

## Minutes

### RESIDENTS, EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

4 November 2019

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chairman), Michael Markham (Vice-Chairman), Allan Kauffman, Heena Makwana, Devi Radia, Paula Rodrigues, Steve Tuckwell, Jazz Dhillon (In place of Stuart Mathers) and Tony Eginton (In place of Jan Sweeting)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Phillip Corthorne</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), Vikram Hansrani, (Assistant Director of SEND And Inclusion) Dan Kennedy (Director, Housing, Environment, Education, Performance, Health &amp; Wellbeing), Cathy Knubley (Head of Waste Services), and Chris Fallon (Education, Strategy and Quality Assurance Manager)</p>
41.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillors Mathers and Sweeting. Councillors Dhillon and Eginton were present as their respective substitutes.</p>
42.	<p><b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Eginton declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 6, as he was a Governor at two maintained primary schools within the Borough.</p>
43.	<p><b>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</b> (<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>
44.	<p><b>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The clerk provided an update on some of the actions remaining from previous meetings. It was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regarding the Emergency Response item considered at the 18 July meeting, details of the major incident exercises held in October and November would be forwarded to the Committee following the completion of the exercise in November.</li><li>• Regarding Enforcement of Parking Schemes, considered at the meeting on 4 September, the Committee's suggestion that number plate recognition be</li></ul>

considered as a way to combat stop-and-shop parking infringements had been put to the Council's Parking Manager, Roy Clark. Mr Clark had subsequently confirmed that legislation prohibited local authorities from using automatic number plate recognition for enforcement purposes.

- Following the witness session on Littering and Fly Tipping held on 4 September, officers were drafting a letter that Councillors and residents could pass to those people known to be persistent offenders, as requested. A draft would be passed to Members once available.

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 be approved as a correct record.**

45. **REVIEW INTO LITTERING AND FLY TIPPING WITHIN HILLINGDON - THIRD WITNESS SESSION** (*Agenda Item 5*)

The Committee received a presentation from Rose Tehan, Research and Innovation Development Manager for Keep Britain Tidy (KBT).

**An evidence led approach**

Ms Tehan first set out KBT's framework, which was developed by the charity's Centre for Social Innovation which conducted research to understand litter, waste and local environmental issues, before using the insights from this research to design and pilot interventions to change behaviour.

An example of the Centre's work was to address dog fouling was cited, which found the following:

- Dog walkers knew they should pick up dog litter
- Dog fouling was worse at night/in winter and in areas not overlooked
- Some people did not pick up when they felt they were safe from being watched

As a result of these findings, the Centre attempted to make dog walkers feel that were being watched. This resulted in the 'We're Watching You' campaign, which involved 17 local government / land manager partners across England installing glow in the dark posters, showing images of eyes, at 128 target sites. Each poster was tested in isolation, at a range of land use types, e.g. housing areas, parks, alleyways, retail areas, etc. Dog refuse was then monitored, with the result that dog fouling was found to have reduced at the sites by 46% overall.

National campaigns were then launched in November 2014 and March 2015, with 219 partners across England taking part. The campaigns subsequently won a number of awards, including Silver Nudge Award, the Guardian Best Ads of 2015, Charity Awards 2016.

**Litter**

Following research conducted, the charity had found that litter was often a result of a lack of personal obligation towards putting extra time and effort into finding a bin, an unwillingness to deal with 'messy' rubbish, and a lack of understanding of the broader consequences of littering.

It had been found that litter bred litter, with the public adding to existing piles of refuse at litter hotspots. There was a perception that someone else would 'deal with it', exacerbated by a culture of single-use packaging, and bad packaging design. It had

also been found that the presence of litter bins could act as magnets for more litter.

KBT's interventions included the 'It's Still Littering' campaign, which aimed to address the issue of people littering by placing or leaving their rubbish behind, such as on a bench where they have been sitting or on a surface they are walking past, like a window sill. It was believed that people littered in this way as it was seen as a more 'acceptable' way to do so. The campaign aimed to address this perception and highlight that 'leaving it is littering it'.

The 'Walk This Way' campaign aimed to address the issue of people littering bagged dog refuse in parks and green spaces. Following a national survey (with 2,000 respondents), it was found that 13% (260) admitted to the behaviour. Of those, just over half (54%) said that they had done so because there were no bins nearby. The intervention involved creating dog-walking routes in parks and green spaces. Clearly marked bins and route markers then defined the walking route, with bins placed at regular intervals along the routes. The promotion of the dog walking routes focused on the health and wellbeing benefits for dogs and humans, rather than specifically mentioning litter or dog fouling.

