



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

## Minutes

### COUNCIL

15 January 2015

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

Councillor Catherine Dann (Mayor)

	<p><b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Councillors: Lynne Allen</td> <td>Tony Eginton</td> <td>Douglas Mills</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teji Barnes</td> <td>Duncan Flynn</td> <td>Richard Mills</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jonathan Bianco</td> <td>Neil Fyfe</td> <td>John Morgan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mohinder Birah</td> <td>Janet Gardner</td> <td>John Morse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wayne Bridges</td> <td>Narinder Garg</td> <td>June Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tony Burles</td> <td>Dominic Gilham</td> <td>Susan O'Brien</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keith Burrows</td> <td>Raymond Graham</td> <td>John Oswell</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Roy Chamdal</td> <td>Becky Haggart</td> <td>Jane Palmer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alan Chapman</td> <td>John Hensley</td> <td>Ray Puddifoot MBE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Philip Corthorne</td> <td>Henry Higgins</td> <td>John Riley</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brian Crowe</td> <td>Patricia Jackson</td> <td>Robin Sansarpuri</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peter Curling</td> <td>Allan Kauffman</td> <td>Scott Seaman-Digby</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peter Davis</td> <td>Manjit Khatra</td> <td>David Simmonds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nick Denys</td> <td>Mo Khursheed</td> <td>Jagjit Singh</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jazz Dhillon</td> <td>Kuldeep Lakhmana</td> <td>Brian Stead</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jem Duducu</td> <td>Eddie Lavery</td> <td>Jan Sweeting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Janet Duncan</td> <td>Richard Lewis</td> <td>Shehryar Wallana</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Beulah East</td> <td>Peter Money</td> <td>Michael White</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ian Edwards</td> <td>Carol Melvin</td> <td>David Yarrow</td> </tr> </table>	Councillors: Lynne Allen	Tony Eginton	Douglas Mills	Teji Barnes	Duncan Flynn	Richard Mills	Jonathan Bianco	Neil Fyfe	John Morgan	Mohinder Birah	Janet Gardner	John Morse	Wayne Bridges	Narinder Garg	June Nelson	Tony Burles	Dominic Gilham	Susan O'Brien	Keith Burrows	Raymond Graham	John Oswell	Roy Chamdal	Becky Haggart	Jane Palmer	Alan Chapman	John Hensley	Ray Puddifoot MBE	Philip Corthorne	Henry Higgins	John Riley	Brian Crowe	Patricia Jackson	Robin Sansarpuri	Peter Curling	Allan Kauffman	Scott Seaman-Digby	Peter Davis	Manjit Khatra	David Simmonds	Nick Denys	Mo Khursheed	Jagjit Singh	Jazz Dhillon	Kuldeep Lakhmana	Brian Stead	Jem Duducu	Eddie Lavery	Jan Sweeting	Janet Duncan	Richard Lewis	Shehryar Wallana	Beulah East	Peter Money	Michael White	Ian Edwards	Carol Melvin	David Yarrow
Councillors: Lynne Allen	Tony Eginton	Douglas Mills																																																								
Teji Barnes	Duncan Flynn	Richard Mills																																																								
Jonathan Bianco	Neil Fyfe	John Morgan																																																								
Mohinder Birah	Janet Gardner	John Morse																																																								
Wayne Bridges	Narinder Garg	June Nelson																																																								
Tony Burles	Dominic Gilham	Susan O'Brien																																																								
Keith Burrows	Raymond Graham	John Oswell																																																								
Roy Chamdal	Becky Haggart	Jane Palmer																																																								
Alan Chapman	John Hensley	Ray Puddifoot MBE																																																								
Philip Corthorne	Henry Higgins	John Riley																																																								
Brian Crowe	Patricia Jackson	Robin Sansarpuri																																																								
Peter Curling	Allan Kauffman	Scott Seaman-Digby																																																								
Peter Davis	Manjit Khatra	David Simmonds																																																								
Nick Denys	Mo Khursheed	Jagjit Singh																																																								
Jazz Dhillon	Kuldeep Lakhmana	Brian Stead																																																								
Jem Duducu	Eddie Lavery	Jan Sweeting																																																								
Janet Duncan	Richard Lewis	Shehryar Wallana																																																								
Beulah East	Peter Money	Michael White																																																								
Ian Edwards	Carol Melvin	David Yarrow																																																								
	<p><b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b> Fran Beasley, Jean Palmer OBE, Paul Whaymand, Tony Zaman, Raj Alagh, Lloyd White, Mark Braddock, Morgan Einon, Beth Rainey and Nikki O'Halloran</p>																																																									
35.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from the Deputy Mayor (Councillor G Cooper) and Deputy Mayoress (Councillor J Cooper) and Councillors Dheer, Dhot, Jarjussey, Kelly and Markham.</p>																																																									
36.	<p><b>MINUTES</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2014 be agreed as a correct record.</p>																																																									
37.	<p><b>MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Mayor announced that she would be holding a Quiz Night on Wednesday 21 January 2015 and encouraged those present to support the event which would be raising money for Michael Sobell Hospice.</p>																																																									

