

## Minutes

### COUNCIL

3 November 2011

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



Councillor Mary O'Connor (Mayor)  
Councillor Michael Markham (Deputy Mayor)

	<p><b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b></p> <p>Councillors: David Allam                      Beulah East                      Anita MacDonald Lynne Allen                                      Neil Fyfe                              John Major Bruce Baker                                      Sid Garg                              Carol Melvin Tim Barker                                        Roshan Ghei                        Douglas Mills Richard Barnes                                Dominic Gilham                    Richard Mills Jonathan Bianco                                Raymond Graham                  John Morgan Lindsay Bliss                                    Paul Harmsworth                  June Nelson Sukhpal Brar                                    Shirley Harper-O'Neill            Susan O'Brien Wayne Bridges                                 John Hensley                        David Payne Mike Bull                                         Henry Higgins                      Ray Puddifoot Keith Burrows                                 Patricia Jackson                   Andrew Retter Paul Buttivant                                 Phoday Jarjussey                  John Riley George Cooper                                 Sandra Jenkins                    David Routledge Judith Cooper                                 Allan Kauffman                    Avtar Sandhu Philip Corthorne                               Judy Kelly                            Robin Sansarpuri Brian Crowe                                    Peter Kemp                           Scott Seaman-Digby Peter Curling                                  Mo Khursheed                      David Simmonds Catherine Dann                                Kuldeep Lakhmana                Brian Stead Jazz Dhillon                                    Eddie Lavery                        Michael White Janet Duncan                                  Richard Lewis                       David Yarrow</p>
	<p><b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b> Hugh Dunnachie, Jean Palmer, Linda Sanders, Raj Alagh, Lloyd White, Paul Whaymand, Mark Braddock, Morgan Einon and Nikki O'Halloran</p>
	<p><b>PRAYERS</b></p> <p>Prayers were said by Father Angel Ochagavia CMF.</p>
31.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barrett, Benson and Gardner.</p>
32.	<p><b>MINUTES</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2011 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
33.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Barnes, Bridges, Corthorne, Curling, Dann, Higgins, Jarjussey, O'Brien and Payne declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 – Report of the Head of</p>

Democratic Services, as they were independently appointed school Governors, and remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillors G Cooper, J, Cooper, Curling, Fyfe and Kemp declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8 – Article 4 Direction to Control Houses in Multiple Occupation Around Brunel University, and left the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillor Routledge declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 – Article 4 Direction to Control Houses in Multiple Occupation Around Brunel University, and remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

Councillors Baker, G Cooper, J, Cooper, Corthorne, Crowe, Curling, Dann, Duncan, Gilham, Harmsworth, Harper-O’Neill, Hensley, Higgins, Khursheed, Lavery, Lewis, Nelson, O’Brien, Payne, Puddifoot, Retter, Sansarpuri, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds and White declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9 – Governance Arrangements for the Pension Fund, as they were members of the local government pension scheme, and remained in the room during the consideration thereof.

34. **MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS** (*Agenda Item 4*)

The Mayor welcomed a party of journalism students from Brunel University to the meeting. She went on to advise that the figures for the number of events that had been attended by the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and past Mayors on the Mayor’s behalf would be reported to the next Council meeting.

It was noted that the Mayor had invited many volunteers from a range of organisations such as Mencap, Hillingdon Hospital Radio and the Scouts and Guides to the Mayor’s Parlour. The length of time that these individuals had been volunteering had been rewarded with a special gold, silver or bronze lapel pin. The Mayor advised that she was keen to recognise the service that volunteers provided in the Borough and encouraged Members to suggest additional individuals and groups that could be invited.

35. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME** (*Agenda Item 5*)

**5.1 QUESTION FROM MR DAVID BISHOP OF LICHFIELD ROAD, NORTHWOOD HILLS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“I would like to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Ray Puddifoot (question referred to Councillor Burrows as Lead Cabinet Member), if the residential roads around Northwood Hills station can be designated as a resident’s only permitted parking area, to prevent the growing encroachment of commuters and non- residents vehicles, which is rapidly turning Northwood Hills into a free car park?”

Councillor Burrows thanked Mr Bishop for his question and his overview of the history of the debate about a residents’ parking scheme for Northwood Hills. He advised that Northwood Hills was not the only station in the Borough that was not surrounded by a parking management scheme.