The charity had experimented with removing litter bins from parks, with mixed results. Within the three parks tested, waste left in the parks was seen to have decreased by 68%. Park manager feedback suggested a visible reduction in litter on the ground, though monitoring showed that litter had increased in two of the three parks. The tests had been seen to have reduced fly-tipping (particularly at locations of bins).

Roadside beautification aimed to promote flower planting as a method of reducing littering on roadsides. In the first year, KBT partnered with North West Leicestershire District Council to trial roadside beautification on two 100m stretches of roadside verge. Daffodils and bluebells were planted, though the flowers died off soon into the intervention month. In the second year, KBT partnered with Braintree District Council to trial native wildflower planting on 4 stretches of the A131 – a hotspot for roadside litter. As a result, litter was seen to have reduced at two sites and increased at two; results were therefore inconclusive. However, feedback from local residents and visitors was extremely positive, with many highlighting a perceived reduction in litter due to the planting.

## **Fly-Tipping**

Research showed that there was a lack of awareness as to what constituted fly-tipping. Upon canvassing the public, 91% said that they understood the term 'fly-tipping', but only 1% were able to correctly identify all 10 examples of fly-tipping. The term itself was also at times a source of confusion, with London research showing that 20% of non-UK nations had not heard the term 'fly-tipping'.

The speedy response of Councils to collect fly-tipped waste had been seen to legitimise and incentivise the act of fly-tipping, and public perceptions were that fly-tipping was low impact and socially acceptable. Research showed that a key driver for fly-tipping behaviour was the expectation that fly-tips would be collected quickly and without repercussions.

As a way to combat this, it was piloted that fly-tips be wrapped in 'crime scene investigation' tape and left in place for up to three days to allow the perpetrator and other residents to see it. Results showed a 78% reduction in fly-tipping at one pilot site over 17 weeks, (63% reduction after one month). Doorstop surveys conducted showed that 67% said that the CSI intervention made them 'realise that dumping waste on

streets is illegal', while 49% said that the CSI intervention would make them think twice about what they did with their unwanted items in the future. Further upcoming pilots were to take place in Havering, Islington and Merton.

Contributing factors to fly-tipping were anything that increased the 'hassle factor' for residents, including being fussy about what will be collected / accepted; requiring measurements; onerous booking systems, etc.

There was a high level of awareness of the legal consequences of fly-tipping (80% of survey respondents said that offenders could receive a fine, 59% said that they could go to court and 52% said that they could get a criminal record). However, the perceived threat of enforcement was very low, with only 11% of respondents saying that it was likely that a person who fly-tipped would be caught.

The research suggested that many residents did not feel personally responsible for their unwanted items and waste once it was 'off their hands'. This was largely seen as the Council's responsibility and often linked with paying Council Tax.

It was recommended that solutions to these issues should focus on getting the basics right: communications/awareness, ease of using services, infrastructure etc., increasing the visibility of enforcement / provide direct feedback, and use of targeted interventions to tackle problematic behaviours,

Further potential actions included informing people of the cost implication of clearing up after them, and particularly how the money spent is taken from other services such as healthcare, education etc. Other actions included working with schools to reinforce messaging at an early age, providing welcome packs for new residents and businesses, and using ghost stencils to highlight waste on the street, among others.

Hillingdon could also choose to sign up to the KBT network which, for a fee, provided access to digital campaigns, legal, litter and waste expertise, annual conferences and meetings, discounted services, the Keep Britain Tidy Litter App, and opportunities to work with the charity on new intervention and campaign trials.

The Committee requested further information on a number of points, including:

**Was KBT doing anything to address fly-tipping by landlords and tenants of rented accommodation?**

The issue was common across many authorities. A pilot was being undertaken in Hounslow to provide a pack for landlords and tenants that would signpost them towards waste services and best practice actions.

**What campaigns were being held nationally?**

KBT held the Great Britain Spring Clean each year. The next scheduled event was in March 2020, and it was hoped that 60,000 people would take part. Local authorities were encouraged to get involved, with more information to be found via the KBT website.

**Were local resident groups consulted before changes, such as the removal of bins, were carried out?**

Previous pilots had made changes without highlighting the changes in advance, in an effort to test in isolation. However, experiences showed that this was a mistake, and it

was recommended that local groups should be engaged prior to any changes being made.

