminated Land at New Years Green Lane Landfill, Harefield is required to be designated as a Special Site Dated 26th May 2011

Councillor Lavery clarified that the water supply mentioned in the question was not an active source of public water for Ickenham or any other area. Concerns about water quality or quantity were best directed to the Environment Agency, the statutory regulator. The Council had been in discussions with the agency about the New Years Green Lane landfill site and its groundwater impact. Although earlier monitoring showed a reduced impact, it had prompted a review of future monitoring plans and details of the review would be made public once agreed.

5.6 QUESTION FROM JOHN SCRIVENS OF BROADWOOD AVENUE, RUISLIP AND THE FRIENDS OF THE RAGC, TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SERVICES & PROPERTY - COUNCILLOR BIANCO:

“In order to scrutinise the Cabinet's decision to close the Rural Activities Garden Centre, is the Council able to provide evidence that it has examined the option of Community Asset Transfer to transfer management of RAGC to Friends of RAGC, or other community organisation, as this is an obvious alternative to closure which would open additional funding opportunities for RAGC and be supported by the on-site RAGC operating team.”

Councillor Bianco confirmed that the Council had not yet explored future use options for the Rural Activities Garden Centre site. On 26 June 2025, Cabinet had agreed to close the retail element and had begun consulting on relocating social care services to the Civic Centre. Nominations to list the site and adjoining car park as community assets were under review in line with the Localism Act 2011. It was noted that no decision had been made to sell the site and the community asset transfer process would only apply if a sale was proposed.

5.7 QUESTION FROM MARK PEARMAN OF MELLOW LANE EAST, HAYES, TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR EDWARDS:

“We have seen it before where the Council promises what their plans are with no details and asks the residents to trust them. In the past we have seen Colham Green Day Centre close and used for a housing estate. This Centre was moved to a smaller centre (Parkview Day Centre) along the Uxbridge Road. After a few years that Centre was closed, and the service was moved to a warehouse in Uxbridge. Shortly after this closed too.

“Can the Leader of the Council explain why this time it will be any different and why the Council has been purposely managing the decline of the RAGC site?”

Councillor Edwards advised that the Council needed to change how it delivered services and used assets. These changes had been approached sensitively and with consideration for users' needs. The Rural Activities Garden Centre had been subject to a motion and further comments would follow later in the meeting. Councillor Edwards stated that the Council had closed the retail garden centre but the future of the horticultural activities at the centre had not yet been determined.

17. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES (Agenda Item 6)

i) Urgent Implementation of Decisions

Members noted the urgent decisions taken since the Council meeting in May 2025, as

	detailed in the report. ii) Political Groups on the Council, Calculation of Political Balance and Committee Memberships. Councillor Edwards moved, and Councillor Bianco seconded, the motion as set out on the Order of Business, and it was: RESOLVED: That the alteration of the overall political balance of the Council, following the formation of the Hayes Independent Party Group, be noted and the following changes to membership of Council Committees etc. be approved: • Licensing Committee – Councillor Gardner to remain a member of the Committee but representing the Hayes Independent Party Group. • Pensions Committee – Councillor Basit to replace Councillor Burles and Councillor Sullivan to replace Councillor Burrows. Councillor Burles to be a nominated substitute. • Registration and Appeals Committee – Councillor Curling to replace Councillor Makwana and Councillor Basit to replace Councillor Judge. • Appointments Committee – Councillor Mathers to replace Councillor Curling. • Residents Services Select Committee - Councillor Garelick to replace Councillor Gardner. • Corporate Resources and Infrastructure Select Committee - Councillor Mand to replace Councillor Mathers and Councillor Islam to replace Councillor Garelick. • Hillingdon Planning Committee – Councillor Sansarpuri to replace Councillor Mand. iii) Appointment of Statutory Officer Councillor Edwards moved, and Councillor Bianco seconded, the motion as set out on the Order of Business and it was: RESOLVED: That the new Corporate Director of Finance, Stephen Muldoon, be appointed to the statutory role of Section 151 and Chief Financial Officer of the Council once their appointment to the post of Corporate Director of Finance had been confirmed and they had commenced employment at the Council. iv) North West London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference Councillor Edwards moved, and Councillor Bianco seconded, the motion as set out on the Order of Business and it was: RESOLVED: That Council agreed the changes to the NWL JHOSC Terms of Reference as set out in the report.
18.	MEMBERS' QUESTIONS <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i> To take questions submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11. 7.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR HAGGAR TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE - COUNCILLOR PALMER: The Mayor asked the following question on behalf of Cllr Haggar:

