

Minutes

CORPORATE RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE SELECT COMMITTEE

7 April 2026



Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors John Riley (Chair), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Scott Farley, Gursharan Mand (Opposition Lead) and Mohammed Islam</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Roy Thabrew – Street Lighting and Signs Manager Stephen Gunter – Fleet Manager Steve Muldoon – Corporate Director of Finance Hazel Greenstreet – Lead Finance BP Pete Carpenter - Director, Pensions, Treasury & Stat Accounts Anisha Teji – Democratic Services</p>
133.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Farhad Choubedar and Councillor Kaushik Banerjee.</p>
134.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
135.	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2026 be agreed, subject to noting that Members requested consideration of Cabinet and Select Committee meeting timetables to support timely reporting.</p>
136.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED AS PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED AS PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part I.</p>
137.	<p>ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW: 12 MONTH UPDATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>The Committee received an update on delivery of the Council's Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure programme. It was reported that phase one had been completed, with 22 existing charging points replaced and 24 new units installed, resulting in 46 operational chargers across the Borough.</p>

Phase two was expected to deliver a further 14 units, supported by £100k of funding from the Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV). Eight sites were initially installed; however, four units were later removed after residents raised concerns about the loss of on-street parking. Two units remained in place and were awaiting meter connections, with activation expected by the end of the month. Members were also advised that £1.2m of matched OZEV funding had been secured through a partnership with six London boroughs. Procurement for the next phase was underway, with potential locations identified and consultation reports being prepared for Member consideration.

Members raised concerns about the impact of EV charging points on residential parking, particularly in areas where properties did not have driveways. It was acknowledged that charging bays were publicly accessible and could not be reserved for individual households. Officers confirmed that site selection had been informed by mapping exercises, as well as requests from councillors and residents. It was noted that complaints had been received at a small number of locations, and units were removed where necessary in response.

Alternative solutions were discussed, including lamppost charging and cable gullies across footways. Officers confirmed that lamppost charging was being explored through the multi-borough partnership and that a further £90k of OZEV funding had been secured to support cable channel solutions, subject to procurement.

Members were advised that grid capacity constraints and approvals from UK Power Networks continued to impact delivery timescales. It was confirmed that phase one units were operational and that phase two units would go live following meter connections.

Charging speeds were discussed, with officers confirming that 22kW fast chargers had been installed at two locations, while most other locations used 7kW chargers due to supply limitations. Future funding would support a mix of slow on-street chargers and fast chargers in town centres and short-stay locations.

Members welcomed the largely grant-funded approach and emphasised the need for stronger planning requirements on developers and large retailers to reduce reliance on highway-based infrastructure. Lobbying of central government and the Greater London Authority was suggested.

In response to questions on fleet charging, officers advised that depot-based vehicles would charge on-site once infrastructure capacity allowed, while work was ongoing to identify suitable arrangements for staff-taken-home vehicles. Full depot electrification was reported to require significant infrastructure upgrades over several years.

The Committee requested a future update clarifying the circumstances and decision making around the removal of charging units. Members were advised that charging costs were set at 63p per kWh for residents and 65p for non-residents and that maintenance was managed by APCOA through a 24-hour monitoring service. The importance of future-proofing infrastructure and feeding back operational issues to suppliers was emphasised.

RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the contents of the report.

Item 6)

The Committee considered the Month 10 budget monitoring report. It was reported that the Council was forecasting a net overspend of £36.3m, representing a £0.4m adverse movement from Month 9 but remaining broadly stable since Month 6. Members were advised that an additional internal review had been undertaken ahead of year end and had identified no material change.

It was explained that the adverse movement largely related to the interventions and mitigations line, where forecast mitigation had reduced from £1.0m to £0.5m. This was attributed to favourable movements elsewhere being treated as mitigation, including a £0.5m receipt from the West London Waste Authority. Members were advised that the underlying pressure remained primarily within service budgets.

A net £0.8m favourable movement was reported across services within the Committee's remit, comprising £0.1m in Finance, £0.1m in Corporate Services and £0.6m in Place. The Place improvement was largely attributable to lower National Non-Domestic Rates costs across corporate estates.

Finance pressures were said to be mainly driven by agency staffing costs, particularly to deliver statutory functions and transformation programmes. Members also noted grant funding received for asylum support administration. An insurance overspend of £0.4m was reported, linked to reduced use of reserves to meet in-year costs. In contrast, Freedom Pass expenditure was forecast to be £1.0m below budget, reflecting revised GLA allocations based on lower relative usage and population factors.

