

Minutes

COUNCIL

4 November 2010

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



Councillor David Yarrow (Mayor)
Councillor Mary O'Connor (Deputy Mayor)

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <p>Councillors: David Allam Beulah East Richard Lewis Lynne Allen Neil Fyfe Anita MacDonald Bruce Baker Sid Garg John Major Tim Barker Roshan Ghei Michael Markham Richard Barnes Dominic Gilham Carol Melvin Josephine Barrett Raymond Graham Douglas Mills Jonathan Bianco Paul Harmsworth Richard Mills Wayne Bridges Shirley Harper-O'Neill John Morgan Mike Bull John Hensley June Nelson Keith Burrows Henry Higgins David Payne Paul Buttivant Patricia Jackson Ray Puddifoot George Cooper Phoday Jarjussey Andrew Retter Judith Cooper Sandra Jenkins David Routledge Philip Corthorne Alan Kauffman Avtar Sandhu Brian Crowe Judy Kelly Robin Sansarpuri Peter Curling Peter Kemp Scott Seaman-Digby Catherine Dann Mo Khursheed David Simmonds Jazz Dhillon Kuldeep Lakhmana Brian Stead Janet Duncan Eddie Lavery Michael White</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Hugh Dunnachie, Fran Beasley, Christopher Neale, Chris Spencer, Jean Palmer, Linda Sanders, Raj Alagh, Lloyd White, Mark Braddock, Morgan Einon and Nikki Stubbs</p>
	<p>PRAYERS</p> <p>Prayers were said by Reverend Adrian Guthrie.</p>
33.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Benson, Bliss, Brar, Gardner, O'Brien and Riley.</p>
34.	<p>MINUTES (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2010 be agreed as a correct record.</p>

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

The Mayor advised that the Borough shooting team had taken part in the annual competition organised by the London Boroughs' National Small Bore Rifle Association. The Mayor congratulated the team members for winning the competition for the fourth successive year, equalling the record for the longest period that the shield had been retained.

The Mayor, Mayoress and chaplain had attended the Mayors' Service at Westminster Abbey.

The Mayor had attended a Town Twinning planning meeting in Germany on 29 October 2010. The meeting had also been attended by the Mayors from two of the Borough's twin towns: Schleswig and Mantes-la-Jolie.

The Council was advised that, since the last meeting, the number of events that had been attended by the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and past Mayors on the Mayor's behalf totalled 87. 75 of these events were within the Borough with the remaining 12 being outside of Hillingdon.

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

5.1 QUESTION FROM IAN MOULES, ST JOHN'S CLOSE, UXBRIDGE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES – COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS

"After his visit to the Whitehall schools on Monday 18 October, what does Councillor Simmonds see as the key obstacles to expanding Whitehall Infant School and Whitehall Junior School while maintaining the excellent educational standards and meeting legal requirements, and what strategies do the local authority have in place to address these obstacles?"

Councillor Simmonds responded that the Council recognised the challenge of providing more school places and consideration had been given in the past to the expansion and reduction of schools in line with the changing population. The increase in births since 2008 had meant that Uxbridge now required four forms of entry towards the end of the decade and more school places sooner than previously expected.

The Council's strategy for providing more school places in the Uxbridge area had included the delivery of a 3fe school at RAF Uxbridge. It was anticipated that this would provide 50% more places than the child-yield expected from the Whitehall site but would not be available until 2013 at the earliest. As such, the Council needed to create sufficient local school places for the interim period (at least three years) and look at the creation of a fourth form of entry in the longer term.

Several options had been considered including working with two local church schools. Despite these schools having limited admissions criteria, discussions had taken place with the diocesan authorities and concluded that one of the schools had expansion potential without significant investment, but only for one school year. The Hermitage School site had also been considered but was thought to be very constrained. As such, there was little potential for expansion. A further suggestion for a programme of rolling expansion was also being considered.