Hillingdon had again participated in the Lord Mayor of London's New Year's Day Parade. The Mayor thanked those who had taken part in the event which had resulted in Hillingdon being awarded third place and receiving £5k towards the Mayor's charity.

The Mayor thanked those who had sponsored her chauffeur, Mr Richard Wallace, to take part in the Trinity Homeless BigSleepout on her behalf. She and Councillor Yarrow had visited those taking part on the night and was pleased to announce that Mr Wallace had raised £571 for the charity.

The Leader of the Council congratulated Ms Jean Palmer, the Council's Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services on being awarded an OBE in the Queen's New Year's Honours List. Ms Palmer had dedicated 14 years of her 40 year local government service to Hillingdon and had made significant improvements to the services that the Council provided during this time. The Leader noted that Ms Palmer was a talented, hard working and outstanding public service employee.

The Leader of the Labour Group welcomed Councillor Oswell to the Council following his election at the Charville by-election in November 2014. He went on to echo the Leader's congratulations to Ms Palmer on being awarded an OBE.

38. **REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES** (*Agenda Item 5*)

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out in the Order of Business. The motion was seconded by Councillor Simmonds and it was:

**RESOLVED: That:**

- i) **the result of the Charville by-election held on 27 November 2014 be noted.**
- ii) **upon the recommendation of the Labour Group, the following changes be made to Committee Memberships 2014/15:**
  - **Councillor Oswell to be appointed to the vacancy on the Social Services, Housing and Public Health POC.**
  - **Councillor Oswell to replace Councillor Dhot on North Planning Committee.**
- iii) **the urgency decisions detailed in the report be noted.**
- iv) **the timetable of meetings for 2015/16, as set out in Appendix A, be approved and the Head of Democratic Services in consultation with the Chief Whip of the Majority Party be authorised to make any amendments that may be required throughout the course of the year.**

39. **POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACES REVIEW** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Councillor D Mills moved the recommendation as set out in the Order of Business. The motion was seconded by Councillor Puddifoot.

Councillor Dhillon moved, and Councillor Nelson seconded, the following amendment:

Delete all after "*consistent*" and add "*democratic and convenient level of provision be given to all residents of each ward within the Borough, all existing polling stations be maintained and those in Townfield and Brunel wards that were removed at the last polling review be reinstated.*"

A motion from Councillor Puddifoot that the question on the amendment be now put was agreed and the amendment was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting for: Councillors Allen, Birah, Burles, Curling, Dhillon, Duncan, East, Eginton, Gardner, Garg, Khatra, Khursheed, Lakhmana, Money, Morse, Nelson, Oswell, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

Those voting against: The Mayor (Councillor Dann), Councillors Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Burrows, Chamdal, Chapman, Corthorne, Crowe, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Graham, Haggar, Hensley, Higgins, Jackson, Kauffman, Lavery, Lewis, Melvin, D Mills, R Mills, Morgan, O'Brien, Palmer, Puddifoot, Riley, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds, Stead, Wallana, White and Yarrow.

The amendment was lost.

Following debate on the original motion (Councillors Allen, Khatra, Khursheed, Morse, Nelson, Sasarpuri and Sweeting), it was put to a recorded vote:

Those voting for: The Mayor (Councillor Dann), Councillors Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Burrows, Chamdal, Chapman, Corthorne, Crowe, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Graham, Haggar, Hensley, Higgins, Jackson, Kauffman, Lavery, Lewis, Melvin, D Mills, R Mills, Morgan, O'Brien, Palmer, Puddifoot, Riley, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds, Stead, Wallana, White and Yarrow.