Councillor Burrows was sure that Mr Bishop was aware that the Council, far from failing to support the local community, had twice consulted with residents of Northwood Hills on a possible parking management scheme for the area. The first

consultation had taken place in early 2003 and there was strong opposition at the time, with only four roads out of the 105 roads consulted indicating a preference for controlled parking.

The Cabinet Member stated that Mr Bishop would also be aware of a second informal consultation on a residents' parking scheme in February 2009, following a petition raised by local businesses and residents. This eventually led to the implementation of the "Stop and Shop" parking scheme in Joel Street that had been so well received by the local community.

However, Councillor Burrows noted that responses received from residents to the informal consultation on a residents' parking scheme had indicated that there was still very little support for an area-wide scheme. Eight out of the eleven roads consulted had wanted no change to the current unrestricted arrangements.

Councillor Burrows stated that the Council would continue to put residents first and that the Council would not impose restrictions unless they received the support of the community. The two consultations that the Council had undertaken with residents of Northwood Hills had both suggested that there was no overall support for a parking management scheme in that area. Although it was recognised that there were some roads that suffered from non-residential parking, these had not provided a cohesive area for blanket parking controls.

Councillor Burrows stated that he was aware that Mr Bishop knew these issues only too well, as he had put forward ideas in the past, which were subsequently rejected by the public. He went on to advise that the Council would be happy to work with residents and Ward Councillor to develop a parking management scheme when there was evidence to suggest that the majority of residents wanted one. However, Councillor Burrows noted that there had not yet been any evidence of this and it appeared to be yet another suggestion rejected by local residents.

## **5.2 QUESTION FROM MR COLIN SHELLARD OF HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING - COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

"Can Councillor Burrows please tell me why I have not received an acknowledgement or response from the London Borough of Hillingdon to the petition I submitted last year in April 2010, requesting a residents' only parking scheme for Hilliard Road, details of which with three options was provided by the traffic engineers department and have the parking stress and speed survey been carried out?"

Councillor Burrows thanked Mr Shellard for his question and stated that he recalled the petition in question. He advised that it had been received on 1 April 2010 and contained 74 signatures. The petition was considered by Councillor Burrows at a Petition Hearing on 13 October 2010 where he had approved a series of action points laid out in the recommendations, including undertaking a parking stress survey, as alluded to in the question. This survey involved Council officers recording registration numbers at different times of the day, from as early as 5am to late in the evening. The main purpose of this, as was explained at the time of the Petition Hearing, was to establish with some reasonable certainty where the parking problem came from. Often the problem would be commuters or shoppers, or it could simply be the residents who lived there.

Councillor Burrows was clear that the reason for the problem needed to be

determined as the next stage of the process would be to gauge the level of public support for a parking management scheme. In practice, these schemes only really benefited the street if the parking had come from outside.

The Cabinet Member noted that the surveys he had seen so far had suggested that the majority of the cars parked in Mr Shellard's road appeared to be associated with the people who lived there. He went on to advise that this undermined the case for a parking management scheme when there were many other areas across the Borough where residents were clearly suffering from commuter and non-resident parking and pressing for similar schemes. Councillor Burrows stated that he had received many requests for parking schemes which had to be prioritised.

The Council had also agreed to measure speeds in Hilliard Road. With regard to the speed surveys that had been undertaken so far, the number of vehicles had actually been quite small. Councillor Burrows had therefore asked officers to undertake a more robust survey during the autumn term so that it was completed when the school was open. This survey was scheduled to take place before Christmas. Once Councillor Burrows had the results, a more considered debate could take place about what, if anything, needed to be done in Hilliard Road. He went on to assure Mr Shellard that, as always, the Council would not seek to impose any scheme on residents, but would consult fully to ensure that, should a scheme be implemented, it would be to the benefit of all residents concerned.

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

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds and:

**RESOLVED: That:**

- i) the Urgency decisions detailed in the report be noted.
- ii) the Scheme of Officer Delegations be amended as follows:

**To the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Planning, Environment, Education & Community Services:**

1. To take all procedural steps necessary prior to deciding whether to give a direction to admit a child in the borough to a specified voluntary aided or foundation school in accordance with section 97 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.
2. To issue a direction to admit a child in the borough to a specified voluntary aided or foundation school in accordance with section 96 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.
3. To request an Academy to admit a child in the Borough to it.