Of the options available, the expansion of Whitehall schools appeared to offer the best solution. The Whitehall schools had a surplus of classrooms because they were previously four forms of entry. Although the amount of space was far from ideal, the Council had met with the Head Teachers who had made suggestions to resolve the issue and had stated a preference for temporary expansion.

Whilst temporary expansion would not be ruled out, the Council preferred the two-storey permanent expansion option. However, it was acknowledged that this would be disruptive, would render a significant part of the school un-useable while the work was carried out and would take longer to complete than a single storey block.

Councillor Simmonds advised that he would be chairing a Petition Hearing on Monday 8 November 2010 where consideration would be given to three petitions regarding the Whitehall schools.

The schools, parents and Councillors had lobbied on the issue and Councillor Simmonds advised that a final resolution had not yet been found. Once he had received all of the evidence, he would make a decision on the matter so that it could be implemented as soon as possible.

5.2 QUESTION FROM PETER JAMES, THE GREENWAY, UXBRIDGE TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COUNCILLOR SIMMONDS

"Would the Leader of the Council or Councillor Simmonds please tell the Council why an agreement between Council Officers and the Whitehall Schools on the location and boundary of the Children's Centre on Whitehall School playing field is not being honoured and why the Director of Education and Children's Services chose the afternoon of 22nd of October to inform the Headteachers of Whitehall Infant School and Whitehall Junior School that work would be commencing on site on the morning of 23rd October."

Councillor Simmonds noted that Mr James had previously been elected as a Hillingdon Councillor and, during his time in office, had sat on the Committee which, on 15 February 1996, considered the expansion of Whitehall schools and resolved that there be four forms of entry.

In response to the question, Councillor Simmonds advised that, at a meeting in early 2009, the plans for the new Children's Centre building had been shared with the Governing body and it was confirmed that these would be submitted for planning approval. Although the Planning Department had consulted on these plans in the usual way and the schools had raised their concerns about the plans with the Council, no objections were raised at that time by the schools.

Shortly before the work was due to start, the Chairman of the Governors had raised concerns about the location of the building and requested that it be moved 3m further back into the wooded area. Officers had agreed to try and relocate the building further into the wooded area. However, the Planning Department had advised that a new planning application would need to be submitted.

Meetings were held with the school to resolve a number of issues such as the location of the perimeter fence, the management of the building and the location of a path from the Centre to the school. However, as it was proposed that the building be relocated closer to houses backing on to the school, neighbours strongly objected to the

proposal and the impact it would have on them. Officers subsequently redrafted plans to try and meet these concerns, but there remained strong objections.

The Children's Centre capital programme was grant funded and the deadline for total spend of this grant was 31 March 2011. As delays to the planning application increased, it became obvious that, unless work started on site quickly, this deadline would not be met. This would mean a loss of grant funding for the Council and that costs incurred on this project would have to be met from the revenue budget. It would also mean that 1,000 children under five and their families would miss out on Children's Centre provision. The Council had a statutory duty to provide sufficient Children's Centres and had agreed with the Department for Education that it would build six Centres in the Phase 3 programme.

The Council believed that the Children's Centres were an asset to the Borough so was keen to go ahead with the development. As such, a decision was made on 21 October 2010 that the Council would not go ahead with a new planning application and would instead invoke the previously agreed planning permission for the site. The Director of Education and Children's Services met with Head Teachers the following day to advise them that the hoarding to separate the site from the school would be erected the following week (half term week which commenced on 25 October 2010) and that enabling work would happen over the following two weeks, with building work starting on the site on 22 November 2010.

5.3 QUESTION FROM MR BUTLER AND MISS JEFFRIES OF BYRON WAY, WEST DRAYTON TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND HOUSING – COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE

“Would it not have been better for Hillingdon Homes to have applied for and gained planning permission for the whole Glebe estate, and then spread the works over a longer period, by doing one section of the works at a time, for example fencing the whole estate at the same time, thus enabling better discounts for parts and labour etc., hopefully lowering the costs to leaseholders and the council, rather than the expensive, disorganised, and to the residents, disruptive way that these works have been proceeding on these two blocks at present?”

