

Minutes

RESIDENTS' SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

6 November 2025



Meeting held at

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chair), Kishan Bhatt, Darran Davies, Ekta Gohil, Scott Farley, Kamal Preet Kaur (Opposition Lead) and Elizabeth Garelick</p> <p>Officers Present: Steve Austin (Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager) Daniel Ferrer (Licensing Team Manager) Andy Goodwin (Head of Strategic Finance) Julia Johnson (Director of Planning and Strategic Growth) Ian Kavanagh (Head of Business Intelligence) Dan Kennedy (Corporate Director of Residents Services) Freddie Mohammed (Parking Representations and Appeals Manager) Bernard Ofori-Atta (Head of Finance - Residents' Services) Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer) Jas Rattu (Parking Infrastructure Manager) Andrew Tebbutt (Planning Obligations Team Leader) Richard Webb (Director of Community Safety & Enforcement)</p>
112.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Peter Smallwood with Councillor Kishan Bhatt substituting.</p>
113.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
114.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 9 September 2025 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
115.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
116.	<p>BUDGET AND SPENDING REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Dan Kennedy, Corporate Director of Residents' Services, presented the Month 5 budget monitoring report, noting that the information had been drawn from the Cabinet report which was already in the public domain. It was stated that the Residents'</p>

Services Directorate showed an £8.8 million overspend at Month 5, primarily due to temporary accommodation pressures amounting to £6.5 million. Additional pressures included underachievement of income from parking charges and the green waste subscription service, where the £2.5 million target was forecasted to achieve £1.6 million. The Housing Revenue Account was reported as breaking even.

Councillors queried the underperformance of parking income and whether this could be attributed to post-pandemic behavioural changes or pricing issues, as well as the availability of data to distinguish the causes. It was confirmed that significant work had been undertaken to strengthen data analysis, including detailed monitoring of car park payment machine usage. While charges were considered competitive compared to other boroughs, it was noted that it remained too early to confirm the reasons. Patterns of usage were being examined to inform proposals for the forthcoming budget.

Councillors enquired whether forecasts had accounted for potential income tax increases referenced in national budget speculation. Officers confirmed that predicting the effect on residents' spending patterns—and consequently on Council income streams—was challenging. However, cost-of-living and wider socioeconomic impacts were being considered as part of the budget build for Cabinet consultation in December.

Councillors questioned why the purchase of 400 houses had not reduced temporary accommodation figures and whether this was linked to arrivals from the Chagos Islands. It was explained that demand had risen sharply, with 40 households presenting as UK nationals in one month, equating to over 150 individuals requiring support. Leased properties intended to reduce costs had either been delayed or offered at unaffordable prices, limiting supply. Negotiations continued, but these properties had been removed from forecasts until viable agreements were secured.

Members asked why the Council was not generating income from commercial trade waste when private companies were profiting. It was reported that competitors undercut Council prices and exploited published fees by offering special deals. A more agile pricing strategy was under review to ensure competitiveness. It was confirmed that commercial trade waste did generate income for the Council; however, the income was falling short of the target.

Councillors sought clarification on whether the report covered data up to September and raised concerns about unclear language in reports, noting previous commitments to improve transparency. Officers confirmed that the report covered August and welcomed feedback to enhance clarity in future reports.

Councillors queried why Table 1 appeared to add costs under “management action.” It was explained that managers reviewed budgets at their level, with subsequent adjustments made by senior officers based on additional information. These adjustments were aggregated, and detailed breakdowns could be provided if required.

The Select Committee questioned the £7.3 million overspend in planning, housing and growth, noting that Heathrow-related pressures could not account for the full variance. Officers responded that arrivals through Heathrow had spiked significantly since July 2024. UK nationals arriving without meeting habitual residency requirements required extended support, creating substantial costs. Government funding covered only the first ten days, leaving the Council to fund accommodation and essentials for weeks.