“What effect is the Cabinet decision to close the retail operation of the Rural Activities Garden Centre likely to have on the Social Care provision of horticultural therapy?”

Councillor Palmer advised that that Cabinet’s closure of the Rural Activities Garden Centre’s retail arm had marked a strategic shift in delivering horticultural and life skills activities. Most users attended on a sessional basis and their other activities had remained unchanged. Gardening at the Civic Centre had already been established and was expected to continue, supported by familiar staff and new opportunities. The Civic Centre model reflected a move towards flexible, outcome-focused care aligned with national priorities and the Council, rated ‘Good’ by the CQC, remained capable of delivering quality care from any location.

There was no supplementary question.

7.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR SWEETING TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES & EDUCATION - COUNCILLOR O’BRIEN:

“Why was Hillingdon’s important Annual Education Standard’s Report 2023/24 not considered by Cabinet this year as has been the case with similar reports in previous years?”

Councillor O’Brien advised that the Education Standards Report for 2023–2024 had been reviewed by the Children, Families & Education Select Committee in March 2025, with their feedback incorporated into the final report approved in June 2025. The Committee had noted attainment gaps and performance trends across key stages and had been reassured that steps were being taken to address these. The scrutiny had been deemed appropriate, in line with the Council’s Constitution and the report had not gone to full Cabinet due to its historical data.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Sweeting asked why the Children, Families and Education Select Committee’s comments noting that Key Stage 5, 4, 2, and Early Years results in Hillingdon were below regional outcomes and had not been made publicly available in any Council published documents.

In response, Councillor O’Brien confirmed that this information was publicly available as it was part of the Committee’s discussion, noted in the minutes and available on the Council’s website.

7.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DENYS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE & TRANSFORMATION - COUNCILLOR GODDARD:

“Will the Cabinet Member please provide an update on the Financial Improvement Programme which was initiated following the Budget setting at February Council?”

Councillor Goddard explained that the financial improvement programme, announced during the February budget setting, aimed to modernise finance operations and improve cost effectiveness. This included reviews of budget monitoring, forecasting, and the finance team’s structure, alongside the rollout of the Oracle Fusion EPM system, expected to be finalised by autumn 2025. Additional work had identified £14.6 million in savings from the high needs block, with break-even projected by 2027/28. The Council had also advanced digital and procurement reforms and a new Section 151 officer with relevant experience had been appointed. Due to financial modernisation processes, the final outturn report had been delayed to July Cabinet

however regular budget monitoring would resume as scheduled.

There was no supplementary question.

7.6 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BURLES TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY:

“The Rural Activities Garden Centre is described as a 'hidden Gem' and for over 40 years has provided vital life changing services for our adults with learning difficulties. Can the Cabinet member explain why he did not seek alternative providers like the Council did for the Beck Theatre and Early Years Nursery Centres so that it can remain open?”

Councillor Lavery advised that the Council had financially supported the site, contributing £137,000 in the last year, and he believed a better outcome could be achieved at the Civic Centre. Councillor Palmer had already outlined the support in place for users. Councillor Lavery noted that previous relocations of services had also been opposed and they had ultimately been successful.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Burles asked whether the decision to close the Rural Activities Garden Centre had been rushed or politically motivated.

Councillor Lavery stated that the Cabinet report, presented in June 2025, had followed normal procedures and had detailed the closure of the loss-making retail operation and the support arranged for users, with Councillor Bianco having elaborated on it during the Cabinet meeting.