Members raised concerns about the delivery and long-term sustainability of savings. It was explained that some savings had been delayed due to the time needed to put enabling activity in place, and that original assumptions had sometimes been affected by optimism bias. Officers highlighted the importance of robust challenge during budget setting and early identification where savings were no longer achievable.

Discussion focused on major cost pressures in children's services, adult social care and homelessness. It was acknowledged that financial pressures were driven by both increased demand and rising unit costs. Officers outlined the importance of managing demand, reviewing need, supporting lower-cost provision and preventing escalation, while maintaining appropriate service standards.

Members requested improved transparency in future reports, particularly clearer explanations of why variances had occurred and whether movements were permanent, one-off or timing-related. Officers acknowledged this feedback.

Further clarification was provided on agency staffing costs, including the distinction between unbudgeted project roles, budgeted vacancies and longer-term posts that had since been built into future budgets. It was confirmed that permanent recruitment would help reduce overspends but would generally be treated as mitigation rather than the delivery of formal savings.

Members welcomed the increased stability of the financial forecasts and the improved clarity of explanations, while recognising the ongoing financial challenges facing the Council. In response to questions on savings delivery, it was clarified that savings described as "banked" had been achieved, with others assessed as on track, at risk or not deliverable. It was further noted that unrelated underspends were treated as mitigation and not counted as savings delivery.

In closing, Members welcomed the improved stability and clarity of reporting and thanked officers for their work.

RESOLVED: That the Committee:

- 1. Noted the budget monitoring position as at January 2026 (Month 10) for the Council.**
- 2. Noted the budget monitoring position as at January 2026 (Month 10) for the services within the remit of the Corporate Resources and Infrastructure Select Committee.**

139. **UPDATE ON COUNCIL'S FLEET** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The Committee considered the Fleet Management report and received an update on vehicle replacement, emissions compliance, damage costs and driver performance. Members were informed that the Council operated a diverse fleet of around 295 vehicles, and that replacing ageing vehicles remained challenging, particularly where electrification was limited by cost and the availability of charging infrastructure.

It was reported that electric refuse collection vehicles continued to be significantly more expensive than diesel alternatives, with limited grant funding available for heavier and specialist vehicles. As a result, 26 older vehicles remained in operation and were incurring Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) charges of between £6,500 and £8,000 per month, alongside higher maintenance and hire costs. Members were advised that no scrappage scheme had been made available to local authorities following the ULEZ expansion, and that the Council had been required to meet these costs directly, despite an unsuccessful legal challenge. With the procurement of new compliant diesel vehicles underway, these ULEZ charges were expected to cease later in the year.

Members referred to discussion on YouTube regarding fleet costs and queried whether the reported £800,000 annual vehicle damage cost indicated poor performance. Officers explained that around half of this figure related to third-party insurance claims, with the remainder reflecting direct vehicle damage. When benchmarked against other councils operating similar fleets in dense urban environments, costs were described as broadly comparable. It was noted that the fleet regularly operated in narrow residential streets and constrained layouts, increasing the risk of damage.

The Committee was advised that a range of measures was in place to manage and reduce damage costs. These included mandatory driver assessments linked to operator licence requirements, telematics-based monitoring of driving behaviour, targeted feedback and training, and escalation where repeated incidents occurred. Although these measures had led to reductions in previous years, damage costs had remained broadly stable at around £800,000 per annum over the last three years.

To strengthen accountability, Members were informed that from 1 April 2026, vehicle damage costs would be recharged monthly to service areas. This was described as a trial aimed at increasing cost awareness and supporting further reductions.

Members acknowledged the complexity of managing a large municipal fleet and recognised that, while driver behaviour was a factor, the operating environment itself presented unavoidable challenges. Questions were raised about whether environmental factors and route design were being considered alongside driver performance. Officers confirmed that route reviews, smaller vehicle specifications and

	<p>alternative collection methods were being explored to reduce risk in constrained streets.</p> <p>Members were also advised that trials of electric refuse vehicles and sweepers had shown positive results in terms of range, noise reduction and drivability. However, infrastructure limitations and capital costs remained the main barriers to wider adoption in the short term. In the interim, a decision had been taken to procure 32 new emissions-compliant diesel vehicles to reduce operational risk and running costs.</p> <p>An update was provided on vehicle tracking, with 65% of the fleet currently fitted, and full rollout expected by summer 2026.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the noted the contents of the report.</p>
140.	<p>FORWARD PLAN (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Forward Plan be noted.</p>
141.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Work Programme be noted.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.53 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji, Senior Democratic Services Officer on ateji@hillington.gov.uk or 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

--	--