	<p>In response to questions about unchanged figures between February and March despite reported spikes, it was explained that the data represented net positions, which varied monthly depending on admissions, departures, and alternative housing solutions.</p> <p>Councillors asked about contingency plans if providers exited the market following the introduction of price caps on nightly placements. Officers reported successful implementation of the cap by August, with most providers agreeing to reduced rates. It was noted that a few had withdrawn, but others had filled the gap. Negotiations continued to ensure security and quality for both parties.</p> <p>Members sought clarification on the use of £1 million of capital receipts for transformation activity. It was confirmed that capital receipts from asset disposals could be used under government regulations to fund transformation projects that generated savings. Officers explained that the Council drew from a reserve built up over years, rather than linking specific disposals to individual projects.</p> <p>On the subject of trade waste, the Select Committee asked whether the Council was obliged to provide the service and whether it represented value for money. It was clarified that the service generated £1.3 million in 2024/25 and remained profitable, though targets were under pressure. Operating costs were marginal, making the service financially beneficial.</p> <p>Councillors asked about collaborations to reduce housing costs. Officers described lobbying efforts for fair government funding and collaborative procurement schemes across London to standardise rates and prevent boroughs from competing and inflating prices.</p> <p>Members were informed that the strategy agreed in February had achieved reductions in new placements, averaging 55 per month compared to 62 last year, against a target of 50. Progress had been made on increasing private rented sector properties and implementing rate caps. Challenges remained due to persistent demand and difficulties securing affordable leased accommodation.</p> <p>Councillors queried the £0.8 million shortfall in green waste subscription income and whether consultation results had predicted this. It was explained that setting accurate targets for new initiatives was challenging. Benchmarking had been used, and achieving £1.6 million income partway through the year was considered a success. The scheme would remain under review.</p> <p>Members expressed concern that savings appeared to result from vacancies or reduced operational activities such as repairs and caretaking. In response it was confirmed that vacancy details could be provided, and that underspends in repairs reflected reduced need due to investment in property improvements, such as boiler replacements. It was highlighted that vacancies were managed carefully, with temporary redeployment used to address short-term demand spikes.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Select Committee noted the 2025/26 Month 5 budget monitoring position.</p>
117.	<p>ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Ian Kavanagh, Head of Business Intelligence, and Julia Johnson, Director of Planning</p>

and Sustainable Growth, were in attendance to respond to Members' questions and requests for clarification in relation to the information in the report included in the agenda pack.

A question was asked by the Committee about whether the figure of 245 new Council properties represented a net figure after accounting for Right to Buy losses. It was clarified that the figure referred to gross new acquisitions. It was noted that a significant spike in Right to Buy applications had occurred when discounts were reduced, similar to trends experienced by other local authorities. It was explained that it was difficult to determine how many applications would ultimately convert.

Concerns were raised by Members about underreporting of fly-tipping incidents and the inability of operatives to record data effectively. A query was made regarding measures to capture accurate data. In response, it was confirmed that reporting had been promoted through communication channels, including social media and newsletters. Officers acknowledged increasing pressure from fly-tipping and outlined actions such as responsive collection services, bulky waste collection, and targeted engagement in hotspot areas. It was emphasised that outreach to residents in flats and provision of accessible disposal sites were part of a blended approach.

Further concerns were expressed about recurring fly-tipping despite action days and about contamination of recycling leading to waste being disposed of as general refuse. A question was also raised by Councillors regarding the proportion of contaminated recycling within household waste. **It was stated that figures would need to be obtained and reported back to the Committee.**

The Committee enquired about audits of resident services datasets, error rates, and remediation plans. Officers explained that specific figures were not available at the meeting, but data quality reporting and processes such as standardisation and normalisation were in place to improve accuracy.

Members raised queries regarding the decline in service requests and whether this reflected positive outcomes, as feedback from residents suggested otherwise. It was reported that new sweepers had been introduced to address weed control and detritus quickly, and positive feedback had been received regarding their deployment.

Clarification was sought on the meaning of "refreshing" the local plan and justification for associated costs. It was explained that a statutory review was required every five years, and a full review had commenced. The process involved consultations, evidence gathering, housing need assessments, employment land analysis, site identification, and a green belt review, which accounted for the budget allocation.

With regard to the increase in ASB reports, Councillors enquired whether this reflected improved reporting or worsening conditions. It was confirmed that growth was largely due to easier reporting via online tools. It was noted that ASB encompassed a broad range of issues, and approximately half of reported cases were actionable.