Councillor Corthorne responded that the Glebe project was a large one which covered the whole of the estate. Due to the complexity of the project involving eight different garage areas and 18 diverse blocks of flats and maisonettes, it was not possible to do all the consultation and planning submissions at once. The estate had therefore been split up into six zones to enable manageable sized packages of works to be put together.

The estate wide works were scheduled over a three to four year period and works were currently being carried out to the first two individual blocks of flats and would last approximately 18 weeks. Councillor Corthorne advised that it would be disruptive for residents in these blocks to have the work carried out element by element over a long period of time or for the estate as a whole to have separate elements of work carried out to every block of flats over a long period.

As far as costs were concerned, Hillingdon Homes, now Hillingdon Housing Service, had a partnering arrangement with Apollo Property Services Group Ltd. Apollo had entered into long term arrangements with suppliers and sub-contractors to drive down prices and obtain discounts, which benefited both the Council and leaseholders. However, the Council had a fiduciary duty to charge leaseholders for the cost of those

works for which they were required to pay in accordance with the terms of their leases.

5.4 QUESTION FROM MRS SMITH OF STRATFORD ROAD, YEADING TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES – COUNCILLOR BIANCO

“The Council has responsibilities for animal welfare and for the welfare of children. It works in partnership with the Police, the London Boroughs, the GLA, M.P.’s, and other partners and agencies across London and it has a strong voice. Will the Council make it’s position absolutely clear that dog fighting and abuse of animals will not be tolerated and, that enforcement action will be taken against those engaged in these illegal, cruel and barbaric practices?”

Councillor Bianco responded that he was delighted for the opportunity to re-affirm the Council’s position on what Mrs Smith quite rightly described as cruel and barbaric practices. The Council utterly condemned dog fighting as it was a cruel and deplorable practice that would never be tolerated in this Borough.

Enforcement action against dog fighting was normally carried out by the Police and RSPCA inspectors using powers under the Animal Welfare Act 2006. The Council’s Animal Control Officers had always worked closely with the Police and RSPCA officers, and any intelligence on dog fighting gathered during their routine visits was always shared with the relevant officers.

Councillor Bianco advised that Hillingdon was one of the few local authorities in the UK that had an Animal Welfare Charter, which set out the Council’s stance on animal welfare issues and had been in place for 10 years. The Charter had been recognised by the RSPCA as an example of good practice and had received an RSPCA bronze footprint. It was noted that, in 2009, the RSPCA had prosecuted and convicted 31 cases of dog fighting.

Furthermore, it was noted that a Dogwatch scheme had been set up earlier in the year in conjunction with the Yiewsley Safer Neighbourhood Team and was working well. The purpose of the scheme was to build links between police and dog walkers in a bid to reduce crime.

Councillor Bianco stated that the Council would continue to do everything in its power to ensure that this terrible practice did not take place in the Borough and, where it did happen, action would be taken against the perpetrators.

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

(i) THE CABINET

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business. These were seconded by Councillor Simmonds. Following debate (Councillors Bianco, Burrows, Harmsworth, Kauffman, D Mills and Retter) the motion was put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) the composition of the Cabinet and the Cabinet portfolios be noted as set out in Annex A; and**
- b) Councillor Jenkins be thanked for her outstanding contribution to the**

work of the Cabinet.

(ii) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNCIL'S BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DELIVERY PROGRAMME

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds. The motion was then put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to amend existing officer and Member delegations, job titles, etc, throughout the Constitution arising from the Business Improvement Delivery Programme.

(iii) AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds. The motion was then put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That the amendments to the Constitution, as set out in Annex B, be approved for implementation with immediate effect, including the current Council meeting.