7.4 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR SMALLWOOD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY:

“Can the Cabinet member confirm that Hillingdon Council is not levying parking charges on those visiting Breakspear Crematorium to pay their respects to deceased relatives?”

Councillor Lavery clarified that rumours of parking charges for crematorium visitors were false. The Council only applied charges to a small section used by Lido visitors, while crematorium visitors continued to park for free in the lower car park, where no machines had been installed. A small area had been used for Lido parking only on Easter Sunday and Father's Day.

There was no supplementary question.

7.9 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR PUNJA TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, HOUSING & GROWTH - COUNCILLOR TUCKWELL:

“It is a year since Council resolved that a report be sent to Cabinet considering the sufficiency of evidence required under Part 2 Housing Act 2004 to extend licensing obligations to all properties with 3 bedrooms housing multiple unrelated occupants and to commence consultation on the implementation of this additional licensing obligation where it is justified.

“I note that the report is shown on the Forward Plan as due to be submitted to Cabinet in July. Please can the Cabinet member explain why it has taken a year to produce this report and what actions are going to be taken as the increasing rise in HMOs are

changing our streets and impacting on our Council services?”

Councillor Lavery explained on behalf of Councillor Tuckwell that Cabinet had committed to a proper process for considering additional HMO licensing. Following approval in October 2024, the Council had begun gathering evidence and preparing for public consultation. The process typically took 12–18 months and skipping steps could lead to legal challenges. In the meantime, HMO-related concerns had continued to be addressed through enforcement where needed.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Punja asked whether delays in extending HMO licensing had been due to the Council avoiding licence fees by temporarily converting HMOs into temporary accommodation.

Councillor Lavery confirmed that this was not the case.

7.7 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BANERJEE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY:

“Can the Cabinet member please update Council on the rollout of the garden waste subscription scheme?”

Councillor Lavery reported that around 18,000 subscriptions to the new scheme had generated £1.6 million, with numbers rising after collections began and marketing efforts. The Council had prepared across departments and officers were thanked for a successful first week. Progress would continue to be monitored and adjusted as needed.

There was no supplementary question.

7.10 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR MAND TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE & TRANSFORMATION - COUNCILLOR GODDARD:

“Can the Cabinet Member please explain the absence and delays of budget monitoring reports and financial reports to Cabinet and Select Committee meetings?”

Councillor Goddard advised that this had been addressed in his earlier response to Councillor Denys’ question and he had nothing further to add.

In response to Cllr’s Mand’s supplementary question suggesting that the Council may already have met the threshold for a Section 114 notice and withheld this from backbenchers, Councillor Goddard confirmed that although the Council was experiencing financial pressures, it would not be required to file a S114 notice and that all relevant details would be presented in the July 2025 Cabinet report.

7.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BURROWS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT - COUNCILLOR LAVERY:

“Does the Cabinet member consider the decision to relocate Uxbridge Library to have been successful?”

Councillor Lavery reported that the library relocation had been a success, with increased book issues and membership. The new site was fully accessible, safer for families and more cost-effective. It had also enhanced the Civic Centre campus, with further improvements, including a museum and multi-purpose space, planned.