Those voting against: Councillors Allen, Birah, Burles, Curling, Dhillon, Duncan, East, Eginton, Gardner, Garg, Khatra, Khursheed, Lakhmana, Money, Morse, Nelson, Oswell, Sansarpuri, Singh and Sweeting.

The motion was carried and it was:

**RESOLVED: That, with the aim of ensuring a consistent level of provision of 3 Polling Places per ward wherever possible, the proposed polling arrangements within the Borough be approved.**

40. **COUNCIL TAX BASE 2015/16 AND BUSINESS RATES FORECAST 2015/16**  
(Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Bianco moved, and Councillor Puddifoot seconded, the recommendations as set out in the Order of Business.

Councillor Eginton moved, and Councillor Nelson seconded, an amendment to the motion which was put to the vote and lost.

The original motion was put to the vote and it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED: That:**

- a) the report of the Corporate Director of Finance for the calculation of the Council Tax Base and the Business Rates Forecast be approved.
- b) in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 the amount calculated by the London Borough of Hillingdon as its Council tax Base for 2015/16 shall be 91,200.
- c) the Corporate Director of Finance be authorised to submit the 2014/15 NNDR1 return to the Department of Communities & Local Government (CLG) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) in line with the business

rates forecast contained within the report.  
d) the continuation of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme in 2015/16, originally approved by Council on 17 January 2013 be approved.

41. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**8.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR WALLANA TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

"Would the Cabinet Member please give an update on the progress with supported housing and the arrangements for the safeguarding of these residents?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that supported living was a key feature of modern transformed social care services. As well as providing far better outcomes and quality of life for residents than institutional care options, it was also considerably better value for money. Working together, social care and housing in Hillingdon had made significant progress in the development of new supported housing within the Borough.

In 2014, 220 people were provided with supported living, including a new development of 24 flats at Swan House, West Drayton. In 2015, the Council would be opening three further supported living schemes for people with learning disabilities and people with mental health needs, which would deliver 36 more flats. These developments, and the procurement of others directly provided by other organisations, meant that the Council expected the number to have reached 310 by the end of 2015.

The Council's focus had always been to ensure that services were of high quality and were provided in a way that ensured service users were safe. In the last year, the procurement process had been amended for providers to ensure a greater emphasis on the quality scoring of tenders. The quality scoring now accounted for 40% of the assessment rather than 20%. It was very important that the Council grew a strong and capable care market in the Borough.

Adult Social Care and Category Management had considerably strengthened the approach to monitoring quality of care provision over the last year with the establishment of a Care Governance Board overseen by the Director of Adult Services. The Board brought together information from care management, complaints, safeguarding, contract monitoring and inspection to provide a clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses of local services and to provide timely interventions or improvement plans with providers.

The Council was actively encouraging providers to sign up to the 'Social Care Commitment' which had recently been introduced by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to ensure that unqualified social care staff were checked, trained and monitored in a consistent way against a quality framework. Robust action had been taken to support providers to improve areas of poor performance and, when the situation had not satisfactorily improved, had ended contracts and sourced new providers who were able to deliver quality services where necessary. When needed, residents and their parents or carers had been fully included in the decision making and supported with any required transition.

There was no supplementary question.

**8.8 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR SWEETING TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND CHILDRENS' SERVICES - COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS**

"Much to the surprise of West Drayton residents, the new 5 Form of Entry Junior School which was given planning permission by this Council and is currently under construction within 50 metres of Laurel Lane School has suddenly morphed into a 3 Form of Entry Church of England Primary School without sufficient classrooms and with no nursery. Please explain in detail how this major and costly mistake has taken place?"

Councillor Simmonds advised that the construction of the new school in West Drayton was on track to open by September 2015, was within budget and had not been a mistake. In 2013, the Council had responded to the changing needs of residents and the requirement for additional schools places. The contract to build a new three form entry primary school had been awarded to The Frays Academy Trust which comprised St Matthew's CE Primary School in Yiewsley, Cowley St Laurence CE Primary School in Cowley and Laurel Lane Primary School in West Drayton. Councillor Simmonds noted that Councillor Duncan was a governor at St Matthews and that Councillor Sweeting was a governor at Laurel Lane. He went on to advise that the Executive Head Teacher of the Academy had led the development project.

Although the Council had approached the Department for Education (DfE) with proposals for the creation of a new junior and infant school, the provider had been unable to achieve the standards required. However, the DfE had confirmed that it was a requirement of grant funding that the Local Authority provide a new three form entry primary school on the site. It was the intention of the Trust that, in the future, an infant school and a junior school would be established using the two adjacent school buildings available to them (the new school and the existing school).

