



# **WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL**

A Meeting of the **COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** will be held at the Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham RG40 1BN on **MONDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2015 AT 7.00 PM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andy Couldrick', written in a cursive style.

Andy Couldrick  
Chief Executive  
Published on 13 November 2015

This meeting may be filmed for inclusion on the Council's website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council's control.

## **Our Vision**

***A great place to live, an even better place to do business***

### ***Our Priorities***

**Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential**

**Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth**

**Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development**

**Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough**

**Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services**

### ***The Underpinning Principles***

**Offer excellent value for your Council Tax**

**Provide affordable homes**

**Look after the vulnerable**

**Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life**

**Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency**

**Deliver quality in all that we do**

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### Councillors

Norman Jorgensen  
(Chairman)  
Ken Miall  
Bill Soane

Michael Firmager (Vice-  
Chairman)  
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey  
Shahid Younis

Chris Bowring  
David Sleight

### Substitutes

Mark Ashwell  
Alison Swaddle

Lindsay Ferris

Tom McCann

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
10.		<p><b>APOLOGIES</b> To receive any apologies for absence.</p>	
11.		<p><b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b> To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2015.</p>	5 - 8
12.		<p><b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</b> To receive any declarations of interest.</p>	
13.		<p><b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME</b> To answer any public questions</p> <p>A period of 30 minutes will be allowed for members of the public to ask questions submitted under notice.</p> <p>The Council welcomes questions from members of the public about the work of this committee.</p> <p>Subject to meeting certain timescales, questions can relate to general issues concerned with the work of the Committee or an item which is on the Agenda for this meeting. For full details of the procedure for submitting questions please contact the Democratic Services Section on the numbers given below or go to <a href="http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/publicquestions">www.wokingham.gov.uk/publicquestions</a></p>	
14.		<p><b>MEMBER QUESTION TIME</b> To answer any member questions.</p>	
15.		<p><b>COUNCIL POLICY ON HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION</b> To receive and consider an update from the Executive Member for Highways and Planning on Council Policy on Houses of Multiple Occupation.</p>	9 - 14

**16. ROAD REPAIRS - IMPACT OF EXPECTED INITIATIVES AROUND CUSTOMER SERVICE AND PUBLIC AND WARD MEMBER ROAD REPAIR NOTIFICATIONS.**  
To discuss the issue including impact of expected initiatives around customer service and public and ward Member road repair notifications so the Committee can seek assurance that current arrangements are effective.

**17. WORK PROGRAMME** **15 - 20**  
To consider the Committee's work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

**18. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT**  
A Supplementary Agenda will be issued by the Chief Executive if there are any other items to consider under this heading.

	<b>CONTACT OFFICER</b>
<b>Colm Ó Caomhánaigh,</b>	Tel 0118 974 6059 Email
<b>Democratic Services</b>	colm.ocaomhanaigh@wokingham.gov.uk
<b>Officer</b>	
<b>Tel</b>	0118 974 6059
<b>Email</b>	colm.ocaomhanaigh@wokingham.gov.uk
<b>Postal Address</b>	Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 19 OCTOBER 2015 AT 7.05 - 8.15 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Chris Bowring, Michael Firmager, Norman Jorgensen, Ken Miall, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Shahid Younis

**Other Councillors Present**

Mark Ashwell, Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Committees; and Tim Holton

**Officers Present**

Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer  
Bernie Pich, Head of Town Centre Regeneration Scheme

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE 2015/16 MUNICIPAL YEAR**

The Secretary called for nominations for Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

It was proposed by Michael Firmager and seconded by Chris Bowring that Norman Jorgensen be elected as Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

It was unanimously agreed that Norman Jorgensen should be elected as Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

**2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE 2015/16 MUNICIPAL YEAR**

The Chairman called for nominations for Vice-Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

It was proposed by Norman Jorgensen and seconded by Ken Miall that Michael Firmager be elected as Vice-Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

It was unanimously agreed that Michael Firmager should be elected as Vice-Chairman for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

**3. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from David Sleight (substituted by Alison Swaddle) and Bill Soane.

