

Minutes

RESIDENTS, EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

8 October 2018

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chairman), Vanessa Hurhangee, Allan Kauffman, Heena Makwana, Stuart Mathers, Paula Rodrigues, Jan Sweeting and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>Also Present:</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Roy Clark (Parking Services Manager), Lynn Hawes (YOS Service Manager), Dan Kennedy (Deputy Director, Housing, Environment, Education, Health & Wellbeing), Laura Baldry (Senior Admissions and Access Officer), Sally Ellis (Restorative Justice Co-ordinator), Tom Murphy (Assistant Director of Early Intervention Prevention & SEND) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
28.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Markham and Tony Little.</p>
29.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
30.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ALL ITEMS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT ANY ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked as Part I, and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
31.	<p>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2018 be approved as a correct record.</p>
32.	<p>RESTORATIVE JUSTICE WORK WITHIN THE YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Lynn Hawes - Youth Offending Service Manager, Sally Ellis - Restorative Justice Co-ordinator, and Tom Murphy - Assistant Director of Early Intervention Prevention & SEND, introduced a report on Restorative Justice within the Youth Offending Service (YOS).</p>

Restorative Justice was an initiative which aimed to bring together the victims of an offence, together with those responsible for the offence, to explore how the harm caused might be repaired. This included the victims meeting or communicating with the young person who committed the crime, to explain the impact of the crime and allow the young person to have the opportunity to take responsibility and make amends for their actions.

The Committee was shown a video interview of an adult couple who had been a victim of an offence, (in this instance, an assault by a group of teenage girls), and who had subsequently taken part in the process. The interview set out how the victims had felt following the incident, their initial apprehension at meeting the perpetrator of the assault, and their feelings following the meeting. The victims described feeling overwhelmingly positive about the experience, and the video concluded with their endorsement of the initiative.

The initiative was launched at Hillingdon Council approximately 3 years ago. All known victims were approached but not all wished to engage in the process, sometimes for practical reasons, for example where the victim lived a considerable distance away. Since April 2015, the YOS had supported approximately 25 direct conferences between victims and perpetrators. Since June 2018, a further 20 victims had been identified through links with the Police, from which 1 face to face direct conference had been held. It was forecast that 2 additional conferences would be held in the near future.

Challenges to be overcome included changes to obtaining personal contact information following the launch of GDPR. Discussions on how to address this were ongoing between the Council and the Police.

Members sought additional information, and asked a number of questions including:

How was the YOS addressing young people who were the victims of a crime?

All victims, regardless of age, were offered the opportunity to engage with the initiative. Similar to adults, some young people were willing to engage, whilst some were not. In addition, parents of the young people were often unwilling to allow their child to take part, due to concerns over the potential for victimisation or recrimination.

What training did staff undergo to enable them to carry out direct conferences successfully?

Staff were required to attend a 3 day training course delivered by the Restorative Justice Council. Currently, Hillingdon had four staff trained to moderate direct conferences. Feedback from all parties following the conferences was used to determine areas for improvement.

How was mental health considered within the process?

Hillingdon's team included a part time mental health worker, who was of great benefit in all its work, particularly when facilitating referrals to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). Mental health issues for young people being regularly identified were those of emotional wellbeing and trauma issues, rather than clinical issues such as depression or psychosis. Partnerships with health teams were in place to facilitate services such as counselling or speech and language therapy, where required.

It was confirmed that Hillingdon was operating in line with the statutory victim requirements, and that all victims had the opportunity to explore the options for restitution open to them.

Members requested that any future reports on the topic include data set by year.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

33. **QUARTERLY SCHOOL PLACES PLANNING UPDATE** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Dan Kennedy - Deputy Director, Housing, Environment, Education, Health & Wellbeing, and Laura Baldry – Admissions and Allocations Officer, updated the Committee on the Council's School Places Planning.

It was confirmed that every child within the Borough had been offered a primary or secondary school place as part of the latest admission round. Currently, the Council was maintaining sufficient spare places, which allowed for in-year admissions. Common reasons for in-year admissions included parental preference, residential development, or changing Ofsted school ratings.

Figures for primary schools places were showing a slight reduction in demand, which had not been anticipated three or four years previously. A similar reduction had been seen within other London boroughs, and possible reasons for the decline could be the EU referendum or affordability of homes within London, as well as throughput from a lower birth rate in 2014 to the current reception classes. In particular, schools close to physical barriers, or on the edge of heavy residential areas, were seeing a decline. The majority of remaining capacity was located within a small number of schools. Secondary schools had a smaller number of spare places, but like primary schools, spare capacity was within a small number of schools.