37. **POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACES REVIEW 2011** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Councillor D Mills moved the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor G Cooper. Following debate (Councillors Allen, Harmsworth, Jarjussey and Khursheed), the motion was put to the vote and agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the proposed changes for the polling arrangements within the Borough be approved.**

38.	<p><b>ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION TO CONTROL HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION AROUND BRUNEL UNIVERSITY</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Burrows moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Corthorne. Following debate (Councillors Allen, Khursheed, Major and R Mills), the motion was put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That an Article 4 Direction for the Uxbridge South and Brunel Wards to address student Houses in Multiple Occupation issues raised by local residents be approved.</b></p>
39.	<p><b>GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PENSION FUND</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Corthorne moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Bianco, then put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the terms of reference of the Investment Strategy Sub-Committee be amended to include the authority for it to reallocate assets and/or generate market exposure using established financial instruments up to 10% of Scheme assets, subject to the conditions outlined in the body of the report.</b></p>
40.	<p><b>MEMBERS' QUESTIONS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>10.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR GILHAM TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR IMPROVEMENT, PARTNERSHIPS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY – COUNCILLOR D MILLS</b></p> <p>“Following on from the very successful partnership between Hillingdon Council, Job Centre Plus and Tesco in placing well over 50 unemployed local residents with jobs in the new Yiewsley store, can the Cabinet Member please advise what other partnership initiatives are in operation?”</p> <p>Councillor D Mills responded that the Council worked in close partnership with Uxbridge College and Brunel University to ensure that potential developers were made aware of the skills and knowledge that were available in the Borough. It was noted that, over the next six months, the Council, Uxbridge College, Brunel University and a major European employer would be discussing new employment opportunities that business could bring by moving into the Borough.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Gateway Heathrow project, which was led by Hillingdon but included other West London boroughs, looked to assist unemployed local residents to access jobs at Heathrow Airport and the surrounding areas. Members were advised that, through the project, more than 620 residents had received support in gaining employment, 274 residents had received accredited skills and 240 residents had gained full time permanent employment (126 of which had stayed in their new posts for six months or more).</p> <p>Councillor D Mills stated that, although the Council was limited on how it could help improve unemployment, its primary role was as a force for good, working with partners to improve opportunities for its residents. He noted that, although Brunel University brought challenges, it also brought job opportunities. The University attracted large employers to the Borough that wanted to take advantage of the students’ skills.</p>

Councillor Gilham, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Cabinet Member would agree that the 10% reduction in unemployment in Yiewsley was a good news story and how the unemployment figures for the whole Borough compared to a year ago.

Councillor D Mills stated that, as at September 2011, there were 168 fewer unemployed in the Borough than there were the previous year despite the national figure increasing. He advised that the Council would not be complacent as it was aware that there were still individuals, particularly those over 50, that were finding it difficult to be unemployed and secure new jobs.

Councillor D Mills noted that 14.8% of those aged 18-24 in London were not in education, employment or training (NEET). The equivalent figure for Hillingdon was 4.3%. He noted that the unemployed were assets that were waiting to be employed, irrespective of whether they were 25 or 55 years old. The Cabinet Member stated that the Core Strategy had been very clear about where the Council wanted to encourage new business and noted that the advent of developments such as Crossrail would provide new employment opportunities for residents.

## **10.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CURLING TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION & RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“Some years ago the speed limits on the Townfield estate were altered resulting in Central Avenue and part of Church Road having a speed limit of 20 MPH whilst all the other roads (even the smallest roads) on the estate have a limit of 30 MPH.

Hemmen Lane was later added to the 20 MPH zone after a petition from the Children of Dr Triplett’s School, however we still have a situation where a major road like Central Avenue has a 20 MPH limit and the minor roads off of it are at 30 MPH.

During the summer, I had to make a house call to a family in Hesa Road who had witnessed their much loved dog knocked over and killed by a speeding motorist.

Can the Cabinet Member ensure that the speed limits on the Townfield estate are unified at 20m.p.h?”