	There was no supplementary question. 7.8 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BENNETT TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE - COUNCILLOR PALMER: <i>“Following the CQC inspection, which rated Adult Social Care as ‘good’, can the Cabinet Member please provide any further updates on the service?”</i> Councillor Palmer reported that, following a positive CQC rating, adult social care had continued to improve through strategic initiatives. Shared Lives and domiciliary care inspections had been rated “good,” digital tools and a tech-enabled care plan had been introduced and a principal social worker had been appointed. Despite financial pressures, the year was considered a strong one for the service. There was no supplementary question.
19.	MOTIONS (Agenda Item 8) To consider Motions submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12. 8.4 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR EDWARDS 8.4 Councillor Edwards moved, and Councillor Bianco seconded, the following motion: <i>That this Council notes that Hillingdon has the highest number of asylum seekers housed in hotels or dispersed accommodation of any local authority in London (more than 4.5 times the London average) and possibly the highest nationally. It is unfair and unsustainable to require Hillingdon's residents to carry the grossly disproportionate burden of supporting former asylum seekers evicted from hotels as required by law. Council also notes with concern the commitment of Government to evict into this borough more than 2,300 asylum seekers presently housed in our hotels by the end of the present Parliament.</i> <i>To protect the interests of Hillingdon's residents, this Council requires Government to cease the practice of evicting former asylum seekers from hotels and dispersed accommodation within our borough without the necessary future support and accommodation having been secured and funded by the Home Office and to refund the cost shouldered by Hillingdon's residents to date.</i> <i>Furthermore, this Council calls on our three Members of Parliament to work with Government to secure the immediate funding for Hillingdon's asylum cost to date, to ensure that the responsibility for supporting and accommodating those evicted from hotels in the borough will from this point on be equitably shared nationally, and that the funding of port authorities is commensurate with the additional responsibilities that they discharge on behalf of the nation.</i> Supporters of the motion stated that the Council had been unfairly burdened by the national Government's asylum policies, which had forced Hillingdon to spend millions of pounds, £16 million already, with projections reaching £21 million, on accommodation and support for asylum seekers without adequate support and funding from the Government. The shortfall had diverted resources from essential

services and placed pressure on communities, especially due to the proximity to Heathrow. The motion had not been about party politics but about securing fair funding and protecting residents from the financial consequences of national decisions. The lack of planning and support from the Government had placed a strain on local services and communities and the motion had been presented as a necessary step to demand reimbursement, explore legal options and ensure that Hillingdon residents were not left to bear the cost of a national issue alone.

The distinction between asylum seekers and refugees was noted, focusing on those placed in hotels and released without support. Specific figures were withheld to avoid tension, but financial strain and a rise in looked-after children were highlighted. Unity was urged in demanding proper funding.

Those speaking against the motion argued that it was misleading, divisive and based on inaccurate claims. It was suggested that the Council was not obligated to house asylum seekers and only support those with priority needs. The motion had failed to acknowledge increased government funding, including a 380% rise in the asylum dispersal grant, and had omitted key data on the number of individuals supported. The motion was viewed as politically motivated and morally irresponsible, shifting blame onto vulnerable people and the new government. A past judicial review loss was recalled, and concerns were raised about fuelling division and damaging the Council's credibility.

The motion was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting in favour: The Mayor (Councillor Philip Corthorne), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Reeta Chamdal), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Banerjee, Bennett, Bhatt, Bianco, Burrows, Roy Chamdal, Davies, Denys, Edwards, Goddard, Gohil, Higgins, Lavery, Lewis, Makwana, Martin, D Mills, R Mills, O'Brien, Palmer, Riley, Smallwood and Sullivan.

Those voting against: Councillors Abby, Basit, Burles, Curling, Dhot, Farley, Gardner, Garelick, Garg, Gill, Islam, Kaur, Lakhmana, Mand, Mathers, Money, Nelson, Nelson-West, Punja, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was carried and it was:

RESOLVED: That this Council notes that Hillingdon has the highest number of asylum seekers housed in hotels or dispersed accommodation of any local authority in London (more than 4.5 times the London average) and possibly the highest nationally. It is unfair and unsustainable to require Hillingdon's residents to carry the grossly disproportionate burden of supporting former asylum seekers evicted from hotels as required by law. Council also notes with concern the commitment of Government to evict into this borough more than 2,300 asylum seekers presently housed in our hotels by the end of the present Parliament.

To protect the interests of Hillingdon's residents, this Council requires Government to cease the practice of evicting former asylum seekers from hotels and dispersed accommodation within our borough without the necessary future support and accommodation having been secured and funded by the Home Office and to refund the cost shouldered by Hillingdon's residents

to date.