**4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

**6. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

**6.1 Question submitted by Councillor Prue Bray  
Question**

At what date will the Wokingham town centre regeneration project reach the point at which it has brought in more money than has been spent on it?

## **Answer**

The financial viability appraisal is based on realising the full value of all constructed assets 2 years post project completion (allowing for rent free periods). At this point, assuming all assets were sold, the value realised would exceed the cost incurred. Debt will be held for a longer period depending on how many assets are realised and at what point they are realised. Decisions on the exact approach have yet to be made. Once the full value of commercial assets are realised (sold) the associated revenue stream is foregone.

## **Supplementary Question**

Given the squeeze on the Council's finances and the high spend involved in this scheme, are you confident that the scheme is going to work and that it will not increase the strain on finances in years to come?

## **Supplementary Answer**

The funds required are already allocated and should not be a problem for the Council. We expect that we will realise a substantial return from the scheme.

## **7. REVIEW OF TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION SCHEME**

Mark Ashwell, Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Committees and Mr Bernie Pich, Head of Town Centre Regeneration, gave the Committee an update on the town centre regeneration scheme.

Mark Ashwell reminded Members of the objectives of the scheme and that any profit that may result would be a by-product and would be then reinvested in schemes for other parts of the Borough. He gave an overview of the mechanisms used to mitigate risk such as appraisal reviews, viability testing, independent financial reviews, market testing etc.

Bernie Pich spoke about financial tools such as cost plans and rental value forecasts, the details of which were laid out in Part 2 of the report. He said that data is reviewed and updated at key points.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey questioned whether it was correct to exempt the financial information in the report from public disclosure. She suggested that information relating to proposed development for which the local planning authority may grant itself planning permission was not exempt.

The meeting adjourned to take advice on this matter.

Following the adjournment it was agreed that discussion of the financial part of the report be deferred to the next meeting so that legal advice could be obtained.

Members asked how long the regeneration scheme is likely to have an impact and what happens after the scheme is complete. There were also questions about the type of retailers the scheme attracts or retains, the level of control the Council has over retailers, the likely impact of internet sales and any likely return from the scheme.

Bernie Pich told the meeting that they had identified that intervention was needed to regenerate the town centre but it was hoped that it wouldn't be needed again when the scheme is complete. They hope to be in a position to start regeneration schemes in the Borough's other towns about two years after completion - that would be 2022 but they can plan ahead of that. It was necessary to retain some big name stores but the rents charged were attractive to small independent retailers too. The Council could control some aspects

through lease agreements but they couldn't control everything that happens so they try to identify the key issues. He said that they were not concentrating only on retail businesses but that much of the current growth was in the café/restaurant sector.

Mark Ashwell told Members that they could discriminate positively in favour of types of business they want to attract. He said that the scheme must not be a cost to the taxpayer and the Council had aimed for a 5% return as a contingency and that current predictions are above that figure.

**RESOLVED:** That the report, excluding the financial information, be noted and that discussion of the financial information be deferred to the next Meeting pending legal advice.

## **8. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered the Work Programme as set out on Agenda pages 157 to 162.

The Committee noted the proposed work programme. The Secretary told the meeting that the report relating to Houses of Multiple Occupation was ready.

Concern was expressed that Government legislation on the Right to Buy Scheme might not be passed before the next Committee meeting in November. The Chairman said that he would keep that item under review.

It was noted that the financial information of the Review of the Town Centre Regeneration Scheme may be on the next Agenda, pending legal advice.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## **Controls over HMOs**

### **Legislative Controls**

There are a number of approaches that can be taken to address issues caused by Houses in Multiple Occupations (HMOs) some of which are informal in nature and others which are controlled by legislation. The legislative controls are Licencing, Environmental Protection (statutory nuisance) and the Planning System. For information, the Licencing and Environmental Protection (statutory nuisance) service are provided by the Shared Service which is hosted by West Berkshire Council. However, the responsible authority for these services remains Wokingham Borough Council as the shared service only administers these services on behalf of the Council. The legislation governing the shared service and the relevant policies are the same as they would be if the service was administered by WBC. The planning regulatory service is in house. Below is an explanation of these legislative controls and this paper then addresses some of the non-regulatory approaches that could be considered to address HMOs.