Councillor Burrows advised that, as a dog owner himself, he was sorry to hear of the sad loss of a family pet through what appeared, on the face of it, to have been the result of inconsiderate driving. This was something which was sadly all too common on the roads. He stated that there was a limit to what the Council could do in cases like this, but that it must, and indeed did, work closely with its partners in the Metropolitan Police in all areas of road safety.

The measures in Central Avenue, Church Road and Hemmen Lane all came about as a consequence of requests from residents and, in the latter case, from Dr Triplett’s School. Pupils from the school had made a compelling case when Councillor Burrows went to see them. He was pleased to note that, in each case, the Council had been able to improve the roads, with better surfaces and suitable traffic calming measures.

Although some local authorities had tried introducing 20mph zones without any traffic calming measures, the Metropolitan Police had advised that it did not support this approach. Such schemes relied upon enforcement by the Police and were usually far less successful than ones with some form of physical traffic calming that actually

forced vehicles to slow down.

Councillor Burrows advised that these schemes tended to be expensive and were often dependent upon funding from Transport for London. It was noted that, with the limited funds available, the Council needed to be absolutely sure that any such measures were both justified and supported by the majority of the residents directly affected.

Councillor Burrows suggested that a good starting point for this was the petition process where, as Ward Councillors knew from their own experience, residents submitted petitions for the Cabinet Member's consideration. These residents were afforded the opportunity to meet the Cabinet Member face-to-face and were often supported by the Ward Councillors.

Councillor Burrows stated that there was not currently much evidence beyond this one sad incident that there was a strong case for a traffic calming scheme in these other roads, let alone strong support from the whole community. However, the Cabinet Member advised that a petition which clearly set out what residents would like to see could give the Council a mandate to take further action.

Councillor Curling, by way of a supplementary question, noted that Central Avenue was a main drag with a 20mph limit yet smaller roads in the same vicinity had 30mph limits and he asked whether it would be more logical to unify the 20mph limit in the whole area.

Councillor Burrows responded by advising that he would speak to officers and ask that they look at the area in question. In the meantime, he suggested that Councillor Curling help residents to organise a petition to move the issue up the agenda.

### **10.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR HARMSWORTH TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION & RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“Despite constant calls for action to be taken against those who are feeding pigeons, on a daily basis, the problem still remains.

Since it is generally recognised that these are vermin and spread disease, could I ask whether the Cabinet Member has been made aware of the problem and, if so, what action is proposed to combat the problem?”

Councillor Burrows responded that he was aware that pigeons could be a significant nuisance and that feeding them in public spaces should be discouraged. However, he noted that the Council's litter enforcement efforts were currently aimed at those who deliberately littered the public highway and green spaces with items such as cigarette butts, cans, bottles, paper and fast food waste. Councillor Burrows advised that fast food waste was seen as a major source of food for pigeons and rodents, and that people dropping this type of material could receive fixed penalty notices if caught.

However, Councillor Burrows stated that the Council was not currently seeking to enforce against those who might perhaps be easy targets when deliberately feeding pigeons in public spaces. Wherever possible, he stated that it was not this administration's policy to beat its residents with a stick. As this practice was often seen regularly at the same locations, Councillor Burrows would prefer that officers simply talk to the small number of people involved and educate them as to the

consequences of their good intentioned actions. They could then be encouraged to limit their activities to their own gardens, if possible. This stance could be reviewed in the future if needed.

Councillor Harmsworth, by way of a supplementary question, asked if consideration would be given to banning pigeon feeding in certain areas where the practice was prevalent, for example, Hayes Town Centre.

Councillor Burrows responded that he would rather that these individuals were educated as to the consequences of their actions.

#### **10.4 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION & RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“Members will recall that I raised the issue of the number of ‘Games Rooms’ springing up in Hillingdon particularly in the South of the Borough. Once built many of these buildings are turned into homes for let. Could the Cabinet Member please inform Members as to how many letters requesting access have been sent out, follow up visits made by officers and enforcement notices served and adhered to since May 2008 in relation to these rooms?”

Councillor Burrows responded that the Council received approximately 800 planning enforcement related complaints each year and that this figure had been at this level for the last 3-4 years consecutively. However, the type of complaints had varied during this time. The changes to permitted development rights in 2008 allowed people greater freedom to build extensions. The Council therefore had had less complaints about extensions as householders had learned to exploit the permitted development rights for extensions. There were more complaints year-on-year for outbuildings, though. This increase was as a result of the planning team taking a strict stance on certificates of lawfulness and planning applications concerning outbuildings and had been very successful at appeal in defending the refusals.

