

Minutes

COUNCIL

2 November 2017

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



Councillor Carol Melvin BSc (Hons) (Mayor)
Councillor John Morgan (Deputy Mayor)

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <p>Councillors: Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Janet Duncan Michael Markham Lynne Allen Beulah East Douglas Mills Teji Barnes Ian Edwards Richard Mills Jonathan Bianco Tony Eginton Peter Money Mohinder Birah Duncan Flynn John Morse Wayne Bridges Neil Fyfe June Nelson Tony Burles Janet Gardner Susan O'Brien Roy Chamdal Narinder Garg John Oswell Alan Chapman Dominic Gilham Jane Palmer George Cooper Becky Haggart Ray Puddifoot MBE Judith Cooper John Hensley John Riley Brian Crowe Henry Higgins Robin Sansarpuri Peter Curling Patricia Jackson Scott Seaman-Digby Catherine Dann Allan Kauffman David Simmonds CBE Peter Davis Judy Kelly Jagjit Singh Nick Denys Mo Khursheed Jan Sweeting Jazz Dhillon Kuldeep Lakhmana Michael White Jas Dhot Eddie Lavery David Yarrow Jem Duducu Richard Lewis</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Fran Beasley, Jean Palmer, Paul Whaymand, Tony Zaman, Lloyd White, Morgan Einon and Beth Rainey, Mark Braddock and Neil Fraser</p>
26.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Burrows, Corthorne, Dheer, Graham, Jarjussey, Khatra and Stead.</p>
27.	<p>MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2017 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
28.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Lynne Allen declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 8.1, in that she was a member of the Independent Advisory Group, and stayed in the room during consideration thereof.</p> <p>Councillor Lewis declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 8.4, in that he</p>

was an honorary Group Captain of 601 Squadron, based at RAF Northolt, and stayed in the room during consideration thereof.

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

The Mayor announced that, six months into her Mayoralty, she had now attended 229 diverse engagements involving people and groups from all walks of life.

Of the 229 events attended, 29 had been outside of the Borough, supporting a number of different mayors in their various charity events. This had been reciprocated at the charity event at the Battle of Britain bunker, with lunch at RAF Northolt Officer's mess, which was very well attended by a number of mayors across London and further afield.

The Mayor encouraged those present to attend her next charity quiz night on 29 November 2017. In addition, Uxbridge College had agreed to their students again conducting a charity murder mystery evening and meal, tentatively scheduled for the first week in March 2018, though the date was still to be confirmed, and encouraged all present to attend.

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

5.1 Question from Mr Chris Waters of Ferrers Avenue, West Drayton to the Leader of the Council - Councillor Puddifoot:

"Would the Council Leader be willing to adopt a better approach to "putting residents first", by way of implementing a less formal system of interaction between the residents and those making the decisions within the Council, which will allow the residents to table concerns in a more social environment?"

Councillor Puddifoot thanked Mr Waters for his question, and responded that resident interaction with Hillingdon's democratic process was at an all-time high. This was not only through formal means, such as by submitting a petition, but increasingly in more social ways, for example through watching Council meetings online, as Councillor Puddifoot believed Mr Waters was doing for the answer to his question.

Mr Waters' question indicated that he had watched the Council meeting online in January, when he had submitted a previous public question. Two years ago Mr Waters would not have been able to do this. Mr Waters' question - and Councillor Puddifoot's response to it - would be streamed live across the Borough and beyond, which was a great example of how residents could engage directly with decision-makers.

Last year, nearly 26,000 people had viewed the Council's planning, cabinet, licensing and full Council meetings on YouTube, and Council broadcasts were relevant to residents. For example, over 500 people tuned in to watch a licence application for the new Cineworld at South Ruislip, and similarly, thousands tuned in to see planning committee decisions that directly affected their street and neighbourhood. Those watching could gain a great insight into how Councillors carefully weighed up the different views and information before they made a final, fair and balanced decision.