Councillor Simmonds noted that the cost of construction would be within the agreed budget. He suggested that, as the Head Teacher had agreed the appropriate number of places to be able to meet the needs, Councillor Sweeting should raise the issue with him.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Sweeting asked, as the St Martin's site did not have sufficient space, whether there were any plans in place to move back as there would be considerable associated costs that would need to be met.

Councillor Simmonds advised that the Head Teacher had longer term plans in place to develop a junior and infant school on the same site once it had met the DfE requirements. Insofar as additional costs were concerned, this issue would need to be addressed by the Academy. However, the building itself would be cost neutral and could either be converted or remain as built.

**8.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR RILEY TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES – COUNCILLOR SEAMAN-DIGBY**

"How many successful prosecutions have Legal Services brought in the Magistrates and Crown Court over the last 12 months and what are the range of offences which these prosecutions cover?"

Councillor Seaman-Digby advised that the Council's award-winning Legal Services team had brought prosecutions in circumstances where there was sufficient evidence

and where it was in the public interest to prosecute.

In the last 12 months, 640 successful prosecutions had been brought. The majority of these related to littering offences (590). The remaining 50 prosecutions covered a wide range of offences and could be broken down as follows:

- Benefit Fraud - 22
- Planning breaches which included beds in sheds - 9
- Trading Standards - 8
- Noise Nuisance - 3
- Failure to secure regular attendance at schools of registered pupils - 8

Councillor Seaman-Digby noted that the Council had successfully recovered 177 properties from individuals that had been committing fraud and cheating the system, ensuring that these properties could be used by those who genuinely needed them.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Riley asked whether the Council generally recovered its costs for bringing the prosecutions and whether other orders, such as proceeds of crime, were applied for and obtained.

Councillor Seaman-Digby noted that the Council applied for its costs in every case in which it secured a conviction. However, costs were at the discretion of the Court and therefore the Council did not fully recover its costs in every case. With regard to the littering prosecutions, the average amount of costs recovered by the Council in each case was £100.

The other prosecutions which the Council brought were more complicated and therefore the amount of costs applied for were higher. The prosecution lawyer would provide a detailed breakdown of the costs to the Court and make an application in every case where a conviction was secured for the full amount of the costs which it had incurred.

The Council applied for ancillary orders where it was appropriate to do so. For example, it had successfully applied for forfeiture orders in Trading Standards cases where the goods had been used to commit offences.

The Council had also successfully made applications for proceeds of crime orders in the last twelve months. A £1m proceeds of crime order had been obtained in the SAS case in which the company was selling bogus burglar alarms to elderly and vulnerable residents in the Borough. A further proceeds of crime order had been made for £170k in respect of a prosecution for a planning breach.

### **8.13 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR EAST TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

"Can the Cabinet Member tell us how many residents have taken up Personal Budgets?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that a personal budget presented residents with a number of options as to how their needs could be met and funded, providing them with greater control and choice whilst also ensuring that services met an individual's particular needs and wishes.

Personal Budgets were seen as one of the key areas of Personalisation in Adult

Services and the Government had set a target where councils needed to ensure that 70% of those eligible were in receipt of a personal budget by April 2013. In Hillingdon, there were currently 3,651 eligible individuals in receipt of a personal budget and this was expected to increase even further as Adult Social Care improved its reviewing activity.

In order to improve the choice and control available to residents, the Council had recently purchased the 'Shop4Support' system. This system was due to be implemented in April and would provide an online marketplace that would help the Council to:

- Provide more choice and control to residents through having direct access to a wide range of local providers to meet their care and support needs;
- Provide the same level of information and opportunity to residents in receipt of Council funded support and those who were self funders;
- Enable self funders to make informed choices about how best to meet their care and support needs and provide transparency on associated costs; and
- Increase engagement with local providers through encouraging wide range of suppliers to utilise the marketplace.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor East asked whether Government funding would be ringfenced to help disabled and vulnerable residents to retain their independence.

Councillor Corthorne advised that the Government recommended the level of spend and the Council planned to continue to provide a level of service that met the needs of the service users and opened up opportunities for them.