Councillor Burrows advised that, quite simply, people were not being given planning permission for any outbuildings that were large enough to be converted to residential units. This meant that, over the corresponding period, the Council had encountered more attempts to build unauthorised outbuildings and hence had more complaints concerning this type of development. It was noted that requests for access were not directly recorded, but enforcement action was. The proportion of planning enforcement cases that were outbuildings had increased since 2008 from approximately 80 to 160 per year of all cases.

In most cases, residents reduced the size of outbuildings or ceased residential use when threatened with enforcement notices or prosecution. If the resident did not respond to written threats of enforcement action, the Council served an enforcement notice. There had been a total of 212 enforcement notices served since January 2008 - 25% of these notices were in relation to outbuildings.

There had been 28 prosecutions in the last two years through the Courts. The Council prosecuted all cases where the notice was not complied with. There were numerous examples of successful enforcement actions against outbuildings, and clearly the number of notices and prosecutions were a fraction of the closed cases.

Councillor Allen, by way of a supplementary question, asked whether the measures contained within the new Government proposals would weaken the Council’s ability to



get rid of these 'Games Rooms'.

Councillor Burrows responded by advising that the proposals would strengthen the Council's abilities. He went on to state that the Council also had policies in place to support this course of action.

#### **10.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR GARDNER TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH & HOUSING – COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

Councillor Major asked the following question on behalf of Councillor Gardner:

“Can the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Health and Housing assure me that everything that can be done is being done to help the residents of North Road and Uxbridge Road Hayes, who are being evicted from their homes by the London & District Housing Ltd.?”

Councillor Corthorne responded that London & District Housing Ltd was a private business which specialised in property acquisition, sale and management. The company had bought the properties in question in bulk from another landlord and intended to break up the portfolio and sell it on as individual units.

Council officers were in direct contact with London & District Housing Ltd and the affected households and were working with both parties during the sale of the properties. There were 13 households affected, the tenants of which were all in employment. Four of the households were protected tenants who had a right to remain in the properties after they were sold.

This left nine households that might need to find alternative accommodation. Three of these nine households had already been served with notices to quit that would expire in December this year. This would enable London & District Housing Ltd to sell the properties with vacant possession.

Councillor Corthorne advised that the Council was continuing to work with all of the affected households and everything was being done to help them to either remain in the property (where possible) or find alternative suitable accommodation.

Councillor Major, by way of a supplementary question, asked whether Councillor Corthorne agreed that the Council needed to lobby the Government to strengthen the rights of tenants.

Councillor Corthorne responded that care was needed as the action being taken was a routine business transaction. He advised that he would give the matter some thought and provide Councillor Major (and Councillor Gardner) with a written response.

#### **WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE:**

*Councillor Corthorne advised that the issue raised by the North Road evictions related to private developers and private landlords. There was a balance that needed to be struck between encouraging a vibrant private rented sector for the benefit of local residents and safeguards for tenants when properties were sold. The Council needed to ensure that tenants had security of tenure but, at the same time, the Council did not*

want to see regulation that worked against the ability of private landlords to provide a good supply of homes in the private rented sector.

*The key point though was that of security of tenure. The current tenancy laws had been in place and working well for around 25 years, striking a good balance between tenant security and landlords' ability to finance the buying and selling of property.*

*It was always unfortunate to hear stories of evictions and the Council would always work with tenants and landlords to minimise these. The Council's Homeless Persons Unit was not seeing a high number of illegal evictions or enquiries of that nature in North Road.*

*Councillor Corthorne did not therefore think that at present, it was necessary to lobby central Government for changes to the law. However, the situation was being closely monitored and the issue was being raised at networking meetings across West London and with London Councils to see if there was evidence of a trend that might cause the Council to reconsider.*

#### **10.6 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BLISS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION & RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“Can I ask the Cabinet Member for Planning Transportation & Recycling, is it fair that residents on three estates in the Borough have to pay an extra charge to have their refuse collected?”