### **Licencing**

In accordance with the legislation, a licence for a HMO is needed only when there are more than 5 residents where the building is 3 stories plus in height. Under the licencing system, issues that can be addressed focus on safety to ensure that the standard of accommodation is acceptable for the residents of the HMOs. In accordance with the licencing legislation, the only criteria that can be addressed are:-

- That the proposed licence holder and any manager of the property is a fit and proper person;
- That the proposed licence holder is the most appropriate person to hold the licence;
- That proper management standards are being applied at the property;
- That the HMO is reasonably suitable, or can be made suitable, for occupation by the number of tenants allowed under the licence with at least the minimum prescribed standards of amenities and facilities. These include the number, type and quality of shared bathrooms, toilets and cooking facilities.

### **Environmental Protection (statutory nuisance)**

Noise and disturbance issues can be addressed by environmental protection legislation (statutory nuisance). In respect of HMOs, noise can result from the building operations to convert the property or ongoing noise from occupants of the HMOs. There is no legislative control over noise and disturbance unless it is excessive. In these cases, the Council's normal approach would be to get the parties to talk to each other to try to resolve the issues amicably. Where this fails there is a standard procedure to investigate and serve an abatement (stop) notice with criminal offences created if the notice is not adhered to.

### **Planning**

The change of use of a dwelling to a HMO with 7 occupiers or more needs planning permission. If a planning application is submitted then the issues that can be addressed include the impact on parking, highway safety and neighbour amenity. If the use of the

property includes 7 people or more and does not have planning permission, this will be investigated by the planning enforcement team and if a breach of planning control is found, the Council will seek to resolve this through a negotiated solution. If this cannot be achieved, the expediency of taking action will be assessed and an enforcement notice served if expedient to do so. The Council is unable to take any action against potential future breaches of planning control. The breach must exist and be evidenced before any action can be taken.

A HMO of 6 or fewer people who are living together as a family unit is permitted development and does not need planning permission. In these cases, there is no planning control. As such, the impact of a HMO upon parking provision or neighbour amenity etc cannot be taken into account.

There are existing planning policies contained in the Core Strategy and the MDD Local Plan to address noise and disturbance and visual amenity. However, the Council does not have a separate parking standard for HMOs which are considered as normal family dwellings under the current standards. This has made it very difficult for planning applications for the larger HMOs that need planning permission to be refused on parking grounds.

There is an opportunity to reconsider the parking standards for HMOs to identify if the current standards are appropriate. However, this will require evidence to be collected at considerable expense and there is currently no resource for this.

Any further planning policy would need to be part of a local plan to have any significant weight and this would need to form part of the local plan review which will take a minimum of 2 years. A Supplementary Planning Document could provide further guidance against which planning applications could be considered but again, the resource associated with this and the time period for preparation and public consultation would be considerable. To do this in-house would be at the expense of planning application and enforcement work. This would need to be backed up by evidence that HMOs are causing issues across the borough to have any weight if an application was refused and challenged at appeal.

### **Position in Wokingham Borough**

The Council understands that HMO accommodation can lead to problems for local residents who live in the vicinity. Many of the problems arise from the intensification of the use of a HMO property and if there is a concentration of these, the cumulative impact can have significant consequences on the amenity of nearby occupiers. Many of the problems are associated with increased pressure on parking and other facilities. However, there have also been complaints from local residents about the behaviour of the occupiers of the HMOs.

In the past, the Council has received complaints about HMOs in an area known as Shinfield Park. This site is also known as the Former Met Office Site which received planning permission in 2005 for approximately 300 residential units. The development is comprised of 3 storey apartments and terraced town houses, and some detached properties and two storey properties.