### **How did KBT address the issue of roads falling under the responsibility of multiple authorities when beautifying roadsides?**

At times, it was challenging to engage with all appropriate responsible parties. Recommendations to address such challenges including bringing decision makers together through joint meetings and robust scheduling of communications.

The 'Don't be A Tossler' campaign was a preventative campaign aimed at reducing roadside littering, and a new campaign due for launch in 2020 was aiming to further address littering and its impact on wildlife.

### **How involved was KBT with schools?**

KBT was involved with the Eco Schools programme, which aimed to empower children to drive change and improve their environmental awareness. KBT engaged with schools to run workshops and provide structure to campaigns. It was hoped that by embedding an awareness of environmental issues and best practice at a young age, the programme would have long-term benefits for the environment.

### **Did KBT engage with transport and utility companies regarding the management of driver litter?**

Councils such as North West Leicestershire District Council, with support from KBT, were running campaigns focussed on engaging haulage and distribution companies to implement a process of litter disposal for drivers.

### **Had KBT run any cost analysis exercises to determine return on investment for local authorities?**

Cost analysis was difficult, due to the way in which local authorities combined costs within services and service areas.

46.

### **UPDATE ON THE REVIEW INTO THE COUNCIL'S CURRENT AND FUTURE RELATIONSHIP WITH ACADEMIES AND FREE SCHOOLS** *(Agenda Item 6)*

Chris Fallon, Education Strategy and Quality Assurance Manager, provided the Committee with an update on the implementation of recommendations that resulted from the previous review into the Council's current and future relationship with Academies and Free Schools.

Mr Fallon confirmed that, of the six recommendations that had resulted from the review, five had been completed. The sixth, which recommended that the Council work to review the school improvement framework, was in progress, with a draft School Improvement Strategy currently under consideration with Lead Members. Once approved, formal consultation would follow.

As part of the review, a number of meetings had been held with schools and head teachers. These meetings had shown that schools were eager to understand Hillingdon's position in respect of school improvements and future relationships. However, it was noted that some schools wanted to engage with the Council on different levels, and that work was required to promote a level of trust between the Council and the schools.

The framework would provide clarity on how the Council was to provide support to schools within three categories:

1. Schools that were receiving positive Ofsted results and were performing well did not need a high level of support;
2. 'Targeted' schools who needed additional support, or support within certain areas; and
3. Schools who were not providing their pupils a good quality of education and who therefore needed intensive support.

The Committee sought clarity on a number of points, including:

**Officers were visiting maintained schools, and some Academies. Had any Academies refused to engage?**

No school had refused to engage with the local authority. All schools had been written to, and an intensive schedule of meetings was ongoing.

**How could the Council further support Academies?**

Training for school governors was scheduled for 26 November, which would provide detail on how the Council could support all schools, including Academies.

**What support could the Council give to small colleges who were facing severe financial challenges?**

There was a wider multi-academy Trust, with reserves, who allocated finances based on a needs assessment of pupils. Budgets were ring-fenced within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

**When would the new School Improvement Strategy be available for the Committee to review?**

The draft was currently under consideration by lead Members. Once approved, the strategy would be available for all Committees and Schools to review and provide comment. An information item on the strategy could be brought to this Committee in January 2020.

**The report referred to the creation of a Governance Action Plan. When would the Plan be ready?**

It was expected that work would continue through January 2020. A platform would provide schools with the ability to share training courses and professional development opportunities through an active online platform. As the platform evolved, it would grow to include development opportunities for school governors.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted; and
2. That a report on the new School Improvement Strategy be added to the Work Programme for consideration at the January 2020 meeting.

Vikram Hansrani, Assistant Director of SEND and Inclusion, and Dan Kennedy, Director of Housing, Environment, Education, Performance, Health and Wellbeing, provided the Committee with information on the Council's provision of Special Educational Need and Disability Services to schools.

The Committee was informed that, to address the need for specialist provision within the Borough, the updated SEND Provision Capital Plan set out a number of expansions, including:

- An expansion of Hedgewood Special School totalling 25 places;
- An expansion of Moorcroft Special School totalling 10 places for September 2020;
- The creation of two Special Resource Based Provision at Ruislip High School (Autism Spectrum Disorder and Physical Disabilities);
- An expansion of 30 places at Uxbridge College for post-16 children;
- The creation of a Satellite Special School hub to meet the needs of children with complex needs, using two different sites accommodating 30 children at each site.