Furthermore, this Council calls on our three Members of Parliament to work with Government to secure the immediate funding for Hillingdon's asylum cost to date, to ensure that the responsibility for supporting and accommodating those evicted from hotels in the borough will, from this point on, be equitably shared nationally, and that the funding of port authorities is commensurate with the additional responsibilities that they discharge on behalf of the nation.

8.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MATHERS

Councillor Mathers moved, and Councillor Gill seconded, the following motion:

That this Council is seriously concerned at the Cabinet's broken promises to its residents with reversal of the affirmation agreed in July 2023 by Full Council that: "this Council affirms our commitment to free weekly bin collections, including recycling and green waste collections and thanks our Council staff for their dedication to their work."

And that this: "Council reaffirms that it rejects the idea of charging residents for the collection of garden waste".

The Cabinet reasons for supporting policies that have introduced an initial £70 subscription charge for this service in the borough was to save £34 million to balance the budget and avoid bankruptcy.

Therefore, this Council calls on the Cabinet to refer the implementation and introduction of charges for waste to the relevant select committee in order to scrutinise the effectiveness of this measure in achieving the desired savings at regular intervals over the coming financial year to assure residents that this and other aspects of the savings programme will raise the required funds in year to remain within budget.

Those speaking in support of the motion suggested that the introduction of a £70 garden waste subscription represented a serious breach of the Conservative administration's manifesto promise to maintain free weekly green waste collections. It was noted that there was no clarity provided on future charge increases and it had been framed as part of a broader trend of rising fees and broken commitments. Residents already faced steep increases in parking permits and service charges, and the Council had committed to annual 5% rises in fees since 2024. 79% of residents opposed the charge in the consultation, with many indicating that they would resort to fly-tipping or dispose of green waste in general waste bins. These actions could cost the Council more than the revenue generated. A lack of transparency and scrutiny were also criticised, with only 17% of residents reportedly indicating they would subscribe, casting doubt on the projected £2.5 million income. The motion had been presented as a call for accountability, with a referral to a select committee for review urged, alongside a restoration of public trust through honouring commitments and ensuring proper oversight.

Those speaking against the motion noted that the Council's decision to introduce a garden waste subscription had been a regrettable but necessary response to financial pressures, which had been caused by broken promises from the Labour government. It was explained that the Council had been forced to abandon its July 2023 commitment due to an unexpected rise in employer National Insurance contributions, which had initially been promised to be offset by the government but had not been

delivered. As a result, a budget gap had been created and needed to be addressed through the new charge. Criticism was also directed at the Labour government for its failure to control illegal immigration, rising public debt and its contribution to inflation and job losses, all of which were said to have intensified financial strain on local authorities. The motion was described as one that ignored these broader economic realities and unfairly targeted a voluntary £70 charge which was lower than those imposed by many neighbouring Labour councils, while overlooking the Council's efforts to manage its finances responsibly. It was suggested that free disposal options remained available to residents and that the motion was politically motivated rather than a genuine attempt to address challenges.

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

8.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

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

That this Council notes the devastating impact that a third runway, at Heathrow airport, would have on our borough and its residents. Council further notes the well documented detrimental impact on the environment, as well as the adverse impact on the health and well-being of a significant number of residents within our borough, should a third runway be built and brought into operation.

This Council therefore reaffirms its strong, cross party, opposition to a third runway at Heathrow Airport.

Support from all parties was expressed for the motion on the grounds that the proposed third runway at Heathrow would cause irreversible harm to the environment and local communities, and that the Council's long-standing cross-party opposition should be reaffirmed. The proposed expansion would threaten historic villages, increase pollution, worsen health outcomes and contribute to the climate crisis. It was noted that Heathrow had already impacted more residents than any other major European airport, and that proposed mitigation measures were not considered adequate. Social impacts such as the loss of family homes, the rise in HMOs and the breakdown of community cohesion were also highlighted.