#### **8.14 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR DENYS TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES – COUNCILLOR SEAMAN-DIGBY**

"At the Full Council in February 2013 the Conservative Administration pledged to bring all staff up to the pay levels of the London Living Wage with effect from January this year, where the next Local Government pay award failed to have this effect. Could the Cabinet Member clarify the current position for us?"

Councillor Seaman Digby advised that the Local Government pay award had now been implemented but had not brought all salaries up to the London Living Wage of £9.15 per hour.

Only a very small number of staff working in Hillingdon Council had a regular basic take home pay that was below the London Living Wage. In line with the statement referred to in the question, those who fell below this line had been identified and would receive a top up to their salaries which would bring them up to the London Living Wage level.

There was no supplementary question.

#### **8.9 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR GARDNER TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

"Considering the huge amount of families in the Borough, living in private rented accommodation, which is both grossly over-priced and sub-standard, would the Cabinet Member consider very seriously licensing private landlords and inspecting

their premises on a regular basis before any of our families are accommodated in them?"

Councillor Corthorne noted that the Housing Act 2004 made provision for local authorities to introduce "Selective Licensing". There were two criteria, one of which must be met before the DCLG would sign off applications to do this from local authorities. Firstly, it had to be in an area of low housing demand (this was not the case in Hillingdon). Secondly, there needed to be an exceptional level of antisocial behaviour - the advice from officers was that Hillingdon would not fulfil this criteria either.

As such, Councillor Corthorne noted that Hillingdon could not adopt this even if the Council wanted to. In any case, he believed that it would be the wrong option, since a blanket approach was very resource intensive, and could result in limited resources being focussed on the better landlords and dwellings at the expense of getting to grips with the dwellings which were causing real concern.

In difficult market conditions, procuring temporary accommodation of a reasonable standard was a real challenge for the Council. The Private Sector Housing Team and Anti Social Behaviour and Investigations Team worked to raise standards and enforced where required (though Hillingdon was not helped when boroughs like Harrow were keen to take temporary units which would not be acceptable here). Hillingdon had its own HMO licensing scheme and a sign off process for all temporary accommodation (whether it was procured by the Council or home seekers did it themselves through Finders Fee, for example) supplemented by six monthly reviews.

The Council did sometimes come across dwellings which, for any number of reasons, were not of a satisfactory standard. Councillor Corthorne believed that the targeted approach that he had described would be a much better way of focusing resources where they could add the most value.

In conclusion, Councillor Corthorne advised that, if there were specific cases where these issues were not being addressed, he would be happy to discuss them on a case-by-case basis.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Gardner asked, if it was not possible to obtain social housing, whether it would be possible for the Homeless Prevention Team to ensure that the relevant safety checks were undertaken on the private rented accommodation secured.

Councillor Corthorne advised that an introductory briefing was provided for vulnerable residents in relation to these issues. However, if these messages were not consistent or robust, he asked that he be advised so that he could ensure that the issue was addressed.

#### **8.10 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CURLING TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

"Can the Cabinet Member tell us how many ex-council homes have been bought back by the council under the buy-back scheme?"

In light of a Cabinet report being considered on this issue at the meeting on 22 January 2015, Councillor Curling requested that his question be withdrawn. This was



agreed.

### **8.12 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING - COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE**

"Could the Cabinet Member please inform Members at what rate tenants are charged when they move into the Council properties that have been turned into short term lets - are they charged B&B rates, same rent as other Council tenants, private sector rents or another rent?"

Councillor Corthorne advised that short term lets in Council properties were charged at the same rent as permanent Council tenants.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Allen asked whether Councillor Corthorne had spoken to the Leader about the possibility of utilising properties brought back to the market by not providing a 25% Council Tax discount for second homes, perhaps by helping a charity to buy them.

Councillor Corthorne advised that a significant number of second properties had been bought and rented out privately in the Borough so he did not support Councillor Allen's argument. He went on to suggest that the opposition would be better placed putting issues like this forward for consideration by the relevant Policy Overview Committee.

### **8.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR OSWELL TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES – COUNCILLOR SEAMAN-DIGBY**

"How much time and what facilities are provided to the Trade Unions by Hillingdon Council?"

Councillor Seaman-Digby advised that the Council had always actively supported and worked closely with the trade unions and had, as a result, a very positive and constructive relationship with them.

Where an employer recognised a trade union, they were legally obliged, under current legislation, to provide elected representatives of that union with reasonable time and facilities to discharge their trade union duties - the Council had a facilities agreement in place which governed this. The facilities agreement was closely monitored by HR and a budget was also in place to ensure that services employing trade union officials were compensated for the facilities time taken by these staff.