The Council wanted to be as open as possible to residents; however, the laws around decision-making understandably required some element of procedure in terms of interaction. As was often said, the Council holds meetings in public - not public meetings. If the latter were the case, it would be very hard to make decisions and get

anything done for residents.

The petitions process, established in 2002, provided a very effective route for public engagement. Highly valued, it was even more popular today than when it started. Last year the Council received over 113 petitions about Council services, and 130 directly relating to planning applications. Within these petitions were tens of thousands of residents' signatures, where they had taken the time and trouble to add their name to a local cause they believed in, and engaged in local democracy.

Most petitioners got the opportunity to address the Members directly, before a decision was made. Where possible, the Council endeavoured to progress simpler petitions before they went to a petition hearing. This saved time, and ensured the Council was as responsive as possible to residents' wishes. Feedback from residents since 2014 showed over 86% satisfaction with the way they engaged with the Council's democratic process.

Whilst Councillor Puddifoot and Cabinet colleagues regularly met informally with residents and local organisations to listen to their views, the cornerstone of democracy for residents was their local representative - or Ward Councillor. Ward Councillors in Hillingdon played a vital role putting forward residents interests directly to Cabinet Members, and the Council always sought to take these into account when making decisions.

Synonymous with good decision-making was strong accountability. The Council had made effective Cabinet governance and leadership a central feature of operation, so Hillingdon residents knew who was responsible at the political, elected level.

Mr Waters' question mentioned putting residents first, and this was one of the four principles that the current administration operated on, the others being heritage, environment, and sound financial management. To a large degree they were all linked to putting residents first, including maintaining libraries and leisure centres, having the best parks and open spaces in the UK, investing in new schools and road maintenance, maintaining weekly waste and recycling collections, and providing a level of support to older residents far exceeding that provided by other local authorities.

The Council defended its residents against inappropriate developments such as HS2 and the Heathrow expansion plans. If there were any truth at all in the scaremongering rumours about expanding Northolt airfield, being put about by an unidentified but well-funded group similar to Back Heathrow, the Council would be leading the fight against that too, by funding the residents' groups running the campaigns against these proposals.

Councillor Puddifoot set out a challenge to those funding and running the Stop Northolt campaign, to either 'put up or shut up'. Councillor Puddifoot requested that those responsible send to him the names and addresses of all involved in managing that campaign, and a list of all the expenditure incurred to date, and funding received, by the end of the month. The request, and the details of the responses, would be published in the next edition of Hillingdon People, for Hillingdon residents to judge for themselves the validity and purpose of this organisation. The response, or lack of it, would also be reported to the next Council meeting.

Councillor Puddifoot concluded by referring to the Administration's many achievements working side by side with residents, which demonstrated that the Council really did live up to its mission of "putting our residents first". In summary,

whilst the Council had interaction with residents which was essential to the decision-making process, for the Council it was as much about delivering services and facilities as a process of Council functions, and ultimately, at local elections the residents would decide if the Council was succeeding.

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

i) **URGENT IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS**

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Urgency decisions detailed in the report be noted.

ii) **MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES 2017/18**

It was highlighted that recommendations a) and b) had been amended from those shown in the agenda. Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out in the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds and it was:

RESOLVED: That:

- a) **Council note that the Audit Committee have made a recommendation for the appointment of an independent Chairman of the Audit Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year, subject to receipt of satisfactory references.**
- b) **Authority be delegated to the Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Labour Group, to confirm the appointment, once satisfactory references have been received, and to provide all Members with details of the appointment, once confirmed.**
- c) **Councillor Allen replace Councillor Dhot as a member of the Residents' and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee.**

iii) **REVIEW OF COUNCIL CONSTITUTION - PENSIONS BOARD**

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds and it was:

RESOLVED: That the changes to the operation of the Pensions Board, as set out below, be approved.