Recently, in respect of HMOs, complaints have been received from 3 individuals who have raised concerns about HMO use of 15 properties at Shinfield Park. It has been requested by these residents that the HMO licences are revoked on the basis of anti-social behaviour. However, many do not require a licence for the reasons explained above, and as the licence can only address the quality of the residential accommodation, the Council is unable to revoke the licence on the basis of anti-social behaviour. Further, if the Council refused to grant any further licences on the basis of these problems being experienced by local residents, this could be challenged through the courts and this would constitute mal-administration by the Council as only the quality and safety of the accommodation can be addressed under the licence.

The Council's Community Wardens have been in contact with residents, landlords and tenants at Shinfield Park to try and resolve the issues associated with the HMO properties. The management company responsible for a number of the HMO properties has been discussing these matters with the residents association to try and resolve the problems being experienced. The Council's Environmental Health team have been to the site on a number of occasions but there is no statutory nuisance occurring and therefore they have no power to address this issue under the Environmental Protection legislation.

There have been reports of problems associated with car parking at Shinfield Park and some of the residents of the HMOs have been parking in other residents allocated car parking spaces. The Shinfield Park estate was granted planning permission when the Council's car parking standards required a reduced level of parking relative to the current position as was required by Government at the time. As some of the roads have not been adopted by the Council it is the responsibility of the residents through the residents association to enforce issues relating to parking on these roads and in the private car parking areas. On the roads that have been adopted, to date the police has been the agency responsible to take any action in respect of inconsiderate parking. However, as the Council has now agreed to adopt Civil Parking Enforcement, this matter can be addressed by the Council in the future (see below).

Outside of Shinfield Park, complaints about HMOs across the rest of the borough are sporadic and isolated. There is no evidence that there is any other geographical concentration of HMOs in Wokingham Borough that result in any major issues. Some members have mentioned that the ward of Whitenights experiences issues associated with HMOs. However, the Licencing, Environmental Health and Planning teams are not aware of any significant complaints or cases in this area.

### **Options for further Control**

As addressed above, there is no option available to the Council to address existing regulated HMOs under the licencing regulations unless this is on the grounds of quality or safety of the accommodation. However, the Council has sympathy and understands that HMOs uses can lead to noise and disturbance experienced to local residents. As such, the Council will continue to work with residents, resident associations and management companies/ landlords to try and address such problems informally. If the problems are excessive, it can take action under the Environmental Health legislation.

Under the planning System there is no power to be able to take any action against HMOs that have been granted planning permission, have become lawful through passage of time, or that have been implemented under permitted development rights. The only formal planning action that can be taken at present is to address unauthorised HMOs and to consider how HMOs will be addressed in the future.

There is a provision within the legislation to remove rights for permitted development through an Article 4 Direction to prevent further smaller HMOs without the need for planning permission. These would then need to be assessed in the same way as a planning application for larger HMO schemes. Any Article 4 Direction must be justified on planning grounds and must be referred to the National Planning Policy Casework Unit. The SoS has the right to intervene in this process if he feels that the Article 4 Direction is not justified.

### **Article 4 Direction**

Central Government is deregulating and removing much of the “red tape” around planning and extending the right for people to undertake certain types of development without the need for planning permission. Any restriction through increased planning control by an Article 4 Direction would be considered in this context and would be contrary to this general approach.

There are number of examples of local authorities having served Article 4 Directions to prevent the current permitted change of use of properties to smaller HMOs without the need for planning permission. These include Worcester City Council, Torbay Borough Council, Reading Borough Council, and Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council.

In the Worcester Article 4 example, the reason that this was made was mainly due to the impact of the concentration of student houses in the city that has very tightly defined boundaries. In the Torbay case, this was due to the impact of tourism that reduced the amount of accommodation available for local residents. In both these cases, the temporary occupation by certain groups of people had an impact on the area and then on the flip side, so did vacancy during certain times of the year which effected the vibrancy of these areas and the viability of services.

In the case of Reading, again this was as a result of student housing but this did differ from the two examples above as it related only to specific areas rather than the whole borough.