Further queries were raised by the Committee in relation to engagement with housing associations. It was explained that liaison occurred on a case-by-case basis, with social landlords expected to take the lead in resolving issues.

Members sought further clarification regarding IT system readiness for integration and how residents would access information. It was stated that existing systems captured

	<p>most required data, and no major issues were anticipated. Future changes would depend on finalised metrics. It was confirmed that data would be made freely available and efforts would be made to present information transparently.</p> <p>Councillors queried whether businesses attending the Hillingdon Take Off conference had been consulted on regeneration plans. It was reported that an investor conference had been held, and programmes funded through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund had supported local business engagement. Initiatives included town centre projects, an innovation hub, and development of an economic growth plan.</p> <p>Further questions were raised about collaboration with Heathrow. It was confirmed that a roundtable summit had been organised to align resources with local priorities.</p> <p>Members queried how Hillingdon's recycling rates compared to London averages and strategies for improvement. It was reported that recycling rates had continued to increase, supported by initiatives such as food waste segregation and campaigns to reduce household waste.</p> <p>With regards to fly tipping, a query was raised about plans to enhance enforcement through CCTV and AI. It was confirmed that mobile cameras were deployed in hotspots, but identification challenges remained. It was assured that robust evidence was pursued and enforcement action taken where possible.</p> <p>A question was asked by the Select Committee Members about the cost-benefit analysis of opting for cleaning services to reduce contamination. It was agreed that further information on contamination rates and mitigation measures would be provided to the Committee.</p> <p>In response to Members concerns regarding the difficulty for residents to report waste-related ASB accurately, it was confirmed that a new reporting system with photo upload, geolocation, and AI classification was being introduced to improve analytics and ease of reporting.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Select Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the Annual Performance Report for 2024/25, as attached in Appendix 1; and 2. Noted that the report would be presented to full Council in November alongside the Annual Performance Report.
118.	<p>REVIEW OF FOOTWAY PARKING IN PRIORITY AREAS (PHASE 1): WITNESS SESSION 1 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Richard Webb (Director of Community Safety and Enforcement), Steve Austin (Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager), Freddie Mohammed (Parking Representations and Appeals Manager) and Jas Rattu (Parking Infrastructure Manager) were in attendance to present the report and respond to Members' questions and requests for clarification.</p> <p>The Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager thanked Members for the list of roads identified for phase one review and explained that officers had undertaken initial observations:</p>

For Botwell Common Road, Hayes, Members heard that most issues appeared to be between Botwell Lane and Badgers Close, where the majority of footway parking occurred. Officers had also observed some footway parking in other parts of the road but noted that the lay-bys along Botwell Common Road were generally full and were not managed through a permit system.

In respect of Clifton Gardens, Hillingdon, it was explained that the road contained numerous dropped kerbs, and from observations, residents tended to park across their own dropped kerbs during the evening due to limited space between them. The Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager noted that formalising a scheme in this road would remove this option and severely reduce capacity, estimating that only six to ten spaces might remain if a footway parking scheme were introduced.

Regarding Windsor Avenue, Hillingdon, the Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager referred to a previous consultation, noting that the response rate had been 31%, with 30% of respondents supporting a formalised footway parking scheme and 70% opposing it. He suggested that unless attitudes had changed significantly, similar results would likely be obtained again.

For Ryefield Avenue, Hillingdon, Members were informed that, while it might be possible to formalise footway parking near Long Lane, the complexity increased further along the road due to numerous dropped kerbs and the presence of a shopping parade where parking was already managed.

Members were informed that Colham Green Road, Brunel, could be removed from the list of roads as controlled parking had been implemented along its length, eliminating footway parking issues. Similarly, Windsor Close in Northwood had a successful parking management scheme in place, and residents were encouraging the Council to extend its operating times.

With regards to Wood End Green Road, Hayes, it was explained that there were significant lengths of single and double yellow lines. The Officer noted that many issues related to illegal parking on footways and grass verges behind these lines, which was not permitted, and suggested that some residents knowingly parked unlawfully.