Since August 2018, Hillingdon had received 790 applications for primary school places, (200 of which were for children new to the country or Borough), and 430 for secondary school places (180 new to the country or Borough.) The start of a school year was recognised as being turbulent, with many parents moving their children to different schools as higher preferences became available, or as a result of families moving into the area.

It was forecasted that primary school places would remain mostly stable, though pockets of surplus places would need managing in light of the financial impact that unused places had on schools. Residential development within the Uxbridge and Hayes areas was expected to add additional pressure on places at local schools, however there was confidence that schools in nearby surrounding areas could meet any increased demand.

Demand for secondary school places was expected to increase, with many pupils travelling from the south to the north of the Borough for a school place. Modelling was continuing, and it was expected that schools in the north of the Borough would require 7 form entry, with 6 form entry in the south.

Approval had been granted for a new free school in the north of the Borough, though issues with securing a suitable location had resulted in a revised estimate of 2022/23 for its availability. As a contingency, the Council was reviewing options for the temporary expansion of existing schools.

Members sought further clarity and raised a number of questions, including:

Given that children in the south of the Borough were having to attend school in the north or outside of the Borough, and the difficulties in expanding schools in the south, why was the Council not exploring options for a new school in the south?

Council officers were reviewing all options through a defined process. The potential expansion of existing schools was reviewed first, before moving to the potential creation of new schools. Options for expansion would be assessed alongside planning officers, to take into consideration minimum space standards, parking provision, playing field space etc. If expansion was deemed unsuitable, then officers would then look at the creation of a wholly new school.

Was the forecast of secondary school need to 7 form entry in the north, and 6 form entry in the south, now completed/planned for?

The forecast had identified this need, but implementation was subject to planning approval. Some schools had already been expanded, e.g. Oakwood and Swakeleys, whilst expansions at other schools was underway, such as Vyners and Ruislip High.

The Local Plan Part 2 had identified an urgent need for 5 form entry at primary schools. Had this changed?

Demand for primary school places remained high in certain areas, such as Hayes. However, the reduced demand for places in other areas, such as Townfield, had helped to offset this. The Council was monitoring the situation and was confident that demand could be met. In the short term, bulge classes were an option, and there was unused classroom space available to accommodate these bulge classes. Officers were keeping the situation under close review.

How were geographic pinch points and fluctuating resident numbers factored into the school places forecast?

Such information was built into the forecast, with population numbers of neighbouring Boroughs regularly reviewed. Currently, population was fairly stable, though it was understood that this could change and affect demand for school places within Hillingdon.

Were bulge classes in secondary schools likely?

It was too early to comment on this. A report was being prepared to be presented to Members by the end of October, which would include details of potential school expansions, as well as the latest news on the new free school in the north of the Borough.

Officers were reminded that significant residential development in Yiewsley and other places would need to be closely monitored when forecasting demand for school places and assessing unfilled capacity.

It was agreed that Councillor Sweeting would forward a request for further information to officers outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

34. **WITNESS SESSION FOR REVIEW INTO PAYMENT MODERNISATION** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Roy Clark – Parking Services Manager, provided evidence as part of the Committee's review into payment modernisation across key resident services, focussing on the ways that residents and customers can pay for parking within Hillingdon.

The Committee was informed that the Council's Parking Services receives a number of payments for parking services, including permits, suspensions, Penalty Charge Notices and payments for parking in on-street parking bays and within the Council's car parks.

Payments for parking permits average £234k per annum and payments can be made online through a third party payment provider, by cheque or postal order, or by telephone. As all permit and visitor voucher applications are received by post, cash payments are not encouraged. However, on occasion cash is received by post and in such instances, the cash is banked as normal. Additional visitor vouchers can be purchased at Hillingdon libraries. A newly introduced parking ticket system allows motorists to view CCTV footage, and pay or appeal fines, online.

Payments for parking bay charge suspensions and waivers to park on yellow lines during essential works average £116k per annum. Payments for parking suspensions/waivers can be made by cheque or payment card over telephone. For Penalty charge Notices (PCNs), the Council receive a total of £3.4m per year. Payments for PCNs can be made online via a third party supplier, by an automated telephone service or by cheque or postal order.

The two multi-storey car parks in Uxbridge (Cedars and Grainges car parks) operate a barrier control system with Pay on Foot machines. The machines accept banknotes, coins or contactless credit/debit cards. The average income from the car parks is £981k per annum.