The Council recognised five separate trades unions and the facility time allocated varied according to the size of the staff group they represented. This could range from the equivalent of 1.7 FTE of the working week (in the largest case, Unison), to the smallest allocation which was the equivalent of 0.1 FTE of the working week. It was noted that not all union officials were employed by the Council. Those employed by the unions themselves were not subject to this grant or agreement. Union officials were also provided with office space and equipment, although the unions themselves paid for stationery.

The precise detail of exact amounts of facilities used was difficult to provide in a verbal answer. With effect from 2 February 2015, local authorities would be required to publish full data relating to facilities time granted and, as such, the full details

requested by Councillor Oswald would be available for scrutiny and put on the website from that date - alternatively, a written response could be provided for Councillor Oswald with the specific allocation per union if requested.

Whilst Councillor Seaman-Digby fully expected to continue this positive working relationship with the trade unions, there was some concern that they were not wholly representative of the full range of the Council's workforce. As a result, consideration was being given to expanding the Council's consultation process to include non trade union staff representatives who could represent their colleagues as part of a more inclusive staff forum.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Oswald asked how this compared with five years ago.

Councillor Seaman-Digby advised that he would provide Councillor Oswald with a written response to his supplementary question.

N.B. The response was subsequently provided as follows:

*The table below shows the Council's agreed Trade Union Facilities time agreement.*

<b>TRADE UNION</b>	<b>FTE facilities time</b>	<b>Equivalent days</b>
<i>Unison</i>	<i>1.7 FTE</i>	<i>8.5 days per week</i>
<i>GMB</i>	<i>0.3 FTE</i>	<i>1.5 days per week</i>
<i>Unite</i>	<i>0.3 FTE</i>	<i>1.5 days per week</i>
<i>NUT</i>	<i>0.1 FTE</i>	<i>0.5 days per week</i>
<i>NASUWT</i>	<i>0.1 FTE</i>	<i>0.5 days per week</i>
<i>ATL</i>	<i>0.1 FTE</i>	<i>0.5 days per week</i>

*This agreement has been in place since 2007 and has not changed during this time.*

#### **8.6 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BIRAH TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL – COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT**

"Could the Leader of the Council please provide full details of all London Borough of Hillingdon contractors who have been fined or had penalties imposed on them for poor or inadequate performance since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that the response to this question would depend on the value of the contract. Analysis over the last five years showed a total of 4,739 contracts with a value of £20k or more.

There were a multitude of remedies that could be included in a contract - mediation and the termination of the contract were just two of the options available. However, there was still some poor performance in some areas which needed to be addressed.

The number of contractors subject to lower level action ran into the hundreds, but very few would get to the more extreme end of the scale such as termination. There were currently 8 contractors where more serious action was being taken.

There was no supplementary question.

#### **8.5 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR BURLES TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES – COUNCILLOR BIANCO**

"Could the Cabinet Member please confirm the potential cost to the Pension Fund of the statutory redundancies planned for 2015-2018?"

Councillor Bianco advised that the only potential cost implication for the Pension Fund was when an individual made redundant was over 55 and was in the Pension Scheme and was therefore entitled to the early payment of benefits which produced a cost to the Pension Fund.

However, in such circumstances, the Council paid a sum into the Pension Fund equivalent to that cost as part of the cost of funding the redundancy. No further contributions were then made by the Council - it was simply a one off contribution. As such, there was no net cost to the Pension Fund arising from any redundancy. There were earmarked reserves already set up to fund the cost of redundancies in the MTFF and any associated impact on the Pension Fund.

There was no supplementary question.

#### **8.4 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR MORSE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES – COUNCILLOR BIANCO**

"Could you please provide a breakdown of monthly payments and annual total paid to Capita under the ITO (Information Technology Outsourcing), since the contract was signed?"

At Councillor Morse's request, Councillor Bianco agreed to provide a written response to this question.