Councillor Burrows responded that all residents received weekly recycling and refuse collections as part of normal service provision. Green waste was collected every two weeks. The Council would remove all waste properly presented, as a part of this service.

Second collections of refuse could be requested by landlords or management companies of housing developments if their bin stores or compounds had insufficient space inside for the number of bins they needed to have. This meant that, rather than store bins outside, they could instead choose to increase the frequency of collections. A charge was made for this optional extra service.

The vast majority of residents did not have second refuse collections. If the Council was to provide these optional second collections without recovering the additional cost, this would lead to an increase in the overall cost of the service to everyone.

This optional additional service was available to all landlords or management companies and the same rates were applied in all instances. In summary, every household received a free weekly collection; additional collections would incur additional charges.

Councillor Bliss, by way of a supplementary question, asked what action residents could take to stop paying for refuse collections.

Councillor Burrows advised that, if Councillor Bliss emailed him the details of the properties referred to in the question, he would take the matter up with the manager of the relevant department.

#### **10.7 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR KHURSHEED TO THE**

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION & RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS**

“In view of the national crisis during the last winter caused by the shortage of road grit, can the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling please assure me that the Council has adequate supplies to cope with weather of similar severity during the coming winter, especially with regard to:

- a. how the expected level of supplies has been calculated?
- b. whether consideration has been given to the inclusion of side roads in the gritting schedule?
- c. which, if any, pavements are included, bearing in mind the large numbers of people in our Borough who have limited mobility?”

Councillor Burrows responded that the country had experienced severe weather over the last two winters. He was grateful to Councillor Khursheed for giving him another opportunity to place on record the administration’s thanks for the wonderful job that the Council’s gritting teams had done over those winters.

During 2009/10, the Council used 2,860 tonnes of grit salt, and in 2010/11 2,030 tonnes. National standards and recommendations were that councils should keep a starting stock equivalent to 48 runs of the full primary network at a spread rate of 20g/m<sup>2</sup> as a minimum amount. Councillor Burrows noted that Councillor Khursheed would already be aware that the Cabinet had approved expenditure to purchase salt stocks.

Hillingdon had a starting stock of 3,500 tonnes, which was well in excess of the recommended amount and above that used on the roads in the previous two years. As a back up, approval had also been given to place a ‘call off’ order of a further 1,000 tonnes with the Council’s supplier should it be required. The Cabinet Member advised that the Council was prepared.

The gritting routes were reviewed each year to maximise the efficiency of the Council’s salting operations and to ensure that a network of roads were treated in order to keep the Borough moving. Not all roads in the Borough were included in the list due to available finite resources. However, side roads would be treated on request, following inspection, to confirm that they required gritting.

It was noted that footways were treated once snow had settled or during periods of prolonged freezing conditions on a priority basis at locations including:

- Town Centres
- Hospitals
- Old Peoples Homes
- Day Centres
- Schools (during term times only so that stocks were not wasted)
- Footbridges
- Bus Stops

Secondary footway treatment would be carried out once the priority footways had been treated. If any reports of icy footways were received for locations not included on the Priority or Secondary listings, the footway would be inspected to assess whether it should be treated or not. The Council had also invested in refurbishing its gritting fleet and making sure that enough vehicles were in place to meet the needs and cover any breakdowns. Councillor Burrows stated that, whilst the Council could

not predict what the weather would be or exactly how much salt would be needed, thanks to the continued forward thinking of the administration, Hillingdon was once again better placed than most to meet whatever challenge the weatherman threw at it.

There was no supplementary question.

41. **MOTIONS** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**11.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS MILLS**

Councillor D Mills moved the following motion:

“This Council welcomes the Governments commitment to reduce the total cost of politics by means of the removal of fifty MPs at Westminster.

Council instructs the Chief Executive to respond to the Boundary Commission's proposals to reduce the number of constituencies in London from 73 to 68 and make sure that each constituency has a similar number of registered electors, as follows:

welcoming,

- a) the return of Ickenham to the Uxbridge & South Ruislip Constituency
- b) the linking of the wards of Hillingdon East and Charville along the Uxbridge Road
- c) the joining together of Yiewsley and West Drayton wards

but also expressing concern at,

- a) the removal of Yeading from the Hayes town centre wards, especially in view of the strong links in the area as shown by the Hayes and Yeading football club.
- b) the Commission's intention not to link the five adjacent Harrow wards, (Pinner, Pinner South, Rayners Lane, Roxbourne and Roxeth) with the Hillingdon wards in the proposed Ruislip, Northwood & Pinner constituency.
- c) the proposals for Feltham & Hayes as these two areas have no common links.
- d) the counter proposals from the Liberal Democrats that would leave Heathrow Villages as the only Hillingdon ward with other Hounslow wards.