Finally, the Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager addressed North Road, West Drayton, stating that officers had developed a parking management scheme for the northern section between Porters Way and Thornton Avenue following a petition from residents. This scheme was ready for implementation once funding was identified. However, south of Thornton Avenue, residents were strongly opposed to any formalisation of parking, whether on the footway or through a management scheme.

Members referred to a recent petition for Clifton Gardens and requested that its progress be monitored. They recalled the Windsor Avenue consultation from approximately ten to twelve years ago, noting that confusion among residents about the difference between formalised parking and permit schemes had likely influenced objections. Councillors suggested reviewing the consultation material to ensure clarity that no paid service was proposed. They also queried whether the parking management schemes for Colham Green Road and Windsor Close had been implemented recently. It was confirmed that both had been in place for some years and an amended definitive list was included in the agenda. The Committee expressed concern that the previous list had categorised these roads incorrectly, indicating a need

for officers to review and update lists regularly.

Members suggested that Nine Elms Avenue be considered in place of Colham Green Road, citing recent pavement resurfacing followed by residents parking on the new surface. They highlighted that the last review of Nine Elms Avenue had been in November 1990 and suggested that the Committee consider adding it to the list. Officers acknowledged the historic nature of the decision and agreed that the matter could be revisited.

Councillors raised safety concerns on Wood End Green Road, particularly near the school and allotments, describing dangerous behaviour by parents parking on pavements and even forcing pedestrians to move. They opposed any formalised footway parking in this area on safety grounds. Officers assured the Select Committee that enforcement applied behind yellow lines and confirmed there was no intention to formalise footway parking in hazardous areas. It was explained that some drivers knowingly parked illegally and dangerously, which enforcement teams continued to address.

Further questions focused on complaint handling and the Council's responsiveness. Members asked how many complaints were required before a review was triggered and whether petitions were necessary. The Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager clarified that a single complaint would be sufficient if it related to a road safety issue, but wider changes such as introducing formal schemes required evidence of community support to reassure the Cabinet Member. He noted that the Council received between 200 and 250 requests for road safety matters annually, which did not always result in new restrictions but could lead to other measures such as white bar markings across dropped kerbs.

The discussion then turned to suspended enforcement. Councillors asked for clarification of this term and whether vehicles parked fully on pavements in such roads would receive a penalty. Officers explained that enforcement could be carried out where vehicles were parked outside marked areas or contrary to signage, but informal schemes without signs or lines created exemptions for entire roads, making enforcement challenging. In Windsor Avenue, for example, if the location was not exempt, enforcement would apply, but exemptions typically allowed two wheels on the footway.

Councillors questioned whether increased enforcement could resolve issues and asked if all calls to the enforcement hotline were logged. Officers confirmed that calls were logged but details of complaints were not routinely recorded, acknowledging a gap in intelligence gathering. They agreed to review processes to capture more detailed data, including trends in roads where enforcement was limited.

Members asked about the impact of changes on bus routes. Officers confirmed that they held regular liaison meetings with emergency services, bus operators, and Transport for London, and acted promptly when bus routes were affected by parking issues. They cited a recent example on Station Road where temporary measures were introduced to maintain bus flow while legal processes for double yellow lines were completed.

Accessibility considerations were raised, with Councillors asking when the Council's Accessibility Officer would be involved and whether feedback would be reported to the Committee. Officers agreed to consult the Accessibility Officer and consider site visits