(iv) APPOINTMENT OF CHAMPION

Councillor Puddifoot moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Simmonds. The motion was then put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Jenkins be appointed Council Champion for the Environment.

(v) MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor G Cooper moved the recommendations as set out on the Order of Business with the addition of Mrs Elizabeth Kemp replacing Mr Geoff Courtenay as a Conservative representative on the Hoenigsberg Memorial Trust. These were seconded by Councillor Markham. The motion was then put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That:

a) on the recommendation of the Leader of the Conservative Group:

- **Pensions Committee – Councillor Simmonds to replace Councillor G Cooper**
- **Ruislip Combined Charities – Councillor Lavery to replace Mr Tony Eginton**
- **Uxbridge United Welfare Trusts – Councillor Graham to replace Mr P Ryerson from 14/11/10**
- **Hoenigsberg Trust – Mr Graham Horn to replace Mr Tony Eginton**
- **Hoenigsberg Memorial Trust – Mrs Elizabeth Kemp to replace Mr Geoff Courtenay**

b) on the recommendation of the Leader of the Labour Group:

- **Ruislip Combined Charities – Mr David Horne to be reappointed**
- **Standards Committee Review Sub-Committee – Councillor**

Harmsworth to replace Councillor Garg

- **To note that Councillor Garg will no longer be a Labour Group appointee on any Council Committees**

38. PETITIONS TO THE COUNCIL (*Agenda Item 7*)

Councillor G Cooper moved the recommendation as set out on the Order of Business. This was seconded by Councillor Markham. The motion was then put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by Cabinet on 14 October 2010, Council adopt a new Petition Scheme, as set out in Annex C, and agree the necessary Constitutional changes as set out in the report.

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

8.1 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR MACDONALD TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES, HEALTH & HOUSING – COUNCILLOR CORTHORNE

“Can the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Health & Housing let the Council know how many Wise Lane estate leaseholders requested a full roof replacement in the recent consultation by Hillingdon Homes, now Hillingdon Council?”

Councillor Corthorne responded that questionnaires had been sent to the 42 leaseholders. Responses had been received from 26 of them: 12 supported the option of full roof replacement; 8 supported the option to continue repairing the roofs; and 6 returned their questionnaires without expressing a preference but requesting more information.

It was noted that this was an initial consultation exercise with leaseholders about the need for the work and the options open to the Council. The Council had worked closely with the Leaseholders Association regarding the strategy. It was acknowledged that not all leaseholders would be happy with the decision that was eventually made but that the process had been transparent and the Council had fulfilled its fiduciary duty.

Councillor MacDonald, by way of a supplementary question, stated that the response figures quoted were incorrect and asked if the Cabinet Member could look into this matter further. Councillor Corthorne advised that he would investigate the matter and respond to Councillor MacDonald in writing.

8.2 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR ALLEN TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS

“Could the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation please inform this Council why no action has been taken to move forward with the Consultation for a CPZ in Little Road, Chalfont Road and Austin Road, despite the Members for Townfield being consulted at least three times already?”

Councillor Burrows responded that he was surprised and disappointed at Councillor Allen’s allegation that there had been no action on this matter. He was fully aware from his regular discussions with officers that there had been effort on their part to

agree a way forward with Councillor Allen that the Ward Councillors would be happy with.

Councillor Burrows stated that Councillor Allen had spoken as a Ward Councillor at a Petition Hearing where residents of Little Road had petitioned for a parking management scheme in their road alone. At this meeting, she had rightly pointed out to the residents that a parking management scheme in just one road did not usually work as the parking problem was simply displaced elsewhere. This view had prompted a rather negative response from some of the petitioners who argued that Little Road was a special case and that they were unhappy about sharing a scheme with other roads.

Since then, officers had been working with Councillor Allen to try to agree a way forward and to define a workable area for a parking management scheme that might encompass other roads and take advantage of off-street parking. This Council did not seek to impose schemes on local residents but preferred to respond to residents' aspirations. Ward Councillors could play a valuable part in shaping this process as they were an integral part of their local community and should know what the issues are for their constituents. Only then would the Council seek to undertake a consultation in all the roads affected.