- **The membership of the Board be amended to comprise 2 employer and 2 employee representatives with no Councillors automatically appointed to sit on the Board;**
- **Applications for the employer representatives will be invited from a) the Council (Members will be entitled to apply for this position should they so wish);**
b) **all other employer bodies contributing to the fund, and then selected at interview by the Chairman and one other Member of the Pensions Committee and a Senior Officer, on the basis of**

capacity and/or experience;

- The requirement for a Councillor to Chair the meetings of the Board be removed and the terms of reference be amended accordingly;
- The frequency of the meetings be determined by the Board and the terms of reference be amended accordingly.

32. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (*Agenda Item 7*)

7.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR LAVERY TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS:

"Can the Cabinet Member say how many children gained a place at their school of choice in Hillingdon in this year's admissions?"

Councillor Simmonds responded, confirming that last year there had been a 2% increase in the number of school place applications across London. Hillingdon participated in a pan-London process, as many Hillingdon residents lived close to Borough boundaries, and so were applying to schools in other Boroughs. Hillingdon itself had experienced a 3% increase, above that of the London average, which reflected many years of growth in the number of children who were resident within the Borough. Despite that increase, to a record high of 3416 applications in total for secondary school places, Hillingdon remained as one of the top boroughs both in London and in the local area of West London, for allocating school places at a school of choice.

As an example of what that meant in the context of London, on national offer day 7% of children across London as a whole had not received an offer of any school place in response to the applications that they had made. However, in Hillingdon 100% of applicants were offered a school place on offer day. In terms of percentages, 94.9% of Hillingdon pupils had received one of their preferred choices on offer day and of those, 67.4% were allocated their first choice of secondary school within the Borough.

It was important to recognize that not all parents would put the number one school choice for their child as the number one on the application form, as applications were treated equally in the way that preferences were allocated, and the first choice places were not the only important consideration. Therefore it was important to consider what percentage of children also received one of their top choices, and 94.9% receiving one of their preferred choices reflected that Hillingdon was seeking to make sure that every Hillingdon child received a choice of a good school place within the Borough.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Lavery asked what steps the Council had taken to ensure that there are sufficient spaces in secondary schools, especially given the developing pressure in the north of the Borough where there had historically been less spare capacity?

Councillor Simmonds responded, stating that the north/south divide in relation to secondary school spaces was the opposite of the north/south divide historically seen regarding primary school places.

Members were reminded that when the previous Labour government had wanted to rebuild and refurbish every secondary school in the land, one of the expectations they had set out for Hillingdon's participation was that at least one secondary school in the south would be closed, as Hillingdon was regarded as having too much capacity. Since then, there had been significant growth in terms of both housing development

and people moving into existing homes and people having children within the south of the Borough, but the historically lower level of capacity in secondary schools in the north meant that the demand there was becoming more acute sooner than within the south of the Borough.

The measures the Council had been taking to address this included the £30m+ investment in Abbotsfield School, to rebuild the school to provide a higher standard learning environment, but also to provide an additional 75 places in each year group, becoming a co-educational school to ensure it offered places to a wider range of children.

In addition, construction at the new Northwood Secondary School had taken place, which now provided a total of 1080 places in the very north of the Borough, an expansion over the previous capacity providing an additional 30 places in each year group.

Turning to the future, a variety of work was underway, including the expansion of schools in areas of very high demand, such as Vyners School. Those school places under the direct control of central government were more of a challenge. Hillingdon had two bids to open a new sixth form of entry secondary school in the north of the Borough; one from the Church of England Academy known as the Bishop Arden School proposal and the second one from a consortium of local Hillingdon schools known as the Hillingdon High proposal. Unfortunately, despite a good deal of urging Hillingdon was yet to receive any approach from the Education and Skills Funding Agency to discuss the location of such a school.