	<p>where necessary, noting that some roads might not present accessibility issues due to wide footways, but others could require attention. Members suggested that engagement with schools, GP surgeries, and Chambers of Commerce should also be considered, particularly for roads near schools such as Windsor Avenue, where Oak Farm School had previously raised concerns about enforcement near zebra crossings.</p> <p>Councillors requested updated ward boundary information to assist with the review. Officers confirmed they would work with GIS colleagues to provide this, although it might require manual processes. Officers concluded by reminding members to encourage residents to submit petitions if they wished to see formalised footway parking schemes introduced, whether with permits or without.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee noted the evidence heard at the witness session and sought clarification as necessary in the context of its review of Footway Parking in Priority Areas.</p>
119.	<p>DRAFT COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Richard Webb, Director of Community Safety and Enforcement, was in attendance to respond to Members' questions and requests for clarification in respect of the Draft Community Safety Strategy.</p> <p>Members began by asking when the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Coordinator would be appointed and what governance procedures would apply if recruitment were delayed. It was explained that this had been discussed recently and funding for the post was being considered. It was confirmed that the role was recognised as essential to enable integrated work with the management board. Probation services were reviewing operational details and practices elsewhere, and a proposal would be brought to the next Safer Hillingdon Partnership meeting alongside other elements of the strategy and delivery plan. The Director of Community Safety and Enforcement noted that funding constraints would limit the ability to deliver some areas, but ambitions were being set where strengthening was required.</p> <p>Councillors then referred to a recent Safer Neighbourhood Team meeting at which suggestions had been made about improving lighting in certain roads and alleyways. They asked whether such measures could be included in the strategy to create safer spaces. The Director of Community Safety and Enforcement responded that requests for lighting and alleyway improvements were received regularly through resident feedback and petitions. However, these were often problematic due to issues such as privacy, light intrusion, and costs associated with maintaining mirrors, which were frequently damaged and required replacement. Barriers to prevent cycling in alleyways could also restrict accessibility. It was explained that the delivery plan included the establishment of the Hillingdon Enforcement Safety Panel, a new group tasked with identifying locations where safety risks existed and improvements could be made. Resident requests would be referred to this group for consideration. The Officer added that the Anti-Social Behaviour Team currently reviewed such requests, but the new approach would provide a stronger, partnership-based response, although not all requests could be satisfied.</p> <p>The Committee raised a further point regarding green spaces, suggesting that the possibility of locking them should be reconsidered due to concerns about drug-related issues. The Officer acknowledged this and confirmed that the matter would be referred back to the Cabinet Member, noting that the decision to unlock green spaces had been</p>

made earlier in the year for various reasons.

Councillors then queried the proposed panels—the Hillingdon Enforcement Safety Panel and the IOM panel—asking what hard targets would apply to each, such as hotspot resolution times, reduction in repeat victimisation, or reoffending rates, and what baseline measures would be used. It was explained that a new performance framework for anti-social behaviour was being developed, partly driven by requirements from the social housing regulator. This framework would include indicators such as the speed of risk assessment for cases, satisfaction surveys, and resolution times. It was confirmed that this work was in progress and that the Committee would receive details in the next ASB update, including the indicators being collected and performance against them, which would represent an improvement on previous arrangements. Regarding the IOM panel, it was stated that targets had not yet been developed because the panel had not commenced, but they would be probation-focused and linked to reducing reoffending, which was a statutory duty. The Officer emphasised that success would be measured by the effectiveness of approaches to reducing reoffending.

Members referred to recent announcements by the Mayor of London about cutting 1,700 police officer posts and closing front counters across London, leaving only two operating 24 hours a day. They asked what impact these changes might have on the community safety strategy and whether the implications for residents had been considered. In response, it was confirmed that the matter had been discussed at the Safer Hillingdon Partnership. While the changes did not directly affect the strategy, the Partnership aimed to maintain a clear public strategy reflecting resident priorities and data. The Officer noted that the police were a key partner and that questions would be asked about the local impact of reductions. Although unable to speak on behalf of the police, the Director of Community Safety and Enforcement stated that discussions indicated efforts were being made to avoid impacts on frontline policing. Any significant changes would be monitored through partnership data and police reports at each meeting to understand practical outcomes.

The Select Committee commented on the need for clearer performance measures, observing that outputs in the strategy lacked definition and were difficult to measure. Councillors suggested linking outputs to specific reviews, such as the anti-social behaviour review, to clarify what measurements were being used. In response, it was confirmed that the partnership would have a delivery plan containing specific measures, which would be presented to the Committee as part of six-monthly performance reviews and police updates. These measures would not appear in the strategy itself but would be developed and agreed by the partnership and reviewed regularly.