The situation surrounding Little Road and adjacent roads was ongoing and, as Councillor Allen acknowledged in her question, numerous meetings had taken place. Therefore, to say that no action had been taken was simply not true.

Councillor Burrows urged Councillor Allen to get back around the table with officers to focus on progressing the issue to a conclusion which would be beneficial to residents.

Councillor Allen, by way of a supplementary question, advised that the Petition Hearing had taken place in July 2009 and asked why she had only received three emails from officers about the matter since then and why the issue had not yet been resolved.

Councillor Burrows advised that residents had not been able to agree a way forward and it was not the Council's usual practice to impose a scheme on residents that they did not want. Councillor Burrows suggested that Councillor Allen speak to the officers to work on resolving the matter.

8.3 QUESTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR HARMSWORTH TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING – COUNCILLOR BURROWS

“Does the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation have any plans to switch off all or some of the speed cameras in the Borough?”

Councillor Burrows responded that this question allowed him to dispel some of the common myths about 'speed cameras' – technically known as 'safety cameras'. There had been a great deal of national public debate about the merits (or otherwise) of these devices, and the Council's view was that they did have a role to play in some cases, but only if it could be clearly proven that they fulfilled a genuine public service in tackling a real road safety problem.

The Council had no plans to switch off any of the safety cameras in Hillingdon as they were not the Council's to switch off. In London, Transport for London and the

Metropolitan Police were in control of all the safety camera sites. At present, the managing body for these London-wide safety cameras (including the ones in Hillingdon) was the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP). However, like many such bodies, its future was a little uncertain in light of the recent spending review.

Whenever the LSCP identified a possible site for a safety camera in Hillingdon, it always asked the Council for its views on the proposal. As the only sites chosen had been ones which had suffered from especially high rates of serious or fatal injuries, the Council had generally been supportive. However, the Council would not support any initiative which could be misinterpreted as a revenue-earning device to punish motorists. In any case, none of the revenue from penalty notices issued by the Police through the use of these cameras came to the Council.

In London, the boroughs did not directly contribute to the LSCP, so the Council's road safety budgets were not directly affected in the same way that the Shire Counties were. No doubt, however, the Mayor of London and Transport for London would be looking at the future of the camera network.

In summary, Councillor Burrows advised that there were no plans for the Council to switch off any of the cameras as the cameras were not under the control of the Council.

Councillor Harmsworth, by way of a supplementary question, asked whether there were any cameras which Councillor Burrows or the majority group would like switched off or locations where they thought cameras should be installed.

Councillor Burrows advised that, as the Council had been supportive of the cameras that had already been installed, there were none which he would like to see removed. With regard to the installation of new cameras, Councillor Harmsworth was advised that the Council had lobbied the LSCP for the installation of cameras on Ducks Hill Road following a fatality. Although this location was not high on the LSCPs list of priorities, the Council would continue to lobby on the matter.

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

9.1 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR CURLING

Councillor Curling moved the following motion:

"This Council recognises that the habit of spitting in the street is both anti-social and a hazard to public health. Council therefore calls on Cabinet to set out a scheme of public information and education on the subject of spitting in public areas, and consider the introduction of a "No Spitting Zone" throughout the borough."

The motion was seconded by Councillor Allen. Following debate (Councillors Corthorne, D Mills and Simmonds), the motion was put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: That this Council recognises that the habit of spitting in the street is both anti-social and a hazard to public health. Council therefore calls on Cabinet to set out a scheme of public information and education on the subject of spitting in public areas, and consider the introduction of a "No Spitting Zone" throughout the Borough.

ANNEX A - COMPOSITION OF CABINET & PORTFOLIOS

	ANNEX B - AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION
	ANNEX C - PETITION SCHEME
	ANNEX D - RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.40 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.