Finally, further to Councillor Lavery's and other Members' previously expressed interest in the provision for children with special educational needs and disabilities, Hillingdon had been shown to have a good track record, recently highlighted by Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission when they inspected local arrangements. However, it had been noticeable that there had been an increase in the number of children with special educational needs and disabilities who were seeking places in mainstream schools in the Borough, in addition to those who are going to the available special schools. One of the reasons for this increase could be a result of the expansion of capacity at Vyners School for children with hearing impairments, which had been funded by the Council to ensure that those children continued to enjoy access to good quality education, the same as their peers.

Councillor Simmonds concluded by stating that work was in hand to make sure that every child received a good quality school place, and reassured Members and the public that Hillingdon would continue to put pressure on the Government to ensure the additional programs were delivered on time and on budget.

7.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR GARDNER TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - COUNCILLOR PUDDIFOOT:

"In addition to the recommendations of the Social Services, Housing and Public Health POC's review into housing benefit and with specific regard to Universal Credit, can the Leader of the Council / the relevant Cabinet Member work with the Job Centres to minimise any rent arrears that our residents may incur?"

"We should do this by Council officers working with Job Centre Plus staff to encourage vulnerable residents to pay their rent direct to their landlord."

Councillor Puddifoot responded, stating the Government's Universal Credit

programme had been intended to create a simplified benefit system by consolidating benefits into one monthly payment, so that it was more understandable as a 'household income' further incentivising claimants to work.

There were, however, some challenges with the introduction of a new benefit payments system. It was recognised that not everyone claiming benefits would be skilled in managing their own money and nor would many households have the necessary savings to help cushion the move from a weekly or fortnightly benefit payment to a monthly arrangement. As a consequence there was the risk that some claimants would fall behind with their housing rent payments.

The Council had been working closely with Jobcentre Plus for several years in the run-up to Universal Credit being rolled out fully in Hillingdon from July 2018, to ensure that the transition was as smooth as possible for residents to avoid arrears. This included:

- Providing co-ordinated advice and support to residents to secure and sustain paid employment to reduce their reliance on benefits.
- Joint working with the Job Centre Plus Business Partner to implement a programme of communications and support to ensure that residents receive regular and timely information about the forthcoming changes and advice / support about moving to Universal Credit.
- An established Housing Support Team that covered all tenures to mitigate the risk of tenancy failure, including rent arrears arising from welfare reform. The team provides targeted practical advice, assistance and support to residents.
- Co-ordinated, joined-up working across the Council to plan for the roll-out of the changes. This included joint working with the homeless prevention team, social care and the revenues and benefits team in the Council.
- Identifying vulnerable residents who would be eligible to apply for the housing element of their benefit to be paid direct to their landlord.
- Improving IT systems and introducing new ways of working to identify those Council tenants most at risk of rent arrears based on a range of information to pro-actively support them with advice and assistance. This includes new tenants at the tenancy sign-up stage, Joint working with other partner agencies that were able to provide practical advice and advocacy to residents about household budget and debt management, claims for benefits and making payments.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Gardner asked if the Leader would consider producing a leaflet to be published in Hillingdon People which could spell out in detail where residents could get help to manage their budgets, and emphasize the dangers of eviction if they fell into arrears?

Councillor Puddifoot replied, stating that this was, in principle, a good idea, and confirmed that he would look into it further.

33. **MOTIONS** (*Agenda Item 8*)

8.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR RILEY

Councillor Riley moved, and Councillor D. Mills seconded, the following motion:

"That Council fully supports the submission made by the Administration to the MOPAC Draft Public Access and Engagement Strategy consultation document and notes the main concern from the proposed strategy of there being only one publicly accessible police station in a borough the size and shape of Hillingdon is not realistic and the proposed location is not in the interests of our residents.

Council acknowledges that, like Hillingdon Council, the Mayor of London has received reduced funding from central government. However, unlike Hillingdon who have put residents first and demonstrated that by managing finances and operating efficiently it is possible to avoid potentially damaging cuts to front line services, the Mayor has simply chosen the easy route of blaming the Government and saying that this is all that he can do.