N.B. The response was subsequently provided as follows:

*The Council has **no** single ICT outsourcing contract with Capita.*

*Hillingdon's ICT services are delivered through an agile, co-ordinated and balanced approach which includes professional in-house staff, strategic partnerships with companies like Northgate who host the Council's servers, along with the commissioning of external suppliers for bespoke software systems. Together, this forms the backbone to the way the Council's organisation and services operate, transform and innovate in a cost-effective and business-like manner.*

*The Council does not write its own software in-house and, like most organisations, seeks out the relevant expertise from the private sector. For example, the Virgin Media broadband connection, the Google contract, specialised IT systems to support multi-agency working in Children's Services, through to the HillingdonFirst Card scheme and the Ocella planning system.*

*The Council does have three small supplier contracts with different parts of Capita Plc. for the following systems:*

**Capita AIM** - a contract for software that integrates with the Council's financial system, providing a central transaction database that automates payments to

suppliers. The cost of this is £1,216 per month, which equates to a yearly spend of £14,600.

**Capita SIMS** - the "Schools Information Management System", which the Council procures on behalf of schools. It is used by the vast majority of schools across the UK and, in Hillingdon, the Council also provides the technical support, which is highly valued. The system itself holds all the details and records of pupils and helps school administrators complete the necessary returns. It can also link up with parents online, for example, so they can arrange catering choices and dinner money for their children. The cost of this is £8,750 per month, annualised at £105,000.

**Capita Recruitment Vetting Service** - a new online disclosure and barring service checking system, as a result of a BID review where it was clear that we needed to improve the turnaround time of DBS applications. It currently takes between 1-5 weeks for a paper DBS check, but the online system can reduce this to just days. The cost of this system depends upon the number of DBS checks, but it is projected to cost £5,125 per month, yearly £61,500.

#### **8.7 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR LAKHMANA TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL – COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT**

"Following the Leader's statement at the September 2014 Council meeting regarding the introduction of filming of Council meetings, can the Leader please advise of the timescale for the introduction of the Council's own recordings of its meetings?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that, at the September Council meeting, he had referred to the question of whether the Council should have its own definitive record of official Council proceedings, should a member of the public or the media decide to do their own recording or filming. This had followed a change in the law, providing new rights for residents and other interested parties to report on proceedings. This was particularly relevant for meetings that dealt in planning and licensing matters.

The current position was that, in the event someone decided to record or film a meeting, Democratic Services was able to audio record proceedings so the Council could have its own record. This might be all the Council needed to do.

Councillor Bianco had been charged with developing a range of other options, which included both basic and high definition filming through to live broadcasting of meetings. As part of this, some Members would be aware of the test filming undertaken at a Licensing Sub-Committee in December last year.

Any decision to move towards the filming of Council or Committee meetings would need to be carefully considered by the Cabinet beforehand.

There was no supplementary question.

#### **8.11 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR EGINTON TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL – COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT**

"Do you consider that the Cabinet fully reflects the gender and ethnic make up of the residents in Hillingdon?"

Councillor Puddifoot advised that he was fully aware that the Labour Group had no experience of operating a Cabinet system which had been introduced in 2000. Since

that time, the Labour leadership in Hillingdon had changed 9 times. He was also aware that the Labour Group would abandon the Leader and Cabinet model and go back to the old committee system if it regained power. However, the Council would not have achieved what it had under the old system.

With regard to the make-up of Cabinet, Councillor Puddifoot advised that he did not care for tokenism and would continue to select the best person based on their ability to do the job in question. He noted that the current Cabinet membership was fully able to continue to deliver services for the Borough's residents.

There was no supplementary question.

42. **MOTIONS** (*Agenda Item 9*)

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

"That this Council recognises that well-run pubs play an invaluable role at the heart of our local communities, providing safe, regulated and sociable environments in which people can interact. In recent years Hillingdon has seen a number of long well established local pubs go out of business and then get turned into some other use, anything from a block of flats to a supermarket.

"The new National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Act 2011 establish new responsibilities and tools for local councils to promote and protect local pubs. However, the flexibility for a pub to be converted into a wide range of uses without planning permission still means local communities are often denied any say in what's happening in their neighbourhoods and are unable to protect valued local pubs.

"Council also notes that similar motions to this have gained all-party support in many local councils across the country as well as at the Greater London Authority.

"Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to investigate the possibility of protecting community pubs in Hillingdon by ensuring that planning permission and community consultation are required before pubs are allowed to be converted to betting shops, supermarkets and pay-day loan stores or other uses, or are allowed to be demolished. This should include a community policy provision within the Hillingdon Local Plan and specific planning guidance and viability testing that can be used when considering planning applications involving pubs."

As Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning Policy, Councillor Burrows spoke in relation to the motion and noted that well run pubs offered a focus for the community, whilst others had a negative impact by attracting anti social behaviour. The Council therefore needed to balance the protection of some pubs with the flexibility to bring forward suitable redevelopment proposals for those that were clearly not viable and/or caused local nuisance.

Unfortunately, the Government allowed the change of use of pubs into restaurants, financial and retail uses under permitted development rights. Clearly, in these situations, there was little the Council could do. With these issues in mind, and in response to Councillor Curling's motion, Councillor Burrows proposed the following measures:

- i) The vast majority of pub conversions were currently treated as minor applications, with limited public consultation. Councillor Burrows would instruct officers to treat all future proposals of this nature as major applications, so that there was wider

	<p>consultation. This simple step would increase the awareness and scrutiny of proposals involving the loss of pubs in the Borough.</p> <p>ii) It was acknowledged that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that planning policies should plan positively for local communities, including public houses. Policy DMCI 1 in the emerging Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies document already sought to protect community facilities. Councillor Burrows would ask officers to amend the supporting text to Policy DMCI 1 to reflect the references to public houses in the NPPF. In addition, applicants proposing the loss of a pub would be required to take account of the particular planning guidance for pubs produced by the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA), which had been circulated to all London Boroughs.</p> <p>Furthermore, Councillor Burrows acknowledged Councillor Curling's concern that pubs might be changed into betting shops and hot food takeaways and drew attention to policy DMTC 4, which sought to limit the concentration of these uses.</p> <p>Following debate (Councillor East) the motion was put to the vote and lost.</p>
	<p><b>PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS 2015-2016</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.26 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

## Programme of Meetings 2015/2016

NB. Times may occasionally vary from those shown in first column. Dates in brackets are reserve dates for the budget process

MEETING (and start time)	May	June	July	Aug'	Sept'	Oct'	Nov'	Dec'	Jan'	Feb'	Mar'	April	May
COUNCIL (7.30pm)	14 (A)		9		10		5		14	18 (25)			12 (A)
CABINET (7pm)	21	18	23		24	22	19	17	21	11	17	21	19
Central & South Planning Committee (7pm)	20	11,30	22	11	2, 22	14	3, 26	15	6, 28	16	9,31	19	18
North Planning Committee (7pm)	13	2,23	16	5, 26	15	6, 28	18	8	5, 20	9	3, 22	12	11
Major Applications Committee (6pm)	13	2,23	16	5, 26	15	6, 28	18	8	5, 20	9	3, 22	12	11
Whips Meeting (5pm)	12		7		8		3		12	16 (23)			9
Pensions Committee (7pm)		17			23			9			23		
Pensions Board (5pm)			1			7			12			5	
Audit Committee (5pm)			2		24			15			15		
Health & Wellbeing Board (2.30pm)			21		22			10			15		
Health & Wellbeing Board Working Group (dates tbc)													
Domestic Violence Action Forum (2pm)			8			7			6			6	
Domestic Violence Steering Executive (10am)		29			14						21		
Petition Hearings with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation & Recycling (7pm)	20	17	15		16	14	11	9	20	17	16	13	18
Petition Hearings with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Property & Business Services (7pm)		24			9		4		13	24		20	
Petition Hearings with other Cabinet Members (dates & times tbc)													
Licensing Committee (10am)		17			24				12			14	
Licensing Sub-Committee (time tbc)	15, 29	5, 26	3, 23	7, 21	1, 16	2, 16	6, 26	7	5, 21	3, 19	1,16, 31	18, 22	
Executive Scrutiny Committee (at the rising of Cabinet)	21	18	23		24	22	19	17	21	11	17	21	19
Social Services, Housing & Public Health Policy Overview Committee (POC) (7pm)			2, 30		8	6	4		20	23	24	20	
Residents' & Environmental Services POC (5.30pm)		25	29		23	15	12		19	24	23	27	
Children, Young People and Learning POC (7pm)		24	15		9	7	25		13	17	16	13	
Corporate Services and Partnerships POC (7.30pm)		25	21		15	13	10		7	2	10	26	
External Services Scrutiny Committee (6pm)		17	14		17	8	17		12	16	15	26	
Hillingdon SACRE (7.30pm)		16					4				8		
Standards Committee (7pm)		15			14			7			7		
Corporate Parenting Board (5pm)	11		20		21		16		11		14		18
Registration & Appeals Committee (dates / times tbc)													

Minute Annex

This page is intentionally left blank