Finally, Members asked whether the Anti-Social Behaviour priority in the Strategy could include specific provisions for tower blocks, as these were major locations for such behaviour. They highlighted issues arising when partial closure orders expired, allowing problems to return quickly, and suggested that processes be put in place to enable back-to-back applications for closure orders to prevent recurrence. Officers agreed that this was an important point and confirmed that tower blocks and similar communal areas would be reflected in the strategy as a particular focus.

The Chair concluded by referring members to the recommendation that the Select Committee review the draft community safety strategy and provide comments for consideration before final approval by Cabinet. The Chair proposed liaising with the

	<p>Labour lead outside the meeting to draft comments through Democratic Services, subject to members' agreement.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. reviewed the draft Community Safety Strategy for the Borough; and 2. delegated the drafting of any comments for the consideration of Cabinet to Democratic Services in conjunction with the Chair and in consultation with the Labour Lead.
120.	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>Julia Johnson, Director of Planning and Sustainable Growth, and Andrew Tebbutt, Planning Obligations Team Leader, were in attendance to respond to Members' questions and requests for clarification in respect of the Infrastructure Funding Statement.</p> <p>Councillors began by asking whether the Council was on target to secure all monies due within the required timeframe, emphasising the importance of avoiding any lapse and ensuring funds were available when needed. The Director of Planning and Sustainable Growth confirmed that monthly meetings were held with the team to review outstanding payments and that a process was in place with legal services to pursue unpaid monies. It was explained that an annual review was conducted through the starts and completions exercise using Council Tax data to identify completed developments, which was then compared against obligations. Monitoring occurred monthly to ensure developers reported commencement and compliance with payment requirements.</p> <p>Members sought reassurance that funds were being spent appropriately and within deadlines to prevent lapses. It was confirmed that a list was maintained for all items approaching the 18-month deadline and that a monthly infrastructure meeting reviewed these proactively. It was stated that no funds had lapsed recently, although there had been close cases involving health projects where collaboration with the NHS was required. In some instances, extensions were requested from developers to avoid issues.</p> <p>The Select Committee asked about the proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts transferred to the Greater London Authority or Transport for London, requesting either a percentage or approximate figure. Members also queried whether the Council could retain a greater share locally or whether this was determined nationally. It was explained that the Council acted as the charging and collecting authority under legislation, retaining an administrative fee of 4%, with the remainder remitted to the Mayor for transport infrastructure. The officer undertook to provide precise figures from the report and confirmed that the 4% fee was the maximum permitted under regulations.</p> <p>A further question concerned progress on updating the system for recording Section 106 contributions and expenditure, which had been discussed at previous meetings. Councillors asked how far back the review had gone and what remained outstanding. It was reported that all current expenditure and receipts were now processed through the system and detailed in the appendix to the Infrastructure Funding Statement. However, historic data was still being migrated from paper files, with progress dependent on team</p>

	<p>capacity. It was explained that priority was given to securing new monies and spending funds, with backlog reconciliation undertaken as resources allowed. Most categories had been reconciled, but the system was not yet a single definitive source, as spreadsheets were still used for overall positions.</p> <p>Members expressed disappointment at the lack of significant progress, noting that the Committee had discussed this issue for several years. They stressed the importance of understanding the origin of Section 106 monies, the developments generating them, and the projects funded. Officers responded that the appendix listed receipts and expenditure for the current year, although presented by address rather than scheme. The Committee reiterated that the promised database should enable clear identification of contributions by development and corresponding expenditure. In response it was clarified that data for schemes delivered in the last three to four years could likely be produced, but the statutory report followed a national standard and did not include that level of detail. Additional data could be provided outside the report if required.</p> <p>Members observed that heavily developed areas did not appear to benefit visibly from CIL or Section 106 expenditure, leading to perceptions that funds were not reinvested locally. It was explained that CIL spending was determined annually by Cabinet and that the report set out the total receipts and allocations. Officers noted that most CIL expenditure had been directed to the West Drayton Leisure Centre and acknowledged the point about demonstrating tangible improvements linked to developments. They agreed to consider how presentation could better illustrate the relationship between contributions and local benefits, including whether agreed improvements had been delivered.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the contents of the Infrastructure Funding Statement 2024-2025; and 2. delegated the drafting of any comments for the consideration of Cabinet to Democratic Services in conjunction with the Chair and in consultation with the Labour Lead.
121.	<p>STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Daniel Ferrer, Licensing Team Manager, was in attendance to respond to Members' questions and requests for clarification in relation to the Statement of Licensing Policy.</p> <p>In response to Members' requests for an update on the status of the consultation, it was explained that the consultation had closed on Monday after a six-week period. Initially, seven comments had been received, but this number had increased to ten. A full report was scheduled to be presented to Cabinet on 18 December. Among the responses, three had come from responsible authorities: the anti-social behaviour team, the food health and safety team, and the immigration team. These responses primarily sought clarification on contact details and provided helpful guidance. The remaining seven responses had been submitted through the survey, which had been managed in collaboration with the customer engagement team. It was noted that some comments highlighted unclear information and possible technical issues with accessing details. Resident concerns largely focused on enforcement, echoing themes previously discussed in the Licensing Committee. It was confirmed that the enforcement section of the licensing policy had remained unchanged, as had the provisions on processing and fees. Proactive and risk-weighted inspections continued to be carried out, and</p>