Council agrees that the Mayor should reconsider his approach to this matter and review his proposals to ensure that our residents continue to receive a police service that works for them in the long term, not just a police function with a short term vision."

Councillor Curling moved, and Councillor Dhillon seconded, an amendment to the motion, to the effect that the motion read as follows:

"That Council acknowledges the submission made by the Administration to the MOPAC Draft Public Access and Engagement Strategy consultation document and notes the main concern from the proposed strategy of there being only one publicly accessible police station in a borough the size and shape of Hillingdon is not realistic and is not in the interests of our residents.

Council also acknowledges that, the MOPAC proposals are a result of funding cuts by the previous Mayor of London and further funding cuts from central government, totalling £1 Billion over the last 7 years.

Council agrees that the administration should enlist the support of the three borough MPs to assist the Mayor of London in lobbying central government for the appropriate funding for a police service that has sufficient resources for the long term protection of our residents."

Following debate (Councillors Allen, D Mills, Morse, Nelson, Simmonds, and Sweeting), the amended motion was put to a vote:

The amended motion was lost.

The original motion was then debated (Councillors Crowe, Dhillon, D Mills, and Yarrow) and put to a recorded vote.

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

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

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was carried, and it was:

RESOLVED: That Council fully supports the submission made by the Administration to the MOPAC Draft Public Access and Engagement Strategy consultation document and notes the main concern from the proposed strategy of there being only one publicly accessible police station in a borough the size and shape of Hillingdon is not realistic and the proposed location is not in the interests of our residents.

Council acknowledges that, like Hillingdon Council, the Mayor of London has received reduced funding from central government. However, unlike Hillingdon who have put residents first and demonstrated that by managing finances and operating efficiently it is possible to avoid potentially damaging cuts to front line services, the Mayor has simply chosen the easy route of blaming the Government and saying that this is all that he can do.

Council agrees that the Mayor should reconsider his approach to this matter and review his proposals to ensure that our residents continue to receive a police service that works for them in the long term, not just a police function with a short term vision.

8.3 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR DUNCAN

Councillor Duncan moved, and Councillor Sansarpuri seconded, the following motion:

"That this Council is concerned that recent evidence has shown that Housing Benefit is not always delivered by the Council in a way that encourages people to start, resume or continue work.

Further to the Council's recent review of Housing Benefits and recommendations approved by Cabinet this Council therefore agrees that the monitoring and management system of Housing Benefit should include delivery timescales, once all documentation is in place to enable determinations to be made. This would help to provide clarity, improve efficiency, save money, avoid evictions and encourage people to start or continue working. Council therefore requests Cabinet to consider this matter and make the appropriate changes."

Following debate (Councillor Bridges), the motion was put to a vote.

The motion was lost.

8.2 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR D MILLS

Prior to consideration of the Motion, under Council Procedure Rule 14.7, Councillor D Mills requested the meeting's consent to make an alteration to the Motion to insert the words 'where appropriate' in the 5th paragraph. The meeting's consent to the request was signified without discussion.

Councillor D Mills moved, and Councillor Lavery seconded, the following motion:

"That Council notes the publication by the Boundary Commission, for consultation purposes, of the proposed new parliamentary constituencies for England.

Council notes that the proposals for London include the creation of a new 'Hillingdon and Uxbridge' Constituency which includes two wards from the London Borough of Ealing; Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End. Council further notes that the proposed new constituencies separate the Ruislip wards, thus continuing to ignore natural boundaries and community affiliations.

Council notes that the majority of responses by both individuals and organisations, including residents' associations, to the original Commission's proposals, were opposed to the inclusion of the two Northolt wards and in favour of joining together four Ruislip wards.

Council notes that, although the Boundary Commission must work within numbers as laid out by statute - that is that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507, and, therefore, any proposal to amend the make-up of the proposed new constituencies will have an effect on the make-up of neighbouring constituencies, there are, in fact, a number of possible alternatives available to achieve a better outcome whilst still meeting the parameters set out above.