The most similar authority to us experiencing the HMO issue is Basingstoke. This is because Basingstoke serves the Greater Reading area and experiences the same pressures as Shinfield for HMOs, to accommodate young professional people.

The officer who dealt with this issue at Basingstoke has provided some advice to WBC Officers. He felt that the main reason that the Article 4 was not overruled by SoS when referred to him in accordance with the regulations because the authority limited the Article 4 Direction to a small number of very contained areas where it could be demonstrated that HMOs were more common. He indicated that the smaller the area, the less scrutiny that the Article 4 would come under by the case work unit and the greater likelihood that it would not be challenged by the Secretary of State. Furthermore, because the areas were specific and

small in scale, the impact could be more clearly identified. Thus, more justification could be provided.

In light of the above, it is recommended that if the Council resolves in the future to prepare an Article 4 Direction, this should focus on those areas where HMOs are concentrated. In order to justify an Article 4 Direction the Council would need to collect evidence that HMOs are causing issues and it is considered that it would be able to provide a more robust argument about the need for the direction in a concentrated area experiencing these issues. Generally, it is considered that a wider approach across the whole borough could not be justified as it could not be demonstrated that there is a need for the restriction. This is especially in light of the central government approach to deregulation.

It appears that issues being experienced as a result of HMOs are focussed in one area of the borough namely Shinfield Park. The impact of these issues in this area is greater given the concentration of HMOs and as a result of a limited parking ratio per property as planning permission was granted at a time when central government parking requirements were low. It could be argued that it is appropriate to focus on this development to identify if an Article 4 Direction and justified primarily on parking grounds but also in respect of the impact of further HMOs on the character of the area. However, undertaking this work would take considerable time and resource and in reality, only affect the few remaining properties that are not already HMOs in this area. Furthermore, as one year's notice of the Article 4 Direction must be given to avoid the Council having to pay compensation, the effect of the Article 4 Direction could be to encourage the owners of the remaining family properties in the area to convert these to HMOs ahead of the implementation of the Article 4 Direction thus exacerbating the problems being experienced.

In light of the above, it is considered that an Article 4 Direction may not be the most effective way of addressing the problems associated with HMOs in Shinfield Park. The resource involved to implement the Article 4 would be considerable and as this cannot address existing HMOs, the impact is likely to be minimal. However, the Council understands the issues and problems being experienced by Shinfield Park residents and will continue to work with residents and landlords to address the problems being experienced. There are other options available to the council that are likely to be more effective to address the issues and these include Civil Parking Enforcement (see below) in addition to a continued community safety focus to seek to resolve the issues through a negotiated solution.

### **Civil Parking Enforcement**

From complaints received, the biggest issue associated with HMOs appears to be problems associated with the inconsiderate and indiscriminate parking of motor vehicles by the occupiers. In the area where HMOs cause the most problems, this is compounded by limited parking provision. In September 2015, the Council's Executive resolved to take responsibility for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). It is anticipated that this will be implemented as soon as possible and as a result, the Council will have the ability to challenge and take action against indiscriminate and dangerous parking, and to work with the communities to focus resources upon areas where the parking problems are the greatest. The Council will be able

to work with local residents and Parish Council focus resource on areas such as Shinfield Park to address the problems on a regular basis.

Another opportunity that the Council could help local residents and Town/Parish Council's to explore is in looking at opportunities for areas within estates to be converted to provide additional parking in areas that are clearly experiencing parking problems and that have below current standard parking provision.

Civil Parking enforcement and working with the community to address additional parking opportunities are considered to be a far more effective and immediate solution to address car parking issues that HMOs are causing for local residents in the borough.

## **Summary**

The Council understands that HMOs can lead to significant problems within communities as a result of the intensification of use that they cause placing additional pressures on existing facilities such as parking provision and in giving rise to some antisocial behaviour, noise and disturbance. While some of these issues can be addressed through a number of different regulatory controls, many of the solutions are informal in nature.