The majority of other parking charges are received via Pay and display (P&D) machines, which account for a total of £1.9m per annum. The Council currently operates 252 Pay and display machines, that provide cheaper parking rates to owners of the Hillingdon First card. Use of these sites of predominantly short stay (i.e. ½ - 2 hours), and 75% of all payments are at the Hillingdon First cheaper rate.

While Pay and display machines currently accept coins only, advances in technology now allow for a cashless option via credit or debit cards, which also allows for use of the Hillingdon First cards.

Options for cashless machines include:

- P&D machines with cash only facilities and a card payment system available through a mobile phone system (under this system coin only machines would remain and a separate mobile phone payment system would also be introduced).
- P&D machines with a card only payment system fitted to the machine (under this system only a payment card reader would be available at the machines - there would be no coin payment option available).
- P&D machines with cash **and** card payment facilities fitted to the machine (under this option motorists could pay with coins at the machine and there would also be a payment card reader fitted to the machine).

- P&D machines with cash **and** card payment facilities fitted to the machine, **and** an additional card payment system available through a mobile phone system (under this option motorists could pay with coins at the machine and there would also be a payment card reader fitted to the machine. There would also be a separate mobile phone payment system available).

There are benefits and drawbacks to all optional options, set out in detail within the appendix to the report. Introduction of cashless machines would reduce the risk of theft from the P&D machines. In addition to improving the range of options and ease of payments for motorists, cashless parking systems provide a cost benefit to the Council as there is less cash to collect, count and bank. The introduction of a mobile phone system would also reduce wear and tear on the machines, resulting in a longer term of life and less of a requirement for maintenance. However, officers are mindful of the need to retain a cash option.

The P&D machines have an expected working life expectancy of 10 years, and many are now at the end of that life and will need replacement. However, there would be significant financial implication to replacing, or updating machines to incorporate new technology. Replacement with a cash-only machine would cost £3,400 per machine. Replacement by a cash machine with integrated card reader would total £4,125 per machine. Replacement of all 252 machines across 4 years would therefore total £856,800 and £1,039,500, respectively. A competitive tendering exercise could help to confirm and/or reduce these estimates.

A mobile telephone/card payment system, which would operate independently of existing P&D machines, would provide a greater range of payment options to motorists without the requirement for large capital investment. The cost to implement such a system would total an estimated £10k, with ongoing annual expenditure of circa £3,500.

Members asked a number of questions, including:

How many P&D machines were currently active?

Currently, approximately 20 of the total 252 machines were out of service. These tended to be machines that were in less popular parking spots and that subsequently took very small amounts of money.

Were machines online or offline?

The machines were currently online. If a machine had a card reader, it would need to be online in order to function.

Were contactless machines separate from card reader machines?

Machines could be fitted with dual options, to allow for card payments via pin code as well as by contactless. Alternatively, machines could be installed with the option of one or the other.

Would a mobile phone system include a smartphone app?

Yes, such a system would allow motorists to call and pay for parking via telephone, or via registration through a smartphone app. Smartphone apps had the added benefit of storing payment details, car registrations and most used parking sites, as well as providing the option for virtual permits and visitor vouchers. Safeguarding options for

single use of tickets, time allocations and similar, could be implemented dependant on how the system was configured.

Did the cost estimates outlined in the report include provision for changes to signage, handheld devices for parking wardens, etc.?

The cost implication to update signage was not included, though there were several cost-effective options available to the Council such as the use of vinyl sheets and laminated notices. A recent refresh of parking equipment for wardens meant that there was no need to replace current devices.

How did the machines currently report their status or cash deposits to the Council?

The current system allowed machines to report faults, allowed for changes to electronic messaging, and reported the amount of money within each machine, to Council officers. Machines in parking hotspots had their money collected 3 times a week. All machines, including machines that only collect low levels of income, are collected within a maximum of 2 weeks.

Members suggested that if a cashless option was implemented, signage and instructions at parking sites would need to be bright and clear.

Members suggested that future witnesses could include a charitable organisation that dealt with people in deprivation, such as Step Change.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

35. **CABINET FORWARD PLAN** (*Agenda Item 8*)

It was confirmed that the Car Parking Season Tickets Policy was no longer due for consideration at Cabinet. It was agreed that the clerk would provide the Committee with details on the policy, once available.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

36. **MULTI-YEAR WORK PROGRAMME** (*Agenda Item 9*)

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.30 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.