complaints or referrals from responsible authorities were addressed promptly.

The Committee commended the quality of the report, acknowledging the effort invested and praising the inclusion of modern clauses such as the “Ask Angela” initiative. Councillors also welcomed the incorporation of the agent of change principle, explaining that developers, rather than long-standing pubs, should bear responsibility for soundproofing when new developments were built nearby. The Licensing Team Manager expressed appreciation for these comments and explained that the licensing taskforce, established by the government, had encouraged modernisation. Members were informed confirmed that both the Ask Angela initiative and the agent of change principle were specifically mentioned in national recommendations, and the Council aimed to remain aligned with best practice and other boroughs undertaking similar reviews.

Councillors enquired how the level of response compared to previous consultations. It was stated that engagement appeared slightly better than before, noting that earlier consultations had sometimes attracted only two comments from responsible authorities. The Licensing Team Manager credited improvements to the involvement of the customer engagement and web teams, which had enhanced accessibility and produced charts for inclusion as annexes in the Cabinet report. He emphasised a desire for greater engagement and reiterated that all comments were valued and would inform changes to the licensing policy where appropriate.

Councillors observed that efforts to promote the consultation had been visible on social media and queried whether similar promotion had occurred elsewhere. It was confirmed that outreach had extended to stakeholders, responsible authorities, and neighbouring boroughs, stressing that the legal process was an essential component of consultation. Additional detail had been provided in areas such as safeguarding children to ensure clarity for the licensing trade, residents, and Committee Members. It was explained that practical solutions had been incorporated based on issues encountered over the past five years, including closer consideration of planning matters, which had previously been excluded from licensing discussions.

The Select Committee asked whether any collaboration had taken place with the Community Safety department or Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT), given their operational role. It was confirmed that such engagement had occurred, noting that priorities identified in community safety strategies—such as tackling violence against women and girls—had influenced the inclusion of measures addressing spiking and the Ask Angela initiative. The Licensing Team Manager emphasised that the licensing policy had not been developed in isolation but worked in conjunction with other strategies, including Public Space Protection Orders.

Members suggested that engagement could be increased by sharing information at upcoming SNT meetings and encouraging attendees to participate. The Officer welcomed this suggestion and acknowledged that, with a fully staffed team of nine officers, there was scope for greater direct engagement.

The Committee concluded by commending the inclusion of new provisions on issues such as drink spiking, third-party contractors, and overrates. The Chair expressed satisfaction with the thoroughness of the report and the positive reception of the consultation, congratulating the officers on their work.

RESOLVED: That the Committee considered the revisions to the Statement of

	Licensing Policy.
122.	FORWARD PLAN (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>) RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee noted the Cabinet Forward Plan.
123.	WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>) Democractic Services informed Members that a visit with the gritting team over the winter months was planned. Details had yet to be confirmed. Members reiterated their request for a site visit to the Borough's Civic Amenity Sites. With regard to fly-tipping, the Committee also suggested a visit with the cage vans. RESOLVED: That the Residents' Services Select Committee considered the Work Programme report and agreed any amendments. .
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.04 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.

--	--