Eden Academy Trust had applied to develop two new free schools within the Borough for children with Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) and Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (PMLD), at the grand Union Village site (approximately 80 primary places age 3-11) and at Pinn River (180 places age 3-19). As a result, Grangewood Primary School was to be closed. The programme had been agreed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA), and officers were in discussion with Eden Academy and the ESFA to review proposed timetable and delivery options.

With regard to support for mainstream schools, the Service had been newly transformed, which had resulted in a revised SEND strategy which helped to support these schools through a three tiered approach:

1. The SEND Advisory Service was a multidisciplinary pre-statutory service designed to meet the needs of children and young people at a much earlier stage, as opposed to the process of an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) assessment.
2. The Educational Psychology service, which performed statutory functions (i.e. Reports and assessments for EHCPs), as well as extending trade offers to schools; and
3. The SEND Casework team, who supported the pupils and schools through actioning of casework.

Members sought further information on a number of points, including:

**Could the Committee be provided with a copy of the new SEND Strategy?**

Detail of the SEN Strategy, and the Additional Needs Strategy, could be provided to Members following the meeting.

**Was the £5m SEN grant providing value for money?**

The £5m available to Hillingdon was broadly commensurate to the figures available to neighbouring authorities. Historically, it had been challenging to assess value for money and outcomes for young people, areas which would be addressed through the use of the SEND Advisory Service.

Hillingdon had circa 2,400 young people with EHCPs within the Borough. Use of the grant was expected to result in a more children accessing SEN support, though this would likely result in an increased number of requests for assessments. The new SEND Advisory Service was to be responsible for supporting these requests for early support funding and sharing best practice between practitioners, as well as providing a robust challenge where necessary, with a view to ensuring the best outcomes for the Borough's young people.

### **How was the Council addressing the problems with funding for High Need?**

Hillingdon had a number of measures in place to support High Need. This included the current provision of providing additional financial resource to schools who have over 2% of their population with an EHCP.

In addition, Hillingdon was in the process of developing a pathway for schools to access extra support funding for children with a degree of additional need, or children with emerging needs prior to the 20-week EHCP assessment. However, all requests would be subject to robust governance within the decision making process.

### **How would the Council address children affected by the retention, or removal, of temporary teaching blocks at Meadow School?**

Meetings had been held with the head teacher of Meadow School to discuss how to manage long-term risk due to the temporary blocks. Options were still being considered.

### **Was there strong evidence that the new Strategy's early stage support was effective, and was it expected that requests for assessment would reduce as a result?**

The success of the new strategy would be dependant on building trust with schools and ensuring that the schools understood how to access services and that there was value for money in the services being provided. A review of data from other local authorities had shown that a number of requests being made were for a lower tier of support that could be dealt with earlier, without the requirement for a 20 week assessment.

### **What kind of training and development was being provided to the newly restructured Casework team?**

The team currently had a mixture of agency and contracted staff. Recruitment was ongoing and three new staff members had recently been appointed. Support and development to staff included regular meetings, and the provision of a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme. A full service away day was scheduled for 22 November.

It was expected that the team would be fully staffed by January 2020.

### **Hillingdon currently has 2,400 young people with ECHPs. What did forecasting expect this number to be in 3-4 years time?**

Based on growth forecasts, and without the transformation that had just been implemented, it was likely that the number would double to approximately 5,000 in 3-4 years. The measures being put in place now as part of the new strategies, such as Capital development, were expected to ensure that there was sufficient budget and resources to meet the needs of this increased number.



**Was the Council developing a long-term Capital programme?**

In order to access funding, the Council had to consult with stakeholders. The options presented as part of that consultation would form a larger piece of strategic thinking and long-term strategy to meet the needs of young people.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted; and
2. That the Committee be provided with detail of the new SEN Strategy, and the new Additional Needs Strategy.

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

**RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Forward Plan be noted.**

49. **WORK PROGRAMME** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Consideration was given to the work programme.

It was confirmed that the previously requested update on the Council's position regarding school places for September 2020 had been scheduled for the January 2020 meeting. In addition, this meeting would also receive the item on the new School Improvement Strategy, as requested during discussion on item 6.

The previously suggested item on the enforcement of parking management schemes would be considered for inclusion on the work programme for municipal year 2020-21.

**RESOLVED: That the Work Programme be noted.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.45 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.