In Wokingham Borough, there is a concentration of HMOs in parts of Shinfield and this has given rise to a number of complaints. The complaints primarily focus on parking problems and antisocial behaviour. The most effective way to address the parking issues is through the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement, in concentrating resources on those areas that experience problems associated HMOs and inconsiderate parking by the occupiers. If the parking provision on these estates is substandard, the Council can explore opportunities for additional parking provision if the local residents and Town and Parish Council's support this.

For issues associated with noise and disturbance and antisocial behaviour, the Council's Community Services Teams will continue to address resident's concerns working with landlords and management companies to try and resolve these issues amicably. In cases where there are significant issues of anti-social behaviour, the Council will use its powers under statutory nuisance legislation to address this.

There are limited controls against HMOs at present in the borough through the planning system. While some authorities have sought Article 4 Direction to restrict HMOs, these are usually in areas experiencing significant pressure for HMO accommodation which is only experienced in very small pockets in Wokingham Borough. It is unlikely that the Council would be successful in securing a borough-wide Article 4 Direction and there would need to be significant work undertaken to support this at significant cost. Even for a smaller area, there would be significant resource required to collect the evidence to justify this. Furthermore, any Article 4 would require a 12 month notice period to be applied before it could be implemented that would be likely to encourage early conversion of properties to HMOs in high pressure areas thus exacerbating the issues and problems experienced. As many of the HMOs in Shinfield Park are existing and cannot be controlled by any future Article 4, the effectiveness of this would be likely to be insignificant.

**COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**Work Programme from November 2015**

**Please note that the work programme is a 'live' document and subject to change at short notice.  
The information in this work programme is subject to approval at the Committee meeting scheduled for  
23 November 2015**

*The order in which items are listed at this stage may not reflect the order they subsequently appear on the agenda / are dealt with  
at the scrutiny meeting.*

**All Meetings start at 7.00pm in the Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, unless otherwise stated.**

**COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16**

<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR CONSIDERATION</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER</b>
<b>20 Jan 2016</b>	<b>To assess and review and the potential impact of the Government's Right to Buy Scheme</b>	To consider how to progress a review of this scrutiny review subject.	Review referred to the Committee by the Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee	Stuart Rowbotham/ Simon Price
	<b>Review of Town Centre Regeneration Scheme</b>	To consider the business case for the regeneration of the town centre and to scope the review	Referred to the Committee by the OSMC	Mark Ashwell / Bernie Pich
	<b>Review of Outside Bodies Appointments</b>	This will enable the Committee to seek reassurance regarding the Council's appointment to these outside bodies.	Transferred from Community Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	Mark Ashwell



	<b>Update on Review of the Voluntary Sector by the Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities</b>	Following on from the work of the Community Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee to receive an update from the Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Community Services on the review of voluntary sector outside bodies.	Transferred from Community Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	Mark Ashwell/ Brian Grady
	<b>Work Programme</b>	To consider the work programme for the committee for 2015/2016 so that the resources of the committee can be used as effectively as possible.	Standing Item	Democratic Services

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
14 Mar 2016	<b>Update on the Progress of the Community Café at Shutters, Wokingham Borough Council</b>	To consider an update report on how the project has developed from the group of young people running the Café in order that the Committee can understand the impact and value added of the project.	Requested by the Community Partnership O & S Committee in March 2015  <i>(Transferred from the Community Partnerships O &amp; S Forward Programme)</i>	Brian Grady
	<b>Work Programme</b>	To consider the work programme for the committee for 2015/2016 so that the resources of the committee can be used as effectively as possible.	Standing Item	Democratic Services

**POTENTIAL ITEMS FOR REVIEW REFERRED FROM  
THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
TBC	<b>Possible income generation possibilities from the Cross Rail project</b>	To consider possible income generation opportunities from the Crossrail project.	Referred to the Community Partnerships O & S Committee by the Overview & Scrutiny Management  <i>(Transferred from the Community Partnerships O &amp; S Committee Forward Programme).</i>	

**This page is intentionally left blank**