Successive governments were criticised for prioritising economic growth over public health and environmental sustainability. The motion was a call for stronger Council action through planning controls and enforcement as the runway would cause unacceptable disruption and long-term damage and continued opposition was essential.

The motion was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting in favour: The Mayor (Councillor Philip Corthorne), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Reeta Chamdal), Councillors Abby, Ahmad-Wallana, Banerjee, Basit, Bennett, Bhatt, Bianco, Burles, Burrows, Roy Chamdal, Choubedar, Curling, Davies, Denys, Dhot, Edwards, Farley, Gardner, Garelick, Garg, Gill, Goddard, Gohil, Higgins, Islam, Kaur, Lakhmana, Lavery, Lewis, Makwana, Mand, Martin, Mathers, D Mills, R Mills, Money, Nelson, Nelson-West, Palmer, Punja, Riley, Sansarpuri, Singh, Smallwood, Sullivan and Sweeting.

Those voting against: None.

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was unanimously agreed, and it was:

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the devastating impact that a third runway, at Heathrow airport, would have on our borough and its residents. Council further notes the well documented detrimental impact on the environment, as well as the adverse impact on the health and well-being of a significant number of residents within our borough, should a third runway be built and brought into operation.

This Council therefore reaffirms its strong, cross party, opposition to a third runway at Heathrow Airport.

8.3 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR PUNJA

Councillor Punja moved, and Councillor Mathers seconded, the following motion:

That this Council agrees to call on Councillor Lavery, Cabinet Member for Community and Environment to reconsider the Cabinet decision to close the retail operations of the Rural Activities Garden Centre made on June 26th 2025 for the following

- a) failure to accurately analyse or calculate financial income year on year income under Financial Implications*
- b) failure to have sought and costed alternative providers for the site to remain open.*
- c) failure to have scoped, costed, assessed and consulted on new provision for gardeners with social care package to ensure a safe environment*
- d) misleading information on £1.2m needed for investment to meet Health and Safety standards as this cost was based on an improvement plan proposal.*
- e) failure to provide reasonable adjustments for adults with learning disabilities as per guidance in the Equalities Act at the initial engagement meeting of 30th May 2025*

This Council values robust reporting to make high quality decisions and asks the Cabinet member for Community and Environment to instruct officers to provide an updated report addressing, but not limited to, the concerns listed above and submit to the relevant Select Committees for scrutiny before going to Cabinet for a decision.

Support was expressed for reconsidering the closure of the Rural Activities Garden Centre, which had been valued for its beneficial and inclusive services. Despite strong public opposition, the Conservative administration was reported to have approved the closure of its retail operations, with key Cabinet Members absent during the decision. The Cabinet report was criticised for inaccuracies and procedural failings and concerns were raised over the lack of alternative provision and consultation. A 90 day fundraising period was requested to avoid reliance on Council subsidy. The decision-making process was condemned as lacking integrity and compassion.

Opposition to the motion was based on the view that the Rural Activities Garden Centre had been a commercial, not commissioned, service. The subsidy withdrawal was defended as financially responsible, consistent with previous decisions on non-essential services. Confidence was expressed in adult social care services and assurances were given that alternative support would be provided. The closure was described as limited to retail operations, with horticultural activities under review and engagement with families ongoing. It was maintained that the Council lacked the

	mandate to run a commercial garden centre. The motion was put to a recorded vote: Those voting in favour: Councillors Abby, Basit, Burles, Curling, Dhot, Farley, Gardner, Garelick, Garg, Islam, Kaur, Lakhmana, Mand, Mathers, Money, Nelson, Nelson-West, Punja, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting. Those voting against: The Mayor (Councillor Philip Corthorne), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Reeta Chamdal), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Banerjee, Bennett, Bhatt, Bianco, Burrows, Roy Chamdal, Choubedar, Davies, Denys, Edwards, Goddard, Gohil, Higgins, Lavery, Lewis, Makwana, Martin, D Mills, R Mills, Palmer, Riley, Smallwood and Sullivan. Those abstaining: None. The motion was lost.
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.17 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 democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.