Further, Council instructs officers in conjunction with the Leader of the Council to submit appropriate counter proposals which address the above points and in particular to create new constituencies which can be named:

- Hayes & Southall
- Feltham & West Drayton

whilst complying with the Commission's remit.”

The motion was seconded by Councillor Morgan. Following debate (Councillor Major), the motion was put to the vote and agreed.

**RESOLVED: That this Council welcomes the Government's commitment to reduce the total cost of politics by means of the removal of fifty MPs at Westminster.**

**Council instructs the Chief Executive to respond to the Boundary Commission's proposals to reduce the number of constituencies in London from 73 to 68 and make sure that each constituency has a similar number of registered electors, as follows:**

welcoming,

- a) the return of Ickenham to the Uxbridge & South Ruislip Constituency
- b) the linking of the wards of Hillingdon East and Charville along the Uxbridge Road
- c) the joining together of Yiewsley and West Drayton wards

but also expressing concern at,

- a) the removal of Yeading from the Hayes town centre wards, especially in view of the strong links in the area as shown by the Hayes and Yeading football club.
- b) the Commission's intention not to link the five adjacent Harrow wards, (Pinner, Pinner South, Rayners Lane, Roxbourne and Roxeth) with the Hillingdon wards in the proposed Ruislip, Northwood & Pinner constituency.
- c) the proposals for Feltham & Hayes as these two areas have no common links.
- d) the counter proposals from the Liberal Democrats that would leave Heathrow Villages as the only Hillingdon ward with other Hounslow wards.

Further, Council instructs officers in conjunction with the Leader of the Council to submit appropriate counter proposals which address the above points and in particular to create new constituencies which can be named:

- a. Hayes & Southall
- b. Feltham & West Drayton

whilst complying with the Commission's remit.

## **11.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ALLEN**

Councillor Allen moved the following motion:

“That this Council, on behalf of the residents of Hayes and Harlington, put more effort into finding a more suitable temporary replacement refuse holding centre in Hayes until such time, finances permitting, that a permanent site is found.

Townfield Ward, like many wards in the south of the borough, suffers from fly tipping problems and more so since the Rigby Lane Refuse Centre closed.

A number of roads are continuously blighted by those who dump their rubbish, on a daily basis, usually large household items such as beds and mattresses which means that the view outside the homes of residents living in those roads is that of a rubbish tip.

The good residents of Hayes and Harlington have, on the whole, been helpful to their neighbours who have no car or means of transport to dispose of household rubbish. Whilst it was a short journey the cost was small and often the cost was borne by the carrier - the good neighbour or friend.

The price of petrol now being higher and the journey longer the good neighbour and friend has to consider whether they can bear the cost. The only option for many, due to cost and distance of the nearest refuse centre, is to either pile it up in their back gardens or sheds etc or have a bonfire. The less neighbourly dispose of it on the streets - any street but their own.

	<p>In order to bring a halt to the constant fly tipping, we as Townfield Councillors have made regular requests for the usage of the mobile CCTV, only for this to be refused.</p> <p>We have, where CCTV is already in place, requested the area be monitored but told that unless we have the time the rubbish was dumped, this is not possible. As most are aware, fly tippers dump their load very late at night or in the early hours of the morning - never in broad daylight.</p> <p>We spend hours every week inspecting roads and requesting removal of fly tipping and dumped household waste.</p> <p>Apart from the infrequent usage permitted at Tavistock Road, which is inaccessible to many of the residents in the South, all have waited patiently for the replacement to Rigby Lane.”</p> <p>The motion was seconded by Councillor Dhillon. Following debate (Councillors Burrows, Duncan, Harmsworth, Jarjussey, D Mills and Retter), the motion was put to the vote and lost.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.40 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Lloyd White, Head of Democratic Services on 01895 556743. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.