Council, therefore, authorises the Head of Democratic Services in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, to respond with a counter proposal to establish three Constituencies, of which, where appropriate, two will consist entirely of Hillingdon wards, recognising the fact that there is no natural boundary or affiliation to justify the inclusion of Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End Wards within the proposed Hillingdon and Uxbridge Constituency and that meets the wishes of the community for keeping the Ruislip wards together."

Councillor Eginton moved, and Councillor Morse seconded, an amendment to the motion, to the effect that the motion read as follows:

"That Council notes the publication by the Boundary Commission, for consultation purposes, of the proposed new parliamentary constituencies for England. Council authorises the Head of Democratic Services in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, to respond by confirming Council's agreement to the proposals."

Following debate (Councillor D Mills), the amended motion was put to a vote.

The amended motion was lost.

The original motion was then debated (Councillors Lavery) and put to a recorded vote.

Those voting for: The Mayor (Councillor Melvin), the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Morgan), Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Barnes, Bianco, Bridges, Chamdal, Chapman, G Cooper, J Cooper, Crowe, Dann, Davis, Denys, Duducu, Edwards, Flynn, Fyfe, Gilham, Haggard, Hensley, Higgins, Jackson, Kauffman, Kelly, Lavery, Lewis, Markham, D Mills, R Mills, O'Brien, Palmer, Puddifoot, Riley, Seaman-Digby, Simmonds, White and Yarrow.

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

Those abstaining: None.

The motion was carried, and it was:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the publication by the Boundary Commission, for consultation purposes, of the proposed new parliamentary constituencies for England.

Council notes that the proposals for London include the creation of a new 'Hillingdon and Uxbridge' Constituency which includes two wards from the London Borough of Ealing; Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End. Council further notes that the proposed new constituencies separate the Ruislip wards, thus continuing to ignore natural boundaries and community affiliations.

Council notes that the majority of responses by both individuals and organisations, including residents' associations, to the original Commission's proposals, were opposed to the inclusion of the two Northolt wards and in favour of joining together four Ruislip wards.

Council notes that, although the Boundary Commission must work within numbers as laid out by statute - that is that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507, and, therefore, any proposal to amend the make-up of the proposed new constituencies will have an effect on the make-up of neighbouring constituencies, there are, in fact, a number of possible alternatives available to achieve a better outcome whilst still meeting the parameters set out above.

Council, therefore, authorises the Head of Democratic Services in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, to respond with a counter proposal to establish three Constituencies, of which, where appropriate, two will consist entirely of Hillingdon wards, recognising the fact that there is no natural boundary or affiliation to justify the inclusion of Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End Wards within the proposed Hillingdon and Uxbridge Constituency and that meets the wishes of the community for keeping the Ruislip wards together.

8.4 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR MORSE

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

"That, to clarify the conflicting reports about the potential to develop Northolt as a Commercial airport, the Council authorise the Chief Executive to undertake the following actions:

- 1) *seek legal advice to confirm the MOD has authority to increase commercial flights at Northolt.*

- 2) *propose the introduction of Public Safety Zones around the airport to provide modern safety measures that are an improvement on safeguarding planning rules.*
- 3) *open consultation with the MOD about what developments are taking place at Northolt, to clarify if the development is for the operational needs of the RAF which does not need planning permission, and to identify development that supports commercial operations needing planning permission.*
- 4) *consult with the MOD about environmental concerns raised by residents as the ARK report commissioned by the MOD talks about initially raising aircraft movements to 20,000 and then leasing the airport to a commercial company with the potential for 50,000 aircraft movements.*
- 5) *negotiate with the MOD to seek a reduction to 5,000 movements for commercial aircraft at Northolt to improve the environment."*

Following debate on the item (Councillors Allen, Crowe, Hensley, Kauffman, Lewis, Puddifoot, Simmonds, and Yarrow) the motion was put to a vote.

The motion was lost.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.46 pm.

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